

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.** Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

# **U·M·I**

University Microfilms International  
A Bell & Howell Information Company  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA  
313 761-4700 800 521 0600



Order Number 9010484

**Adolescent prosocial behaviors in relation to empathy, identity  
and self-esteem**

Preisser, Gayla, Ph.D.

The University of Arizona, 1989

**U·M·I**  
300 N. Zeeb Rd.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106



ADOLESCENT PROSOCIAL BEHAVIORS IN RELATION  
TO EMPATHY, IDENTITY AND SELF-ESTEEM

by

Gayla Preisser

---

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the  
DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

In partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
WITH A MAJOR IN EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 8 9

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Final Examination Committee, we certify that we have read  
the dissertation prepared by Gayla Preisser

entitled Adolescent Prosocial Behaviors in Relation to  
Empathy, Identity, and Self-Esteem

and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement  
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

*Lawrence Aleamoni*  
Dr. Lawrence Aleamoni

August 22, 1989  
Date

*Shitala P. Mishra*  
Dr. Shitala Mishra

8-22-89  
Date

*Sharon Conley*  
Dr. Sharon Conley

8-22-89  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the  
candidate's submission of the final copy of the dissertation to the Graduate  
College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my  
direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation  
requirement.

*Lawrence Aleamoni*  
Dissertation Director

August 22, 1989  
Date

## STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advance degree at the University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgement of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his or her judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: Jayla D. Cissel

## DEDICATION

With Respect and Love

To My Mother  
Adrienne Schanel Preisser  
1925 - 1970  
A Most Helpful and Caring Individual

and

To My Niece  
Aztin Lou Preisser  
1983 - 1989  
A Most Kind and Giving Child

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Chuck McCloud, his secretary Cheryl Kape, and all the participating teachers at Casa Grande Union High School for their assistance in data gathering. I would also like to thank all the participating students for sharing their perspectives and experiences. A special thanks to Greg Cannon for his help in analyzing the data. Also, I wish to thank Jessie Fryer, Leticia Green, and Kelly Morris for their help throughout my doctoral program, and for their contributions in preparing this manuscript.

I would like to thank my dissertation committee members, Drs. Lawrence M. Aleamoni, Sharon C. Conley, and Shitala P. Mishra, for sharing their knowledge and experiences; for their encouragement, guidance, and support; for their belief and trust in me; and for the insights and opportunities they offered me. I would also like to acknowledge the late Dr. Hershel Thornburg for affording me the opportunity to grow in the discipline; for sharing his academic style and wisdom; and for his interest, concern, and kindness.

Near lastly, but lovingly, I wish to thank my father, J. G., for his constant belief in my ability and his many words of wisdom; my siblings, Rodney, Cheryl, Karen, Gary, Denise, Kenny, Tami and their families, each of whom in their own way contributed much to my graduate career; and my friends, Joe, for the constant reminders; Leti and Mark, for the endless hours of inspiring and helpful conversation; Laura, for fifteen years of caring friendship; and Pete, for the miles of comfort and laughter.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge and extend my appreciation to all the many, many people who made my stay here in Arizona worthwhile, and wonderful. Thank you!

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	LIST OF TABLES.....	9
	ABSTRACT.....	11
1.	INTRODUCTION.....	13
	Overview of Major Issues.....	15
	Statement of the Problem.....	19
	Overview of the Study and Research Questions.....	20
2.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	23
	Definitions of Terms and Theoretical Frameworks.....	23
	Prosocialness.....	23
	Empathy.....	37
	Identity.....	48
	Self-Esteem.....	53
	Definitions Employed in this Study...	63
	Empirical Underpinnings.....	64
	Empathy and Prosocial Behavior..	64
	Identity and Prosocialness.....	73
	Self-Esteem and Prosocial Behavior.....	81
3.	METHOD.....	85
	Research Design.....	85
	Participants.....	86
	Selection.....	87
	Characteristics.....	89
	Description of Measures.....	89
	Open-Ended Prosocial Survey.....	92
	Predictor Variables.....	93
	Cognitive and Affective Processes of Empathy.....	93
	Identity.....	95
	Self-Esteem.....	96

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

		Page
3.	<u>Continued</u>	
	Criterion Variable.....	98
	Prosocial Response.....	98
	Descriptive Questionnaire.....	100
	Procedure.....	100
4.	RESULTS.....	104
	Qualitative Data Results.....	104
	Method of Analysis.....	104
	Response Themes and Clusters.....	107
	Summary of Themes and Clusters.....	114
	Validity and Bias.....	122
	Quantitative Data Results.....	125
	Reliabilities.....	125
	Means and Standard Deviations.....	125
	Analysis of Mean Differences in Empathy, Self-Esteem, Identity, and Prosocial Response.....	127
	Multiple Regression Analysis.....	128
	Factor Loadings for Prosocial Response Scale.....	130
5.	DISCUSSION.....	135
	Summary and Interpretation of Results.....	135
	Qualitative Data.....	135
	Quantitative Data.....	138
	Implications.....	141
	Research.....	141
	Theory.....	142
	Practice.....	143
	Conclusions.....	143
	APPENDIX A:    QUALITATIVE, QUANTITATIVE, AND DESCRIPTIVE MEASURES USED IN EXAMINING CORRELATES OF ADOLESCENT PROSOCIALITY.....	145
	APPENDIX B:    ASSORTED MATERIALS ACCOMPANYING RESEARCH MEASURES USED IN EXAMINING CORRELATES OF ADOLESCENT PROSOCIALITY.....	162

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
APPENDIX C:      ACTUAL QUANTITATIVE INSTRUMENTS ADMINISTERED.....	171
REFERENCES       .....	179

## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Characteristics of participants in the qualitative aspects of the study .....	90
2	Characteristics of participants in the quantitative aspect of the study.....	91
3	Adolescent conceptions of prosocial behaviors.....	108
4	Adolescent self-reported positive behaviors.....	109
5	Adolescent reasons for their own prosocialness.....	110
6	Adolescent reasons for peer prosocialness.....	111
7	Self-reported helping, sharing, comforting, and cooperative behaviors among adolescents.....	112
8	Self-reported circumstances engendering adolescent helping, sharing, and cooperative behavior.....	113
9	Overall cluster themes regarding self-reported adolescent responses to prosocial survey.....	121
10	Internal consistency reliabilities.....	126
11	Total empathy, identity, self-esteem, and prosocial response scores by gender, age, and ethnicity.....	127
12	Correlation matrix for empathy, identity, self-esteem, and prosocial response.....	129
13	Multiple regression results using empathy, identity, and self-esteem as predictors of prosocial response.....	129

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table		Page
14	Factor loadings for prosocial response scale.....	131
15	Prosocial item loadings according To perceived cost, potential benefits, and personal distance.....	134

## ABSTRACT

This study examined prosocial perceptions, and the effects of empathy, identity, and self-esteem on prosocial responding among two samples of 9th-, 10th-, 11th- and 12th-graders. One group (N = 109) was asked to provide written responses to various open-ended questions about their own and their peers' prosocialness. Responses varied in terminology and examples, however, underlying themes were quite similar. Respondents described the given prosocial concerns in terms of academics, affect, negative consequences, particular behaviors or situations, personal mood or characteristics, reciprocal acts, relationships, social involvement or esteem, socialization influences, and morals or values. Many of the respondents reported that prosocial behavior involved popularity, participating in activities, or having a lot of friends and being well liked. Others described prosocial behavior as being helpful or caring, and acting in a socially desirable or positive manner. Some defined the construct in terms of internalized values, ideals, or morals. Noted differences emerged in reported attributions for one's own and one's peers prosocialness. Empathy was more frequently reported in explaining one's own prosocial behavior, while benefitting others was more often associated with peer responding. The

second sample of students (N = 326) responded to a series of Likert-type scales assessing levels of empathy, identity, self-esteem, and prosocial responding. Results showed moderate to high correlations between empathy and prosocial responding, and between identity and self-esteem. Empathy accounted for 38% of the variance in prosocial responding. Identity and self-esteem had virtually no effect on prosocial responding, however the two shared considerable variance. Females scored significantly higher in both affective and cognitive components of empathy, and in prosocial responding. Nonminority respondents scored significantly higher in empathy, however, there was no ethnic difference in prosocial responding. No age, or other ethnic and gender differences were found.

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

Understanding human conduct has been a focus of philosophical and psychological inquiry for centuries. Much of this inquiry centers on the individual's capacity for both cruel, unjust behaviors and kind, caring behaviors. Similarly, individuals demonstrate acts designed solely to benefit the self as well as behaviors intended to promote the well-being of another. With recent exceptions (Hornstein, 1976; Zahn-Waxler, Cummings & Iannotti, 1986), the model for explaining such behaviors was to dichotomize them. That is, ancient theologians and philosophers pondered whether the nature of mankind was basically "good" or "evil". During the seventeenth century, philosophers debated whether behavior was altruistically or egoistically oriented (Calderwood, 1890; Mercer, 1972).

As scientific disciplines emerged, debates about the principle impetus for human behavior continued. In the evolutionary paradigm, for instance, some (Darwin, 1871) proposed that biological antecedents sanction cooperative and helpful behavior among humans. Others (Audrey, 1961; Lorenz, 1966) argued that behavior evolved from aggressive and "killer" instincts. Within early psychology, human conduct was viewed, in part, according to learning

(Thorndike, 1903), reinforcement or punishment (Skinner, 1971; 1953), and modeling principles (Bandura, 1977) and their impact on either acceptable or unacceptable behavior. Thus, in the study of human behavior, the tradition has been one of conceptually distinguishing between positive and negative behaviors.

This dichotomous classification of behavior has influenced the study of human behavior in several ways. It has, for example, neglected the interplay and relationship between aggression and altruism (Strayer & Noel, 1986). Also, examining behavior in either positive or negative terms engendered an either/or approach to behavioral research. Such an empirical approach suggests scientific advancement in one area over another, and indeed, greater empirical attention has been given to antisocial behaviors.

As Eisenberg (1982a) notes, because aggressive behaviors are typically viewed as being more detrimental to society than positive behaviors are enhancing, the need to explore, explain, and control antisocial behaviors is more pressing. Consequently, empirical investigation into prosocial behavior (e.g., helping, sharing, comforting, cooperation) has lagged behind that of aggressive or antisocial behavior. In fact, with few exceptions (Hartshorne & May, 1928; Murphy, Murphy, & Newcomb, 1937), it wasn't until the occurrence of the classic Genovese murder as well as the sociopolitical themes of the sixties

that empirical attention focused on prosocial concerns. Since then interest in prosocial behaviors and related concepts has grown considerably,

#### Overview of Major Issues

There has been substantial increases in prosocial literature over the past several decades. However, this research focuses primarily on the acquisition or nature of prosocial orientations, reasoning, and behavior among young children (Mussen & Eisenberg-Berg, 1977; Staub, Bar-Tal, Karylowski, & Reykowski, 1984) and college students (Aderman & Berkowitz, 1970; Wilson & Petruska, 1984; Van Ornum, Foley, Burns, DeWolfe, & Kennedy, 1981). Empirical exploration into adolescent prosociality is scarce.

There are various reasons expounding the need for prosocial research among adolescent groups. First, diverse frameworks exist for explaining altruistic capacities. These include, for example, issues in moral reasoning (Eisenberg-Berg, 1979a; Raviv, Bar-Tal, & Lewis-Levin, 1980); norms and social responsibility (O'Connor, Cuevas, & Dollinger 1981); learning (Rushton, 1982); perspective-taking ability (LeMare & Krebs, 1983); and affect (Hoffman, 1982). However, with only some exceptions (Bar-Tal & Nissim, 1984; Eisenberg-Berg & Mussen, 1978; Eisenberg-Berg, 1979b; Hanson & Mullis, 1985), few of these issues have been addressed among adolescent populations. Second, given the assumption "that experiences occurring after childhood

affect patterns of prosocial behavior in adulthood" (Zeldin, Savin-Williams, & Small, 1984, p. 100), adolescent research in the area becomes noteworthy. This is especially true given the thrust to view prosocial development from a life-span perspective (Eisenberg & Fabes, in press). Third, prosocialness is linked to numerous issues in adolescent development. For example, high school youths are typically experiencing increased autonomy, family conflict, greater peer interaction, and changing friendships. They are also beginning to understand and accept moral and social responsibilities. All of which incorporate aspects of prosocial behavior. Finally, it has been suggested (Spence, 1985) that our nation's emphasis on achievement and individualism may be inhibiting obligations toward others and society. Moreover, many of our nation's young persons engage in aggressive or antisocial behaviors (U.S. Department of Justice, 1983). Such instances suggest that "there is a critical need to assist adolescents in becoming well adjusted, socially competent, and socially responsible individuals" (Estrada, 1986, p. 2).

Beyond lacking in adolescent research, inquiry regarding relationships between prosocial behavior and personal characteristics, antecedent factors, or related phenomena is limited to a narrow range of variables. For example, considerable evidence suggests a relationship between empathy and prosocial or altruistic responding

(Batson & Coke, 1981; Eisenberg, 1986; Hoffman, 1982; Krebs, 1975). There is also some, though less, evidence regarding the relationship between prosocial behavior and internalized values (Schwartz & Howard, 1984), personality (O'Connor & Cuevas, 1982), competence (Midlarsky & Hannah, 1985), attributions (Bem, 1972; Weiner, 1980; Smith, Gelfand, Hartmann, & Partlow, 1979 ), and perspective-taking skills (LeMare & Krebs, 1983). However, a number of potentially related variables have received little, if any, empirical attention. For instance, related research (Isen, Horn, & Rosenhan, 1973; Karylowski, 1976; Rosenhan, Salovey, Karylowski, & Hargis, 1981) has shown that the effect (as well as perceived effect) of positive or negative experiences on an individual's self-concept influences their subsequent helping behavior. This suggests that self-esteem may be an influential factor in prosocial responding, however, with few exceptions (Rutherford, Harris, & Keasey, 1970) little research has addressed the relationship between the two.

There has also been a growing concern about the lack of research addressing self-awareness or knowledge of oneself in relation to prosociality (Staub, 1986). Such concern is warranted in that one's sense of self, or degree of self-acceptance and self-understanding, is generally recognized as an important factor in many behavioral outcomes. Thus, one's sense of self is likely to influence the way they

relate to other people. Some researchers and theorists (Berkowitz, 1970; Staub, 1971; 1986) suggest that persons with an insecure sense of self find it difficult to show concern for another's well-being. In fact, research has shown that delinquents often perceive others' behavior as threatening, and in turn, act aggressively (Slavson, 1965). Similarly, Toch (1969) found that among prison inmates actual or perceived insults or threats by others often led to violent acts. Such acts were interpreted as a means of defending one's sense of self, or self-image. These findings suggest that in extreme cases self-doubt or insecurity give rise to aggressive or violent behavior. In less extreme cases, and more salient to this study, an insecure identity may lead to self-preoccupation which in turn diminishes the likelihood of attending to another's need (Berkowitz, 1970; Staub, 1986).

In sum, empirical prosocial research among adolescents would aid in our theoretical understanding of prosocial phenomenon throughout the lifespan, and enhance our general understanding of the adolescent. Moreover, understanding and facilitating prosocial behavior among our nation's teenagers would be of social heuristic value. Further, an investigation into the role of self-perceptions (i.e., self-esteem and identity) in prosocial responding would expand our understanding of prosocialness. It would also provide

insights into possible antecedents to prosocial behaviors, thus aiding in the facilitation of positive behaviors.

#### Statement of Problem

In considering prosocial literature, several shortcomings can be noted. One is the general lack of adolescent research in the area, especially in terms of adolescents' own perceptions about prosocial concerns. Current research provides little insight into young people's conceptualization of prosociality, their ideas about what actually constitutes a prosocial act, or their perception of prosocial responding among themselves and their peers. Open-ended investigation into these concerns is needed in order to broaden our understanding of prosocialness in light of how adolescents view it, thus facilitating future research in adolescent prosociality.

The other major concern is the lack of attention given to the influence of self-perceptions (i.e., identity, self-esteem) on prosocial responding. Also, though considerable research addresses the role of empathy in prosocial behavior, few studies have examined the relationship among adolescents. Moreover, much of this existing work overlooks the impact of self-other connections (i.e., attention to self versus other) on empathy and subsequent prosocial behavior. That is, self-esteem and identity may be influential variables mediating the role of empathic response in prosocialness. To this end, research into the

various effects, functions, or interrelations of empathy, identity, and self-esteem on prosocial response is needed.

In brief, there is a need for further prosocial research among adolescents. Also, research into the separate or combined effects of empathy, identity, and self-esteem on prosocial responding is needed. Because adolescence is typically marked by self-esteem concerns (Rosenberg, 1965) and identity conflict (Erikson, 1968), this age group is an ideal population for exploring these effects.

#### Overview of the Study and Research Questions

The focus of this research will be to provide initial steps toward addressing the problems discussed above. Thus, the purpose of the study is twofold. One purpose is to examine how adolescents view prosocialness. That is, how do they define prosocial behavior, what kind of behaviors do they consider prosocial, and how do they explain prosocial responses among themselves and their peers? The other purpose is to examine the relationships between empathy, identity, self-esteem and prosocial responding among adolescents. In order to best accomplish these, the research study will be conducted in two stages.

First, adolescents' conceptions, descriptions, and perceptions of various aspects of prosocial behavior will be qualitatively assessed. A number of questions will guide this component of the research study. These are:

- 1) How do adolescents conceptualize (i.e, define, describe, explain) prosocial behaviors?
- 2) What kinds of behaviors do adolescents report as being positive?
- 3) Do adolescents view themselves as kind, caring, and helpful people? Why?
- 4) Do adolescents view their classmates as kind, caring, and helpful people? Why?
- 5) What kinds of helping, sharing, cooperative, and comforting acts do adolescents engage in?
- 6) Under what circumstances are adolescents most likely to help, share, or cooperate with another?

Second, the roles of empathy, identity, and self-esteem in adolescents' self-reported prosocial responding will be examined. The following questions will direct this aspect of the study:

- 1) Are empathy, identity, and self-esteem related to adolescent prosocial responding?
- 2) What are the separate and combined influences of these variables on adolescent prosocial responding?
- 3) What, if any, age, gender, or ethnic differences exist regarding the relationship or influence of these variables on adolescent responding?
- 4) What are the overall levels of reported empathy, identity, self-esteem, and prosocial responding among adolescents?

5) Do these levels vary according to age, gender, or ethnicity?

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The chapter is organized in three major sections. First, various definitional and theoretical frameworks for each of the research variables are discussed. Secondly, research variables employed in this study are defined. The third section reviews selected literature addressing the relationship between empathy and prosocial behavior among adolescents as well as literature linking identity and self-esteem to prosocial interactions.

#### Definitions of Terms and Theoretical Frameworks

##### Prosocialness

Within prosocially oriented inquiry, prosocial behaviors are most often defined as "behavior carried out to benefit another without anticipation of rewards from external sources" (Macauley & Berkowitz, 1970, p. 3). Many researchers (Bar-Tal, 1976; Mussen & Eisenberg-Berg, 1977) argue that a prosocial act must also be voluntary, that is, the response cannot be solicited from another. Others (Eisenberg, Cameron, & Tryon, 1984) differentiate between spontaneous prosocial behaviors (i.e., behavior initiated by the actor without recipient request), and asked-for prosocial behaviors (i.e., behavior in response to a

request). Similarly, Bar-Tal (1976) suggests two types of prosocial behaviors. These are altruism and restitution.

Altruism in this model is synonymous with the more generic criteria for prosocial behavior, that is, a voluntary act which benefits another without expectation of an external reward. According to this definition, an altruistic prosocial act can be self-rewarding (e.g., feelings of satisfaction, pride, or joy). Some researchers define only those acts which incur some loss to the beneficiary as altruistic (Hull & Reuter, 1977; Krebs, 1982; Midlarsky, 1968). Others refer to altruism and/or altruistic prosocial behavior as "behavior that benefits another, is voluntary and intentional, and is not consciously performed to promote one's own self-interest" (Eisenberg, 1983a, p. 196). More recently, Eisenberg (1986) suggests that altruism is "one subtype of prosocial behavior, that is, voluntary behavior intended to benefit another (regardless of the motive)" (p. 2). Eisenberg further claims that while altruistic prosocial behaviors are typically thought to be moral, such acts can be "motivated by nonmoral (e.g., the desire for social approval) or even immoral (e.g., the desire to manipulate another for one's own benefit) motives" (p. 2). Still others eliminate the need for making inferences regarding intentions or expectations by defining altruism purely on a behavioral

continuum. Thus, altruism is "defined as a social behavior carried out to achieve positive outcomes for another rather than the self" (Rushton, 1980, p. 8).

Restitution, the second type of prosocial behavior according to Bar-Tal (1976), is behavior whereby an individual reciprocates previously received aid or compensates for previous harm-doing. A third type of prosocial behavior arising from exchange theory (Homans, 1958) can be noted. In this case a beneficial act is performed with the expectation of either material or social gain for the self. That is, one aids another in the hope of receiving some form of gratitude.

Various modes of prosocial responding exist. Those most dominant in the literature are acts of helping, sharing, and comforting. "Each type of behavior involves and/or is related to a different configuration of costs, benefits, and competencies" (Eisenberg et al., 1984, p. 103). Helping entails either verbally or physically assisting another, and generally may cost the benefactor time and effort. Helping acts are intended to alleviate another's nonemotional distress. Sharing usually refers to the "giving up of an object (or workplace)" which is "in the [individual's] possession" (Eisenberg et al., 1984, p. 103). The act requires little loss of time and effort, but rather, a loss of material possessions. Comforting behaviors are

those aimed at alleviating another's emotional distress, and generally involve time and attention (Eisenberg et al., 1984).

Helping behavior has typically been operationalized as volunteering for a dull task (Eisenberg-Berg & Mussen, 1978), or aiding in some project such as binding books for the elderly (Bar-Tal & Nissim, 1984). Some (Zeldin, Small, & Savin-Williams, 1982) have measured helping behavior by recording spontaneous, naturally occurring acts of physical (helping another repair a broken object) or verbal (explaining to another how to solve a problem) assistance. Measures of sharing or generosity largely reflect donating patterns. The youngster either earns or is given a determined amount of possessions by playing a game or for participating in a decoy experiment. The individual is then given an opportunity to donate a portion or all of the earned goods, for example candy (Hull & Reuter, 1977; Sims, 1978), money (Eisenberg-Berg & Geisheker, 1979; Lipscomb, Bregman, & McAllister, 1983; Roush & Hudson, 1985), pencils (Grusec, Kuczynski, Rushton, & Simutis, 1978) or prize chips (Barnett, King, & Howard, 1979). Cooperative behaviors have also received considerable attention. These usually involve examining behavior in group games or on other laboratory tasks (Levine & Hoffman, 1975). Little research addresses comforting behavior, perhaps because of the difficulty in

operationalizing and assessing such behaviors. One attempt by Burleson (1982) used hypothetical situations in which an age-mate "was experiencing some kind of emotional distress" (p. 1580). Subjects were asked what they would do, and if they wanted to make the story character feel better, how would they proceed.

To summarize, prosocial behaviors are those which result in benefiting others, though the motivations behind these responses vary. In general, altruistic prosocial acts are those intended to aid another without regard for the self. Restitution acts are performed to alleviate a "behavioral debt", and exchange acts are performed in anticipation of future gain. Prosocial behaviors are generally operationalized as voluntary acts of helping, sharing, and comforting as well as cooperative behavior. These behaviors are defined according to their varied costs and benefits, and are typically assessed by measures of volunteering service, donating, alleviating another's emotional discomfort, or group behaviors.

