THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EMPATHY AND PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR OF NON-DISABLED STUDENTS TOWARDS STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM FKIP SEBELAS MARET UNIVERSITY

Wahyu Abdi Prastyo[*] Dewi Sri Rejeki, Mahardika Supratiwi

Special Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia 57126

[*]Corresponding Email: wahyuabdi1214@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to determine the relationship between empathy and prosocial behavior of non-disabled students towards students with disabilities. Special Education Study Program (PKh) FKIP Sebelas Maret University. This research is a quantitative research of the correlational type This research was conducted at Sebelas Maret University, Special Education Study Program, involving non-disabled students of the 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023 batches. The data collection method uses an online questionnaire where respondents need to fill out the available forms. Data analysis uses inferential statistics. The results of the study showed a considerable strong correlation between empathy and prosocial behavior with a negative correlation in non-disabled students in the Special Education Study Program (PKh) FKIP UNS. It is hoped that this research will be a reminder for Special Education Study Program students to pay attention to the use of empathy as necessary in daily life.

Keywords: Empathy, Prosocial Behavior, Students, Inclusive education

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui hubungan antara empati dengan perilaku prososial mahasiswa non penyandang disabilitas terhadap mahasiswa penyandang disabilitas.Prodi Pendidikan Khusus (PKh) FKIP Universitas Sebelas Maret. Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian kuantitatif jenis korelasional Penelitian ini dilakukan di Universitas Sebelas Maret, Prodi Pendidikan Luar Biasa, melibatkan mahasiswa non penyandang disabilitas Angkatan 2020, 2021, 2022, dan 2023. Metode pengumpulan data menggunakan kuisioner online dimana responden perlu mengisi form yang tersedia. Analisis data menggunakan inferential statistic. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan korelasi cukup kuat antara empati dengan perilaku prososial dengan arah korelasi negatif pada mahasiswa non penyandang disabilitas di Prodi Pendidikan Khusus (PKh) FKIP UNS. Diharapkan penelitian ini menjadi pengingat bagi mahasiswa Prodi Pendidikan Khusus untuk memperhatikan penggunaan empati yang seperlunya dalam kehidupan sehari-hari.

Kata kunci: Empati, Perilaku Prososial, Mahasiswa, Pendidikan inklusif

INTRODUCTION

In Law Number 8 of 2016, in Article 10, it is stated that the right to education for people with disabilities, one of which is the right to get quality education in educational units in all types, paths, and levels of education in an inclusive and special manner. One form of education received by people with disabilities is inclusive education. However, inclusive education has various obstacles and challenges, especially in higher education, such as establishing new friendships, changes in attitudes and behaviors

of each informant, changes in perspective, trying to be more independent, and obstacles in performing assignments and exams (Rosydi and Dwi, 2020). In order to help overcome the obstacles and challenges above, non-disabled students are expected to have prosocial behavior that helps students with disabilities in lectures. One of the factors that affects the prosocial behavior of non-disabled students is empathy.

Borba stated that empathy is the basis of moral intelligence, empathy is the ability to understand the feelings of others (Borba. 2008). Eisenberg and Mussen provide a definition of prosocial behavior, which is a voluntary individual action that aims to help or provide benefits for an individual or group of individuals (Eisenberg and Mussen. 1989). Empathy, as a form of emotion, has a dark side, that empathy in addition to triggering prosocial behaviors can also trigger cruelty, that empathic pressure is not entirely an effective motivator because it causes burnout (Bloom, 2016). This is explained by Goleman, that emotions can take over rational thinking in decision-making, which is related to prosocial behavior (Goleman, 2023). That is, empathy is seen as an emotion that is on par with other emotions, in decision-making and prosocial behavior, without adding a moral burden to empathy.

The above opinion is certainly contrary to popular opinion, where empathy can encourage higher levels of help in line with the level of empathy, even with easy psychological escape conditions (Stocks, Lishner, and Deckers, 2009). Empathy also promotes higher decision-making, where people with high empathy scores have lower response times in dealing with social dilemmas (Forsgaardc, et al. 2014). Other research on empathy and prosocial behavior shows that the contribution of empathy variables is 73.4% (Nurulsani, et al, 2022), that there is a relationship between empathy and prosocial behavior (Anjani, 2018), that there is no relationship between interpersonal intelligence and psosocial behavior (Tartila and Aulia, 2021). Therefore, the purpose of this study is to find out whether there is a relationship between empathy and the social behavior of non-disabled students towards students with disabilities.

