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Abstract

This small-scale pilot study explored the effectiveness of proposed research instruments in measuring the outcomes of the prosocial and global education curriculum, Journey Around the World (JAWD), regarding attitudes toward school, affective language, prosocial motivation and behavior of second-grade school students.

Overall, the results of this study support the research methodology. Specifically, the proposed measures demonstrated the capacity to detect the positive changes following the Journey Around the World program in the attitudes toward school, learning motivation, affective vocabulary, and prosocial behavior and motivation. Furthermore, the results demonstrated the sensitivity of the proposed method to reflect the children’s growing appreciation for diversity and cultural perspective taking. Nevertheless, some measures needed modifications. These include the following: 1) the Peer Nominations method should be reduced to include only one question per category; 2) the Sticker Sharing test should include three distinct emotions (e.g., sadness, anxiety, and fear) and photographs of different characters; 3) only one situation per category of prosocial behavior to assess children’s perceptions of others’ motivations for prosocial behaviors; and 4) all the proposed stories should include hypothetical characters of different ethnicity and/or culture to accurately assess children’s cultural sensitivity.

The results also indicate a need to refine the Journey Around the Curriculum implementation to place more emphasis on exploring the effect of the curriculum on children’s oral and written language, including teaching emotional vocabulary. All in all, the obtained results can be used for refining both the Journey Around the World curriculum and the outcome measures in order to conduct a large-scale program evaluation study in the future.
Chapter 1. Introduction

Prosocial behavior in children has become the focus of extensive psychological research in the past decade. It was demonstrated that prosocial behavior is important for children’s healthy well-being and psychosocial development (Bartlett & DeSteno, 2006; Brownell, Hyson & Taylor, 2011; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998; Eisenberg et al., 1999; Eisenberg et al., 2006; Hyson, 2008; Wentzel, 2015). Prosocial behavior has been associated with positive outcomes, including better perspective-taking, empathic responding, and positive peer and parental relationships (Carlo, Fabes, Laible, & Kupanoff, 1999; Eisenberg et al., 2006). Furthermore, prosocial behavior is associated with positive academic outcomes, and positive relationships with teachers (Bierman et al., 2009; Knafo-Noam, 2016; Wentzel, 2015). In contrast, the lack of prosocial behavior has been associated with aggression and delinquency, poor social adjustment, peer rejection and social exclusion (Crick, 1996; Obsuth, Eisner, Malti, & Ribeaud, 2015; Parkhurst & Asher, 1992; Twenge et al., 2007).

Prosocial behavior is defined as voluntary and unselfish behaviors with the intent to benefit others and is characterized by helpfulness, acceptance, caring, and exhibiting kindness towards others (Caputi, Lecce, Pagnin, & Banerjee, 2012; Eisenberg et al., 2006). In school-settings, this would include acts of helping a classmate, including a peer to join a group, intervening on behalf of a classmate who is excluded, and showing respect to teachers (Wentzel, 2015). Prosocial behavior is essential to healthy child development, and predicts later ability to develop and maintain positive relationships with others (Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989; Upright, 2002).

Research has found that children’s prosocial behaviors are cultivated by the development of their social competences (Eisenberg et al., 2006; Gross et al., 2015; Hoffman, 2008; Waugh,
Brownell, & Pollock, 2015; Wentzel, 2015). Specifically, children’s capacity for prosocial behavior is fostered through socialization, including close relationships with peers, teachers, and parents (Brownell et al., 2013; Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989, Lockwood, et al., 2014; Santrock, 2004; Warneken & Tomasello, 2013). Relationships that are characterized by acceptance and warmth help children develop their social competences, and can establish and enhance their motivation, understanding, and skills needed for prosocial behaviors (Eisenberg et al., 2006; Ensor et al., 2011; Dunn, 2008).

In addition to social competences, children must also possess the emotional capacities to recognize and understand that others need help before they can display prosocial behaviors (Eisenberg et al., 2006; Hay et al., 2004). For example, Eisenberg et al. (2006) found that merely the social knowledge and skills of prosocial behaviors may not be enough to result in prosocial behaviors without the emotional competences, which include the awareness, understanding, and caring towards the emotional states of others. Specifically, the emotional competences are considered to be the preconditions of prosocial behaviors and essential for empathic responding and prosocial behaviors (Eisenberg et al., 2006; Upright, 2002). Similarly, CASEL (Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning) highlighted both the social and emotional competences as essential core competences underlying children’s capacity to display prosocial behaviors.

As highlighted, the fundamental feature of prosocial behavior includes the ability to comprehend other’s emotions- or empathy (Eisenberg, 1989; Eisenberg et al., 2010; Eisenberg, Fabes, & Spinrad, 2006; Hoffman, 2008; Lockwood et al., 2014; Roth-Hanania, Davidov, & Zahn-Waxler, 2011; Vaish, Carpenter, & Tomasello, 2009; Zahn-Waxler, Radke-Yarrow, Wagner, & Chapman, 1992). In other words, prosocial behavior also requires recognizing
others’ emotions, understanding why and how those feelings happen, being able to see things from others’ points of view, and developing the ability to be empathic (Zins et al., 2004). Research suggests that empathy has a direct effect on prosocial behaviors among children, as it enhances their ability to accept others and express tolerance (Chapman et al., 1987; Cotton, 2001; Eisenberg et al., 2006; Hoffman, 2008; Upright, 2002). Furthermore, empathic children were found to have more positive and meaningful social interactions, as they were better able to display prosocial behaviors because of their ability to vicariously experience the feelings of others (Hoffman, 2008).

Given the benefits associated with the development of social and emotional competences, schools are encouraged to support children’s prosocial behaviors (Greenberg et al., 2003; Wentzel, 2015). Schools are an important context for children to learn, practice, and refine their social and emotional competences as they continue to navigate their relationships with their peers and teachers (CASEL, 2008; Solomon et al., 1988; Wentzel, 2015). Moreover, the role of the teachers is to facilitate and encourage prosocial behaviors and enhance children’s social and emotional competences through formal and informal classroom instructions and structured learning experiences, including extracurricular activities and community services (Dusenbery et al., 2011; Ladd, 2005; Yoder, 2014). Many school-based socio-emotional learning (SEL) programs focus on teaching children skills “necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions” (CASEL, 2008, p. 6). It was found that many SEL programs yielded positive results, including an increase in children’s emotional knowledge, prosocial behaviors, perspective-taking, and positive interpersonal relationships (Caldarella, 2009; Schonert-Reichl, 2012; Walker & Gresham, 2003).
Research Gaps

Social and emotional learning is broadly understood as the process through which children build awareness and skills to manage emotions, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions – all of which can lead to successes in schools and life (CASEL, 2008). Among the many foundational social and emotional skills for children are self-awareness, emotion management, and social awareness – or specifically, perspective-taking, empathy, and the ability to develop relationships with others (Denham, 2006; Yoder, 2014). Children learn social and emotional competences through social environments, especially schools, which provide children with opportunities to develop prosocial skills through their daily interactions with peers and teachers (CASEL, 2008). Therefore, when children develop their social and emotional competences, it is believed that their ability to connect with peers of diverse perspectives, cultures, languages, and identities are also enhanced (Durlak et al., 2011).

Given that many of today’s schools are becoming increasingly more multicultural and diverse with students from different social and cultural backgrounds, there is an increasing need for socio-emotional learning programs to address the relevance of cultural competences of children. Research suggests that multicultural education - or the time spent to cultivate an understanding of unique features of different cultures – is essential at every stage of children’s development as it helps them feel more welcomed, integrated, and willing and able to cooperate with others in their classrooms (Bredenkamp, 1986; Chen, 2009; Gollinick & Chinn, 1994; Rubin & Menzer, 2010). Furthermore, it was suggested that exposing and teaching children about different cultures can also create an exciting learning environment (Levy, 2008). Teaching cultural awareness and appreciation for diversity requires a significant dedication from the teachers and school administrators as they themselves need to be culturally competent and
intentional about incorporating learning curriculum and activities that would allow children to appreciate and value diversity (Levy, 2008).

Many schools have been successful in implementing the social-emotional learning programs, but not many programs use learning about cultures as a context for advancing children’s social and emotional competences (Chen, 2009; Cole et al., 2010). Specifically, while the implementation and delivery of the instructional strategies of the programs are increasingly becoming more sensitive to the cultural and linguistic differences of the children in the classrooms, there is a lack of the *multicultural content* that is deliberately embedded within the curriculum to enhance children’s sensitivity to the cultural differences that exist among one another (Ball, 2010; Chen, 2009; Espinosa, 2006; Greenfield et al., 2012). This highlights the need for developing a learning curriculum that is not only designed to enhance children’s social and emotional competences, but one that also teaches children about culture and diversity to enhance their cultural awareness. *Journey Around the World* (JAWD) is a global and prosocial education curriculum that combines socio-emotional learning with cultural diversity. Specifically, the JAWD curriculum focuses on the development of empathy and prosocial behaviors in children, as well as cultural competency and appreciation for diversity, by teaching about various children’s lives in other cultures, including others’ cultural values and practices.

**Purpose of the Present Research**

The purpose of the present study was to determine whether the proposed research methods are appropriate in determining the outcomes of the *Journey Around the World* curriculum related to children’s prosocial behaviors and attitudes toward school. The results from this study will help to refine both the curriculum and outcome measures in order to conduct a large-scale outcome study in the future.
**Research Question.** Do the proposed research measures capture the changes in children’s attitudes towards school, prosocial behaviors, affective vocabulary and perspective taking ability following the *Journey Around the World* curriculum?
Chapter 2. Literature Review

In order to best understand the relationship between empathy and prosocial behavior, it is important to first define the construct of empathy (Hoffman, 2008). The following section focuses on definitions of and contributors to the development of empathy, cognitive and affective perspectives of empathy, distinctions of empathy from other related reactions, and the outcomes associated with empathy development.

**Empathy**

There is no consensus on the definition of empathy among researchers (Hoffman, 2008; Hojat, 2016), and empathy has been described as a “slippery concept that has provoked considerable speculation, excitement, and confusion” (Eisenberg & Strayer, 1987, p. 3).

Broadly, empathy is the inner experience of comprehending the momentary emotional and psychological states of another person (Eisenberg et al., 2010; Hoffman, 2000), which allows for a shared emotional experience or the “immediate experience of the emotions of another person (Duan & Hill, 1996, p. 263). The ability to empathize with others’ feelings is undoubtedly important, as empathy motivates prosocial behaviors (Zahn-Waxler, 2016). All in all, empathy encompasses the capacity to understand the feelings and perspectives of others, and experience those feelings and perspectives – suggesting both cognitive and affective components (Bengtsson & Johnson, 1992; Cotton, 2001; Hoffman, 2008; Karem, Fishman, & Josselson, 2001; Knight 1989; Upright, 2002).

Several authors identified **two components of empathy**: affective and cognitive (de Wied, Goudena, & Matthys, 2005; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1990, 2014; Eisenberg & Miller, 1987; Roberts & Strayer, 1996; Van Lissa et al., 2016). Affective empathy is the ability to share the emotions of others or the capacity to experience and vicariously feel the same or similar emotions of others (Cotton, 2001; Karem, Fishman, & Josselson, 2001). Eisenberg (1989)
described affective empathy as an “emotional response that stems from the apprehension of another’s emotional state or condition that is congruent with the other’s emotional state or condition” (p. 108). Similarly, Hoffman (1981) defined it as a “vicarious affective response to someone else’s situation rather than one’s own” (p. 41). Affective component involves the elicitation of similar emotional response in the observer (e.g., “I feel what you feel.”).