Various theoretical views are used to explain the development of prosocial behaviors. Most widespread are those stemming from the grand theories (Gagne & Middlebrooks, 1977; Hall & Lindzey, 1954; Piaget, 1965), and moral development theory (Eisenberg, 1977; Kohlberg, 1976, 1978). Recently, however, there have been trends

toward viewing prosocial response in terms of cognitive and/or affective processes (Eisenberg, 1986; Hoffman, 1982), and from a sociobiological perspective (Cunningham, 1985/86; Zahn-Waxler, Cummings, & Iannotti, 1986).

While none of the grand theories (e.g., psychoanalytic, learning, cognitive-developmental) address prosocial or altruistic development specifically, each offers insight into such development. According to psychoanalytic theory, the individual is irrational, egoistic, and driven to moral behavior by fear, anxiety, and guilt. In short, personality is comprised of three internal structures: the id, the ego, and the superego. The id represents an individual's innate instinctual desires, while the ego consists of the rational cognitive aspects of personality. The superego, most relevant to prosocial development, is viewed as the internalized arbiter of moral conduct. It develops from the child's identification with the same-sex parent, and subsequent internalization of the motives, attitudes, values, and behaviors of that parent.

Freud (Hall, 1979) further claims that the superego is composed of two subsystems, the conscience and the ego ideal. The former evaluates behavior, and the latter represents the moral standards one aspires toward. It is the purported interplay between these two structures which gives rise to moral behavior. That is, if the individual

acts in such a manner as to violate the standards within the ego ideal, the conscience punishes the individual with feelings of fear and guilt. Conversely, if one behaves according to the ego ideal's standards, the conscience rewards the individual with feelings of praise.

From this perspective, an individual behaves prosocially in order to avoid the feelings of guilt engendered from nonprosocial behavior. This assumes, however, that the blind internalization of parental values reflect positive or prosocial behavior. As this is a large assumption, more recent ego psychologists (Breger, 1973; Flugel, 1961) propose that simple identification cannot account for moral reasoning, but rather that intellectual development and changing self-perceptions are of importance. Current work in prosocial development and behavior largely downplay the psychoanalytic perspective. However, many of the concepts served as a major impetus for early research regarding parental socialization and internalization of altruistic traits (Rutherford & Mussen, 1968).

Modern learning theory is not a unified theory, however, the major premise underlying the various approaches is the same. Namely, that behaviors, including prosocial acts, are learned. Indeed, Rushton (1982) suggests that "if we wish to understand how children develop prosocial consideration for others, it is necessary first to

understand the laws of learning " (p.86). Essentially, three learning paradigms are noted in the prosocial literature. These are respondent, operant, and observational.

Several theorists (Aronfreed, 1970; Eysenck, 1960) emphasize the role of respondent conditioning in the development of morality. In brief, an individual acquires feelings of guilt or empathy through the repeated pairing of affective responses and positive or negative behaviors. Much like Freudian theory, these emotional states are the basis for moral responding. Thus, a child who experiences feelings of pleasure with someone else's expression of positive affect, will pair these events, and empathic orientations are likely to result. Such empathicness is purported to lead to altruistic actions.

Prosocial behavior has also been explained in terms of operant conditioning (Skinner, 1971). In its purest sense, operant learning theory argues that behavior is under the control of its consequences. Thus, if a behavior occurs and is rewarded, it is likely to increase. Conversely, if a behavior is punished it is likely to decrease. From this perspective, then, prosocial behaviors are the result of, for example, positive reinforcement of such behavior. Prosocial research stemming from operant learning principles, while not extensive, is evident in the

literature (Beaman, Stoffer, Woods, & Stoffer, 1982; Midlarsky, Bryan, & Brickman, 1973; Rushton & Teachman, 1978). Much of this research focuses on understanding the frequency of behaviors that already exist rather than on explaining the development of, or reasoning behind, such behavior.

The principles advanced by social learning theorist (Bandura, 1977; Gagne & Middlebrooks, 1977; Mischel & Mischel, 1976; Rushton, 1982) are quite prevalent within current prosocial literature. In fact, the observation of others (modeling) is viewed by some (Rushton, 1980) as a major contributor to prosocial development. Research in this area primarily addresses the various factors associated with the effectiveness of modeling. For example, the effects of model characteristics (Rushton, 1980), expected behavioral outcomes (Mischel & Mischel, 1976), preachings, instructions, and attributions (Rushton, 1980; Sims, 1978), among others, have been examined. This perspective further focuses on the socialization of norms and standards. This research is concerned with socializing agents as precursors to altruism and typically investigates aspects of various norms, such as the norm of social responsibility and the norm of reciprocity (O'Connor & Cuevas, 1982). From a social learning view, then, prosocial behaviors develop through modeling, and the acquisition of various norms.

Cognitive developmentalists (Piaget, 1965) view individuals as constructing their own knowledge via interactions with others and the environment. According to this view, individuals are active participants in their development. They are not simply driven by innate instincts as in psychanalytic theory nor are they simply molded by social agents as in social learning theory. Rather, knowledge of the world is constructed by active interactions with people, tasks, and events. The nature of these interactions change in accordance with the individual's evolving cognitive structure. That is, "development is characterized as a sequence of qualitative changes from simpler to more complex and differentiated forms of organization " (Eisenberg, 1986, p. 22). That is, they are 1) distinct modes of thinking or qualitatively different structures, 2) invariant in sequence (though environmental factors may alter the rate of development), 3) structured wholes, and 4) a reintegration of lower stage structures (Kohlberg, 1976).

Cognitive-developmental theory has primarily influenced the study of prosocial behavior in two related areas. One is the emphasis on cognitive motivation or reasons underlying prosocial behavior. The other is the concern with age-related reasoning and behavioral trends, and the subsequent developmental patterns of prosocial responding.

From this view, prosocial behaviors are largely determined by one's developing cognitive skills, hence greater perspective-taking and moral reasoning ability (Bar-Tal & Raviv, 1982; Eisenberg-Berg, 1979a). For example, Kohlberg (1978) argues that moral development progresses in a sequential, universal manner ranging from reasoning reflecting the avoidance of punishment, to issues of conformity, and finally to rational considerations.

Eisenberg (1982b) notes that while Kohlberg's research "provided valuable information regarding the types of reasoning that individuals might use with prosocial dilemmas" (p.224), his dilemmas do not tap prosocial moral reasoning. That is, Kohlberg's research involves prohibition-oriented reasoning (e.g., violations of laws, rules) whereas prosocial reasoning involves "reasoning about conflicts in which the individual must choose between satisfying his or her wants or needs and those of others" (p. 230) where the role of authority, rules, etc., is de-emphasized. Eisenberg (1979, 1982b) proposed an empirically derived five stage model of prosocial moral reasoning. The stages, similar to Kohlberg's (1978), range from hedonistic motives to empathic concern to internalized values and respect.

In summary, psychoanalytic theory claims the individual acquires standards of morality through the identification

process, and that moral conduct is the result of emotions, such as guilt and fear. Social learning theory argues that environmental factors are a major influence in prosocial development. From this perspective prosocial acts are learned through traditional learning and modeling principles. In cognitive-developmental theory, prosocial behaviors are largely a function of one's perspective-taking skills and moral reasoning ability, which in turn are influenced by the individual's evolving cognitive structures.

There is currently a theoretical trend toward delineating cognitive and affective influences in prosocial development. Cognitive factors refer to the individual's rational thinking processes or decision-making strategies. Most often within prosocial literature affective dimensions refer to empathy, though guilt (Hoffman, 1982) and mood states (Cialdini, Kenrick & Baumann, 1982) are increasingly viewed as determinants in altruistic action. Other constructs, which exist outside the realm of major theories that have been suggested as factors in explaining prosocial behavior, include, among others, altruistic oriented attitudes, beliefs, and values (Rushton, 1980). Though such constructs have received limited empirical attention.

Another approach toward explaining prosocial behavior is to address factors influencing whether a prosocial act

will occur. Bar-Tal (1976) describes a decision-making model in which one must first be aware that an individual is in need of help, and then decide whether to aid the needy other. This decision to help involves two primary judgments. One is the attribution of responsibility whereby the potential benefactor "judges possible causes that could have brought the person in need to a situation in which he needs help" (p.57). Specifically, one ascertains the extent to which the needy other is responsible for the situation. The decision regarding whether a person is in need of help due to factors beyond their control or due to their own fault is influential in determining whether one aids another. In short, persons are more apt to benefit another when their needy state is due to external factors (Berkowitz, 1970). The second judgment in deciding to aid another, according to Bar-Tal (1976), involves cost-reward analysis whereby an individual ascertains "how costly in relation to self-rewards it is for him to provide...help" (p. 52). In short, individuals are influenced by the perceived costs of aiding another. That is, help given to a needy other decreases as the cost of helping increases.

Numerous variables affect the outcome of the two aforementioned judgments. According to Bar-Tal these can be grouped into four major categories. These are:

(a) personal variables, which consist of the enduring characteristics of the potential helper such as demographic characteristics and personality traits; (b) situational variables, which consist of characteristics of the particular situation and temporary psychological states of the potential helper; (c) variables that characterize the person in need; and (d) cultural variables, which consist of norms and values that prescribe desirable behavior in the social group of the potential helper (p. 52).

Bar-Tal further notes that various other factors may influence whether one chooses to aid another. For example, ethnicity, age, gender, previous exposure to harm-doing or positive acts, presence of others, similarities between potential benefactor and recipient, and the relationship between the two parties have been shown to affect helping behavior.

More recently, Schwartz and Howard (1984) have postulated a value-based decision-making model regarding the underlying processes in deciding whether to aid another.

The five stage model includes:

(1) attention to need and awareness of potential actions; (2) generation of value-based motivation; (3) evaluation of the costs and benefits of potential actions; (4) possible defense against anticipated moral costs; and (5) overt behavior or inaction (p. 232).

Like Bar-Tal's model (1976), the various steps in the decision process are influenced by situational and person variables. Other noted influential factors in deciding whether to help involve one's assessment of their competency in providing adequate help (Midlarsky, 1984), demographic characteristics of the potential benefactor (Korte, 1984),

and contextual features of the general social interaction (Bierhoff, 1984).

In practice, it is likely that no single theoretical approach is adequate in explaining prosocial development. This is apparent, in that particular themes of given theories are adopted as explanations for varying aspects of prosocialness. For example, those (e.g., Rushton, 1980) interested in studying the socialization of altruism rely heavily on social learning theory, while those (e.g., Krebs, 1982; Eisenberg, 1982b) concerned with underlying motivational processes draw largely from cognitive-developmental theory. It is evident that a grand theoretical explanation for prosocial development will require an integrative approach comprising aspects of existing theories as well as cognitive, affective and situational components.

### Empathy

Various approaches have been used in defining empathy. In the past, some theorists (Dymond, 1949) believed empathy was a form of social insight. Others (Deutsch & Madle, 1975; Hogan, 1969) viewed empathy as the ability to cognitively understand another's emotional state. Still others (Murphy, et. al., 1937; Olden, 1958) defined empathy in more affective terms, that is, one's ability to feel and respond to another's emotional state. Similarly, empathy

development was viewed as a process of inner imitation, that is, the individual established an identification with another and consciously or unconsciously imitated the other (e.g., physical stances, gestures, or expressions). This led to a heightened understanding and/or an increased appreciation of the other through shared behaviors and experiences (Lipps, 1926). Thus, empathy was viewed as a sort of partial identity spurred by the individual's desire to share another's feelings, that is to "feel" like them.

In time, and largely as the result of Mead's (1934) work, conceptualizations of empathy shifted. In short, empathy was no longer explained simply in terms of one's perceptual awareness of, and identification with, another's affect. Rather, empathy was viewed as involving a cognitive component as well. To be empathic, then, required that an individual have the ability to understand what another was feeling. In order to understand another's emotion, for example in response to a misfortunate situation, requires one to view the situation as the other person sees it (e.g., putting oneself in the other's place). Hence, the earlier view that empathy involved the blending or merging of identities (Lipps, 1926) yielded to a self-other differentiation (Goldstein & Michaels, 1985).

These two perspectives, one emphasizing affect and the other cognition, are at the root of most current

definitional and theoretical approaches addressing empathy. In fact, a good portion of the literature on empathy has been devoted to distinguishing cognitive and affective components of empathy as well as debating which element is most critical in the empathic process (Hoffman, 1984). However, this distinction has become less prominent, especially in understanding the role of empathy in prosocial behavior (Feshbach, 1982). Though, in general, debates over the various roles of affect and cognition in behavior have long been, and continue to be, evident in the literature.

Some writers argue that affect or emotion is largely the result of cognitive thought (Royce & Diamond, 1980). Others (Zajonc, 1980) propose that affect is of prime importance and can lead to behavior in its own right with little help from cognitive processes. Still others propose integrative solutions. For example, Cowan (1982) contends that cognitive structures always have some degree of affect, and conversely, affect is always influenced by cognition. In considering empathy and prosocialness, it is likely that emotion and cognition work together in a complex and multifaceted manner. Yet, current researchers and theorists, while recognizing the cognitive antecedents in empathy, focus more on the affective components of empathy in defining the construct. Thus, empathy is generally defined as an affective response to another's emotional

state (Hoffman, 1982; Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972; Underwood & Moore, 1982).

The nature of this affective responsiveness can be described in various ways. For some investigators (Feshbach & Roe, 1968), an affective response is one in which the individual matches their own feelings with those of another. In other words, "to empathize means to feel the same emotion as another " (Eisenberg & Lennon, 1983, p. 101). For others (Batson & Coke, 1981), this affective reaction is not merely emotional matching, but rather a demonstrated concern for the other's welfare. That is, empathy is viewed as "sympathy and compassion for another's position" (Eisenberg & Lennon, 1983, p. 101).

Recently, Eisenberg (1986) suggests that there are at least three types of empathic or emotional responses possible. The first, labeled emotional contagion, occurs when an individual feels the same emotion as another, but is not particularly directed towards either self or other concern. Second, an individual may respond to another's emotional state by feeling a similar emotion, but one which elicits concern or compassion for the distressed other. This is referred to as sympathy or sympathetic distress. The third type of affective reaction, labeled personal distress, is a self-oriented reaction whereby the individual feels worried or anxious about another's distress. Beyond

distinguishing among various types of affective responses, current literature strives to differentiate between state and trait empathy. In short, state empathy implies that the situation serves as the impetus for an individual's empathic responding, whereas trait empathy refers to one's general disposition to be empathic (Eisenberg, 1986).

While there are a number of theoretical views regarding empathy development (Lichtenberg, Bornstein & Silver, 1984), those advanced by Aronfreed (1968, 1970, 1978), Feshbach (1975, 1982), and Hoffman (1975, 1976, 1982) are most prevalent in developmental and social psychology.

Feshbach's (1975, 1982) model differs from the others in that it was developed to investigate the development of a variety of empathy experiences. For example, much of the work grounded in this model focuses on differences in empathy acquisition rates for different emotions, individual differences in empathy development, and the various factors influencing rate of acquisition and empathic response (Feshbach & Roe, 1968; Feshbach, 1975, 1982). The remaining two frameworks more closely address the association between empathy and altruism.

Feshbach (1975, 1982) proposes a "three factor model" of empathy development. Two of the components are cognitive in nature and the other is affective. In essence, these three components or factors describe the skills necessary in

order for empathy to occur. First, according to this model, an individual must have the cognitive ability to identify, and discriminate among, another person's emotional state(s). For example, in order for one to empathize with another's sadness, they must be able to identify the emotional cues associated with sadness and distinguish these from other emotional cues. Secondly, the capacity to empathize requires the individual to assume the perspective and role of the other. Thus, to empathize one must be capable of cognitively understanding the situation from the other's point of view. The final component in Feshbach's model is emotional responsiveness, that is, the individual must be able to experience the emotion that the other is having.

While Feshbach's (1975, 1982) conceptualization of empathy development, in part, stems from cognitive-development theory, Aronfreed (1968, 1970) describes empathy acquisition in terms of learning theory. In brief, Aronfreed suggests that empathy is acquired through conditioning, that is, through repeated pairings of the child's own feelings of pleasure or distress (spurred by external cues) with corresponding emotions in others. Subsequently, others' emotions elicit corresponding emotions in the child. The child further learns that responding to another's emotion in a positive, helpful, or like manner leads to positive outcomes for the self as well. With time,

the child learns that helping behavior is self-rewarding, which in turn serves as the motive for future behavior.

Hoffman (1975, 1976, 1982) has provided one of the most detailed accounts of empathy development. The model is unique in that it views empathy, not as a construct in itself, but as the major mediator of prosocial behavior. Hence, the focus of the model is on empathic distress, that is, response to suffering, distress, or need. However, Hoffman (1982) suggests that the model may be pertinent to the development of empathy for other feelings as well. In short, Hoffman proposes six developmentally different modes of empathic arousal. These modes, more or less, are channels used in an individual's capacity to vicariously respond to another's need.

The most rudimentary of these, the "reactive cry" mode, involves the infant's reactive cry to another infant's crying. Hoffman (1982) suggests that the infant, unable to differentiate their own cry from another's cry, responds to another's cry as if it were their own and then continues to cry to the sound which is now truly their own cry. This response, possibly innate, is viewed as a critical precursor to developing full empathic response because the child comes to expect that they will experience distress when distressed is perceived in another. With the onset of elementary perceptual skills, emerging slightly after the reactive cry,

empathic response is evoked through classical conditioning. This mode is similar to Aronfreed's (1968, 1970) perspective in that other's distress cues become the conditioned stimulus leading to feelings of distress in oneself.

The third mode of empathic distress evolves from the child's accumulated memories of painful or distressful experiences. According to Hoffman (1982), observations of another's discomfort elicits these memories, and a resultant empathic distress response occurs in the child. Similarly, upon observing the stimulus person's facial signs of distress, the young child automatically imitates these emotional expressions. These imitative movements aid the child in experiencing and understanding the same feeling. Hoffman defines this process as the "motor mimicry" mode.

The fifth mode, notably more advanced than the previous four, is "symbolic association". This requires that the child understand symbolic cues of distress (e.g., the label for the emotion or a description of an emotional event). Such cues become associated with the youngsters own distressed experiences, which gives rise to appropriate emotional response. The final mode, unlike the others, is not an automatic process. Rather, according to Hoffman, it requires greater cognitive maturation and purposive action. In this mode of empathic arousal, "role taking", the individual deliberately tries to take the perspective of the

target other. In doing so, the person forms a mental representation of themselves in the victim's situation, or imagines how they would feel in the same situation.

Hoffman (1982) believes that these modes, excluding reactive crying which disappears after infancy, are used in varying degrees throughout adulthood. The given mode, or combinations of, that operate in a particular situation depends upon which cues from the stimulus person are available and salient. In short, Hoffman's model depicts the various processes or means by which an individual is empathically aroused or how one comes to experience internal emotional distress, from witnessing external distressed stimuli such as the discomfort, distress, or pain of another. This empathic distress response for the distressed other, according to Hoffman, may be partially transformed into feelings of concern and compassion, and a conscious desire to aid the needy other. Hoffman (1982) suggests that this feeling, referred to as sympathetic distress, represents the link between empathy and prosocial behavior.

While there is evidence that the affective and cognitive components of empathy mature in the maturational and developmental manner advanced by Feshbach (1975, 1982) and Hoffman (1975, 1976, 1982), it is also evident that socialization factors influence empathy development. As Aronfreed's (1968, 1970) work demonstrated, empathy can also

be learned through conditioning principles, which require personal experiences with the emotion in question. Thus, one way socialization tactics impact empathy is by the degree of variety and intensities of feelings the child is exposed to. Goldstein and Michaels (1985), in their review, note a number of other well recognized external influences on empathy. These include, among others, parental socialization, parental discipline techniques, and social learning practices such as reinforcement and modeling. Research in the field further suggests that the socialization of females and males varies, and that these differences may account for the reported sex differences in empathy levels.

In an extensive literature review addressing the relationship between empathy and prosocial behavior, Eisenberg (1986) identified six general approaches for assessing empathic responsiveness. The various approaches tend to view empathy from different conceptual vantage points, and thus differ somewhat in their operationalization of empathy. Also, while most of the measuring techniques assess state empathy, several focus on trait empathy. Further, the approaches are largely age specific, that is, certain methodologies are used primarily with children and others with adults. Moreover, while each offers certain methodological advantages, each also has potential pitfalls.

Primary among these shortcomings are social desirability effects, response variations depending on sex of subject and sex of experimenter, and uncertainty about which emotional response is actually being measured as well as the interpretations of observable emotions (Eisenberg, 1986).

Briefly, these six approaches are: (1) individuals' verbal or nonverbal identification of another's emotional state or mood after exposure to hypothetical scenarios involving the targeted other; (2) self-report measures describing one's own emotional response to simulated situations; (3) observer ratings of an individual's facial or gestural reactions to another's emotional state or predicament; (4) physiological measures of an individual's reaction to another's emotional state or predicament; (5) self-report, pencil and paper scales designed to measure empathy; and (6) other-reports (e.g., parents, peers, teachers) of the individual's degree of empathic responsiveness.

Of these, the first four assess emotional responsiveness in a particular situation (state empathy), and with the exception of the self-reported approach, view empathy as one's ability to match their emotions with another's. Obviously, though, as Eisenberg notes, it is difficult to know exactly what the nature of the measured response is (e.g., empathy, sympathy, self-distress). The

remaining two measures are concerned with empathic dispositions (trait empathy) and largely assess one's sympathy or concern for another's emotional state or situation. The self-report, pencil and paper measure of empathy is the only approach which has been used across age groups. Further, in the limited number of studies addressing empathic antecedents of adolescent prosocial responding, empathy has largely been assessed through self-report questionnaires.

In sum, empathy is an affective and/or cognitive reaction to another's emotion or situation. From a cognitive reference, an individual rationally discerns how another person is feeling. From an affective view, individuals respond to another by either feeling the same emotion, feeling sympathetic towards the other's position, or feeling anxious about another's distress. Further, empathic responses can be derived either from the situation (state) or personality (trait), or both. Empathy has been operationalized in a variety of ways as is evident in the six most common measurement approaches used. These approaches include several types of self-report indices, other-reports, observer ratings, and physiological measures.

### Identity

Erikson's (1968) psychosocial theory of development has received much attention within behavioral science

disciplines. In brief, the theory poses eight developmental stages across the lifespan, each of which represents a distinct task, or step towards attaining a "healthy" personality. The stages, and their respective conflicts, coincide with the individual's changing social interactions brought about by increasing maturity and environmental demands. Erikson further suggests that individuals pass through the stages in a hierarchy fashion. That is, each stage must, though not necessarily totally, be resolved in order for a healthy progression into the next stage. In short, one can either resolve the stage conflict in a positive manner, leading to healthy self-development; or in a negative manner, leading to confusion and frustration within the individual. However, Erikson also notes that the particular stages involve a gradual emergence of the conflict, reaching a crisis or turning point, and then becomes resolved towards the end of the stage period. The stages are not defined limits, but often overlap and intertwine. Moreover, it is possible to positively resolve a given conflict at a later developmental stage. For example, while Erikson argued adolescence was the prime age for identity achievement, he did not claim that this was the only time for resolving identity issues. Rather, identity achievement is viewed as an ongoing, life-long process.

