

The Effects of Peer and Adult Influence on Adolescent Prosocial Behavior

by

Shaka A. Arnold

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Master of Education

December 2013

Goucher College

Graduate Programs in Education

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
List of Tables	ii
I. Introduction	1
Overview	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Hypothesis	2
Operational Definitions	3
II. Literature Review	4
Influences on Behavior	4
Regulatory Focus Theory	6
Prosocial Behavior	8
Summary	11
III. Methods	12
Design	12
Participants	12
Instrument	13
Procedure	13
IV. Results	14
V. Discussion	17
Comparisons to Other Studies	17
Potential Threats to Validity	18
Suggestions for Further Research	19

Conclusions	20
Reference List	21
Appendices	23
Appendix A: Revised Prosocial Tendencies Measure (PTM-R)	23
Appendix B: Event Reaction Questionnaire (ERQ)	24

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine if there would be differences in self-reported adolescent behavior in the presence of adults versus peer groups. This study was also designed to determine if those influences would cause specific types of prosocial behavior. The instrument used to assess prosocial behavior in this study was the Prosocial Tendencies Measure (PTM) and the Higgins' Event Reaction Questionnaire (ERQ). This study used a static-group comparison design with participants completing the aforementioned paper and pencil measures. There were no significant effects on behavior demonstrated by the 101 middle school aged participants. Research in this area should continue in order for educators to develop appropriate curriculum for students that teaches and encourages prosocial behavior.

List of Tables

1. Measures of Central Tendency for Each Group	15
2. Independent Samples Test	16

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Overview

This study was designed to examine the motivation of students who exhibit prosocial behavior in an independent, all male, private, nondenominational middle school. The investigator, the dean of students at that school, is an experienced observer of behavior. Sometimes decisions made by children are based on their understanding of external standards (for example, school rules); sometimes their decisions are intended to gain reward (including social rewards such as status and approval), and sometimes the child acts in certain ways because he or she wants to do what is right. Kohlberg and Hersh's (1977) research on moral development noted that as children mature into adolescents the strength and composition of social influences on behavior changes. Whereas young children understand 'right' from 'wrong' based on authority figures such as parents and teachers, as children enter adolescence, parental influence wanes and peer influence increases (Brendtro & Mitchell, 2010). Explicating the differences in the manner through which adult versus peer cues influence adolescent prosocial behavior is the primary question of the current research.

One promising theory advanced by Higgins (1997) suggests that an individual's inclination to behave prosocially may vary not only as a result of stable individual traits but also because of environmental differences, notably the presence or absence of adults. When adults are present, Higgins hypothesizes, the adolescent is more likely to be motivated by a desire for safety and security and the avoidance of punishment—what Higgins calls a “prevention” (p. 1282) focus. When adults are not present, by contrast, the person is more likely to be motivated by the desire to achieve a positive goal and to seek advancement—what he calls a “promotion”

(p. 1282) focus. This study sought to examine the connection student behavior and promotion and prevention focus.

It is relevant to explore the motivation behind student behavior not only in order to teach children the value of positive behavior, but also to be able to guide students through difficulties they encounter when attempting to make positive decisions. It is more desirable for student behavior to be motivated by and validated by intrinsic reward than by any external or extrinsic reward a student may receive.

Statement of the Problem

This study explored the motivational mechanisms through which social context (peer versus adult influence) affects prosocial behavior. Specifically, it is proposed that fundamental motivational systems—prevention focus and promotion focus—mediate the effects of peer/adult influence on a multidimensional construct of prosocial behavior. Because social behavior is a multidimensional construct, the relationships between the two regulatory focuses and prosocial behavior are multiple and distinct, and understanding those relationships requires examining prosocial behavior within a multidimensional perspective.

