Strong Alone, Stronger Together:
The Role of Collectivism, Individualism, Egoism, and Self-Efficacy in the Prosocial Behavior of Flood Volunteers

[*Strong Alone, Stronger Together:*
Peran Kolektivisme, Individualisme, Egoisme, dan Efikasi Diri Pada Perilaku Prososial Relawan Banjir]

Muhammad Abdan Shadiqi, Sri Lestari Handayani, Aulia Nur Azizah,
Laras Aliffya Aziza, & Marina Dwi Mayangsari
Program Studi Psikologi, Fakultas Kedokteran
Universitas Lambung Mangkurat

In natural disaster conditions, such as floods, there are always disaster volunteers involved in assisting the people affected. Although this is the case, empirical information related to the prosocial behavior of disaster volunteers (such as during floods) is still limited. Several studies concerning prosocial behavior in Indonesia were more focused on this prosocial behavior using general samples, and those of social volunteers (not in the context of natural disasters). This study was aimed at testing the role of cultural values (collectivism and individualism), self-efficacy, and egoism (egoistic motives), regarding the prosocial behavior of flood volunteers. The authors conducted an online cross-sectional survey, of 150 volunteers involved at the time of the large-scale flood disaster in South Kalimantan, in 2021. In the study, the authors utilized measuring instruments which had already passed through a cross-cultural adaption process, and which have been proven to have satisfactory reliability and validity. The participants were chosen through purposive sampling technique, with the criteria being them having been flood volunteers in South Kalimantan and being 18 years or more of age. The results of bivariate correlation testing indicated that only the values of collectivism and self-efficacy were significantly correlated to prosocial behavior. Multiple regression testing found identical results, that partially, the values of collectivism and self-efficacy significantly predicted prosocial behavior, whilst the other variables (the values of individualism and egoistic motives) were not significant. The results of these findings illustrated that the high level of prosocial behavior by flood volunteers was explained by the presence of the value of the culture of collectivism found in Indonesian culture. Besides this, self-efficacy as flood volunteers was an influential factor in volunteer activities. The values of collectivism and self-efficacy simultaneously and significantly predicted prosocial behavior, with an effect size of $R^2 = .225$. The results of this study have implications for the understanding of, and increasing of the level of, prosocial behavior amongst the public, via the values of a culture of collectivism and of self-efficacy.

Keywords: prosocial behavior, collectivism, self-efficacy, flood volunteer

Pada kondisi bencana alam, seperti banjir, selalu ada relawan bencana yang terlibat menolong masyarakat yang terdampak. Walaupun demikian, penjelasan empiris sehubungan perilaku prososial relawan bencana (seperti saat banjir) masih terbatas. Beberapa studi mengenai perilaku prososial di Indonesia lebih fokus menjelaskan perilaku prososial tersebut pada sampel umum dan relawan sosial (bukan dalam konteks bencana alam). Studi ini bertujuan untuk menguji peran nilai budaya (kolektivisme dan individualisme), efikasi diri, dan egoisme (motif egoistik) terhadap perilaku prososial pada relawan banjir. Penulis melakukan survei *cross-sectional* secara daring terhadap 150 relawan yang terlibat membantu saat bencana banjir besar di Kalimantan Selatan pada tahun 2021. Dalam studi ini, penulis menggunakan instrumen alat ukur yang telah melewati proses adaptasi lintas budaya dan terbukti memiliki reliabilitas serta validitas yang memuaskan. Partisipan dipilih melalui teknik *purposive sampling* dengan kriteria pernah menjadi relawan banjir di Kalimantan Selatan dan berusia 18

tahun ke atas. Hasil uji korelasi *bivariate* menunjukkan bahwa hanya nilai kolektivisme dan efikasi diri yang signifikan berkorelasi dengan perilaku prososial. Uji regresi berganda menemukan hasil yang serupa, secara parsial, nilai kolektivisme dan efikasi diri signifikan memprediksi perilaku prososial, sementara variabel lain (nilai individualisme dan motif egoistik) tidak signifikan. Hasil temuan ini menggambarkan bahwa perilaku prososial para relawan banjir yang tinggi dijelaskan oleh adanya nilai budaya kolektivisme yang melekat pada budaya Indonesia. Selain itu, efikasi diri sebagai relawan banjir menjadi faktor yang berpengaruh pada aktivitas kerelawanan. Nilai kolektivisme dan efikasi diri secara simultan signifikan memprediksi perilaku prososial dengan *effect size* R^2 = 0,225. Hasil studi ini memiliki implikasi untuk memahami dan meningkatkan perilaku prososial di masyarakat melalui nilai budaya kolektivisme dan efikasi diri.

Kata kunci: perilaku prososial, kolektivisme, efikasi diri, relawan banjir

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: Korespondensi sehubungan dengan artikel ini ditujukan pada: Muhammad Abdan Shadiqi, Program Studi Psikologi, Fakultas Kedokteran, Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, PH2P+V62, Jl. Brigjen Jalan Hasan Basri, Pangeran, Kecamatan Banjarmasin Utara, Banjarmasin 70123, Kalimantan Selatan, Indonesia. E-Mail: abdan.shadiqi@ulm.ac.id

In Indonesia, study of prosocial behavior is more focused on social volunteer groups (Ashar et al., 2017; Christy & Sahrani, 2016; Hidayatullah et al., 2021), health volunteers (Bella et al., 2020; Istiana, 2016; Istiono & Efendy, 2021; Setiawan & Budiman, 2021), and education volunteers (Akhtar et al., 2021; Cahyani, 2019). Studies related to prosocial behavior by natural disaster volunteers in Indonesia need to be conducted with more depth, because of the small number of existing publications on this topic. Amongst a number of studies on disaster volunteers (Akhrani & Nuryanti, 2021; Muthmainnah et al., 2021; Nuryanti, 2020), it was only the researches of Ratri and Masykur (2019) which phenomenologically (qualitatively) examined the experiences of disaster volunteers, and one of the findings was related to helpful behavior, or prosocial behavior. Besides this, the number of natural disasters in Indonesia rose in 2021 (with a total of 5,402 disasters), compared to those in 2020 (with a total of 2,952 disasters; Statista Research Department, 2022), so that it is important that the study of prosocial behavior amongst natural disaster volunteers be conducted, to become a practical basis of reference, to strengthen prosocial behavior amongst volunteers. In general, volunteers assist without hope of reward (Fitroh et al., 2019), and the principal capital for becoming a volunteer is the existence of a strong desire to assist others, or what is generally termed prosocial behavior (Shadiqi, 2018). Sometimes prosocial behavior is performed without any direct

Di Indonesia, kajian perilaku prososial lebih banyak berfokus pada kelompok relawan sosial (Ashar et al., 2017; Christy & Sahrani, 2016; Hidayatullah et al., 2021), relawan kesehatan (Bella et al., 2020; Istiana, 2016; Istiono & Efendy, 2021; Setiawan & Budiman, 2021), dan relawan pendidikan (Akhtar et al., 2021; Cahyani, 2019). Studi sehubungan perilaku prososial pada relawan bencana alam di Indonesia perlu dikupas lebih lanjut, karena kecilnya angka publikasi di topik ini. Di antara beberapa studi dengan responden relawan bencana (Akhrani & Nuryanti, 2021; Muthmainnah et al., 2021; Nuryanti, 2020), hanya riset Ratri dan Masykur (2019) yang mengkaji pengalaman relawan bencana secara fenomenologis (kualitatif) dan salah satu hasilnya dikaitkan dengan perilaku menolong atau perilaku prososial. Selain itu, jumlah bencana alam di Indonesia meningkat di tahun 2021 (dengan jumlah 5.402 bencana) dibandingkan di tahun 2020 (dengan jumlah 2.952 bencana; Statista Research Department, 2022), sehingga studi perilaku prososial pada relawan bencana alam menjadi penting dilakukan untuk menjadi dasar acuan praktis untuk menguatkan perilaku prososial antara para relawan. Pada umumnya, relawan menolong tanpa mengharap imbalan (Fitroh et al., 2019), dan modal utama menjadi relawan adalah adanya niat yang kuat untuk membantu orang lain, atau biasa disebut dengan perilaku prososial (Shadiqi, 2018). Terkadang perilaku prososial dilakukan tanpa ada manfaat langsung yang akan diterima oleh

benefit being received by the helper (Branscombe & Baron, 2017).

Prosocial behavior may be divided into: (1) minor or simple assistance (for example: the provision of light snacks); (2) substantial or more personal assistance (for example: the loan of a motor vehicle); (3) emotional assistance (for example: hearing someone pour out their heart); through to (4) emergency assistance (for example: assistance to accident victims; McGuire, 1994). Voluntary action is one example of planned prosocial behavior, despite it occurring in a disaster situation (Shadiqi, 2018). There is a number of prosocial behavior theories, such as: (1) the theory of social exchange, as a psychological explanation; (2) the theory of social norms, as a sociological explanation; through to (3) the theory of evolution, as a biological explanation (Myers & Twenge, 2022). Besides by using a theoretical approach, prosocial behavior can also be explained through the hierarchical domain, from the analysis unit levels, these being: (1) the micro level (personal); (2) the meso level (two people) and; (3) the macro level (group level; Schroeder & Graziano, 2018). In this article, the authors have striven to provide explanations at each analysis unit level of the domain, from prosocial behavior as found by Schroeder and Graziano (2018), such as: (1) self-efficacy at the micro level; (2) collectivism (vs. individualism) and egoism (egoistic motives) at the meso level; and (3) the prosocial behavior of flood volunteers ("volunteerism") at the macro level. The combination of the three levels of analysis units of this variable is one of the novelties of the findings of this study. Besides this, in this article, the authors have also resolved several empirical findings which were inconsistent in direction or significance of inter-variable relationships. Thus, two things which are at the basis of the determination of the four predictor variables are: (1) the hierarchical domain theory of prosocial behavior, from Schroeder and Graziano (2018); and (2) a number of inconsistent empirical findings, which are explained further in the sub-sections which follow. Regarding the goal of this study, it was to prove the roles of the cultural values (collectivism and individualism), self-efficacy, and egoistic motives, related to the prosocial behavior of the flood volunteers in South Kalimantan. In the literature review section, the authors have offered clarification of the arguments, the rationale for their choices of the variables, and the hypothesis statements.

penolong (Branscombe & Baron, 2017).

Perilaku prososial dapat dibedakan menjadi: (1) bantuan kecil/sederhana (contoh: memberi makanan ringan); (2) bantuan substansial/lebih personal (contoh: meminjamkan mobil); (3) bantuan emosional (contoh: mendengar curahan hati); hingga (4) bantuan darurat (contoh: menolong korban kecelakaan; McGuire, 1994). Aksi kerelawanan merupakan salah satu contoh perilaku prososial yang terencana, meskipun terjadi pada situasi darurat (Shadiqi, 2018). Terdapat sejumlah teori perilaku prososial, seperti: (1) teori pertukaran sosial di penjelasan psikologis; (2) teori norma sosial di penjelasan sosiologis; hingga (3) teori evolusi di penjelasan biologis (Myers & Twenge, 2022). Selain menggunakan pendekatan teori, perilaku prososial juga dapat dijelaskan melalui domain hierarki dari level unit analisis, yakni: (1) level mikro (personal); (2) meso (dua orang); dan (3) makro (kelompok; Schroeder & Graziano, 2018). Pada artikel ini, penulis berusaha menyediakan penjelasan di setiap domain level unit analisis dari perilaku prososial yang dikemukakan oleh Schroeder dan Graziano (2018), seperti: (1) efikasi diri di level mikro; (2) kolektivisme (vs individualisme) dan egoisme (motif egoistik) pada level meso; dan (3) perilaku prososial relawan banjir ("kerelawanan") di level makro. Kombinasi ketiga level unit analisis variabel ini merupakan salah satu kebaruan temuan dari studi ini. Selain itu, pada artikel ini, penulis juga menguraikan beberapa temuan empiris yang inkonsisten pada arah atau signifikansi hubungan antar-variabel. Dengan demikian, dua hal yang mendasari penetapan keempat variabel prediktor adalah: (1) teori domain hierarki perilaku prososial dari Schroeder dan Graziano (2018); dan (2) sejumlah temuan empiris inkonsisten yang akan dijelaskan lebih lanjut pada sub-bagian berikutnya. Adapun tujuan dari studi ini adalah membuktikan peran nilai budaya (kolektivisme dan individualisme), efikasi diri, dan motif egoistik terhadap perilaku prososial pada relawan banjir di Kalimantan Selatan. Pada bagian reviu literatur, penulis menyajikan klarifikasi argumentasi, alasan pemilihan variabel, dan pernyataan hipotesis.