The first four of Erikson's stages take place during infancy and childhood and include the conflicts between trust and mistrust; autonomy and doubt; initiative and guilt; and industry and inferiority. The adolescent conflict is that of identity versus identity confusion. The final three stages, occurring in adulthood, are intimacy versus isolation, generativity versus stagnation, and integrity versus despair. Of these, Erikson views the identity stage as critical because it acts as a bridge connecting the first four and last three stages.

Erikson (1968) described adolescence as a period of redefining oneself, that is, merging one's past experiences with future aspirations. Similarly, Ingersoll (1989) writes that during adolescence individuals seek answers to such questions as "Who am I? What do I value? What is my role in life? What do I want to become?" (p. 51). While this developmental phenomenon is easily recognized, defining identity and understanding its antecedents or development is troublesome. For Erikson, the adolescent task is one of resolving the identity conflict, either by attaining a sense of ego identity or falling into a state of identity diffusion. This stage of development is marked by the increasing need to balance within the individual the childhood sets and behaviors, with the oncoming adult roles as prescribed by the cultural surroundings. In its purest

form, Eriksonian theory views acquiring an ideology (religious and political views) and an occupation as criteria for reaching a level of attained identity. Acquiring these criteria involve "working through" a variety of psychological and social tasks. Some (Donovan, 1975a) argue that Erikson's criteria of acquiring an ideology and occupation do not "capture the essence of identity formation" (p. 30). In fact, many view the construct in a more general sense. For example, Ingersoll (1989) interprets Erikson's identity as the individual's reassessment of their self-image. That is, the adolescent must reformulate their existing image to include an image of the adult role they anticipate. This reformulation of "personal identity" requires that the "adolescent actively breaks down and restructures the organization of his or her personality" (p. 59).

From an Eriksonian perspective, an individual's sense of identity broadly refers to the continuity between, or blending of, their past, present, and social roles. Thus, ego identity implies a sense of self-knowing; not only oneself, but of oneself in a socially acknowledged manner. It is the way individuals establish meaning in the world (e.g., values, beliefs, commitments, etc.), and the way individuals define their role in the world. According to Bourne's (1978) interpretation, ego identity is "the

adaptation of the individual's special skills, capacities, and strengths to the prevailing role structure of the society" (p. 225). In short, identity provides "a stable frame of reference" (p. 226) from which the individual can function. Protinsky (1975) views Erikson's identity as "both a conscious and unconscious awareness of the continuity in one's interpersonal life and intra-psychic existence. It is thus a sense of coherence, relatedness, and integration" (p. 428).

One means for operationalizing the construct of identity stems from Erikson's (1968) contention that identity achievement requires individual commitment to ideological and occupational values. Specifically, Marcia (1966) used these criteria to develop a typology of identity formation. Marcia assessed individuals according to (1) the degree to which they had actively explored and weighted occupational and ideological value options, and (2) their degree of commitment to these given values. In brief, the Identity Status Interview (ISI) measures the state of one's value exploration (crisis), and demonstrated beliefs (commitment). Depending upon each, individuals are assigned to one of four identity levels: Identity Diffused, Foreclosed, Moratorium, and Achieved. Each of the identity statuses represent a different configuration of crisis and commitment. For example, a foreclosed individual is one who

has simply internalized their parents' beliefs and values, that is, expressing "commitment" without experiencing a "crisis", whereas an Identity Achieved individual is one who has actively explored value options, and subsequently, adopted various beliefs and roles (Marcia, 1966). Most of the identity related research employs the ISI or an adapted version of it (Grotevant & Adams, 1984; Raskin, 1984), though some (Cote & Levine, 1983) argue that Marcia's measure is not an adequate operationalization of Erikson's perspective on identity formation.

One alternate operationalization and assessment of identity is offered by Rosenthal, Gurney, and Moore (1981). Their approach is one of assessing the degree to which an individual has successfully resolved Erikson's Identity versus Confusion stage. This is determined by measuring one's self-perception of various issues suggested in Eriksonian theory as indicative of a sense of identity. From this perspective identity is viewed as a global understanding of oneself rather than the degree to which individuals express committed goals and values.

#### Self-Esteem

Some argue that one of the most important aspects of individual growth is the development of the concept of self. For example, Rosenberg (1979) suggests that "if there is one thing in the world that concerns every one of us, it is the

self-concept" (p.ix). Rosenberg (1979) further suggests that it "is the preadult years that the self-concept emerges, evolves, and crystallizes; this is the time of life when the self-concept is most malleable, and when social and developmental factors operate in the most interesting, and sometimes unexpected, ways " (p. x). Similarly, Ingersoll (1989) writes that "the central task of the adolescent transition is the development of a positive sense of self-worth" (p. xi). Indeed, much of the empirical research addressing self-concept and self-esteem concerns children and adolescents. Such emphasis reflects the importance of these age groups in the development of self-conceptions.

There are a number of constructs used in discussing an individual's attitude or perception of themselves. For example, reference is made to one's self-concept, self-esteem, self-image, self-worth, ideal self, and others (Ingersoll, 1989). The variety of approaches in defining or explaining this phenomenon has made it difficult for researchers and theorists to agree on a common definition (Wylie, 19764). There are, however, several perspectives which seem to dominant the literature.

Foremost among these is Rosenberg's (1965, 1979) description of the total self-concept. In this framework self-concept refers to all the beliefs and attitudes one has about their personal strengths, talents, shortcomings,

physical traits and others. In brief, it is all the thoughts and feelings an individual has in viewing themselves. Moreover, one's self-concept represents three separate but related self-views. First, the Extant Self is an individual's view of themselves as it exists right now, or their present self-concept. Secondly, is the Desired Self, or a person's view of how they would like to be. And, third, is one's Presenting Self which refers to the image that one presents to others. Thus, one's self-concept is the accumulation of how they view themselves, how they would like to be, and how they think others see them. Others (Offer, Ostrov & Howard, 1981b) assert that one's self-image involves five primary dimensions of the self. In brief, these are the psychological self, the social self, the sexual self, the familial self, and the coping self. Thus, an individual's view or attitude regarding each of these dimensions constitutes their self-concept.

Regardless of which framework researchers adopt, most agree that self-concept pulls together various self-images, and that these collective images represent one's objective appraisal of who they think they are. Self-concept results from looking at oneself as an object and making honest statements about that self. For example, statements such as "I am a shy person", "I am well-organized", or "I am uncomfortable in crowds" are reflections of how one sees

themselves and, thus, represent their self-concept (Ingersoll, 1989). In contrast, though the two are often used interchangeably (Wells & Marwell, 1976), self-esteem refers to one's subjective evaluation of their self-concept. A well accepted definition of self-esteem is that offered by Coppersmith (1967). That is, the "evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to [themselves]; it expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval, and indicates the extent to which the individual believes [themselves] to be capable, significant, successful, and worthy. In short, self-esteem is a personal judgement of worthiness" (pp. 4-5). Similarly, Rosenberg (1979) views self-esteem as signifying a positive or negative orientation toward the self. According to Rosenberg, the person with high self-esteem has self-respect, self-worth, and appreciates their merits. High self-esteem does not imply a sense of superiority or conceit. Rather, the individual, while aware of their faults and shortcomings, values their traits and talents. Conversely, individuals with low self-esteem, consider themselves to be unworthy, less than desirable, or inadequate. In brief, they demonstrate an overall lack of self-respect or self-like.

In sum, while the importance of an individual's developing self-image (Offer, et. al., 1981ab), self-concept

(Rosenberg, 1979), and self-esteem (Coopersmith, 1967; Rosenberg, 1965) is recognized, there are differences regarding the meaning and emergence of such conceptions. However, most scholars in the field agree that self-concept refers to one's objective view of themselves, and that self-esteem is one's evaluation of their self-concept. Though self-concept and self-esteem are, in theory, separate entities, the two are not easily distinguishable. In fact, the development of each is largely interwoven.

Various theoretical models and principles address self-concept formation and self-esteem development. Rosenberg (1979) endorses four such principles in particular. These include, first, the idea of reflected appraisals suggested in Mead's (1934) writings. Secondly, the principle of social comparison (Festinger, 1954) is viewed as fundamental to self-concept formation. Third, aspects of attribution theory (Weiner, 1974) contribute insights in explaining self-image. Finally, the notion of psychological centrality, as discussed in Rosenberg and Pearlin (1978), is useful in examining self conceptions. Although these principles do not represent a complete theoretical system, Rosenberg (1979) claims that most research in the area is theoretically grounded in one or more of them.

The first of these principles, reflected appraisals, suggests that individuals are extremely susceptible to, and

influenced by the attitudes others have of them. In fact, the principle argues that in time individuals come to view themselves as they are viewed by others. Embedded within this idea are several phenomena or doctrines. These are direct reflections, perceived selves, and the generalized other. Briefly, direct reflections holds that one's self-concept is shaped by the known responses of others. The idea of perceived self argues that one's self-concept is influenced not only by other's actual view of an individual, but by one's perception of that view. Finally the doctrine of the generalized other suggests that an individual's self-perception is formed in part by the attitudes and values adopted by society as a whole. As an example of how these three concepts affect one's developing self-esteem, consider the case of someone who has cheated on an exam (Rosenberg, 1979). First, if others know of the event and respond with contempt, the individual may experience a sense of low self-esteem in response to others' reactions. If the individual infers that others feel contempt for them even though they have no knowledge of the event, the individual's lowered self-esteem is derived from the perceived self. If, on the other hand, the individual condemns themselves for failing to uphold society's standards, lowered self-esteem would be attributed to the doctrine of the generalized other. Despite the widespread acceptance of reflected appraisals on

one's self-concept, empirical evidence is inconclusive. Rosenberg (1979) notes that the principle "is empirically true" (p. 63), however, Shrauger and Schoeneman (1979) concluded from their review of the literature that "there is no clear indication that self-evaluations are influenced by the feedback received from others in naturally occurring situations" (p. 549).

A second fundamental perspective in understanding the development of self-concept and esteem is the principle of social comparisons. In other words, people learn about themselves by comparing themselves to others. This evaluation in turn leads to a variety of self-ratings, that is, positive, negative, or neutral feelings about oneself. While researchers in the field most often consider people's comparisons to referent individuals or reference groups, individuals may also compare themselves to a variety of other standards. For example, one may evaluate oneself against their own past or expected performance, idealized or hypothetical images, and religious or moral convictions. Two general types of social comparison can be noted. One is concerned with the individual's view of oneself as being superior or inferior to others on some criterion of excellence (e.g., smarter or duller; weaker or stronger). The other focuses not on whether one is better or worse, but if they are the same as or different than another individual

or social group. One noted difficulty (Rosenberg, 1979) in interpreting the influences of social comparisons on one's self-perception is that it is difficult to know exactly what characteristics an individual is comparing themselves to. It is also difficult to discern the relative importance of such comparative attributes to the individual. Yet, the social comparison principle is an accessible theoretical interpretation for many research findings because it is quite easy to identify plausible groups with which one may be comparing themselves.

Another viable approach for explaining one's developing self-perceptions is the principle of self-attribution. The premise here is that individuals draw conclusions about themselves by observing their own behavior and its outcomes. For example, the child who receives high marks and recognition for their school performance is likely to conclude that they are academically bright and capable. Thus, with respect to intellectual capacities, develop a positive self-esteem. Similarly, a youngster may observe their failing ability to, for example, catch a softball and conclude they are inept in the game. This may in turn lead the individual to believe they lack athletic ability, and to feel poorly because of it. Related to this is the concept of psychological centrality. In short, this refers to the idea that one's "self-concept is not a collection but

an organization of parts, pieces, and components and that these are hierarchically organized and interrelated in complex ways" (Rosenberg, 1979, p. 73). Thus, in the example above, the degree to which an individual's lack of athletic ability affected their global self-esteem would depend on the importance they attached to athletic capabilities. In this case, the individual who cared about the quality would probably have a lower self-esteem than one who placed little value on the sport.

In sum, each of these four concepts influence how individuals come to view themselves. The first two, reflected appraisals and social comparisons, are socially oriented, in that one either sees themselves from the point of view of others or compares themselves to others. The last two, self-attribution and psychological centrality, while influenced by social factors, are psychologically oriented. One involves incorporating attributes of observable behaviors into one's self-view, and the other refers to the importance of various qualities.

In addition to theoretical influences on self-concept and self-esteem, situational factors affect adolescents' developing self-image. For example, it has been shown that socioeconomic status (e.g., Rosenberg & Pearlin, 1978), ethnicity (e.g., Simmons, Brown, Bush & Blyth, 1978), significant life events (e.g., Rabkin & Struening, 1976),

neighborhood and religious values (e.g., Rosenberg, 1975), and parental interaction (e.g., Rutter, 1980) influence adolescent self conceptions.

Research also addresses variation in adolescent self-concept and self-esteem as a function of development throughout the teen years (Dusek & Flaherty, 1981; Montemayor & Eisen, 1977). That is, with age and maturity one's conceptual structure becomes increasingly complex and interconnected. For example, responses to the question "Who am I?" become more abstract and multifaceted. A nine-year-old's answer likely consists of almost completely concrete attributes (e.g., I have brown hair.), while an eleven-year-old is likely to use more abstractness and social comparisons in describing themselves (e.g., I am truthful and I am tall for my age.). By late adolescence, most individual's describe themselves in terms of personal style (e.g., I am moody, indecisive, and ambitious.). An individual's self-concept and esteem develops smoothly and continuously over the adolescent years. However, one's view of themselves can be temporarily or permanently altered by the occurrence of significant social or psychological crisis. Also, one's self-concept and self-esteem grow out of one's experiences. They are not independent of other developmental and psychological growth and needs, and both are in a state of continuous evolution (Ingersoll, 1989).

Various aspects of self-esteem have recently been proposed. For example, some make a distinction between "(a) self-esteem based on a sense of competence, power, or efficacy and (b) self-esteem based on a sense of virtue or moral worth" (Gecas, 1982, p. 5). There are also some (Jackson & Pounonen, 1980) who consider self-esteem from both the trait view (personal disposition) and the situational view (self-evaluation regulated by situations). Still, self-esteem is generally defined and operationalized as an overall evaluation of one's self-concept.

Self-esteem is most commonly measured with paper and pencil, self-report, Likert-type instruments. Most notably are the Rosenberg (1965) Self-Esteem Index and the Coopersmith (1967) Self-Esteem Inventory. Some also assess self-esteem by determining the discrepancy between current self and desired self using adjective checklist (Gough, 1960). In general, measures provide a numerical index of one's overall level of self-esteem.

#### Definitions Employed in this Study

Consistent with the study's research questions and measures of the research variables, the construct definitions endorsed in this study are:

Prosocial Behavior/Response. The individual's perceived willingness and/or tendency to help, share with,

comfort, or cooperate with a hypothetical classmate, regardless of motive.

Empathy. An individual's reported affective and/or cognitive reaction to another's emotion or situation.

Identity. The individual's perceived sense of self, that is the degree to which they have successfully resolved or secured a healthy identity as prescribed by Eriksonian theory.

Self-Esteem. One's general positive or negative evaluation of themselves, where a high self-esteem refers to self-respect and personal worth and a low self-esteem indicates lack of self-respect or worthiness.

#### Empirical Underpinnings

##### Empathy and Prosocial Behavior

The prosocial literature suggests three broad areas of empirical concern. These are prosocial development, prosocial moral reasoning, and prosocial behavior. While overlap and interplay undoubtedly exist among the three, subtle distinctions can be made. Investigations concerned with the development of prosocial orientations typically revolve around various antecedents or factors related to the acquisition of prosocial traits. These include, among others, changing cognitive processes, child rearing, parental identification, and the internalization of moral codes or values. Research within the prosocial reasoning

domain focuses on the reasons individuals provide for behaving in either a prosocial or nonprosocial manner. A primary assumption within this line of inquiry is that reasons for engaging in prosocial acts explain, in part, why such behavior occurs. Further, reasoning patterns point to, and aid in understanding, developmental influences on prosocial responding. Prosocial behavioral research investigates how persons actually behave in both contrived and naturalistic settings. Such inquiry further examines behavioral differences among different groups (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity) and factors affecting behavioral outcomes (e.g., modeling, reinforcements).

The relative importance and role of empathy in each of these domains has received considerable empirical attention. However, as noted previously, the majority of this research involves children and adults. While interest in examining this relationship stems from the theoretical assumption that empathy is a mediator of altruistic prosocial behavior (Batson & Coke, 1981; Hoffman, 1982), the empirical association between the two is inconsistent. That is, some studies have found a moderately positive relationship between empathy and prosocial responding and others have not (Eisenberg, 1986). Such inconsistencies are often attributed to measurement and/or age differences. For example, among children, those studies using picture/story

measures of empathy often show nonsignificant or inconsistent relationships between empathy and prosocialness (e.g., Eisenberg-Berg & Lennon, 1980). On the other hand, studies using other measures tend to show positive relationships among the two variables (e.g., Brehm, Powell & Coke, 1984). Eisenberg (1986) notes that the research findings for adolescents and adults demonstrate relatively consistent positive relationships between empathy and prosocial behavior. Most of these studies, however, operationalize empathy as responses to self-report scales designed to measure empathy. Thus, it could be that the relationship between empathy and prosocial response may increase with age (Underwood & Moore, 1982), that older subjects are more capable of defining their feelings, and/or that self-report measures engender greater empathic-like responding.

Despite these inconsistencies it is generally recognized that empathy, in some form (e.g., sympathy, affective, cognitive, personal distress), contributes to prosocial responding (Batson & Coke, 1981; Eisenberg, 1986; Hoffman, 1982). Surprisingly, very little research has examined this relationship among high school adolescents. Eisenberg (1983a), in an extensive review of the literature, writes that "for adolescents there appears to be a somewhat . . . consistent positive relation between empathy and

prosocial behavior . . . although no association was found in one of the four available studies" (pp. 196-197). Of these four research studies, one was an unpublished manuscript and one had a sample of sixth- through eighth-graders. For this review, five published studies were identified which investigated the relationship between empathy and prosocial responding among high school aged adolescents. Two of these (Eisenberg-Berg & Mussen, 1978; Barnett, Howard, King & Dino, 1981) were included in Eisenberg's (1986) review, two (Ellis, 1982; Kaplan & Arbuthnot, 1985) stem from delinquent behavior literature, and one (Duggan, 1978) provides findings from an intervention program for troubled youth. All suggest that empathy, to some degree, is related to adolescent prosocial behavior. Further, some have noted gender differences in empathy and/or its relationship to prosocialness.

Eisenberg-Berg and Mussen (1978) assessed the relationship between empathy and both prosocial moral reasoning and helping behavior in 72 ninth, eleventh, and twelfth graders (37 females, 35 males). Empathy was defined in this study as affective role-taking (i.e., matching one's own feelings with those of another), and was measured using the Mehrabian and Epstein (1972) empathy questionnaire. Results showed that females scored significantly higher in empathy than males did. Further, empathy was positively

related to helping behavior, measured by one's volunteering and actual help in a task. This relationship, however, was significant for males only (i.e., biserial  $r=.40 < .05$ ).

In a more recent study (Barnett, Howard, King, & Dino, 1981) with 103 tenth through twelfth graders (70 females, 33 males), female empathic scores were also found to be higher than male scores. Though in this study no sex differences were noted regarding the relationship between empathy and helping. Specifically, participants in the study completed the Mehrabian and Epstein empathy scale and a filler task. Based upon the results of the empathy scale, high and low empathic groups for both females and males were established. Individuals within each group were then randomly assigned to one of three conditions, each of which saw three videotapes depicting mock "news briefs". One of these three tapes varied for each of the research conditions. Two groups viewed tapes designed to be empathy-arousing presentations, that is, one watched a tape about institutionalized crippled children, and the other saw a tape on institutionalized mentally retarded children. The third group watched an affectively neutral tape. In all cases participants were under the impression that their task was to evaluate the quality of the "news briefs". After viewing the tapes, participants in each group were given an opportunity to bind "activity booklets" the experimenter was preparing to donate

to institutionalized children. Thus, helping behavior was assessed by the number of booklets the individual prepared in the time allowed. The results demonstrated that high empathic participants completed significantly more booklets ( $x = 4.29$ ) than did low empathic participants ( $x = 3.13$ ,  $F(1, 91) = 4.12$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Further, "the difference in the number of booklets completed by high and low empathic individuals was not found to be significantly greater following the empathy-arousing presentations than following the affectively-neutral presentation" (p. 131). Thus, empathy level appeared to be an influential factor in adolescents' subsequent helping behavior.

Although this research is limited, it does provide initial empirical support for the theoretical assumption that empathy is an influential variable in prosocial behavior among adolescents. Additional support, though indirect, is that similar studies among both older children (e.g., Barnett, Howard, Melton & Dino, 1982) and college students (e.g., Aderman & Berkowitz, 1970) have found empathy and prosocial behavior to be related. This suggests that altruism among high school students is probably related to empathy as well. Further, research stemming from investigative paradigms outside the realm of those cited above lend support for such a relationship.

Operating within a psychotherapeutic framework, Duggan (1978) qualitatively explored the relationship between empathy and prosocial responding among troubled and/or delinquent adolescents in an intervention setting, namely, the Childcare Apprenticeship Program. The program involved carefully pairing an adolescent with a preschool child (recognized as disadvantaged or at-risk) to work together in the playroom, on field trips, and in general to act as primary caregiver for that child during the allotted time. Focusing on this relationship and over a three year period, Duggan (1978) investigated, among others, the role of empathy in adolescent caregiving.

Empathy was broadly defined as "responsiveness to the needs of another" (p. 3), and was assessed using a hypothetical-scenario interview developed for the study. Prosocial responding (e.g., helping, caring, comforting) was assessed through observation, periodic open-ended surveys, and a variety of narrative techniques relating to the caregiver relationship. Duggan (1978) concluded that an adolescent caregiver's "response to the Measure of Empathy did bear a relationship to his or her program performance . . . those displaying cognitive understanding, an ability to identify, and a role-taking capacity . . . played with and cared for children with spontaneity, joy, and total absorption in the task . . . their focus of attention was

riveted on the child's needs, both physical and emotional" (pp. 140-141). Moreover, many of those who demonstrated real efforts of helping the child (e.g., bringing them something special, taking extra care to listen and explain), reported knowing how "they" feel and feeling sorry for "them" as their reasons. Many reported a desire to help because their own misguided childhood had hurt them. Also noteworthy is that as steps were taken to enhance the adolescents' empathic capacity, their efforts toward helping and caring for the children appeared to improve.

Duggan's (1978) work certainly does not establish an empirical link between empathy and helping behavior. In fact, the vague and/or limited descriptions of methodology and analyses make it difficult to gauge the strength of the reported conclusions. Yet, the work is unique in that it is one of the few accounts of empathic arousal (among other variables) and prosocial behavior among adolescents in an ongoing, committed relationship. As such, it provides much insight into adolescent empathy and prosocialness as well as the relationship between the two. Another approach in examining whether empathy is a critical factor in prosocial development, is to consider if a lack of empathy is associated with antisocial or delinquent behavior. Indeed, several studies have found this to be the case.