Hypothesis

Adolescent students in an environment that includes adults will focus more on the avoidance of negative consequences (prevention) versus the pursuit of positive consequences (promotion) when compared to adolescent students in an environment without adults. Peer pressure acts through promotion focus (motivation to achieve positive outcomes such as social recognition/esteem), while adult influence acts through prevention focus (motivation to avoiding negative outcomes such as punishment). Therefore, promotion motives are most influential with

regard to public, compliant, and emotional prosocial behavior. Prevention motives are more closely related to anonymous, altruistic, and dire prosocial behavior.

Operational Definitions

Prosocial Behavior

Prosocial behavior is behavior that is positive in nature and does not cause physical or emotional harm to others. Thus, prosocial behavior is altruistic and stems from an individual's ability to sense the emotional state and or need of another person or group of persons. As noted, prosocial behavior is multidimensional. Table 1 presents Carlo and Randall's (2002) six-dimensional model of prosocial behaviors with definitions for each of the six types.

Table 1

Six Types of Prosocial Behavior

Public	Help that is conducted in front of an audience and is motivated, at least in part, by a desire to gain the approval and respect others
Anonymous	Helping that is performed without the knowledge of whom helped
Compliant	Helping others in response to a verbal or nonverbal request
Altruism	Helping that is voluntary and motivated by concern for the needs and welfare of another; often induced by sympathy responding and internalized norms/principles consistent with helping others
Emotional	Helping others under emotionally evocative circumstances
Dire	Helping in crisis or emergency situations

(Gustavo & Randall, 2002)

Regulatory Focus Theory

According to Higgins (1997), there are two main motivation systems that drive behaviors: a prevention focus and a promotion focus. A prevention focus emphasizes safety, responsibility, and security needs. A promotion focus emphasizes hopes, accomplishments, and advancement needs.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review examines the meaning of prosocial behavior and the motivation that drives students or preadolescents to their decisions. The first section discusses adolescent compliance with adult versus peer influence. The second section defines and discusses the different motivation systems. The third section defines prosocial behavior and its dimensions.

Influences on Behavior

According to Friedman, Higgins, and Shah (1998), “There is little question that incentives motivate behavior. But the perceived value of an incentive lies in the extent to which it supports an individual’s goals, and thus the same incentive can motivate individuals differently depending on their personal goals or needs” (p. 285). The motivation for behavior can come from different sources. A child’s behavior is an important part of the school community’s and greater community’s wellbeing. As noted by Eisenberg, Cumberland, Guthrie, Murphy, and Shepard (2005), “prosocial responding, including helpful or caring behaviors and related values and cognitions, are valued in most cultures, probably because of their harmonious human relationships” (pp. 235-236). Research, however, also examines several possible reasons why children demonstrate behavior that would not be considered prosocial. These reasons may include the school environment, the home environment, and other social factors.

Recent research has found effective practices that educators may use to encourage prosocial or positive behavior in children. Hersh and Kohlberg (1977) argue, “Whether we like it or not schooling is a moral enterprise. Value issues abound in the content and process of teaching....The aim of education is growth or development, both intellectual and moral” (p. 53,

55). Battistich and Hom (1997) found that students' level of feeling community in their school was related to negative behaviors. They relate the following:

Higher levels of school sense of community were associated with significantly less student drug use and delinquent behavior. Taken with the findings from earlier studies, this finding indicates that the social context of the school is related to a wide range of student attitudes, motives, and behaviors and thus merits increased attention in future research as an important determinant of children's developmental outcomes. (p. 2000)

Their research suggests a relationship between school climate and student behavior but leaves room for additional study to be conducted.

Family life is another effect on a child's behavior at school. Lickona (1991) writes, "When families don't meet the basic physical and emotional needs of children, children are not prepared to function in school mentally or morally... Learning difficulties and behavior problems are often the result" (p. 34). Finally, it is also true that parents themselves may model behavior or teach their children in ways that are the opposite of the school's expectations. Lickona notes, "Some parents even espouse values that are the direct opposite of what the school is trying to teach..." (p. 35).