Collectivism vs. Individualism
in Prosocial Behavior

The values collectivism and individualism are derived from the study by Hofstede (1980), known as the six dimensions of cultural values (Hofstede, 2011), being: (1) Power Distance; (2) Uncertainty Avoidance; (3) Individualism/Collectivism; (4) Masculinity/Femininity; (5) Long/Short Term Orientation; and (6) Indulgence/Restraint. Hofstede (1980), together with Triandis and Gelfand (2012) clarified that, in individualist cultures, the individual tends to have independent and egoist characteristics, whereas in collectivist cultures, the individual is more dependent upon others, and is oriented more towards the group. These two cultural values have consequences in the cognitive, motivational, emotional, and behavioral aspects of humanity (Triandis & Gelfand, 2012). Jung et al. (2020) in their meta-analysis, utilized two of the six cultural values, i.e., collectivism and long term orientation, in their model of the moderation of prosocial behavior, even though these two cultural values have no relationship with prosocial behavior. A study performed by Jung et al. (2020) was one of the studies concerning cultural values in prosocial behavior, but the data from an Asian country involved only the People's Republic of China, India, and South Korea, with an addition of the data from Israel ($k = 4$ of 87). The study by Guo et al. (2018), which used data from yang 94 countries, with a wider coverage, discovered significant effects of the moderation of cultural collectivism (vs. individualism) on prosocial behavior. These two studies, Jung et al. (2020) and Guo et al. (2018), were one basis for the selection of the values of collectivism and indvidualism. Empirical studies by Lampridis and Papastylianou (2017), as well as those by Lee and Kim (2021), found the existence of a relationship between the value of collectivism and prosocial behavior. An empirical study by Davis et al. (2018) produced the result that the involvement of the mother, or parenting involving the value of collectivism amongst adolescents, had a positive relationship with changes in prosocial behavior. Individuals with high levels of individualism will assist others, who arouse their feelings of pity (affection; Oyserman et al., 2002; Steelman, 1995a; 1995b). On the other hand, there are studies which found opposing results, such as that by De Clercq et al. (2022), which found that collectivism is not related to prosocial behavior, in the context of

Kolektivisme vs. Individualisme
Pada Perilaku Prososial

Nilai kolektivisme dan nilai individualisme berasal dari studi Hofstede (1980) yang dikenal dengan enam dimensi nilai budaya (Hofstede, 2011), yakni: (1) *Power Distance*; (2) *Uncertainty Avoidance*; (3) *Individualism/Collectivism*; (4) *Masculinity/Femininity*; (5) *Long/Short Term Orientation*; dan (6) *Indulgence/Restraint*. Hofstede (1980) serta Triandis dan Gelfand (2012) menerangkan bahwa dalam budaya individualis, individu cenderung bersifat independen dan egois, sedangkan dalam budaya kolektivis, individu lebih bergantung pada orang lain dan berorientasi pada kelompok. Kedua nilai budaya ini memiliki konsekuensi pada aspek kognitif, motivasi, emosional, dan perilaku manusia (Triandis & Gelfand, 2012). Jung et al. (2020) dalam meta-analisisnya menggunakan dua dari enam nilai budaya, yakni kolektivisme dan *long term orientation* pada model moderasi perilaku prososial, meskipun kedua nilai budaya tersebut tidak berhubungan dengan perilaku prososial. Studi yang dilakukan oleh Jung et al. (2020) merupakan salah satu studi mengenai nilai budaya pada perilaku prososial, namun data dari negara Asia hanya melibatkan negara Republik Rakyat Cina, India, dan Korea Selatan, serta tambahan data dari Israel ($k = 4$ dari 87). Studi Guo et al. (2018) yang menggunakan data 94 negara dengan cakupan yang lebih luas menemukan efek moderasi yang signifikan dari nilai budaya kolektivisme (vs individualisme) pada perilaku prososial. Kedua studi tersebut, Jung et al. (2020) dan Guo et al. (2018), menjadi salah satu dasar pemilihan nilai budaya kolektivisme dan indvidualisme. Studi empiris dari Lampridis dan Papastylianou (2017), serta Lee dan Kim (2021), menemukan adanya hubungan antara nilai kolektivisme dengan perilaku prososial. Studi empiris dari Davis et al. (2018) menghasilkan bahwa keterlibatan ibu atau *parenting* terkait nilai kolektivisme pada remaja berhubungan secara positif dengan perubahan dalam perilaku prososial. Individu dengan nilai individualisme tinggi akan menolong orang lain yang menimbulkan rasa kasihan (afeksi; Oyserman et al., 2002; Steelman, 1995a; 1995b). Di sisi lain, ada studi yang menemukan hasil bertentangan, seperti studi De Clercq et al. (2022) yang menemukan bahwa kolektivisme tidak berhubungan dengan perilaku prososial pada

companies whose employees are under harsh supervisory pressure.

Besides this, a study by Finkelstein (2010) found that the value of individualism and that of collectivism increased the desire to display prosocial behavior (volunteer), but for different reasons. A study by Lampridis and Papastylianou (2017) found that the value of individualism had no relationship with prosocial behavior; but this was contrary to the findings of a study by Finkelstein (2010). Although the values of cultures of collectivism and individualism have opposing characteristics, the two may be assumed to be related to prosocial behavior, based upon a number of empirical studies. The testing of the values of cultures of collectivism and individualism, regarding prosocial behavior, was chosen by the authors because there have been several findings with inconsistent characteristics in their explanations of the strength of the relationships. From this, this study had the opportunity to add new findings, by giving alternative explanations related to the cultural values (collectivism and individualism) in prosocial behavior, particularly in a sample of disaster volunteers in Indonesia.

Hypothesis 1: There is a role between the value of collectivism and the prosocial behavior of flood volunteers.

Hypothesis 2: There is a role between the value of individualism and the prosocial behavior of flood volunteers.

Self-Efficacy and Prosocial Behavior

Baudinet (2013) defined four factors which influenced prosocial behavior: (1) empathy; (2) self-efficacy; (3) altruism; and (4) aggression. Self-efficacy is the conviction of effectiveness and competence in a individual performing a task (Myers & Twenge, 2022), which may be described as the conviction which states, "I can" (Santrock, 2018). There is a number of previous studies which discovered significant relationships between self-efficacy and prosocial behavior, such as that by De Caroli and Sagone (2013), which found a positive correlation between the self-efficacy and prosocial behavior of adolescents in Italy. Results of this study were in line with the results of a study conducted with social volunteers in four cities in Central Asia

konteks perusahaan di bawah tekanan pengawasan yang kasar.

Selain itu, studi Finkelstein (2010) menemukan bahwa nilai individualisme dan nilai kolektivisme meningkatkan kemauan untuk menampilkan perilaku prosocial (sukarela), tetapi untuk alasan yang berbeda. Studi Lampridis dan Papastylianou (2017) menemukan bahwa nilai individualisme tidak berhubungan dengan perilaku prososal; dan hal ini bertentangan dengan temuan studi Finkelstein (2010). Meskipun nilai budaya kolektivisme dan individualisme bersifat saling bertentangan, keduanya dapat diasumsikan berhubungan dengan perilaku prososial berdasarkan beberapa studi empiris. Pengujian nilai budaya kolektivisme dan individualisme pada perilaku prososial dipilih oleh penulis karena ada beberapa temuan yang bersifat inkonsisten dalam menjelaskan kekuatan hubungannya. Maka dari itu, studi ini berpeluang untuk menambah temuan baru dalam memberi penjelasan alternatif kaitan nilai budaya (kolektivisme dan individualisme) pada perilaku prososial, khususnya pada sampel relawan bencana alam di Indonesia.

Hipotesis 1: Terdapat peranan antara nilai kolektivisme dengan perilaku prososial pada relawan banjir.

Hipotesis 2: Terdapat peranan antara nilai individualisme dengan perilaku prososial pada relawan banjir.

Efikasi Diri dan Perilaku Prososial

Baudinet (2013) menjabarkan empat faktor yang mempengaruhi perilaku prososial: (1) empati; (2) efikasi diri; (3) altruisme; dan (4) agresi. Efikasi diri ialah keyakinan efektif dan kompetensi individu ketika melakukan sesuatu (Myers & Twenge, 2022), yang dapat digambarkan sebagai keyakinan yang menyatakan bahwa "Saya bisa" (Santrock, 2018). Terdapat sejumlah studi terdahulu yang menemukan hubungan signifikan antara efikasi diri dan perilaku prososial, seperti studi oleh De Caroli dan Sagone (2013) yang menemukan korelasi yang positif antara efikasi diri dengan perilaku prososial pada remaja di Italia. Hasil studi tersebut sejalan dengan hasil studi yang dilakukan pada relawan sosial di empat kota Asia

(Pandya, 2020), and those of a study performed in Indonesia with teachers, by Hanisah et al. (2019). Although this is the case, there are contradictory study results related to connections between these two variables, such as the results in a study by Steinemann et al. (2020), which stated that prosocial behavior, in any form at all, cannot be predicted from self-efficacy. This number of mutually contradictory and inconsistent study results became a powerful rationale for the authors to re-test relationships between the two variables, in this study.

Hypothesis 3: There is a role between the self-efficacy and the prosocial behavior of flood volunteers.

Egoistic Motive: Assisting for Personal Benefit

Batson (2011) explained that egoistic motives are marked by the giving of assistance to others, but with the principle goal of obtaining personal benefits. Egoistic is a word describing attitudes and behaviors related to emphasis on oneself (Phillips & Phillips, 2011), wherein one's own interests are considered to be greater and more valuable than the interests of others (Saroglou, 2013). The person with a high level of egoistic motives helps others because they wishes to receive praise and be noticed by others, as well as obtain higher status (Siem & Stürmer, 2019). The positive role of egoistic motives in prosocial behavior may still be debated, because there are findings which appear mutually contradictory. A study by Siem and Stürmer (2012) found that attention focused upon oneself reduces the responsiveness of an individual to assist, meaning that egoistic motives reduce the tendency towards prosocial behavior. However, the study by Feiler et al. (2012), which took the form of an experimental study, produced the findings that egoistic motives have influence in the increase of the wishes of a person to make donations (prosocial behavior) to groups. Based upon these pieces of scientific evidence, it may be concluded that several studies have produced different results, so that, in order to strengthen the drawing of any conclusions related to the connections between egoistic motives and prosocial behavior, the authors re-examined the connections between these two variables.

Hypothesis 4: There is a role between the egoistic motives and prosocial behavior of flood

Tengah (Pandya, 2020) dan hasil studi di Indonesia pada guru oleh Hanisah et al. (2019). Walaupun demikian, ada hasil studi yang bertentang sehubungan hubungan kedua variabel ini, seperti hasil studi Steinemann et al. (2020) yang menyatakan bahwa perilaku prososial dalam bentuk apapun tidak dapat diprediksi oleh efikasi diri. Sejumlah hasil studi yang saling bertentangan dan inkonsisten ini memberikan alasan kuat bagi penulis untuk menguji kembali hubungan kedua variabel pada studi ini.

Hipotesis 3: Terdapat peranan antara efikasi diri dengan perilaku prososial pada relawan banjir.

Motif Egoistik: Menolong Untuk Keuntungan Pribadi

Batson (2011) menjelaskan bahwa motif egoistik ditandai dengan memberikan bantuan kepada orang lain tetapi dengan tujuan utama untuk mendapatkan keuntungan pribadi. Egoistik adalah sikap dan perilaku yang berkenaan dengan mementingkan diri sendiri (Phillips & Phillips, 2011), ketika kepentingan diri sendiri dianggap lebih besar dan lebih bernilai daripada kepentingan orang lain (Saroglou, 2013). Individu dengan motif egoistik yang tinggi menolong orang lain karena ingin dipuji dan dilihat oleh orang lain, serta mendapat status yang lebih tinggi (Siem & Stürmer, 2019). Peran motif egoistik pada perilaku prososial masih dapat diperdebatkan, karena ada temuan yang tampak saling berlawanan. Studi Siem dan Stürmer (2012) menemukan bahwa perhatian yang terpusat pada diri sendiri menurunkan ketanggapan individu untuk menolong, yang berarti motif egoistik menurunkan kecenderungan perilaku prososial. Namun, studi Feiler et al. (2012), yang berupa studi eksperimen, menghasilkan temuan bahwa motif egoistik memiliki pengaruh untuk meningkatkan keinginan individu untuk memberikan donasi (perilaku prososial) bagi kelompok. Berdasarkan sejumlah bukti ilmiah tersebut, dapat disimpulkan bahwa beberapa studi menemukan hasil yang berbeda, sehingga untuk memperkuat penyimpulan mengenai keterkaitan motif egoistik dengan perilaku prososial, penulis meneliti kembali hubungan kedua variabel tersebut.

