

## ASSESSMENT OF PROSOCIAL-ALTRUISTIC BEHAVIOR OF MEMBERS AND NON-MEMBERS OF THE SCOUT MOVEMENT

M. Rosario Ruiz-Olivares;\* M<sup>a</sup> José Pino;\*\* Javier Herruzo;\*\*\*

\*Dr. M. Rosario Ruiz-Olivares; Assistant Professor of the University of Cordoba.

TLF: 957-212093. FAX: 957-212513.

E-MAIL: rosario.ruiz@uco.es

\*\*Dr. M<sup>a</sup> José Pino Osuna ; Full Professor of the University of Cordoba.

E-MAIL: mjpino@uco.es

\*\*\*Dr. Javier Herruzo Cabrera; Chair Professor of the University of Cordoba.

E-MAIL: jherruzo@uco.es

\* Correspondence: Area of Personality, Psychological Evaluation and Treatment. Department of Psychology. Faculty of Education Sciences. University of Cordoba, C/ San Alberto Magno, s/n., 14071-Córdoba. (Spain)

### ABSTRACT:

The aim of this study is to evaluate the differences in pro-social altruistic behaviour between children and young students who belong to the scout movement, and those who do not belong to this or any other similar movement. The pro-social altruistic behaviour has been assessed with questionnaires for school: self-evaluation, teacher, classmate and parents. By means of a Prospective Design of case-control, every *scout* has been compared with another *non scout*) equalled in variables like age, number of siblings, whether he/she is the oldest, the youngest, etc., sex, the order between the siblings, if the mother works inside or outside the home, and he/she lives to their two parents. The results show that significant differences exist between one group and another in the questionnaires of self-evaluation, for the teacher and for the classmate. It seems that children and young people who are scout members are better assessed than them *non scouts* in pro-social altruistic behaviour.

*Keywords: altruism, prosocial-altruistic behavior, Scout movement, leisure activities, factors, childhood, adolescence.*

Frequent media reports of gender-based violence, domestic violence, peer violence, mobbing, and related phenomena, make it seem as though violence has become a normal occurrence in our society. This social concern has been reflected not only in the media but also in the scientific community, which has produced a great deal of research on this topic over the last two decades. If we were to place violence at one end of a continuum, then at the other end we would find selflessness, altruism, generosity, and solidarity, behaviors that undoubtedly are of interest to society to the extent that they counteract violence. The question then becomes: how does one define altruistic behavior? From a scientific standpoint, altruistic behavior is any behavior performed with the intention of benefiting others without any expectation of being compensated in the near or distant future (Batson & Powell, 2003; González, 1992; López, et al., 1993, 1994a; Moñivas, 1996). However, given the difficulty of defining intentionality, some authors later proposed the term “prosocial behavior”, defined as behavior that is performed voluntarily and benefits others, regardless of whether the intention to benefit others is present (Batson & Powell, 2003; Miller, Bernzweig, Eisenberg, & Fabes, 1995; Molero, Candela & Cortés, 1999; Moñivas, 1996; Penner, Dovidio, Pilliavin & Schroeder, 2005). Finally, given this conceptual dichotomy, plus the difficulty of assessing the ultimate intention of the performer of an altruistic act and the excessive generality of the term prosocial, some authors proposed the term “prosocial-altruistic behavior” (Fuentes, et al., 1993; López, et al., 1994a; Ortiz, et al., 1993). According to Fuentes, et al. (1993), prosocial-altruistic behavior is prosocial behavior that satisfies the observable requirements of altruistic behavior plus the following criteria:

- 1) The behavior benefits another person; 2) it is voluntary; 3) the beneficiary of the act is well-defined, thereby excluding cases in which a third-party happens to

benefit; 4) the performer of the act does not expect to receive any external benefit from the act (p. 75).