Meldrum and Hay (2012) use self-control theory and examined other factors besides parenting that influence the development of self-control in children, particularly peer influence. Although they focus on students in the seven to ten age ranges, their research found a "significant relationship between peer associations and self-control persisted" (p. 700). Furthermore, they reported

Peers should be important for self-control by influencing a child's perceptions of the consequences of such things as aggressing against others, losing one's cool, and acting without regard for costs. For children with pro-social peers, these acts may provoke peer rejection, criticism of the behavior, and isolation from play groups. (p. 700)

Brendtro and Mitchell (2010) indicated that teens usually display negative behavior when they are in groups; therefore, it is more effective to change the group dynamic. Consequently, when positive behavior is characteristic of the group, then the individuals in the group will display more positive behavior. In their article, Brendtro and Mitchell reported that effective approaches for changing teen behavior were ones that "enlist young people in peer helping" (p. 7). Also, according to Brendtro and Mitchell,

As children enter school, peer acceptance becomes increasingly important... among teens, the deep need for peer approval – coupled with immature brain pathways – makes them more likely to mimic others than responsibly manage themselves. Peer influence is not a problem in prosocial peer groups, for the brain's mirror neurons have positive models. (p. 6-7)

Regulatory Focus Theory

Regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997) was birthed out of the longstanding hedonic principle of motivation. According to Higgins (1997), the author of Regulatory Focus Theory (RFT), persons are driven in their decision making by the amount of pain or pleasure those decisions will cause them to experience; however, the sole reliance on the hedonic principle of approaching pleasure and avoiding pain is limited. The hedonic principle does not reveal exactly how persons approach pleasure or avoid pain. Higgins notes, "The theory of self-regulatory

focus begins assuming that the hedonic principle should operate differently when serving fundamentally different needs, such as the distinct survival needs of nurturance and security” (p. 1281). In other words, children regulate their behavior in order to cultivate relationships with their caretakers and thus receive both nurturance and security. They seek, according to Higgins, to “approach pleasure and avoid pain...nurturance-related regulation involves a promotion focus, whereas security- related regulation involves a prevention focus” (p. 1281).

Promotion focused self-regulation sees goals as ideals, and a person acting in this way would be concerned with achieving gains or positive results and avoiding those results that are not positive. The prevention-focused self-regulation views its goals with a concern for making sure that negative experiences are avoided. People make choices that are influenced by one of the two types of regulatory focus. According to Higgins (2002), positive outcomes are simply what people seek when making decisions. Furthermore, Higgins (1997) reported that a prevention focus emphasizes safety, responsibility, and security needs. Goals are viewed as “oughts,” and there is a strategic concern with approaching non-losses (the absence of negatives) and avoiding losses (the presence of negatives). A promotion focus emphasizes hopes, accomplishments, and advancement needs. Goals are viewed as ideals, and there is a strategic concern with approaching gains (the presence of positives) and avoiding non-gains (the absence of positives). These regulatory focuses are influenced by both enduring predispositions (that can be measured as traits) and by situation/task specific framing (that can be manipulated experimentally).

Prosocial Behavior

Prosocial behavior is positive and does not cause any physical or emotional harm to others (Eisenberg, 2004). It is meant to benefit others and consists of altruism and empathy. Cumberland et al. (2005) stated “prosocial responding, including helpful or caring behaviors and related values and cognitions, are valued in most cultures, probably because of their harmonious human relationships” (p. 236). The behaviors people display and their attendant decisions are rooted in their morality or ethics. According to Pagnin and Andreani (2000),

Moral behavior is based on specific cognitive ability and specific education towards rational analysis and discussion of actions concerning rights, duties, consequences (about life, affects [sic], well-being, etc.) of self and others; moral behavior is based on affective roots and emotional education (in terms of empathy, commitment to others, care for others). (p. 1)

Prosocial behavior exists, therefore, with consideration for the needs of others, and it is characterized by respect for the humanity of others.

