



CATÓLICA
FACULDADE DE EDUCAÇÃO
E PSICOLOGIA

PORTO

PROSOCIAL TENDENCIES MEASURE ADAPTATION: A PORTUGUESE CONTRIBUTE FOR THE HEROIC IMAGINATION PROJECT

Dissertation presented to Universidade Católica Portuguesa
in order to obtain the degree of Master in Psychology

- Major in Psychology of Justice and Deviant Behavior -

Sara Emanuela Castro Nunes da Silva

Porto, December 2016



CATÓLICA

FACULDADE DE EDUCAÇÃO
E PSICOLOGIA

PORTO

PROSOCIAL TENDENCIES MEASURE ADAPTATION: A PORTUGUESE CONTRIBUTE FOR THE HEROIC IMAGINATION PROJECT

Dissertation presented to Universidade Católica Portuguesa
in order to obtain the degree of Master in Psychology

- Major in Psychology of Justice and Deviant Behavior -

Sara Emanuela Castro Nunes da Silva

under the orientation of

Ph.D. Mariana Barbosa, and Ph.D. Gábor Orosz

Porto, December 2016

Acknowledgements

To you dad, thank you for teaching me what's truly important in life, to have a kind heart and do good. Wherever you are right now, this work, and all this effort is for you.

To my mum, your dedication, your unconditional support has made this possible. Even now, while I'm writing this words, you're watching over Lucas for me. To you mum, and dad I owe everything.

To my dearest husband, who has been my companion for so long. Thank you for inspiring me to reach for new heights. For sharing my enthusiasm, for the endless discussions about my work, for reading and revising it.

To my beloved daughters Mariana and Bárbara. I'm so proud of you two. Thank you for your understanding when I was so busy and couldn't go out for a walk in the park or ride the bike, and even though I knew you were sad, you would still encouraging me with your words.

To my baby boy, Lucas, a Hero in training.

To Professor Mariana Barbosa, thank you for your friendship. Our shared convictions and beliefs have made this work even more inspiring. Thank you for believing in me and staying by my side when I was struggling to carry on.

To Professor Lurdes Verissimo and Professor Pedro Dias, thank you for your guidance and availability to answer my questions and doubts.

To Professor Gábor Orosz, thank you for your support and orientation, and for your interest and dedication to this work.

To my sweet friends and colleagues, Marta, Mariana, Ana, Tiago, André, and Carolina. It has been a great pleasure to work with you all. Thank you for your support, for always being there, and for being who you are.

Index

Abstract.....	1
Introduction.....	2
Theoretical Framework.....	4
Contributions of psychology to the understanding of immoral behavior...6	
Conceptual Delimitation.....	8
Altruism vs. Heroism.....	9
Prosocial Behaviors.....	10
Prosocial Tendencies Measure (PTM).....	12
Method.....	13
Results.....	15
Discussion.....	17
Conclusion.....	18
References.....	20

Appendix Index

Appendix I- Medida de Tendências Prosociais

Abstract

Human strengths have been emerging as a topic of great interest, especially because they may provide us with a path to develop a more just and equal world. Psychology has paid small attention to human behavior that considers the welfare of others above it's one (Zimbardo, 2004) and for such reason the Heroic Imagination Project has set its goal to redefine heroism making it reachable for anyone. Because we expect to implement the HIP in Portugal and evaluate the direct outcomes of the interventions, we have made the aim of the present study to develop the Portuguese version of one of the evaluation instruments that compose HIP's evaluation protocols: the Prosocial Tendencies Measure (PTM), measuring six types of prosocial tendencies. We have used a convenience sample of 1.457 high school students. We present evidence of a validated five-factor structure (emotional / dire; anonymous; public; compliant; altruism), supporting the notion of differentiated forms of helping, as pointed out by the literature. The exploratory factor analysis demonstrates that the Portuguese version of the PTM is reliable and internally consistent, enhancing the utility of the PTM as a valid measure of prosocial behaviors to be use with late Portuguese adolescents.