This type of behavior is difficult to study not only because of the difficulty of conceptualizing it, but also because of the nature of the variables that may foster and maintain it. One of the contributing factors of prosocial-altruistic behavior that has appeared most consistently in the literature is socialization, a process during which a person internalizes and learns a large number of behaviors, including prosocial-altruistic behavior (Garaigordobil, 2003; Ma, Chang & Shek, 2007; Maganto, 1994; Martorell, González, Aloy & Ferris, 1995; Mestre, Samper, Tur & Diez, 2001; Mestre, Tur & Del Barrio, 2004). This area of research has studied the manner in which the socializing context may promote prosocial-altruistic behavior, and the extent to which significant persons in this context value such behavior. Family and school stand out as socializing contexts that are directly involved in educating children (Garaigordobil, 2003; Ma, et al., 2007; Maganto, 1994; Mestre, et al., 2001; Mestre, et al., 2004). Some studies have found that certain characteristics of parents and parent behavior increase the probability that prosocial-altruistic behavior will develop in their children. For example, parents who allow for security of attachment (López, 1993, 1998; Ortiz, et al., 1993, López, et al., 1998); who strongly insist that their children avoid harming others and that they repair any harm done (Ceballos & Garrido, 1998; Hallmark, Beck, Downs, Kattar & Uriburu, 2003; Ma, 2003); who are models of altruism in their social interactions (Gorman-Smith, Tolan, Henry & Florsheim, 2000; Zahn-Waxler, Cummings, McKenw & Radke-Yarrow, 1984); who reinforce with social approval spontaneous acts of sharing, helping, and cooperating (Caro, Frias, Maturana, Quiroz & Rioseco, 2000; Dunn, 1983; Dunn y Kendrick, 1982; Lamb, 1982; Rehberg & Richman, 1989); and those who use an inductive style of discipline in which the reasons behind rules are

explained to the child (Ceballos & Garrido, 1998; Garaigordobil, 1994, 2003; López, 1993; López, et al., 1994b; Mestre, et al, 2004; Mestre, Tur, Samper, Nácher & Cortés, 2007); probably foster more prosocial-altruistic behavior in their children than parents who do not act in these ways. Other studies have found that siblings, too, have a significant effect on the development of one's prosocial-altruistic behavior, with number of siblings and birth order being key factors (Dunn & Kendrick, 1982; Dunn, 1983). Children with siblings appear to be more prosocial-altruistic than those without siblings, and among the former group older siblings appear to be more prosocial-altruistic than middle or younger siblings (Dunn & Kendrick, 1982; Dunn, 1983; Caro, et al., 2000).

School may also promote the learning of prosocial-altruistic behavior. In this context, the personal characteristics of teachers and their classroom manner have interactive effects on the learning of prosocial-altruistic behavior (Birch & Ladd, 1998; Garaigordobil, 2003; McClellan & Katz, 2001). In addition, interactions among peers may be an important variable in this learning process (Eisenberg, Cameron, Tryon & Dodez, 1981; Farver & Husby, 1994 Eisenberg, Cameron, Tryon & Dodez, 1981; Farver & Husby, 1994).

However, in our society, education does not occur only in formal contexts such as in the family and school, but also in informal contexts and in the network of social relationships that the child develops. For example, participation in extracurricular activities, especially those involving community service, appears to be related to academic achievement, school engagement, educational aspirations, high resilience, and low depression (Eccles & Barber, 1999; Mahoney, Schweder & Stattin, 2002; Eccles, Barber, Stone & Hunt, 2003; Fredricks & Eccles, 2005; Fredricks & Eccles, 2006). A noteworthy study in this regard is that of Tidwell (2005), who found that adults who

voluntarily participated in and identified with a nonprofit organization showed higher levels of prosocial-altruistic behavior. Another relevant study is that of Fredricks and Eccles (2008), who compared the consequences, in adolescents, of participating in sports-oriented and civically-oriented extracurricular activities. The authors found that the latter were more strongly related to prosocial-altruistic behavior. However, further studies are necessary to compare the prosocial-altruistic behavior of youth who engage in extracurricular activities with that of youth who do not engage in such activities at all (Fredricks & Eccles, 2008).