In 1973, Lawrence Kohlberg authored the most significant and accepted theory on moral development. Kohlberg was also the contemporary of French psychologist Jean Piaget. Their definitions and research on moral development provide a concise model for how individuals come to understand the values within the social structure of their environment and the greater world. According to Hersh and Kohlberg (1977):

Moral development represents the transformations that occur in a person’s form or structure of thought. The content of values varies from culture to culture; hence the study of cultural values cannot tell us how a person interacts with his social environment or how a person goes about solving problems related to his/her social world. This requires

the analysis of developing structures of moral judgment, which are found to be universal in a developmental sequence across cultures. (p. 54)

In order to expect certain behaviors from children of middle school age, it is important to understand their perspective of right and wrong. The decisions they make on a daily basis are based on that level of understanding and must be taken into consideration by educators when expecting certain behaviors in certain situations. Hersh and Kohlberg (1977) list the three age-related stages of moral development in the following order: pre-conventional level, conventional level, and the post-conventional level. The pre-conventional and conventional stages are most relevant to this study.

At the pre-conventional level, spanning ages five through nine, “a child is responsive to cultural rules and labels of good and bad” (Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977, p. 54), but he or she interprets goodness or badness according to the physical consequences of any action. Appreciation of the human values and the moral view of those actions are not important concepts to a child in this stage. The most important goal for the child during this stage of development is to avoid the punishment and seek the positive result of the action, instead of seeking to live in agreement with a particular social norm or ethical code. This further indicates the fact that the consequences of any action are more important than the actual right or wrongness of the action. Children are selfish in this stage, and their own needs are their first priority. Their parents define moral law; that is to say, children’s sense of what is right or wrong is defined by their interactions with their parents or guardians. For example, if a child lies, his or her understanding of lying will be developed by the response of those persons who are responsible for him or her.

In the conventional level, from age nine through all of adolescence, the focus of a child’s moral understanding moves outward. Hersh and Kohlberg (1977) explain

At this level, maintaining the expectations of the individual's family, group, or nation is perceived as valuable in its own right, regardless of immediate and obvious consequences. The attitude is not only one of conformity to personal expectations and social order, but of loyalty to it, of actively maintaining, supporting, and justifying the order, and of identifying with the persons or group involved in it...there is much conformity to stereotypical images of what is majority or "natural" behavior. (p. 55)

This is the level that includes middle school children. In this stage, the child seeks to live in agreement with the community's values or school's values. In this stage, Hersh and Kohlberg note, "Right behavior consists of doing one's duty, showing respect for authority, and maintaining social order for its own sake" (p. 55).

Lickona (1991), who has written extensively on education and character, defines good character within Aristotle's view of "right conduct." Lickona states, "Good character consists of knowing the good, desiring the good, and doing the good – habits of mind, habits of heart, and habits of action" (p. 51). Together, the concept of moral development stages and research on the concept of character clarify how children make choices throughout their development into adulthood. Decisions that exemplify good character are decisions that provide help, care, and benefit to others and to the person making the decisions. The personal benefit that one can achieve is not the motive of good character but a natural byproduct of it. However, it is clear that depending on the stage of children's moral development, a child's own perception of his or her action as good is not always fully defined.

Summary

Experimental studies examining decision making among adolescents have confirmed that motivation systems and regulatory focus are influential. According to the literature, middle school-aged students will be motivated differently and display different behavior when influenced by their peers and adults, as hypothesized. Understanding the specific motivation behind students' decisions in various situations may help educators craft curriculum as a means of building positive character traits.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Design

This study used a static-group comparison research design to determine the regulatory focus of middle school students' self-reported prosocial behavior when influenced by two different groups of people: peers versus adults.

Participants

Participants were a sampling of middle school boys (grades 6 through 8) at a private, all-male preparatory school in Baltimore, Maryland with an enrollment of 260 students.

Instrument

The instrument used to assess prosocial behavior in this study was the Prosocial Tendencies Measure (PTM) (Carlo & Randall, 2002) which was developed originally for college-age students and young adults (PTM) but then later modified (PTM-R) for use with middle and high school-age adolescents. The PTM, as reported in Carlo and Randall (2002), displayed a Cronbach's Alpha for public items on the behavior scale of .78, .85 for anonymous, .63 for dire, .80 for compliant, and .74 for altruistic. The PTM has also been found to have adequate reliability and validity in previous samples (Carlo, Hausmann, Christiansen, & Randall, 2003; Hardy & Carlo, 2005).

