

Prosocial behavior

Prosocial behavior^{[1][2]} is a social behavior that "benefit[s] other people or society as a whole",^[3] "such as helping, sharing, donating, co-operating, and volunteering". The person may or may not intend to benefit others; the behavior's prosocial benefits are often only calculable after the fact. (Consider: Someone may intend to 'do good' but the effects may be catastrophic.)^[4] Obeying the rules and conforming to socially accepted behaviors (such as stopping at a "Stop" sign or paying for groceries) are also regarded as prosocial behaviors.^[5] These actions may be motivated by culturally influenced value systems; empathy and concern about the welfare and rights of others;^[6] egoistic or practical concerns, such as one's social status or reputation, hope for direct or indirect reciprocity, or adherence to one's perceived system of fairness;^[1] or altruism, though the existence of pure altruism is somewhat disputed, and some have argued that this falls into the philosophical rather than psychological realm of debate.^[7] Evidence suggests that prosociality is central to the well-being of social groups across a range of scales, including schools. Prosocial behavior in the classroom can have a significant impact on a student's motivation for learning and contributions to the classroom and larger community.^{[8][9]} In the workplace, prosocial behavior can have a significant impact on team psychological safety, as well as positive indirect effects on employee's helping behaviors and task performance.^[10] Empathy is a strong motive in eliciting prosocial behavior, and has deep evolutionary roots.^{[11][12]}

Prosocial behavior fosters positive traits that are beneficial for children and society. It helps many beneficial functions by bettering production of any league and its organizational scale.^[13] Evolutionary psychologists use theories such as kin-selection theory and inclusive fitness as an explanation for why prosocial behavioral tendencies are passed down generationally, according to the evolutionary fitness displayed by those who engaged in prosocial acts.^[14] Encouraging prosocial behavior may also require decreasing or eliminating undesirable social behaviors.^[9]

Although the term "prosocial behavior" is often associated with developing desirable traits in children,^{[15][16]} the literature on the topic has grown since the late 1980s to include adult behaviors as well.^[17] The term "prosocial" has grown into a world-wide movement,^{[18][19]} using evolutionary science^[20] to create real-world pro-social changes from working groups^[21] to whole cultures.^[22]

History

According to the psychology researcher Daniel Batson, the term "was created by social scientists as an antonym for antisocial."^[23]

The concept of prosocial behavior in psychology gained popularity in the 1970s. It was introduced to describe acts that promote positive social outcomes, such as cooperation and helping, and has since been examined through the lens of evolutionary biology, neuroscience, and cross-cultural psychology. Interest in prosocial behavior has deep historical roots, particularly within religious, philosophical, and psychological traditions.^[24]

Reciprocity vs. altruism in motivation

The purest forms of prosocial behavior are motivated by altruism, an unselfish interest in helping another person. According to psychology professor John W. Santrock,^[25] the circumstances most likely to evoke altruism are empathy for an individual in need, or a close relationship between the benefactor and the recipient. However, many prosocial behaviors that appear altruistic are in fact motivated by the norm of reciprocity, which is the obligation to return a favor with a favor. People feel guilty when they do not reciprocate and they may feel angry when someone else does not reciprocate. Reciprocal altruism suggests that "such helping is driven by a genetic tendency".^[26] Thus some professionals argue that altruism may not exist, and is completely motivated by reciprocity.^[27] Either reciprocity or altruism may motivate many important prosocial behaviors, including sharing.^[25]

Types of Prosocial Behavior

- Altruism: Helping others with no expectation of reciprocation.
- Reciprocal altruism: Helping others with the expectation that the favor may be returned.
- Cooperation: Working together toward shared goals.
- Volunteering and charitable giving: Contributing time or resources to benefit others without compensation.

Situational and individual factors

Prosocial behavior is mediated by both situational and individual factors.

Situational factors

One of the most common situation factors is the occurrence of the bystander effect. The bystander effect is the phenomenon that an individual's likelihood of helping decreases when passive bystanders are present in a critical situation. For example, when someone drops a stack of papers on a crowded sidewalk, most people are likely to continue passing him/her by. This example can be extended to even more urgent situations, such as a car crash or natural disaster. Bystanders are less likely to intervene as group size increases when surrounded by strangers, but they become more likely to help when accompanied by friends.^[28]

The decision model of bystander intervention noted that whether or not an individual gives aid in a situation depends upon their analysis of the situation. An individual will consider whether or not the situation requires their assistance, if the assistance is the responsibility of the individual, and how to help.^[29]

This model, proposed by professors Bibb Latané and John M. Darley,^[30] describes five things that must occur in order for a person to intervene:

1. Notice the situation
2. Construe it as an emergency.
3. Develop feelings of responsibility.
4. Believe they have skills to succeed.

5. Reach a conscious decision to help.

The number of individuals present in the situation requiring help is also a mediating factor in one's decision to give aid, where the more individuals are present, the less likely it is for one particular individual to give aid due to a reduction in perceived personal responsibility.^[29] This is known as diffusion of responsibility, where the responsibility one feels for the person(s) in need is divided by the number of bystanders. Another factor that comes into play is evaluation apprehension, which simply refers to the fear of being judged by other bystanders. Finally, pluralistic ignorance may also lead to someone not intervening. This refers to relying on the reaction of others, before reacting yourself.

Additionally, psychology professors John F. Dovidio, Jane Allyn Piliavin, and colleagues (1981) noted that individuals are likely to maximize their rewards and minimize their costs when determining whether or not to give aid in a situation – that is, that people are rationally self-motivated. Prosocial behavior is more likely to occur if the cost of helping is low (i.e. minimal time, or minimal effort), if helping would actually benefit the individual providing the help in some way, and if the rewards of providing the help are large. If it is in an individual's interest to help, they will most likely do so, especially if the cost of not providing the help is great.^[31]

People are also more likely to help those in their social group, or their "in group". With a sense of shared identity with the individual requiring assistance, the altruist is more likely to provide help, on the basis that one allocates more time and energy towards helping behavior within individuals of their own group. The labeling of another individual as a member of one's "in-group" leads to greater feelings of closeness, emotional arousal, and a heightened sense of personal responsibility for the other's welfare, all of which increase the motivation to act prosocially.^[31]

Researchers have also found that social exclusion decreases the likelihood of prosocial behavior occurring. In a series of seven experiments conducted in 2007 by Professor Jean M. Twenge and colleagues, researchers manipulated social inclusion or exclusion by telling research participants that other participants had purposefully excluded them, or that they would probably end up alone later in life. They found that this preliminary social exclusion caused prosocial behavior to drop significantly, noting that "Socially excluded people donated less money to a student fund, were unwilling to volunteer for further lab experiments, were less helpful after a mishap, and cooperated less in a mixed-motive game with another student."^[32] This effect is thought to be due to the fact that prosocial behavior, again, is motivated by a sense of responsibility in caring for and sharing resources with members of one's own group.

Individual factors

Individuals can be compelled to act pro-socially based on learning and socialization during childhood. Operant conditioning and social learning positively reinforces discrete instances of prosocial behaviors. Cognitive capacities like intelligence for example, are almost always related to prosocial likings.^[33] Helping skills and a habitual motivation to help others is therefore socialized, and reinforced as children understand why helping skills should be used to help others around them.^[34]

Social and individual standards and ideals also motivate individuals to engage in prosocial behavior. Social responsibility norms, and social reciprocity norms reinforce those who act prosocially. As an example, consider the child who is positively reinforced for "sharing" during their early childhood years.^[35] When acting prosocially, individuals reinforce and maintain their positive self-images or

personal ideals, as well as help to fulfill their own personal needs.^[36] The correlation between a helper's state and helping tendencies are greatly restricted to the relationship between whoever takes part in the situation.^[37]

Emotional arousal is an additional important motivator for prosocial behavior in general. Batson's (1987) empathy-altruism model examines the emotional and motivational component of prosocial behavior. Feeling empathy towards the individual needing aid increases the likelihood that the aid will be given. This empathy is called "empathetic concern" for the other individual, and is characterized by feelings of tenderness, compassion, and sympathy.^[38]

Agreeableness is thought to be the personality trait most associated with inherent prosocial motivation. Prosocial thoughts and feelings may be defined as a sense of responsibility for other individuals, and a higher likelihood of experiencing empathy ("other-oriented empathy") both affectively (emotionally) and cognitively. These prosocial thoughts and feelings correlate with dispositional empathy and dispositional agreeableness.^{[39][40]}

Wealth

Subjective wealth correlated positively with all aspects of prosociality in a preregistered study of 80,337 people from 76 countries, representing 90% of global population. Objective wealth correlated positively with positive reciprocity, donating, volunteering, and helping strangers but negatively with trust. The results were highly consistent across the world, without any systematic variation.^[41]

Influence of Incentives

Behavioral experiments demonstrate that monetary incentives can influence prosocial behavior. Financial rewards tend to increase participation among those who lack intrinsic motivation. There are findings that suggested that prosocial and financial incentives may activate distinct motivations and encourage different types of posting behavior.^[42] Prosocial acts can be motivated by non-material incentives, such as the emotional satisfaction of giving often referred to as the warm-glow effect.