Cognitive empathy is the ability to be aware of and understand the emotional states of another person (Cotton, 2001; Kalliopuska, 1986). It is related to the individual’s ability to accurately interpret the meanings and situations of other’s emotional experiences (emphasis added; Hoffman, 1982, 2000). Cognitive capacities, including perspective-taking, are among the features that some theorists have included in their definitions of cognitive empathy (Hojat, 2016). For example, Mackay, Hughes, and Carver (1990) defined cognitive empathy as the “ability to understand someone’s situation without making it one’s own” (p. 155). Cognitive component involves the intellectual understanding and recognition of emotional state of others (e.g., “I understand what you feel.”).

Both affective and cognitive forms of empathy are thought to be essential for successful social interactions and development of prosocial behavior, as understanding and sharing the emotional states of others are important components to accurately and appropriately respond to the plight of others (Carlo et al., 2003; Eisenberg et al., 2002; Svetlova, Nichols, & Brownell, 2010; Roberts & Strayer, 1996; Wlodarski, 2015).

**Empathy and Empathy-Related Emotional Reactions**

Both empathy and sympathy are important for successful interpersonal relationships (Eisenberg, 1988, 2010; Gruen & Mendelsohn, 1986; Hojat, 2016; Vossen et al, 2016; Wispe, 1986). However, while the constructs of empathy and sympathy are often used interchangeably,
research suggests that sympathy is an output of the empathic process, and not part of it (Reniers et al., 2011). Similarly, Eisenberg and colleagues (2010) posited that sympathy “often stems from empathy” (p. 145). Therefore, although empathy and sympathy are both other-oriented, they are not synonymous. For example, Gordon (2014) suggested that empathy is “vicariously feeling another’s emotions, while sympathy is an outward other-oriented wish for that person to feel better, demonstrated by feelings of concern or sadness for that individual” (p. 3). These outward feelings are related to the concern and sorrow for the affected individual, rather than the experiencing of identical emotions of the person in distress (Eisenberg, 2010). Also, sympathy can be derived from retrieval of information from memory (Eisenberg et al., 2010). The difference between empathy and sympathy is aptly highlighted by Wispe (1986): “Sympathy is a way of relating. Empathy is a way of knowing” (p.314). In other words, sympathy is conceptualized as an empathic response, and not a form of empathy.

Another concept related to empathy is personal distress. Personal distress is defined as the “self-oriented response to others’ emotional or negative states” (Eisenberg et al., 2010, p. 130) or an “aversive emotional reaction to the vicarious experiencing of another’s emotions,” which are characterized by discomfort and anxiety (Eisenberg & Morris, 2002, p. 97). For example, an observer can respond with either sympathy (other-oriented empathic response) or personal distress (self-oriented empathic response) in reaction to vicariously experiencing the emotions of others (Batson, 1987; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1990). Furthermore, personal distress may result in increased tendency to avoid contact with the individual in need, rather than being compelled to offer help (Batson, 1991; Hoffman, 2000). Notably, personal distress and prosocial behaviors are found to be conversely associated, while empathy is positively related to prosocial behaviors (Carlo et al., 2003; Eisenberg, 2000).
Finally, theory of mind is also related to empathy. Both empathy and theory of mind are central to social interactions and characterized by the ability to mentalize and understand other’s mental and emotional states. However, theory of mind is a much broader term than empathy and reflects the ability to “infer the full range of mental states (beliefs, desires, intentions, imaginations, emotions, etc.) and to reflect on the content of one’s own and other’s mind” (Baron-Cohen, 2001, p. 174). In other words, theory of mind allows children to interpret the situations of others accurately and are generally associated with positive behavioral outcomes. In contrast, Shakoor et al. (2012) suggested that children with poor theory of mind may be at a higher risk for anti-social behaviors, including bullying.

**Development of Empathy**

Research shows that empathy is present in infants; however, the ability to respond with empathy begins around the age of two (Zahn-Waxler et al., 1992). It was found that the affective component of empathy develops prior to the cognitive component, and it is necessary for the development of cognitive empathy (Kahn et al., 2016). Signs of affective empathy can be observed as early as 12 months of age when infants provide comfort to others in distress (Warneken & Tomasello, 2009). Hoffman (2000) found that children by their first birthday display empathic responses and cry when other children cry, attempt to help others who are hurt, or look sad in response to caregiver’s despondent look. Preston and de Waal (2002) also found that the ability to discern and experience other’s emotional states were evident in infants, suggesting that empathic responses may be innate. Cognitive empathy develops with children’s cognitive maturity. Children's ability for cognitive empathy improves as children enter the preschool and elementary school years and such improvement is partially associated with the children’s increased language capacities (Bengtsson & Johnson, 1992; Hojat, 2016).
The developmental course of empathy was outlined by Warden and Christie (1997, p. 5) and includes:

“(a) An awareness of the separateness of other people as individuals (by two years), (b) an awareness of the mental state of others, and that their feelings in a situation may differ from one’s own (developing slowly from three years onwards), and (c) an awareness of others’ different attitudes and life experiences and the ability to interpret their feelings in the light of such knowledge (gradually from late childhood onwards).”

Hoffman (2000) outlined four stages of empathy development. From infancy to the age of two, infants display precursors to empathy when they involuntarily mimic the emotions of others, which is characterized as global empathy. An infant crying when another infant is crying is an example of this first stage of empathy. At this stage, repeated modeling and encouragement of empathy is essential. From ages 3 to 4, an awareness of feelings develops and children begin to actively offer help to others. This stage is called egocentric empathy, as the kind of help offered will be based on their own needs rather than the needs of the distraught individual (e.g., offering a teddy bear to comfort an adult). In this stage, children display the ability to help, but may lack the necessary insights to offer the appropriate type of help. By the end of fourth year and beyond, as their vocabulary continues to expand, children begin to understand the internal states of others, can differentiate the feelings of others from their own, and display empathy for another’s feelings. According to Hoffman (2000), this stage “has all the basic elements of mature empathy and continues to grow and develop throughout life” (p. 72). During this stage, children’s responses to other’s distress and consequent offering of help may be more appropriate to the needs of the distressed individual. Finally, by early adolescence, children begin to display empathy for another’s life condition, or comprehensive empathy, as they become cognitively
capable of taking the perspectives beyond their own and recognizing the distress and/or emotions of others, which results in increased prosocial behavior, guided by the growing tendency to react spontaneously to the emotions of others.

**Outcomes of Empathy**

There are many benefits of empathy. First, empathy is positively associated with academic success, connection to school, positive relationships with peers and teachers, and classroom behaviors (Caprara et al., 2000; Durlak et al., 2011; Eisenberg, 1992; Svetlova, Nichols, & Brownell, 2010). Similarly, Wardle (2003) found positive relationships between empathy and cooperative behaviors in children. Related, children who were more empathic demonstrated more socially appropriate behaviors and experienced more meaningful and higher quality social interactions with teachers and peers (Eisenberg et al., 2012; Eisenberg & Miller, 1987; Wardle, 2003; Zhou et al., 2002). Secondly, empathy is related to the inhibition and/or reduction of anti-social behaviors, such as aggression and delinquency (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2004, 2011). For example, research has found that lower levels of affective and cognitive empathy result in higher levels of aggressive behavior in children, including bullying and lack of concern for well-being of others (Carlo et al., 2012; Connor, 2002; Jolliffe & Farrington, 2004).

Empathy is also an essential foundation for prosocial behavior, including helping, sharing, and volunteering, as it underlies the capacity to understand the feelings and perspectives of others (Eisenberg & Miller, 1987; de Waal, 2008; de Wied, Gispen-deWied, & van Boxtel, 2010; Knafo et al., 2008; Zahn-Waxler et al., 1992; Zhou, Valiente, & Eisenberg, 2003). For example, if a child sees a peer in distress, the child may himself begin to feel distressed, which could inform him that the other person needs help. This empathic experience may then promote helping behavior to ease the peer’s distress. Moreover, studies have consistently found positive
associations between children’s ability to empathize and helping behaviors towards others (Eisenberg & Miller, 1987; Hoffman, 2008; Knafo et al., 2008; Zahn-Waxler et al., 1992). To this end, empathy is fundamental to inhibiting aggressive acts and conduct problems in children, as well as facilitating prosocial behaviors (Hoffman, 2008; Zahn-Waxler & Radke-Yarrow, 1990).

**Prosocial Behavior**

Prosocial behavior is defined as a “voluntary behavior intended to benefit other people,” (Eisenberg, 1992, p. 3) and can be broadly grouped into four categories: Sharing, helping, cooperating, and including (Taylor, 2010; Warden et al., 2003; Wentzel, 2015). Therefore, prosocial behavior is important for development of healthy relationships with others (Upright, 2002). It involves the acts of generosity and kindness, as well as acceptance of others, and focuses on benefiting individuals in distress and/or need (Caputi, Lecce, Pagnin, & Banerjee, 2012; Eisenberg & Fabes; 1998; Eisenberg, Fabes, & Spinrad, 2006; Grusec, Davidov, & Lundell, 2002). These behaviors can be characterized by showing concern for others, cooperating with others, and taking other people’s perspectives (Marion, 2003).

Additionally, prosocial behavior is associated with social competence and acceptance by peers (Denham & Holt, 1993; Santrock, 2004). Moreover, children who exhibited prosocial behavior in early childhood were later found to demonstrate fewer externalizing problems (Hastings, Zahn-Waxler, Robinson, Usher, & Bridges, 2000). Previously, research emphasis had mostly focused on understanding social behavior related to prevention of negative and maladaptive behaviors such as aggression and bullying, while the “identification and characteristics of prosocial children have, until recently, received less attention” (Warden, Cheyne, Christie, Fitzpatrick, & Reid, 2003, p. 547). However, studies have since examined the positive functioning across academic and social contexts to promote healthy child development,
including ways to foster prosocial behaviors in children (Carlo et al., 2012; Denham, 2006; de Wied et al., 2010; Dunfield et al., 2011; Hoffman, 2009; Knafo et al., 2008).

There are well-documented positive associations between early prosocial behaviors and social acceptance and approval from peers (Clark & Ladd, 2000; Wentzel, 2015); more friendships (Hastings, Utendale, & Sullivan, 2007); psychosocial adjustment; emotion regulation (Eisenberg et al., 2006; Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989; Fabes, Carlo, Kupanoff, & Laible, 1999); and negative association with externalizing problems (Hastings, Zahn-Waxler, Robinson, Usher, & Bridges, 2000). In addition, prosocial children were found to perform better academically (Caprara et al., 2000; Clark & Ladd, 2000; Wentzel, 2015). In contrast, the lack of prosocial behavior in children is associated with poor social adjustment, including peer rejection and aggressive behaviors (Crick, 1996).

While the exact cause for either the presence or absence of prosocial behavior in children remains to be better understood, many researchers suggest that empathy plays an important role (Batson, 1991; Eisenberg & Miller, 1987; Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989; Eisenberg et al., 2006, 2010; Lockwood et al., 2014). Specifically, Christov-Moore et al. (2014) suggested that empathy is the “driving force” for prosocial behavior and that empathy “evokes concern for the other, distinct from oneself, that is beyond self-interest” (Batson et al., 1997, p. 508). Furthermore, empathy was found to guide prosocial tendencies that continues to develop and motivate helping behaviors in children into young adulthood (Eisenberg 1999, 2010).