The instrument used to measure regulatory focus was Higgins' Event Reaction Questionnaire. The promotion scale's internal reliability was .73, and the prevention scale was .80 (Ayduk, Friedman, Harlow, Higgins, Idson, & Taylor, 2001).

Procedure

Half of the students were assigned to a situation in which they were in a room with only their classmates (the proctor left the room) and they were asked, via the instructions provided as a preamble to the questionnaire, to imagine that they were with a group of their classmates in an unsupervised setting and there was no adult present in the room; the other half were assigned to a situation in which they were in a supervised setting (there was an adult present as a proctor). These situational manipulations are consistent with a study conducted by Crowe and Higgins (1997) on regulatory focus induction in which subjects were asked to complete tasks and that they would be given a final task based on their performance on the initial tasks. Students were not given a final task in this study based on their performance.

Both groups were asked to report their regulatory focuses (prevention and promotion focuses) and to report their expectation that they would engage in prosocial behaviors using Carlo and Randall's (2002) 23-item measure of adolescent prosocial behavior.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The hypothesis of this study was not supported. As noted, the study was designed to determine the effects of peer and adult influence on prosocial behavior in middle school-aged boys and whether or not those variables would influence specific prosocial behaviors. The study used a static group comparison design in which two groups of students were assigned to rooms either with an adult or with no adult present. Each group was administered both the Event Reaction Questionnaire (ERQ) and the multi-dimensional Prosocial Behavior Tendencies Measure (PBTM). There were no effects in either setting, or there was no significant effect or shift on regulatory focus in the presence of an adult or the presence of peers (See Table 2). There were no significant relationships between any of the prosocial behaviors and the two regulatory fit dimensions (See Table 2). There was, however, a significant difference in self-reports of altruistic behavior intentions between the peer and adult conditions.

Table 1

Measures of Central Tendency for Each Group

Behavior	Recoded Condition	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Public	Peers	55	2.4727	.94213
	Adults	45	2.6074	.93552
Emotional	Peers	56	3.3321	.83058
	Adults	45	3.5378	.90536
Altruism	Peers	56	4.0357	.70619
	Adults	45	3.6556	.81235
Dire	Peers	56	3.6726	.72611
	Adults	45	3.8593	.72991
Anonymous	Peers	56	2.7991	.7796
	Adults	45	2.7667	.84174
Compliant	Peers	56	3.6429	.94731
	Adults	45	3.6889	.78544
Promotion	Peers	55	22.1636	3.84305
	Adults	45	22.7556	3.37205
Prevention	Peers	56	20.8750	3.36864
	Adults	43	20.7674	2.69777

Table 2

Independent Samples Test

t-test for Equality of Means						
		Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2 Tailed)	Mean Diff.
Public	<i>Equal variances assumed</i>	.892	-.713	98	.477	-.13468
	<i>Equal variances not assumed</i>		-.714	94	.477	-.13468
Emotional	<i>Equal variances assumed</i>	.448	-1.188	99	.238	-.20563
	<i>Equal variances not assumed</i>		-1.177	91	.242	-.20563
Altruism	<i>Equal variances assumed</i>	.557	2.514	99	.014	.38016
	<i>Equal variances not assumed</i>		2.476	88	.015	.38016
Dire	<i>Equal variances assumed</i>	.905	-1.281	99	.203	-.18664
	<i>Equal variances not assumed</i>		-1.280	94	.204	-.18664
Anonymous	<i>Equal variances assumed</i>	.154	.201	99	.841	.03244
	<i>Equal variances not assumed</i>		.199	91	.843	.03244
Compliant	<i>Equal variances assumed</i>	.093	-.262	99	.794	-.04603
	<i>Equal variances not assumed</i>		-.267	99	.790	-.04603
Promote	<i>Equal variances assumed</i>	.397	-.809	98	.420	-.59192
	<i>Equal variances not assumed</i>		-.820	97	.414	-.59192
Prevent	<i>Equal variances assumed</i>	.128	.171	97	.864	.10756
	<i>Equal variances not assumed</i>	.128	.176	97	.860	.10756

