

SCTMG 2020

International Scientific Conference «Social and Cultural Transformations in the Context of Modern Globalism»

FEATURES OF SAFE BEHAVIOR IN VARIOUS SOCIAL, CULTURAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Pavel Kislyakov (a)*, Elena Shmeleva (a, b), Olga Silaeva (a, b), Nataliya Belyakova (a),
Dmitriy Savchenko (a)
*Corresponding author

(a) Russian State Social University, Wilhelm Pieck str., 4, Moscow, 129226, Russia, pack.81@mail.ru,
(b) Ivanovo State University, Kooperativnaya Str., 24, Shuya, 155908, Russia, noc_shmeleva@mail.ru

Abstract

The article studies the characteristics of respondents' choice of a type of safe prosocial behavior depending on the socio-cultural and economic conditions of the region of residence. For safe prosocial behavior, the focus on safe existence of other people and society as a whole is crucial. The hypothesis is the assumption that there are regional differences in preferences to help other people. Internet survey techniques and the variance analysis were used. The calculations were based on the SPPS 17. 963 people from 14 regions of the Russian Federation participated in the empirical study. The age range was 17–62 years old, 221 respondents (23 %) were men, 742 respondents (77 %) were women. The purpose of the study is to analyze and identify features of typical preferences in choosing types of safe prosocial behavior of groups of people on the basis of a territorial community (region). The data indicate that ideas about safe prosocial behavior are based on the socio-cultural and economic conditions of the regions and depend on universal values and civic identity.

2357-1330 © 2020 Published by European Publisher.

Keywords: Safe prosocial behavior, typical perceptions, regions.



1. Introduction

In modern conditions, in the context of national security support, it is necessary to develop socio-psychological foundations for the development of prosocial behavior oriented towards the help to other people and society in children, youth and the population as a whole. Many spiritual, moral, and sociocultural guidelines and social norms have been lost, including duties towards another person or a group of people who are in difficult life situations and need help.

Prosocial behavior is a way of conscious and purposeful manifestation of social activity for the benefit of other people. Such activities cover various social actions (help, support, donation, etc.) that aim to help other people (Grishunina & Pyatakova, 2014; Kislyakov et al., 2019; Shamionov & Grigoryev, 2019).

Prosocial behavior is determined by many factors that contribute to or impede acts of care. Prosocial behavior is a result of interaction with other people and the environment (Poghosyan, 2019; Svetsitsky, 2018). This environment is characterized by requirements, rules, traditions, customs, assimilated values, patterns, models, norms of desirable, permissible behavior that dominate the culture. Interest and a positive attitude towards people, concern for others, moral support and judgments can act as determinants of prosocial behavior. The likelihood of helping other people and society can be affected by external conditions, features of the territorial community (region).

2. Problem Statement

An analysis of the prosocial behavior reveals a huge layer of factors that determine the development of the individual, as well as the uniqueness of the structure and models of this type of behavior. In social psychology, several motives of prosocial behavior are distinguished: religious motives; a desire to help other people; a way of self-realization and an opportunity to be socially useful to society; a way to find like-minded people and spend leisure time; a desire to participate in interesting activities; creative implementation; social skills development.

3. Research Questions

Social behavior is a projection of sociocultural matrices (i.e., norms and values of consciousness) and prescriptions that dominate in a particular social environment (Gritsenko & Kovaleva, 2014). It is assumed that the external conditions associated with the characteristics of the region of residence may affect the specifics of preference of prosocial practices. There may be regional differences in prosocial behavior. The article analyzes preferred forms of safe prosocial behavior chosen by residents of various territorial communities (regions).

An analysis of studies on safe prosocial behavior showed that an essential characteristic is the focus on safe existence in modern society, orientation on the common good, minimization of social risks (national, cultural, moral), and willingness to confront risk factors (Curcuruto et al., 2015; Kislyakov et al., 2019).

Robinson and Piff (2017) found that for lower-SES individuals prosocial behavior is a contextually adaptive response that serves to increase control over threatening social environments).

Another study found that representatives of a lower socioeconomic status act more prosocially because of a greater commitment to egalitarian values and feelings of compassion.

The studies in Russian regions showed that there are differences in prosocial behavior of students living in a megalopolis, a regional center, and a town (Akimova & Persiyantseva, 2019a). Students of a metropolis interact with others under the influence of accepted standards in comparison with the students from towns; the latter base their behavior on individual-personality relationships and situational characteristics (Akimova & Persiyantseva, 2019b).

4. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to identify typical ideas about safe prosocial behavior formed on the basis of territorial communities (regions), in various socio-cultural and economic conditions: metropolis – Moscow; a region in conditions of civil and political transitivity – the Republic of Crimea; depressed regions – Ivanovo region, Kostroma region; regions in the conditions of a stable ethnosociocultural identity – Republic of Mordovia, Karachay-Cherkess Republic; stable developing regions – Kaluga region, Yaroslavl region, Moscow region; regions with special climatic and geographical conditions: Tyumen region, Komi Republic, Novosibirsk region, Rostov region, Sverdlovsk region.