METHOD

The research method used in this study is a quantitative research method. This study uses a correlational research design, where the focus of the research is on testing hypotheses to get conclusions that can be accounted for. The population in this study is 240 students of non-disability students from the 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023 Special Education Study Program of Sebelas Maret University. The sampling technique used in the study is simple random sampling, where every student of the above batch has the same opportunity to be selected. The data collection method used is an online questionnaire. The data obtained was then analyzed by inferential statistical techniques. This study uses a validity test with the type of content validity and an item differentiation test, where the instrument has been consulted first with experts, and then tested and analyzed by item analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The number of respondents in this study was 41 non-disabled students in the Special Education Study Program at Sebelas Maret University, with 7 male genders and 34 female genders. Details based on the batch are: 13 non-disabled students of the Class of 2020, 18 non-disabled students of the Class of 2021, 5 non-disabled students of the Class of 2022, and 5 non-disabled students of the Class of 2023.

The data regarding the descriptive analysis of the empathy scale are as follows: of the 41 people had the lowest empathy score of 30, and the highest empathy score of 103, with an average empathy score of 55.20, and a standard deviation of 11.064. Data on the empathy score of non-disabled students is as follows:

Table 1. Categorization of Empathy Scale Assessment

Range of Number	Category	Number of Respodents	Percentage (%)
X> 110	Very High	1	2,39
66 <X≤ 87	High	1	2,39
44 <X≤ 65	Medim	36	87,81
22 <X≤ 43	Low	3	7,32
X≤ 21	Very Low	0	0

Based on the table above, there are 3 non-disabled students (7.32%) have low empathy scores, 36 non-disabled students (87.81%) have moderate empathy scores, and 1 non-disabled student (2.39%) has a high empathy score, and 1 non-disabled student (2.39%) has a very high empathy score. Based on this data, it can be concluded that most non-disabled students have a moderate category empathy score for students with disabilities in the PLB FKIP UNS Study Program, which is 87.81%.

The data regarding the analysis of the prosocial behavior scale are as follows: of the 41 people had the lowest prosocial behavior score of 41, and the highest prosocial behavior score of 94, with an average empathy score of 78.85, and a standard deviation of 9.188. Meanwhile, the data on the prosocial behavior score of non-disabled students are as follows:

Table 2. Categorization of Prosocial Behavior Scale Assessment

Range of Number	Category	Number of Respondents	Percentage (%)
X> 115	Sangat Tinggi	1	2,43
69 <X≤ 92	Tinggi	36	87,81
46 <X≤ 68	Sedang	3	7,31
23 <X≤ 45	Rendah	1	2,43
X≤ 22	Sangat Rendah	0	0

Based on the table above, there are 1 non-disabled student (2.43%) who has a low Prosocial Behavior score, 3 non-disabled students (7.31%) who have a moderate Prosocial Behavior score, and 36 non-disabled students (87.81%) who have a high Prosocial Behavior score, and 1 non-disabled student (2.43%) who has a very high Prosocial Behavior score. Based on this data, it can be concluded that most non-disabled students have a high category of ProSocial Behavior score for students with disabilities in the PLB FKIP UNS Study Program, which is 87.81%.

The results of the normality test in this study, the Asymp value. Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.200. From these results, it can be concluded that the data in this study is normally distributed because it meets the requirements of $p > 0.05$ with 0.200 >0.05. While the result of the linearity test is that the significance value (linearity) in this study is 0.001. From the results of the linearity test, it can be concluded that this study is linear because it meets the linearity requirements $p < 0.05$ with 0.001 < 0.05.

Table 3. Processed results of statistical data description

Correlations			
		Empati	**Prosocial behavior**
Empati	Pearson Correlation	1	-.434**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.005
	N	41	41
Prosocial behavior	Pearson Correlation	-.434**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	
	N	41	41

Based on the table above, it can be known that the significance value is 0.005 and the calculation value is -0.434. So that the hypothesis proposed by the researcher was accepted, namely that there is a relationship between empathy and prosocial behavior of non-disabled students towards students with disabilities of the FKIP Special Education Study Program of Sebelas Maret University (UNS), with a significance level of 5% and a sig. (2-tailed) of 0.005.With a negative r value (-0.434) indicates that the direction of the relationship is inversely proportional. The meaning of the negative relationship is that the higher the empathy score of non-disabled students, the lower the prosocial behavior score of students with disabilities. Then based on the value of r when compared to the table (0.434 > 0.40), the correlation strength is quite strong, where 0.434 > 0.40 but 0.434 <0.60. Therefore, the higher the empathy score of non-disabled students, the lower the prosocial behavior score of non-disabled students, with a considerable strong correlation power.