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The findings did not support the hypothesis that peer pressure acts through promotion focus, while adult influence acts through prevention focus. The second part of this study's hypothesis predicted that peer pressure and promotion focus would produce public, compliant and emotional prosocial behaviors; prevention focus would produce anonymous, altruistic, and dire prosocial behaviors. The presence of altruistic prosocial behavior was supported by the responses of all the students who participated, whether they were in the peer or adult group. Altruistic prosocial behavior was the only behavior that reported significance. It suggested that the students had some concern for the welfare and needs of others. That concern may simply be a product of students' environment outside of school.

Comparisons to Other Studies

Prior to this action research study, other studies have examined the different influences on prosocial behavior. This study did not provide any feedback for subjects during or after they completed the measure as did a study by Friedman et al. (1998) and Idson and Higgins (2000), which showed that both feedback and the presence of incentives have affected the strength of either promotion or prevention motivation in individuals.

One study's results concluded that aspects of conscience, moral affect, and moral cognition can help to predict high levels of prosocial behavior and low levels of aggression (Carlo, Eye, & Laible, 2008). Another study examined how religious practice was related to prosocial behavior, finding that religious practice was a predictor of compliant, anonymous, and altruistic behavior, but that it was not a positive predictor of public, dire, and emotional prosocial behaviors (Hardy & Carlo, 2005). A final study sought to determine whether the affirmations of the participants' most important perceived values and skills would affect prosocial feelings and

behaviors (Thomaes, Bushman, de Castro, & Reijntjes, 2012). The participants in this study demonstrated an increase in prosocial feelings and behaviors over the study period.

The above studies involved children with an age range of twelve to sixteen years old. This action research study's participants were no older than fourteen and no younger than eleven years old. Participants in this study consisted of only males, while the above studies consisted of coed participants. The participants in other studies were given some type of positive reinforcement or incentive during the study, while there was no such reinforcement given to participants in this study.

Potential Threats to Validity

The fact the students who participated in this study represented a nonrandom sample was a threat to external validity. The participants were from an all-boys school, which limits the generalization of the results to other groups of students outside of this study and outside of this school. Treatment diffusion or the boys communicating with each other outside of the testing room may have threatened external validity also. The boys were told not to communicate with anyone about the test, but in a small school where the boys were very familiar with each other, that may have not been avoidable. Also, the school that the participants attended has an established honor code and set of school expectations for behavior that created a unique culture that disallows the results to be generalized to other to students at other schools. The relationship the students had with the researcher or the participant effects that took place constitute an additional threat to external validity. Some students may have wanted to participate merely because they knew it would provide them with special attention or win them some type of favor in the eyes of the researcher. The peer and adult situations did not shift the regulatory focus of the students because the hypothetical conditions were weak. The presence of an adult in the adult

condition room neither provided nor simulated a strong enough adult influence in the perceptions of the kids. The same was true for the room with the peer condition. The conditions in each room may have not been strict enough, and as stated, did not create a strong enough simulation for the participants. The environment or classroom in which the study was conducted presented a threat to validity. According to Gay, (2009), “It is very difficult to conduct a well-controlled study in a classroom” (p. 243). The less natural the environment felt to the participants, the more minimal is the internal validity of the study.

Suggestions for Further Research

Further research could be extended to assess or measure the effect of parenting on both moral development and prosocial behavior. The participants in this study attended an all-boys school. A future study could explore gender differences by using a coed group of participants from a random sample or from students from several different schools. Parenting styles could be examined or measured, and/or the relationship that participants have with their parent(s) or guardian(s) could be factored into future studies.