**Development of Prosocial Behavior**

Researchers believe that prosocial behaviors can be acquired and learned through various interactions and relationships with others and agree that various factors contribute to the development of prosocial behavior (Brownell, 2013; Thompson & Newton, 2013). Early
childhood is an important period for the development of prosocial behavior (Hay et al., 2004). It was found that prosocial behaviors can emerge at a young age (Knafo et al., 2008). Children’s ability to demonstrate prosocial behavior at a very early age suggests biologically-based predisposition for prosociality (Svetlova et al., 2010; Zahn-Waxler, Robinson, & Emde, 1992). Specifically, it has been found that infants react to the facial expression of distress of caregivers by crying and begin to display the behavioral capacities to ease the discomfort of others (Zahn-Waxler, Radke-Yarrow, Wagner, & Chapman, 1992). Further, it was found that toddlers, as early as two years of age, experienced joy when they shared toys or candies with others (Aknin et al., 2012). These prosocial tendencies increase with age and become increasingly intentional by the preschool years (Eisenberg, Fabes, & Spinrad, 2006).

The development of prosocial behaviors is also closely related to the development of perspective-taking (Brownell, 2013; Eisenberg et al., 2006; Marion, 2003; Sebanc, 2003). Eisenberg and Mussen (1989) described that children’s capacity to be aware, interpret, and recognize that someone is in need is an important precursor to prosocial behaviors. Specifically, children must develop the cognitive capacity to recognize self as the agent of helping behavior, in addition to the emotional capacity to empathize with the feelings of others (Knafo et al., 2008). The increased capacity for prosocial behaviors in children are related to their “growing ability to understand others’ thoughts and feelings and to regulate their own distress and impulsive behavior” (Hyson & Taylor, 2011, p. 76). As cognitive maturity is related to increased empathic capacities, it is also related to the increased capacities for and likelihood of prosocial behaviors. Eisenberg et al. (2001) conducted a longitudinal study examining changes in prosocial behaviors and perspective-taking abilities from age of 4 to 24, and found that early prosocial tendency was consistent over time. Specifically, they found that children who
exhibited prosocial behaviors, characterized by sharing, helping, and comforting others, at age 4 and also demonstrated empathic responses at age 24.

It was also suggested that child’s social environments, including peers and teachers, may influence the development of prosocial behaviors (Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989; Hastings, Utendale, & Sullivan, 2007). Bredekamp and Copple (1997) posited that “children do not construct their own understanding of a concept in isolation but in the course of interaction with others” (p. 114). In addition to peer influences, modeling by teachers can also influence children’s prosocial development (Bandura, 1961; Eisenberg, Fabes, & Spinrad, 2006). Research has suggested that while children were “capable of engaging in truly cooperative play with their peers and forming real friendships, [they] need coaching and supervision to learn and maintain appropriate behavior with others” (Bredekamp & Copple, 1997, p. 116). If children observe teachers who are warm and nurturing, they are more likely to display similar behaviors. Through interactions with peers and teachers, children learn to recognize and discuss feelings, be aware of and sensitive to the needs of others, and show respect to others, thereby increasing their prosocial capacities (Van Hoorn et al., 2014).

In addition to the influence of the relationships with peers and teachers, classroom social environment can also have an influence on the development of prosocial behaviors (Bay-Hinitz, Peterson, & Quilitch, 1994). For example, a communal learning environment can support children’s prosocial development by making them feel as a part of a group, thus increasing their sense of connectedness and responsibility (Hyson & Taylor, 2011). While competitive relationship in the classrooms may result in less cooperation and higher aggression and bullying, cooperative relationships result in an increased ability to comfort others in need (Leontopoulos,
2010; Sutton & Keogh, 2000). These findings suggest the importance of classroom environments in shaping children’s prosocial reactivity.

Furthermore, studies suggest the association between children’s prosocial behavior and parent-child relationships, including parental involvement, warmth, connectedness, and encouragement (Brophy-Herb et al., 2010; Clark & Ladd, 2000). In fact, family environments may be the most important socio-cultural factor that can influence the social and emotional development of children (Ferreira et al., 2016; Krevans & Gibbs, 1996). For example, it was found that children who displayed higher frequency of helping and sharing behaviors also had nurturing and supportive parents who encouraged their children to talk about their emotions (Brownell et al., 2013; Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989). In contrast, children whose parents were authoritarian or strict were found to exhibit less prosocial behaviors (Hastings et al., 2007).

Children’s responses to others in their environments and development of prosocial behaviors can also be influenced by cultural factors (Chen, 2009). Specifically, cultural norms and values regarding prosocial behavior may vary in different cultures (Rubin & Menzer, 2010). For example, prosocial behaviors were expressed differently by children from individualistic and collectivistic societies (Schneider et al., 2005), and that children in the Western culture were least likely to provide help compared to children in other cultures, including India, Kenya, Japan, and Mexico (Edwards, 2000).

In sum, children’s prosocial competences are largely influenced by socialization, including relationships with parents and the quality of teacher-child and peer relationships, as well as cultural factors (Chen, 2009; Cohen, 2001; Eisenberg et al., 2006; Eivers et al., 2012; Fryxell, 2000; Wentzel, 2015). Given these factors that influence the development of prosocial behaviors in children, there is an increasing importance of and the need for fostering children’s
prosocial competences through the implementation of socio-emotional learning and collaborative learning activities in schools.

**Prosocial Motivation**

The developmental course and outcomes of prosocial behavior have received much attention over the years, but little is known about the motivations that prompt these prosocial behaviors (Hepach, Vaish, & Tomasello, 2012). For behavior to be accurately labeled as prosocial, motivation behind it should also be considered (Hepach, Vaish, & Tomasello, 2012). Vaish and Warneken (2012) suggested that as children engage in prosocial behaviors for a variety of reasons, including selfish ones to gain approval or be rewarded or to relieve their own stress evoked by witnessing other’s distress, understanding the disparate motivations underlying these behaviors is essential to understanding prosociality.

With the same prosocial behaviors (i.e., sharing, helping), the underlying motives that resulted in such behaviors may be different (Eisenberg, 1992). In other words, two children can both exhibit the same sharing behavior (e.g., sharing snack with peer), but the reasons behind their actions may reveal different motivations. For example, one child may be motivated to share due to strong moral conviction and parental influence, but the other child may have expected reciprocation (e.g., that receiving peer would later share snacks with him) in the future. In another example, inviting a peer to join in the game may have different motivations (e.g., preventing the excluded peer from feeling lonely, or to receive teacher’s praise). In the latter example, empathic concern and affective perspective-taking abilities for others influenced the first behavior, while self-driven motivation (e.g., earning teacher’s approval) resulted in the other (Hinnant & O’Brien, 2007; Vaish, Carpenter, & Tomasello, 2009). While it has been suggested that children’s prosocial behavior is derived by both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations, children
with empathy (intrinsic motivation) were more likely to exhibit prosocial behaviors, including helping and cooperating (Hastings et al., 2006; Hepach, Vaish, & Tomasello, 2012). In contrast, “directed helping performed for extrinsic reasons (i.e., following a command) rather than for intrinsic reasons might lose its inherent satisfaction, possibly resulting in diminished prosocial motivation” (Rapp et al., 2017, p. 113). Specifically, studies have found that offering extrinsic rewards in exchange for prosocial behaviors, such as helping peers, resulted in reduced subsequent helping in toddlers and school-aged children (Fabes et al., 1989; Warneken & Tomasello, 2008). Furthermore, studies found that children’s prosocial behavior is in part driven by concern for others and that they possess the ability to recognize and react to their concern for others, but also that prosocial behavior produced by intrinsic motivation were more likely to be consistent and enduring throughout the children’s development (Warden & Christie, 1997, Warden et al., 2003).

**Socio-Emotional Interventions to Promote Prosocial Behavior**

Research indicates a rise in emotional difficulties among children in the last several decades (Humphrey et al., 2013). To this end, Weissberg et al. (2016) suggested that there has been an “explosion of interest” in social and emotional learning in the past 30 years to reverse the trends. Both parents and educators want their children/students to succeed in their academic, personal, social lives. Therefore, in order to help young people establish positive relationships with their peers and adults, learn to effectively adapt to the demands of their complex environments, and make responsible decisions regarding their behaviors, schools, families, and communities have worked to “promote the positive development and academic success of children and youth across the globe” for decades (Weissberg et al., 2016, p. 3). This section
highlights the key aspects and outcomes of some socio-emotional learning programs that have been successfully implemented over the past three decades.

 Experts in socio-emotional learning (SEL) argue that schools must work to produce “students who are culturally literate, intellectually reflective, and committed to lifelong learning, [and] should teach young people to interact in socially skilled and respectful ways; to practice positive, safe, and healthy behaviors; to contribute ethically and responsibly to their peer group, family, school, and community” (Greenberg et al., 2003, p. 466). In this regard, successful SEL programs should promote more than academic learning, but also establish the foundation for lifelong development and make a difference in children’s lives – present and future (CASEL, 2008; Zins et al., 2004).

 Broadly, socio-emotional learning is the process aimed at developing children’s social and emotional competences – or the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to make healthy and successful choices (CASEL, 2008). Durlak et al. (2011) defined SEL as the process of “acquiring core competencies to recognize and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, appreciate the perspectives of others, establish and maintain positive relationships, make responsible decisions, and handle interpersonal situations constructively” (p. 406). Children’s social and emotional skills begin to develop in the early years and continue throughout their childhood and adolescence; therefore, it is recommended that the SEL programs are implemented at younger age in order to establish the foundation for promoting attitudes and behaviors that foster healthy social relationships and personal well-being throughout their developments (Jones & Bouffard, 2012).

 As children spend a significant portion of their time in schools, schools are an important context for children’s social and emotional development (Jones & Bouffard, 2012). Through
their interactions with peers and teachers, children learn to develop skills related to managing their negative emotions, following instructions, staying focused on tasks, navigating relationships with peers and teachers (Jones & Bouffard, 2012). Greenberg et al., (2003) suggested that socially and emotionally competent children create safe and caring classroom atmospheres, and that positive learning environments provide opportunities for children to further develop their social and emotional competences. Furthermore, implementation of SEL programs in schools can help students achieve academic success, as well as positive attitudes towards schools (Greenberg et al., 2003).

Given the benefits of social and emotional competences for children related to academic performance, positive relationships with others, and prosocial behaviors (Garner et al., 2014; Jones & Bouffard, 2012; Malecki & Elliott, 2002; Spivak & Durlak, 2016; Zins et al., 2004), many schools have adopted and implemented various SEL programs (Dusenbery et al., 2011; Yoder, 2014). However, for many schools, SEL programs have remained uncoordinated and disconnected from regular curriculum, which can negatively impact student learning and overall engagement (Durlak et al., 2011; Elias, 2014). Related, it has been found that successful implementation of SEL has been previously supplanted by the academic demands in the classrooms (Buchanan et al., 2009). Nevertheless, Elias et al. (1997) suggested that the “time devoted to SEL programs may in fact reinforce and enhance academic learning, and therefore should not be perceived as detracting from academic attention and focus” (p. 85).