Historically, private groups dedicated to volunteer service have always existed, such as the Red Cross, a number of religious groups (Hardy & Carlo, 2005; Ji, Pendergraft & Perry, 2006; Tidwell, 2005), and the Scout movement (Castillo, 2001). At present no studies have compared the prosocial-altruistic behavior of youth who are members of these organizations with that of youth who are not members of such organizations. One of these organizations, the Scout movement, is a global movement having existed for over 100 years (founded in England in 1907 by Lord. Baden Powell) that aims to educate children and adolescents under a common value system (Baden Powell, 1983). The main objective of the movement is “to contribute to the education of young people, through a value system based on the Scout Promise and Law, to help build a better world where people are self-fulfilled as individuals and play a constructive role in society” ([scout.org/en/about\\_scouting/mission\\_vision/the\\_mission](http://scout.org/en/about_scouting/mission_vision/the_mission)). The wide age range of the members (6-21 years) provides stability to the value system, which makes it interesting to study the effect of such education on prosocial-altruistic behavior. Given that the objective of the Scout movement is to serve society by instilling values in youth, and that adult volunteers make the organization possible, it appears to possess the essential defining features of prosocial-altruistic behavior. For these reasons, we felt it

would be interesting to explore the extent to which child and adolescent members of the Scout movement perform prosocial-altruistic behavior (outside the context of the Scout movement) compared to non-members. Thus, the aim of this study was to assess differences in the prosocial-altruistic behavior of primary/secondary school students who were members the Scout movement and those of similar characteristics who were not members of the Scout or any similar movement.

## **Method**

### *Participants*

The participants were 100 students between 6 and 17 years of age. Fifty participants were members of the Scout movement (Group 1, G1) and the other 50 were not members of the Scout or any similar type of association (Group 2, G2). Each participant in G1 was matched with a participant in the G2 features such as age, sex, number of siblings, birth order, and mother's place of work (at versus away from home). The complete selection procedure is described on page 7. The general characteristics of the sample based on the gender were that 34% were girls and 66% were boys, and as for the age, 24% were between 6-8 years, 26% of 9 -11 years, 26% between 12-14 years and 24% aged 15-17.

### *Instruments*

It was used a *Socio-demographic Questionnaire* developed for this study to collect information on sex, date of birth, school, Scout membership, length of Scout participation, number of siblings, birth order, and mother's place of work (at versus away from home).

To measure the participants' prosocial-altruistic behavior, we used a questionnaire battery developed by Roche (1998). The battery contained a self-assessment

questionnaire (Cronbach's alpha =  $\square$ 0.93) [e.g., *When I see somebody who is sad, I speak to and console the person for as long as necessary*]; a questionnaire for teachers (Cronbach's alpha = 0.96) [e.g., *Helps a peer with a physical disability (a broken arm/leg, an eye patch) perform difficult tasks*]; a questionnaire for peers (Cronbach's alpha =  $\square$ 0.92) [e.g., *approaches and sits next to a peer who is left out and supports him or her*]; and a questionnaire for parents (adapted from the questionnaire for teachers) (Cronbach's alpha for mothers = 0.92; Cronbach's alpha for fathers= 0.94;) [e.g., *helps a sibling or family member avoid dangerous situations (falling from a chair, slipping,...)*]. Each questionnaire has 40 items (except the questionnaire for the partner who only has ten items) and a Likert response scale (from 0 to 4). The author of the battery (Roche 1999) notes that the questionnaire includes ten dimensions or factors measured by four items each (Table 1): physical assistance, physical service, share, help verbal, verbal reassurance, confirmation and positive evaluation of the other, deep listening, empathy, solidarity, positive presence, and unity with the group.

### *Design*

The study used a prospective *ex post facto* design with a quasi control group (48), in which each boy and girl pertaining to the Scout group (G1) had a non-Scout control participant (G2) equaled on the variables described in the *Participants* section.

The independent variable (IV) was Scout membership status, with two levels: member, non-member. The dependent variables (DV) were levels of prosocial-altruistic behavior, as measured by the questionnaires developed by Roche (1998): self-assessment, questionnaire for teachers, questionnaire for peers, questionnaire for mother, and questionnaire for father.

### *Procedure*

We randomly chose one of the scout groups located in the province of Cordoba to serve as the pool from which we would select the G1 participants of our study. The chosen scout group had 95 members, 70 of whom fell into the age range of 6–18 years, and the group had the following characteristics: (1) the group belonged to the Scout Association of Andalusia-ASDE and the Scouting Federation of Spain; (2) it was located in Cordoba capital; and (3) it had been in existence for over 30 years. First, the participants who would enter the G1 of our study were selected based on their responses to the socio-demographic questionnaire. Prior to carrying out the selection process, we trained the scout leaders who would aid in collecting these data to consistently answer the respondents' questions in the same manner.