5. Research Methods

The sample included 963 people living in 14 regions of the Russian Federation: Moscow (24.4 %) and Moscow Region (11.32 %), Republic of Mordovia (10.07 %), Crimea (2.8 %), Komi (2, 7 %), Karachay-Cherkessia (11.63 %), Ivanovo (14.95 %), Yaroslavl (2.6 %), Tyumen (2.28 %), Rostov (3.84 %), Novosibirsk (2, 49 %), Sverdlovsk (2.6 %), Kostroma (6.02 %) and Kaluga regions (2.28 %). 23 % were men, 77 % were women aged 17-62 years old. The study involved people representing similar age groups, but differing in their place of residence.

To identify preferences in choosing types of prosocial behavior, a questionnaire was used. Respondents were asked to evaluate the degree of significance of different types of prosocial behavior (1 – not important, 5 – very important). To collect data, an Internet survey was carried out. The answers were processed using qualitative and quantitative methods: content analysis, ranking, variance analysis.

6. Findings

The significance of types of prosocial behavior was assessed by calculating the total score for the answers “4” and “5” for each of the 29 points of the questionnaire. The first quartile (X) was determined. Its content is the most preferred types of prosocial behavior (table 01).

Table 01. Assessment of the importance of types of prosocial behavior in various regions of Russia

Types of prosocial behavior	Ivanovo	Moscow	Moscow region	Mordovia	Yaroslavl	Crimea	Tyumen	Komi	Rostov	Karachay-Cherkes Republic	Novosibirsk	Sverdlovsk region	Kostroma region	Kaluga region
Assistance to people who need money						X								
Fundraising for socially vulnerable groups				X		X	X	X		X	X			X
Assistance to people with disabilities, older people in public places	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Assistance to boarding houses, centers for the elderly and disabled	X			X			X	X			X			X
Provide emotional support to people in difficult life situations	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Participation in environmental campaigns	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Landscaping	X	X			X	X		X	X	X			X	
Help homeless animals		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	
Participate in the promotion of cultural traditions.														
Participate in the conservation of historical and cultural monuments														
Landscape memorial sites and military graves	X		X						X		X		X	
Help veterans	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Organize religious events														
Assist in the restoration of religious buildings														
Organize sports events														
Promote a healthy lifestyle	X	X	X		X	X	X	X			X	X		X
Donate blood and its components					X		X					X		
Take part in protests														
Participate in mass mourning and sorrow actions														
Be a volunteer in emergency situations														
Assist in searching for missing people				X		X								X

Provide volunteer assistance in the Internet environment																			
Be a national warrior																			
Be proactive and report abuses																			
Show negative attitudes towards corruption																		X	
Report dangerous (illegal) Internet content																			
Participate in educational work, educational programs																			
Be a mentor or a tutor																			
Participate in social projects of your institution / organization																			

Representatives of most regions indicated such important types of prosocial behavior as helping people with disabilities and older people in public places, empathy, emotional support and helping people in difficult situations, helping veterans, interacting with veteran organizations, and helping homeless animals (donations or care), promoting the healthy lifestyle, prevention of diseases, participation in organizing health days.

By the popularity, the improvement of memorial sites and military burials, assistance in perpetuating the memory of those who defended the Fatherland, assistance in caring for people, organizing leisure time in boarding houses, centers for the elderly and disabled, participation in landscaping (tree planting, garbage collection in forest, subbotnik in the yard, etc.) were included in the second group.

Blood donation, assistance in the search for missing people, demonstration of a negative attitude to corruption are less important types preferred by a small number of residents.

An analysis of the results showed that residents of Ivanovo, Yaroslavl, and Novosibirsk regions, and the Komi Republic prefer types of prosocial behavior aimed at helping people in difficult life situations, preserving the living environment and landscaping (ecology and healthy lifestyle).

Residents of Moscow and Moscow region, Rostov, Sverdlovsk and Kostroma regions, Karachay-Cherkessia, and Crimea help homeless animals, but are less willing to care for people, organize leisure activities in boarding houses and centers for the elderly and disabled.

Respondents from the Republic of Mordovia, Kaluga and Novosibirsk regions indicated their readiness to collect donations for socially vulnerable groups of people and provide assistance in searching for missing people. Mordovians, as well as residents of Tyumen region and Karachay-Cherkessia, are less likely to contribute to the healthy lifestyle, while respondents from Kaluga region would like to improve territories and memorial places.

Residents of the Republic of Crimea are ready to help people in difficult life situations, maintain and preserve the environment, collect donations for people and animals, donate money (they turned out to be the only ones who prefer this form of charity in the first quartile of preferences). However, the forms

of prosocial behavior associated with perpetuating the memory of the dead and assistance to veterans turned out to be less significant for them, as well as for residents of Yaroslavl, Tyumen, Sverdlovsk, Kaluga regions, the Republics of Mordovia, Komi, and Karachay-Cherkessia.

Representatives of Sverdlovsk region indicated demonstration of a negative attitude towards corruption as an important type of prosocial behavior. Along with residents of Yaroslavl region, they prefer blood donation and its components.