This study highlighted the sensitive nature of trying to predict and explain the motivation of prosocial behavior. It could be useful to have students provide a self-reported qualitative understanding of their views on motivation. It is suggested that future studies might consider offering feedback to students as they completed the measure or when they were finished as well offer some type of incentive for their completion of the measures. Giving students a pre- and posttest at different times of the year or after some significant event occurred at school or in the students’ lives is another possible variation of this study. In between the two administrations, students could participate in classes that thoroughly explain the different types of regulatory focuses and the dimensions of prosocial behavior. The current study provided a single

assessment, administered at the end of the school year. Future studies could also bring together peer groups with established relationships and history among them that indicates a more realistic connection between the participants. It may also be helpful for an adult, such as a parent or guardian with an established relationship with the participants, to participate in the adult treatment.

Conclusions

Based on this study, it is justifiable to conclude that students in this study were motivated to display helping behaviors. This altruistic behavior is motivated by their sympathy for the individual and not necessarily by the presence of their peers or an adult. Altruistic behavior is also intrinsically motivated as opposed to extrinsically, which produces behavior that does not seek attention or reward. This was interesting because the researcher suggested earlier in this paper the need for educators to cultivate an environment that encourages prosocial behavior and responding. Therefore, constructing curriculum for which the goal is to teach empathy and sympathy to students may provide the most genuine type of behavior or at least behavior that remains consistent regardless of the influences on children.

Reference List

- Battistich, V., & Hom, A. (1997). The relationship between students' sense of their school as a community and their involvement in problem behaviors. *American Journal of Public Health, 87*(12), 1997-2001.
- Brendtro, L. K., & Mitchell, M. L. (2010). The profound power of groups. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 19*(3), 5-10.
- Carlo, G., Hausmann, A., Christiansen, S., & Randall, B. A. (2003). Sociocognitive and behavioral correlates of a measure of prosocial tendencies for adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 23*(1), 107-134.
- Carlo, G., & Randall, B. A. (2002). The development of a measure of prosocial behaviors for late adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 31*(1), 31-44.
- Crowe, E., & Higgins, T. (1997). Regulatory focus and strategic inclinations: promotion and prevention in decision-making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 69*(2), 117-132.
- Eisenberg, N. (2004). Development of prosocial behavior. In *Encyclopedia of applied psychology*. Retrieved from Credo Reference database.
- Eisenberg, N., Cumberland, A., Guthrie, I.K., Murphy, B.C., & Shepard, S.A. (2005). Age changes in prosocial responding and moral reasoning in adolescence and early adulthood. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 15*(3), 235-260.
- Gay, L.R., Mills, G.E., & Airasian, P. (2009). *Educational research: competencies for analysis and applications* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Hardy, S. A., & Carlo, G. (2005). Religiosity and prosocial behaviours in adolescence: The mediating role of prosocial values. *Journal of Moral Education, 34*, 231-249.

- Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52, 1280-1300.
- Higgins, E. T. (2002). How self-regulation creates distinct values: The case of promotion and prevention decision making. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 12, 177-191.
- Higgins, E. T., Friedman, R. S., Harlow, R. E., Idson, L. C., Ayduk, O. N., & Taylor, A. (2001). Achievement orientations from subjective histories of success: Promotion versus prevention pride. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 3-23.
- Idson, L. C., & Higgins, E. T. (2000). How current feedback and chronic effectiveness influence motivation: Everything to gain versus everything to lose. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30(4), 583-592.
- Kohlberg, L., & Hersh, R.H. (1977). Moral development: A review of theory. *Theory Into Practice*, 16, 53-59.
- Laible, J., Eye, J., & Carlo, G. (2008). Dimensions of conscience in mid-adolescence: Links with social behavior, parenting, and temperament. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 37, 875-887.
- Lickona, T. (1991). *Educating for character: How our schools can teach respect and responsibility*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- Meldrum, R. C., & Hay, C. (2012). Do peers matter in the development of self-control: Evidence from a longitudinal study of youth. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 41, 691-703.
- Pagnin, A., & Andreani, O. D. (2000). New trends in research in moral development in the gifted. In K. A. Heller, F. J. Monks, R. Subotnik, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *International handbook of giftedness and talent* (2nd ed.). Retrieved from Credo Reference database.
- Shah, J., Higgins, E.T., & Friedman, R.S. (1998). Performance incentives and means: How regulatory focus influences goal attainment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 285-293.