Second, the non-scout group (G2) was formed by visiting the school of each G1 participant and selecting a student who was not a member of the scout movement and who was of the same age and sex, had the same number of siblings and birth order, and whose mother had the same place of work (at versus away from home) as his or her scout counterpart. The non-scouts were matched with scouts on all these variables. This process required the participation of teachers who never disclosed the purpose of the study. The teachers administered the socio-demographic questionnaire to all their students, and out of all the students whose characteristics coincided with those of a given G1 member (sex, age, number of siblings, birth order, and workplace of the mother), one was randomly selected to be in the control group.

The prosocial–altruistic behavior questionnaires were administered by the first author over the course of 1 month. The questionnaire for peers was administered to the participants' classmates on which they rated the participant's behavior (both scouts and non-scouts). To avoid any bias that could stem from personal opinion, we administered the questionnaire to four randomly selected peers in the classroom, and in the statistical



analyses, the average was used. The questionnaires were completed in the presence of the experimenter, who provided the following instructions: (1) Be very honest; (2) Answer the questions by yourself and do not copy off anyone; (3) Do not answer out loud; and (4) If you do not understand a question, ask us before answering. The questionnaires for parents were administered and collected by the teachers, who also collected permission slips from parents and school directors giving us their consent to include the students in the study.

The permission slips expressed the researchers' interest in the students' participation and guaranteed the anonymity of the data. Parents and teachers were given the following instructions for completing the questionnaires: (1) If you know the answer to an item, you may write your answer; (2) If you are unsure of the answer to an item, observe the child's behavior for a few days before answering; (3) If after several days of observing you are still unsure of the answer, you may provoke the situation referred to in the item and observe the resulting behavior; and (4) Do not leave any items blank.

## **Results**

The purpose of this study was to assess differences in the prosocial-altruistic behavior of primary/secondary school students who were members the Scout movement and those of similar characteristics who were not members of the Scout or any similar movement. Table I presents a summary of the data from each questionnaire for the Scout and non-Scout groups. As shown in the table, those in the Scout group rated themselves, and were rated by their teacher and four peers, as more prosocial-altruistic than their non-Scout counterparts. An analysis of variance revealed these differences to be statistically significant: self-assessment,  $F(1,98)=2.139$ ,  $p<0,05$ ; questionnaire for teachers,  $F(1,98)=6.756$ ,  $p<0,05$ ; and the average of the four questionnaires for peers,

$F(1,98)= 4.727$ ;  $p < 0,05$ . No significant differences were revealed in the questionnaires for mothers and fathers.

(Insert Table I aprox. Here)

Table II displays the total average score of each of the 10 factors assessed in the five questionnaires (self-assessment, teacher, peers, father, mother). As shown in the table, an analysis of variance revealed that the Scout group scored higher than the non-Scout group on 7 out of the 10 factors: *Physical Help*, *Sharing*, *Verbal Help*, *Verbal Consoling*, *Empathy*, *Solidarity*, and *Positive Presence and Unity with the Group*. In the case of *Physical Service* and *Positively Affirming and Valuing Others*, the differences were statistically significant, but with the non-Scout group scoring higher. Finally, no significant differences were found on the factor *Deep Listening*.

(Insert Table II aprox. Here)

A factor analysis revealed that 8 out of the 10 factors explained 59.37% of the variance. These factors, and the variance explained by each, are shown in Table III. Although the eight factors together explained more than a sufficient percentage of the variance and each factor contributed to the model, the first two factors accounted for the bulk of the variance. Based on the rotated component matrix (see Table IV), the first factor consisted of 13 items explaining 12.23% of the variance, and the second factor consisted of 12 items explaining 11.23% of the variance. We labeled the factors, considering the items loading onto each, as follows: 1) Verbal consoling and being considerate of the group; 2) Solidarity with the group; 3) Knowing how to listen; 4) Physical help; 5) Fellowship; 6) Sharing; 7) Serving others; 8) Willfulness.

(Insert Table III and IV aprox. Here)

## **Discussion**

We found that children and adolescents belonging to the Scout movement scored higher than non-Scouts on prosocial-altruistic behavior. This difference was found after controlling for age, sex, number of siblings, birth order, and mother's place of work, thereby lending internal validity to our conclusion.