Hipotesis 4: Terdapat peranan antara motif egoistik dengan perilaku prososial pada relawan

volunteers.

In this study, the authors grouped four predictor variables together in a regression model, to predict the prosocial behavior of natural disaster volunteers. The theory on which this decision was based was the theory of the hierarchical domain of prosocial behavior, by Schroeder and Graziano (2018). The three levels of hierarchy representing the explanation of prosocial behavior in this study were: (1) the micro level: self-efficacy; (2) the meso level: cultural values (collectivism and individualism) and egoistic motives; together with (3) the macro level: the context of responsiveness (voluntariness) to natural disaster in the form of prosocial behavior. According to Schroeder and Graziano (2018), a multi-level approach would be able to provide explanations which are mutually complementary, coherent, and comprehensive regarding prosocial behavior. For this, the authors provided a final hypothesis, as follows:

Hypothesis 5: There are joint roles (simultaneously) between the values of collectivism, self-efficacy, and egoistic motives, in the prosocial behavior of flood volunteers.

Method

This study utilized a quantitative approach, via a study of a cross-sectional survey, with correlational testing, which was performed online with a group of flood volunteers. Data collection was performed online, via a Google Forms link, sent a la personal chat via the WhatsApp application, in accordance with the data which may be seen on the web page of the *Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana* (*BNPB*; National Institute for Disaster Countermeasures), related to the *Desk Relawan Tanggap Darurat Banjir Kalimantan Selatan 2021* (Volunteer Response Desk for the South Kalimantan Flood Disaster 2021). Besides this, the authors requested community and volunteer organization representatives on the same database to send the Google Forms survey link to their relevant member groups. On the Google Forms link, the participants had first to complete the informed consent form, then to complete their volunteer identification, to read all the instructions and fill in the measurement instruments. After the data is collected, the authors provided a reward to 25 participants via mobile phone credit vouchers,

banjir.

Pada studi ini, penulis menggabungkan empat variabel prediktor sekaligus pada model regresi untuk memprediksi perilaku prososial pada relawan bencana alam. Teori yang mendasari keputusan ini adalah teori domain hierarki perilaku prososial dari Schroeder dan Graziano (2018). Tiga level hierarki yang mewakili penjelasan perilaku prososial dalam studi ini adalah: (1) level mikro: efikasi diri; (2) level meso: nilai budaya (kolektivisme dan individualisme) dan motif egoistik; serta (3) level makro: konteks kerelawanan bencana alam berupa perilaku prososial. Menurut Schroeder dan Graziano (2018), pendekatan multilevel akan dapat memberikan penjelasan yang saling melengkapi, koheren, dan komprehensif pada perilaku prososial. Untuk itu, penulis mempersiapkan hipotesis terakhir sebagai berikut:

Hipotesis 5: Terdapat peranan bersama (simultan) antara nilai kolektivisme, efikasi diri, dan motif egoistik pada perilaku prososial pada relawan banjir.

Metode

Studi ini menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif melalui studi survei *cross-sectional* dengan uji korelasional, dan dilakukan secara daring pada kelompok relawan banjir. Pengambilan data dilakukan secara daring, melalui tautan *Google Forms* yang dikirim secara *personal chat* melalui aplikasi *WhatsApp*, sesuai dengan data yang dapat dilihat pada laman *web* Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana (BNPB) sehubungan dengan Desk Relawan Tanggap Darurat Banjir Kalimantan Selatan 2021 (Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana (BNPB [National Institute for Disaster Countermeasures], 2021). Selain itu, penulis meminta perwakilan komunitas dan organisasi relawan di pangkalan data yang sama untuk mengirimkan tautan survei *Google Forms* ke grup anggota yang bersangkutan. Pada tautan *Google Forms*, partisipan akan mengisi formulir *informed consent* terlebih dahulu, kemudian mengisi identifikasi kerelawanan, dan membaca semua instruksi hingga mengisi alat ukur. Setelah data terkumpul, penulis memberikan *reward* kepada 25 partisipan melalui undian berupa

or electronic transfers, to the value of IDR 20,000.00 (USD 1.35) each. This study received approval for its ethical compliance from the Fakultas Kedokteran, Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, with the number [692-697-696/KEPK-FK ULM/EC/VIII/2021].

Participants

The participant population in this study comprised disaster volunteers from a variety of community and volunteer organizations in South Kalimantan, Indonesia, totaling 3,306 persons (Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana (BNPB) [National Institute for Disaster Countermeasures], 2021). The size of the sample in the study was 150 flood volunteers. The sample size met the determining criteria for the measurement of the sample, using *G*Power* (f^2 = 0.1; *error prob.* = 0.05; *power* = 0.80). All of the participants fulfilled the two principle criteria, those being: (1) aged 18 years or more; and (2) volunteers directly involved in the management of the flooding in South Kalimantan early in 2021. The technique for sample selection in this study was the non-probability sampling technique, i.e., a purposive sampling technique, based upon the criteria previously determined by the authors, for selection from the existing population (Kurniawan & Puspitaningtyas, 2016). This sampling technique was the one most possible to be used in this the study, recalling the limited number of volunteers and the difficulties in finding volunteers who fit the criteria. The participants comprised 81 (54%) males, and 69 (46%) females, aged between 18-48 years, with an average age of 23.48 years (*SD* = 6.29). The majority of the sample comprised Muslims (149 participants; 99.3%) and tertiary students (108 participants; 72%). The data collection process was performed online, beginning with looking at the data of the community and volunteer organizations on the webpage of the *Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana* (*BNPB*; National Institute for Disaster Countermeasures) related to the *Desk Relawan Tanggap Darurat Banjir Kalimantan Selatan 2021* (Volunteer Response Desk for the South Kalimantan Flood Disaster 2021; Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana (BNPB) [National Institute for Disaster Countermeasures], 2021). From that webpage, the authors found the mobile phone and WhatsApp contact data.

voucher pulsa atau uang elektronik seharga IDR 20.000,00. Studi ini telah mendapatkan persetujuan kelayakan etik dari Fakultas Kedokteran, Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, dengan nomor [692-697-696/KEPK-FK ULM/EC/VIII/2021].

Partisipan

Populasi partisipan dalam studi ini adalah relawan bencana alam dari berbagai komunitas dan organisasi relawan di Kalimantan Selatan, Indonesia, yang berjumlah 3.306 individu (Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana (BNPB) [National Institute for Disaster Countermeasures], 2021). Jumlah sampel dalam studi ini adalah 150 orang relawan banjir. Jumlah sampel memenuhi kriteria penentuan ukuran sampel menggunakan *G*Power* (f^2 = 0,1; *error prob.* = 0,05; *power* = 0,80). Seluruh partisipan memenuhi dua kriteria utama, yaitu: (1) berusia 18 tahun ke atas; dan (2) merupakan relawan yang terlibat langsung pada penanganan banjir di Kalimantan Selatan pada tahun awal 2021. Teknik pengambilan sampel yang digunakan dalam studi ini adalah teknik *non-probability sampling*, yaitu teknik *purposive sampling* yang didasarkan pada kriteria yang telah ditetapkan sebelumnya oleh penulis dari anggota populasi yang ada (Kurniawan & Puspitaningtyas, 2016). Teknik *sampling* ini paling mungkin dilakukan untuk studi ini, mengingat terbatasnya jumlah relawan dan sulitnya mencari relawan yang cocok dengan kriteria. Partisipan terdiri atas 81 (54%) laki-laki dan 69 (46%) perempuan, dengan usia berkisar dari 18-48 tahun dengan rerata usia 23,48 tahun (*SD* = 6,29). Mayoritas sampel adalah Muslim (149 partisipan; 99,3%) dan berprofesi sebagai mahasiswa (108 partisipan; 72%). Proses pengambilan data dilakukan secara daring, dimulai dengan melihat data komunitas dan organisasi relawan dari laman *web* Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana (BNPB) sehubungan dengan Desk Relawan Tanggap Darurat Banjir Kalimantan Selatan 2021 (Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana (BNPB) [National Institute for Disaster Countermeasures], 2021). Dari lawan *web* tersebut, penulis menemukan data kontak nomor ponsel dan *WhatsApp*.

Measurement

A cross-cultural adaptation process was carried out on the four measurement instruments, using references from Beaton et al. (2000). There was one measurement instrument (self-efficacy) which already existed in a Bahasa Indonesia version, so that it did not have to go through the adaptation process. All measurement instruments satisfactorily passed the criteria for reliability. The authors also performed testing of content validity, using content validity testing of profiles (face) and logic, which were performed by two individuals from the authorship team who have social psychology skills and who are practicing psychologists. Besides this, there was also the readability testing phase, performed by a small representative sample ($n = 10$). The measurement instruments were provided in the form of a survey, using Google Forms, which was loaded with research information, informed consent form, volunteer identification, instructions and the contents of the measurement instruments, and, finally, forms for personal data. All of the elements of the measurement instruments may be seen in the Appendix.

Prosocial Behavior

The prosocial behavior scale was used to measure the prosocial behavior experiences of the volunteers in the context of everyday lives. The authors adapted 16 items of the Adults' Prosocialness Scale by Caprara et al. (2005), which comprised several aspects, such as: (1) sharing; (2) helping; (3) taking care of; and (4) feeling emphatic. The Adults' Prosocialness Scale has responses on a Likert scale (five points, with a range from "1 (*Never*)" to "5 (*Always*)") and a Cronbach's Alpha value of .903. An example item from the Adults' Prosocialness Scale is: "I am happy to help my friends/colleagues in their activities.".

The Values of Collectivism and Individualism

This study utilized the Horizontal-Vertical Collectivism scale to measure the cultural values held by the participants. This measurement instrument was developed by Triandis and Gelfand (1998), and has eight items for the variable of the value of collectivism, and eight items for the variable of the value of individualism. The Horizontal-Vertical Collectivism scale has

Pengukuran

Proses adaptasi lintas budaya dilakukan pada empat alat ukur, dengan menggunakan acuan dari Beaton et al. (2000). Ada satu alat ukur (efikasi diri) yang telah memiliki versi Bahasa Indonesia, sehingga tidak melewati proses adaptasi. Seluruh alat ukur telah memenuhi kriteria reliabilitas yang memuaskan. Penulis juga melakukan uji validitas isi menggunakan uji validitas tampang dan logis, yang dilaksanakan oleh dua individu anggota tim penulis dengan kepakaran psikologi sosial dan sebagai praktisi psikolog. Selain itu, juga ada tahapan uji keterbacaan oleh sampel kecil ($n = 10$) yang representatif. Alat ukur disajikan dalam bentuk survei menggunakan *Google Forms* yang memuat informasi penelitian, formulir *informed consent*, identifikasi kerelawanan, instruksi dan isi alat ukur, diakhiri dengan isian data diri. Semua butir alat ukur dapat dilihat pada Lampiran.

Perilaku Prososial

Skala perilaku prososial digunakan untuk mengukur pengalaman perilaku prososial para relawan di konteks kehidupan sehari-hari. Penulis mengadaptasi 16 butir *Adults' Prosocialness Scale* dari Caprara et al. (2005) yang terdiri atas beberapa aspek, seperti: (1) *sharing*; (2) *helping*; (3) *taking care of*; dan (4) *feeling emphatic*. *Adults' Prosocialness Scale* memiliki respon dengan skala *Likert* (lima poin, dengan rentang "1 (*Tidak Pernah*)" sampai "5 (*Selalu*)") dan nilai *Cronbach's Alpha* sebesar 0,903. Contoh butir dari *Adults' Prosocialness Scale* adalah: "Saya senang membantu teman/rekan saya dalam aktivitas-aktivitas mereka.".