Key-words: Prosocial behaviors, Heroism, Measurement, Adolescents

Introduction

Founded by Philip Zimbardo, Professor Emeritus of Psychology at the University of Stanford, the Heroic Imagination Project¹ (HIP) aims to redefine heroism and make it more relevant to the world of the twenty-first century. Accordingly to HIP's philosophy, the real heroism is not something reserved only to exceptional individuals, who perform something extraordinary or particularly risky, but on the contrary, it is something within the reach of anyone. In this perspective, heroism is conceptualized as an active attempt to confront injustice or create positive change in the world, despite possible opposing pressures. Thus, heroism is no longer only available to physically courageous individuals, for it may reveal itself in any individual with the courage to act accordingly to his principles and moral convictions. Accordingly to the HIP¹, the most important aspect of heroism is the ability to create positive change in challenging situations. It may involve engaging effectively in dealing with unclear or emergency situations, helping those in need, or may involve the establishment and achievement of objectives in order to promote the welfare of others. HIP argues that this mentality, the "heroic imagination", can be learned, encouraged and modeled, being reachable by anyone, at any time of one's life. The 'heroic imagination' can be defined as the natural ability that each individual has to dream about a better future. Accordingly to Zimbardo (2006) the development of a heroic ideal can help guide the behavior of individuals in times of trouble or moral uncertainty. In this sense, the 'heroic imagination' can be a powerful means of personal and social transformation, helping individuals to be more aware of the ethical issues that underlie complex situations (Zimbardo, 2006).

Given HIP's purpose to promote the 'good' by 'heroic imagination', the discussion of the psychology of 'good' and 'evil' is certainly timely. Considering the overall objective of psychology to promote human well-being (Barbosa, Matos & Machado, 2013) to understand the nature of 'good' and 'evil', and how they evolve, the 'evil' can be prevented and 'good' can be created and promoted (Staub, 2003). The author also notes that early prevention is less consuming, but is rarely used. This early prevention allows inhibition and transformation of influences that lead to violence and therefore should become the goal of the international community (Staub, 2011).

¹ <http://heroicimagination.org>

From the perspective of Zimbardo (2007) most people who become authors of "evil deeds" are directly comparable to those who become authors of heroic deeds. In this sense, Zimbardo suggests that it is possible to counter the notion of Arendt's 'banality of evil', the 'banality of goodness', and hence the 'banality of heroism'. Both emerge from particular situations where situational forces play a crucial role, increasing the probability of the individual to harm, instead of helping others. This perception implies that anyone of us can easily become a perpetrator of 'good' or a perpetrator of 'evil', a hero or a villain, depending on how we are influenced by situational forces (Zimbardo, 2007). Psychology, whose contributions have allowed the understanding of violent and/or passive behavior, have paid little attention to human behavior that resists to external pressures and considers the welfare of others above its one (Zimbardo, 2004). Understanding these behaviors and their promotion could contribute to building a more just and equal world. As stated by Barbosa, Matos and Machado (2013) the history of psychology in the service of war is as old as the history of psychology itself, and if psychology has proven to be so useful in the service of war, why not instead be so in the service peace?

In HIP, the results of research on the psychological foundations of negative forms of social influence, such as compliance, obedience, and the bystander effect, are translated into meaningful insights and tools to which individuals can turn to, in their daily lives, in order to turn around negative situations and create positive change. HIP aims to develop in individuals a clear understanding of the psychological processes that underlie difficult social situations, and the unwanted behaviors they can produce. It also aims to provide the necessary skills and tools to analyze and effectively respond to social pressures and promote commitment to the construction and maintenance of cultures with greater transparency, openness and ethical behavior.

This is an innovative response to a global and national concern, leading us to believe that the implementation of the HIP program in Portugal constitutes a crucial opportunity for our country to be at the forefront when it comes to research and intervention in this field.

Given the above, our ultimate goal is the implementation of the HIP in Portugal. We expect to implement and evaluate the effectiveness of the program in the near future. In order to achieve this goal, it is necessary to firstly develop the Portuguese version of the evaluation protocols, which will allow us to measure the direct outcomes of the interventions. It is also important to refer that the redefinition and promotion of heroism, accordingly to the HIP, is performed through certain dimensions of prosocial behavior. Recent work (e.g. Jayawickreme & Chemero, 2008) on character strengths had provided useful insights into how people can be prepared for heroism through the fostering of cognitive, emotional, and

behavioral competencies that may lead to heroic behavior. Consequently, the aim of the present dissertation is to validate the measure of “Prosocial Tendencies Measure” (PTM), one of the scales that compose this evaluation protocols, developed by Carlo and Randall (2002) which is a 23-item self-report measure to assess different types of prosocial behaviors in late adolescents and adults.