APPENDIX A – REVISED PROSOCIAL TENDENCIES MEASURE

Below are sentences that might or might not describe you. Please indicate *HOW MUCH EACH STATEMENT DESCRIBES YOU* by using the scale below.

DOES NOT DESCRIBE ME AT ALL	DESCRIBES ME A LITTLE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIBES ME	DESCRIBES ME WELL	DESCRIBES ME GREATLY
1	2	3	4	5

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| <i>Pub</i> | 1. I can help others best when people are watching me. |
| <i>Emot</i> | 2. It makes me feel good when I can comfort someone who is very upset. |
| <i>Pub</i> | 3. When other people are around, it is easier for me to help others in need. |
| <i>*Alt</i> | 4. I think that one of the best things about helping others is that it makes me look good. |
| <i>Dire</i> | 5. I tend to help people who are in a real crisis or need. |
| <i>Com</i> | 6. When people ask me to help them, I don't hesitate. |
| <i>Anon</i> | 7. I prefer to help others without anyone knowing. |
| <i>Dire</i> | 8. I tend to help people who are hurt badly. |
| <i>*Alt</i> | 9. I believe that giving goods or money works best when I get some benefit. |
| <i>Anon</i> | 10. I tend to help others in need when they do not know who helped them. |
| <i>Emot</i> | 11. I tend to help others especially when they are really emotional. |
| <i>Pub</i> | 12. Helping others when I am being watched is when I work best. |
| <i>Dire</i> | 13. It is easy for me to help others when they are in a bad situation. |
| <i>Anon</i> | 14. Most of the time, I help others when they do not know who helped them. |
| <i>Emot</i> | 15. I respond to helping others best when the situation is highly emotional. |
| <i>Com</i> | 16. I never wait to help others when they ask for it. |
| <i>Anon</i> | 17. I think that helping others without them knowing is the best type of situation. |
| <i>*Alt</i> | 18. One of the best things about doing charity work is that it looks good. |
| <i>Emot</i> | 19. Emotional situations make me want to help others in need. |
| <i>*Alt</i> | 20. I feel that if I help someone, they should help me in the future. |
| <i>Emot</i> | 21. I usually help others when they are very upset. |

Note. * indicates item is reverse scored. *Pub* = Public, *Emt* = Emotional, *Dire* = Dire, *Anon* = Anonymous, *Alt* = Altruism, *Com* = Compliant.

APPENDIX B – Event Reaction Questionnaire

This set of questions asks you HOW FREQUENTLY specific events actually occur or have occurred in your life. Please indicate your answer to each question by circling the appropriate number below it.

1. Compared to most people, are you typically unable to get what you want out of life?

1 2 3 4 5
never or seldom sometimes very often

2. Growing up, would you ever “cross the line” by doing things that your parents would not tolerate?

1 2 3 4 5
never or seldom sometimes very often

3. How often have you accomplished things that got you “psyched” to work even harder?

1 2 3 4 5
never or seldom sometimes very often

4. Did you get on your parents’ nerves often when you were growing up?

1 2 3 4 5
never or seldom sometimes very often

5. How often did you obey rules and regulations that were established by your parents?

1 2 3 4 5
never or seldom sometimes very often

6. Growing up, did you ever act in ways that your parents thought were objectionable?

1 2 3 4 5
never or seldom sometimes very often

7. Do you often do well at different things that you try?

1 2 3 4 5
never or seldom sometimes very often

8. Not being careful enough has gotten me into trouble at times.

1 2 3 4 5
never or seldom sometimes very often

9. When it comes to achieving things that are important to me, I find that I don’t perform as well as I ideally would like to do.

1 2 3 4 5
never true sometimes true very often true