Such forms as participation in festivals, competitions, concerts, exhibitions, popularization of cultural traditions, preservation of historical and cultural monuments, participation in religious mass events, holidays, assistance in the restoration of religious buildings (temples, mosques, etc.), participation in sports events (Olympic games, Paralympic games, championships), rallies and demonstrations to draw attention to social problems, mass actions of mourning and grief, volunteerism, volunteer assistance in the Internet environment, assistance to law enforcement agencies in protecting public order, active citizenship and reporting of offenses, dangerous (illegal) Internet content (drug propaganda, extremism, malicious computer programs, etc.), participation in educational activities and programs, mentoring, corporate volunteering were not included in the the first quartile of typical ideas about safe prosocial behavior.

The analysis of variance identified significant differences in typical ideas about safe prosocial behavior only in 16 out of 29 types, including 9 types from the first quartile.

For residents of Kostroma region, safe prosocial behavior is associated with assistance to poor people ($F = 4.03$, $p < 0.05$), empathy, emotional support, and assistance to people in difficult life situations ($F = 4.52$, $p < 0.01$), improvement of territories ($F = 4.34$, $p < 0.05$), memorial sites and military burial places, contributing to the perpetuation of the memory of those who died in defense of the Fatherland ($F = 4.4$, $p < 0.01$), assistance to veterans ($F = 4.55$, $p < 0.05$) and search for missing people ($F = 4.36$, $p < 0.038$). At the same time, Kostroma region ranks 60th by living standards, 55th – by health conservation practices, and there is a high percentage of disabled there.

For the Republic of Crimea, safe prosocial behavior is associated with collection of donations for socially vulnerable groups of the population ($F = 4.14$, $p < 0.01$), assistance to people with disabilities, elderly people in public places ($F = 4.48$, $p < 0.05$), demonstration of a negative attitude to corruption ($F = 4.05$, $p < 0.05$).

Residents of Ivanovo region associate safe prosocial behavior with care for people, organizing leisure activities in boarding houses, centers for the elderly and disabled ($F = 4.39$, $p < 0.05$)

It is noteworthy that the Republic of Crimea, Kostroma and Ivanovo Regions occupy far from leading positions in the living standards ranking, have a large share of disabled and are developing volunteer practices.

7. Conclusion

For residents of most regions, the most popular type of prosocial behavior is care for the environment, nature, and participation in environmental campaigns. The choice reflects the global nature of preferred types of prosocial behavior associated with safety and preservation of the human environment. However, the specifics of preferred prosocial practices are influenced by sociocultural and economic factors. There are differences in the preferred types of safe prosocial behavior in residents of

various territorial communities (regions). Typical ideas about safe prosocial behavior are based on the socio-cultural and economic conditions of the regions, and depend on universal values and civic identity.

Acknowledgments

The study was funded by the RFBR as part of the research project No 18-313-20001.

References

- Akimova, M. K., & Persiyantseva, S. V. (2019a). Regional features of helping behavior (for example, student youth). *Vector sci. of Togliatti State Univer. Ser. Pedag., Psychol.*, 2(37), 51–56. <https://doi.org/10.18323/2221-5662-2019-2-51-56>
- Akimova, M. K., & Persiyantseva, S. V. (2019b). The influence of normativity and specific situational factors on the prosocial behavior of young people in different regional samples. *The world of pedag. and psychol.*, 9(38), 118–127.
- Curcuruto, M., Conchie, S. M., Mariani, M. G., & Violante, F. S. (2015). The role of prosocial and proactive safety behaviors in predicting safety performance. *Safety Sci.*, 80, 317–323.
- Grishunina, E. V., & Pyatakova, E. N. (2014). Characteristics of the personality of volunteers. *Quest. of Psychol.*, 5, 71–78.
- Gritsenko, V. V., & Kovaleva, Y. V. (2014). Correlation of Values of Culture with Standards and Types of Prosocial Behavior of Russians and Byelorussians. *Psychol. J.*, 35(4), 56–67.
- Kislyakov, P., Shmelyova, E., Silaeva, O., & Steklova, Y. (2019). Prosocial Predictors of personality Tolerance in Youth. *European Proceedings of Social & Behavioural Sciences, SCTCMG 2018*, 888–894.
- Kislyakov, P. A., Shmeleva, E. A., & Gowin, O. (2019). Contemporary volunteering in the formation of prosocial behaviour of a person. *Obrazov. i Nauka*, 21(6), 122–145.
- Poghosyan, V. G. (2019). Methodological aspects of the study of social behavior. *Social Policy and Sociol.*, 18(1), 132–139.
- Robinson, A. R., & Piff, P. K. (2017). Deprived, but not depraved: Prosocial behavior is an adaptive response to lower socioeconomic status. *Behavioral and brain Sci.*, 40, e341. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X17001108>
- Shamionov, R. M., & Grigoryev, A. V. (2019). The image of socially active individual in the representations of student youth. *Int. J. of Cognitive Res. in Sci., Engineer. and Ed.*, 7(1), 15–20.
- Sventsitsky, A. (2018). Assistance in the field of organizational civic behavior. *Psikhologicheskii zhurnal*, 39(6), 95–101. <https://doi.org/10.31857/S020595920002255-6>