Spivak and Durlak (2006) outlined the following components of successful SEL interventions: "a) caring relationships with adults and peers, b) adults modeling and reinforcing prosocial characteristics, c) training in empathy and perspective-taking, and d) active learning approaches such as cooperative learning” (p. 3). Therefore, it is essential that socio-emotional
learning is nurtured and provided in the context of caring, well-managed, and participatory classrooms and schools (Zins et al., 2004). Research suggests that successful socio-emotional programs should include activities to promote understanding and managing emotions, goal setting and achievement, problem-solving, and relationship building – all designed to improve children’s affective skills, perspective-taking abilities, and prosocial capacities (Dusenbery et al., 2011; Kahn & Lawthorne, 2003; Yoder, 2014; Zins et al., 2004). SEL programs in school-settings that “struggle with communicating behavioral expectations and fail to provide opportunities for children to practice social and emotional skills on an ongoing basis tend to be unsuccessful and may even exacerbate the social emotional problems that some children already have” (Garner et al., 2014, p. 166). A review of meta-analyses of 270 currently existing socio-emotional learning programs found that the interventions improved children’s feelings of attachment to and overall attitudes towards schools and education, academic performance, social competence, including prosocial behaviors and better relationships with peers and teachers, and decreased aggression (Dusenbury et al., 2011; Greenberg et al., 2010; Jones & Bouffard, 2012; Weissberg et al., 2015; Yoder, 2014). All in all, socio-emotional learning “builds children’s skills to recognize and manage their emotions, appreciate the perspectives of others, establish positive goals, make responsible decisions, and handle interpersonal situations effectively [through] developmentally and culturally appropriate classroom instruction and application of learning to everyday situations” (Greenberg et al., 2003, p. 468).

Among the core competences of socio-emotional learning is social awareness, or the ability to take perspectives of and empathize with others (CASEL, 2015). It is especially important when children interact with peers from different cultures, as research indicates that cultural biases can be learned at an early age (Cameron, Alvarez, Ruble, & Fuligni, 2001;
Martin, Wood, & Little, 1990). However, it was also found that stereotypes can be reduced and that children can take more accurate perceptions of others by learning to take the perspectives of others – specifically, the perspectives of others’ cultures and ideals (Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000). For example, Cotton (2001) found that exposing children to various cultures to increase their awareness of differences among peers and teaching social skills increased their empathy and prosocial behaviors towards peers of different cultural backgrounds. Given the many positive developmental outcomes of social and emotional competences, including perspective-taking and empathy, SEL curriculum that deliberately exposes and teaches children about different cultural norms and values as they relate to the feelings and behaviors of others remains essential to help foster cultural perspective-taking abilities and empathy towards diversity.

**Existing Socio-Emotional Learning Programs**

Feshbach and Feshbach (1984) developed the Empathy Training Program, for third- through fifth-graders – for use in small groups of four to six children - aimed at regulating children’s aggressive behaviors and enhancing empathic skills. The training – provided three times a week for ten weeks with each session about 45 minutes - consisted of classroom activities that included story-telling, problem-solving games, written exercises, group discussion, and conflict resolution. Activities were designed to help children identify emotions and foster the ability to consider the perspectives of others. Furthermore, children were also asked to identify the emotions conveyed in photographs to evaluate their improvement in affect recognition. The outcomes that were measured through the Empathy Index for Children and Adolescents (Bryant, 1982) and Child Behavior Scale (Ladd & Profilet, 1996) suggested that children in the empathy-training program demonstrated a significant decline in aggressive
behaviors and increase in prosocial behaviors. Specifically, after participating in the program, children exhibited significant increases in cooperation, helping, and generosity.

The Child Development Project, a comprehensive elementary school-based program, was designed to promote children’s social, emotional, and academic development, and is characterized by “supportive interpersonal relationships, shared goals, responsiveness to students’ developmental and sociocultural needs, and an emphasis on prosocial values of personal responsibility, concern for others, and fairness, as well as a commitment to learning” (Battistich et al., 2000, p. 75). The teachers work to foster children’s feelings of competence and social connectedness to improve their feelings of attachment to schools and to improve social, emotional, and academic outcomes, as well as enhancing prosocial behaviors (Solomon et al., 2000). Two schools in each of six school districts participated in the program over a three-year period; two additional schools in each district served as a comparison group. The following student outcomes were measured: Interpersonal behaviors (e.g., kindness and concern for peers; spontaneous prosocial behavior); feelings of connectedness; academic performance; and positive decision-making (Solomon et al., 2000). These outcomes were measured using teacher- and student-rated questionnaires, classroom observations, and test data. After three years, children in the programs exhibited increases in social and interpersonal attitudes and skills, including more prosocial behaviors and concern for others, their feelings of belonging and connectedness with peers and to schools, and improved attitudes toward others. Notably, there were no significant differences in the academic progresses and performances between children in the program and comparison groups - revealing evidence that such SEL programs would not interfere with regular curriculum and learning progress.
The Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS) curriculum is a comprehensive classroom-based program designed to promote social and emotional competences and to reduce aggressive and problematic behaviors for elementary school-aged children up to Grade 6 (Domitrovich et al., 2007). It is implemented two or more times per week for a minimum of 20-30 minutes per session intended to develop children’s self-control, promote recognizing and expressing feelings, reduce aggressive behaviors, and contribute to problem-solving skills by improving their social and emotional competences (Domitrovich et al., 2007). Two third-grade cohorts in 14 schools across three districts participated in the program over a three-year span; within each district, schools were randomly assigned to either treatment or comparison group, in which traditional curriculum was taught (Hugh & Deborah, 2013). With the use of literature, cartoon drawings, and story-telling, the following outcomes were measured: Aggressive behaviors; conduct problems; and emotional vocabulary. These outcomes were assessed through parent-, teacher-, and child-rated questionnaires, and classroom observations. The results found that children in the program exhibited less aggressive and disruptive behaviors and better social competence, as well as improved receptive emotion vocabulary, compared to the comparison group.

Roots of Empathy is a preventive and evidence-based socio-emotional learning program designed for children between kindergarten and Grade 8 with the objectives to reduce aggression, while enhancing empathy and social and emotional competence, including perspective-taking (Gordon, 2009). It is based on theory that “when children learn to label emotions and take the perspectives of others, their empathy and prosocial behavior increase, while their physical and indirect aggression decrease – thereby preventing violence” (Santos et al., 2011, p. 82). Specifically, children learn to be socially and emotionally attuned to the
feelings, needs, and intentions of others by observing the parent-infant interaction through classroom visits by a family. During each visit, children are guided through the discussions that served as underpinnings for deepening of emotion understanding, perspective-taking, and concerns for others, as children learned to recognize and label the perspectives and feelings of the baby. An independent randomized control trial of the program suggested that compared to comparison groups, children in the Roots of Empathy program demonstrated a decrease in aggression, an increase in prosocial behavior (e.g., sharing, helping, and including), and an increase in overall socio-emotional knowledge (Santos et al., 2011). Schonert-Reichl, Smith, Zaidman-Zait, and Hertzman (2011) used a child-rated measure that assessed different dimensions of empathy; peer nominations for prosocial and antisocial behaviors; and teacher-rated scale to assess children’s behaviors with peers to measure the outcomes of the curriculum. The authors found that children in the program exhibited improved emotional understanding and displayed increased levels of prosocial behaviors as rated by their peers and decreased display of aggression as reported by teachers.

The Incredible Years Classroom Management Program is designed to enhance social and emotional competence, academic performance, and to promote positive school behavior for children in kindergarten to Grade 3 (Webster-Stratton et al., 2010). Through classroom-based activities that include emotion-recognition game, group activities/discussions, role-plays, and videotape vignettes, children are trained on emotion management (e.g., perspective-taking, self-regulation), social skills (e.g., effective communication, collaboration), problem solving (e.g., anger, conflict management), and classroom behaviors (e.g., following rules). The program is presented to children two to three times a week for 20-30 minutes, followed by 20-minute practice activities. The outcomes were evaluated by the following measures: Parent- and
teacher-rated Child Behavior Scale, teacher-observation of peer interactions using Peer Problem-Solving-Interaction Communication-Affect Rating System, and Child’s Attributions consisting of scenarios with ambiguous intentions of characters, which the children were asked to identify as either aggressive or accidental. Children who participated in the program demonstrated an increased prosocial behavior in response to peer conflicts, improved compliance to teacher directives, improve overall classroom atmosphere, and decreased aggressive behaviors.

The 4Rs Program (Reading, Writing, Respect & Resolution) is a school-based intervention that integrates social and emotional learning and language arts curriculum for children from kindergarten to Grade 8 (Jones et al., 2010). Specifically, the program develops socio-emotional skills related to understanding feelings, enhancing empathy, and conflict resolution primarily by using children’s literature and age-appropriate activities, including discussion, role play, and writing. The children's literature includes books on different cultures, ethnicities, and backgrounds in order to help the children understand and appreciate diversity. A review of a three-year randomized control trial for third and fourth grade children suggested improved academic performance, decreased conduct problems/emotional distress, and enhanced prosocial behavior, as evaluated by the following measures: Pictorial vignettes that asked children to identify possible attributions regarding the characters’ intents; Normative Beliefs About Aggression scale; Prosocial subscales of What I Think instrument; and end-of-year results of children’s standardized assessments of math and reading achievements.

The Slowly but Steadily program is an elementary school classroom-based socio-emotional learning program which suggests that children’s social and emotional skills need to be developed like academic skills, and that it should be developed and learned in schools (Raimundo, Marques-Pinto, & Lima, 2013). It is designed to enhance socio-emotional
adjustment and school performance, while reducing conduct and emotional problems for children. For the duration of school year, a weekly 45-60-minute session, including story-telling activities, role-playing, and collaborative games, was implemented to enhance perspective-taking and empathy, understanding of others’ emotions, interpersonal skills, and emotion regulation. The measures used to evaluate its outcomes included: Teacher-rated School Social Behavior Scales that assessed compliance, peer relations, and academic behaviors of children (Raimundo et al., 2012); and assessment of Children’s Emotions Scale that assessed understanding of social behaviors, social situations, and facial expressions (Schultz, Izard, & Bear, 2004). The program was delivered to 213 fourth-grade students and the results revealed a significant increase in children’s socio-emotional competences – mainly better peer relationships and overall improved social competence (Raimundo, Marques-Pinto, & Lima, 2013).

**Journey Around the World (JAWD)**

*Journey Around the World (JAWD)* is an elementary school curriculum “that fosters prosocial and global competencies in elementary school children through oral and written language instruction (Savina, & Hart, 2014). It prepares children to become responsible global citizens who can communicate and collaborate effectively across different cultures. Deepening of global and prosocial competences in children requires the capacity to understand and help and care for others, as well as the appreciation for cultural diversity. The objectives of this program are to develop children’s social understanding and perspective-taking skills; promote prosocial values, feelings and behaviors; and increase knowledge about cultural diversity and a sense of global citizenship.

Journey curriculum is based on story-telling. Socio-cultural stories engage children in exploring the world beyond their immediate environment and provide information about world
cultures with the focus on cultural values, artifacts, and practices. Children together with the stories characters, “visit” local schools and learn about children’s lives in other cultures; they encounter problem situations where they must apply cultural knowledge and prosocial skills to act responsibly. Through their “journey” around the world, children are exposed to and learn about different cultural practices and values and are encouraged to consider the perspectives of others.
Purpose of the Present Research

The purpose of the present study was to determine whether the proposed research methods are appropriate in determining the outcomes of the *Journey Around the World* curriculum related to children’s prosocial behaviors and attitudes toward school. The results from this study will help to refine both the curriculum and outcome measures in order to conduct a large-scale outcome study in the future.

Research Question. Do the proposed research measures capture the changes in children’s attitudes towards school, prosocial behaviors, affective vocabulary and perspective taking ability following the *Journey Around the World* curriculum?
Chapter 3. Method

Participants

The study was conducted in a public elementary school in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States (population approximately 50,000), which has a total of 438 enrolled students. Enrollment data from 2014 suggested that the school was mixed in ethnicity (58% Hispanics; 28% White; 10% Black; 2% Multi-racial; 1% Asian) and has a 53% (233 students) of male students and 47% (205 students) of female students. Further, 83% of enrolled students (363 students) are eligible for free or discounted school lunch, indicating a higher level of poverty (www.nces.ed.gov).