We observed a difference between Scouts and non-Scouts when the scores were reported by the participants' teacher or by four classmates, an important fact considering that the same judge (teacher or peer) was rating Scout as well as non-Scout participants, thereby reducing the influence of biases (biases that might be present in the self-assessment, father and mother reports). In line with previous studies, we believe it is reasonable to conclude that the Scout movement may have a positive effect on the prosocial-altruistic behavior of youth in their leisure time (Garaigordobil, 2003; Ma, et al., 2007; Martorell, et al., 1995; Mestre, et al., 2001; Mestre, et al., 2004; McClellan & Katz, 2001; Mahoney, et al., 2002). Keeping in mind that the Scout activities take place in an informal context, while the prosocial-altruistic behavior was assessed in the formal context of a school, it appears, in this case, that the prosocial-altruistic behavior generalized across contexts. It is likely that much of the behavior occurring in the context of the Scout movement is similar to that occurring at school, and vice versa, which may facilitate the extrapolation of prosocial-altruistic behavior patterns, and produce the observed difference between Scouts and non-Scouts in the classroom. However, given the correlational nature of the study, we could not rule out the possibility that the Scout members had acquired prosocial-altruistic behaviors before joining the Scout movement, or that these behaviors contributed to their initial interest in joining such an association.

It is noteworthy that, on the self-assessment questionnaire, Scouts rated themselves more positively than non-Scouts. Previous studies have shown that participation in

civically oriented leisure activities foster personal development, particularly in adolescents (Eccles & Barber, 1999; Mahoney, et al., 2002; Eccles, et al., 2003; Fredricks & Eccles, 2005; Fredricks & Eccles, 2006; Fredricks & Eccles, 2008). It may be that the type of education that young people receive in the context of the Scout movement, which aims to build cooperation, self-esteem, working in groups, etc., increases the likelihood of positive self-assessments. Interactions occurring in the family context could also influence the self-esteem of these youth. Certain factors related to this family context, still unidentified, might increase the likelihood of valuing and joining groups such as the Scout movement. All these factors have the potential to improve the self-view of these youth.

The concept of prosocial-altruistic behavior, as suggested by some authors, is multifactorial, including varied behaviors such as cooperation, sharing, solidarity, etc. (Batson & Powell, 2003; Moñivas, 1996; Roche, 1998, 1999). However, the literature has not offered any statistical support for this concept, so we felt it was appropriate to perform a factor analysis. The factor analysis suggested that prosocial-altruistic behavior is indeed characterized by *Verbal Consolation and Being Considerate of the Group, Solidarity with the Group, Knowing how to Listen, Physical Help, Fellowship, Sharing, Serving Others, and Willfulness*.

One of the limitations of this study was the possibility of social desirability effects in the responses to the questionnaires for parents, and perhaps social desirability effects may account for the lack of differences between Scouts and non-Scouts on this questionnaire. Future studies should consider including validity scales to assess honesty and social desirability effects, and eliminate these participants from the analysis.

In conclusion, this study has made makes a contribution on at least three fronts. First, we provided new empirical data on the effect that the Scout movement or related social

contexts may have on the prosocial-altruistic behavior of individuals between 6 and 18 years of age. Second, we examined the effect of informal activities performed by youth in their leisure time, which, as suggested by Fredricks and Eccles (2008), are important in the development of prosocial-altruistic behavior. Yet, no studies have compared this type of behavior in children and adolescents who participate in these types of activities versus those who do not (Fredricks & Eccles, 2008). Thus, the present study represents the first such study, to our knowledge. Finally, this study was conducted outside of the United States, an important fact considering that most studies on prosocial-altruistic behavior and participation in civically oriented leisure activities so far have been conducted in the United States (Eccles & Barber, 1999; Mahoney, et al., 2002; Eccles, et al., 2003; Fredricks & Eccles, 2005; Fredricks & Eccles, 2006, 2008).