Other factors

In addition to situational and individualistic factors, there are some categorical characteristics that can impact prosocial behavior. Several studies have indicated a positive relationship between prosocial behavior and religion^{[43][44][45]} as well as social status.^{[46][47][48]} In addition, there may be sex differences in prosocial behavior, particularly as youths move into adolescence.^[49] Research suggests that while women and men both engage in prosocial behaviors, women tend to engage in more communal and relational prosocial behaviors whereas men tend to engage in more agentic prosocial behaviors.^[50] A recent study examining workplace charitable giving looked at the role of both sex and ethnicity. Results showed that women gave significantly more than men, and Caucasians gave significantly more than minority groups. However, the percent of minority individuals in the workplace was positively associated with workplace charitable giving by minorities.^[51] Culture, sex, and religion are important factors to consider in understanding prosocial behavior on an individual and group level.

Developmental Trajectories

Prosocial behavior in childhood often begins with questions of sharing and fairness. From age 12–18 months, children begin to display prosocial behavior in presenting and giving their toys to their parents, without promoting or being reinforced by praise.^[52] The development of prosocial behavior continues throughout the second year of life, as children begin to gain a moral understanding of the world.^[53] As obedience to societal standards becomes important, children's ability to exhibit prosocial behavior strengthens, with occurrence and diversity of these behaviors increasing with age and cognitive maturity.^{[52][53][1][54]} What is important developmentally is that the child has developed a belief that sharing is an obligatory part of a social relationship and involves a question of right and wrong.^[6] So, as children move through childhood, their reasoning changes from being hedonistic and needs-oriented to becoming more concerned with approval and more involved in complex cognitive forms of perspective taking and reciprocity reasoning.^[55] Additionally, children's prosocial behavior is typically more centered around interest in friends and concern for approval, whereas adolescents begin to develop reasoning that is more concerned with abstract principles such as guilt and positive affect.^[55]

Parents can set examples that children carry into their interactions and communication with peers, but parents are not present during all of their children's peer exchanges. The day-to-day constructions of fairness standards is done by children in collaboration and negotiation with each other.^[6] Recent research demonstrates that invoking the self using subtle linguistic cues (e.g. identifying someone as a "helper" versus labeling the action, "helping") fosters the perception that a behavior reflects identity, and increases helping, or prosocial, behaviors in children significantly across tasks.^[56]

Another study by psychology professor Amélie Nantel-Vivier and colleagues (2009) used a multi-informant model to investigate the development of prosocial behaviour in both Canadian and Italian adolescents aged 10–15.^[57] Their findings have indicated that, in early adolescence, although empathy and moral reasoning continue to advance, the development of prosocial behaviors reaches a plateau. Theories for this change in development suggest that it is the result of more individualized and selective prosocial behaviors. During adolescence, youth begin to focus these behaviors toward their peer groups and/or affiliations.^[57] However, findings on the development of prosocial behavior vary across studies, likely due to differences in research methods.^[58]

Consistent with previous analyses, this study also found a tendency toward higher prosocial behaviors in young adolescent girls compared to their male classmates. The earlier maturation in females may be a possible explanation for this disparity. A more recent study that focused on the effects of pubertal timing found that early maturation in adolescents has a positive impact on prosocial behaviors. While their findings apply to both genders, this study found a much more pronounced effect in males. This suggests that earlier onset of puberty has a positive correlation with the development of prosocial behaviors.^[59]

In many Indigenous American communities, prosocial behavior is a valued means of learning and child rearing. Such behaviors are seen as contributing in an eagerly collaborative and flexible environment, aimed at teaching consideration, responsibility, and skills with the guidance and support of adults.^[60] Culturally valued developmental goals are integrally tied to children's participation in these contexts.^[61] It is also helpful for children to learn cultural mores in addition to individual personality development. Children learn functional life skills through real-time observation of adults and interactive participation of these learned skills within their community.^[62]

In Education

Prosocial behavior can act as a strong motivator in education, for it provides students with a purpose beyond themselves and the classroom. This purpose beyond the self, or self-transcendence,^[63] is an innate human need to be a part of something bigger than themselves. When learning in isolation, the way Western academics are traditionally designed, students struggle to make connections to the material and its greater overarching purpose. This disconnection harms student learning, motivation, and attitudes about education.

If teachers make space for prosocial behavior in education and social learning, then they can illustrate that what students are learning will have a direct impact on the world that they live in. This would be considered a mutually constituting relationship,^[64] or a relationship in which both individuals and culture develop interdependently. In other words, what students are learning in a classroom could be intimately connected with a purpose towards a greater cause, deepening the learning itself.

Studies by Yeager et al.^[63] test the effects of having a self-transcendent purpose for learning, with the results showing that such a purpose for learning led to fewer future college dropouts, increased high school math and science GPAs, and persistence on boring tasks. This self transcendent purpose may not only encourage persistence on boring tasks, but may help to make boring tasks more meaningful and engaging.

A person's ideas and opinions are largely shaped by the world that they grow up in, which in turn determines what sort of change they want to instill in the world. For example: a girl who grew up in poverty becoming a social worker. The environment she grew up in gave her an awareness of the workings of poverty, motivating her to instill change in either the institutions that cause it, or help those affected by poverty.

There aren't many opportunities to make prosocial contributions in school; which makes school feel isolated and irrelevant. By encouraging students to find a self-transcendent purpose in their learning, others enable them to enjoy their learning and make connections to community contributions.^{[65][66]}

In the workplace

Studies and meta-studies have shown an association between pro-social behaviour and successful outcomes for an organisation, such as increased profitability and shareholder value. The association holds true for pro-social behaviour on the part of both workers and bosses.^{[67][68][69]}

Influences

Media programming and video games on children

Studies have shown that different types of media programming may evoke prosocial behaviors in children.

The channels aimed at younger viewers like Nickelodeon and Disney Channel had significantly more acts of altruism than the general-audience demographic channels like A&E and or TNT, according to one large-scale study. This study examined the programming of 18 different channels, including more than 2,000 entertainment shows, during a randomly selected week on television. The study revealed that nearly three quarters (73 percent) of programs contained at least one act of altruism and on average viewers saw around three acts of altruism an hour. Around one-third of those behaviors were explicitly rewarded in the plot, potentially sending the message that these acts of prosocial behavior can come with positive consequences.^[70]

Another study on the topic was conducted by University at Buffalo, Iowa State University and University of Minnesota professors. They studied children for two years for the purpose of investigating the role of media exposure on prosocial behavior for young boys and girls. The study concluded that media exposure could possibly predict outcomes related to prosocial behavior.^[71]

Other experimental research has suggested that prosocial video games may increase prosocial behavior in players^[72] although some of this work has proven difficult to replicate.^[73] However other scholars have been critical of this work for tending to falsely dichotomize video games into prosocial/violent categories despite significant overlap as well as methodological flaws in the experimental studies.^[74] For instance a study by Ferguson and Garza found that exposure to violent video games was associated with increased prosocial behavior, both on-line as well as volunteering in the real world. The authors speculated this may be due to the prosocial themes common in many violent games, as well as team oriented play in many games.^[74]

Legislation

In the United States, in an effort to get stations to air education and prosocial programming for children, the Children's Television Act was adopted in 1990. It states that channels must produce and air programming developed specifically for children as a condition to renew broadcast licenses. After discussions as to what the definition of "specifically designed for children" really means, in 1996 guidelines were passed to correct this ambiguity.^[75]

Arts

The arts are increasingly recognized as influential for health behaviors in strengthening social bonds and cohesion and promoting prosocial behavior.^{[76][77]} Evidence of the impact of different arts is emerging and research is growing on literature, movies and theatre. A review of current literature argues that performative arts are more prone to elicit empathic concern which is linked with more durable prosocial behavior during stressful situations such as the COVID-19 pandemic outbreak: in particular theatre and virtual reality are seen as promising.^[78] An active role of the arts in sustaining prosocial behavior should however integrate an ethical approach to avoid the risk of mass manipulation and intergroup bias.^[79]

Observation

People are generally much more likely to act pro-socially in a public setting rather than in a private setting. One explanation for this finding has to do with perceived status, being publicly recognized as a pro-social individual often enhance one's self-image and desirability to be considered for inclusion in social groups.^[80] Other research has shown that merely given people the "illusion" that they are being

observed (e.g., by hanging up posters of "staring" human eyes) can generate significant changes in prosocial acts such as charitable giving and less littering. Pictures of human eyes trigger an involuntary neural gaze detection mechanism, which primes people to act pro-socially.^[81] There are two different forms of prosocial behaviors. Ordinary prosocial behavior requires "situational and sociocultural demands". Extraordinary prosocial behavior doesn't include as much. This indicates that one form is used for a more selfish result while the other is not.^[82]

Perception of responsibility and guilt

Guilt has long been regarded as a motivator for prosocial behavior.^{[83][84]} Extensive data from a 2012 study conducted by de Hooge,^[85] demonstrates that when a secondary individual repairs a transgressors' damage caused to victims, the transgressors' guilt feelings, reparative intentions, and prosocial behavior drastically diminish. Thus, reduction of guilt may have more to do with reparative actions broadly, rather than necessarily prosocial behaviors taken on by oneself.