Theoretical Framework

In the theoretical framework we seek to illustrate the complexity of the human condition in relation to the 'good' and 'evil', emphasizing the potential of all of us to be agents of 'good' and as well of 'evil'. We also expect to contribute to the better understanding of the psychological processes that underlie violent and immoral behavior. By evoking the understated role of situational forces that can alter mental representations, and consequently the behavior of individuals, groups and nations, we expect to raise the awareness of individuals to this reality; a reflection which can contribute to the proliferation of behaviors that permit counteracting the injustice that exists today. The theoretical framework will also illustrate the important role of all of us in this mission, and emphasize the contributions of psychology to the understanding of immoral behavior and to the conceptual delimitation of heroism and altruism, pointing out its main differences. Because our purpose is the validation of the PTM, hereunder we seek to conceptualize prosocial behaviors and their definition and how the study of such behaviors has been conducted so far. We finalize by providing a thorough description of the PTM and of its main objectives.

The search of explanation for the violent and aggressive behavior or for the indifference regarding the suffering of others, has always motivated scientific research compelled to try understanding the genesis of violent behavior. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights considers certain rights as universal to all individuals, namely the freedom not to be subjected to torture nor to cruel or inhuman punishment or treatment, and the freedom of opinion and expression. However, we are seeing all over the world, the violation of these fundamental rights (High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2015). In contrast to the unique capacity of human beings to commit violent acts is also their ability to adopt altruistic and heroic behavior (Staub, 2003).

Many inhumane acts are typically committed by people who can, in different areas of their lives, be considerably affectionate and sensitive, and can be both cruel and human in relation to different individuals (Bandura, 2004). It is arguable that individuals are essentially good by nature and that under certain circumstances this intrinsic tendency prevails (Rogers, 2009).

The ability to be aware of one's kindness and sensitivity toward the others, makes emerge the true human nature, "*when this unique ability to be aware that man has works freely and fully, we see that we have before us, not an animal that we should fear, not a beast that we must control, but a body able to access a balanced, realistic behavior, valuing himself and valuing others*"(Rogers, 2009, p.133).

Rogers also refers that when the individual does not meet the necessary conditions for his growth, naturally constructive, "*in fact we have every reason to fear him and fear his behavior*" (Rogers, 2009, p.134). Other authors, in turn, understand the human being as essentially selfish and guided by his own interests and motivations. As noted by Freud (2000) individuals need to acquire internal control mechanisms in order to suppress and prevent the naturally aggressive and violent behavior. Despite these differences between authors, there is unanimity in considering that it is within individuals that resides the potential for both the 'good' and the 'evil' (e.g. Staub, 2003; Staub, 2014; Zimbardo, 2004; Zimbardo, 2007) leading us to what Zimbardo (2007) considers a fundamental question: "*what makes people go wrong?*", and how can we explain the fact that some people live their lives in a fair and moral way, while others are corrupted by immorality and crime? (Zimbardo, 2007). It is also important to consider the human tendency to separate between "us" and "them", between those who do "good" and those who do "evil" (Staub, 2003). The problem that underlies this view is that the "inner world" of individuals only sees the 'good' in itself and 'negative' on others (Galtung, 2007). The situationist approach emphasizes the relative ease with which ordinary individuals are induced to adopt behaviors that harm others by enabling or disabling situational and social variables (Zimbardo, 2012).

As we shall see, this view meets the classic psychological studies, including the experience of Stanford Prison Zimbardo (1971) Milgram's obedience to authority studies² (1974) which show the underestimated power of social situations to change the mental representations, and hence the behavior of individuals, groups and nations (Zimbardo, 2004). The situationist perspective, influenced by a research body and by the socio-psychological theory, contrasts with the traditional perspective that explains the evil behavior with individual predispositions. While recognizing the importance of internal factors that individuals design in certain situations, as suggested by the dispositional orientation, it is essential to consider the extent to which human actions can arise as a result of situational influences. As Zimbardo

² The experiments on obedience to authority, the participants, without knowing that the shocks were being staged, were bidden to administer electric shocks as punishment to individuals when they roamed the answers to a set of questions. An actor of the study, presenting himself as a figure of authority, ordered the inducement of progressive intensity shocks, from 15 volts up to 450 volts. It was found that most of the participants followed the range of shocks to be administered, including those of supposedly lethal intensity.