Participants included 25 second grade children, ten in the experimental group and 15 in the control group. In the experimental group five children were Hispanic, four children - Caucasian, one - African American. (Demographic information about the participants from control group was not available). While the parents for children assigned to the control group all gave their consents, one parent for a child assigned to the experimental group refused consent for her child to participate in the study. Furthermore, three children originally assigned to the experimental group were excluded from the study due to limited English proficiency. As a result, the experimental group included 10 children (7 boys and 3 girls), and the control group included 15 children (8 boys and 7 girls).

Protection of Participants’ Rights

Prior to the study, an informed consent was sent to the parents and/or guardian of each participant to explain the nature of the study and request permission for their children to participate without any consequences to the child for declining participation (Appendix A). Upon obtaining parental/guardian consents, assent from children were obtained by explaining the
study prior to their participation. They were asked to participate on a voluntary basis only and were informed that they could withdraw from the study any time if they would feel uncomfortable (Appendix B). No identifying information was collected and each child was given a participant ID for research purposes.

All of the proposed study measures were printed and student responses were handwritten by the researchers. Each participant was assigned a numeric code that was generated at random by the researchers. Once the list of names and numeric codes had been completed, the study data forms were de-identified. As the participants’ names were the only identifying information, the children’s names were blacked out from the study data forms. A sheet with both the participants’ names and codes were stored separately from the data. Furthermore, signed consent and assent forms were also stored separately and securely from study data. Specifically, the consent and assent forms, and the de-identified study data were stored in a locked file cabinet in the dissertation advisor’s office, and the list of students’ names and the numeric research codes were stored in a locked file cabinet in this writer’s office. Both offices are located at the university where only the researcher and dissertation advisor have access.

*Journey Around the World* curriculum was implemented during the regular instructional time devoted to teaching language arts. The curriculum was implemented in one classroom assigned as the experimental group; while the traditional language arts instruction was provided in another classroom assigned as the control. The curriculum had 40 lessons taught 2-3 times a week from February to May of 2016.

**Procedure**

Upon ensuring the children’s understanding of the study and their participation, four measures were administered to participants from both experimental and control groups prior to
the implementation of the JAWD curriculum. Children’s understanding of the study and their participation were ensured by asking each child to state their understanding of the purpose of the study and their desire to either participate or not participate. After the JAWD curriculum was provided, children in both groups were evaluated again with the same four measures. On both occasions, children were evaluated individually in a quiet location at the school.

**Measures**

**Attitudes Toward School**

The Attitudes Toward School survey was designed specifically for this study (Appendix C). It consisted of questions to evaluate students’ attitudes toward school, students’ favorite school subjects, and students’ motivation for attending school. The following questions were read out loud for children: “Do you like to go to school?”; “Why do you like school?”; “If your teacher will give you permission to stay home and play instead of coming to school, would you stay home or go to school?”; and “Why do you want to stay home/go to school?” and “What do you like the best: Math, reading, or writing?”

The coding process included two coders, which included the primary researcher of this study and his dissertation advisor, and used both an inductive approach (constructed from the children’s responses) and deductive approach (driven by the conceptualization of learning motivation). Through both approaches, frequently reported patterns reflected in the responses were examined to find dominant themes that were consistent within the overall research objectives. Through this process, which was repeated four times to ensure intercoder reliability, the following codes were generated:

- **Intrinsic Motivation** (Examples include: “It’s fun to learn.”; “I get to learn new things”).
• Extrinsic Motivation (Examples: “I get to play basketball”; “You can go outside and don’t have to go to math”).

• Socialization Motivation (Examples: “I have many friends at school”).

• Other (Examples: “Because it’s good to go to school”; “I like school. Days (are) short”).

**Peer Nomination for Prosocial Behavior**

The Child Social Behavior Questionnaire (Warden, Christie, Cheyne, Fitzpatrick, & Reid, 2003) was used to measure peer nomination for prosocial behavior. The questionnaire is based upon children’s observations of their peers’ prosocial behaviors. The original version of the questionnaire was developed to assess both prosocial and antisocial behaviors, and includes three versions – self-, peer-, and teacher-ratings. However, for this study, only the peer version that assessed the prosocial dimensions was used (Appendix D). The eight selected items from the CSBQ were related to four prosocial categories: Helping (H); Sharing (S); Comforting (C); and Including (I). The children were instructed to identify a peer who had displayed one or more of the stated behaviors.

The children were given the following instructions: “I am going to read you some things about what happens in your classroom. When I am finished, I would like you to tell me a name of anyone in your class if you have seen them doing the things that I read you. There is no right or wrong answer. I just want to know your opinion. Do you have any questions? If not, we can start.” Following the instruction, children were provided with the following prompts: “Have you seen anybody in your class, besides your teacher...”

• Helping another child in your class with their work? (H)

• Helping another child if they’ve fallen over or hurt themselves? (H)
• Letting another child in your class play with his/her game or toy? (S)
• Sharing sweets or crayons with another child during playtime? (S)
• Being nice to another child in your class who was sad or unhappy? (C)
• Cheering up another child who was crying or upset? (C)
• Playing with another child in your class who has nobody to play with? (I)
• Sticking up for another child in your class who was in trouble? (I)

Upon completion, nominations for each child for each prosocial category, excluding self-nominations, were calculated by summing all the nominations. For example, if five children nominated Johnny for helping another child with his/her work, and he did not garner any other nominations from his peers for the remainder of other categories of prosocial behaviors, Johnny’s total count for peer-nominations would be five.

It should be noted that the interviewer of children assigned to the experimental group followed a standard protocol and asked for the name of only one peer who exhibited the particular prosocial behavior. However, in the control group, the interviewer departed from the standard protocol and asked for additional names of peers after children named the first peer for prosocial behavior.

**Prosocial Motivation**

Children’s beliefs about motivation for prosocial behaviors were measured using scenarios describing children displaying prosocial behaviors. The scenarios were adopted from *Teaching Social Behavior: Classroom Activities to Foster Children’s Interpersonal Awareness* (Warden & Christie, 1997). Researchers used eight cartoons depicting two characters in interpersonal situations and the brief scenarios attached to each cartoon (Appendix E). Two scenarios were used for each type of prosocial behaviors including helping, sharing, caring, and
including. Two sets of gender-specific scenarios were used. One set depicted boys displaying prosocial behavior to other boys, while the other set depicted girls displaying prosocial behavior to other girls. Same sex only scenarios were presented deliberately to avoid the potential attribution of romantic motives (Rapp, et al., 2017).

Each drawing included a written short sentence that described the scenario and behavior being depicted (e.g., “Colin is stuck with his classwork. Billy tries to help him.”; “Cindy is upset because her dog has died. Tina tries to comfort her and cheer her up.”). The drawings were presented one by one and read aloud for the children. It was explained that there were no correct or incorrect responses, and that they were to simply provide the reasons behind the behaviors being depicted in the picture.

Qualitative content analysis was used to code children’s responses. The analysis involved condensing the responses into categories or themes. Through both inductive and deductive approaches, the codes were developed by analyzing the responses and identifying meaningful themes related to prosocial motivation. Once the thematic codes were independently developed by the coders, coding consistency was then assessed through consensus coding procedure. To further ensure the consistency of coding, a coding manual, which consists of thematic codes, definitions, and examples was developed. During several meetings/discussions that involved rounds of compare-and-contrast processes of data analysis, the coding manual evolved and was refined to clarify the eventual resulting eight codes. These codes are described below:

- **Prosocial Norms/Beliefs/Attitudes**: Explanation of behavior as a result of internal characteristics of an individual and socially desirable and prosocial values, norms, attitudes, and traits (Examples include: “Because she wanted to be kind and try to her do work.”; “He is trying to be a good friend.”).
• Actions to Benefit Others: Explanation of behavior as a result of focusing on another person’s needs without stating and/or recognizing the mental and/or emotional conditions of the other person (Examples: “To make him happy.”; “Because she might have gotten lost if she didn’t”).

• General Perspective-Taking: Explanation of behavior as a result of inferring another person’s condition without the recognition of the emotional conditions of the other person (Examples: “Because he is new and he might not know where to go.”; “Because she might be new to school and she wants to make friends”).

• Affective Perspective-Taking: Explanation of behavior as a result of understanding of the emotional condition of others (Examples: “Because he is really sad.”; “So she doesn’t get embarrassed if she goes to a different class”).

• Cultural Perspective-Taking: Explanation of behavior as a result of sensitivity toward others’ cultural perspective (Example: “Because Emma might be from a different country and she doesn’t know where it is, because at her old school, the cafeteria was at another place”).

• Non-Prosocial Behavior: Explanation of behavior that is deviant from the social norm (antisocial); result of potential personal benefits (self-interest); and complying to command/direction of adult(s) (Examples: “Because they don’t like her.”; “To get him in trouble”).

• Re-Stating: Explanation of behavior as a result of re-stating of the external events without any hint of emotional reaction (Examples: “Because her dog died.”; “Because he is stuck with his work”).

• Miscellaneous
These eight codes were combined into two large groups: *Prosocial Motivation* and *Other*. *Prosocial Motivation* category included prosocial norms/beliefs/attitudes, actions to benefit others, general perspective-taking, affective perspective-taking, and cultural perspective-taking, while the *Other* category included non-prosocial behavior, re-stating, and miscellaneous.

**Prosocial Behavior: Sticker sharing**

Children’s affective vocabulary and sharing behavior were evaluated using the sticker sharing method (Williams, O’Driscoll, & Moore, 2014). Children were provided with three stories describing an imaginary child (Mary, Johnny, Jenny) encountering situations that provoke feelings of sadness (Stories 1 and 2) and humiliation (Story 3). Story 1 was about a girl and her lost puppy; Story 2, a best friend moving to another town; and Story 3, a new student tripping in the hallway in front of other children (Appendix F).

Children were provided with the following instruction: “*I want to tell you some stories.*” After each story was read out loud for children, they were asked, “*How do you think (Character) feels?*” Upon their responses, children were then given 10 stickers and the following instructions: “*Here are 10 stickers, you can keep them all, or you can share with (Character) to make (him/her) feel better. Do you want to share?*” If a child declined to share, the next story was read. If the child expressed desire to share the stickers to appease the character in distress, the following instruction was given: *How many stickers would you like to give to (Character)? You can give as many or few as you want.*” The child was then prompted to place the stickers on an index card. These instructions were given for all three stories.
Chapter 4. Results

The goal of the present pilot study is to determine the adequacy of the research methods in measuring intervention outcomes related to attitudes towards school and prosocial behaviors and motivations in second-grade children. The results that are described will help to refine outcome measures in order to conduct a large-scale outcome study in the future.

*Measure of Attitudes Toward School*

The Attitudes Toward School questionnaire was designed for this study and consisted of questions to evaluate students’ attitudes toward school, students’ motivation for attending school, and student’s favorite school subject. Obtained data is provided in Table 1.

**Table 1. Attitudes Toward School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental Group (N = 10)</th>
<th>Control Group (N = 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you like to go to school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8 (80%)</td>
<td>8 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do you like school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization Motivation</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you stay home or go to school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay Home</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to School</td>
<td>8 (80%)</td>
<td>8 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do you like to go to school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intrinsic Motivation 3 (30%) 5 (50%) 2 (13%) 1 (7%)
Extrinsic Motivation 2 (20%) 2 (20%) 1 (7%) 2 (13%)
Socialization Motivation 1 (10%) 1 (10%) -- --
Other 2 (20%) -- 4 (27%) 4 (27%)
No Response -- -- -- 1 (7%)

\[a\] One child cited both extrinsic and socialization motivations
\[b\] Two children cited both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations

In order to determine the whether the questionnaire could evaluate children’s attitudes toward school and their learning motivations, the results that compare the responses of children in both groups between pre- and post-evaluations, are presented. Related, these results reflected the changes in children’s attitudes toward school.