Social media effects

Global use of social media is growing, especially among adolescent social media users.^[86] The negative effects of social media has been a large focus of scientific research;^[86] however, social media can also be a catalyst for prosocial behavior both online and offline. Social media is one of the most newly profound ways to spread awareness. Erreygers and colleagues define online prosocial behavior as "voluntary behavior carried out in an electronic context with the intention of benefitting particular others or promoting harmonious relations with others".^[87] Examples of online prosocial behavior include electronic donation of money to specific causes or the sharing of information and resources, such as in times of natural disaster.

One example of online prosocial behavior during natural disasters is the relief efforts in the wake of the 2011 Tōhoku earthquake and tsunami off the coast of Japan, when users turned to Facebook and Twitter to provide financial and emotional support via their social networks. Direct donations to Japanese relief were possible on The Red Cross fan page on Facebook,^[88] and via online discount sites like Groupon and LivingSocial.

Emotional Influences on Prosocial Behavior

Mood and prosocial behavior are closely linked. People often experience the "feel good-do good" phenomena, where being in a good mood increases helping behaviors. Being in a good mood helps us to see the "good" in other people, and prolongs our own good mood. For example, mood and work behaviors have frequently been examined in research; studies show that positive mood at work is associated with more positive work-related behaviors (e.g., helping co-workers).^[89] Similarly, prosocial behaviors increase positive mood.^[90] Several studies have shown the benefits of volunteering and other prosocial behaviors on self-esteem, life satisfaction, and overall mental health.^{[91][92][93]} Additionally, negative mood can also impact prosocial behavior. Research has shown that guilt often leads to prosocial behaviors, whereas other negative mood states, such as fear, do not lead to the same prosocial behaviors.^{[94][95][96]}

A recent pilot study examined whether an intervention increasing prosocial behavior (kind acts) in young adults with social anxiety would both increase positive affect and decrease social anxiety in participants. Participants randomly assigned to a four-week Kind Acts intervention, where individuals were instructed to engage in three kind acts each day twice a week over the four-week period, showed both higher self-reported positive mood and increased satisfaction with relationships at the end of the intervention. This intervention demonstrates ways in which prosocial behavior may be beneficial in improving mood and mental health.^[97]

A meta-analysis from 2020 by Hui et al., which looked at 126 prior studies involving almost 200,000 participants, found that spontaneous instances of prosocial behavior, such as helping an older neighbor carry groceries, had a stronger positive effect on well-being than did more formal instances of prosocial behavior, such as volunteering for a charity at a pre-scheduled time.^[98]

Other research suggests that cultivating positive emotions, such as gratitude, may also facilitate prosocial behavior. A study by Bartlett & DeSteno examined the ability of gratitude to shape costly prosocial behavior, demonstrating that gratitude increases efforts to assist a benefactor even when such efforts are costly (i.e., hedonically negative), and that this increase is qualitatively different from efforts given from just general positive affective state. They also show that gratitude can increase assistance provided to strangers, not just close social ties. Awe is another positive emotional state that has been closely linked to inspiring generosity and prosocial behavior. Piff et al.^[99] studied this phenomenon through experiments using economic and ethical-decision making games and explain, "When people experience awe they really want to share that experience with other people, suggesting that it has this particularly viral component to it... awe binds people together—by causing people to want to share their positive experiences collectively with one another."

Psychopathy and Prosocial Deficits

In 1941, Hervey Cleckley^{[100][101]} described psychopathy as a disorder in which individuals often initially appear intelligent, charming, and even kind but are in fact egocentric, grandiose and impulsive. He described individuals who would, on a whim, leave their families to cross the country gambling, drinking and fighting, only to return and act as if nothing was out of the ordinary.

Today, psychopathy is described as antisocial personality disorder, which is characterized by decreased anxiety, fear, and social closeness as well as increased impulsivity, manipulateness, interpersonal dominance and aggression.^{[102][103][104]} These traits lead to numerous types of antisocial behavior including high rates of substance abuse,^[104] serial short term relationships,^[105] and various forms of criminal behavior.^[106] One common misconception about psychopathy though is that all psychopaths are serial killers or other vicious criminals. In reality, many researchers do not consider criminal behavior to be a criterion for the disorder although the role of criminality in the disorder is strongly debated.^{[107][108][109]} Additionally, psychopathy is being researched as a dimensional construct that is one extreme of normal range personality traits instead of a categorical disorder.^{[110][111]}

In regards to the lack of prosocial behavior in psychopathy, there are several theories that have been proposed in the literature. One theory suggests that psychopaths engage in less prosocial behavior (and conversely more antisocial behavior) because of a deficit in their ability to recognize fear in others, particularly fearful facial expressions.^[112] Because they are unable to recognize that their actions are

causing another distress, they continue that behavior in order to obtain some goal that benefits them. A second theory proposes that psychopaths have a sense of "altruistic punishment"^[113] where they are willing to punish other individuals even if it means they will be harmed in some way. There has also been an evolutionary theory proposed^[105] stating that psychopaths lack of prosocial behavior is an adaptive mating strategy in that it allows them to spread more of their genes while taking less responsibility for their offspring. Finally, there is some evidence that in some situations psychopaths behavior may not be antisocial but instead it may be more utilitarian^[114] than other individuals. In a recent study, Bartels & Pizarro (2011) found that when making decisions about traditional moral dilemmas such as the trolley problem, individuals high in psychopathic traits actually make more utilitarian (and therefore more moral in some views) choices. This finding is particularly interesting because it suggests that psychopaths, who are often considered immoral or even evil, may actually make better moral decisions than non-psychopaths. The authors of this study conclude that individuals high in psychopathic traits are less influenced by their emotions and therefore make more "mathematical" decisions and choose the option that leads to the lowest number of deaths.

The theories discussed above are not intended to be a comprehensive list but instead to provide a sense of how psychopaths differ in their approach to social interactions. As with most psychological/social phenomena, it is likely a combination of these factors that leads to psychopaths' lack of prosocial behavior. Further research is needed to determine the causal nature of any one of these individual deficits as well as if there is any way to help these individuals develop more prosocial patterns of behavior.

The Emotional Uplift of Giving

Psychologists have shown that helping others can produce "feel-good" neurotransmitters such as oxytocin and that, similar to any other pleasurable activity, the act of volunteering, giving and behaving prosocially can become addictive (warm-glow giving).^[115]

Some work has been done on utilizing this principle through the concept of helper therapy, in which therapeutic benefits are gleaned from assisting others. Community health workers have been found to gain helper benefits that include positive feelings about self, a sense of belonging, valuable work experience, and access to health information and skills through their prosocial vocation, which may buffer against the various stressors inherent in this line of work.^[116]

In addition, Helper therapy may also be highly beneficial for distressed adolescents experiencing suicidal thoughts. Studies indicate that when help-seeking youth use online community forums, the help-seekers often begin to provide support for other help seekers, and develop a reciprocal prosocial community battling depression together.^[117]

Altruistic dissidence

Stefano Passini and Davide Morselli argue that groups will obey authority so long as its system, basis, and demands are viewed as legitimate. Passini and Morselli distinguish between anti-social disobedience, which they see as destructive, and prosocial disobedience, which they see as constructive. "Disobedience becomes prosocial when it is enacted for the sake of the whole society, including all its different levels and groups. In contrast, anti-social disobedience is enacted mainly in favour of one's own group, in order

to attain individual rights." A main difference between anti-social and pro-social dissidence is the way that they relate to authority; anti-social dissidents reject authority and disobey its norms and laws, while pro-social dissidents understand the important roles that societal laws play in maintaining order, but also recognize and address the flaws in authoritative reasoning. Pro-social protests, if viewed in a positive manner, can increase freedoms and equality for the general public, and improve democratic institutions.^[118]