Nilai Kolektivisme dan Individualisme

Studi ini menggunakan skala *Horizontal-Vertical Collectivism* untuk mengukur nilai budaya yang dianut oleh partisipan. Alat ukur ini dikembangkan oleh Triandis dan Gelfand (1998), dan memiliki delapan butir untuk variabel nilai kolektivisme dan delapan butir untuk variabel nilai individualisme. Skala *Horizontal-Vertical Collectivism* memiliki respon dengan skala *Likert* (lima poin, dengan

responses on a Likert scale (five points, with a range of "1 (*Strongly Disagree*)" to "5 (*Strongly Agree*)"), a Cronbach's Alpha value for the variable of the value of collectivism of .829 and for the variable of the value of individualism of .768. An example item of the variable of the value of collectivism is: "If my workmate gets an award, I will feel proud.", whilst an example item of the variable of the value of individualism is: "I choose to rely on myself rather than on others.".

Self-Efficacy

The General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES) was utilized to measure self-efficacy over a wide range. The scale comprises ten items, with a four-point Likert scale, i.e.,: "1 (*Incorrect*)", "2 (*Nearly Correct*)", "3 (*Quite Correct*)", dan "4 (*Absolutely Correct*)". The General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES) was developed by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995), and has been translated into in 33 languages. The authors utilized the version which has been developed in Bahasa Indonesia, and whose construct validity has been tested by Novrianto et al. (2019). The Cronbach's Alpha value of the General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES), Bahasa Indonesia version, is .894. An example item of the General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES), Bahasa Indonesia version, is: "I can always resolve difficult problems, if I strive hard enough.".

Egoistic Motives

The authors utilized the Egoistic Motives Scale to measure the egoistic motives involved when an individual helps another. This measurement instrument comprises 12 favorable items, and has responses on the Likert scale (five points, with a range of "1 (*Strongly Disagree*)" to "5 (*Strongly Agree*)"). The Egoistic Motives Scale was adapted from that developed by Carlo and Randall (2002), and has a Cronbach's Alpha reliability value of .851, with two items being deleted. An example item of the Egoistic Motives Scale is: "As a helper, I wish to perform helpful deeds, so that I may be well regarded.".

Data Analysis

The data was analyzed using the International Business Machines (IBM) Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS) Version 23 software.

rentang "1 (*Sangat Tidak Setuju*)" hingga "5 (*Sangat Setuju*)") dan nilai *Cronbach's Alpha* dari variabel nilai kolektivisme sebesar 0,829 dan variabel nilai individualisme sebesar 0,768. Contoh butir variabel nilai kolektivisme adalah: "Jika rekan kerja mendapat hadiah, saya akan merasa bangga.", sedangkan contoh butir variabel nilai individualisme adalah: "Saya lebih memilih untuk bergantung pada diri saya sendiri daripada orang lain.".

Efikasi Diri

General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES) digunakan untuk mengukur efikasi diri pada cakupan yang luas. Skala tersebut terdiri atas 10 butir dengan empat poin skala *Likert*, yaitu: "1 (*Tidak Benar*)", "2 (*Hampir Benar*)", "3 (*Cukup Benar*)", dan "4 (*Sangat Benar*)". *General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES)* dikembangkan oleh Schwarzer dan Jerusalem (1995), dan telah dikembangkan dalam 33 bahasa. Penulis menggunakan versi yang telah dikembangkan ke dalam Bahasa Indonesia dan telah diuji secara validitas konstruk oleh Novrianto et al. (2019). Nilai *Cronbach's Alpha* yang dimiliki skala *General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES)* versi Bahasa Indonesia sebesar 0,894. Contoh butir dari *General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES)* versi Bahasa Indonesia adalah: "Saya selalu dapat menyelesaikan masalah-masalah sulit jika saya berusaha cukup keras.".

Motif Egoistik

Penulis menggunakan *Egoistic Motives Scale* untuk mengukur motif egoistik saat individu menolong orang lain. Alat ukur tersebut terdiri atas 12 butir *favorable*, dan memiliki respon dengan skala *Likert* (lima poin, dengan rentang "1 (*Sangat Tidak Setuju*)" hingga "5 (*Sangat Setuju*)"). *Egoistic Motives Scale* diadaptasi dari skala yang dikembangkan oleh Carlo dan Randall (2002), dan memiliki nilai reliabilitas *Cronbach's Alpha* sebesar 0,851, dengan dua butir gugur. Contoh butir dari *Egoistic Motives Scale* adalah: "Sebagai penolong, saya ingin menggunakan tindakan menolong agar diri saya terkenal.".

Analisis Data

Data dianalisis menggunakan perangkat lunak *International Business Machines (IBM) Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS)* Versi 23.

After all measurement instruments had been tested for reliability, the scores for the variables were calculated from the average scores. Statistical analysis was initialized with assumption testing (residual normality, linearity, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity), with these being followed by descriptive testing and Pearson's correlation. Hypothesis testing utilized multiple hierarchical regression.

Setelah seluruh alat ukur diuji reliabilitas, skor variabel dihitung dari skor rerata. Analisis statistik dimulai dengan uji asumsi (normalitas residual, linearitas, multikolinearitas, dan heterokedaktisitas), lalu dilanjutkan dengan uji deskriptif dan korelasi *Pearson*. Uji hipotesis menggunakan regresi hierarki berganda.

Results

Hasil

Initial Analysis

Analisis Awal

At the initial stage of the analysis, the authors conducted residual normality testing and found as a result that the data was distributed normally ($KS = 0.063$; $p = .200$). In other assumption testing, the authors conducted linearity testing and found that the value of collectivism related to prosocial behavior ($p = .000$), and that self-efficacy related to prosocial behavior ($p = .000$), had a linear relationship. However, the authors did not find any connection between any egoistic motive and prosocial behavior ($p = .430$), nor between value of individualism and prosocial behavior ($p = .768$). The authors presumed that this non-linear result was caused by the absence of any connection between egoistic motives and the value of individualism, in prosocial behavior, and from this the authors performed further testing of correlation and regression. With all predictor variables, there was no multicollinearity found ($VIF < 5.0$). Other testing did not find any indication of heteroscedasticity.

Pada tahapan analisis awal, penulis melakukan uji normalitas residual dan menemukan hasil bahwa data terdistribusi normal ($KS = 0,063$; $p = 0,200$). Pada uji asumsi lain, penulis melakukan uji liniearitas dan menemukan nilai kolektivisme dengan perilaku prososial ($p = 0,000$) dan efikasi diri dengan perilaku prososial ($p = 0,000$) memiliki hubungan yang linear. Namun, penulis tidak menemukan adanya hubungan liniear motif egoistik dengan perilaku prososial ($p = 0,430$) dan nilai individualistik dengan perilaku prososial ($p = 0,768$). Penulis menduga bahwa hasil tidak linear ini dikarenakan tidak adanya hubungan antara motif egoistik dan nilai individualisme dengan perilaku prososial, dan maka dari itu penulis menguji lebih jauh pada uji korelasi dan regresi. Pada semua variabel prediktor, tidak ditemukan multikolinearitas ($VIF < 5,0$). Uji lain tidak menemukan adanya indikasi masalah heterokedaktisitas.

In the following stage of the analysis, the authors performed *Pearson's bivariate* correlation testing (see Table 1). The results showed the presence of a significant positive relationship between the value of collectivism and the prosocial behavior of the flood volunteers ($r = .392$; $p < .001$). A significant positive relationship was also found between self-efficacy and prosocial behavior ($r = .367$; $p < .001$). There was also a different finding, that being that there was no significant relationship between egoistic motives and prosocial behavior ($r = -.065$; $p = .432$). No significant relationship was found between the value of individualism and prosocial behavior ($r = .024$; $p = .771$).

Pada tahap analisis berikutnya, penulis melakukan uji korelasi *bivariate Pearson* (lihat Tabel 1). Hasil menunjukkan adanya hubungan positif yang signifikan antara nilai kolektivisme dengan perilaku prososial pada relawan banjir ($r = 0,392$; $p < 0,001$). Hubungan positif yang signifikan juga ditemukan antara efikasi diri dengan perilaku prososial ($r = 0,367$; $p < 0,001$). Ada temuan berbeda yang juga ditemukan, yakni tidak adanya hubungan signifikan antara motif egoistik dengan perilaku prososial ($r = -0,065$; $p = 0,432$). Selain itu, nilai individualisme juga tidak ditemukan ada hubungan signifikan dengan perilaku prososial ($r = 0,024$; $p = 0,771$).

Table 1

Results of Correlation and Statistical Description

	α	Scale	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. Value of Collectivism	.829	1-5	4.151	0.580	-	.301**	.225**	.051	.392**
2. Value of Individualism	.768	1-5	3.590	0.655		-	.145	.155	.024
3. Self-Efficacy	.894	1-4	3.023	0.529			-	.054	.367**
4. Egoistic Motives	.851	1-5	2.455	0.701				-	- .065
5. Prosocial Behavior	.903	1-5	4.109	0.511					-

Note. **$p < .01$.

Tabel 1

Hasil Korelasi dan Deskriptif Statistik

	α	Skala	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. Nilai Kolektivisme	0,829	1-5	4,151	0,580	-	0,301**	0,225**	0,051	0,392**
2. Nilai Individualisme	0,768	1-5	3,590	0,655		-	0,145	0,155	0,024
3. Efikasi Diri	0,894	1-4	3,023	0,529			-	0,054	0,367**
4. Motif Egoistik	0,851	1-5	2,455	0,701				-	- 0,065
5. Perilaku Prososial	0,903	1-5	4,109	0,511					-

Catatan. **$p < 0,01$.

Hypothesis Testing

Based upon the results of correlation testing, the authors decided to conduct multiple hierarchical regression analysis, with the aim of examining the results of the regression analysis of the two variables which had significant correlation (the values of collectivism and self-efficacy), as Model 1. The authors then also looked at changes in the regression model, once the variables having no significant correlation (the values of individualism and egoistic motive) were entered into the regression analysis, so that four predictor variables were found, as Model 2.

In both Model 1 and Model 2, the results of hypothesis testing proved that there was a significant role between the value of collectivism and prosocial behavior (Model 1: β = .326; B = .287; t = 4.400; $p < .001$; *CI B 95%* [0.158; 0.416] and Model 2: β = .362; B = .319; t = 4.734; $p < .001$; *CI B 95%* [0.186; 0.452]), so that Hypothesis 1 was accepted. The value of collectivism had a positive relationship, which being that the higher the value of collectivism in an individual, the greater also was the tendency of that individual to engage in prosocial behavior, and vice versa.

Other results also found that self-efficacy was a significant predictor of prosocial behavior (Model 1: β = .294; B = .284; t = 3.967; $p < .001$; *CI B 95%*

Uji Hipotesis

Berdasarkan hasil uji korelasi, penulis memutuskan untuk melakukan teknik analisis regresi hierarki berganda, dengan tujuan untuk melihat hasil analisis regresi dari dua variabel yang memiliki korelasi signifikan (nilai kolektivisme dan efikasi diri) sebagai Model 1. Kemudian, penulis juga melihat perubahan model regresi jika variabel yang tidak berkorelasi signifikan (nilai individualisme dan motif egoistik) dimasukkan dalam analisis regresi, sehingga terdapat empat variabel prediktor sebagai Model 2.

Baik pada Model 1 atau Model 2, hasil uji hipotesis membuktikan bahwa terdapat peranan signifikan antara nilai kolektivisme dengan perilaku prososial (Model 1: β = 0,326; B = 0,287; t = 4,400; $p < 0,001$; *CI B 95%* [0,158; 0,416] dan Model 2: β = 0,362; B = 0,319; t = 4,734; $p < 0,001$; *CI B 95%* [0,186; 0,452]), sehingga Hipotesis 1 diterima. Nilai kolektivisme memiliki arah hubungan yang positif, yakni semakin tinggi nilai kolektivisme individu, maka semakin tinggi pula kecenderungan individu melakukan perilaku prososial, dan sebaliknya.

Hasil lain juga menemukan bahwa efikasi diri memprediksi perilaku prososial secara signifikan (Model 1: β = 0,294; B = 0,284; t = 3,967; $p < 0,001$;

[0.142; 0.425] and Model 2: β = .307; B = .296; t = 4.159; $p < .001$; $CI\ B\ 95\%$ [0.155; 0.437]), so that Hypothesis 3 was accepted. These two variables had a positive relationship, meaning that the higher the self-conviction of an individual regarding their abilities (self-efficacy), the greater also was the tendency of that individual to engage in prosocial behavior, and vice versa.

In Model 2, different outcomes were found in the results of partial regression testing, between the value of individualism and prosocial behavior. The authors found no presence of any significant role between the value of individualism and the prosocial behavior of the flood volunteers (β = - .117; B = - .091; t = - 1.525; p = .127; $CI\ B\ 95\%$ [- 0.208; 0.026]), so that Hypothesis 2 was rejected. These results of regression analysis were in line with those of the findings in the bivariate correlation testing.