(2004) refers, focus on people as the main cause for "evil", disclaims responsibility from social structures and political decision making, to provide input on the most fundamental circumstances that lead to poverty, the marginalization of some citizens, racism, sexism and elitism.

Contributions of psychology to the understanding of immoral behavior

The search for answers to violence and conflict has led to a number of contributions in the field of psychology to better understand these phenomena. Several authors in sociology and psychology have studied neutralization of moral judgments. Within sociology, stand out the original studies of Sykes and Matza (1957, cit. in Barbosa, 2014) on the neutralization techniques, the most recent work by Cohen (2001, cit. in Barbosa, 2014) on the mechanisms of denial, or the work of Jock Young (2007, cit. in Barbosa, 2014) on othering mechanisms. In psychology, we highlight the contributions of authors such as Bandura (1999, 2002, 2004a, 2004b) and Reicher and Haslam (2008, cit. in Barbosa, 2014), as they focus on the analysis of moral judgments in contexts of violence perpetration (e.g. war, torture). In the view of these authors, individuals will not adopt inhuman behaviors unless they have justified to themselves its morality. For example, the theory of moral disengagement of Bandura (2004) postulates that during the moral development of individuals, they learn to distinguish between 'good' and 'evil', adopting standards of right and wrong. The individual tends to act in accordance with these standards, being able to experience satisfaction when the behavior is consistent with the adopted internal standards, or self-condemnation, when the behavior jeopardizes these standards (Bandura, 1990). However, these self-regulatory mechanisms do not act unless they are abled, and there are many psychological processes by which the moral control can be disabled (Almeida, 2010).

The self-regulation behavior system is vulnerable to moral disengagement, as this can be switched off selectively, using tools that rationalize and justify the behavior (Bandura, 2002). Thus, individuals disengage themselves morally from situations that contradict their personal moral convictions, being able to act immorally against their principles and values without experiencing self-censorship (Bandura, 1990).

Evidence suggests that individuals, having initiated this process, are more prone to aggressive behavior or to making unethical choices (Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara & Pastorelli, 1996; Detert, Trevino & Sweitzer, 2008; Osofsky, Bandura & Zimbardo, 2005). Recent research results support this theory (e.g. White-Ajmani & Bursik, 2014) and it has been observed that when individuals find justifications and rationalizations for their behavior, their moral tendencies cease to have as much influence. As referred by Shu, Gino and Bazerman (2011)

individuals are more prone to moral disengagement when they are in more lenient environments. In contrast, when the ethical codes are well established, there seems to be a minor moral disengagement. Some authors (e.g. Moore, 2008; Paciello, Fida, Tramontano, Lupinetti & Caprara, 2008) add that moral disengagement should not be conceptualized as a trace of stable personality, but instead as a guideline, which is subject to suffer changes with the individual long-term experience, and with the short-term social context.

We should also consider certain experiences in the area of psychology, which demonstrate the power of the situation on the behavior of individuals and how ordinary people can be led to commit cruel acts. In the Milgram's obedience to authority experiment (1974) we can see that actions that inflict pain on others can also be committed under the influence of authority. Despite the significant number of participants who obeyed the orders were being transmitted to them, evading responsibility from what happened by shifting the blame to the experimenter who ordered the administration of shocks - being this information consistent with the theory of moral disengagement from Bandura (1990; 2004) -, stand out the participants who chose to challenge authority, referring that they felt personally responsible for the suffering they were causing (Milgram, 1974). The Asch³ (1956) experiments on compliance demonstrated how individuals can ignore their own perspective to follow the opinion of the group. Similarly, they identified individuals who, despite pressure to do otherwise, acted accordingly to what they considered correct, not yielding to the pressure of the majority.

The existence of individuals who, despite the pressure to do otherwise, resist situations that contradict their moral convictions and actively fight against injustice situations, should be the focus of more attention from the psychological community, because they demonstrate the individual's potential as agents of 'good'. The reflection on one's way of acting in contexts of social injustice could lead us to the proliferation of these behaviors.