Labor market outcomes

Recent scientific research shows that individuals who volunteer have better labor market outcomes in terms of hiring opportunities and wages.^[119]

See also

- Altruism – Concern for the well-being of others
- Cooperation – Groups working or acting together
- Eusociality – Highest level of animal sociality a species can attain
- Friendship – Mutual affection between people
- Helping behavior – Voluntarily prosocial behaviour
- Humanitarian aid – Material or logistical assistance for people in need
- Reciprocal altruism – Form of behaviour between organisms
- Rescue – Operations for life saving, removal from danger and liberation from restraint
- Sharing – Joint use of a resource or space
- Social animal – Form of collective animal behaviour
- Socialization – Lifelong process of inheriting and disseminating norms, customs and ideologies
- Social psychology – Study of social effects on people's thoughts, feelings, and behaviors
- Social support – Support systems for individuals
- Social value orientations
- Volunteering – Act of freely giving time and labor
- Tootling – Reporting of only positive, rather than inappropriate, social behaviors

References

1. Eisenberg, Nancy; Fabes, Richard A; Spinrad, Tracy L (2007). "Prosocial Development". *Handbook of Child Psychology*. doi:10.1002/9780470147658.chpsy0311 (<https://doi.org/10.1002%2F9780470147658.chpsy0311>). ISBN 978-0-470-14765-8.
2. Joyal-Desmarais, Keven; Euh, Hyun; Scharmer, Alexandra; Snyder, Mark (2024). "Understanding prosocial and antisocial behaviours: The roles of self-focused and other-focused motivational orientations" (<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ejsp.3110>). *European Journal of Social Psychology*. **54** (7): 1610–1643. doi:10.1002/ejsp.3110 (<https://doi.org/10.1002%2Fejsp.3110>). ISSN 0046-2772 (<https://search.worldcat.org/issn/0046-2772>).

3. Prosocial behavior, PsychWiki.com (http://www.psychwiki.com/wiki/Prosocial_Behavior), Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20110811015452/http://www.psychwiki.com/wiki/Prosocial_Behavior) 2011-08-11 at the Wayback Machine, Aug. 4, 2011
4. Arthur P. Brief & Stephan J. Motowidlo (1986). "Prosocial organizational behaviors". *The Academy of Management Review*. **11** (4): 710–725. doi:10.2307/258391 (<https://doi.org/10.2307%2F258391>). JSTOR 258391 (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/258391>).
5. Baumeister & Bushman (2007). *Social Psychology and Human Nature*. Cengage Learning. p. 254. ISBN 978-0-495-11633-2.
6. Santrock, John W. A Topical Approach to Life Span Development 4th Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2007. Ch. 15, pp. 489–491
7. Sloan Wilson, David (2015). *Does Altruism Exist?: Culture, Genes, and the Welfare of Others*. Yale University Press. ISBN 978-0-300-18949-0.
8. Helliwell, J. F.; Putnam, R. D. (2004). "The social context of well-being" (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1693420>). *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. **359** (1449): 1435–1446. doi:10.1098/rstb.2004.1522 (<https://doi.org/10.1098%2Frstb.2004.1522>). PMC 1693420 (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1693420>). PMID 15347534 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15347534>).
9. Straubhaar, Joseph D., Robert LaRose, and Lucinda Davenport. *Media Now: Understanding Media, Culture, and Technology* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=Bu1tHocwCy8C>). Boston, MA: Wadsworth, 2009. pp. 427–28 ISBN 1-4390-8257-X.
10. Frazier, M. L.; Tupper, C. (2018). "Supervisor Prosocial Motivation, Employee Thriving, and Helping Behavior: A Trickle-Down Model of Psychological Safety" (<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1059601116653911>). *Group & Organization Management*. **43** (4): 561–593. doi:10.1177/1059601116653911 (<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1059601116653911>).
11. Silk, J & House, B (2011). "Evolutionary foundations of human prosocial sentiments" (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3131813>). *PNAS*. **108** (Suppl 2): 10910–7. Bibcode:2011PNAS..10810910S (<https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2011PNAS..10810910S>). doi:10.1073/pnas.1100305108 (<https://doi.org/10.1073%2Fpnas.1100305108>). PMC 3131813 (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3131813>). PMID 21690372 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21690372>).
12. Decety, J (2011). "The neuroevolution of empathy". *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. **1231** (1): 35–45. Bibcode:2011NYASA1231...35D (<https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2011NYASA1231...35D>). doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2011.06027.x (<https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fj.1749-6632.2011.06027.x>). PMID 21651564 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21651564>). S2CID 9895828 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:9895828>).
13. "Lacking Status Hinders Prosocial Behavior Among the Powerful" (<http://libraryproxy.tulsacc.edu:2096/ehost/detail/detail?vid=7&sid=56ee3e19-0d0c-47eb-8169-24dd1d43295b%40pdc-v-sessmgr02&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRi#AN=131843269&db=aph>).
14. Barrett, Louise (2002). *Human Evolutionary Psychology*. Princeton University Press. ISBN 978-0-691-09622-3.
15. Eisenberg, Nancy; Paul Henry Mussen (1989-08-25). *The Roots of Prosocial Behavior in Children*. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-33771-7.
16. "Prosocial Behavior Page, US Dept. of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families-US Dept. of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families" (<https://web.archive.org/web/20111007181424/http://nccic.acf.hhs.gov/taxonomy/term/1166>). Archived from the original (<https://nccic.acf.hhs.gov/taxonomy/term/1166>) on 2011-10-07.

17. Prosocial Behavior. Excerpt from "More about Generosity: An Addendum to the Generosity, Social Psychology and Philanthropy Literature Reviews" (<http://generosityresearch.nd.edu/publications-2/literature-reviews/prosocial-behavior/>) Archived (<https://web.archive.org/web/20111006125558/http://generosityresearch.nd.edu/publications-2/literature-reviews/prosocial-behavior/>) 2011-10-06 at the [Wayback Machine](http://www.waybackmachine.org/), University of Notre Dame, July 7, 2009
18. "Landing" (<https://www.prosocial.world/>). *www.prosocial.world*. Retrieved 2020-08-08.
19. "Prosocial.World" (<https://www.facebook.com/groups/371382446315626/>). *www.facebook.com*. Retrieved 2020-08-08.
20. Biglan, Anthony. *The nurture effect: how the science of human behavior can improve our lives and our world*. Oakland, CA. ISBN 978-1-60882-956-9. OCLC 903690030 (<https://search.worldcat.org/oclc/903690030>).
21. Atkins, Paul W. B. (2019). *Prosocial: using evolutionary science to build productive, equitable, and collaborative groups*. Wilson, David Sloan, Hayes, Steven C. Oakland, CA. ISBN 978-1-68403-024-8. OCLC 1080428681 (<https://search.worldcat.org/oclc/1080428681>).
22. Biglan, Anthony (2020). *Rebooting Capitalism: How We Can Forge a Society That Works for Everyone*. Eugene, OR, US: Values to Action. ISBN 978-0-578-69090-2.
23. "Altruism and prosocial behavior CD Batson... – Handbook of psychology - 1998 – Wiley Online Library" (https://scholar.google.com/scholar?start=10&q=prosocial&hl=en&as_sdt=0,9). *Scholar.google.com*. Retrieved 2012-01-08.
24. Smith, R.J. (2017). "The Relationship Between Adolescent Prosocial Moral Reasoning, Risk Taking, and Perceived Environment to Prosocial Behaviors" (<https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/relationship-between-adolescent-prosocial-moral/docview/1910174776/se-2>).
25. Santrock, John W. A Topical Approach to Life Span Development 4th Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2007. Ch 15. pp. 489–491 ISBN 0-07-338264-7
26. Dickerson, P. Social Psychology Traditional and Critical Perspectives. Pearson, 2012. Chapter 8. ISBN 978-1-4058-7393-2
27. Pinel, John P.J. Biopsychology 8th Edition. New York: Pearson, 2011. Chapter 17. ISBN 0205832563
28. Fluke, S.M. (2016). "Standing up or standing by: Examining the bystander effect in school bullying" (<https://www.proquest.com/psychology/docview/1821965291/9CD83CC43384520PQ/3?accountid=11824&sourcetype=Dissertations%20&%20Theses>).
29. Latane, B., & Darley, J. 1970. *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
30. Latane, B., & Darley, J. 1970
31. Dovidio, J.F., Piliavin, J.A., Gaertner, S.L., Schroeder, D.A. & Clark, R.D., III. (1991). The arousal: Cost-reward model and the process of intervention. In M.S. Clark (Ed.) *Review of personality and social psychology*: Vol. 12: Prosocial behaviour. pp. 86–118. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
32. Twenge, J., Baumeister, R., DeWall, C. N., Ciarocco, N. and Bartels, J.M. (2007). "Social exclusion decreases prosocial behavior" (http://dericbownds.net/uploaded_images/prosocial.pdf) (PDF). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. **92** (1): 56–66. CiteSeerX 10.1.1.472.8502 (<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.472.8502>). doi:10.1037/0022-3514.92.1.56 (<https://doi.org/10.1037%2F0022-3514.92.1.56>). PMID 17201542 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17201542>). S2CID 16983578 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:16983578>).