Still related to Model 2, insignificant results were also found in the results of partial regression testing, between egoistic motives and prosocial behavior. The authors found no existence of any significant role between egoistic motives and the prosocial behavior of flood volunteers (β = - .086; B = - .060; t = - 1.126; p = .262; $CI\ B\ 95\%$ [- 0.164; 0.045]), so that Hypothesis 4 was rejected. The results of these findings of regression analysis were in line with the results of the findings from the bivariate correlation testing.

Simultaneously, in Model 1, the authors found that only the values of collectivism and self-efficacy together predicted prosocial behavior to a significant degree ($F(4. 145)$ = 12.527; $p < .001$). The two predictor variables had an effective contribution of 23.5% (R^2 = .235), whilst there were 76.5% of the other factors which played roles. The addition of the two other variables (the values of individualism and egoistic motives), caused no significant changes to the value of F (F change $(2. 145)$ = 2.103; p of F Change = .126), meaning that the addition of the two other variables did not make any significant change in Model 2, where the value of R^2 changed only at the rate of .022. Although this was so, the results of regression analysis indicated that the four indicators, simultaneously, could predict prosocial behavior to a significant degree ($F(4.145)$ = 12.527; $p < .001$), so that Hypothesis 5 was accepted. The complete results of regression testing may be seen in Table 2.

$CI\ B\ 95\%$ [0,142; 0,425] dan Model 2: β = 0,307; B = 0,296; t = 4,159; $p < 0,001$; $CI\ B\ 95\%$ [0,155; 0,437]), sehingga Hipotesis 3 diterima. Kedua variabel tersebut memiliki arah hubungan yang positif, dengan arti semakin tinggi keyakinan diri individu pada kemampuannya sendiri (efikasi diri), maka semakin tinggi pula kecenderungan individu melakukan perilaku prososial, dan sebaliknya.

Pada Model 2, hasil yang berbeda ditemukan pada hasil regresi parsial antara nilai individualisme dan perilaku prososial. Penulis tidak menemukan adanya peranan signifikan antara nilai individualisme dan perilaku prososial pada relawan banjir (β = - 0,117; B = - 0,091; t = - 1,525; p = 0,127; $CI\ B\ 95\%$ [- 0,208; 0,026]), sehingga Hipotesis 2 ditolak. Hasil temuan analisis regresi tersebut searah dengan hasil temuan pada uji korelasi *bivariate*.

Masih sehubungan dengan Model 2, hasil yang tidak signifikan juga ditemukan pada hasil regresi parsial antara motif egoistik dan perilaku prososial. Penulis tidak menemukan adanya peranan signifikan antara motif egoistik dan perilaku prososial pada relawan banjir (β = - 0,086; B = - 0,060; t = - 1,126; p = 0,262; $CI\ B\ 95\%$ [- 0,164; 0,045]), sehingga Hipotesis 4 ditolak. Hasil temuan analisis regresi ini searah dengan hasil temuan pada uji korelasi *bivariate*.

Secara simultan di Model 1, penulis menemukan bahwa hanya nilai kolektivisme dan efikasi diri yang bersamaan memprediksi perilaku prososial secara signifikan ($F(4, 145)$ = 12,527; $p < 0,001$). Kedua variabel prediktor memiliki sumbangan efektif sebesar 23,5% (R^2 = 0,235), sementara ada sebanyak 76,5% faktor lain yang berperan. Penambahan dua variabel yang lain (nilai individualisme dan motif egoistik) tidak signifikan memberikan perubahan pada nilai F (F change $(2, 145)$ = 2,103; p of F Change = 0,126), yang berarti bahwa penambahan dua variabel lain tidak membuat Model 2 berubah secara signifkan, ketika nilai R^2 hanya berubah senilai 0,022. Walaupun demikian, hasil analisis regresi menunjukkan bahwa keempat prediktor secara simultan dapat memprediksi perilaku prososial secara signifikan ($F(4, 145)$ = 12,527; $p < 0,001$), sehingga Hipotesis 5 diterima. Hasil lengkap uji regresi dapat dilihat pada Tabel 2.

Table 2
Results of Multiple Linear Regression Testing on Prosocial Behavior

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	p	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	SE	β			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Model 1: Step 1							
(Constant)	2.061	0.308		6.685	0.000	1.452	2.670
Value of Collectivism	0.287	0.065	0.326	4.400	0.000	0.158	0.416
Self-Efficacy	0.284	0.071	0.294	3.967	0.000	0.142	0.425
	$R = .485; R^2 = .235; Adjusted R^2 = .225; F(2. 147) = 22.610; p < .001$						
Model 2: Step 2							
(Constant)	2.362	0.340		6.953	0.000	1.691	3.034
Value of Collectivism	0.319	0.067	0.362	4.734	0.000	0.186	0.452
Self-Efficacy	0.296	0.071	0.307	4.159	0.000	0.155	0.437
Value of Individualism	- 0.060	0.053	- 0.082	- 1.126	0.262	- 0.164	0.045
Egoistic Motives	- 0.091	0.059	- 0.117	- 1.535	0.127	- 0.208	0.026
	$R = .507; R^2 = .257; Adjusted R^2 = .236; F(4. 145) = 12.527; p < .001$						
	$F Change = 2.103; p of F Change = 0.126$						

Tabel 2
Hasil Uji Regresi Linear Berganda Pada Perilaku Prososial

Prediktor	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	p	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	SE	β			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Model 1: Step 1							
(Constant)	2,061	0,308		6,685	0,000	1,452	2,670
Nilai Kolektivisme	0,287	0,065	0,326	4,400	0,000	0,158	0,416
Efikasi Diri	0,284	0,071	0,294	3,967	0,000	0,142	0,425
	$R = 0,485; R^2 = 0,235; Adjusted R^2 = 0,225; F(2, 147) = 22,610; p < 0,001$						
Model 2: Step 2							
(Constant)	2,362	0,340		6,953	0,000	1,691	3,034
Nilai Kolektivisme	0,319	0,067	0,362	4,734	0,000	0,186	0,452
Efikasi Diri	0,296	0,071	0,307	4,159	0,000	0,155	0,437
Nilai Individualisme	- 0,060	0,053	- 0,082	- 1,126	0,262	- 0,164	0,045
Motif Egoistik	- 0,091	0,059	- 0,117	- 1,535	0,127	- 0,208	0,026
	$R = 0,507; R^2 = 0,257; Adjusted R^2 = 0,236; F(4, 145) = 12,527; p < 0,001$						
	$F Change = 2,103; p of F Change = 0,126$						

Discussion

The results of regression analysis indicated that, simultaneously, the four variables (collectivism, individualism, egoism [egoistic motives], and self-efficacy) significantly predicted the prosocial behavior of flood volunteers, meaning that Hypothesis 5 of this study was accepted. However, from the partial regression analysis, it was found that only the values of collectivism and self-efficacy were significant in positively predicting

Diskusi

Hasil analisis regresi menunjukkan bahwa secara simultan, keempat variabel (kolektivisme, individualisme, egoisme [motif egoistik], dan efikasi diri) memprediksi perilaku prososial relawan banjir secara signifikan, yang berarti bahwa Hipotesis 5 dalam studi ini diterima. Namun, dari analisis regresi parsial ditemukan bahwa hanya nilai kolektivisme dan efikasi diri yang signifikan secara positif memprediksi perilaku

prosocial behavior. This finding was in line with the results of the bivariate correlation.

In this study, the authors discovered the existence of a significant role between the value of collectivism and the prosocial behavior of the flood volunteers, with a positive relationship, meaning that the higher was the value of collectivism, the more were volunteers inclined to perform prosocial behavior. This result was in accord with those of a study by Lampridis and Papastylianou (2017), as well as that of Lee and Kim (2021), which stated that collectivism increased the desire to perform prosocial behavior.

Indonesian culture is very close to the values of collectivism (Muluk et al., 2018). There was one domain from the measurement of the value of collectivism which was thought by the authors to be closely related to flood volunteers, that being the "duty" to sacrifice one's own interests for those of all the members of society (Oyserman et al., 2002). For individuals with high collectivism values, other individuals may be considered to be part of an extended family, so that the collective interests would be prioritized over those of the individual (Hofstede et al., 2010). From this, it was not surprising that, in this study, the value of collectivism of the flood volunteers had greater influence on prosocial behavior than that of the other predictors. This was caused by volunteers generally: (1) having a feeling of unity as part of a social group; (2) the values of *gotong royong* (an Indonesian social principle, meaning, "mutual assistance, cooperation"); (3) of acting without pressure; and (4) a genuine desire to help others. The volunteers had the orientation of helping one's group or other people.

This study's findings discovered that, in contrast to the value of collectivism, the value of individualism did not have any significant role in the prosocial behavior of flood volunteers. Lampridis and Papastylianou (2017) reported results in line with the findings of this study, though not in line with those of other studies, such as those by Steelman (1995a; 1995b). Triandis and Gelfand (2012) explained that the value of the culture of individualism was opposed to that of collectivism. Volunteers help society, not in their own interests, but in the interests of society itself. People with individualist values will assist, but to

prososial. Temuan ini sejalan dengan hasil korelasi *bivariate*.

Dalam studi ini, penulis menemukan adanya peranan signifikan antara nilai kolektivisme dengan perilaku prososial pada relawan banjir dengan arah hubungan yang positif, yang berarti bahwa semakin tinggi nilai kolektivisme, maka relawan akan semakin terdorong untuk melakukan perilaku prososial. Hasil tersebut sejalan dengan studi Lampridis dan Papastylianou (2017), serta Lee dan Kim (2021), yang menyatakan bahwa kolektivisme meningkatkan niat untuk melakukan perilaku prososial.

Budaya Indonesia sangat erat dengan nilai kolektivisme (Muluk et al., 2018). Ada satu domain dari pengukuran nilai kolektivisme yang penulis duga berkaitan erat dengan hasil temuan pada relawan banjir, yakni "tugas" (*"duty"*) untuk melakukan pengorbanan terhadap sesama anggota masyarakat (Oyserman et al., 2002). Bagi individu dengan nilai kolektivisme yang tinggi, individu lain dapat dianggap sebagai bagian dari keluarga besar, sehingga individu akan lebih memprioritaskan kepentingan kolektif daripada kepentingan individu (Hofstede et al., 2010). Maka dari itu, tidak mengherankan dalam studi ini bahwa nilai kolektivisme relawan banjir berpengaruh lebih kuat dibandingkan prediktor lain terhadap perilaku prososial. Hal ini dikarenakan pada umumnya relawan: (1) memiliki rasa kesatuan sebagai bagian dari kelompok masyarakat; (2) nilai gotong royong; (3) bertindak tanpa ada tekanan; dan (4) ikhlas membantu sesama. Para relawan memiliki orientasi menolong terhadap kelompok atau orang lain.

Berkebalikan dengan nilai kolektivisme, hasil studi ini menemukan bahwa nilai individualisme tidak memiliki peranan signifikan terhadap perilaku prososial pada relawan banjir. Lampridis dan Papastylianou (2017) melaporkan hasil searah dengan temuan studi ini, meskipun tidak searah dengan temuan lain seperti Steelman (1995a; 1995b). Triandis dan Gelfand (2012) menjelaskan bahwa nilai budaya individualisme berlawanan dengan kolektivisme. Para relawan menolong masyarakat bukan atas dasar kepentingan diri sendiri, tetapi untuk kepentingan masyarakat. Individu dengan nilai individualis akan menolong

benefit their own careers (Finkelstein, 2010), or out of feelings of sympathy (Steelman, 1995a; 1995b). The value of individualism is considered to be the value which can lead to a lack of concern or ignorance (Marni, 2014). The findings of this study, and the arguments from the findings of previous studies, increasingly strengthened the findings that, based upon the results of descriptive statistics, flood volunteers had lower degrees of the value of individualism than of that of collectivism. This made the value of collectivism more significant than that of individualism, in explaining prosocial behavior. The findings of the authors, concerning the values of individualism, strengthened the explanation that in an individual from a strong culture of collectivism, such as that of Indonesia, assistance to others is not motivated by fulfillment of one's own interests (the value of individualism). For a volunteer, helping society was a form of self-sacrifice and wholehearted assistance to others who had been struck by catastrophe.