Future research should explore the factors that might lead parents to encourage their children to join groups such as the Scout movement. It would be particularly interesting to assess the prosocial-altruistic behavior of the parents, given that parents may model such behavior inside the home. It would also be useful to develop tools adapted to the home context and to extracurricular contexts such as the Scout movement, in order to study which particular factors of the Scout movement might lead its children and adolescent members to display a greater number of prosocial-altruistic behaviors than children who do not belong to this movement or any similar movement. Longitudinal studies would be very helpful in this regard.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was funded partly by the Santa Maria Foundation Research Grant (Year 2000) (Beca de Investigación de la Fundación Santa María (SM), Convocatoria de 2000), a doctoral training grant (Beca de Formación de Personal Docente e investigador de la Junta de Andalucía, Convocatoria 2000), and the X Funding Program for Doctoral Research of the University of Cordoba (X Programa de Ayudas para la realización de Tesis Doctorales de la Universidad de Córdoba).

## References

- Baden Powell, R.S. Scouting for boys; 1989, 9<sup>o</sup> Edition. Available URL: <http://www.asde.scouts-es.net/extremadura/epm.pdf>.
- Batson C, Powell A. Altruism and prosocial behavior. In: Theodore M, Melvin L, (Editors). Handbook of Psychology: Personality and Social Psychology. New York: John Wiley y Sons, Inc. XIX; 2003.
- Birch SH, Ladd GW. Children's interpersonal behaviors and the teacher-child relationship. *Developmental Psychology* 1998; 34(5): 934-946.
- Caro R, Frias P, Maturana A, Quiroz E, Rioseco F. Psicología del desarrollo. Universidad del Desarrollo; 2000. Available URL: <http://www.geocities.com/heartland/faro/8810/investig/prosoc2.html>.
- Castillo Porras CM. El aprendizaje-servicio, una experiencia de Costa Rica. Escuela y Comunidad: La propuesta pedagógica del aprendizaje-servicio; 2001. Available: URL: [http://ftp.me.gov.ar/edusol/2001\\_actas\\_3y4.pdf](http://ftp.me.gov.ar/edusol/2001_actas_3y4.pdf)
- Ceballos E, Garrido MJ. Las metas y estrategias de socialización entre padres e hijos. In: Rodrigo MJ, Palacios J, editores. Familia y Desarrollo Humano. Madrid: Alianza Editorial; 1998.
- Duncan S, Duncan E, Strycker L, Chanmeton N. Relations between youth antisocial and prosocial activities. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine* 2002; 25(5): 425-438.
- Dunn J, Kendrick C. Siblings and Their Mothers: Developing Relationships within the Family. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 1982.
- Dunn J. Sibling relationships in early childhood. *Child Development* 1983; 54: 787-881.
- Eccles JS, Barber BL, Stone M, Hunt J. Extracurricular activities and adolescent development. *Journal of Social Issues* 2003; 59: 865-669.
- Eccles JS, Barber BL. Student council, volunteering, basketball, or marching band: What kinds of extracurricular involvement matters?. *Journal of Adolescent Research* 1999; 14: 10-43.
- Eisenberg N, Cameron E, Tryon K, Dodez R. Socialization of prosocial behavior in the preschool classroom. *Developmental psychology* 1981; 17: 773-782.
- Farver J, Husby W. Preschoolers prosocial responses to their peers' distress. *Developmental Psychology* 1994; 30(3): 334-341.