33. Erlandsson, Arvid; Nilsson, Artur; Tinghög, Gustav; Västfjäll, Daniel (2018). "Bullshit-Sensitivity Predicts Prosocial Behavior" (<http://libraryproxy.tulsacc.edu:2096/ehost/detail/detail?vid=10&sid=56ee3e19-0d0c-47eb-8169-24dd1d43295b%40pdc-v-sessmgr02&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWwhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRI#AN=130998546&db=aph>). *PLOS ONE*. **13** (7) e0201474. Bibcode:2018PLoSO..1301474E (<https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2018PLoS O..1301474E>). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0201474 (<https://doi.org/10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0201474>). PMC 6067753 (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6067753>). PMID 30063739 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30063739>).
34. Grusec, J. E.; Goodnow, J. J.; Kuczynski, L. (2000). "New directions in analyses of parenting contributions to children's acquisition of values". *Child Development*. **71** (1): 205–211. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00135 (<https://doi.org/10.1111%2F1467-8624.00135>). JSTOR 1132234 (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/1132234>). PMID 10836575 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10836575>).
35. Dovidio, John F (1984). "Helping Behavior and Altruism: An Empirical and Conceptual Overview". *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology Volume 17*. Vol. 17. pp. 361–427. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60123-9 (<https://doi.org/10.1016%2FS0065-2601%2808%2960123-9>). ISBN 978-0-12-015217-9.
36. Omoto AM, Snyder M (1995). "Sustained helping without obligation: motivation, longevity of service, and perceived attitude change among AIDS volunteers". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. **68** (4): 671–86. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.68.4.671 (<https://doi.org/10.1037%2F0022-3514.68.4.671>). PMID 7738770 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/7738770>).
37. Moradi, Saleh; Van Quaquebeke, Niels; Hunter, John A. (2018). "Flourishing and Prosocial Behaviors: A multilevel investigation of national corruption level as a moderator" (<http://libraryproxy.tulsacc.edu:2096/ehost/detail/detail?vid=8&sid=56ee3e19-0d0c-47eb-8169-24dd1d43295b%40pdc-v-sessmgr02&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWwhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRI#AN=130650733&db=aph>). *PLOS ONE*. **13** (7) e0200062. Bibcode:2018PLoSO..1300062M (<https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2018PLoS O..1300062M>). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0200062 (<https://doi.org/10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0200062>). PMC 6042718 (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6042718>). PMID 30001332 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30001332>).
38. Batson (1987). "Prosocial Motivation: Is it ever Truly Altruistic?". *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology Volume 20*. Vol. 20. pp. 65–122. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60412-8 (<https://doi.org/10.1016%2FS0065-2601%2808%2960412-8>). ISBN 978-0-12-015220-9.
39. Graziano, William G; Eisenberg, Nancy (1997). "Agreeableness". *Handbook of Personality Psychology*. pp. 795–824. doi:10.1016/B978-012134645-4/50031-7 (<https://doi.org/10.1016%2FB978-012134645-4%2F50031-7>). ISBN 978-0-12-134645-4.
40. Penner, Louis A., Barbara A. Fritzsche, J. Philip Craiger, and Tamara R. Freifeld. 1995. "Measuring the Prosocial Personality." pp. 147–163 in J. Butcher and C.D. Spielberger (Eds.) *Advances in Personality Assessment*, Vol. 10. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
41. Paul Vanags, Jo Cutler, Patricia Lockwood, Fabian Kosse (18 September 2023). "Greater wealth is associated with higher prosocial preferences and behaviours across 76 countries" (<https://psyarxiv.com/zc5a3/>). *PsyArXiv*. abstract & discussion.
42. Sasaki, S; Kubo; Kitano (2025). "Prosocial and financial incentives for biodiversity conservation: A field experiment using a smartphone app" (https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800924004038?ssrnid=4756100&dgcid=SSRN_redirect_SD).
43. Moulin-Stožek, Daniel; de Irala, Jokin; Beltramo, Carlos; Osorio, Alfonso (2018). "Relationships between religion, risk behaviors and prosociality among secondary school students in Peru and El Salvador" (http://pure-oai.bham.ac.uk/ws/files/48884209/Relationships_between_religion_risk_behaviours_and_prosociality_among_....pdf) (PDF). *Journal of Moral Education*: 1–15. doi:10.1080/03057240.2018.1438250 (<https://doi.org/10.1080%2F03057240.2018.1438250>). S2CID 149477988 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:149477988>).

44. Norenzayan, Ara; Shariff, Azim F. (2008). "The Origin and Evolution of Religious Prosociality". *Science*. **322** (5898): 58–62. Bibcode:2008Sci...322...58N (<https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2008Sci...322...58N>). CiteSeerX 10.1.1.659.6887 (<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.659.6887>). doi:10.1126/science.1158757 (<https://doi.org/10.1126%2Fscience.1158757>). PMID 18832637 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18832637>). S2CID 28514 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:28514>). The article sounds a note of caution, however, for two reasons. Firstly, "it remains unresolved whether this charity gap persists beyond the ingroup boundaries of the religious groups"; secondly, and more importantly, the sociological surveys that suggest such a gap "are entirely based on self-reports of prosocial behavior. Psychologists have long known that self-reports of socially desirable behaviors (such as charitability) may not be accurate, reflecting instead impression management and self-deception."
45. Galen (2012). "Does religious belief promote prosociality? A critical examination". *Psychological Bulletin*. **138** (5): 876–906. doi:10.1037/a0028251 (<https://doi.org/10.1037%2Fa0028251>). PMID 22925142 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22925142>).
46. Liebe, Ulf; Tutić, Andreas (2010). "Status groups and altruistic behaviour in dictator games". *Rationality and Society*. **22** (3): 353–380. doi:10.1177/1043463110366232 (<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1043463110366232>). S2CID 143710861 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:143710861>).
47. Liebe, Ulf; Schwitter, Nicole; Tutić, Andreas (2022). "Individuals of high socioeconomic status are altruistic in sharing money but egoistic in sharing time" (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9237058>). *Scientific Reports*. **12** (1): 10831. Bibcode:2022NatSR..1210831L (<https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2022NatSR..1210831L>). doi:10.1038/s41598-022-14800-y (<https://doi.org/10.1038%2Fs41598-022-14800-y>). PMC 9237058 (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9237058>). PMID 35760835 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35760835>).
48. Korndörfer, Martin; Egloff, Boris; Schmuckle, Stefan C. (2015). "A large scale test of the effect of social class on prosocial behavior" (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4507988>). *PLOS ONE*. **10** (7) e0133193. Bibcode:2015PLoSO..1033193K (<https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2015PLoSO..1033193K>). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0133193 (<https://doi.org/10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0133193>). PMC 4507988 (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4507988>). PMID 26193099 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26193099>).
49. Beutel; Johnson (2004). "Gender and prosocial values during adolescence: A research note". *Sociological Quarterly*. **45** (2): 379–393. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.2004.tb00017.x (<https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fj.1533-8525.2004.tb00017.x>). S2CID 145133676 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:145133676>).
50. Eagly (2009). "The his and hers of prosocial behavior: An examination of the social psychology of gender". *American Psychologist*. **64** (8): 644–658. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.64.8.644 (<https://doi.org/10.1037%2F0003-066x.64.8.644>). PMID 19899859 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19899859>).
51. Leslie, Snyder; Glomb (2012). "Who gives? Multilevel effects of gender and ethnicity on workplace charitable giving". *Journal of Applied Psychology*. **98** (1): 49–63. doi:10.1037/a0029943 (<https://doi.org/10.1037%2Fa0029943>). PMID 22985116 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22985116>).
52. Parke R, Gauvain M, Schmuckler, M. Child Development: A contemporary view point, McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 2010, pages=552–553
53. Zahn-Waxler, C, Radke-Yarrow, M, Wagner, E, Chapman, M (January 1992). "Development of concern for others". *Developmental Psychology*. **28** (1): 126–136. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.28.1.126 (<https://doi.org/10.1037%2F0012-1649.28.1.126>). ProQuest 618116441 (<https://www.proquest.com/docview/618116441>).