Ellis (1982) examined empathy in 395 twelve to eighteen year old delinquents and nondelinquents using Hogan's (1969) social-cognitive empathy measure. Results showed that delinquents reported significantly lower levels of empathy than their nondelinquent counterparts (i.e.,  $t(393) = 6.04, p = .05$ ). Further comparisons were made with respect to the type of delinquency demonstrated among the delinquent sample. Nonaggressive delinquents scored significantly higher on empathy than both the aggressive-against-person and aggressive-against-property delinquents. However, there were no significant differences in empathy scores between nonaggressive delinquent and nondelinquent adolescents. Similar results were found in an eighth-grade sample (Kaplan & Arbuthnot, 1985) using Duggan's (1978) semi-structured, affective-oriented empathy interview. That is, delinquents scored lower than did nondelinquents. However, the groups did not differ in scores on a self-report measure designed to assess affective empathy.

In sum, though the research is limited and the results inconclusive or inconsistent, there appears to be some evidence that empathy is positively related to prosocial responding among high school adolescents. As such, additional research into the relationship is warranted.

### Identity and Prosocialness

Inquiry into prosocial development and behavior has not addressed the possible influences of one's sense of self or identity. In fact, such concern has only recently been suggested, and even then only in brief, theoretical terms. Specifically, Staub (1986) suggests that "self-awareness, or knowledge of oneself, and acceptance of the varied aspects of the self . . . can also be of great importance in affecting altruism. . ." (p. 146). Surprisingly, given this argument as well as the intuitive assumption that self-awareness affects one's willingness and/or ability to aid another, no empirical prosocially-oriented literature on the topic was found.

While Staub's (1986) hypothesis stems primarily from Jungian and Rogerian theory, which view self-awareness, in part, as awareness of impulses or emotions within oneself, knowledge of oneself may also be interpreted from an Eriksonian perspective. From this framework, if a greater sense of self is positively related to prosocial responding, individuals expressing resolution of the identity crisis would be more likely to respond to the need of another. While there were no identified studies within Eriksonian inspired literature addressing prosocial constructs, some evidence, albeit indirect, suggests a plausible link.

Most noteworthy are several studies addressing the relationship between identity status and moral development. Podd (1972) assessed ego identity using Marcia's (1966) Identity Status Interview, and moral development using Kohlberg's (1978) model in 134 male college students. Results indicated that participants scoring high in ego identity demonstrated the most mature level of moral judgement. That is, they felt "that each individual had the right to determine [their] own ethical standards independent of those who do or do not hold the same beliefs" (p. 498). Conversely, those showing a relative lack of ego identity were characterized as displaying the least mature level of moral reasoning. Among this group, "avoidance of punishment and achievement of gratification [were] the major factors in making moral determinations" (p. 498). Similarly, though the authors express caution in interpreting the results, Rowe and Marcia (1980) administered measures for logical thought, moral development, and identity status to a small sample ranging in ages from eighteen to twenty-six. The findings showed that formal operational thought was related to both moral development and to identity achievement. Further, moral thought was found to be positively related to achievement of identity.

These findings, though limited, suggest that identity and prosocial behavior may be related insofar as moral

thought and prosocial responding are related. While inconclusive, there is some evidence suggesting this may be the case. Several of studies (though few among adolescents) have demonstrated a positive relationship between prosocial moral reasoning and prosocial behavior (Eisenberg, 1986). These findings are grounded in Eisenberg's (1977) developmental model of prosocial moral reasoning. According to this model, less mature reasoning focuses on hedonism (e.g., self gain), stereotyped approval (e.g., approval and acceptance from others), and the identification of need (e.g., noting that another needs something), whereas more mature reasoning involves empathic considerations (e.g., sympathetic concern and caring) and internalized values (e.g., concern with the rights of others).

Measures of moral development in identity research, however, stem from Kohlberg's (1978) model. Though, Eisenberg's (1979) model closely parallels Kohlberg's (1978), the two "differ in theoretical orientations, in the types of moral dilemmas studied, and...in the scoring systems" (Eisenberg, 1986, p. 187). Given this, the link between a Kohlbergian moral reasoning and identity relationship found in the identity literature, and a prosocial moral reasoning and altruism relationship noted in the prosocial literature is not entirely warranted. However, relationships have also been found, though less

strong, between prosocial behaviors and both Kohlbergian moral reasoning (Kohlberg & Candee, 1984; McNamee, 1978) and distributive justice reasoning (Blotner & Bearison, 1984).

Following the same logic, and given the evidence suggesting an empathy-altruism connection, an association between empathy and morality would further support an identity-prosocial relationship. Among adolescents, research regarding empathy and moral reasoning has demonstrated mixed findings. In one study, Eisenberg-Berg and Mussen (1978) found that adolescent prosocial reasoning (assessed with hypothetical dilemmas) and empathy (assessed with an affectively oriented scale) were significantly correlated for both males and females. Another study (Hanson & Mullis, 1985), assessed the relationship between empathy and moral reasoning among 330 adolescents (12-20 years) using the "Flexibility of Moral Judgment Index". This measure reflects Piaget's (1965) assertion that individuals advance from "moral realism", an unquestionable obedience to authority, to "moral relativism", an internal value structure. Thus, high scores indicate a more flexible or internalized level of moral reasoning. In this case, there was no relationship between measures of empathy and moral reasoning, older adolescents scored higher in both, and females ranked higher in empathy whereas males were slightly higher in moral reasoning flexibility.

In sum, this research, though limited, suggests that moral development is related to identity development, and that moral reasoning is related, in part, to prosocial responding and empathy. Thus, it is plausible that an individual's level of identity would influence their degree of prosocialness. Still, given the differences in theoretical approach and measurement, the collected findings are at best suggestive of such a relationship.

There are a number of other identity related findings among adolescents and college students which inadvertently, or at least intuitively, suggest an identity-prosocial association. Related to moral reasoning, several researchers have shown differences in cognitive processing among high and low identity groups. Waterman and Waterman (1974) examined reflective/impulsive thinking patterns among male college students in each of Marcia's (1966) four identity statuses. Results showed that "achievers and moratoriums are generally reflective and that foreclosures and diffusions are typically impulsive (p. 5). The authors suggest that this characteristic may explain why some persons never change from one status to another, in that, the possibility of never considering alternatives may lie in one's reflective thinking ability. Identity achievers have shown more integrative social-cognitive reasoning skills, whereas individuals demonstrating less identity achievement

have shown problems considering multiple and conflicting sources of information (Slugoski, Marcia, & Koopman, 1984). Similarly, Read, Adams, and Dobson (1984) found that identity achieved individual process more extensive amounts of information and are more self-confident about their judgements, while foreclosed persons tend to exclude relevant information because of attentional limitations. With regard to prosocial responding, though unexplored empirically, the ability, for example, to consider alternatives, to integrate complex and often contradictory social information, and to respond with confidence in making judgements is likely to influence an individual's ability to respond prosocially. Thus, that one's sense of identity appears, in part, to be a function of such traits, suggests that identity may be related to prosocialness.

Several studies identify potential affective traits linking identity and prosocialness. Donovan (1975b) examined interpersonal styles and traits among the different identity statuses using Marcia's (1966) instrument, and various measures of personality. The research indicated "that level of identity development is directly related to interpersonal style" (p.53), that is, identity achievers interact in different ways than do nonachieved persons. For example, those with less secure identities were characterized as withdrawn, noninvolved, quiet, and as

engaging in appropriate behaviors. Conversely, identity achievers were described as calm and nurturant, more tolerant of situations and others, quite active, needing less reassurance, and as having emotionally mature, warm relations with others. A similar (Orlofsky, Marcia, & Lesser, 1973) study, examining the association between intimacy and identity, among college students found that identity achievers appeared to have the greatest capacity for engaging in intimate interpersonal relationships. That is, achievers demonstrated more of those traits typically viewed as engendering intimate relations.

While certainly not conclusive, these findings suggest that persons achieving identity are more apt to display emotionally mature and concerned interpersonal relations. It is likely that such interpersonal style is related to prosocial responding for several reasons. One is that concerned and caring interpersonal styles develop through, for example, childrearing practices and exposure to varied emotions and experiences. The socialization pattern underlying this development may give rise to or facilitate empathy development as well. It may also be, however, that early empathy development engenders emotionally mature and warm relational patterns. While the association between empathy development and the development of interpersonal style is at this time theoretical, it seems unlikely that

the two personality traits develop independently. Another is that persons exhibiting more involved and concerned interactions, in this case identity achievers, are likely to encounter, and subsequently engage in, more prosocial opportunities. That is, they are not only more accessible to potential aid-bearing experiences, but are also more apt to feel capable and comfortable in responding. Again, however, this pattern is speculative.

Two further findings bearing on a plausible identity-prosocial relationship can be noted. Marcia (1966) found that identity achievers appraised task involvement and accomplishment efforts more realistically than did low identity achievers. Such ability may influence one's decision to aid another. Finally, Orlofsky (1977) investigated the relationship between psychological androgyny and identity development, and concluded that "high levels of both masculinity and femininity are highly conducive to identity achievement " (p. 571). Though unexplored, it is likely that identification with cross sex-typed traits enhances empathic arousal, thus facilitating prosocial behavior.

In sum, though a relationship between self-knowledge and altruism has been suggested (Staub, 1986), there doesn't appear to be any empirical literature directly examining this interrelatedness. Moreover, the isolated findings

regarding, for example, moral reasoning, cognitive and interpersonal styles, and affective characteristics, while suggestive, cannot be taken as support for an identity-prosocial connection. In fact, given the different research paradigms and measures, the suggestibility of these findings are limited. This is especially true in this case because while most identity studies employ Marcia's (1966) identity status measure, the present study uses a more general index of Erikson's identity resolution (Rosenthal, Gurney, & Moore, 1981). Nonetheless, given Staub's (1986) premise and the related findings cited here, investigation into the relationship between self-knowledge and prosocialness would be of value.

#### Self-Esteem and Prosocial Behavior

Considerable research suggests that positive experiences (e.g., success, kindness from others) increase helpfulness and generosity. Negative experiences (e.g., failure, embarrassment) have been shown in most cases to decrease positive behavior, and in others, to increase such acts (Rosenhan, Salovey, Karylowski, & Hargis, 1981). One explanation for this is that negative and positive events temporarily affect both self-esteem and attention to self versus other (Staub, 1986). For example, Berkowitz (1970) noted that actual as well as perceived negative experiences or evaluations can lead to self-preoccupation. Moreover,

negative experiences can sometimes lead to increased focus on oneself, for example, through improvement or avoidance efforts. This heightened attention toward oneself often results in diminished attention to others and their needs. Conversely, positive encounters may reduce preoccupation with oneself, and thus, allow for greater attention and concern toward others.

Staub (1986) suggests that because positive and negative behaviors "are connections between the self and others, it is not surprising that how people feel about themselves would affect the way they feel about others, as well as their willingness to extend themselves for others" (p. 145). Given this premise, self-esteem should influence prosocial responding. While empirical exploration into this relationship is lacking, one early study by Mussen, Rutherford, Harris and Keasey (1970) investigated the correlation between several variables, including self-concept, and moral behavior among 95 male and female sixth-graders. Mussen and his colleagues administered a 70-item self-concept scale addressing, among others, information regarding one's ego strength (e.g., self-esteem, self-confidence). These factors were then viewed in relation to the youngsters' honesty and altruism level as measured by sociometric scales and situational tasks. The results showed that positive peer interactions and adequate social

and school adjustment were related to high levels of altruism for both boys and girls, as were high levels of self-confidence and self-esteem. In particular, among female respondents a significant relationship was found between reported scores on the self-esteem subscale and altruism ( $r = .28, p < .05$ ). Similarly, though for boys the self-esteem subscale findings were not reported, the scale item "I am pretty sure of myself" was positively related to altruistic responding ( $r = .32, p < .05$ ).

Obviously, findings from a single study do not support a relationship. Still, several related fields of inquiry provide some indication that self-esteem may be associated with prosocialness among adolescents. Ingersoll (1989) notes that the degree to which adolescents are "able to accept the strengths and limits of others is directly related to their ability to accept their own strengths and limits" (p. 65). It is likely that accepting others is a primary component in the decision to respond in a prosocial manner, and that this acceptance rests in part on one's own degree of self-worth or self-esteem. Further support for the association between self-esteem and prosocial responding can be drawn from research noting the relationships between self-esteem and shyness, achievement, peer relations, and locus of control (Ingersoll, 1989). Though unexplored, characteristics embedded within these variables are likely

to play a role in one's desire and ability to respond prosocially. Given that a relationship between self-esteem and altruism was found (Mussen, et. al., 1970), that the relationship has been theoretically suggested, and that related fields of study indirectly suggest such a relationship, it seems worthwhile to further examine the constructs' interrelatedness.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHOD

This chapter includes four major sections. First, the research design of the study is described including both qualitative and quantitative components. Secondly, information about study participants (i.e., selection, characteristics) is provided. Third, the research measures are discussed. Finally, research procedures are described.

#### Research Design

The qualitative aspect of the study will follow primarily an exploratory or emergent research design (Miles & Huberman, 1984). This is appropriate in that the purpose of this inquiry is to discern common prosocial themes among adolescents, not to confirm existing hypotheses. While a pure emergent design calls for evolving variations in data collection and research questions, the research questions and data gathering strategies in this study will be predetermined. Specifically, the design calls for brief, written responses to open-ended questions addressing the broader research questions defined in the study. Responses will be subjected to various data reduction and classification procedures (Miles & Huberman, 1984).

A multivariate prediction design will be used to examine the study's quantitative research questions. This method is appropriate in that the purpose of the research is to explore the relationship between, and prediction value of, given variables (Borg & Gall, 1983).

#### Participants

Study participants will be ninth through twelfth grade students. The high school was chosen for the study through a non-random, word-of-mouth procedure. The school, located in an urban, middle-income area of a Southwest city, is the only public high school in town and has an approximate enrollment of 2,200 students. The socioeconomic status of the school, while largely middle class, contains all levels ranging from homeless poor to wealthy. Half of the school's student population are ethnic minorities, including Hispanic, Black, American Indian, and Asian American. In considering the school's academic structure, accumulation of credit hours and the choice of elective courses are largely the student's responsibility. However, courses are divided into four categories. These are accelerated, regular, remedial, and resource. To better ensure that respondents understand the research measures, only "regular" and "accelerated" classes will be considered for the sample.

The school grounds, including classroom buildings, athletic and physical education facilities, a bookstore,

several cafeterias and/or snack bars, and administrative offices, are quite spread out. In fact, one part of the campus (VoTech) is a number of blocks away. In visiting the school, the atmosphere could be described as very open, with students demonstrating a great deal of independent and "hanging out" behaviors. The school area was crowded, loud, and patrolled by several security guards. Overall, however, the grounds seemed in order, clean, and cared for. Students mingling in the area appeared to be extremely casual, slightly sloppy, and very boisterous.

#### Selection

From this population, two independent groups of participants will be selected. One will form the qualitative study sample. The other group will serve as the correlational study sample.

In considering the qualitative sample, several criteria will guide the selection process. One is to have a sample large enough to provide a sufficient data base and representation, yet small enough to provide manageable analysis. Another is to include only those students performing at an average high school student level. These criteria will be most closely met by using a single required "regular" class from each of the four grade levels. Thus, arrangements will be made through one of the principal's offices for a teacher from each grade to administer the

surveys to one of their classes. In order to meet school officials' request that teachers be given some flexibility in the day and time of survey administration, participating classes will be selected by the teachers. Thus, teachers will be provided written instructions regarding guidelines for selecting their participating class. They will also be asked to complete a brief form describing the selected class and any individual or situational characteristics that may affect student responses (See Appendix B).

Selection of participants for the quantitative aspect of the study will be similar. However, in this case several teachers from each grade level will be asked to administer the Likert-type scale to all five of their "regular and/or accelerated" classes. On average, each class has twenty-five students. Given this, a 100% response rate for a single teacher would result in samples for each grade level of roughly 125 students, and a total sample size of 500 participants. Recognizing that actual response rates will be considerably lower, questionnaires will be provided to two teachers from each grade level, resulting in a total sample pool of 1000 students. Academic policy requires that every student at each grade level be enrolled in one and only one core English course. Thus, in order to prevent the possibility of respondents encountering the quantitative survey task twice (e.g., attending courses taught by several

of the cooperating teachers), only those teachers responsible for teaching the required core English course will be recruited to administer the Likert-type scales.

### Characteristics

The resultant qualitative research sample consisted of 109 participants. Of these, 60 were female and 49 were male. There were nearly equal numbers of females and males in each of the four grade levels. While all age groups (14 years through 18) were represented, 84% of the sample were between the ages of fifteen and seventeen. Similarly, 89% of the participants were White or Hispanic, though other ethnic groups were represented. A full description of the qualitative sample is presented in Table 1.

The sample for the quantitative portion of the study included 326 participants (Females=178; Males=146; Missing=2). All age groups were represented (14 through 18 with n's of 41, 93, 70, 51, 71, respectively). Again, all noted ethnic groups were represented, though 85% of the sample were White or Hispanic. Further sample characteristics are presented in Table 2.

### Description of Measures

Measures for the study will be of two general types. First, qualitative data will be collected with an open-ended survey developed for this study. Second, Likert-type questionnaires will be used to measure each of the predictor

Table 1. Characteristics of participants in the qualitative aspect of the study.

	Grade				Total
	9th (n=28)	10th (n=30)	11th (n=28)	12th (n=23)	(n=109)
<b>Sex</b>					
Female	17 (61) *	18 (60)	14 (50)	11 (48)	60 (55)
Male	11 (39)	12 (40)	14 (50)	12 (52)	49 (45)
<b>Age</b>					
14	16 (51)	-----	-----	-----	16 (15)
15	11 (39)	14 (47)	-----	-----	25 (23)
16	1 ( 4)	15 (50)	14 (50)	-----	30 (27)
17	-----	-----	11 (39)	15 (65)	26 (24)
18	-----	1 ( 3)	3 (11)	8 (35)	12 (11)
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
American Indian	3 (11)	-----	1 ( 4)	-----	4 ( 4)
Black	1 ( 4)	1 ( 3)	-----	2 ( 9)	4 ( 4)
Hispanic	4 (14)	7 (23)	12 (43)	5 (22)	28 (26)
White	18 (64)	21 (70)	15 (54)	15 (65)	69 (63)
Other	2 ( 7)	1 ( 3)	-----	1 ( 4)	4 ( 4)

\*Percentages reported in parentheses.

Table 2. Characteristics of participants in the quantitative aspect of the study.

---

<b>Sex</b>		
Female	178 (55)	
Male	146 (45)	(2 missing)
<b>Age</b>		
14	41 (13)	
15	93 (28)	
16	70 (21)	
17	51 (16)	
18	71 (22)	
<b>Ethnicity</b>		
American Indian	35 (10)	
Black	10 ( 3)	
Hispanic	97 (30)	
White	178 (55)	
Other	6 ( 2)	
<b>Grade</b>		
9th	125 (38)	
10th	84 (26)	(3 missing)
11th	8 ( 3)	
12th	106 (32)	
<b>Self-Report GPA</b>		
3.5-4.0	32 (10)	
3.0-3.4	87 (27)	
2.5-2.9	157 (48)	(1 missing)
2.0-2.4	45 (14)	
1.5-1.9	4 ( 1)	
<b>Number of Siblings</b>		
0	12 ( 4)	
1-2	176 (54)	
3-4	83 (25)	(3 missing)
5-7	33 (11)	
7	19 ( 6)	
<b>Living With</b>		
Both Natural Parents	186 (57)	
Natural Mother	47 (14)	
Natural Father	10 ( 3)	
Natural Parent/Remarried	59 (18)	
Other	24 ( 7)	

---

variables are empathy, identity, and self-esteem. The criterion variable is prosocial response. Demographic information will be obtained by using a brief descriptive questionnaire. Appendix A contains all measures to be used in the study.

#### Open-Ended Prosocial Survey

The Open-Ended Prosocial Survey (OE-PS) was developed to address the study's qualitative research questions, among others. In general, the OE-PS explores how high school students conceptualize various aspects of prosocial and antisocial behaviors, including types of behaviors representing each as well as reasons for engaging in such behaviors. Moreover, it examines adolescent views regarding the nature of, and reasons for, prosocial responding among themselves and their peers. The survey contains 26 short answer questions and/or statements. For example, students will be asked to write responses to questions such as:

"Please describe what you think antisocial (negative and/or harmful) behaviors and prosocial (positive and/or nice) behaviors involve".

"Give three examples of positive or nice behavior among high school students".

"In what situations are you most likely to help a classmate?"

The content of the survey questions reflect, in part, concerns addressed in current prosocial literature. For example, Eisenberg (1982) defines prosocial moral reasoning as choosing between satisfying one's own wants or those of another. Hence, respondents are asked to make such a choice and explain why they made that decision. Further, prosocial behavior is often described as encompassing acts of helping, sharing, comforting, and cooperating (Bar-Tal, 1976; Eisenberg, 1986; Mussen & Eisenberg-Berg, 1977). As such, survey questions address various views and examples of these behaviors as well as reasons for them. Other survey concerns were guided, for example, by an interest in how adolescents might describe or explain prosocial behaviors in general, and among themselves and their peers. Only those responses to questions directly related to the research concerns of this study will be used in data analysis.

#### Predictor Variables

##### Cognitive and Affective Processes of Empathy

Recent literature addresses both cognitive and affective components of empathy (Eisenberg, 1986). In order to consider both aspects in measuring empathy, two recently developed scales were combined to create the Complete Adolescent-Empathy Scale (CA-ES). These were the Empathic Understanding Scale and the Emotional Responsiveness Scale (Estrada, 1986).

The Empathic Understanding Scale is a 14 item Likert-type scale designed to assess respondents' cognitive "understanding of other people's thoughts and feelings" (Estrada, 1986, p. 78). Respondents rate themselves from 1 (Not at All True For Me) to 6 (Very True For Me) on items such as "I can usually determine other people's point of view" and "I usually recognize how other people feel". Unfortunately, there is some confusion regarding the internal reliability of the scale. In her text, Estrada (1986) reports a Cronbach's alpha of .71. However, in a reliability table this figure is reported as .79. Validity information was not reported. The Emotional Responsiveness Scale, derived from Mehrabian and Epstein's (1972) Emotional Empathy Scale, assesses the tendency for adolescents "to become generally emotionally aroused in response to the emotional experiences of others" (Estrada, 1986, p. 85). The scale consists of 18 items such as "I like to watch friends open presents" and "I am very upset when I see a person in pain". The rating system is the same as that for the Empathic Understanding Scale. Cronbach's alpha is reported to equal .71 (Estrada, 1986), and validity concerns were not addressed.

In developing the CA-ES, the exact items from each of the aforementioned scales were combined. However, the rating scale was changed from a six-point numbered scale to

a five-point acronym scale. Further, in the original scales there were only three labeled response categories (Not At All True For Me, Somewhat True For Me, and Very True For Me). The CA-ES labeled each point. These changes resulted in a 32 item Likert-type scale with five response categories including: Very True For Me (VT); Somewhat True For Me (ST); Neither True nor Untrue For Me (NT-UT); Somewhat Untrue For Me (SUT); and Very Untrue For Me (VUT).