- Fredricks JA, Eccles JS. Developmental benefits of extracurricular involvement: Do peer characteristics mediate the link between activities and youth outcomes? *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 2005; 6: 507-520.
- Fredricks JA, Eccles JS. Is extracurricular participation associated with beneficial outcomes: Concurrent and longitudinal relations? *Developmental Psychology* 2006; 42: 698-713.
- Fredricks JA, Eccles JS. Participation in extracurricular activities in the middle school years: Are there developmental benefits for African American and European American Youth?. *Journal Youth Adolescence* 2008; 37: 1029-1043.
- Fuentes MJ, López F, Etxebarria I, Ledesma A, Ortiz MJ, Apodaca P. Empatía, role-taking y concepto de ser humano, como factores asociados a la conducta prosocial-altruista. *Infancia y Aprendizaje* 1993; 61: 73-87.
- Garaigordobil M. *Intervención psicológica para desarrollar la personalidad infantil*. Madrid: Editorial Pirámide; 2003.
- Garaigordobil M. Programas de acción para el desarrollo de la conducta altruista. In Garaigordobil M, Maganto C, editores. *Socialización y conducta prosocial en la infancia y en la adolescencia*. San Sebastián: Servicio Editorial, Universidad del País Vasco; 1994.
- González Portal MD. *Conducta Prosocial: Evaluación e Intervención*. Ed. Morata; 1992.
- Gorman-Smith D, Tolan P, Henry D, Florsheim P. Patterns of family functioning and adolescent outcomes among urban African-american and Mexican-american families. *Journal of Family Psychology* 2000; 14(3): 436-457.
- Hallmark M, Beck K, Downs T, Kattar C, Uriburu D. Family involvement, problem and prosocial behaviour outcomes of latino youth. *American Journal of Health Behavior* 2003; 27: 55-65.
- Hardy SA, Carlo G. Religiosity and prosocial behaviours in adolescence: the mediating role of prosocial values. *Journal of Moral Education* 2005; 34(2): 231-249.
- Ji CH, Pendergraft L, Perry M. Religiosity, altruism and altruistic hypocrisy: evidence from protestant adolescents. *Review of Religious Research* 2006; 48(2): 156-178.
- Lamb ME. Parent-infant interaction, attachment and socioemotional development in infancy. In Emde RN, Harmon RJ, editores. *The Development of Attachment and Affiliative Systems*. Nueva York: Plenum Press; 1982.

- López F, Apodaca P, Etxebarria I, Fuentes MJ, Ortiz MJ. Conducta prosocial en preescolares. *Infancia y Aprendizaje* 1998; 82: 45-61.
- López F, Apodaca P, Eceiza A, Etxebarria I, Fuentes MJ, Ortiz MJ. El altruismo. In Ortiz MJ, Yarnoz S, editores. *Teoría del apego y relaciones afectivas*. Servicio Editorial de la Universidad del País Vasco; 1993: 137-160.
- López F, Apodaca P, Eceiza A, Etxebarria I, Fuentes MJ, Ortiz MJ. Para comprender la conducta altruista. Navarra: Verbo Divino; 1994a.
- López F, Apodaca P, Eceiza A, Etxebarria I, Fuentes MJ, Ortiz MJ. Empatía, toma de perspectiva, imagen del ser humano, apego, disciplina y modelos parentales. In López F, editor. *Para comprender la conducta altruista*. Navarra: Verbo Divino; 1994b: 67-78.
- López F. Evolución de los vínculos de apego en las relaciones familiares. In Rodrigo MJ, Palacios J, editores. *Familia y desarrollo humano*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial; 1998.
- Ma HK, Chang PC, Shek D. The relation of prosocial orientation to peer interactions, family social environment and personality of Chinese adolescents. *International Journal of Behavioral Development* 2007; 31(1): 12-18.
- Ma KH. The relationship of the family social environment, peer influences, and peer relationships to altruistic orientation in Chinese children. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology* 2003; 164(3): 267-274.
- Maganto C. Influencia de la familia y la escuela en la socialización y la conducta prosocial. In Garaigordobil M, Maganto C, editores. *Socialización y conducta prosocial en la infancia y la adolescencia*. San Sebastián: Servicio Editorial, Universidad del País Vasco; 1994: 37-72.
- Mahoney JL, Schweder AE, Stattin H. Structured after-school activities as a moderator of depressed mood for adolescents with detached relations to their parents. *Journal of Community Psychology* 2002; 30: 69-86.
- Martorell MC, González R, Aloy M, Ferris MC. Socialización y conducta prosocial. *Revista Iberoamericana de Diagnóstico y Evaluación Psicológica* 1995; 1(1): 73-101.
- McClellan D, Katz L. Assessing young children's social competence; 2001. Available: URL: [http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC\\_Digests/ed455974.html](http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed455974.html).
- Mestre MV, Samper P, Tur A, Diez I. Estilos de crianza y desarrollo prosocial de los hijos. *Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada* 2001; 54(4): 691-703.