54. Bouchard C, Cloutier R, Gravel F, Sutton A (May 2008). "The role of language skills in perceived prosociality in kindergarten boys and girls". *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*. **5** (3): 338–357. doi:10.1080/17405620600823744 (<https://doi.org/10.1080%2F17405620600823744>). S2CID 143183230 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:143183230>). ProQuest 621963112 (<https://www.proquest.com/docview/621963112>).
55. Eisenberg, 1991
56. Bryan, CJ, Master, A, & Walton, GM. (2014). "'Helping' Versus 'Being a Helper': Invoking the Self to Increase Helping in Young Children". *Child Development*. **85** (5): 1836–42. doi:10.1111/cdev.12244 (<https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fcdev.12244>). PMID 24779480 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24779480>).
57. Nantel-Vivier, Amelie; Katja Kokko; Gian Vittorio Caprara; Concetta Pastorelli; Maria Grazia Gerbino; Marinella Paciello; Sylvana Côté; Robert O. Pihl; Frank Vitaro; Richard E. Tremblay (January 12, 2009). "Prosocial development from childhood to adolescence: a multi-informant perspective with Canadian and Italian longitudinal studies". *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. **50** (5): 590–598. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2008.02039.x (<https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fj.1469-7610.2008.02039.x>). PMID 19207631 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19207631>).
58. Cirimele, F; Concetta; Chiara; Zuffiano; Thartori; Gerbino; Di Guinta; Bacchini; Oburu; Skinner; Sorbring; Steinberg; Tirado; Yotanyamaneewong; Alampay (2024). "The development of prosocial behavior from late childhood to adolescence: a longitudinal and multicultural study" (<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/developmental-psychology/articles/10.3389/fdpsy.2024.1472589/full>).
59. Carlo, Gustavo; Lisa J. Crockett; Jennifer M. Wolff; Sarah J. Beal (November 2012). "The Role of Emotional Reactivity, Self-regulation, and Puberty in Adolescents' Prosocial Behaviors" (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5356224>). *Social Development*. **21** (4): 667–685. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9507.2012.00660.x (<https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fj.1467-9507.2012.00660.x>). PMC 5356224 (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5356224>). PMID 28316370 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28316370>).
60. "Learning by Observing and Pitching In Overview" (<https://web.archive.org/web/20181014001232/http://www.learningbyobservingandpitchingin.com/icp-overview-english>). Archived from the original on 14 October 2018. Retrieved 21 May 2014.
61. Gaskins, Suzanne (1999). *Children's Daily Lives in a Mayan Village*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. pp. 25–81.
62. Paradise, R.; Rogoff, B. (2009). "Side by side: Learning through observation and participation". *Ethos*. **37**: 102–138. doi:10.1111/j.1548-1352.2009.01033.x (<https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fj.1548-1352.2009.01033.x>).
63. Yeager, David S.; Henderson, Marlone D.; Paunesku, David; Walton, Gregory M.; D'Mello, Sidney; Spitzer, Brian J.; Duckworth, Angela Lee (October 2014). "Boring but important: A self-transcendent purpose for learning fosters academic self-regulation" (https://www.perts.net/static/documents/yeager_2014.pdf) (PDF). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. **107** (4): 559–580. doi:10.1037/a0037637 (<https://doi.org/10.1037%2Fa0037637>). PMC 4643833 (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4643833>). PMID 4643833 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/4643833>). Retrieved 27 February 2023.
64. Markus, Hazel Rose; Kitayama, Shinobu (2010). "Cultures and Selves". *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. **5** (4): 420–30. doi:10.1177/1745691610375557 (<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1745691610375557>). PMID 26162188 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26162188>). S2CID 7533754 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:7533754>).
65. Rogoff, Barbara; Callanan, Maureen; Gutiérrez, Kris D; Erickson, Frederick (2016). "The Organization of Informal Learning". *Review of Research in Education*. **40**: 356–401. doi:10.3102/0091732x16680994 (<https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0091732x16680994>). S2CID 149239534 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:149239534>).

66. Kember, David; Ho, Amber; Hong, Celina (2008). "The importance of establishing relevance in motivating student learning". *Active Learning in Higher Education*. **9** (3): 249. doi:10.1177/1469787408095849 (<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1469787408095849>). S2CID 145188628 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:145188628>).
67. Jessica Stillman (6 February 2025). "DOGE Confiscated a 'Be Kind' Desk Sign. Here's All the Science Showing Kindness Increases Success" (<https://www.inc.com/jessica-stillman/do-ge-confiscated-a-be-kind-desk-sign-heres-all-the-science-showing-kindness-increases-success/91143733>). *Inc.* Retrieved 9 February 2025.
68. Crowley, M. (2016), "Neoliberalism, Managerial Citizenship Behaviors, and Firm Fiscal Performance", A Gedenkschrift to Randy Hodson: Working with Dignity (Research in the Sociology of Work, Vol. 28), Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Leeds, pp. 213-232. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0277-283320160000028014>
69. Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(1), 122–141. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013079>
70. Wilson, Barbara J. (2008). "Media and Children's Aggression, Fear, and Altruism" (<https://web.archive.org/web/20111024015332/http://www.princeton.edu/futureofchildren/publications/journals/article/index.xml?journalid=32&articleid=58§ionid=271&submit>). *Children and Electronic Media*. **18** (1): 87–118. doi:10.1353/foc.0.0005 (<https://doi.org/10.1353%2Ffoc.0.0005>). PMID 21338007 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21338007>). S2CID 7712430 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:7712430>). Archived from the original (<http://www.princeton.edu/futureofchildren/publications/journals/article/index.xml?journalid=32&articleid=58§ionid=271&submit>) on 2011-10-24. Retrieved 2011-07-18.
71. Ostrov, Jamie M.; Gentile, Douglas A.; Crick, Nicki R. (2003). "Media, Aggression and Prosocial Behavior" (http://drdouglass.org/drpdfs/Ostrov_Gentile_Crick_in_press.pdf) (PDF). *Social Development*.
72. Greitemeyer, Tobias; Osswald, Silvia (2010). "Effects of prosocial video games on prosocial behavior" (<http://www.psychology.iastate.edu/faculty/caa/abstracts/2005-2009/09GAYISMSLKBHS.pdf>) (PDF). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. **98** (2): 211–21. doi:10.1037/a0016997 (<https://doi.org/10.1037%2Fa0016997>). PMID 20085396 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20085396>).
73. Tear, Morgan; Nielson, Mark (2013). "Failure to Demonstrate That Playing Violent Video Games Diminishes Prosocial Behavior" (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3700923>). *PLOS ONE*. **8** (7) e68382. Bibcode:2013PLoSO...868382T (<https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2013PLoSO...868382T>). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0068382 (<https://doi.org/10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0068382>). PMC 3700923 (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3700923>). PMID 23844191 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23844191>).
74. Ferguson, Christopher; Garza, Adolfo (2011). "Call of (civic) duty: Action games and civic behavior in a large sample of youth". *Computers in Human Behavior*. **27** (2): 770–775. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2010.10.026 (<https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.chb.2010.10.026>).
75. Strabhaar, Joseph. LaRose, Robert. Davenport, Lucinda. "Media Now." Enhanced 6th ed. Chapter 13, p. 427.
76. Faincourt, D. (2019). What is the evidence on the role of the arts in improving health and well-being? A scoping review. World Health Organization. Available at: <https://www.euro.who.int/en/publications/abstracts/what-is-the-evidence-on-the-role-of-the-arts-in-improving-health-and-well-being-a-scoping-review-2019>
77. van de Vyver, J., and Abrams, D. (2018). The arts as a catalyst for human prosociality and cooperation. *Soc. Psychol. Personal. Sci.* **9**, 664–674. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617720275>