Specifically, for the question, “Do you like to go to school?” 80% of children from the experimental group answered positively before the intervention. After the intervention, this number remained the same for the experimental group. In the control group, 73% answered positively to the question at pre-test, but only 47% at post-test.

For both groups, only the children who responded that they liked school were asked a follow-up question, “Why do you like school?” in order to understand their motivations for going to school. It should be noted that the percentages were calculated relative to the total number of children in the class. Before intervention in the experimental group, 20% of children indicated intrinsic motivation such as enjoying learning about their favorite subjects. In addition, 50% of children provided extrinsic motivation (e.g., “Because I can do activities and do fun stuff.”) and 20% endorsed socialization motivation. After the JAWD curriculum, the number of children with intrinsic motivation increased to 50%, while the number of children who provided extrinsic and socialization motivations decreased to 20% and 10%, respectively. In the control
group, 53% of children provided intrinsic and 27% children provided extrinsic motivations and in pre-test. During post-test, 40% indicated intrinsic motivation. Lastly, 7% of children indicated socialization motivation in pre- and post-test.

The third question assessed whether children, if given the option to stay home, would stay home or go to school. There was no difference in the number of children who preferred school between experimental group pre- and post-test (80% of children in both pre- and post-test preferred to go to school). For the control group, 47% of children preferred to go school in pre-test, and 53% in post-test.

Similar to above, only the children who responded that they preferred to go to school over staying home were asked a follow-up question, “Why do you like to go to go school?” in order to understand their motivation for their preference. Before intervention in the experimental group, 30% indicated intrinsic motivation, such as getting better grades and wanting to learn, while after the intervention, 50% endorsed intrinsic motivation. In the control group, 13% indicated intrinsic motivation during pre-test, which dropped to 7% in post-test.

Overall, the Attitudes Toward School questionnaire was shown to detect the changes in attitudes towards their school and learning motivation for children assigned to the experimental group. However, data on the student’s favorite school subjects was not included as the primary focus was on evaluating the students’ general attitudes towards school and learning motivation.

**Measure of Prosocial Behavior: Peer Nominations**

For the Peer Nominations test, each child was asked to nominate his/her peers on four prosocial behaviors including: Helping, sharing, comforting, and inviting. There were two examples of behavior for each category. It should be also noted that interviewer of children in the experimental group followed a standard protocol and asked for the name of only one peer
who exhibited the particular prosocial behavior. However, in the control group, the interviewer unintentionally departed from the standard protocol and asked for additional names of peers after children named the first peer for prosocial behavior. It was decided in the control group, to ask for the additional names during post-test also. Since two different protocol were used in experimental and control group, data are presented in separate tables. Table 2a represents data from the experimental group and Table 2b – from the control group.

Table 2a. Total Number of Peer Nominations Received – Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping (with classwork)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping (when hurt)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing (Toys)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing (Snacks/Crayons)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheering Up</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comforting Others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Others</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sticking Up for Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for all categories</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Self-Nominations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2b. Total Number of Peer Nominations Received – Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping (with classwork)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping (when hurt)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>+44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing (Toys)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing (Snacks/Crayons)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheering Up</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>+27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comforting Others</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>+48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Others</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>+66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sticking Up for Others</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for all categories</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>+15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Self-Nominations</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the *Helping* category, children were provided with two examples of helping others with classwork and assisting peers when hurt. For the experimental group, 6 nominations were obtained before the intervention and 5 nominations were made after the intervention for the *Helping with Classwork* category, which represents a percentage decrease of 16%. In the control group, there was no percentage difference and yielded 39 nominations during both pre- and post-test. For the *Helping Others When Hurt* category, 16 and 10 nominations were observed in the experimental group in pre- and post-test, respectively, which represents a 38% decrease. The same category yielded a percentage increase of 44%, which represents 38 nominations in pre-test and 55 in post-test.

The *Sharing* category included examples of sharing toys and snacks with peers. Before the JAWD curriculum, children in the experimental group provided 9 peer nominations for the *Sharing Toys* category, while after intervention, 12 nominations were made (33% increase). The control group yielded 36 nominations during pre-test, and 30 in post-test, which represents a
16% decrease. For the *Sharing Snacks/Crayons* category, the experimental group yielded 7 and 13 nominations in pre- and post-test, respectively, which represents an 85% increase. Meanwhile, the control group produced an 11% decrease in the same category, with 26 nominations in pre-test and 23% in post-test.

In the category of *Comforting*, 4 and 11 nominations were made for the experimental group before and after the intervention, respectively, for the *Cheering Up* category, which represents a 175% increase. In the same category, the control group yielded 37 nominations in pre-test and 47 during post-test, resulting in an increase of 27%. In the *Comforting Others* category, there was an increase of 80% in the experimental group, which represents 5 nominations in pre-test and 9 in post-test. For the control group, 25 nominations in pre-test and 37 nominations in post-test were observed. This represents a 48% increase.

For the *Inviting* category, two examples of including peers in playing and standing up for others were provided. For the *Including Others* category, the experimental group yielded 12 peer nominations during both pre- and post-intervention. In the control group, there was an increase of 66% during post-test, which represents 45 nominations. During the pre-test, 27 nominations were observed. However, the experimental group also yielded an increase of 550% in the *Sticking Up for Others* category, which represents 2 and 13 nominations in pre- and post-test, respectively. There was a decrease of 29% in the control group, which represents 27 nominations in pre-test and 19 in post-test.

There was a significant positive change for one child in the experimental group. Before the intervention, she did not receive any nominations from her peers, indicating that her behaviors with and around her peers were not particularly noted to be prosocial. However, after the intervention, she earned a total of 9 peer nominations across all four categories. Specifically,
she received 2 nominations for *Helping with Classwork*, 3 for *Sharing Snacks/Crayons*, 1 for *Cheering Up*, 1 for *Including Others*, and 2 for *Sticking Up for Others*. Notably, the significant changes in the child’s behavior and her peers’ perceptions of her prosocial behaviors were accurately reflected through the Peer Nomination method.

In addition to nominating their peers, the children also nominated themselves for prosocial behaviors. For the experimental group, 5 self-nominations were made prior to receiving the curriculum, and 12 self-nominations post-intervention, which represents a 140% increase. The children in the control group provided 25 and 12 self-nominations in pre- and post-test, respectively – representing a percentage decrease of 52%.

While the Peer Nomination method was successful in detecting the changes in a child’s behaviors as perceived by his/her peers, it should be noted that the method could be shortened. Specifically, asking participants to nominate peers for two separate examples of the same prosocial behavior (e.g., “Have you seen anybody in your class, besides your teacher, sharing sweets or crayons with another child during playtime?” and “Have you seen anybody in your class, besides your teacher, letting another child in your class play with his/her game or toy?”) seemed repetitive and could be collapsed into one question (e.g., “Have you seen anybody in your class, besides your teacher, sharing candies or toys with another child?”)

**Measure of Prosocial Motivation and Perspective Taking**

To test the proposed research measure, children were presented with cartoon drawings with a short scenario regarding what is depicted in the drawings. Children were asked to explain the motivation for prosocial behaviors of characters. Several types of prosocial motivation were identified including prosocial norms/beliefs, actions to benefit others, general, affective, and
cultural perspective-taking. “Other” motivation included non-prosocial behavior, re-stating, and miscellaneous. Data presented in Table 7 describe the number of responses for each category.

Table 7. Prosocial Motivation Categories: Frequency of Mention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prosocial Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Norms/Beliefs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions to Benefit Others</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Perspective-Taking</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Perspective-Taking</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Perspective-Taking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Prosocial Motivation</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Prosocial Behavior</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-stating</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, children in the experimental group provided 39 counts of *Prosocial Motivation* before the intervention which increased to 45 counts after receiving the JAWD curriculum. In the control group, 81 and 74 counts of prosocial motivation were noted in pre- and post-test evaluations, respectively. There was a decrease in the number of responses in the *Other Motivation* category between pre- and post-intervention for the experimental group (25 to 18), while no change was observed in the control group (23 to 23). These results reflect the potential
for the capacity of the proposed method in evaluating children’s ability to take perspective of others in need and identify prosocial motivation. However, the measure could be shortened as there were too many scenarios, which were found to be redundant.

Notably for both groups, the frequency of children’s attribution of the characters’ behaviors to prosocial norms/attitudes decreased in the post-test evaluation. Specifically, the experimental group provided 12 counts before the intervention and 10 following the curriculum, compared to 27 and 22 in the control group.

In the experimental group, before the intervention, 13 counts of *Actions to Benefit Others* were provided which increased to 15 in the post-intervention phase. For example, before the intervention, a child said, “He’s just trying to be nice – or he wants another player or a new friend” which did not have a reference to the person in need but focused on his own needs. However, after the JAWD curriculum, the same child showed an increased capacity to focus on a person in need: “Because everyone was being mean to him and he didn’t get invited to anyone’s game, so Lee invited him to the game.” In the control group, fewer children indicated behaviors to benefit others (27 to 18 in pre- and post-test, respectively).

Results indicate that children in both experimental and control groups demonstrated increased capacity to take the perspectives of others. For example, the attribution of the characters’ motives as a result of general perspective-taking capacities increased from 7 to 10 in the experimental group before- and after- the intervention, respectively. Similarly, the control group produced the same pattern with the increase from 20 in pre-test to 22 in post-test. Children in both groups demonstrated some increase in their affective perspective-taking abilities to describe the characters’ motivation for prosocial behavior. Specifically, before the intervention, children in the experimental provided 7 counts, compared to 8 after the
intervention. In the control group, a similar pattern was observed and provided 7 and 12 counts in pre- and post-test evaluation, respectively.

Notably, before the intervention, neither children from experimental nor control group were able to take cultural perspectives, i.e., displaying the understanding of and appreciation for differences among cultures. However, after the intervention, two children from experimental group indicated that the characters were prosocial because of their recognition of cultural difference of other students. For instance, in response to a cartoon that depicted a child helping a new student find his/her way to the dining hall, before the intervention, one child in the experimental group provided the following response: “Because she’s a new person and doesn’t know where to go.” However, after the intervention, the same child responded, “Because Emma might be from a different county and she doesn’t know where it is because at her old school, the cafeteria was at another place.” Similarly, before the intervention, another child stated, “I think because the principal told Billy to help” which indicates an attribution of prosocial behavior to a need to be compliant to the directives of adults. However, after the intervention, this child displayed a change in his perspective-taking abilities by offering the following reason: “I think he was hungry. Also, some people don’t know many languages and Todd might have known the language the new kid knew, so he could help.” Notably, no children in the control group used cultural perspective-taking to describe the characters’ prosocial behaviors.

Overall, the proposed measure of prosocial motivation and perspective-taking appeared to be an appropriate method. However, some of the drawings depicted the similar actions (e.g., sharing lunch and sharing toys) and did not necessarily produce distinct prosocial motivations from children and simply elongated the research protocol.

**Sticker Sharing**
For the Sticker Sharing method, children were asked if they wished to share stickers to appease children described in stories. Data presented in Table 3 revealed an overall upward trend for experimental group between pre- and post-test, while the opposite was true for control group.