### Identity

Identity will be measured with the identity subscale of the Erikson Psychosocial Stage Inventory Scale (Rosenthal, Gurney & Moore, 1981). It is referred to in this study as the Adolescent Identity Scale (A-IS). The Erikson Psychosocial Stage Inventory (EPSI) "measures respondents' resolution of the conflicts associated with the first six psychological stages described by Erikson" (Rosenthal, et. al., 1981, p. 533). Following a Likert format, respondents are asked to choose one of five response categories ranging from "Almost Always True" (5) to "Hardly Ever True" (1). The six subscales, one for each of Erikson's stages, are scored independently yielding a profile of scores for each respondent. Alpha reliability coefficients of .66 for a pilot sample of 97 high school students, and .71 for a test sample of 622 adolescents were reported. Validity was examined by correlating EPSI subscale scores to subscales of

Greenberger and Sorensen's (1974) Psychosocial Maturity Scale (Form D). Overall, "subscales of the EPSI showed encouragingly high correlations with relevant subscales of the PSM, providing some measure of construct validity" (Rosenthal, et.al., 1981, p. 531).

The identity subscale measures respondents' resolution of Erikson's (1968) "identity vs. identity confusion" conflict. Intercorrelations between the EPSI and PSM identity subscales was reported at .56. The subscale has 12 items, for example, "I've got a clear idea of what I want to be" and "I don't really feel involved". Half of the items reflect successful resolution of the identity stage "crisis" and half unsuccessful resolution. Each item is derived from key words characteristic of Erikson's identity development stage. Items were screened by researchers in the discipline for ambiguity and face validity. For the present study, the identity subscale items of the EPSI were used verbatim. However, the rating scale was changed to match that developed for the CA-ES.

#### Self-Esteem

Self-esteem will be measured by Rosenberg's (1965) widely used Self-Esteem Index (R-SEI). The R-SEI is considered an unidimensional measure of global self-regard or self-esteem. Though, some research has demonstrated two uncorrelated scale factors, one termed "self-derogation" and

the other "conventional defense of individual worth" (Wylie, 1974, p. 189). It has 10 items, for instance, "At times I think I am no good at all" and "I feel that I have a number of good qualities". Individuals mark the degree to which they agree with each item. Response choices include Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD). For this study, R-SEI items were used verbatim, however, response categories were changed to match those used in the CA-ES.

Rosenberg (1979) reports "a Coefficient of Reproducibility [Rep.] of 92 percent and a Coefficient of Scalability of 72 percent" (p. 291). Wylie (1974), in a critical review of the scale, concludes that to a certain extent this "Rep. value may be taken as one index of reliability" (p. 183). Silber and Tippett (1965) found a two week test-retest reliability of  $r=.85$ . In considering the validity of the scale, Wylie (1974) suggests that the scaled items have satisfactory face validity. Further, there is some degree of convergent validity. For example, Silber and Tippett (1965) correlated R-SEI scores against several other measures of self-esteem, the Kelly Repertory Test and the Heath Self-Image Questionnaire, and found  $r$ 's of .67 and .83, respectively. Wylie (1974) concludes, that all things considered, the R-SEI is an impressive scale given "that such high reliability is attainable with only 10

items and that such a short scale has yielded relationships supporting its construct validity" (p. 189).

#### Criterion Variable

##### Prosocial Response

Participants' tendency to respond prosocially will be measured by a revised version of the recently developed Prosocial Response Scale (Estrada, 1986). The modified version is referred to as the Prosocial Response Scale-Revised (PRS-R). The original scale was made up of "two items for each of the following prosocial behaviors: helpfulness, comforting, supportiveness, sharing, cooperation, and fairness" (Estrada, 1986, p. 93). For example, one comforting item reads "When a friend tells me she/he is feeling lonely, I try to spend some time with her/him". Using the same rating scale as the Empathic Understanding Scale and the Emotional Responsiveness Scale, respondents indicate the degree to which each item is true for them. Reliability for the original Prosocial Response Scale was reported as low, but adequate (Cronbach's alpha = .62).

Revising the Prosocial Response Scale for use in this study involved a number of changes. First, consistent with the behavioral domains of prosocial responding endorsed in this research, items pertaining to supportiveness and fairness were dropped. In addition, several items which

leaned toward ambiguity were also eliminated. Replacement items were derived from responses provided by participants in the qualitative aspect of this study. Two colleagues and two non-academicians independently categorized items into the four behavioral domains (i.e., helping, sharing, comforting, cooperation). While no formal inter-rater reliabilities were calculated, few discrepancies were evident. In fact, examining the items suggests that they have face validity. Secondly, several changes were made in most of the original items used. These changes were deemed necessary for two reasons. One was that in the original scale some items referred to a friend's need, while others addressed classmate concerns. Because prosocial responding is influenced by characteristics of the potential recipient (Eisenberg, 1983b), and adolescents often respond differently toward friends and classmates (Mannarino, 1976), all items in the revised scale refer only to situations involving classmates. Classmates, rather than friends, were chosen as referents in order to avoid having to address the additional variables inherent in the dynamics of friendship.

Another modification involved writing all items in "third person" format. For example, the item noted above was changed to "When a classmate tells me they're feeling lonely, I try to spend some time with them". Also, in order to reduce the abstractness and/or ambiguity of terms such as

"usually" and "often", items were stated in a concrete and absolute fashion. That is, the statement "When I am working on a group project, I usually try to cooperate with everyone" was changed to "When I am working on a group project, I try to cooperate with everyone". Finally, the rating scale was altered to match changes made in the preceding measures. All of which were revised in an attempt to provide more meaningful response categories and to more clearly define each scale point, thus maximizing the reliability potential for each of the study's scales.

#### Descriptive Questionnaire

Demographic information will be obtained for both the qualitative and quantitative samples. Respondents will be asked to indicate their gender, ethnicity, age, grade level, self-report GPA, number of siblings, and primary caregiver(s) with whom they live. However, the qualitative analysis in the present study will not address demographic differences. Quantitative analysis will only address gender, ethnic, and age differences.

#### Procedure

School officials will be contacted regarding the purpose and scope of the proposed research. Upon receiving consent to conduct the study, arrangements will be made with the school's vice-principal regarding data collection procedures and dates. Data will be collected in two parts.

The qualitative data will be gathered first, and then approximately a month later the quantitative data will be collected. In each case, a week prior to survey administration, cooperating teachers will be given ample copies of the Human Subjects Committee's approved participant and parent consent form (See Appendix B). Teachers will be asked to distribute the consent forms to their students, and explain their contents. Further, teachers will instruct students to take the forms home for parental perusal and signature, and to return them within the given time frame. Difficulties in controlling for consented participation are inherent in this method of gaining research consent. Thus, students will be responsible for participating or not depending upon whether they and their parent previously gave consent. Given the nature of the research, the Human Subjects Committee viewed this procedure as acceptable.

In considering the qualitative data collection, four sets of survey packets (one for each grade level teacher) will be compiled. Each set will contain (1) a letter informing the teacher of the project and explaining class selection and survey administration procedures; (2) a response sheet for the teacher to fill out describing class and/or participating attitude; and (3) thirty open-ended surveys with attached student cover letters. Similarly,

survey packets will be prepared for each of the teachers aiding in the Likert-type data collection. These will include (1) a letter informing teachers of the project and explaining scale administration procedures; (2) a sufficient supply of student questionnaires with attached cover letters; (3) a sufficient supply of student answer sheets; and (4) a supply of No. 2 pencils. In both instances, these materials will be given to the vice-principal, who has agreed to deliver them to the cooperating teachers. In accordance with school officials' request, teachers will have three days to administer the surveys and return them to the vice-principal's office. Actual administration and return of the surveys is primarily the teacher's responsibility. Thus, the number of surveys returned will be a function of teacher response rate.

Participants in the qualitative study will respond by writing directly on the survey form. These will then be obtained from the vice-principal, and subjected to content and theme analysis. Quantitative participants will code their response choices directly onto the coding answer sheets provided. However, in order to prevent respondents from influencing one another through possible markings on the questionnaires, each respondent will receive an unused form. Questionnaires and answer sheets will be collected from each respondent at the close of the survey

administration. Both will be returned to the vice-principal's office by the teacher, and obtained later for analysis.

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS

This chapter presents results of various analyses in two major sections. The first section addresses the qualitative data, including a description of analytic procedures and results. The second section presents the quantitative data results. This section includes various subsections addressing, among others, descriptive statistics, reliabilities, and correlational results.

#### Qualitative Data Results

As part of the Open-Ended Prosocial Survey (OE-PS), participants responded to a number of items directly related to the study's qualitative research questions. These items are noted in the attached Survey (See Appendix A). Responses to these particular questions served as the research data for this analysis. The findings represent an initial step toward understanding adolescent prosocial behavior in terms of how adolescents conceptualize, describe, and explain such behavior.

#### Method of Analysis

Response recording, grouping, patterning, sorting, and clustering tactics were used in analyzing responses to the pertinent questions. In each analytic phase, all responses

related to each of the research questions were reviewed in the order delineated in Chapter 1. That is, all responses to the six research questions were first recorded, sequentially, from question one to six. Similarly, all subsequent groupings were conducted first for the first research question, then for the second, third, and so forth. Sorting and categorizing procedures were conducted in the same manner. Thus, responses for each given research question were analyzed and categorized independently of the others. In the initial phase of analysis, for instance, responses to the first research question regarding adolescent conceptions of prosocial behavior were first recorded for every 9th-grade participant, and then for every 10th- 11th- and 12th-grade participant. The surveys were reviewed again in the same order and answers to the second research question were recorded, and so forth until all responses had been recorded.

In all cases, responses were recorded verbatim when student answers were "listed". When responses were written in complete sentences, they were condensed to reflect the gist of the sentence. Responses which duplicated earlier recorded ones were noted by a tally mark. For example, the response "happy, social, people-person" was recorded as stated, whereas the response "Prosocial means that someone is nice, fun and happy and has a lot of friends and does a

lot of things" was recorded as "nice, fun, many friends, does a lot of things". In this case the "happy" portion of the second response was recorded with a tally mark alongside the already recorded response. At this stage, only identical responses were grouped. This procedure resulted in a thorough, yet simplified response listing for each question.

Each question's response list was then reviewed, and responses duplicating each other in meaning were combined to form response groupings. For example, responses like "does a lot of things", "involved in stuff", "participates in activities" and "really active" were grouped together to form the response theme "generally involved and active in things". The purpose for this phase of analysis was merely to "tighten up" the response listings by grouping obvious redundant comments. In some instances, responses were unchanged. In others, only a few remarks were collapsed, while in some cases, numerous comments were subsumed under a single, representative response. This procedure resulted in a number of response themes for each research question.

Response themes were then reduced into categories or clusters. These were derived through a sorting process which identified and grouped together those themes sharing a common construct or otherwise appearing to be related to one another. Briefly, this procedure involved reviewing the

response theme list for each research question, independently. After several readings, preliminary patterns were noted. For instance, in considering the first research question, response themes leaned toward issues of friendship, activities, caring, school, and values. With these in mind, individual themes were classified into "like" categories. The final category groupings were then further reviewed and evaluated for their commonality. In some cases, responses were regrouped or combined to form a single or new category. Finally, the resultant theme clusters were broadly titled using terms which seemed to be most representative. For example, in analyzing responses addressing the concept of prosocial behavior, themes such as "nice, fun and happy", "someone who is well known and well liked", "being friendly", and "getting along with people" were classified in a single cluster, later titled "Social/Friend Orientation".

#### Response Themes and Clusters

Resultant categories and corresponding sample student responses for each research question are presented in Tables 3 through 8. In brief, five response clusters were generated from answers to the question regarding how adolescents conceptualize (i.e., define, describe, explain) prosocial behavior. These are presented in Table 3. Four clusters were evident in responses addressing positive

Table 3. Adolescent conceptions of prosocial behaviors.

Social/Friend Orientation

Someone who is well known and well liked  
 Getting along with people  
 Nice, fun and happy  
 Being friendly and/or having many friends  
 People-person

Involved/Active Orientation

Generally involved and active in things  
 Getting involved in school activities  
 Outgoing and socially active  
 Eager to take part in things  
 Involved in sports

Affective/Kind Orientation

Helping others, caring and trusting  
 Positive comments about others  
 Love, affection, and generosity  
 Listening to others  
 Polite and kind to people

Positive/Academic Orientation

Getting good grades and wanting to learn  
 Good behavior and honest  
 Not harmful or destructive, not on drugs, etc.  
 Obeying rules, a clean record and community  
 service  
 Smart and does school work

Value/Moral Orientation

Acceptable and beneficial behaviors to society  
 Not prejudice  
 Showing qualities centered on respect,  
 nationality, creed, property and religion  
 Behavior that goes along with society  
 Respect others because they have self-respect

Table 4. Adolescent self-reported positive behaviors.

Academic/School Related

Helping others with assignments  
Things that show school spirit  
Helping and respecting teachers  
Doing homework and taking part in class  
Trying to improve the school  
Volunteering and organizing school activities

Social/Caring Related

Talking with others nicely  
Cheering people up or take time to listen  
Smiling, saying hello to everyone  
Complimenting someone, helping them fit in  
Being friend-like  
Keeping, or helping friends out of trouble

Trait/Characteristic Related

Nice personality  
Good communication style  
Assertive, but polite person  
Courteous and positive attitude  
Happy and good sense of humor

Behavior/Activity Related

Stop fights and staying out of them  
Not ditching  
Not taking advantage of someone  
Sports and activities  
Staying away from drugs  
Good behavior in general

Table 5. Adolescent reasons for their own prosocialness.

Self-View/Self-Esteem

I'm very soft-hearted  
 Feel good about myself  
 Sense of pride and accomplishment  
 I like people or that's my nature  
 I look in the mirror every day

Socialization/Values

That's how everyone should act  
 My mom is very caring  
 Because of the way I was brought up  
 Parental and Christian upbringing  
 If everyone in the world was cruel, what kind of a  
 place would it be

Reciprocity/Relational

I wouldn't have any friends if I was a snob  
 So others will be kind to me  
 I like nice people so I like to be nice  
 I like to be cared about, too

Experience/Empathy

I try to understand what's wrong and help  
 Because I feel sorry if someone's hurt  
 Similar experiences so I know how they feel  
 Experiences with people being unkind to me

Gratitude/Reward

They thank me or give me something  
 So they will reward me

Avoidance of Negative Consequences

I don't like dealing with the problems, so I try  
 to help them be over  
 I'm expected to, or else  
 So no one will pick on me or yell

Betterment of Another

Makes people feel better  
 So others can feel good

Table 6. Adolescent reasons for peer prosocialness.

Other's Self-View/Self-Esteem

They want to be accepted  
 If they don't they wouldn't be very popular  
 No one likes a mean person  
 I guess it makes them feel better

Reciprocity/Relational

Because they want friends  
 They liked to be treated nice  
 They want to be cared for  
 So if they need me, I'll be there

Socialization/Value

Upbringing  
 They do what they think is correct  
 They think that's how they should act  
 Example from elders and parents

Betterment of Another

It makes school enjoyable for everyone  
 They're concerned for the welfare of others  
 Helping everyone else brightens other's load

Perceived View of Other

Because they're not cold-blooded  
 They're caring people and like others  
 Because they're nice

Avoidance of Negative Consequences

They have to  
 So other's won't be mad or think wrong of them  
 They wouldn't want to be laughed at

Gratitude/Reward

If they care they get something for it  
 Someone might reward them

Experience/Empathy

They've needed help at one time or another, and  
 know what it's like

Table 7. Self-reported helping, sharing comforting and cooperative behaviors among adolescents.

Helping

Academic/School

Explained some algebra problems  
Help study for a test

Relational/Caring

Helped friends put back their relationship  
Helped support my friend in track

Behavior/Activity

Carried things for a friend with a broken leg  
Helped some friends sneak out of a bad deal

Sharing

Personal Belongings/Materials

Clothes with a friend or, sometimes, money  
School supplies, books, gum, and lunch

Information/Emotions

Shared a problem I had, and my feelings  
Shared my notes and even some test answers

Comforting

Relational/Dating

Gave advice and listened when her boyfriend  
went out on her  
With a friend whose girl dumped him

Emotional Distress/Tragedy

When she was pregnant and her boyfriend left  
her, and she had to tell her parents  
When a classmate wrecked and the girl he hit  
died

Situational/Personal

When my friend didn't make the cheering squad  
A friend was failing, and worried about a  
test

Cooperative

Academic/Homework

On an English project, and doing math  
problems  
Figured out an answer together

Event/Task

On the yearbook, cheerleading, and a bake  
sale  
Fixing my friend's motorcycle, and basketball

Table 8. Self-reported circumstances engendering adolescent helping, sharing, and cooperative behavior.

Helping

Need/Trouble

When they need help  
 When they've needed help and support to do it  
 When they have problems or are in trouble  
 With problems or trouble in real life  
 With something important or desperate that happens

Situational/Emotional

When there is money involved  
 In classroom situation or with homework  
 When someone has to get something done  
 When they're mad, and can't deal with it  
 When they're overmatched and want to cry

Trait/Personal

When I feel good, or I feel pressured  
 Out of kindness, like when I want to be nice  
 With decent people who have the same concern  
 When I have faced a similar problem

Sharing

Need/Supply

If I had too much and he had none  
 When it benefits everyone  
 If they need something, and I got it

Situational/Relational

When they ask or we're talking about something  
 When I have something I want them to know  
 When I know how they feel and I feel for them  
 When I feel like sharing would be best for us

Cooperation

Conditional

If they wanted to work together, then I would  
 If we can get the work done faster, I do it  
 If I had to, then I would  
 If we're in the same boat, then I would  
 If they have ideas I like, then I will

Situational/Personal

To get an "A", or sometimes to be nice  
 Depends on how well I know them, or mostly friends  
 When I feel good, or to be nice and polite  
 In an assignment or project

behaviors. These are displayed in Table 4. In considering the reasons for self and peer prosociality, seven categories were defined for describing responses to self motives (Table 5), and eight for responses to peer motives (Table 6). The final two research questions, addressing examples of adolescent prosocial behaviors (Table 7) and the circumstances engendering such (Table 8), were analyzed according to the type of prosocial act (i.e., helping, sharing, comforting, cooperating) mentioned in the research questions. This resulted in a number of varying categories for each mode of responding. Unfortunately, while responses were tallied and counted, frequency calculations were not always completely methodical and systematic in securing exact percentage data. Still, all clusters are reported or listed in their estimated order of frequency, that is from the most used response themes to the least. In considering Table 3, for example, more answers referred to social/friend themes than to the others, with moral/value themes representing the fewest number of responses.

#### Summary of Themes and Clusters

In considering adolescent explanations of prosocial behavior, most remarks revolved around friends, social talent, and activities or involvement. A good number of responses described prosocial behavior in terms of helping others, caring and listening, and being kind and generous.

Some defined prosocial behavior as socially desirable or achievement oriented behavior. The least represented category of responses were those referring to abstract, value-oriented definitions. Moreover, while age comparisons were not formally addressed, moral and value oriented descriptors were found almost entirely in the older adolescent responses.

Adolescent reported positive behaviors were easily grouped into academic, social, trait, and activity categories. Further, the response frequency pattern was obvious, with positive school or homework behaviors most common and references to specific activities least notable. A similar trend was found in the types of adolescent helping behaviors reported. Most examples referred to helping another with homework or school events. Some described caring or supportive acts such as helping another with a problem, while others referred to specific helping behaviors or activities. Similarly, reported acts of cooperation most often referred to class projects or homework, though some referred to particular tasks or events such as working on the yearbook or playing basketball. All of the reported sharing behaviors involved loaning or giving away possessions, and disclosing information or feelings.

Noted comforting behaviors mostly addressed relationship concerns, especially dating relationships.

Interestingly, however, such dating concerns were more frequently noted among female respondents. In fact, the most commonly reported comforting theme among females involved situations pertaining to boyfriends. A number of responses noted comforting another in emotionally stressful or tragic situations, for example, when their friend was pregnant or in the case of someone's death. Finally, some responses addressed general situational or personal concerns such as comforting another when they were feeling down or when someone was worried about something.

The most reported reasons for helping another were when the person really needed it or they were in trouble. A number of responses noted situational or emotional reasons, for example, in a homework assignment or when someone was down or angry about something. Other noted reasons for helping involved various trait or personal issues, for instance, when the benefactor reported feeling good or experiencing a similar situation. Reasons for sharing were similar, in that most referred to the other's need and/or their own supply, though some noted situational, personal, or relational concerns. Situational and personal factors were also evident in reported reasons for cooperating. However, the majority of the reported reasons for cooperating involved "if/then" or conditional situations. That is, for example, if the other person was nice to them,

or if there was a reward in it, or if the work could get done faster, then they would cooperate.

In order to consider the overall circumstances engendering helping, sharing, and cooperative behavior among adolescents, all descriptors in every theme category were listed and noted for frequency (See Table 8). In all, there were nine different cluster terms. These were: Situational, Need, Personal, Trouble, Trait, Supply, Emotional, Relational, and Conditional. Three of the seven derived clusters noted situational themes. Need and personal themes were noted in two categories, and the remaining descriptors were only noted once. Thus, responses representing situational, need, and personal characteristics were common considerations across various modes of prosocial behavior.

All but several of the respondents described themselves as being a kind, caring, and helpful person. In considering their reasons why, most respondents referred to their view of themselves (e.g., I'm just that way) or to self-esteem concerns (e.g., It makes me feel good about myself). Many of the responses also noted socialization factors (e.g., That's how I was raised) and reciprocity concerns (e.g., So others will be kind to me). Some of the respondents stated that they were kind, caring, and helpful to others because they understood how the other person felt, that they felt

sorry for someone, or that they had been in a similar situation. Other, though less frequent, responses addressed issues of gratitude, reward, or negative consequences. A few respondents reported that they were kind, caring and helpful to others in order to make that person feel good.

Similarly, most of the respondents felt that their classmates were kind, caring, and helpful. In considering why they thought their peers were, participant remarks addressed all of the same themes present in reasoning about one's own prosociality. However, the response frequency pattern for peers resulted in a somewhat different cluster arrangement. Also, an additional category of responses emerged, that is, responses addressing the individual's perception or characterization of their classmates. The resultant category pattern for responses to why one's self and one's peers behave prosocially are as follows:

<u>Self</u>	<u>Peer</u>
Self-View/Self-Esteem	Other's Self-View/Self-Esteem
Socialization/Values	Reciprocity/Relational
Reciprocity/Relational	Socialization/Values
Experience/Empathy	Betterment of Another
Gratitude/ Reward	Perceived Characteristics
Avoidance of Neg. Consequence	Avoidance of Neg. Consequence
Betterment of Another	Gratitude/Reward
	Experience/Empathy

These cluster patterns, while rudimentary, suggest that adolescents view the impetus for their own prosocial

behavior, and that of their peers, somewhat differently. Many of the responses regarding both self and peer motives noted esteem, socialization, and reciprocity concerns. However, for example, respondents reported empathy concerns much more frequently when considering their own behavior than in explaining peer behavior. Moreover, benefitting others was frequently reported as a reason for another's prosocial behavior, but was rarely reported as a reason for one's own prosocialness. Responses referring to rewards and the negative consequences of not being prosocially oriented were similarly noted as reasons for both one's own and one's classmates' prosocial behavior.

In order to discern common prosocially related themes or trends among adolescents, all the research category descriptors were subjected to the same analytic procedures used in processing item responses. That is, the cluster descriptors noted in Tables 3 through 8 were listed, tallied for repetition, and grouped into like categories. For instance, the noted theme descriptors for Table 8 included: Need, Trouble, Supply, Situational, Emotional, Personal, Conditional, Relational, and Trait. In this case, repeated references to need, situational, and relational concerns were noted with a frequency tally. Theme descriptors for each research question were similarly recorded, and collectively categorized. The resultant overall clusters,

including their respective descriptors, and the frequency percentage of each are presented in Table 14.