Violence and unethical behavior often happens with the knowledge of society, who despites recognizing them as immoral conducts which somehow contributes to the pain and discomfort of others, remain passive to these situations. The individual's ability to rise up against injustice requires moral agency: the individual's capacity to exercise control over the nature and quality of his own life (Bandura, 1999). In individuals guided by a proactive moral agency, their self-esteem perceptions are so deeply rooted in human beliefs and in their social

³ In their experiments on compliance, were submitted to a set of participants, lines with different greetings, so that they could publicly identify which was the greatest of these lines. 5 actors were part of this group of participants (representing the majority) against a maximum of 2 non-participating players (representing the minority). The actors were the first to respond, and intentionally identified a lower compliance line as the largest. It was observed that most participants when faced with the response of the majority conformed to it at the expense of their own judgment.

obligations, that they will be prone to act against what they consider unjust or immoral (Bandura, 1999). This observation leads us to the discussion of the important role of all of us as enhancers of peace, thus stressing out the importance to also consider the bystander effect. Bystanders are all those who witness but are not directly affected by the actions of the perpetrators of violence, who have a crucial influence on the evolution of the event and often, by witnessing other's needs or the aggression against people, do not act in their defense (Staub, 2003). This lack of action, according to Staub (*ibidem*) encourages the perpetuation of immoral behavior. Recalling the words of Mahatma Gandhi: "*if you act against justice and I allow so do, then injustice is mine*". Bystanders, in general, are unaware of the consequences of their behaviors, but in fact they can exert a powerful influence, and their actions may empower victims, while passivity accentuates their suffering (Staub, 2003). They can direct others in the path of empathy and promote values of respect and consideration for others, or rather, by their passivity, they may reinforce the perpetuation of violence and immoral behavior.

Staub (2014) emphasizes the need to develop in individuals the awareness of the humanity shared with others, as well as of the psychological processes existent in themselves, urging them against each other, in order to hinder the way to exclusion, dehumanization and violence. The author appeals to the involvement of the community and states to build positive reciprocity systems for the creation of transversal relationships between groups, and appeals to the development of common projects and higher targets: a path to consider for the promotion of non-violent societies.

Given the above, we can understand how situational forces influence the behavior of individuals, causing them to commit inhuman acts. Likewise, we can identify common citizens, who when facing significant adversity situations, choose a course of action that allows them to transform these situations, and bring about a positive change (Zimbardo, n/d). As states Barbosa (2014) individuals when morally committed, and regardless of the circumstances, tend to do the good. It is therefore our conclusion that any of us has the potential to rise up against injustice, corruption or any other form of behavior that may endanger the welfare and integrity of the other. Reviewing the premises of the Heroic Imagination Project, heroism can be learned, can be taught, can be modeled and can even be a quality of our being, to which we should all aspire.

Conceptual Delimitation

Heroism can be defined as the individual's commitment to a noble cause, which usually aims to promote the welfare of others, and involves a willingness to accept the consequences of

such commitment (Franco, Blau & Zimbardo, 2011; Franco & Zimbardo, 2006; Jayawickreme & Di Stefano, 2012). It is often interpreted as the pinnacle of human behavior, it is something that arouses our attention and curiosity as most of us believe that the heroic behavior is reserved for those with special skills (Franco, Blau & Zimbardo, 2011).

A hero should not be conceptualized only as an individual who manifests prosocial behaviors where there is no associated cost with his actions, but instead as an individual who displays a sustained bold action to promote the welfare of others without expectation of reward and regardless of the negative consequences and risk that such action may involve for himself (Hilberg, 1993). As noted by Jayawickreme & Di Stefano (2012) generally, heroic behavior settings highlight three features: the behavior occurs in a context considered atypical, as in a situation of a natural disaster or where there is someone whose security is threatened; It is seen as unusual, partly due to the personal risks that this behavior implies; and ultimately, it aims to promote the welfare of others. Franco and collaborators (2011) add that heroism is a social assignment, never personal, despite the fact that the behavior itself often is a lonely existential choice. Shepela, Cook, Horlitz, Leal, Luciano, Luffy and Warden (1999) had previously argued that, even though heroism is traditionally considered a prosocial behavior, not always such action is the result of a prosocial motivation, and may be related to the individual internal standards that impel him to act in a given situation, and neither it requires an audience, adding that the decision to act in a heroic manner stems from a private inner process. Franco et. al (2011) defend four main ideas with regard to the definition of heroism: that the concept of heroism is a way to unify different types of courageous actions that have been conceptualized independently in literature; that the mere presence of risk in a given prosocial behavior is not sufficient to define heroism; the heroic behavior should be distinguished from other prosocial activities like compassion and altruism; and that, despite heroism is in its essence a positive act and prosocial, a simplistic view of this behavior may neglect important aspects of this phenomenon, proposing the following definition: "*Heroism is a social activity: it implies a service to others, be it a person, group or community, or in the defense of an ideal, socially sanctioned or by searching for new social norms, it implies a voluntary commitment and the recognition of possible risks / costs that the individual is willing to accept, without expecting any reward*" (Franco, Blau & Zimbardo, 2011, p. 101). This definition appears to be consistent with the literature (e.g. Walker, Frimer & Dunlop, 2010) which advocates that heroic behavior can take various forms and may have various origins.