78. Grignoli, Nicola; Filipponi, Chiara; Petrocchi, Serena (2022-10-20). "Eliciting empathetic drives to prosocial behavior during stressful events" (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9632620>). *Frontiers in Psychology*. **13** 963544. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2022.963544 (<https://doi.org/10.3389%2Fpsyg.2022.963544>). ISSN 1664-1078 (<https://search.worldcat.org/issn/1664-1078>). PMC 9632620 (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9632620>). PMID 36337517 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36337517>).
79. François Matarasso. *A Restless Art: How participation won, and why it matters*. 2019. Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation. ISBN 978-1903080207. <https://arestlessart.com/the-book/download-a-digital-copy/>
80. Ariely, Dan; Bracha, Anat; Meier, Stephan (2009). "Doing Good or Doing Well? Image Motivation and Monetary Incentives in Behaving Prosocially". *The American Economic Review*. **99** (1): 544–555. CiteSeerX 10.1.1.379.4701 (<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.379.4701>). doi:10.1257/aer.99.1.544 (<https://doi.org/10.1257%2Faer.99.1.544>). S2CID 3001131 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:3001131>).
81. manish dahiya,(December,2019).A sample of the self learning course on Advance Personality Development, for individuals who are striving to better their life and unleash their true potential.<https://advancepersonalitydevelopment.blogspot.com/%7C>
82. "Is Extraordinary Prosocial Behavior More Valuable Than Ordinary Prosocial Behavior?" (<http://libraryproxy.tulsacc.edu:2096/ehost/detail/detail?vid=9&sid=56ee3e19-0d0c-47eb-8169-24dd1d43295b%40pdc-v-sessmgr02&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#AN=129236094&db=aph>).
83. Baumeister, R. F.; Stillwell, A. M.; Heatherton, T. F. (1994). "Guilt: An interpersonal approach". *Psychological Bulletin*. **115** (2): 243–267. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.115.2.243 (<https://doi.org/10.1037%2F0033-2909.115.2.243>). PMID 8165271 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/8165271>). S2CID 11239345 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:11239345>).
84. Tangney, J. P.; Stuewig, J.; Mashek, D. J. (2007). "Moral emotions and moral behavior" (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3083636>). *Annual Review of Psychology*. **58**: 345–372. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070145 (<https://doi.org/10.1146%2Fannurev.psych.56.091103.070145>). PMC 3083636 (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3083636>). PMID 16953797 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16953797>).
85. Ilona (2012). "The exemplary social emotion guilt: Not so relationship-oriented when another person repairs for you". *Cognition and Emotion*. **26** (7): 1189–1207. doi:10.1080/02699931.2011.640663 (<https://doi.org/10.1080%2F02699931.2011.640663>). PMID 22394129 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22394129>). S2CID 22747239 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:22747239>).
86. Lysenstøen, Christoffer; Bøe, Tormod; Hjetland, Gunnhild Johnsen; Skogen, Jens Christoffer (2021). "A Review of the Relationship Between Social Media Use and Online Prosocial Behavior Among Adolescents" (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8506009>). *Frontiers in Psychology*. **12**. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.579347 (<https://doi.org/10.3389%2Fpsyg.2021.579347>). ISSN 1664-1078 (<https://search.worldcat.org/issn/1664-1078>). PMC 8506009 (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8506009>). PMID 34650462 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34650462>).
87. Erreygers, Sara; Vandebosch, Heidi; Vranjes, Ivana; Baillien, Elfi; De Witte, Hans (2018-01-30). "Development of a measure of adolescents' online prosocial behavior" (<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17482798.2018.1431558>). *Journal of Children and Media*: 1–17. doi:10.1080/17482798.2018.1431558 (<https://doi.org/10.1080%2F17482798.2018.1431558>). hdl:10067/1482140151162165141 (<https://hdl.handle.net/10067%2F1482140151162165141>). ISSN 1748-2798 (<https://search.worldcat.org/issn/1748-2798>). S2CID 148725122 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:148725122>).
88. Gale, Cheryl Social Media Influence in Japanese Relief (<http://www.business2community.com/social-media/social-media-influence-in-japanese-relief-019459>). business2community.com. March 16, 2011

89. George; Brief (1992). "Feeling Good-Doing Good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship". *Psychological Bulletin*. **112** (2): 310–329. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.112.2.310 (<https://doi.org/10.1037%2F0033-2909.112.2.310>). PMID 1454897 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/1454897>).
90. Snippe, E.; et al. (2017). "The Reciprocity of Prosocial Behavior and Positive Affect in Daily Life" ([https://research.rug.nl/en/publications/the-reciprocity-of-prosocial-behavior-and-positiv e-affect-in-daily-life\(95256165-ae50-482b-84f9-31b49152693c\).html](https://research.rug.nl/en/publications/the-reciprocity-of-prosocial-behavior-and-positiv-e-affect-in-daily-life(95256165-ae50-482b-84f9-31b49152693c).html)). *Journal of Personality*. **86** (2): 139–146. doi:10.1111/jopy.12299 (<https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fjopy.12299>). hdl:11370/95256165-ae50-482b-84f9-31b49152693c (<https://hdl.handle.net/11370%2F95256165-ae50-482b-84f9-31b49152693c>). PMID 28093772 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28093772>). S2CID 3737616 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:3737616>).
91. Schwartz, C. E.; Meisenhelder, J. B.; Yusheng, A.; Reed, G. (2003). "Altruistic social interest behaviors are associated with better mental health" (<http://www.psychosomaticmedicine.org/content/65/5/778.long>). *Psychosomatic Medicine*. **65** (5): 778–785. doi:10.1097/01.psy.0000079378.39062.d4 (<https://doi.org/10.1097%2F01.psy.0000079378.39062.d4>). PMID 14508020 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/14508020>). S2CID 20644442 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:20644442>).
92. Rietschlin, J (1998). "Voluntary association membership and psychological distress". *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. **39** (4): 348–355. doi:10.2307/2676343 (<https://doi.org/10.2307%2F2676343>). JSTOR 2676343 (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/2676343>). PMID 9919856 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9919856>).
93. Wilson, J.; Musick, M. (1999). "The effects of volunteering on the volunteer" (<https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/lcp/vol62/iss4/7>). *Law and Contemporary Problems*. **62** (4): 141–168. doi:10.2307/1192270 (<https://doi.org/10.2307%2F1192270>). JSTOR 1192270 (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/1192270>).
94. Roos, S., Hodges, E.V.E., & Salmivalli, C. (2013). Do Guilt- and Shame-Proneness Differentially Predict Prosocial, Aggressive, and Withdrawn Behaviors During Adolescence? *Developmental Psychology*
95. Ketelaar, T.; Au, W. T. (2003). "The effects of guilt on the behaviour of uncooperative individuals in repeated social bargaining games: An affect-as-information interpretation of the role of emotion in socialinteraction". *Cognition & Emotion*. **17** (3): 429–453. doi:10.1080/02699930143000662 (<https://doi.org/10.1080%2F02699930143000662>). PMID 29715746 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29715746>). S2CID 20885866 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:20885866>).
96. Nelissen, R. M. A.; Dijker, A. J.; De Vries, N. K. (2007). "How to turn a hawk into a dove and vice versa: Interactions between emotions and goals in a give-some dilemma game". *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. **43** (2): 280–286. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2006.01.009 (<https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.jesp.2006.01.009>).
97. Alden; Trew (2013). "If it makes you happy: Engaging in kind acts increases positive affect in socially anxious individuals". *Emotion*. **13** (1): 64–75. doi:10.1037/a0027761 (<https://doi.org/10.1037%2Fa0027761>). PMID 22642341 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22642341>).
98. Heingartner, Douglas (2021-05-27). "Helping others also helps yourself: these studies explain why" (<https://www.psychnewsdaily.com/new-study-shows-that-helping-others-also-helps-yourself/>). *PsychNewsDaily*. Retrieved 2021-07-16.
99. Piff, PK.; Dietze, P; Feinberg, M; Stancato, DM; Keltner, D. (2015). "Awe, the small self, and prosocial behavior". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. **108** (6): 883–899. doi:10.1037/pspi0000018 (<https://doi.org/10.1037%2Fpspi0000018>). PMID 25984788 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25984788>). S2CID 992237 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:992237>).
100. Cleckley, H. (1941). The mask of sanity; an attempt to reinterpret the so-called psychopathic personality.
101. Cleckley, H. (1976). The mask of sanity 5th ed. St. Louis, MO: Mosby.