Table 3. Total number of stickers shared for Sticker Sharing Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Stickers Shared</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 1: Lost Puppy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 2: Friend Moving</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 3: Tripped and Fell</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before the intervention, for Story 1, which described a girl with a lost puppy, children in the experimental group shared 20 stickers. After the intervention, the number of stickers shared to comfort the character increased to 25. In the control group, 56 stickers were shared at pre-test, but 47 during post-test.

In addition, in the experimental group, 18 stickers were shared before and 19 after the intervention for Story 2, which described a situation of friends being separated due to a move of one friend. Children in the control group shared 50 stickers at pre-test, but fewer stickers at post-test with 38 stickers.

The third story that described a situation with a new girl at the school tripping in the hallway in front of other students resulted in 21 stickers shared before the intervention in the experimental group. After the intervention, children shared 23 stickers to comfort the character.
In the control group, the number of stickers shared decreased from 43 to 41 stickers from pre- to post-test, respectively.

The Sticker Sharing test was also used to measure affective vocabulary. Children were asked to identify the feelings of the characters described in the above stories. Data presented in Tables 4 through 6 represent the number of emotions that were identified for each story.

Table 4. *Sticker Sharing: Number of emotions identified for Story 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story 1: Lost Puppy</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonely</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustrated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Story 1, the number of discrete affective words identified by the experimental group increased from 3 to 5 between pre- and post-intervention. More specifically, before the intervention, children identified only three emotions: Sad, upset, and mad. After the intervention, children identified the following additional emotions: Depressed, angry, and furious. Children in the control group have had better vocabulary from the beginning for all three stories. However, the control group demonstrated a decrease from 9 discrete affective vocabulary identified to 6 in pre- and post-test evaluations, respectively.

Table 5. Sticker Sharing: Number of emotions identified for Story 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 2: Friend Moving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonely</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranky</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprised</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Story 2, the number of discrete emotions identified before intervention in the experimental group was 3, and increased to 6 after intervention. Before intervention, children identified the following emotions: Sad, bad, and cranky. After the intervention, the following additional emotions were identified: Depressed, upset, angry, worried, and lonely. In the control group, 11 emotions were identified in pre-test, but 6 in post-test. Furthermore, two children in both pre- and post-test control group provided misattributed emotion (e.g., happy) to inaccurately describe the character likely experiencing feelings of disappointment and/or sadness.

Table 6. Sticker Sharing: Number of emotions identified for Story 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 3: Tripped and Fell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>Post-Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crying</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embarrassed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Story 3, the number of emotions identified remained the same at 5 for experimental group in both pre- and post-intervention. In the control group, the number of emotions identified again decreased from 12 to 9 between pre-and post-test evaluations, respectively.

All in all, while the Sticker Sharing method was appropriate in tracking children’s capacity for prosocial behaviors, the three stories that were used lacked the distinctly different emotions as two of the stories elicited the same emotion (e.g., sadness). Therefore, it is unclear if including three stories with three distinct emotions (e.g., sadness, anxiety, and fear) would have produced different reactions from children. Furthermore, participants were curious if the characters presented were real. As a response to this curiosity, participants were informed that the characters were not “real” children from their school, but that they could be real characters in the community encountering the situations.
Chapter 5. Discussion

The development of social and emotional competences, including empathy and prosocial behaviors, in early childhood has a significant impact on later development, including positive relationship with peers (CASEL, 2008). Importantly, it has been suggested that children will be most successful in schools, homes, and communities when they are taught social and emotional competences (Elias, 2014; Jones & Bouffard, 2012; Zins et al., 2004). Prosocial behavior is essential for learning the values and skills that enable children to effectively navigate their complex social environments, as well as academic achievement (Caprara, et al., 2000; Greenberg et al., 2003). In contrast, lack of prosocial behaviors in children is associated with aggressive and conduct behaviors, poor social adjustment, and peer rejection (Obsuth, Eisner, Malti, & Ribeaud, 2015). Research suggests that children who participate in social-emotional learning programs are more cooperative, inclusive of others, prosocial, and less aggressive compared to children who do not participate in such programs (CASEL, 2008; Eisenberg et al., 2006; Elias, 2014; Jones & Bouffard, 2012; Wenzel, 2015; Zins et al., 2004). Cultivating children’s social-emotional skills is important as these relate to prosocial behaviors that will help children become more engaged and well-adjusted in the future.

The Journey Around the World is an elementary school curriculum that teaches children prosocial competencies through language arts instruction. The purpose of the present study was to determine whether the proposed research methods are appropriate in detecting the outcomes of the Journey Around the World curriculum related to children’s prosocial behaviors and motivations and attitudes toward school, including learning motivation. The results from this study will help to refine both the curriculum and outcome measures in order to conduct a large-scale outcome study in the future.
The first measure was the Attitudes Toward School questionnaire, which was shown to reflect the changes in attitudes for children in experimental group towards their school and learning. The results showed that the questionnaire was able to detect that more children in the experimental group indicated preference for school after the receiving the JAWD curriculum. In the control group, the number of students who expressed preference for school decreased between pre- and post-test evaluation.

Furthermore, after the JAWD curriculum, more children in the experimental group expressed preference going to school over staying home, compared to the control group. These findings were expected as previous research found that students in socio-emotional learning programs demonstrated improved attitudes toward school and feeling more connected to their schools (CASEL, 2008; Durlak et al., 2008; Weissberg et al., 2015).

The results of the present study also demonstrated that after participating in the JAWD curriculum, more children in the experimental group demonstrated intrinsic learning motivation than the control group, which demonstrated a decrease in the intrinsic learning motivation. Overall, the questionnaire developed to assess attitudes toward school was able to capture the expected changes in children’s attitudes towards school and their learning motivation. Related, the question on children’s favorite school subjects can be omitted in the future version of the questionnaire.

The Peer Nomination and Sticker Sharing methods were used to assess if they could detect the changes in prosocial behaviors for children assigned to the experimental group. The results showed that the children participating in the JAWD curriculum displayed increased prosocial behaviors - when assessed by Peer Nominations and Sticker Sharing tests. The number of peer nominations for prosocial behavior across all categories (e.g., helping, sharing,
comforting, and inviting) increased after the intervention for the experimental group. The control group also saw an increase in the Helping, Comforting, and Inviting categories, but there was a decrease in the number of Sharing category. The total amount of increase across all four categories were greater in the experimental group compared to the control group. It should be noted that in the experimental group the greatest increase was for helping and comforting behaviors, but significantly less for sharing and inviting. It was also found that the number of self-nominations for prosocial behavior increased for the experimental group after the intervention. However, the opposite trend was observed in the control group. These findings are significant in that it indicates that the children in the experimental group were not only able to recognize the prosocial behaviors in their peers, but also assert themselves in prosocial manner. This is consistent with the literature that suggested that social and emotional learning for children is associated with a range of positive outcomes, including increased peer-rated prosocial behaviors (Greenberg, 2010). It is important to note that the inadvertent differences in the administration instruction provided by interviewers between control and experimental groups yielded the large differences among the number of nominations observed in the two groups on pre-test. Specifically, the interviewer of children assigned to the experimental group followed a standard protocol and asked for the name of only one peer who exhibited the particular prosocial behavior. However, in the control group, the interviewer departed from the standard protocol and asked for additional names of peers after children named the first peer for prosocial behavior.

It should be noted that the Peer Nomination method could be shortened. Specifically, asking participants to nominate peers for two separate examples of the same prosocial behavior (e.g., “Have you seen anybody in your class, besides your teacher, sharing sweets or crayons
with another child during playtime?” and “Have you seen anybody in your class, besides your teacher, letting another child in your class play with his/her game or toy?”) seemed redundant and elongated the assessment protocol.

For the Sticker Sharing test, children in the experimental group shared more stickers with imaginary children in distress following the JAWD curriculum compared to the control group. These results were also expected since previous studies which indicated that classroom-based SEL programs promoted the development of children’s empathy and prosociality (Schonert-Reichl et al., 2015). The Sticker Sharing test is an age-appropriate and effective way to assess children’s capacity for prosocial behaviors. However, as was mentioned in the Results section, some children had doubts whether peers described in the stories were real and had to be clarified that they were not real children from their school. In this regard, it is not certain how knowing that they were not “real” impacted the participants’ sharing behavior.

The Sticker Sharing was able to detect that children in the experimental group exhibited an upward trend in the number of discrete affective vocabulary identified across all three stories after receiving the JAWD curriculum, while the opposite trend was observed for the control group. However, the increase in the experimental group’s affective vocabulary was modest. As noted above, the trends observed may also not be the most accurate representation of participants’ affective vocabulary due to the lack of three distinct emotions from the three stories.

The measure of prosocial motivation and perspective-taking reflected that children in the experimental group displayed an increase in the following categories of prosocial motivation after receiving the JAWD curriculum: Actions to benefit others, general perspective-taking, affective perspective-taking, and cultural perspective-taking. However, changes in affective
perspective-taking were very small. The control group exhibited a decrease in the actions to benefit others and general perspective-taking categories during post-test evaluation. The stories accompanied with drawings were effective in assessing children’s capacity to take others’ perspectives and provide their understanding of the motives of others’ prosocial behaviors.

Notably, the measure of prosocial motivation and perspective-taking was able to capture cultural perspective-taking ability in the experiment group after the Journey curriculum.

Overall, the results of this study support the research methodology. Specifically, the proposed measures demonstrated the capacity and sensitivity to detect the expected changes in children’s attitudes toward school and learning motivation, affective vocabulary, and prosocial motivation, as indicated by literature. Furthermore, the results also demonstrated that the proposed research method was able to appropriately reflect children’s growing appreciation for diversity and cultural perspective-taking.

**Limitations and Directions for Future Research**

There were several limitations in this study. First, the study had small sample sizes in both experimental and control groups.

Next limitation is related to the time frame of curriculum implementation as the implementation time was shortened (4 months instead of 9 months). While all the content lessons were delivered, lessons aimed at reviewing learning material, practicing prosocial skills, lessons with story-retelling and writing lessons were omitted. Furthermore, there was an unintentional alteration in research protocol. Specifically, there were differences in the administration instruction provided by the interviewers between control and experimental groups for the Peer Nomination method, resulting in large differences of number of nominations provided in the two groups.
Based on the present research the following recommendations have been made for future studies:

1. The question on children’s favorite school subjects can be omitted as the objective remains on the appropriateness of the Attitudes Toward School questionnaire in evaluating the students’ overall attitudes towards school and learning motivation.

2. The number of questions asked in the Peer Nominations method can be reduced. While the main categories of Helping, Sharing, Comforting, and Inviting should remain, having one question for each category might be enough.

3. Future studies may include three distinct emotions in the Sticker Sharing test - for example, sadness, anxiety, and fear. It would be important to ensure that the stories elicit distinctly different emotions to better understand children’s helping behaviors in reaction to emotionally distressing situations.

4. It may be cumbersome to use eight situations to assess children’s perceptions of others’ motivations for prosocial behaviors. For example, some situations depicted similar actions (e.g., “Why do you think Peter is sharing his lunch with Jim?” and “Why do you think Peter is sharing his sweets with Gerry?”) and did not necessarily generate distinct motivations. Similar to the Peer Nomination measure, future studies may modify to include only one situation for each category of prosocial behavior.

5. For Sticker sharing test, it will be helpful to provide illustrations/photographs of characters to help the children to visualize and empathize with the characters in distress.