- Mestre MV, Tur AM, Del Barrio MV. Temperamento y crianza en la construcción de la personalidad. Conducta agresiva, inestabilidad y prosociabilidad. *Acción Psicológica* 2004; 3(1): 7-20.
- Mestre MV, Tur AM, Samper P, Náchter MJ, Cortés MT. Estilos de crianza en la adolescencia y su relación con la conducta prosocial. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología* 2007; 39(2): 211-225.
- Miller P, Bernzweig J, Eisenberg N, Fabes R. El desarrollo y la socialización de la conducta prosocial. In: Hinde R, Groebel J, editores. *Cooperación y conducta prosocial*. Madrid: Visor; 1995: 71-94.
- Molero C, Candela C, Cortés MT. La conducta prosocial: una visión de conjunto. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología* 1999; 31(2): 325-353.
- Moñivas A. La conducta prosocial. *Cuadernos de Trabajo Social* 1996; 9: 125-142.
- Montero I, León O. A guide for naming research studies in Psychology. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology* 2007; 7(3): 847-862.
- Ortiz MA, Apodaka P, Etxebarria I, Ezeiza A, Fuentes MJ, López F. Algunos predictores de la conducta prosocial-altruista en la infancia: empatía, toma de perspectiva, apego, modelos parentales, disciplina familiar e imagen del ser humano. *Revista de Psicología Social* 1993; 8(1): 83-98.
- Penner LA, Dovidio JF, Piliavin, JA, Schroeder DA. Prosocial behaviour: multilevel perspectives. *Annual Review of Psychology* 2005; 56: 365-392.
- Rehberg H, Richman C. Prosocial behaviour in preeschool children: a look at the interaction of race, gender and family composition. *International Journal of Behavioral Development* 1989; 12(3): 385-401.
- Roche R. Educación prosocial de las emociones, valores y actitudes positivas. Barcelona: Blume; 1998.
- Tidwell MV. A social identity model of prosocial behaviors within nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 2005; 15(4): 449-467.
- Zahn-Waxler C, Cummings E, Mcknew D, Radke-Yarrow M. Altruism, aggression, and social interactions in young children with a manic-depressive parent. *Child Development* 1984; 55: 112-122.

Table I. Analysis of variance comparing the Scout group and control group.

QUESTIONNAIRE	SCOUT GROUP	NON-SCOUT GROUP	ANOVA	
			F(1,98)	p
Self-assessment	111,40	108,64	2,139	0,004*
Questionnaire for teacher	102,96	94,52	6,756	0,000*
Questionnaire for peers	24,66	23,04	4,727	0,000*
Questionnaire for father	99,94	102,18	1,003	0,496
Questionnaire for mother	113,38	107,06	1,067	0,410

\*<0,05.

Table II. Analysis of variance comparing the Scout and non-Scout mean each factor.

<b>FACTOR</b>	<b>SCOUT MEAN</b>	<b>NON-SCOUT MEAN</b>	<b>F(1,98)</b>	<b>P</b>
Physical help	8.8210	8.2750	2.407	0.001*
Physical service	8.0440	8.0900	2.536	0.001*
Sharing	9.4440	9.3240	1.676	0.036*
Verbal help	9.1940	8.8800	1.873	0.015*
Verbal Consoling	8.8410	8.2570	1.866	0.015*
Positively affirming and valuing others	9.0250	9.4790	1.947	0.010*
Deep listening	8.4190	8.2170	1.525	0.070
Empathy	9.8670	9.5460	2.042	0.007*
Solidarity	9.5200	9.1220	2.030	0.007*
Positive presence and unity with the group	9.2830	9.0970	2.160	0.004*

\* p<0.05.

Tabla III. Porcentaje de la varianza para cada factor.

<b>FACTOR</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>% variance explained</b>	<b>% cumulative</b>
1	Verbal consoling and being considerate of the group	12.230	12.230
2	Solidarity with the group	11.229	23.459
3	Knowing how to listen	7.935	31.395
4	Physical help	7.090	38.485
5	Fellowship	6.548	45.033
6	Sharing	5.660	50.692
7	Serving others	4.826	55.518
8	Willfulness	3.855	59.373

Extraction method: Principal components.

Table IV: Items loading onto each factor.

FACTORS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
ITEMS	18	39	26	1	15	9	39	5
	20	32	27	2	14	12	7	6
	17	35	25	3	11	13	10	
	24	29	28	4	16	10	40	
	31	36	5					
	23	34						
	38	22						
	39	33						
	19	37						
	36	8						
	30	21						
	33	40						
	37							