There were 76 descriptors noted in the eight Tables, though 32 of these were identically matched with others. Thus, in all, there were 44 different theme descriptors. Of these, the most commonly noted concerns pertained to situational factors. For example, prosocial explanations, decisions, or reasons most often referred to a given activity, task, troubling situation, or another's existing need and one's own emotional state or supply. The second most common definitive terms referred to affective traits, or responses addressing, among others, empathy, morals, positive attitudes, and values. A slightly smaller percentage of survey responses addressed personal or individual traits. Consequential, relationship, academic, and social issues, among others, were also evident in student responses.

Table 9. Overall cluster themes regarding self-reported adolescent responses to prosocial survey.

<u>Situational Factors</u> (21)	<u>Affective Traits</u> (17)*
Behavior	Affective
Activity	Kind
Tragedy	Positive
Situational	Value
Event	Moral
Task	Caring
Need	Empathy
Trouble	Emotions
Emotional	
Supply	
<u>Personal Traits</u> (15)	<u>Consequences</u> (12)
Trait	Reciprocity
Characteristic	Gratitude
Self-View	Reward
Self-Esteem	Avoid. of Neg.
Perceived View of Other	Consequence
Personal	Conditional
<u>Relational Issues</u> (12)	<u>Academic Issues</u> (8)
Friend	Academic
Relational	School
Betterment of Another	Homework
Dating	
<u>Socially Involved</u> (5)	<u>Socialization</u> (5)
Social	Socialization
Involved	Experience
Active	
<u>Information or Belongings</u> (4)	
Personal Belongings	
Materials	
Information	

---

\* Percentages reported in parentheses.

### Validity and Bias

Miles and Huberman (1984) suggest various approaches for organizing and interpreting qualitative data sets. Some (i.e., seeing plausibility, counting, noting patterns and themes, clustering) were used in the present analysis. Primarily, "seeing plausibility" strategies were used in organizing and "making sense" of the open-ended data. Responses were grouped and clustered according to "logical" or "plausible" common, recurring patterns or themes. In considering reported positive behaviors, for example, it seemed logical to conclude that statements such as "cheering people up", and "taking time to listen" refer to general caring behaviors, or comprise such a theme. Similarly, "being friend-like", and "saying hello to everyone" represent general positive social behavior. Caring for others and responding to them in a pleasant social manner are closely related, thus, it "makes good sense" to collapse them. In this case, responses implying social and caring themes were reported as "Social/Caring Related" positive behaviors.

Various concerns or risks are inherent in such approaches to reducing, organizing, and interpreting data (Nisbett & Ross, 1980). Thus, an important concern is whether the meanings derived from such analyses are valid. Various approaches or tactics for avoiding bias and assuring

the quality of data conclusions have been suggested (Miles & Huberman, 1984). These include, for example, checking for representativeness and researcher effects; replicating a finding; and getting feedback from informants.

In general, the present analysis appears to have sufficient validity. The nature of sample selection, and the minimal role of the investigator in data collection, limited threats of sample bias and researcher effects. Further, there is some degree of replicability. Barnett, Thompson, and Schroff (1986), using a self-report, unstructured interview, assessed early adolescents' and college students' reasons for not helping. The reported response categories coincided, in part, with themes emerging from the reasons for helping found in this study. For instance, noted themes engendering a helping response included, among others, if help was needed, if the benefactor felt like being kind or was in a good mood, or if the needy other had shown similar concern. In considering reasons for not helping, Barnett and his colleagues reported themes such as when help was not needed, when the potential benefactor didn't want to or was in a bad mood, or when the potential recipient had been mean or unfair. Also, reasons for responding prosocially reported here are similar to the types of prosocial moral reasoning present in Eisenberg's (1977, 1979) work.

The most probable threat to the validity of these findings rest in interpreting events or responses as being more patterned and congruent than they are (Miles & Huberman, 1984). In the present analysis, however, the extent of such effects are assumed limited. This is due primarily to the nature of the responses, that is, they were typically brief, "cut and dry" statements referring to specific issues. There is, for instance, little debate in interpreting responses such as "going to class", "helping them with algebra", or "doing a class project together". Moreover, it is quite obvious that such remarks represent academic issues.

There were also, however, some instances where response themes were not as obvious. For example, out of context or depending upon one's frame of reference, the remark "doing good in school" could mean one of several things. It could mean doing well academically, excelling in sports, being a successful socializer, or staying out of trouble. Obviously, misinterpreting the intended meaning of, and subsequently misclassifying, such responses can threaten the validity of resultant themes and frequencies. In the present analysis, ambiguous responses were interpreted in their most "stereotypic" meaning. For instance, the saying "doing good in school" is generally recognized, among students, as "getting good grades" or succeeding academically. The

outcome or results of this categorization tactic would be more sound if reliability strategies, such as having another individual sort responses or recoding the data at another time, were undertaken. However, the tactics and procedures employed in analyzing responses suggest an adequate degree of validity.

### Quantitative Data Results

#### Reliabilities

Internal consistency reliabilities were computed for each of the variable scales (See Table 10). Results showed Cronbach's alpha of .79, .80, .75, and .85 for the empathy (CA-ES), self-esteem (R-SEI), identity (A-IS), and prosocial response (PRS-R) scales, respectively. Reliabilities were also computed for both the affective and cognitive components of the CA-ES. Results showed Cronbach's alpha of .70 and .76, respectively. In short, all the research measures demonstrated adequate reliabilities.

#### Means and Standard Deviations

Based on a five-to-one item response category range where a score of five indicated the item was "very true" for the respondent, total score ranges for each scale were determined. Total score ranges were 32 to 160 for empathy (14 to 70 for the cognitive subscale, 18 to 90 for the affective), 10 to 50 for self-esteem, and 12 to 60 for both identity and prosocial response. Adjusting for negatively

Table 10. Internal consistency reliabilities

Measure	Number of items	Reliability
Empathy (CA-ES)	32	.7870
Affective	18	.6966
Cognitive	14	.7593
Self-Esteem (R-SEI)	10	.7970
Identity (A-IS)	12	.7501
Prosocial (PRS-R)	12	.8533

worded items, total scores for each measure were derived by summing individual item scores.

Table 11 presents the total score means and standard deviations for each of the research variables by sample ( $n=326$ ), gender (females=178, males=146), ethnicity, and age. In order to better detect possible ethnic or age differences, while also maintaining sufficient group sizes, particular groups were combined. That is, ethnic categories were collapsed into minority (e.g., American Indian, Black, Hispanic) and nonminority groups with  $n$ 's of 142 and 178, respectively. Similarly, age groups were combined to form two groups representing younger and older adolescents. Scores from 14- and 15-year-old respondents were collapsed

to form the younger age group (n=134), whereas 17- and 18-year-old scores comprised the older age group (n=122).

Analysis of Mean Differences in Empathy, Self-Esteem, Identity, and Prosocial Response

Analysis of Variance was computed for each mean difference reported in Table 11. There were three significant group effects. One was for gender on the

Table 11. Total empathy, identity, self-esteem, and prosocial response scores by gender, age, and ethnicity.

	CA-ES		A-IS		R-SI		PRS-R	
	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD
<u>N</u>	80.78	13.03	31.39	7.51	25.53	7.22	25.33	8.25
<u>Gender</u>								
F	84.57*	12.70	28.83	7.61	24.78	7.32	37.41*	7.26
M	72.81	10.12	28.44	7.34	24.18	7.05	31.41	8.15
<u>Ethnicity</u>								
M	77.40	12.73	28.49	7.54	23.87	6.95	34.84	8.02
NM	80.76*	13.18	28.75	7.57	25.03	7.42	34.62	8.32
<u>Age</u>								
Y	79.95	12.59	28.50	6.98	24.17	7.29	34.95	8.33
O	78.03	13.06	28.77	8.14	24.33	7.61	34.14	7.57

\*  $p < .05$

empathy scale ( $F = 42.91$ ,  $df = 2/323$ ,  $p < .05$ ), indicating that female respondents scored significantly higher in empathy than male respondents. There was also a significant group effect for gender in prosocial responding ( $F = 26.13$ ,  $df = 2/323$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Again, female respondents demonstrated significantly higher scores than did male respondents. Finally, nonminority respondents scored significantly higher in empathy than the minority respondents did ( $F = 5.32$ ,  $df = 1/320$ ,  $p < .05$ ). All remaining mean comparisons were nonsignificant.

In light of the significant gender effect for empathy, further analyses were computed to examine gender in relation to the cognitive and affective components of the CA-ES. Analysis revealed a gender difference on both subscales. That is, female respondents scored significantly higher than did males on both the cognitive ( $F = 33.46$ ,  $df = 2/323$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and the affective subscale ( $F = 15.65$ ,  $df = 2/323$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

#### **Multiple Regression Analysis**

Intercorrelations were computed to examine the interrelatedness of the research variables. These findings are presented in Table 12. Results show that empathy and prosocial response are moderately related with a correlation of .615. Also, identity and self-esteem are related with a

Table 12. Correlation matrix for empathy, identity, self-esteem, and prosocial response.

	CA-ES	A-IS	R-SE	PRS-R
CA-ES	1.000			
A-IS	.264	1.000		
R-SE	.288	.696	1.000	
PRS-R	.615	.271	.288	1.000

correlation coefficient of .696. All other intercorrelations were low.

In order to examine the separate or combined effects of empathy, identity, and self-esteem on prosocial responding, the four variables were entered into a stepwise multiple regression. These results are presented in Table 13.

Table 13. Multiple regression results using empathy, identity, and self-esteem as predictors of prosocial response.

Predictor Variable	r	r squared
CA-ES	.614	.378
R-SI	.625	.391
A-IS	.627	.394

In all, the predictor variables accounted for 39.4 percent of the variance in prosocial responding. Empathy was the first variable entered into the equation indicating that it was the best single predictor of prosocial response. Empathy accounted for 37.8 percent of the variability in prosocial response. The next variable entered was self-esteem which accounted for an additional 1.3 percent of the variance. The final variable entered was identity which only accounted for an additional 0.3 percent of the variability in prosocial response. Given the noted relationship between identity and self-esteem ( $r = .696$ ), and consequent shared variance (48.4%), this is not surprising.

#### Factor Loadings for Prosocial Response Scale

A factor analysis of the prosocial response measure (PRS-R) was conducted in order to determine if the theoretically defined modes of prosocial behavior (helping, sharing, caring, and cooperating) would be empirically supported. Principle components factor analysis with varimax orthogonal rotation yielded a two factor solution (See Table 14).

On the first factor, all three of those items representing caring acts loaded moderate to high. That is, .63 (spending time with a lonely classmate), .74 (cheering up a hurt classmate), and .76 (listening to a classmate's

Table 14. Factor loadings for prosocial response scale.

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>
1	.606	.259
2	.661	.247
3	.580	.279
4	.157	.645
5	.646	.276
6	.763	.085
7	.740	.091
8	.455	.511
9	.222	.729
10	.363	.467
11	.092	.711
12	.628	.237

problems). Two of the three cooperative behaviors had moderate to relatively high factor one loadings. These were cooperating in a group project (.58) and working together as a team in a sporting activity (.65). The third cooperative and .36 for factor 1 and .51 and .36 for factor 2, respectively).

In considering the content of the items loading with one factor or the other, the results did not support the assumed distinction between the four modes of prosocial behavior. Rather, the findings suggests that prosocial responses are distinguished in terms of the type of behavior or the behavioral circumstance, and not by the mode or type of response. In particular, the prosocial responses grouped according to the personal cost of responding, the potential

benefits of responding, and the degree of personal distance (e.g., proximity, affiliation, identification, recognition) in the circumstance evoking a response. These distinguishing dimensions are evident in that those items loading with factor one all represent situations with little costs (e.g., sharing school supplies), potential benefits (e.g., receiving help on an assignment in return), and greater personal proximity (e.g., an identified group member where contributions will be personally recognized). Further, all three of the caring behaviors loaded on factor one. This is noteworthy in that each reflect, in part, little personal cost (e.g., kind words or an understanding ear), potential benefits (e.g., emotional reciprocity or heightened intimacy), and personal proximity (e.g., close affiliation). Conversely, factor two loadings consisted of sharing, helping, and cooperating behaviors where personal cost was high (e.g., loaning out cassette tapes), and personal proximity was low (e.g., event recognition rather than individual).

In sum, factor analysis of the prosocial response scale resulted in two factors. Factor one groups those behaviors with little cost, potential benefits, and greater personal proximity. Factor two behaviors reflect greater cost, fewer benefits, and greater personal distance. The only two behavioral responses which split factor loadings, giving a

classmate a ride and sharing lunch with a classmate who forgot theirs, were incapable of being evaluated along these dimensions because of the nature of their request. Their occurrence is, instead, a function of ability, that is constrained by access to an automobile and physical nutrition needs. As such, they appear to represent a different dimension of prosocial responding, for example, behavioral opportunity or resource. These results are summarized in Table 15.

Table 15. Prosocial item loadings according to perceived cost, potential benefits, and personal distance.

Factor 1	Factor 2
Low Personal Cost/Loss	Greater Personal Cost/Loss
Greater Potential Benefit	Fewer Potential Benefits
Greater Personal Proximity	Greater Personal Distance

PRS-R Items

When a classmate runs out of school supplies, I offer to share some of mine. (1)\*

When I see a classmate having difficulty with an assignment that I know how to solve, I offer to help. (2)

When I am working on a group project, I try to cooperate with everyone. (3)

When I participate in a sport activity, I work together as a team rather than "play for myself". (5)

When a classmate needs to talk about their problems, I try to listen. (6)

When I see a classmate's feelings get hurt by their parents, I try and cheer them up. (7)

When a classmate tells me they're feeling lonely, I try to spend some time with them. (12)

When a classmate needs to borrow cassette tapes for a party, and I have some, I offer to loan them. (4)

When my classmates are trying to organize a party, I volunteer to help. (9)

When my class or school is putting together some event, I work with the others to make it a success. (11)

\* PRS-R item number in parentheses. Items (8) and (10) split factor loadings.

## CHAPTER 5

## DISCUSSION

This chapter has three major sections. First, both the qualitative and quantitative research findings are summarized and discussed. The second section addresses the results in terms of their implications for research, theory, and practice. Finally, research conclusions and related issues are discussed.

## Summary and Interpretation of Results

Qualitative Data

A number of trends or issues are apparant in the item responses. One observation worth noting is that the open-ended survey items for each of the qualitative research questions yielded a number of varied, yet classifiable responses. Regarding adolescent conceptions of prosocial behavior, for example, many respondents used the terms "outgoing, friendly, well-known, happy, or popular". All of which reflect some aspect of friendship and/or social involvement. Similar findings were noted throughout the survey responses and subsequent analysis. While different words, examples, or comments were often written, there were few "middle-of-the-road" answers when it came to categorizing responses. It is possible that this could

merely have emerged from analytic bias, for example, the holistic fallacy (Miles & Huberman, 1984). More likely, this trend suggests that though individual adolescents reported varied prosocial definitions, reasons, and behavioral examples, they shared common underlying views about the noted concerns. In fact, the similarity in many of the participants' written responses tease one into believing the same handful of individuals responded to all of the surveys. This is obviously not the case. Rather, this developmental stage, and consequent shared life climate, engenders similar explanations, perceptions, and views. In this study, for example, the majority of responses addressed academics, activities or behaviors, affect or emotions, relationships, personality traits, situational events, socialization experiences, and values or morals.

Moreover, there was considerable similarity, and replication, among the actual responses comprising these domains. One obvious pattern was in describing helping behaviors. As mentioned earlier, many of the reported examples involved helping another with an academic task. Interestingly, the majority of these specifically referred to helping someone in algebra, math, or chemistry. Another common response pattern of interest was that describing situations in which individuals were most likely to

cooperate. The most popular remarks noted conditional terms, such as, "If it would get things done faster, then I would" or "If they were a decent group, then I would". This suggest that, among adolescents, cooperative behaviors are guided by various condtions or terms.

Overall, these findings provide insight into adolescents' perception of prosocial concerns, and also shed light on adolescents' perceptions, interests, and development in general. Further inquiry and analysis of such open-ended responses is needed in order to more fully understand procialness, as well as related concerns and issues, among this age group.

Another finding which is of particular interest are the reported differences, as well as similarities, in one's own and their peer's prosocial motives. Considerable research has investigated variations in prosocial attributions (Eisenberg, 1986), however, most of this work has not addressed high school aged youth. Several other findings stand out as being of particular interest. One is that most respondents felt self-esteem motives were important among themselves and their peers. This further suggests the import of self-concept among adolescents. Another is that most adolescents felt peers responded prosocially in order to aid or better another. However, this was not viewed as a major reason for one's own prosocial behavior. Such

reasoning may, in part, stem from adolescent's preoccupation with themselves. Future inquiry into this is needed in order to understand the role of egocentric perceptions in adolescents' prosocial moral reasoning.

A final finding which is particular relevant to prosocial research is that respondents addressed questions related to sharing behaviors from two different perspectives. Some viewed it in terms of sharing possessions or objects. This view is consistent with the definition of sharing behavior in the literature. However, some also described sharing in terms of disclosing emotions or information. These differing definitions and understanding of the construct are noteworthy definitional and methodological considerations. In general, the reported themes highlight the need for adolescent research in the area to more closely reflect the views and behavioral patterns of this age-group.

#### Quantitative Data

The present investigation provides empirical insight into the relationships between empathy, identity, self-esteem, and prosocial responding among adolescents as well as the nature and degree of these relationships. The collected findings are noteworthy in that, for example, they add support to existing premises, challenge others, and address various issues for future research in the area.

Empathy was related to prosocial responding and demonstrated some predictive value. This finding is consistent with the prosocial findings in general (Eisenberg, 1986), and provides further support for an empathy/prosocial relationship. The correlational findings did not, however, support the noted theoretical premises regarding the influences of either identity or self-esteem on prosocial response (Staub, 1986). In fact, the constructs yielded very low correlation coefficients in relation to both prosocial responding and empathy. Thus, the findings suggest that adolescents' prosocial behavior is influenced, in part, by their level of empathic responding, but not their level of self-esteem or sense of identity. Similarly, results suggests that adolescents' empathic response level is not influenced by their self-esteem or sense of identity. There was, however, a positive association between adolescents' reported self-esteem and sense of identity.

In considering the overall reported levels of empathy, identity, self-esteem, and prosocial responding among adolescents, there were considerable similarities among the groups. Indeed, with several exceptions, reported levels of empathy, identity, self-esteem and prosocial responding across gender, ethnicity, and age groups were nearly identical. One noted difference was found in reported

levels of empathy among male and female respondents. Specifically, females reported significantly higher levels of empathy. This finding replicates those of numerous other studies in which females have been found to be more empathic than males when self-report measures are used (Bryant, 1982; Eisenberg-Berg & Mussen, 1978; Estrada, 1986). However, the present results extend previous research regarding these differences. That is, findings further showed that females scored significantly higher in both affective and cognitive dimensions of empathy. Similarly, results suggest that females demonstrate significantly more prosocial responses than males. Again, this finding is consistent with those of prosocially oriented literature in general (Eisenberg, 1986; Estrada, 1986; Radke-Yarrow, Zahn-Waxler, & Chapman, 1983).

Another significant relationship evident in this study is the difference between minority and nonminority empathy scores. That is, nonminority adolescents scored significantly higher in empathy than did minority respondents, though a prosocial response difference among ethnic groups was not found. This finding raises some question regarding the consistency of empathy's role in prosocial responding. Moreover, some literature (Kagan & Knight, 1984) has reported Mexican-American youngsters as responding more empathically as well as prosocially than

nonminority groups. Further research is necessary in order to better discern these contradictory results.

The present investigation also provides insight regarding the distinction among various modes of prosocial responding. Results suggest that prosocial behaviors are viewed according to the perceived cost and potential benefits of responding. Also, one's degree of personal proximity to the situation or intended recipient appears to be an important factor in distinguishing among types of prosocial responses. This data tends to support theories of prosocial behavior which emphasize cost/benefit decision making (Bar-Tal, 1976). Continued research into these dimensions is necessary both in terms of better understanding the nature of prosocial responding, as well as developing approaches for the study of such behavior.

#### Implications

##### Research

The present findings have a number of important, and varied, research implications. For example, one obvious contribution of the present study is the noted gender differences in empathy and prosocial responding. This finding adds to the body of literature reporting higher levels of empathy (Adams, 1983; Bryant, 1982; Eisenberg-Berg & Mussen, 1978), and prosocial responding (Estrada, 1986) among females. These are noteworthy findings, especially

given the limited empirical work addressing the constructs among adolescents. Moreover, the finding that females reported both greater levels of affective and cognitive oriented empathy is of particular interest. This finding is especially noteworthy given the current arguments regarding the separate and combined roles of affect and cognition in the development and maintenance of prosocial behaviors (Eisenberg, 1986), and the continued debate regarding the impetus for reported gender differences.

Another major implication of the present study is that it provided an initial approach toward discerning the premise that self-esteem and identity are related to prosociality. Though the findings did not lend evidence to this theorizing, they did provide insights into the constructs' interrelatedness. Thus, the findings have value in considering future research endeavors in the area.

#### Theory

A major implication of this research is that it provides considerable insight into several existing theoretical frameworks. For example, that no relationship was found between one's sense of self or self-esteem and their level of prosocial or empathic responding challenges the proposed hypotheses regarding the interrelatedness among these constructs. It may be that such relationships do not exist, though this is unlikely. Rather, the lack of a

relationship finding indicates that current conceptualizations and/or approaches for integrating these variables be refined or reevaluated. Also, available measures used in investigating the proposed associations may be faulty measures of the constructs, and thus, they should be further examined.

### Practice

Direct practical or programmatic implications stemming from this research are limited, however, the potential use of this line of inquiry within adolescent groups is high. It is generally recognized that high-school aged individuals are developing new, and often lasting perceptions of themselves and their worth. They are also developing new patterns of relating with others. These experiences often give rise to enduring personal characteristics, and serve as the foundation for internalized values. Research concerned with the development of positive behavior and potential influences of self-worth, and identity can add much to the facilitation of individual positive development.

### Conclusions

The findings suggests that identity and self-esteem are not related to prosocial responding among adolescents, though they are related to one another. Nor are self-esteem and identity related to empathy. However, there is a positive relationship among adolescents' reported levels of

empathy and prosocial responding. The present research findings also add support to the current findings regarding the antecedant or predictive value of empathy in prosocial responding among adolescents. Results further indicate, and support, greater capacity for empathy and prosocial responding among females. The noteworthiness of these findings rest in the fact that, to date, few empirical studies have examined these variables and their relationship among high-school populations. As such, the present study provides another stepping stone in prosocially oriented research among adolescent populations. It also encourages continued research in adolescent prosocial responding as well as related issues.

APPENDIX A  
QUALITATIVE, QUANTATIVE, AND DESCRIPTIVE  
MEASURES USED IN EXAMINING CORRELATES  
OF ADOLESCENT PROSOCIALITY

## THE COMPLETE ADOLESCENT-EMPATHY SCALE (CA-ES)

Instructions: For each statement, circle the response which best describes how true that statement is for you. The response choices are as follows:

Very True For Me (VT)	Somewhat true For Me (ST)	Neither True Untrue For Me (NT-UT)	True	Somewhat Untrue For Me (SUT)	Very Untrue For Me (VUT)
-----------------------------	---------------------------------	---	------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------

For example:

For the most part, I find school enjoyable. VT ST NT-UT SUT VUT

If you think this statement is somewhat true for you, you would circle ST.