The authors found the same results with the values of individualism in the non-significant relationship between egoistic motives and the prosocial behavior of flood volunteers. Prosocial behavior was motivated by the wish to obtain agreement, which was less than egoistic (Eisenberg et al., 2016). Egoistic ("good; benefit for me") motives are actually related to altruistic ("good; benefit for other") motives (Levit, 2014). The differences between these two motives are located in who is the principle beneficiary of the assistance (Batson, 2011). However, in the cases in this study, the volunteers helped the flood victims, not because of any aim of personal gain or benefit, but more with their actions being aimed at the gain or benefit of others (the public). This finding was one of the things which caused the egoistic motives to not be in a significant relationship with prosocial behavior. Egoistic motives do have a resemblance to the values of individualism, in that the two of them are focused on the self, and not on others.

All of the results of scientific studies have explained that self-efficacy is one of the predictors of prosocial behavior (De Caroli & Sagone, 2013; Hanisah et al., 2019; Pradnyana & Lestari, 2016). The results of the findings by the authors were in line with those of a number of previous studies, wherein the greater the self-efficacy, the higher

untuk keuntungan karir mereka (Finkelstein, 2010) atau karena ada rasa kasihan (Steelman, 1995a; 1995b). Nilai individualisme dianggap sebagai nilai yang dapat mengarah pada ketidakpedulian (Marni, 2014). Temuan studi ini dan argumentasi dari temuan studi terdahulu semakin menguatkan temuan bahwa berdasarkan hasil statistik deskriptif, para relawan banjir memiliki nilai individualisme yang lebih rendah dibandingkan nilai kolektivisme. Hal ini membuat nilai kolektivisme menjadi lebih signifikan menjelaskan perilaku prososial, dibandingkan dengan nilai individualisme. Temuan penulis mengenai nilai individualisme menguatkan penjelasan bahwa pada individu dengan budaya kolektivisme yang kuat, seperti di Indonesia, menolong orang lain tidak dilatarbelakangi oleh pemenuhan kepentingan pribadi (nilai individualisme). Bagi relawan, menolong masyarakat adalah bentuk pengorbanan dan keikhlasan demi orang lain yang terkena musibah.

Penulis menemukan hasil yang serupa dengan nilai individualisme pada hubungan yang tidak signifikan antara motif egoistik dengan perilaku prososial relawan banjir. Perilaku prososial dimotivasi oleh keinginan mendapat persetujuan yang kurang egoistik (Eisenberg et al., 2016). Motif egoistik ("good; benefit for me") sebenarnya berhubungan dengan motif altruistik ("good; benefit for other"; Levit, 2014). Perbedaan kedua motif ini terletak pada siapa sasaran utama manfaat dari sebuah pertolongan (Batson, 2011). Namun, pada kasus dalam studi ini, para relawan menolong korban banjir bukan karena tujuan kebaikan atau manfaat untuk diri sendiri, tetapi lebih ditujukan untuk kebaikan atau manfaat untuk orang lain (masyarakat). Temuan ini merupakan salah satu hal yang membuat motif egoistik tidak berhubungan dengan perilaku prososial secara signifikan. Motif egoistik memiliki kemiripan dengan nilai individualisme, ketika keduanya berfokus pada diri sendiri, dan bukan pada orang lain.

Sejumlah studi ilmiah telah menjelaskan bahwa efikasi diri merupakan salah satu prediktor dari perilaku prososial (De Caroli & Sagone, 2013; Hanisah et al., 2019; Pradnyana & Lestari, 2016). Hasil temuan penulis searah dengan beberapa temuan terdahulu, ketika semakin tinggi efikasi diri, maka semakin tinggi pula perilaku prososial. Para

also was the level of prosocial behavior. The volunteers, in assisting in the process of flood mitigation, worked in the distribution of aid, the evacuation of victims, the erection of field kitchens, and other matters. Several volunteers had to traverse jungle areas and rivers, to be able to channel the aid (Wardhani, 2021). The actions carried out by these volunteers indicated that, with a high level of self-efficacy, volunteers felt more able to solve problems efficiently, and tended to engage in prosocial behavior. Self-efficacy can be related to self-esteem (Branscombe & Baron, 2017). Individuals who have high self-esteem tend to help others (Fu et al., 2017). Low self-efficacy makes it possible for someone to have self-doubt (or low self-esteem or self-confidence), and to feel valueless, making it difficult to perform prosocial acts. On the other hand, self-efficacy may be seen as the consequence of the roles of the participants in this study as volunteers, in the sense that, because the participants were volunteers, they had a tendency towards high self-efficacy, or, indeed, more positive self-esteem (Stukas et al., 2015).

Limitations and Recommendations

The limitations of this study were the lack of the willingness of the participants to fill in questionnaires online, so that the authors had to strive to seek contact with them via the volunteer webpage, in order to contact aspirant participants directly through WhatsApp. The authors also were not fully able to determine whether the participants had been honest in completing the questionnaires. As an anticipatory step, the authors prepared open questions around flood volunteering, so as to, at the same time, determine whether the participants in the study really did fulfil the criteria for the research. Another limitation was that regarding the limited correlational explanations, so that it would be recommended if further studies utilize a number of other research method approaches, such as those longitudinal and experimental. Besides that, the results of this study need to be able to be generalized across a wider sample, not restricted just to flood volunteers, but to social volunteers, and the public in general.

Conclusion

Based upon the results of this study, it may be concluded that, simultaneously, the four variables (collectivism, individualism, egoism [egoistic

relawan dalam membantu proses penanganan banjir berusaha mendistribusikan bantuan, mengevakuasi korban, mendirikan dapur umum, dan lain sebagainya. Beberapa relawan harus melewati hutan dan sungai untuk dapat menyalurkan bantuan (Wardhani, 2021). Aksi yang telah dilakukan para relawan ini menunjukkan bahwa dengan tingginya efikasi diri, maka relawan akan lebih merasa mampu menyelesaikan masalah secara efisien dan akan cenderung melakukan perilaku prososial. Efikasi diri dapat dikaitkan dengan harga diri (Branscombe & Baron, 2017). Individu yang memiliki harga diri tinggi cenderung akan menolong orang lain (Fu et al., 2017). Efikasi diri yang rendah memungkinkan seseorang memiliki ketidakpercayaan diri (atau kepercayaan diri yang rendah) dan merasa tidak berharga, sehingga sulit melakukan tindak prososial. Di sisi lain, efikasi diri dapat dianggap sebagai konsekuensi dari peran partisipan studi ini sebagai relawan, dalam arti bahwa karena partisipan studi ini adalah relawan, ada kecenderungan memiliki efikasi diri atau bahkan harga diri yang lebih positif (Stukas et al., 2015).

Keterbatasan dan Saran

Keterbatasan studi ini adalah kurangnya minat partisipan dalam mengisi kuesioner daring, sehingga penulis harus berusaha mencari kontak relawan dari laman *web* kerelawanan untuk menghubungi calon partisipan secara langsung melalui *WhatsApp*. Penulis juga tidak sepenuhnya dapat memastikan apakah partisipan mengisi kuesioner yang diberikan secara jujur. Sebagai langkah antisipasi, penulis mempersiapkan pertanyaan terbuka seputar relawan banjir untuk sekaligus memastikan apakah partisipan studi memang sesuai dengan kriteria penelitian. Keterbatasan lain adalah terbatasnya studi ini pada penjelasan korelasional, sehingga studi selanjutnya sebaiknya memikirkan beberapa pendekatan metode penelitian lain, seperti longitudinal dan eksperimental. Selain itu, temuan studi juga perlu dapat digeneralisasikan pada sampel yang lebih luas, tidak hanya pada relawan banjir, tapi pada relawan sosial hingga masyarakat secara umum.

Kesimpulan

Berdasarkan hasil studi ini, dapat disimpulkan bahwa secara simultan keempat variabel (kolektivisme, individualisme, egoisme [motif

motives], and self-efficacy) can significantly predict the prosocial behavior of flood volunteers. However, partially, it was only the values of collectivism and self-efficacy which could positively predict prosocial behavior. The value of collectivism increases the desire for prosocial behavior, and individuals with high self-efficacy tend to opt to conducting prosocial behavior. The volunteers were active in helping the public, because they had an orientation towards group interests, rather than personal interests. Besides this, the volunteers generally had high convictions regarding their personal capacity and competence. In natural disaster volunteers, the values of individualism and egoistic motives were not factors playing roles in their prosocial behavior, because individuals with high values of individualism and egoistic motives tend more to choose to think of their own interests, rather than of helping others. So that the process of flood disaster mitigation can be carried out optimally, it would be as well for the government to engage in joint efforts, to increase the feelings of caring, within the public at large, with aspirant volunteers, existing natural disaster volunteers, and also with other interested parties.

From the implications of the study, aspirant volunteers, or the general public, need to be engaged in the strengthening of the values of collectivism and self-efficacy, through training from the government or community/organizational volunteer movements, particularly by focusing on efforts to: (1) embed the importance of the attitude of being willing to help and of making genuine self-sacrifice in the interests of the group (the value of collectivism) above self-interest; and (2) provide provision of competence to aspirant volunteers, before they involve themselves with the public, to increase their convictions of their own ability and capacity (self-efficacy). Further studies may pay attention to data collection techniques, more up-to-date research methods, and the broadening of research coverage, so that it is not restricted to flood volunteers.

Acknowledgment

egoistik], dan efikasi diri) dapat memprediksi perilaku prososial relawan banjir secara signifikan. Namun, secara parsial, hanya nilai kolektivisme dan efikasi diri yang signifikan secara positif memprediksi perilaku prososial. Nilai kolektivisme meningkatkan niat untuk melakukan perilaku prososial, dan individu dengan tingkat efikasi diri yang tinggi cenderung memilih untuk melakukan perilaku prososial. Para relawan aktif membantu masyarakat karena para relawan memiliki orientasi pada kepentingan kelompok daripada kepentingan pribadi. Selain itu, relawan pada umumnya memiliki keyakinan yang tinggi atas kapasitas dan kompetensi pribadi. Pada relawan bencana alam, nilai individualisme dan motif egoistik bukan faktor yang berperan pada perilaku prososial, karena individu dengan nilai individualisme dan nilai motif egoistik yang tinggi cenderung lebih memilih untuk memikirkan kepentingan diri sendiri dibandingkan menolong orang lain. Agar proses mitigasi bencana banjir dapat terlaksana dengan optimal, ada baiknya pemerintah melakukan kerjasama demi meningkatkan rasa peduli dari masyarakat luas, calon relawan, relawan bencana alam, dan juga pemangku kepentingan lainnya.

Pada implikasi studi, para calon relawan atau masyarakat umum perlu melakukan penguatan nilai budaya kolektivisme dan efikasi diri melalui pelatihan oleh pemerintah atau komunitas/organisasi kerelawanan, khususnya dengan berfokus pada usaha untuk: (1) menanamkan pentingnya sikap rela menolong dan berkorban secara ikhlas demi kepentingan kelompok (nilai kolektivisme) di atas kepentingan pribadi; dan (2) memberikan pembekalan keterampilan bagi calon relawan sebelum turun ke masyarakat untuk meningkatkan keyakinan akan kemampuan dan kapasitas diri (efikasi diri). Studi selanjutnya dapat memperhatikan tentang teknik pengambilan data, metode penelitian yang lebih mutakhir, dan perluasan cakupan penelitian agar tidak hanya pada relawan banjir.

Ucapan Terima Kasih

Environmental Behavior Laboratory (SnEBLAB) of the *Program Studi Psikologi, Fakultas Kedokteran, Universitas Lambung Mangkurat*, which provided technical support in this study.

Program Studi Psikologi, Fakultas Kedokteran, Universitas Lambung Mangkurat yang telah memberikan dukungan teknis pada studi ini.