102. Benning, S. D., Patrick, C. J., Hicks, B. M., Blonigen, D. M., & Krueger, R. F. (2003). "Factor Structure of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory: Validity and Implications for Clinical Assessment". *Psychological Assessment*. **15** (3): 340–350. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.15.3.340 (<https://doi.org/10.1037%2F1040-3590.15.3.340>). PMID 14593834 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/14593834>).
103. Hare, R. D., Harpur, T. J., Hakstian, A. R., Forth, A. E., Hart, S. D., & Newman, J. P. (1990). "The revised Psychopathy Checklist: Reliability and factor structure". *Psychological Assessment*. **2** (3): 338–341. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.2.3.338 (<https://doi.org/10.1037%2F1040-3590.2.3.338>).
104. Blonigen, D. M., Hicks, B. M., Krueger, R. F., Patrick, C. J., & Iacono, W. G. (2005). "Psychopathic personality traits: Heritability and genetic overlap with internalizing and externalizing psychopathology" (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2242349>). *Psychological Medicine*. **35** (5): 637–648. doi:10.1017/S0033291704004180 (<https://doi.org/10.1017%2FS0033291704004180>). PMC 2242349 (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2242349>). PMID 15918340 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15918340>).
105. Jonason, P. K., Li, N. P., Webster, G. D., & Schmitt, D. P. (2009). "The dark triad: Facilitating a short-term mating strategy in men". *European Journal of Personality*. **23** (1): 5–18. CiteSeerX 10.1.1.650.5749 (<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.650.5749>). doi:10.1002/per.698 (<https://doi.org/10.1002%2Fper.698>). S2CID 12854051 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:12854051>).
106. Hare, R. D. (2006). "Psychopathy: A Clinical and Forensic Overview". *J Psychiatric Clinics of North America*. **29** (3): 709–724. doi:10.1016/j.psc.2006.04.007 (<https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.psc.2006.04.007>). PMID 16904507 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16904507>).
107. Skeem, J. L., & Cooke, D. J. (2010). "Is criminal behavior a central component of psychopathy? Conceptual directions for resolving the debate" ([https://web.archive.org/web/20120801025701/http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/Skeembackgrpaper1\(2\).pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20120801025701/http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/Skeembackgrpaper1(2).pdf)) (PDF). *Psychological Assessment*. **22** (2): 433–445. doi:10.1037/a0008512 (<https://doi.org/10.1037%2Fa0008512>). PMID 20528069 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20528069>). Archived from the original (<http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/Skeembackgrpaper1%282%29.pdf>) (PDF) on 2012-08-01. Retrieved 2012-01-08.
108. Hare, R. D., & Neumann, C. S. (2010). "The role of antisociality in the psychopathy construct: Comment on Skeem and Cooke (2010)". *Psychological Assessment*. **22** (2): 446–454. doi:10.1037/a0013635 (<https://doi.org/10.1037%2Fa0013635>). PMID 20528070 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20528070>).
109. Skeem, J. L., & Cooke, D. J. (2010). "One measure does not a construct make: Directions toward reinvigorating psychopathy research—reply to Hare and Neumann (2010)". *Psychological Assessment*. **22** (2): 455–459. doi:10.1037/a0014862 (<https://doi.org/10.1037%2Fa0014862>). PMID 20528071 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20528071>).
110. Benning, S. D., Patrick, C. J., Blonigen, D. M., Hicks, B. M., & Iacono, W. G. (2005). "Estimating facets of psychopathy from normal personality traits" (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2242356>). *Assessment*. **12** (1): 3–18. doi:10.1177/1073191104271223 (<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1073191104271223>). PMC 2242356 (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2242356>). PMID 15695739 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15695739>).
111. Edens, J. F., Marcus, D. K., Lilienfeld, S. O., & Poythress Jr, N. G. (2006). "Psychopathic, not psychopath: Taxometric evidence for the dimensional structure of psychopathy". *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. **115** (1): 131–44. doi:10.1037/0021-843X.115.1.131 (<https://doi.org/10.1037%2F0021-843X.115.1.131>). PMID 16492104 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16492104>). S2CID 19223010 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:19223010>).

112. Marsh, A. A., Kozak, M. N., & Ambady, N. (2007). "Accurate identification of fear facial expressions predicts prosocial behavior" (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2743452>). *Emotion*. **7** (2): 239–51. doi:10.1037/1528-3542.7.2.239 (<https://doi.org/10.1037%2F1528-3542.7.2.239>). PMC 2743452 (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2743452>). PMID 17516803 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17516803>).
113. Masui, K., Iriguchi, S., Nomura, M., & Ura, M. (2011). "Amount of altruistic punishment accounts for subsequent emotional gratification in participants with primary psychopathy". *Personality and Individual Differences*. **16** (7): 44. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2011.07.006 (<https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.paid.2011.07.006>).
114. Bartels, D. M., & Pizarro, D. A. (2011). "The mismeasure of morals: Antisocial personality traits predict utilitarian responses to moral dilemmas" (<http://leeds-faculty.colorado.edu/mcgrawp/PDF/BartelsPizarro.2011.pdf>) (PDF). *Cognition*. **121** (1): 154–61. doi:10.1016/j.cognition.2011.05.010 (<https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.cognition.2011.05.010>). PMID 21757191 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21757191>). S2CID 6942897 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:6942897>).
115. Keltner, Dacher; Kogan, Aleksandr; Piff, Paul K; Saturn, Sarina R (2014). "The Sociocultural Appraisals, Values, and Emotions (SAVE) Framework of Prosociality: Core Processes from Gene to Meme". *Annual Review of Psychology*. **65**: 425–60. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115054 (<https://doi.org/10.1146%2Fannurev-psych-010213-115054>). PMID 24405363 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24405363>).
116. Roman, LA; Lindsay, JK; Moore, JS; Shoemaker, AL (1999). "Community health workers: examining the Helper Therapy principle". *Public Health Nurs*. **16** (2): 87–95. doi:10.1046/j.1525-1446.1999.00087.x (<https://doi.org/10.1046%2Fj.1525-1446.1999.00087.x>). PMID 10319658 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10319658>).
117. Greidanus, E; Overall, RD (2010). "Helper therapy in an online suicide prevention community". *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*. **38** (2): 191–204. doi:10.1080/03069881003600991 (<https://doi.org/10.1080%2F03069881003600991>). S2CID 145613511 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:145613511>).
118. Passini, Stefano; Davide Morselli (2011). "In the Name of Democracy: Disobedience and Value-oriented Citizenship". *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*. **21** (3): 255–267. doi:10.1002/casp.1091 (<https://doi.org/10.1002%2Fcasp.1091>).
119. Baert, Stijn; Sunčica Vujić (2016). "Does it Pay to Care? Prosocial Engagement and Employment Opportunities" (<http://ftp.iza.org/dp9649.pdf>) (PDF). *IZA Discussion Paper Series*. **9649**. Retrieved 27 February 2016.

Further reading

- Biglan, Anthony (2015). *The Nurture Effect: How the Science of Human Behavior Can Improve Our Lives and Our World*. New Harbinger, Oakland, California.
- Eisenberg, Nancy; Paul Henry Mussen (1989). *The Roots of Prosocial Behavior in Children*. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-33771-7.
- Muus, Harriet (12 August 2024). "Evolutionary Ethics and Mate Selection" (<https://osf.io/preprints/psyarxiv/c659q>). *PsyArXiv*. Center for Open Science. doi:10.31234/osf.io/c659q (<https://doi.org/10.31234%2Fosf.io%2Fc659q>).
- Paciello, M; Fida R; Cerniglia L; Tramontano C; Cole E (2013). "High cost helping scenario: The role of empathy, prosocial reasoning and moral disengagement on helping behavior". *Personality and Individual Differences*. **55**: 3–7. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2012.11.004 (<https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.paid.2012.11.004>).
- Patrick, Christopher J. (2006). *Handbook of the psychopathy*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Penner, Louis A; Dovidio, John F; Piliavin, Jane A; Schroeder, David A (2005). "Prosocial Behavior: Multilevel Perspectives". *Annual Review of Psychology*. **56**: 365–92.

doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070141 (<https://doi.org/10.1146%2Fannurev.psych.56.091103.070141>). PMID 15709940 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15709940/>).

- Prosocial Behavior. Excerpt from "More about Generosity: An Addendum to the Generosity, Social Psychology and Philanthropy Literature Reviews" (<https://web.archive.org/web/20111006125558/http://generosityresearch.nd.edu/publications-2/literature-reviews/prosocial-behavior/>), University of Notre Dame, July 7, 2009
- Zimmerman, Barbara J.; Gary D. Levy (2000). "Social Cognitive Predictors of Prosocial Behavior toward Same and Alternate Race Children among White Pre-schoolers.(Statistical Data Included)". *Current Psychology*. **19** (3): 175. doi:10.1007/s12144-000-1014-8 (<https://doi.org/10.1007%2Fs12144-000-1014-8>). S2CID 144309649 (<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:144309649>).

External links

- Prosocial Behavior Page (<https://web.archive.org/web/20111007181424/http://nccic.acf.hhs.gov/taxonomy/term/1166>), US Dept. of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families
- Prosocial Behavior (https://web.archive.org/web/20110811015452/http://psychwiki.com/wiki/Prosocial_Behavior), PsychWiki.com
- Informational Report describing prosocial behaviour (<https://learningtogive.org/resources/prosocial-behavior>)
- NPR interview with commentary on prosocial behavior from David Sloan Wilson (<https://npr.org/2011/08/28/140017376/can-evolution-breed-better-communities>), Aug. 28, 2011, 7 min.
- The Greater Good Institute: Research on Altruism, Empathy and Prosocial Behavior (<https://greatergood.berkeley.edu/resources/studies#>)
- Changing Minds (http://changingminds.org/explanations/theories/prosocial_behavior.htm)
- The Evolution Institute (<https://evolution-institute.org>)

Retrieved from "https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Prosocial_behavior&oldid=1345360837"