- |    |   |    |    |       |     |     |
|----|---|----|----|-------|-----|-----|
| 1. | For the most part, I am good at understanding how other people see things.                  | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 2. | I often have trouble understanding how other people feel.                                   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 3. | I usually know exactly what other people are trying to tell me.                             | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 4. | I can usually figure out other people's point of view.                                      | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 5. | I can usually figure out what other people are feeling.                                     | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 6. | My attitudes toward other people sometimes make it hard for me to understand them.          | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 7. | Sometimes because I feel a certain way, I think <u>other</u> people feel the same way I do. | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |

8. I can tell what other people mean even when they have difficulty saying it. VT ST NT-UT SUT VUT
9. I am good at understanding almost everything about a person, not just some things. VT ST NT-UT SUT VUT
10. I usually recognize how other people feel. VT ST NT-UT SUT VUT
11. In general, I can figure out why other people feel the way they do. VT ST NT-UT SUT VUT
12. When I talk to someone I know, I often can't understand how they feel. VT ST NT-UT SUT VUT
13. I understand people. VT ST NT-UT SUT VUT
14. When other people are upset, I can understand their feelings. VT ST NT-UT SUT VUT
15. It makes me sad to see a lonely stranger in a group. VT ST NT-UT SUT VUT
16. People make too much of the feelings and sensitivity of their friends. VT ST NT-UT SUT VUT
17. I am annoyed by people who are feeling unhappy. VT ST NT-UT SUT VUT
18. I tend to get emotionally involved with a friend's problems. VT ST NT-UT SUT VUT
19. I tend to lose control when I am bringing bad news to a friend. VT ST NT-UT SUT VUT

- |     |   |    |    |       |     |     |
|-----|---|----|----|-------|-----|-----|
| 20. | The people around me<br>have a great deal of<br>influence on my moods.  | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 21. | I like to watch friends<br>open presents.   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 22. | I get very angry when I<br>see someone I know being<br>mistreated.  | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 23. | I am able to remain calm<br>even when those around<br>me worry.   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 24. | When a friend starts to<br>talk about her/his pro-<br>blems, I try to steer<br>the conversation to some-<br>thing else. | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 25. | Another's laughter is<br>not catching for me.   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 26. | I am able to make<br>decisions without<br>being influenced<br>by people's feelings.                                     | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 27. | It is hard for me to<br>see how some things<br>upset people so much.  | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 28. | I am very upset when I<br>see a person in pain.   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 29. | It upsets me to see<br>helpless old people.   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 30. | I become more irritated<br>than sympathetic when I<br>see a classmate's tears.  | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 31. | I become very involved<br>when a friend tells me<br>her/his problems.   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |

32. I often find that I can remain cool in spite of the excitement around me.

## THE ADOLESCENT IDENTITY SCALE (A-IS)

Instructions: For each statement, circle the response which best describes how true that statement is for you. The response choices are as follows:

	Very True For Me (VT)	Somewhat True For Me (ST)	Neither True nor Untrue For Me (NT-UT)	True	Somewhat Untrue For Me (SUT)	Very Untrue For Me (VUT)		
1.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
	I change my opinion of myself a lot.							
2.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
	I've got a clear idea of what I want to be.							
3.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
	I feel mixed up.							
4.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
	The important things in life are clear to me.							
5.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
	I've got it together.							
6.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
	I know what kind of person I am.							
7.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
	I can't decide what I want to do with my life.							
8.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
	I have a strong sense of what it means to be female/male.							
9.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
	I like myself and am proud of what I stand for.							
10.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
	I don't really know what I'm all about.							
11.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
	I find I have to keep up a front when I'm with people.							
12.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
	I don't' really feel involved.							

## ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM INDEX (R-SEI)

Instructions: For each statement, circle the response which best describes how true that statement is for you. The response choices are as follows:

	Very True For Me (VT)	Somewhat True For Me (ST)	Neither True nor Untrue For Me (NT-UT)	True	Somewhat Untrue For Me (SUT)	Very Untrue For Me (VUT)	
1.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT VUT
							I am able to do things as well as most other people.
2.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT VUT
							All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
3.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT VUT
							I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
4.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT VUT
							I feel that I am a person of worth.
5.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT VUT
							At times, I think I am no good at all.
6.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT VUT
							I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
7.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT VUT
							I take a positive attitude toward myself.
8.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT VUT
							On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
9.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT VUT
							I certainly feel useless at times.
10.				VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT VUT
							I wish I could have more respect for myself.

## PROSOCIAL RESPONSE SCALE-REVISED (PRS-R)

Instructions: For each statement, circle the response which best describes how true that statement is for you. The response choices are as follows:

	Very True For Me (VT)	Somewhat True For Me (ST)	Neither True nor Untrue For Me (NT-UT)		Somewhat Untrue For Me (SUT)	Very Untrue For Me (VUT)
1.	When a classmate runs out of school supplies, I offer to share some of mine.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
2.	When I see a classmate having difficulty with an assignment that I know how to solve, I offer to help.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
3.	When I am working on a group project, I try to cooperate with everyone.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
4.	When a classmmate needs to borrow cassette tapes for a party, and I have some, I offer to loan them.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
5.	When I participate in a sport activity, I work together as a team rather than "play for myself".	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
6.	When a classmate needs to talk about their problems, I try to listen.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
7.	When I see a classmate's feelings get hurt by their parents, I try and cheer them up.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
8.	When a classmate says they need a ride and I have a car, I offer a ride.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT

- |     |  |    |    |       |     |     |
|-----|--|----|----|-------|-----|-----|
| 9.  | When my classmates are trying to organize a party, I volunteer to help.                              | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 10. | When a classmate forgets their lunch, I offer to share mine.   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 11. | When my class or school is putting together some event, I work with the others to make it a success. | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 12. | When a classmate tells me they're feeling lonely, I try to spend some time with them.                | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |

## OPEN-ENDED PROSOCIAL INVENTORY (OE-PI)

**\* Item response used in the present analysis.**

Please answer each of the following questions. There are no right or wrong answers; only what you think. Be as specific and thorough as you can.

- 1.\* Please **define** what you think antisocial (negative and/or harmful) behaviors and prosocial (positive and/or nice) behaviors involve.
  
- 2.\* Please **describe** what you think antisocial (negative and/or harmful) behaviors and prosocial (positive and/or nice) behaviors involve.
  
- 3.\* Please **explain** what you think antisocial (negative and/or harmful) behaviors and prosocial (positive and/or nice) behaviors involve.
  
4. Do you think antisocial behaviors are popular in high school?  
Yes? \_\_\_\_\_ No? \_\_\_\_\_  
  
Why or why not?

5. Give three examples of negative or harmful behavior among high school students.

6.\* Give three examples of positive or nice behavior among high school students.

7.\* Do you think of yourself as a kind individual?  
Yes?\_\_\_\_\_ No?\_\_\_\_\_

What kinds of things do you do to make yourself think so?

How come or why do you think you act this way?

8.\* Do you think of yourself as a caring individual?  
Yes?\_\_\_\_\_ No?\_\_\_\_\_

What kinds of things do you do to make yourself think so?

How come or why do you think you act this way?

9.\* Do you think of yourself as a helpful individual?  
Yes?\_\_\_\_\_ No?\_\_\_\_\_

What kinds of things do you do to make yourself think so?

How come or why do you think you act this way?

10.\* Do you think most of your classmates are kind people?  
Yes?\_\_\_\_\_ No?\_\_\_\_\_

What kinds of things do they do to make you think so?

How come or why do you think they act this way?

11.\* Do you think most of your classmates are caring people?  
Yes?\_\_\_\_\_ No?\_\_\_\_\_

What kinds of things do they do to make you think so?

How come or why do you think they act this way?

- 12.\* Do you think most of your classmates are helpful people?  
Yes?\_\_\_\_\_ No?\_\_\_\_\_

What kinds of things do they do to make you think so?

How come or why do you think they act this way?

13. Describe one thing you did to help someone this week, and tell me who it was you helped (e.g., friend, parent, brother, girlfriend, etc).

14. How much do you help others?  
A lot \_\_\_\_\_ Sometimes \_\_\_\_\_ Hardly ever \_\_\_\_\_

Why do you help others or not?

Under what kind of situations are you more likely to help someone?

15. Describe something you did recently that you now think was selfish or mean.

Why do you think you did this?

16. Describe one thing you did this week which maybe hurt someone else, and tell me who it was you might have hurt (e.g., friend, parent, sister, boyfriend, etc.).
  
17. If you had to choose between satisfying your own wants (e.g., having your own way or getting something new), and helping someone else get what they want, what would you do?

How come or why?

- 18.\* Describe one recent instance when you did something to help one of your classmates.

Why did you do this?

- 19.\* Describe one recent instance when you shared something with one of your classmates.

Why did you do this?

- 20.\* Describe one recent instance when you comforted a classmate in need.

Why did you do this?

- 21.\* Describe one instance when you worked together with a classmate to accomplish something.

Why did you do this?

22. If you do something nice for a classmate, do you expect them to "pay you back"? Yes?\_\_\_\_\_ No?\_\_\_\_\_

How come or why?

23. How do you feel when you do something that hurts a classmate?

24.\* In what situations are you most likely to help a classmate?

25.\* Under what circumstances are you most likely to share with a classmate?

26.\* What would prompt you to cooperate with a classmate?

## DESCRIPTIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer all of the following questions.

1. Female \_\_\_\_\_  
Male \_\_\_\_\_
2. American Indian \_\_\_\_\_  
Black \_\_\_\_\_  
Mexican American/Spanish \_\_\_\_\_  
White \_\_\_\_\_  
Other \_\_\_\_\_
3. Age \_\_\_\_\_
4. Grade level \_\_\_\_\_
5. Grade point average \_\_\_\_\_
6. How many brothers and/or sisters do you have?  
\_\_\_\_\_ What are their ages? \_\_\_\_\_
7. Do you live with (check one):  
Both your natural parents \_\_\_\_\_  
Natural mother only \_\_\_\_\_  
Natural father only \_\_\_\_\_  
A natural parent who has remarried \_\_\_\_\_  
Other \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX B  
ASSORTED MATERIALS ACCOMPANYING RESEARCH  
MEASURES USED IN EXAMINING CORRELATES  
OF ADOLESCENT PROSOCIALITY

## RESEARCH PARTICIPATION CONSENT FORMT

## Student and Parent/Guardian Consent Form

Title of Research Project

Adolescent Prosocial Behavior in Relation to Empathy,  
Identity, and Self-Esteem

I am/My teenager is being asked to read the following material to ensure that we are informed of the nature of this research study and of how I/my teenager will participate in it, if we consent to do so. Signing this form will indicate that we have been so informed and that we give consent. Federal regulations require written informed consent prior to participation in this research study so that we can know the nature and the risks of participation and can decide to participate or not participate in a free and informed manner.

I am/My teenager is being invited to voluntarily participate in the above-titled research project. The purpose of this project is to learn about adolescents' understanding of positive behaviors, and the types and frequency of such behavior. If consent is given to participate, you/your teenager will be asked to agree to do one of the following:

- 1) Write out answers to a number of questions about positive/negative behaviors among high school students, and give examples of such behaviors.
- 2) Read a number of statements and mark how true each statement is for yourself/your teenager.

The research task will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. Participation is voluntary and risk free. You/your teenager will not have to give your/their name. Further, there is no cost for participating. Likewise, participants are not paid.

Participating in the research survey is likely to be beneficial because it provides the individual a chance to think about the nature of their own behavior as well as their feelings about certain aspects of themselves.

Before giving consent by signing this form, the methods, inconveniences, risks, and benefits have been explained. We understand that questions may be asked at any

time during the survey and that you are free to withdraw from the task at any time without causing bad feelings. We understand that this consent form will be filed in an area designated by the Human Subjects Committee with access restricted to the principal investigator, Gayla Preisser (\_\_\_\_-\_\_\_\_), or authorized representative of the Educational Psychology Department. We understand that we do not give up any of our legal rights by signing this form.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Subject's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Parent/Legal Guardian

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

STUDENT COVER LETTER FOR QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE  
MEASURES

Dear Student,

I am trying to learn more about social behaviors in high school, and I need your help. Please note, however, that participation is voluntary. Also, note that you should not answer this survey unless you and your parent/guardian have previously agreed to the research consent form.

Please read all directions carefully, and answer all the questions in the following survey. All information will be kept anonymous and confidential. You do not need to include your name.

Remember there are no right or wrong answers; only honest ones. Please, respond according to your true feelings and behaviors.

This project is very important to me, and I am really grateful for your help. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gayla Preisser  
Doctoral Candidate  
College of Education  
University of Arizona

## TEACHER COVER LETTER FOR QUALITATIVE MEASURE

Dear Teacher,

I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Arizona, and have made arrangements to collect my dissertation data at Union High School. I am extremely grateful for this opportunity, and would appreciate it if you could aid me in the process.

I realize that classroom schedules are planned, and that it is often difficult to disrupt this routine in order to meet a given data collection time. Thus, I have decided to provide teachers some flexibility regarding the time they choose to administer the research survey.

The estimated time needed to complete the survey is 35-40 minutes, though a fair amount of variation is possible. Survey administration requires the following:

- 1) Select one of your (grade level) classes. Please be certain that the class is a designated "regular" class with as close to 25-30 students as possible. Also, strive to choose a class which is representative, that is, with both males and females, varied ethnicity, average performance levels, etc.
- 2) Select a day within the given time frame most convenient for you and your students for survey administration. Allow at least 35 minutes for administration.
- 3) Inform your students that you have been asked to administer an open-ended survey about social behavior in high school students. Tell them they will have approximately 35 minutes to complete the form; that their answers will be confidential and anonymous; and that they should read the cover letter, all directions, and each question carefully. Also, if they have questions about filling out the survey they can ask you. Please respond as best you can given the project information you have.
- 4) Ask the students to refrain from conversation, and to answer their questions as honestly and thorough as they can. When they have finished, have them turn their surveys face down on their desks and wait for the others.

## TEACHER QUALITATIVE COVER LETTER (CONT.)

- 5) Collect the surveys and place them back in the container provided. Also, please fill out the form attached to this letter and return it with the completed surveys to the vice-principal's office by the given deadline.

If you have questions about any aspect of this study, please contact me at \_\_\_-\_\_\_-\_\_\_ (office) or \_\_\_-\_\_\_-\_\_\_ (home). If you find you are unable to administer the surveys, please let either myself or the vice-principal know as soon as possible.

Thank you very, very much. Your help is extremely appreciated.

Sincerely,

Gayla Preisser  
Doctoral Candidate  
Division of Educational Psychology  
University of Arizona

## TEACHER RESPONSE FORM FOR QUALITATIVE MEASURE

Name (Please print full name) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Name of course \_\_\_\_\_

Date of administration \_\_\_\_\_

Class period surveys were given \_\_\_\_\_

Number of students enrolled in class \_\_\_\_\_

Number of students absent the day of survey administration  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Reason for selecting this class and/or time for  
 administering the surveys

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe any class, student, and/or situation  
 characteristics which you think might affect the survey  
 outcome (e.g. mostly gifted; responded seriously or  
 nonchalantly; were rushed or interrupted; etc.) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Would you like a brief synopsis of the survey results? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Would you like for me to briefly visit this class and go  
 over the survey outcome? If so, I will contact you to make  
 arrangements.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you greatly for your cooperation.

## TEACHER COVER LETTER FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASURE

Dear Teacher,

I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Arizona, and have arranged to collect my dissertation data at Union High School. I am extremely grateful for this opportunity, and would appreciate it if you could aid me in the process.

I realize that classroom schedules are planned, and that it is often difficult to disrupt this routine in order to meet a given data collection time. Thus, I have decided to provide teachers some flexibility regarding the time they choose to administer the research survey.

The estimated time needed to complete the survey is 30-35 minutes, though a fair amount of variation is possible. Survey administration requires the following:

- 1) Select a day within the given time frame most convenient for you and your students for survey administration. Allow at least 35 minutes for administration. Please do not administer the survey to those classes designated "remedial or resource".
- 2) Inform your students that you have been asked to administer a survey about their social behavior as a high school student. Please go over the directions for responding and filling in the answer sheet. Remind students that numbered questions on the answer sheet run across the page, not up and down! Also, remind them that besides blackening the response letter for a question, they should not bend, staple, or write on any part of the answer sheet. Tell them they will have approximately 30 minutes to complete the form; that their answers will be confidential and anonymous; and that they should read the cover letter, all directions, and each question carefully. Also, if they have questions about answering a survey item or filling out the answer sheet they can ask you. Please respond as best you can given the project information you have.
- 3) Ask the students to refrain from conversation, and to answer their questions as honestly as they can. When they have finished, have them turn their surveys and answer sheets face down on their desks and wait for the others.

## TEACHER QUANTITATIVE COVER LETTER (CONT.)

- 4) Collect the surveys and the answer sheets, and place them back in the container provided. All surveys and answer sheets should be returned to the vice-principal's office by the given deadline.

If you have questions about any aspect of this study, please contact me at \_\_\_-\_\_\_-\_\_\_ (office) or \_\_\_-\_\_\_-\_\_\_ (home). If you find you are unable to administer the surveys, please let either myself or the vice-principal know as soon as possible.

Thank you very, very much. Your help is extremely appreciated.

Sincerely,

Gayla Preisser  
Doctoral Candidate  
Division of Educational Psychology  
University of Arizona

APPENDIX C

ACTUAL QUANTITATIVE INSTRUMENT ADMINISTERED



Instructions: For each statement, find the number of the question on the answer sheet and blacken the response which best describes how true that statement is for you. The response choices are as follows:

Very True For Me (VT)	Somewhat True For Me (ST)	Neither True nor Untrue For Me (NT-UT)	Somewhat Untrue For Me (SUT)	Very Untrue For Me (VUT)
-----------------------------	---------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------------------------

For example:

For the most part, I find school enjoyable.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
---	----	----	-------	-----	-----

If you think this statement is somewhat true for you, you would find the number of the question on the answer sheet and blacken in the letter [B].

- |     |  |    |    |       |     |     |
|-----|--|----|----|-------|-----|-----|
| 8.  | For the most part, I am good at understanding how other people see things.                         | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 9.  | I often have trouble understanding how other people feel.  | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 10. | I usually know exactly what other people are trying to tell me.                                    | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 11. | I can usually figure out other people's point of view.   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 12. | I can usually figure out what other people are feeling.  | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 13. | My attitudes toward other people sometimes make it hard for me to understand them.                 | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 14. | Sometimes because <u>I</u> feel a certain way, I think <u>other</u> people feel the same way I do. | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |

- |     |   |    |    |       |     |     |
|-----|---|----|----|-------|-----|-----|
| 15. | I can tell what other people mean even when they have difficulty saying it.               | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 16. | I am good at understanding almost <u>everything</u> about a person, not just some things. | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 17. | I usually recognize how other people feel.  | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 18. | In general, I can figure out why other people feel the way they do.                       | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 19. | When I talk to someone I know, I often can't understand how they feel.                    | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 20. | I understand people.  | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 21. | When other people are upset, I can understand their feelings.                             | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 22. | It makes me sad to see a lonely stranger in a group.                                      | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 23. | People make too much of the feelings and sensitivity of their friends.                    | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 24. | I am annoyed by people who are feeling unhappy.   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 25. | I tend to get emotionally involved with a friend's problems.                              | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 26. | I tend to lose control when I am bringing bad news to a friend.                           | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 27. | The people around me have a great deal of influence on my moods.                          | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |

- |     |   |    |    |       |     |     |
|-----|---|----|----|-------|-----|-----|
| 28. | I like to watch friends<br>open presents.   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 29. | I get very angry when I<br>see someone I know being<br>mistreated.  | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 30. | I am able to remain calm<br>even when those around<br>me worry.   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 31. | When a friend starts to<br>talk about her/his pro-<br>blems, I try to steer<br>the conversation to some-<br>thing else. | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 32. | Another's laughter is<br>not catching for me.   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 33. | I am able to make<br>decisions without being<br>influenced by people's<br>feelings.                                     | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 34. | It is hard for me to see<br>how some things upset<br>people so much.  | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 35. | I am very upset when I<br>see a person in pain.   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 36. | It upsets me to see<br>helpless old people.   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 37. | I become more irritated<br>than sympathetic when I<br>see a classmate's tears.  | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 38. | I become very involved<br>when a friend tells me<br>her/his problems.   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 39. | I often find that I can<br>remain cool in spite of<br>the excitement around<br>me.                                      | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 40. | I change my opinion<br>of myself a lot.   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |

41.	I've got a clear idea of what I want to be.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
42.	I feel mixed up.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
43.	The important things in life are clear to me.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
44.	I've got it together.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
45.	I know what kind of person I am.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
46.	I can't decide what I want to do with my life.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
47.	I have a strong sense of what it means to be female/male.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
48.	I like myself and am proud of what I stand for.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
49.	I don't really know what I'm all about.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
50.	I find I have to keep up a front when I'm with people.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
51.	I don't really feel involved.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
52.	I am able to do things as well as most other people.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
53.	All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
54.	I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
55.	I feel that I am a person of worth.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT
56.	At times, I think I am no good at all.	VT	ST	NT-UT	SUT	VUT

- |     |  |    |    |       |     |     |
|-----|--|----|----|-------|-----|-----|
| 57. | I feel that I have a number of good qualities.   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 58. | I take a positive attitude toward myself.  | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 59. | On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.  | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 60. | I certainly feel useless at times.   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 61. | I wish I could have more respect for myself.   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 62. | When a classmate runs out of school supplies, I offer to share some of mine.                           | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 63. | When I see a classmate having difficulty with an assignment that I know how to solve, I offer to help. | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 64. | When I am working on a group project, I try to cooperate with everyone.                                | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 65. | When a classmate needs to borrow cassette tapes for a party, and I have some, I offer to loan them.    | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 66. | When I participate in a sport activity, I work together as a team rather than "play for myself".       | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 67. | When a classmate needs to talk about their problems, I try to listen.                                  | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 68. | When I see a classmate's feelings get hurt by their parents, I try and cheer them up.                  | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |

- |     |  |    |    |       |     |     |
|-----|--|----|----|-------|-----|-----|
| 69. | When a classmate says they need a ride and I have a car, I offer a ride.                             | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 70. | When my classmates are trying to organize a party, I volunteer to help.                              | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 71. | When a classmate forgets their lunch, I offer to share mine.   | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 72. | When my class or school is putting together some event, I work with the others to make it a success. | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |
| 73. | When a classmate tells me they're feeling lonely, I try to spend some time with them.                | VT | ST | NT-UT | SUT | VUT |

## REFERENCES

- Adams, G. R. (1983). Social competence during adolescence: Social sensitivity, locus of control, empathy, and peer popularity. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 12, 203-211.
- Aderman, D., & Berkowitz, L. (1970). Observational set, empathy, and helping. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 14(2), 141-148.
- Aronfreed, J. (1978). Moral development from the standpoint of a general psychological theory. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behavior: Theory, research, and social issues. New York: Holt.
- Aronfreed, J. (1970). The socialization of altruistic and sympathetic behavior: Some theoretical and experimental analyses. In J. Maucauley & L. Berkowitz (Eds.), Altruism and helping behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- Aronfreed, J. (1968). Conduct and conscience: The socialization of internalized control over behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- Audrey, R. (1961). African genesis. New York: Bantam Books.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Barnett, M. A., Howard, J. A., King, L. M., & Dino, G. A. (1981). Helping behavior and the transfer of empathy. Journal of Social Psychology, 115, 125-132.
- Barnett, M. A., King, L. M., & Howard, J. A. (1979). Inducing affect about self or other: Effects on generosity in children. Developmental Psychology, 15, 164-167.
- Barnett, M. A., Howard, J. A., Melton, E. M., & Dino, G. A. (1982). Effect of inducing sadness about self or other on helping behavior in high and low empathic children. Child Development, 53, 920-923.