References

Akhrani, L. A., & Nuryanti, S. (2021). Religiusitas dan kebahagiaan relawan bencana [Religiosity and happiness of disaster volunteers]. *Jurnal Talenta Psikologi, XVI*(1), 51-64.
https://jurnal.usahidsolo.ac.id/index.php/JTL/article/view/695

Akhtar, H., Pertiwi, R. E., & Mashuri, M. F. (2021). Eksplorasi motivasi relawan: Sebuah perspektif indigenous psychology [Exploration of volunteer motivation: A perspective of indigenous psychology]. *Jurnal Psikologi Sosial (JPS), 19*(3), 206-216.
https://doi.org/10.7454/jps.2021.23

Ashar, P. M., Maria, C., & Victoriana, E. (2017). Studi deskriptif mengenai motivasi prososial pada relawan Komunitas Berbagi Nasi di Kota Bandung [Descriptive study regarding prosocial motivation on Berbagi Nasi (Sharing Rice) Community volunteers in the city of Bandung]. *Humanitas: Jurnal Psikologi, 1*(3), 197-208.
https://doi.org/10.28932/humanitas.v1i3.757

Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana (BNPB) [Nasional Institute for Disaster Countermeasures]. (2021) *Desk relawan tanggap darurat banjir Kalimantan Selatan 2021* [South Kalimantan 2021 deployable flood volunteer desk]. Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana (BNPB).
https://deskrelawanpb.bnpb.go.id/banjir-kalsel/

Batson, C. D. (2011). *Altruism in humans*. Oxford University Press.
https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2011-04533-000

Baudinet, O. (2013). *Prosocial behaviour in adolescents: Classroom and sport specific environments* [Master's thesis, Massey University]. Massey Research Online.
https://hdl.handle.net/10179/5162

Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Ferraz, M. B. (2000). Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine, 25*(24), 3186-3191.
https://doi.org/10.1097/00007632-200012150-00014

Bella, L. N., Santi, D. E., & Ananta, A. (2020). Korelasi antara locus of control internal dengan perilaku prososial pada relawan MRI Surabaya [Correlation between internal locus of control and prosocial behavior on MRI volunteers in Surabaya]. *Sukma: Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi, 1*(2), 153-163.
https://jurnal.untag-sby.ac.id/index.php/sukma/article/view/4465

Branscombe, N. R., & Baron, R. A. (2017). *Social psychology* (Global edition, 14th ed.). Pearson Educational Limited.
https://www.pearson.com/uk/educators/higher-education-educators/program/Branscombe-Social-Psychology-Global-Edition-14th-Edition/PGM1104071.html

Cahyani, A. (2019). Perilaku prososial sebagai prediktor subjective well-being pada sukarelawan Kelas Inspirasi Yogyakarta [Prosocial behavior as a predictor of subjective well-being on Kelas Inspirasi (Inspiration Class) in Yogyakarta]. *Acta Psychologia, 1*(1), 62-71.
https://doi.org/10.21831/ap.v1i1.43468

Caprara, G. V., Steca, P., Zelli, A., & Capanna, C. (2005). A new scale for measuring adults' prosocialness. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 21*(2), 77-89.
https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.21.2.77

Carlo, G., & Randall, B. A. (2002). The development of a measure of prosocial behaviors for late adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 31*(1), 31-44.
https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1014033032440

Christy, & Sahrani, R. (2016). Hubungan place attachment dengan perilaku prososial relawan sosial [The relationship between place attachment and prosocial behavior of social volunteers]. *Provitae: Jurnal Psikologi Pendidikan, 8*(2), 68-87.
  https://doi.org/10.24912/provitae.v8i2.218 | https://journal.untar.ac.id/index.php/provitae/article/view/218

Davis, A. N., Carlo, G., Streit, C., Schwartz, S. J., Unger, J. B., Baezconde-Garbanati, L., & Szapocznik, J. (2018). Longitudinal associations between maternal involvement, cultural orientations, and prosocial behaviors among recent immigrant Latino adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 47*(2), 460-472.
  https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-017-0792-3

De Caroli, M. E., & Sagone, E. (2013). Self-efficacy and prosocial tendencies in Italian adolescents. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 92*(LUMEN), 239-245.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.08.666

De Clercq, D., Haq, I. U., & Azeem, M. U. (2022). Religion, collectivisme et comportement d'aide: Le rôle revigorant de la surveillance abusive [Religiousness, collectivism, and helping behavior: The invigorating role of abusive supervision]. *Revue Européenne de Psychologie Appliquée [European Review of Applied Psychology], 72*(2), 100702.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erap.2021.100702

Eisenberg, N., VanSchyndel, S. K., & Spinrad, T. L. (2016). Prosocial motivation: Inferences from an opaque body of work. *Child Development, 87*(6), 1668-1678.
  https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12638

Feiler, D. C., Tost, L. P., & Grant, A. M. (2012). Mixed reasons, missed givings: The costs of blending egoistic and altruistic reasons in donation requests. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*(6), 1322-1328.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.05.014

Finkelstein, M. A. (2010). Individualism/collectivism: Implications for the volunteer process. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 38*(4), 445-452.
  https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2010.38.4.445

Fitroh, R., Oktavia, W. K., & Hanifah, H. (2019). Perbedaan perilaku prososial ditinjau dari jenis kelamin pada relawan sosial [The differences in prosocial behavior viewed from the sex and gender of social volunteers]. *Jurnal Psikologi Terapan dan Pendidikan, 1*(1), 9-15.
  https://doi.org/10.26555/jptp.v1i1.15125

Fu, X., Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Brown, M. N. (2017). Longitudinal relations between adolescents' self-esteem and prosocial behavior toward strangers, friends and family. *Journal of Adolescence, 57*(1), 90-98.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2017.04.002

Guo, Q., Liu, Z., Li, X., & Qiao, X. (2018). Indulgence and long term orientation influence prosocial behavior at national level. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9:1798*.
  https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01798

Hanisah, Solfiah, Y., & Kurnia, R. (2019). Hubungan efikasi diri dengan perilaku prososial pada guru PAUD Kabupaten Indragiri Hilir [The relationship of self-efficacy and prosocial behavior on early childhood education teachers of Kabupaten Indragiri Hilir]. *Generasi Emas: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam Anak Usia Dini, 2*(2), 125-133.
  https://doi.org/10.25299/ge.2019.vol2(2).4470
  https://journal.uir.ac.id/index.php/generasiemas/article/view/4470

Hidayatullah, M. N., Lukmawati, L., & Rusli, R. (2021). Perilaku prososial pada relawan anak Sumatera Selatan [Prosocial behavior on child volunteers in South Sumatera]. *Indonesian Journal of Behavioral Studies, 1*(2), 261-270.
  https://doi.org/10.19109/ijobs.v1i2.9290
  https://jurnal.radenfatah.ac.id/index.php/ijobs/article/view/9290

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management & Organization, 10*(4), 15-41.
  https://doi.org/10.1080/00208825.1980.11656300

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede Model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture (ORPC), 2*(11), 1-26.

https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind: Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
https://www.mhprofessional.com/cultures-and-organizations-software-of-the-mind-third-edition-9780071770156-usa

Istiana, I. (2016). Hubungan empati dengan perilaku prososial pada relawan KSR-PMI Kota Medan [The relationship between empathy and prosocial behavior on volunteers of the voluntary corps of Red Cross in the city of Medan]. *Jurnal DIVERSITA, 2*(2), 1-13.
https://doi.org/10.31289/diversita.v2i2.508
https://ojs.uma.ac.id/index.php/diversita/article/view/508

Istiono, A., & Efendy, M. (2021). Kematangan emosi dan prososial pada Relawan Desa Lawan COVID-19 ditinjau dari jenis kelamin [Emotional maturity and prosocial on Relawan Desa Lawan COVID-19 (Village Volunteers Against COVID-19) viewed from sex and gender]. *Psyche 165 Journal, 14*(1), 32-39.
https://doi.org/10.35134/jpsy165.v14i1.92

Jung, H., Seo, E., Han, E., Henderson, M. D., & Patall, E. A. (2020). Prosocial modeling: A meta-analytic review and synthesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 146*(8), 635-663.
https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000235

Kurniawan, A. W., & Puspitaningtyas, Z. (2016). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif* [Quantitative research method]. Pandiva Buku.

Lampridis, E., & Papastylianou, D. (2017). Prosocial behavioural tendencies and orientation towards individualism–collectivism of Greek young adults. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth, 22*(3), 268-282.
https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2014.890114

Lee, J., & Kim, Y. (2021). When thinking of my death leads to thinking of others' deaths: The effect of collectivism, psychological closeness, and mortality salience on prosocial behavioral intentions in the Sewol ferry disaster. *Journal of Risk Research, 24*(6), 756-770.
https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2020.1738530

Levit, L. Z. (2014). Egoism and altruism: The "antagonists" or the "brothers"?. *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences, 7*(2), 164-188.
https://infinitypress.info/index.php/jsss/article/view/713

Marni, M. (2014). *Fenomena sebelum banjir sebagai refleksi individualistis warga Kelurahan Surau Gadang Kecamatan Nanggalo Kota Padang* [Pre-flood phenomenon as individualistic reflection of the Surau Gadang Ward Nanggalo District of the city of Padang] [Bachelor degree's final research project, Sekolah Tinggi Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan (STKIP) Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia (PGRI) Sumatera Barat]. Repositori Sekolah Tinggi Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan (STKIP) Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia (PGRI).
https://repo.stkip-pgri-sumbar.ac.id/id/eprint/10791/

McGuire, A. M. (1994). Helping behaviors in the natural environment: Dimensions and correlates of helping. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20*(1), 45-56.
https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167294201004

Muluk, H., Hudiyana, J., & Shadiqi, M. A. (2018). The development of psychology of culture in Indonesia. In W. W. Li, D. Hodgetts, & K. H. Foo (Eds.), *Asia-Pacific Perspectives on Intercultural Psychology* (1st ed., pp. 140-156). Routledge.
https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315158358-8

Muthmainnah, M., Djafar, S., Suryani, A., Indriani, D., Mursyid, I., & Irmayanti, I. (2021). Gerakan cipta relawan tangguh sadar psikososial pasca bencana [The movement for development tough and psychosocially aware post-disaster volunteers]. *Maspul Journal of Community Empowerment (MJCE), 3*(2), 30-41.
https://ummaspul.e-journal.id/pengabdian/article/view/3277

Myers, D. G., & Twenge, J. M. (2022). *Social psychology* (14th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
https://www.mheducation.com/highered/product/social-psychology-myers-twenge/M9781260888539.html

Novrianto, R., Marettih, A. K. E., & Wahyudi, H. (2019). Validitas konstruk instrumen General Self Efficacy Scale versi Indonesia [Construct validity of the Indonesian version of the General Self-Efficacy Scale]. *Jurnal Psikologi, 15*(1), 1-9.
https://doi.org/10.24014/jp.v15i1.6943

Nuryanti, S. (2020). Empathy and happiness of disaster volunteers. *INTERAKTIF: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial, 12*(2), 10-21.
https://interaktif.ub.ac.id/index.php/interaktif/article/view/244

Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*(1), 3-72.
https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.1.3

Pandya, S. P. (2020). Teaching spiritual techniques in continuing education programmes to train older adults for community service and volunteer work contributes to self-efficacy and prosocial behaviours: A five-year follow-up study in four South Asian cities. *Journal of Adult and Continuing Education, 26*(1), 73-96.
https://doi.org/10.1177/1477971419869359

Phillips, L., & Phillips, M. (2011). Altruism, egoism, or something else: Rewarding volunteers effectively and affordably. *Southern Business Review (SBR), 36*(1), 23-35.
https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/sbr/vol36/iss1/5/

Pradnyana, A. A. G. P. S., & Lestari, M. D. (2016). Peran perilaku prosocial, efikasi diri dan empati pada pegawai Badan Penanggulangan Bencana Daerah (BPBD) di Bali [The role of prosocial behavior, self-efficacy, and empathy on employees of Badan Penanggulangan Bencana Daerah (BPBD; Regional Disaster Countermeasures Institute) in Bali]. *Jurnal Psikologi Udayana, Cultural Health Psychology,* 177-188.
https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/psikologi/article/view/28069

Ratri, A., & Masykur, A. M. (2019). Para pengibar kemanusiaan (Analisis fenomenologi interpretatif tentang pengalaman menjadi relawan bencana laki-laki) [The flagbearers of humanity (Interpretative phenomenology analysis of male disaster volunteer experience)]. *Jurnal Empati, 8*(4), 148-161.
https://doi.org/10.14710/empati.2019.26525
https://ejournal3.undip.ac.id/index.php/empati/article/view/26525

Santrock, J. W. (2018). *Educational psychology* (6th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
https://www.mheducation.com/highered/product/educational-psychology-santrock/M9781260237771.html

Saroglou, V. (2013). Religion, spirituality, and altruism. In K. I. Pargament, J. J. Exline, & J. W. Jones (Eds.), *APA handbook of psychology, religion, and spirituality (Vol. 1): Context, theory, and research* (pp. 439-457). American Psychological Association.
https://doi.org/10.1037/14045-024

Schroeder, D. A., & Graziano, W. G. (2018). Prosocial behavior. In T. D. Nelson (Ed.), *Getting grounded in social psychology: The essential literature of beginning researchers* (pp. 245-285). Routledge.
https://www.routledge.com/Getting-Grounded-in-Social-Psychology-The-Essential-Literature-for-Beginning/Nelson/p/book/9781138932210

Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Self-efficacy measurement: Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES). In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston (Eds.), *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio: Causal and control beliefs* (pp. 35-37). NFER-Nelson.
https://abdn.pure.elsevier.com/en/publications/causal-and-control-beliefs

Setiawan, A., & Budiman, B. (2021). Perilaku prosocial pada relawan Komunitas Peduli Kanker Anak dan Penyakit Kronis Lainnya (KPKAPK) Kota Palembang [Prosocial behavior on volunteers of Komunitas Peduli Kanker Anak dan Penyakit Kronis Lainnya (KPKAPK; Child Cancer and Other Chronic Diseases Care Community) in the city of Palembang]. *Indonesian Journal of Behavioral Studies, 1*(4), 402-418.
https://doi.org/10.19109/ijobs.v1i4.11920
https://jurnal.radenfatah.ac.id/index.php/ijobs/article/view/11920

Shadiqi, M. A. (2018). Perilaku prosocial [Prosocial behavior]. In A. Pitaloka, Z. Abidin, & M. N. Milla (Eds.), *Psikologi sosial: Pengantar dalam teori & penelitian* [Social psychology: Introduction in theory & research] (pp. 227-260). Salemba Humanika.
https://penerbitsalemba.com/buku/10-0116-psikologi-sosial-pengantar-dalam-teori-dan-penelitian

Siem, B., & Stürmer, S. (2012). Meeting recipients' needs in dyadic cross-group helping: When the nature of the helper's motivation matters. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 15*(6), 762-775. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430212444323

Siem, B., & Stürmer, S. (2019). Attribution of egoistic versus altruistic motives to acts of helping: The role of the helper's status and the act's intended publicity. *Social Psychology, 50*(1), 53-66. https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000360

Statista Research Department. (2022). *Number of natural disasters that have occurred in Indonesia in from 2012 to 2021*. Statista.
https://www.statista.com/statistics/954348/indonesia-number-natural-disasters/#:~:text=In%202021%2C

Steelman, L. M. (1995a). *Cultural influences upon altruism: Individualist vs. collectivist patterns of helpful responses with regard to causal attributions of need* [Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston]. University of Houston Libraries.
https://uh.primo.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/01UHO_INST/1m13ils/alma991013155439705701

Steelman, L. M. (1995b). Cultural influences upon altruism: Individualist vs. collectivist patterns of helpful responses with regard to causal attributions of need. *Dissertation abstracts international. B, The sciences and engineering, 57*(3), 2225-2225.

Steinemann, S. T., Geelan, B. J., Zaehringer, S., Mutuura, K., Wolkow, E., Frasseck, L., & Opwis, K. (2020). Potentials and pitfalls of increasing prosocial behavior and self-efficacy over time using an online personalized platform. *PLoS ONE, 15*(6), e0234422.
https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234422

Stukas, A. A., Snyder, M., & Clary, E. G. (2015). Volunteerism and community involvement: Antecedents, experiences, and consequences for the person and the situation. In D. A. Schroeder, & W. G. Graziano (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of prosocial behavior* (pp. 459-493). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195399813.013.012

Triandis, H. C.. & Gelfand, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(1), 118-128.
https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.1.118

Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. J. (2012). A theory of individualism and collectivism. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (Vol 2., pp. 498-520). SAGE Publications Ltd.
https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/handbook-of-theories-of-social-psychology/book233017#:~:text=Providing%20a%20comprehensive%20exploration%20of,this%20vast%20and%20fascinating%20field.

Wardhani, A. K. (2021, January 19). *Kisah relawan tembus hutan dan sungai untuk salurkan donasi pada korban banjir di Kalsel* [Story of volunteers going through forests and rivers to deliver donations to flood victims in South Kalimantan]. TRIBUNnews.com.
https://www.tribunnews.com/nasional/2021/01/19/kisah-relawan-tembus-hutan-dan-sungai-untuk-salurkan-donasi-pada-korban-banjir-di-kalsel

(Appendix Follows) | *(Lanjut ke Lampiran)*

Appendix

Items of the Measurement Instruments in English

A. Value of Collectivism
1. If a workmate receives an award, I will feel proud.
2. The welfare of my workmates is important to me.
3. For me, contentment is spending time with others.
4. I feel good when I work with others.
5. Parents and children should, as much as possible, remain together.
6. It is my duty to look after my family, even when I have to sacrifice what I wish for.
7. Family members must always be united, without concern about any sacrifice required.
8. It is important for me to respect any decisions made by my group.

B. Value of Individualism
1. I choose more to rely upon myself, rather than on others.
2. I nearly always depend upon myself, rarely relying on others.
3. I often do, "my own thing".
4. My personal identity, separate from others, is very important to me.
5. It is important to me to do my work better than others do theirs.
6. Winning is everything for me.
7. Competitiveness is a natural law.
8. When others do better than me, I become tense and triggered off.

C. Self-Efficacy
1. I can always solve problems, if I work hard enough.
2. If someone opposes me, I am able to find a way and a path to get what I want.
3. It is easy for me to stick to my goals and achieve them.
4. I am convinced that I can handle unexpected happenings efficiently.
5. Thanks to my healthy commonsense, I know how to handle unexpected situations.
6. I can solve most problems, if I make the efforts needed.
7. I can stay calm in the face of problems, because I can rely on my own ability to overcome them.
8. When faced with a problem, I can normally discover a number of solutions.
9. When I am in trouble, I can normally think of the solution.
10. I can normally handle anything at all which comes near me.

(Appendix Continues) | *(Lampiran Berlanjut)*

D. Egoistic Motives

1. As a helper, I want to take measures to help so that I become well regarded.
2. As a helper, I hope to get my own career and reputational benefits from helpful behavior.
3. As a helper, I wish for inner calm.*
4. As a helper, I wish to impress others.
5. I wish to obtain personal benefit, when helping others.*
6. As a helper, I want to increase my own self-respect.
7. As a helper, I wish to get the respect of others.
8. As a helper, I enjoy the attention of others.
9. As a helper, I commend myself for being a responsible citizen.
10. As a helper, I think I can appease my feelings of guilt, because I am better than others.
11. As a helper, I help to divert myself from my own problems.
12. As a helper, I help to avoid the poor opinions of others.

Note.   *items deleted because the correlation value of the point, compared to the score totals, was < .30.

E. Prosocial Behavior

1. I am happy to help friends/colleagues in their activities.
2. I share things which I own with my friends.
3. I try to help others.
4. I am prepared to engage in volunteer activities to help those in need.
5. I am empathetic to those in need.
6. I immediately help those in need.
7. I do what I can to help others avoid problems.
8. I really feel what other people feel.
9. I am prepared to make my knowledge and abilities of benefit to others.
10. I strive to console those who are sad.
11. I am quick to lend money, or other things.
12. I am quick to put myself in the place of others who feel uncomfortable.
13. I try to get close to and to care for those in need.
14. I am quick to share with friends at every opportunity I get.
15. I spend time with friends who are feeling lonely.
16. I feel directly the discomfort of friends, although they do not communicate that discomfort to me.

Appendix Continues) | *(Lampiran Berlanjut)*

Lampiran

Butir Alat Ukur Penelitian Dalam Bahasa Indonesia

A. Nilai Kolektivisme
1. Jika rekan kerja mendapat hadiah, saya akan merasa bangga.
2. Kesejahteraan rekan kerja saya penting bagi saya.
3. Bagi saya, kesenangan adalah ketika saya menghabiskan waktu bersama orang lain.
4. Saya merasa baik ketika saya bekerja sama dengan orang lain.
5. Orang tua dan anak-anak harus sebisa mungkin tetap bersama.
6. Merupakan kewajiban saya untuk menjaga keluarga saya, bahkan ketika saya harus mengorbankan apa yang saya inginkan.
7. Anggota keluarga harus tetap bersatu, tidak peduli pengorbanan apa yang diperlukan.
8. Penting bagi saya untuk menghormati keputusan yang dibuat oleh kelompok saya.

B. Nilai Individualisme
1. Saya lebih memilih untuk bergantung pada diri saya sendiri daripada orang lain.
2. Saya mengandalkan diri saya sendiri hampir sepanjang waktu; saya jarang mengandalkan orang lain.
3. Saya sering melakukan "hal saya sendiri".
4. Identitas pribadi saya, terlepas dari orang lain, adalah sangat penting bagi saya.
5. Penting bagi saya untuk melakukan pekerjaan saya lebih baik dari orang lain.
6. Menang adalah segalanya bagi saya.
7. Persaingan adalah hukum alam.
8. Ketika orang lain melakukan lebih baik dari saya, saya menjadi tegang dan terpicu.

C. Efikasi Diri
1. Saya selalu dapat menyelesaikan masalah-masalah sulit jika saya berusaha cukup keras.
2. Jika seseorang menentang saya, saya dapat menemukan cara dan jalan untuk mendapatkan apa yang saya inginkan.
3. Mudah bagi saya untuk tetap berpegang pada tujuan-tujuan saya dan mencapai tujuan saya.
4. Saya yakin bahwa saya dapat menangani kejadian-kejadian tak terduga secara efisien.
5. Berkat akal sehat saya, saya tahu bagaimana menangani situasi-situasi yang tidak terduga.
6. Saya dapat menyelesaikan sebagian besar masalah jika saya melakukan upaya yang diperlukan.
7. Saya dapat tetap tenang saat menghadapi kesulitan-kesulitan karena saya bisa mengandalkan kemampuan saya untuk mengatasi.
8. Ketika saya dihadapkan pada suatu masalah, saya biasanya dapat menemukan beberapa solusi.
9. Jika saya dalam masalah, saya biasanya dapat memikirkan solusinya.
10. Saya biasanya dapat menangani apa pun yang menghampiri saya.

D. Motif Egoistik

1. Sebagai penolong, saya ingin menggunakan tindakan menolong agar diri saya terkenal.
2. Sebagai penolong, saya mengharapkan keuntungan untuk karir dan reputasi saya sendiri dari perilaku menolong.
3. Sebagai penolong, saya ingin hati nurani saya menjadi tenang.*
4. Sebagai penolong, saya ingin membuat orang lain terkesan.
5. Saya berharap mendapatkan manfaat untuk diri sendiri ketika menolong orang lain.*
6. Sebagai penolong, saya ingin meningkatkan harga diri saya.
7. Sebagai penolong, saya ingin mendapatkan penghargaan dari orang lain.
8. Sebagai penolong, saya menikmati perhatian dari orang lain.
9. Sebagai penolong, saya memuji diri saya sendiri karena menjadi warga negara yang bertanggung jawab.
10. Sebagai penolong, saya berpikir bahwa saya dapat meredakan perasaan bersalah saya karena menjadi lebih baik dibandingkan yang lain.
11. Sebagai penolong, saya membantu untuk mengalihkan diri dari masalah saya sendiri.
12. Sebagai penolong, saya membantu untuk menghindari pandangan buruk dari orang lain.

Catatan.   *butir dihapus karena nilai korelasi butir dengan total skor < 0,30.

E. Perilaku Prososial

1. Saya senang membantu teman/rekan saya dalam aktivitas-aktivitas mereka.
2. Saya berbagi hal-hal yang saya miliki dengan teman-teman saya.
3. Saya berusaha membantu orang lain.
4. Saya bersedia melakukan kegiatan sukarela untuk membantu mereka yang membutuhkan.
5. Saya berempati dengan mereka yang membutuhkan.
6. Saya segera membantu mereka yang membutuhkan.
7. Saya melakukan apa yang saya bisa untuk membantu orang lain menghindari masalah.
8. Saya sangat merasakan apa yang orang lain rasakan.
9. Saya bersedia untuk membuat pengetahuan dan kemampuan saya bermanfaat untuk orang lain.
10. Saya mencoba menghibur mereka yang sedang sedih.
11. Saya mudah meminjamkan uang atau hal lainnya.
12. Saya mudah menempatkan diri saya pada posisi orang-orang yang merasa tidak nyaman.
13. Saya berusaha menjadi dekat dan merawat mereka yang membutuhkan.
14. Saya mudah membagikan kepada teman-teman setiap kesempatan baik yang datang kepada saya.
15. Saya menghabiskan waktu dengan teman-teman yang merasa kesepian.
16. Saya langsung merasakan ketidaknyamanan teman-teman meskipun tidak dikomunikasikan secara langsung kepada saya.