Based on the results of the study, it is known that empathy has a negative correlation with prosocial behavior, with a strong correlation power. This result is in line with Bloom (2016) where empathy has limitations when expected as a solution to various social problems such as discrimination, poverty, and conflict. These limitations are the irrational nature of human beings themselves, where a real example is the existence of bias and heuristic in decision-making (Thaler and Sunstein. 2020). This can be seen from a study from Vachon (2014) reporting that only about 1% of aggression variations are caused by a lack of empathy. They concluded, 'There are emotions and considerations beyond empathy, and there are many reasons to care for others.

This is also reinforced by research from Baron-Cohen (2012), stating that individuals with Asperger's syndrome or autism usually have low cognitive empathy – they have trouble understanding the minds of others – and are also said to have low emotional empathy. However, they do not show a tendency to exploit and commit violence. This means that the empathy score does not necessarily reflect the level of a person's prosocial behavior, that it takes more than just empathy to make a person perform prosocial behavior, such as considering the benefits and losses (Penner, et al. 2005).

However, the results of the study contradict several studies, such as a study from Anjani (2018) which states that empathy is positively correlated with prosocial behavior of vocational school students, and a study from Nurulsani (2022) which states that empathy affects prosocial behavior significantly. Empathy, basically a shortcut in the moral compass, because it is easier for a person to decide to help someone according to the emotional response received, hijacking decision-making that originally needed to go through the high path of common sense, into a low emotional path (Goleman, 2023). Research that supports empathy, the positive relationship between empathy and prosocial behavior is based on the nature of empathy where when a person understands others, there is less likely to conflict and the more likely to commit prosocial behavior to others (Bloom, 2016).

The ability to empathize, that is, the ability to know how others feel, is involved in daily life, from management and sales to romance to educating children, from compassion to political action (Goleman. 2020). In this case, empathy underlies moral actions and considerations, one of which is prosocial behavior. Prosocial behavior, where the outline is to help others, goes hand in hand with empathy to a certain extent. Given that prosocial behavior can be driven by cost-benefit motives or altruism, it is difficult to be sure whether empathy and prosocial behavior are in a positive relationship. The main objection to empathy is its nature of highlighting what drives empathy while obscuring the surrounding conditions, a floodlight condition that illuminates one side and darkens the other side in shadows (Bloom. 2016). Empathy, as an emotion, also tends to take over rational thinking, where actions are based solely on emotion (Goleman, 2023). And this tendency is reinforced by human nature that tends to take shortcuts in decision-making, resulting in bias and noise in decision-making, one of the causes of which is emotion (Kahneman. 2020).

Kahneman describes human thought into two systems of thought: a. system 1 which operates automatically and quickly, with little or no effort and without any feeling of deliberate control, b. system 2 which pays attention to mental activities that require effort, is often associated with subjective experiences of being an actor, choosing, and concentrating (Kahneman. 2020). The relationship with empathy and prosocial behavior is to see how empathy is a driver of prosocial action, whether using an automated system 1 or a rational system 2. When empathy and prosocial behavior use system 1, actions and willingness to sacrifice material, time, and thought are in line with the level of emotion and empathy. However, it is different when empathy and prosocial behavior use system 2, where the willingness to act and sacrifice tends to be inconsistent with emotions and empathy. From a rational perspective, empathy and prosocial behavior that uses system 1 tends to be biased and have bad consequences, as Bloom fears, empathy has limitations where prosocial behavior is bound by the emotions of a party.