- Bar-Tal, D. (1976). Prosocial behavior: Theory and research. Washington, DC: Hemisphere.
- Bar-Tal, D., & Nissim, R. (1984). Helping behavior and moral judgement among adolescents. British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 2, 329-336.
- Bar-Tal, D., & Raviv, A. (1982). A cognitive-learning model of helping behavior development: Possible implications and applications. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), The development of prosocial behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- Batson, C. D., & Coke, J. S. (1981). Empathy: A source of altruistic motivation for helping. In J. P. Rushton & R.M. Sorrentino (Eds.), Altruism and helping behavior (pp. 167-187). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Beaman, A. L., Stoffer, G. R., Woods, A., & Stoffer, J. E. (1982). The importance of reinforcement schedules on the development and maintenance of altruistic behaviors. Academic Psychology Bulletin, 5, 309-317.
- Bem, D. J. (1972). Self-perception theory. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 6). New York: Academic Press.
- Berkowitz, L. (1973). Reactance and the unwillingness to help others. Psychological Bulletin, 79, 310-317.
- Berkowitz, L. (1970). Reactance and the unwillingness to help others. Psychological Bulletin, 79, 310-317.
- Bierhoff, H. W. (1984). Altruism and patterns of social interaction. In E. Staub, D. Bar-Tal, J. Karylowski, & J. Reydowski (Eds.), Development and maintenance of prosocial behavior. New York: Plenum Press.
- Blotner, R., & Bearison, D. J. (1984). Developmental consistencies in children's sociomoral knowledge: Justice reasoning and altruistic behavior. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 30, 349-367.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1983). Educational research: An introduction. New York: Longman.

- Bourne, E. (1978). The state of research on ego identity: A review and appraisal (Part I). Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 7, 223-251.
- Breger, L. (1973). From instinct to identity. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Brehm, S. S., Powell, L. K., & Coke, J. S. (1984). The affects of empathic instructions upon donating behavior: Sex differences in young children. Sex Roles, 10, 405-416.
- Burleson, B. R. (1982). The development of comforting communication skills in childhood and adolescence. Child Development, 53, 1578-1588.
- Calderwood, H. (1890). Handbook of moral philosophy. London: Macmillan and Company.
- Cialdini, R. B., Kenrick, D. T., & Baumann, D. J. (1982). Effects of mood on prosocial behavior in children and adults. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), The development of prosocial behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco:Freeman.
- Cote, J. E., & Levine, C. (1983). Marcia and Erikson: The relationships among ego identity status, neuroticism, dogmatism, and purpose in life. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 12, 43-53.
- Cowan, P. A. (1982). The relationship between emotional and cognitive development. New directions for child development, 16, 49-81.
- Cunningham, M. R. (1985/86). Levites and brother's keepers: A sociobiological perspective on prosocial behavior. Humboldt Journal of Social Relations, 13, 35-67.
- Darwin, C. (1871). The descent of man. London: Murray.
- Deutsch, F., & Madle, R. A. (1975). Empathy: Historic and current conceptualizations, measurement, and a cognitive theoretical perspective. Human Development, 18, 267-287.

- Donovan, J. M. (1975a). Identity status: Its relationship to Rorschach performance and to daily life patterns. Adolescence, 10, 29-44.
- Donovan, J. M. (1975b). Identity status and interpersonal style. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 4(1), 37-55.
- Duggan, H. (1978). A second chance. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Dusek, J. G., & Flaherty, J. F. (1981). The development of self-concept during the adolescent years of the Society for Research in Child Development, 46 (4, Serial No. 191).
- Dymond, R. F. (1949). A scale for the measurement of empathic ability. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 13, 27-33.
- Eisenberg, N. (1986). Altruistic emotion, cognition, and behavior. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eisenberg, N. (1983a). The relation between empathy and altruism: Conceptual and methodological issues. Academic Psychology Bulletin, 5, 195-208.
- Eisenberg, N. (1983b). Children's differentiations among potential recipients of aid. Child Development, 54, 594-602.
- Eisenberg, N. (1982a). Introduction. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.) The development of prosocial behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- Eisenberg, N. (1982b). The development of reasoning regarding prosocial behavior. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.) The development of prosocial behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- Eisenberg, N. (1977). The development of prosocial moral judgment and its correlates. (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 37,4753B. (University Microfilms No. 70-44, 184)

- Eisenberg, N., Cameron, E., & Tryon, K. (1984). Prosocial behavior in the preschool years: Methodological and conceptual issues. In E. Staub, D. Bar-Tal, J. Karylowski, & J. Reykowski (Eds.), Development and maintenance of prosocial behavior. New York: Plenum Press.
- Eisenberg, N. & Fabes, R. A. (in press). The development of prosocial behavior from a life-span perspective. Life-span Development Psychology
- Eisenberg, N., & Lennon, R. (1983). Sex differences in empathy and related capacities. Psychological Bulletin, 94, 100-131.
- Eisenberg, N., & Mussen, P. (1978). Empathy and moral development in adolescence. Developmental Psychology, 14, 185-186.
- Eisenberg-Berg, N. (1979a). The development of children's prosocial moral judgment. Developmental Psychology, 15, 128-137.
- Eisenberg-Berg, N. (1979b). Relationship of prosocial moral reasoning to altruism, political liberalism, and intelligence. Developmental Psychology, 15 (1), 87-89.
- Eisenberg-Berg, N., & Geisheker, E. (1979). Content of preachings and power of the model/preacher: The effect on children's generosity. Developmental Psychology, 15, 168-175.
- Eisenberg-Berg, N., & Lennon, R. (1980). Altruism and the assessment of empathy in the preschool years. Child Development, 51, 552-557.
- Eisenberg-Berg, N., & Mussen, P. (1978). Empathy and moral development in adolescence. Developmental Psychology, 14 (2), 185-186.
- Ellis, P. L. (1982). Empathy: A factor in antisocial behavior. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 10, 123-134.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). Identity: Youth and crisis. New York: Norton.

- Estrada, P. (1986). Empathy and prosocial behavior in adolescence. Unpublished Dissertation, Stanford University.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1960). The development of moral values in children: The contribution of learning theory. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 30, 11-21.
- Feshbach, N. D. (1982). Sex differences in empathy and social behavior in children. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), The development of prosocial behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- Feshbach, N. D. (1975). Empathy in children: Some theoretical and empirical considerations. Counseling Psychologist, 5, 25-30.
- Feshbach, N. D. & Roe, K. (1968). Empathy in six and seven year olds. Child Development, 39, 133-145.
- Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. Human Relations, 7, 117-140.
- Flugel, J. C. (1961). Man, morals, and society. London: Duchworth.
- Gagne, E. D., & Middlebrooks, M. S. (1977). Encouraging generosity: A perspective from social learning theory and research. Elementary School Journal, 77, 281-291.
- Goldstein, A. P., & Michaels, G. Y. (1985). Empathy: Development, training, and consequences. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gough, H. G. (1960). The Adjective Check List as a personality assessment research technique. Psychological Reports, 6, 107-122.
- Greenberger, E., & Sorensen, A. B. (1974). Toward a concept of psychosocial maturity. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 3, 329-358.
- Grotevant, H. D., & Adams, G. R. (1984). Development of an objective measure to assess ego identity in adolescence: Validation and replication. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 13, 419-438.

- Grusec, J. E., Kuczynski, L., Rushton, J. P., & Simutis, Z. M. (1978). Modeling, direct instruction, and attributions: Effects on altruism. Developmental Psychology, 14, 51-57.
- Hall, C. S. (1979). A primer of Freudian psychology. New York: New American Library, Inc.
- Hall, C. S., & Lindzey, G. (1954). Psychoanalytic theory and its application in the social sciences. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of social psychology. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hanson, R. A., & Mullis, R. L. (1985). Age and gender differences in empathy and moral reasoning among adolescents. Child Study Journal, 15, (3), 181-187.
- Hartman, D. P., Gelfand, D. M., Smith, C. L., Paul, S. C., Cromer, C. C., Page, B. C., & Lebenta, D. V. (1976). Factors affecting the acquisition and elimination of children's donating behavior. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 21, 328-338.
- Hartshorne, H., & May, M. A. (1928). Studies in the nature of character. Vol. 1: Studies in deceit. New York: Macmillan.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1984). Interaction of affect and cognition on empathy. In C. E. Izard, J. Kagan, & R. B. Zajonc (Eds.), Emotion, cognition, and behavior. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1982). Development of prosocial motivation: Empathy and guilt. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), The development of prosocial behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1976). Empathy, role-taking, guilt, and the development of altruistic motives. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behavior: Theory, research and social issues. New York: Holt.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1975). Developmental synthesis of affect and cognition and its implications for altruistic motivation. Developmental Psychology, 11, 606-622.

- Hogan, R. (1969). Development of an empathy scale. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33, 307-316.
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. American Journal of Sociology, 62, 597-606.
- Hornstein, H. A. (1976). Cruelty and kindness: A new look at aggression and altruism. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hull, D., & Reuter, J. (1977). The development of charitable behavior in elementary school children. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 131, 147-153.
- Ingersoll, G. M. (1989). Adolescents (2nd. Edition). Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Isen, A. M., Horn, N., & Rosenhan, D.L. (1973). Effects of success and failure on children's generosity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 27, 239-248.
- Jackson, D.N., & Paunonen, S.V. (1980). Personality structure and assessment. In M.R. Rosenzweig, & L. W. Porter (Eds.), Annual Review of Psychology, 31, 503-551.
- Kagan, S., & Knight, G. P. (1984). Maternal reinforcement style and cooperation-competition among Anglo-American and Mexican-American children. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 145, 37-47.
- Kaplan, P.J., & Arbuthnot, J. (1985). Affective empathy and cognitive role taking in delinquent and nondelinquent youth. Adolescence, 20, 323-333.
- Karylowski, J. (1976). Self esteem, similarity, liking and helping. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 2, 71-74.
- Kohlberg, L. (1978). Revisions in the theory and practice of moral development. In W. Damon (Ed.), New directions for child development: Moral development (Vol. 2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stage and moralization: The cognitive developmental approach. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development a behavior: Theory, research, and social issues. New York: Holt.

- Kohlberg, L., & Candee, D. (1984). The relationship of moral judgement to moral action. In W.M. Kurtines & J.L. Gewirtz (Eds.), Morality, moral behavior and moral development. New York: Wiley.
- Korte, C. (1984). The helpfulness of urban villagers. In E. Staub, D. Bar-Tal, J. Karylowski, & J. Reykowski (Eds.), Development and maintenance of prosocial behavior. New York: Plenum Press.
- Krebs, D.L. (1982). Altruism: A rational Approach. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), The development of prosocial behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- Krebs, D.L. (1975). Empathy and altruism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 1134-1146.
- LeMare, L., & Krebs, D. (1983). Perspective-taking and styles of (pro)social behavior in elementary school children. Academic Psychology Bulletin, 5, 289-298.
- Levine, L. E., & Hoffman, M. L. (1975). Empathy and cooperation in 4-year old. Developmental Psychology, 11, 533-534.
- Lichtenberg, J., Bornstein, M., & Silver, D. (Eds.), (1984). Empathy II, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lipps, T. (1926). Psychological studies. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.
- Lipscomb, T.J., Bregman, N.J., & McAllister, H.A. (1983). The effect of words and actions on American children's prosocial behavior. The Journal of Psychology, 114, 193-198.
- Lorenz, K. (1966). On aggression. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Macaulay, J., & Berkowitz, L. (Eds.), (1970). Altruism and helping behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- Mannarino, A. P. (1976). Friendship patterns and altruistic behavior in preadolescent males. Developmental Psychology, 12, 555-556.

- Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 3, 551-558.
- McNamee, S. (1978). Moral behavior, moral development and motivation. Journal of Moral Education, 7, 27-31.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). Mind, self and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mehrabian, A., & Epstein, N. (1972). A measure of emotional empathy. Journal of Personality, 40, 525-543.
- Mercer, P. (1972). Sympathy and ethics. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Midlarsky, E. (1984). Competence and helping: Notes toward a model. In E. Staub, D. Bar-Tal, J. Karylowski, & J. Reykowski (Eds.), Development and maintenance of prosocial behavior. New York: Plenum Press.
- Midlarsky, E. (1968). Competence, reticence, and helping by children and adolescents. Developmental Psychology, 21, 534-541.
- Midlarsky, E., Bryan, J.H., & Brickman, P. (1973). Aversive approval: Interactive effects of modeling and reinforcement on altruistic behavior. Child Development, 44, 229-328.
- Midlarsky, E., & Hannah, M.E. (1985). Competence, reticence, and helping by children and adolescents. Developmental Psychology, 21(3), 534-541.
- Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly: Sage Publications.
- Mischel, W., & Mischel, H.N. (1976). A cognitive social-learning approach to morality and self-regulation. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behavior: Theory, research, and social issues. New York: Holt.
- Montemayor, R., & Eisen, M. (1977). The development of self-conceptions from childhood to adolescence. Developmental Psychology, 13, 314-319.

- Murphy, G., Murphy, L.B., & Newcomb, T.M. (1937). Experimental social psychology (Revised edition). New York: Harper & Row.
- Mussen, P., & Eisenberg-Berg, N. (1977). Roots of caring, sharing, and helping: The development of prosocial behavior. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Mussen P., Rutherford, E., Harris, S., & Keasey, C.B. (1970). Honesty and altruism among preadolescents. Developmental Psychology, 3(2), 169-194.
- Nisbett, R. E., & Ross, L. (1980). Human inference: Strategies and shortcomings of social judgement. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- O'Connor, N., & Cuevas, J. (1982). The relationship of children's prosocial behavior to social responsibility, prosocial reasoning, and personality. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 140, 33-45.
- O'Connor, N., Cuevas, J., & Dollinger, S. (1981). Understanding motivation behind prosocial acts: A developmental analysis. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 139, 267-276.
- Offer, D., Ostrov, E., & Howard, K. I. (1981a). (Eds.). Patterns of adolescent self-image. New Directions in Mental Health Services, No. 22. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Offer, D., Ostrov, E., & Howard, K. I. (1981b). The adolescent: A psychological self-portrait. New York: Basic Books.
- Olden, C. (1958). Notes on the development of empathy. The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 13, 505-518.
- Orlofsky, J.L. (1977). Sex-role orientation, identity formation and self esteem in college men and women. Sex Roles, 3(6), 561-575.
- Orlofsky, J.L., Marcia, J.E., & Lesser, I.M. (1973). Ego identity status and the intimacy vs. isolation crisis of young adulthood. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 27(2), 211-219.
- Piaget, J. (1965). The moral judgement of the child. New York: Free Press. (Originally published, 1932)

- Murphy, G., Murphy, L.B., & Newcomb, T.M. (1937). Experimental social psychology (Revised edition). New York: Harper & Row.
- Mussen, P., & Eisenberg-Berg, N. (1977). Roots of caring, sharing, and helping: The development of prosocial behavior. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Mussen P., Rutherford, E., Harris, S., & Keasey, C.B. (1970). Honesty and altruism among preadolescents. Developmental Psychology, 3(2), 169-194.
- Nisbett, R. E., & Ross, L. (1980). Human inference: Strategies and shortcomings of social judgement. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- O'Connor, N., & Cuevas, J. (1982). The relationship of children's prosocial behavior to social responsibility, prosocial reasoning, and personality. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 140, 33-45.
- O'Connor, N., Cuevas, J., & Dollinger, S. (1981). Understanding motivation behind prosocial acts: A developmental analysis. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 139, 267-276.
- Offer, D., Ostrov, E., & Howard, K. I. (1981a). (Eds.). Patterns of adolescent self-image. New Directions in Mental Health Services, No. 22. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Offer, D., Ostrov, E., & Howard, K. I. (1981b). The adolescent: A psychological self-portrait. New York: Basic Books.
- Olden, C. (1958). Notes on the development of empathy. The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 13, 505-518.
- Orlofsky, J.L. (1977). Sex-role orientation, identity formation and self esteem in college men and women. Sex Roles, 3(6), 561-575.
- Orlofsky, J.L., Marcia, J.E., & Lesser, I.M. (1973). Ego identity status and the intimacy vs. isolation crisis of young adulthood. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 27(2), 211-219.
- Piaget, J. (1965). The moral judgement of the child. New York: Free Press. (Originally published, 1932)

- Podd, M.H. (1972). Ego identity status and morality: The relationship between two developmental constructs. Developmental Psychology, 6, 497-507.
- Protinsky, H. D. (1975). Erikson ego identity in adolescents. Adolescence, 10, 428-432.
- Rabkin, J. G., & Struening, E. L. (1976). Life events, stress, and illness. Science, 194, 1013-1020.
- Raskin, P.M. (1984). Procedures in research on identity status; Some notes on method. Psychological Reports, 54, 719-730.
- Raviv, A., Bar-Tal, D., & Lewis-Levin, T. (1980). Motivations for donation behavior by boys of three different ages. Child Development, 51, 610-613.
- Read, D., Adams, G.R., & Dobson, W.R. (1984). Ego-identity, personality, and social influence style. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 169-177.
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). Conceiving the self. New York: Basic Books.
- Rosenberg, M. (1975). The dissonant context and the adolescent self concept. In S. E. Dragastin & G. H. Elder (Eds.), Adolescence in the life cycle. New York: Halstead Press.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenberg, M., & Pearlin, L. I. (1978). Social class and self-esteem among children and adults. American Journal of Sociology, 84, 53-77.
- Rosenhan, D.L., Salovey, P., Karylowski, J., Hargis, K. (1981). Emotion and altruism. In J. P. Rushton & R. M. Sorrentino (Eds.), Altruism and helping behavior. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Rosenthal, D.A., Gurney, R.M., & Moore, S.M. (1981). From trust to intimacy: A new inventory for examining Erikson's stages of psychosocial development. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 10(6), 525-537.

- Roush, C.L., & Hudson, L. (1985). Quantitative versus qualitative dimensions of prosocial development: Age-related contributors to children's donating behavior. Child Study Journal, 15, 157-165.
- Rowe, I., & Marcia, J.E. (1980). Ego identity status, formal operations, and moral development. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 9(2), 87-99.
- Rushton, J.P. (1982). Social learning theory and the development of prosocial behavior. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), The development of prosocial behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- Rushton, J.P. (1980). Altruism, socialization, and society. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Rushton, J.P., & Teachman, G. (1978). The effects of positive reinforcement, attributions, and punishment on model induced altruism in children. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 4, 322-325.
- Rutherford, E., & Mussen, P. (1968). Generosity in nursery school boys. Child Development, 39, 755-765.
- Royce, J. R., & Diamond, S. R. (1980). A multifactor-system dynamics theory of emotion: Cognition-affective interaction. Motivation and Emotion, 4, 263-298.
- Schwartz, S.H., & Howard, J. A. (1984). Internalized values as motivators of altruism. In E. Staub, D. Bar-Tal, J. Karylowski, & Keykowski (Eds.), Development and maintenance of prosocial behavior. New York: Plenum Press.
- Shrauger, J.S., & Schoeneman, T.J. (1979). Symbolic interactionist view of self-concept: Through the looking glass darkly. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 549-573.
- Simmons, R. G., Brown, L., Bush, D. M., & Blyth, D. A. (1978). Self-esteem and achievement of black and white adolescents. Social Problems, 26, 86-96.
- Sims, S.A. (1978). Sharing by children: Effects of behavioral example, induction, and resources. The Journal of Psychology, 100, 57-65.

- Skinner, B.F. (1971). Beyond freedom and dignity. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Skinner, B.F. (1953). Science and human behavior. New York: Free Press.
- Slavson, S.R. (1965). Reclaiming the delinquent. New York: Free Press.
- Slugoski, B.R., Marcia, J.E., & Koopman, R.F. (1984). Cognitive and social interactional characteristics of ego identity statuses in college males. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47, 646-661.
- Spence, J. (1985). Achievement American Style: The rewards and costs of individualism. American Psychologists, 40(12), 1285-1295.
- Staub, E. (1986). A conception of the determinants and development of altruism and aggression: Motives, the self, and the environment. In C. Zahn-Waxler, E.M. Cummings, & R. Iannotti (Eds.), Altruism and aggression: Biological and social origins. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Staub, E. (1971). The learning and unlearning of aggression: The role of anxiety, empathy, efficacy and prosocial values. In J. Singer (Ed.), The control of aggression and violence: Cognitive and physiological factors. New York: Academic Press.
- Staub, E., Bar-Tal, D., Karylowski, J., & Reykowski, J. (Eds.) (1984). Development and maintenance of prosocial behavior. New York: Prenum Press.
- Strayer, F.F., & Noel, J.M. (1986). The prosocial and antisocial functions of preschool aggression: An ethological study of triadic conflict among young children. In C. Zahn-Waxler, E.M. Cummings, & R. Iannotti (Eds.), Altruism and aggression: Biological social origins. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Thorndike, E.S. (1903). Educational psychology. New York: Lemacke and Buchner.
- Toch, H. (1969). Violent men. Chicago: Aldine.

- United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Crime Statistics. (1983). Report to the nation on crime and justice. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Underwood, B., & Moore, B.S. (1982). Perspective-taking and altruism. Psychological Bulletin, 91, 143-173.
- Van Ornum, W., Foley, J.M., Burns, P.R., DeWolfe, A.S., & Kennedy, E.C. (1981). Empathy, altruism, and self-interest in college students. Adolescence, 16(64), 799-808.
- Waterman, A., & Waterman, C. (1974). Ego identity status and decision styles. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 3, 1-6.
- Weiner, B. (1980). A cognitive (attribution)- emotion-action model of motivated behavior: An analysis of judgements of help giving. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 186-200.
- Wells, L.E., & Marwell, G. (1976). Self-esteem: Its conceptualization and measurement. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Wilson, J. P., & Petruska, R. (1984). Motivation, model attributes, and prosocial behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46(2), 458-468.
- Wylie, R.C. (1974). The self-concept. (Vol. 1). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Zahn-Waxler, C., Cummings, M.E., & Iannotti, R. (Eds.). (1986). Altruism and aggression: Biological and social origins. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Zajonc, R.B. (1980). Feeling and thinking: Preferences need no inferences. American Psychologist, 35, 151-175.
- Zeldin, R.S., Savin-Williams, R.C., & Small, S.A. (1984). Dimensions of prosocial behavior in adolescent males. The Journal of Social Psychology, 123, 159-168.
- Zeldin, R.S., Small, S.A., & Savin-Williams, R.C. (1982). Prosocial interactions in two mixed-sex adolescent groups. Child Development, 53, 1492-1498.