6. As the JAWD curriculum aims to enhance the global competence and knowledge about cultural diversity, stories should include hypothetical characters of different
ethnicity and/or culture. For example, including cultural details in the stories/cartoons would help to assess children’s cultural sensitivity.
APPENDIXES

Appendix A. Parent/Guardian Informed Consent

Parent/Guardian Informed Consent

Identification of Investigators & Purpose of Study
Your child is being asked to participate in a research study conducted by Jae Seung Cha, M.Ed. and Elena Savina, Ph.D. from James Madison University. The purpose of this study is to investigate the effect of the prosocial and global education curriculum, *Journey Around the World*, on prosocial behaviors of elementary school children. The curriculum is designed to foster emotional understanding, emotion regulation, social skills, and prosocial behavior through literacy instruction.

Research Procedures
Should you decide to allow your child to participate in this research study, you will be asked to sign this consent form once all your questions have been answered to your satisfaction. This study consists of 4 short surveys. Your child will be asked to identify the names of classmates whom they have seen behaving friendly to other children; to look at the cartoons depicting children helping each other and to explain reason for their behavior; and to share stickers (provided by the researcher) with children in need. Lastly, your child will be asked questions about how much he/she likes school.

Your child will be surveyed before and after receiving the *Journey Around the World* instruction.

Time Required
It will take no more than 20 minutes to complete the surveys.

Risks
The investigators do not perceive more than minimal risks from your child’s involvement in this study.

Benefits
The main potential benefit of participating in this study is getting better knowledge about how to teach children social and emotional skills including friendship, empathy, and understanding emotions.

Payment for participation
There is no payment for taking part in the study.

Confidentiality
The data obtained in study will be treated in confidential manner. The results of this project will be coded in such a way that the child’s identity will not be attached to the final form of this study. All data will be stored in a secure location accessible only to the researcher and after 3 years, it will be destroyed. Only the averaged data will be presented at a dissertation defense.
meeting and professional conferences. The researcher also retains the right to use and publish non-identifiable data.

**Participation & Withdrawal**
Your child’s participation is entirely voluntary. He/she is free to choose not to participate. Should you and your child choose to participate, he/she can withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind.

**Questions about the Study**
If you have questions or concerns during the time of your child’s participation in this study, or after its completion or you would like to receive a copy of the final aggregate results of this study, please contact:

Researcher’s Name: Jae Seung Cha, M.Ed.  
Department: Graduate Psychology  
James Madison University  
Email Address: chajx@dukes.jmu.edu

Advisor’s Name: Elena Savina, Ph.D.  
Department: Graduate Psychology  
James Madison University  
Telephone: (540) 568-5003  
Email Address: savinaea@jmu.edu

**Questions about Your Rights as a Research Subject**
Dr. David Cockley  
Chair, Institutional Review Board  
James Madison University  
(540) 568-2834  
cocklede@jmu.edu

**Giving of Consent**
I have read this consent form and I understand what is being requested of my child as a participant in this study. I freely consent for my child to participate. I have been given satisfactory answers to my questions. The investigator provided me with a copy of this form. I certify that I am at least 18 years of age.

____________________________________  
Name of Child (Printed)

____________________________________  
Name of Parent/Guardian (Printed)

____________________________________    ________
Name of Parent/Guardian (Signed)    Date

____________________________________    ______________
Name of Researcher (Signed)    Date
Appendix B. Child Assent Form

CHILD ASSENT FORM (Ages 7-12)

IRB # ______

The Effect of Journey around the World Curriculum on Prosocial feelings and Behavior in Elementary School Children

We would like to invite you to take part in this study. We are asking you because you are currently a student in (TEACHER)’s class in Spotswood Elementary school.

In this study we want to learn how to help children behave nice to peers and make friends. We will ask you to do answer some simple questions about how much you like school. We will also ask you to tell us the names of classmates whom you have seen behaving friendly to other children. Next, we will show you some pictures and ask you to tell us about what you think about the behavior of children on the picture. Lastly, we will read you three stories and ask you if you would want to make them feel better.

Participating in this study will not hurt you in any way. You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to. The reason we are doing this study is so that we can help children to make friends and be nice to others.

Your parents gave their permission for you to take part in this study.

If you have any questions at any time, please ask one of the researchers.

IF YOU PRINT YOUR NAME ON THIS FORM IT MEANS THAT YOU HAVE DECIDED TO PARTICIPATE AND HAVE READ EVERYTHING THAT IS ON THIS FORM. YOU AND YOUR PARENTS WILL BE GIVEN A COPY OF THIS FORM TO KEEP.

__________________________________________________________
Name of Child (printed)  Date

__________________________________________________________
Signature of Investigator  Date

Researcher’s Name: Jae Seung Cha, M.Ed.  Advisor’s Name: Elena Savina, Ph.D.
Department: Graduate Psychology  Department: Graduate Psychology
James Madison University  James Madison University
Email Address: chajx@dukes.jmu.edu  Telephone: (540) 568-5003
Email Address: savinaea@jmu.edu
Appendix C. Attitudes Toward School

**Attitudes Toward School**

This questionnaire is designed to measure the children’s attitudes towards school and school subjects through the following questions:

1. Do you like to go to school? If “Yes”, ask “Why do you like to go to school?”

   _______________________________________________________________________

   _______________________________________________________________________

2. If your school teacher will give you permission to stay home and play instead of coming to the school, would you stay home or go to school? Why?

   _______________________________________________________________________

   _______________________________________________________________________

3. What do you like the best: math, reading or writing? Why do you like (name the subject identified by the child) the best?

   _______________________________________________________________________

   _______________________________________________________________________
Appendix D. Child Social Behavior Questionnaire (CSBQ)

Child Social Behavior Questionnaire (CSBQ)

This questionnaire is designed to evaluate the children’s prosocial behavior and dispositions from the perspectives of other children. They will be asked to identify a peer based on the listed behaviors:

Ask the child, “Have you seen anybody in your class, besides your teacher...” and write down the name of the identified peer.

- Helping another child in your class with their work? (Helping)

- Helping another child if they’ve fallen over or hurt themselves? (Helping)

- Letting another child in your class play with his/her game or toy? (Sharing)

- Sharing sweets or crayons with another child during playtime? (Sharing)

- Being nice to another child in your class who was sad or unhappy? (Caring)

- Cheering up another child who was crying or upset? (Caring)

- Playing with another child in your class who has nobody to play with? (Inclusion)

- Sticking up for another child in your class who was in trouble? (Inclusion)
Appendix E. Prosocial Motivations

Prosocial Behavior Motives  
(Warden & Christie, 1997)

This questionnaire is designed to assess children’s beliefs about others’ motives for prosocial behaviors using a list of cartoon drawings. Underneath each picture, a brief description of the behavior will be included (e.g., “Shona is in hospital because she is ill. Tina goes to visit her in hospital.”). After each picture is presented, ask the children the following question: “Why do you think (Character) helped (Character)?” Children’s responses will be coded as moral, conventional, or personal.

Boys Version:

“Colin is stuck with his classwork. Billy tries to help him.”

Why do you think Billy helped Colin with his classwork?

“Todd is a new boy at school. Billy is showing him the way to the dining hall.”

Why do you think Billy helped Todd find way to the dining hall?
“Jim has forgotten his lunch, so Peter is sharing his with him.”

Why do you think Peter sharing his lunch with Jim?

_____________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________

“Peter is offering Gerry some of his sweets.”

Why do you think Peter sharing his sweets with Gerry?
“Jake is upset because his dog has died. David tries to comfort him and cheer him up.”

Why do you think David is comforting and cheering Jake up?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

“Ben is in hospital because he is ill. David goes to hospital to visit him.”

Why do you think David is visiting Ben in the hospital?

______________________________________________________________________________
“Lee and his friends are playing tag. Lee says to Peter, ‘Do you want to play?’”

Why do you think Lee is inviting Peter to play tag with him and his friends?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

“Lee sees a new boy at the school gate, and says, ‘Do you want to walk up the road with me?’”

Why do you think Lee is inviting the new boy to walk with him?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
**Girls Version:**

“Nicola is stuck with her homework. Katie tries to help her.”

Why do you think Katie helped Nicola with her homework?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

“Emma is a new girl at school. Katie is showing her the way to the dining hall.”

Why do you think Katie helped Emma find her way to the dining hall?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
“Sarah has lost her money for the school trip. Allison lends her the money.”

Why do you think Allison loaned Sarah her money for the school trip?

“Leah asks, ‘Can I borrow your ropes?’ and Allison gives them to her.”

Why do you think Allison let Leah borrow her ropes?
“Cindy is upset because her dog has died. Tina tries to comfort her and cheer her up.”

Why do you think Tina comforted Cindy to cheer her up?

________________________________________________________________________________________

“Sheri is in hospital, because she is ill. Tina goes to visit her in hospital.”

Why do you think Tina visited Sheri in hospital?

________________________________________________________________________________________
“Mia and her friends are playing tag. Mia says to Beth, ‘Do you want to play?’”

Why do you think Mia is inviting Beth to play tag with her and her friends?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

“Mia sees a new girl at the school gate and says, ‘Do you want to walk up the road with me?’”

Why do you think Mia is inviting the new girl to walk with her?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
Appendix F. Sticker Sharing

Prosocial Behaviors

Children are provided with three stories describing an imaginary child (Mary, Johnny, Jenny) encountering situations that provoke feelings of sadness (Stories 1 and 2) and humiliation (Story 3). The following instructions will be given:

“I want to tell you some stories.”

Read the first scenario out loud for students.

There was a girl named Mary who wanted a puppy. She asked her parents every day if they could get her a puppy for her birthday. Her parents first said “no”, but eventually gave in and bought her a puppy. Mary was very happy and named her puppy, Chewie. Mary and Chewie went for walks every day and Chewie slept in Mary’s bed every night. One day, Mary forgot to shut the screen door and Chewie had ran outside without a leash! Mary looked everywhere for Chewie, but could not find him.

“How do you think Mary feels?”

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Upon the child’s response, provide 10 stickers and an index card and the following instructions:

“Here are 10 stickers, you can keep them all, or you can share with Mary to make her feel better. Do you want to share?”

- If the child declines, move on to the next scenario.
- If yes, ask the child: “How many stickers would you like to give to Mary? You can give as many or few as you want.”
  - The child can place the stickers on the index him/herself, or the examiner can do so.

Read the second scenario out loud for students:

Johnny loved to play with his best friend, Tommy. Rain or sunshine, they would be together, either at the park or at each other’s houses. They were very happy playing together! One day, Johnny found out that Tommy has to move to a different town, because Tommy’s dad got a new job.

“How do you think Johnny feels?”

______________________________________________________________________________

Upon the child’s response, provide 10 stickers and an index card and the following instructions:

“Here are 10 stickers, you can keep them all, or you can share with Johnny to make him feel better. Do you want to share?”

- If the child declines, move on to the next scenario.
- If yes, ask the child: “How many stickers would you like to give to Johnny? You can give as many or few as you want.”
  - The child can place the stickers on the index him/herself, or the examiner can do so.

Read the third scenario out loud for students:

Jenny was new to her school and got lost in the hallway. As she was looking around to find her classroom, she tripped and fell on the floor. Several students pointed at Jenny and made fun of her for being clumsy.

“How do you think Jenny feels?”

________________________________________________

Upon the child’s response, provide 10 stickers and an index card and the following instructions: “Here are 10 stickers, you can keep them all, or you can share with Jenny to make her feel better. Do you want to share?”

- If the child declines, move on to the next scenario.
- If yes, ask the child: “How many stickers would you like to give to Jenny? You can give as many or few as you want.”
  - The child can place the stickers on the index him/herself, or the examiner can do so.
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