When prosocial behavior is bound by emotions that spark empathy, various problems arise. One of the problems that arises is maintaining high empathy while inflamed emotions to remain stable and high. Kahneman (2020) shows how emotions are unstable, by showing how decision-making is in a state of hunger during the day, in contrast to a state of fullness during the day. Hunger, which is

associated with negative emotions, exacerbates decision-making with a tendency to think negatively and defensively. Exposure to bad situations continuously in the long term also produces mental fatigue, where exposure to suffering, poverty, and crime continuously through the mass media makes people apathetic (Roston. 2011). Another issue is scale and priority, where help focuses on the part that encourages empathy, rather than effort to solve the problem. The news of young children suffering from cancer attracting attention and help for other childhood cancer patients when hospital facilities for cancer are underfunded, as Taleb (2020) stated, is a murder and neglect that society is not aware of. Emotional instability and continuous exposure can be used to answer how empathy does not correlate positively with prosocial behavior, where students as human beings have a fluctuating level of emotion when dealing with empathy for a problem. Exposure to information about the suffering and problems of people with disabilities in students also lowers the level of empathy while maintaining high prosocial behavior. Meanwhile, the scale and priorities of students tend to depend on the subjective values and experiences of each student, which reduces the level of empathy and selectivity in helping others.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study, there is a significant relationship between empathy and prosocial behavior of non-disabled students towards students with disabilities in the Special Education Study Program (PKh) FKIP UNS. The direction of the relationship between empathy and prosocial behavior is negative, meaning that the higher the empathy of non-disabled students to students with disabilities, the lower the prosocial behavior of non-disabled students to students with disabilities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Anjani, K. Y. (2018). Hubungan Antara Empati Dengan Perilaku Prososial Pada Siswa SMK Swasta X Di Surabaya. Jurnal Mahasiswa Universitas Negeri Surabaya, 5(2), 1-6.

Baron-Cohen, S. (2012) The Science of Evil: On Empathy and the Origins of Cruelty, Basic Books

Bloom, P. (2016) Against Empathy: The Case for Rational Compassion, Ecco Pres

Borba, M. (2008). Membangun Kecerdasan Moral. Jakarta. Gramedia Pustaka Utama

Goleman, Daniel. (2020). Kecerdasam Emosional: Mengapa EI Lebih Penting daripada IQ (diterjemahkan oleh T. Hermaya). Jakarta. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Goleman, Daniel. (2023). Social Intelligence: Ilmu Baru tentang Hubungan Antar-Manusia (diterjemahkan oleh Hariono S. Imam). Jakarta. Gramedia Pustaka Utama

Kahneman, D. (2020). Thinking, Fast and Slow (diterjemahkan oleh Zia Anshor). Jakarta. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Mussen, P., & Eisenberg-Berg, N. (1977). Roots of caring, sharing, and helping. San Francisco, CA: Freeman.

Mussen, P., & Eisenberg, N. (2001). Prosocial development in context. In A. C. Bohart & D. J. Stipek (Eds.), *Constructive & destructive behavior: Implications for family, school, & society* (pp. 103–126). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/10433-005

Nurulsani,dkk. (2022). Hubungan Empati dan Prososial pada Mahasiswa Program Studi Psikologi Universitas Muhammadiyah Maluku Utara. KAWASA Volume XII Nomor 3. Hlm 33-39

Penner, Louis A, John F. Dovidio, Jane A. Piliavin, David A. Schroeder. (2005). PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR: Multilevel Perspective. Annual Review. 56:365–392.

Roston, Miles. (2011). Jejak-Jejak Pengubah Dunia: Kisah-Kisah Inspirasi Para Pahlawan Dunia di Jalan Sunyi (diterjemahkan oleh Debby Lukito). Solo. Tiga Serangkai Pustaka Mandiri

Rosydi, Robiana, Dinar Sari E. D. (2020). Penyesuaian Diri Pada Mahasiswa Disabilitas. PSIMPHONI, Vol.1. hlm 11-16

Stocks, Eric L, David A. L. (2008). Altruism or psychological escape: Why does empathy promote prosocial behavior?. European Journal of Social Psychology, vol 39, 649–665

Taleb, Nassim. N. (2020). Black Swan: Rahasia Terjadinya Peristiwa-Peristiwa Langka yang Tak Terduga (diterjemahkan oleh Alex Tri Kantjono. W). Jakarta. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Thaler, Richard H, Cass R Sunstein. (2020). Nudge: Memperbaiki Keputusan tentang Kesehatan, Kekayaan, dan Kebahagiaan (diterjemahkan oleh Zia Anshor). Jakarta. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 8 Tahun 2016 Tentang Penyandang Disabilitas