Altruism vs. Heroism

Altruistic behavior has emerged as a topic of great interest specially during the past decade (DeSteno, 2015). Altruism implies absence of egocentrism; altruistic behavior is devoid of any kind of personal interest and is motivated by the needs of others and their welfare (Shepela et. al, 1999). The willingness to help and meet the needs of others, without benefit to the self, is a powerful act, not just seen as a pinnacle of virtue, but if happening often enough, may act as a driving force for the development of cooperation and may contribute for the reduction of violence in societies (DeSteno, 2015). Goetz, Keltner, and Thomas (2010) proposes that compassion, being an emotion that stems from the testimony of suffering, motivates an effort to provide assistance and, in this way, can be directly related to altruistic behavior. However, some authors do not believe that altruism may be truly devoid of internal reinforcements. The theory of reciprocal altruism by Trivers (1971) argues that altruism can be beneficial, in the sense that helping others can benefit the altruist in the future; in other words: we give in order to receive. According to Trivers, the compassion we feel for others needs not to be based on the level of distress or suffering that they experience, but stems from a subjective appreciation motivated by unconscious processes that indicate the likelihood of the target person to return the favor. Alexander (1987, cit. in Saslow, Impett, Antonenko, Feinberg, Keltner, John, Piff, Willer, Wong, Kogan, Clark, & Saturn, 2013) also states that individuals meet the needs of others in order to build an altruistic reputation and thus encourage future rewards from third parties. Despite the contribution of these theories, some authors (e.g. Saslow et. al, 2013) postulate that they are incomplete in the sense they do not explain altruistic behavior towards strangers and in contexts where there is very little probability of future reciprocity or of reputation construction. Simpson and Willer (2015) add that individuals who manifest prosocial behaviors are more likely to behave altruistically, in situations of anonymity.

Regarding the differences between altruism and heroism, Franco et. al (2011) identify the following distinctions:

- 1) The level of risk involved in altruism is considerably lower when compared to the risk incurred in heroic action.
- 2) The outcomes for a person who performs heroic deeds are quite different from the ones who behave altruistically. Accordingly to Oman, Thoresen, and McHahon (1999 cit. in Franco et. al, 2011) prosocial behaviors, such as volunteering, can protect health because they may reduce social alienation. Franco et. al (2011) points out that most of the times social heroism leads to the opposite outcome.

- 3) Altruism and bystander intervention are typically characterized by a period of deliberative indecision that may take several seconds to several minutes, depending on the context's ambiguity (Latané & Nida, 1981 cit. in Franco et. al, 2011). Differently, the heroic action may be defined by a successful execution within a very small window of opportunity and the capacity to act in the moment.
- 4) Most Bystander intervention occurs “*when the psychological exit of the situation is not easy.*” (Franco et. al, 2011, p.104) when there is no alternative but to act. Instead, heroic action can be defined by the willingness to deliberately approach dangerous situations even though there could be an easy way out of the situation.

To conclude, the authors suggest that: “*in contrast to altruism, heroism is a situation in which, no one should act, but a few do anyway*”. (Franco et. al, 2011, p.104).

Prosocial Behaviors

Prosocial behaviors, such as volunteerism, sharing, donating, comforting others and helping, may be defined as actions intended to benefit others (e.g. Mestre, Carlo, Stamper, Tur-Porcar, & Mestre, 2015). Such behaviors are deemed, desirable and beneficial to society (Eisenberg, Fabes & Spinrad, 2006) and have been linked to healthy social functioning and well being (e.g. Carlo, 2014). In fact, accordingly to Eisenberg, Fabes, & Spinrad (2006) prosocial behaviors have been theoretically and empirically linked to a number of positive personal and socioemotional variables, such as perspective taking, moral judgment, emphatic responding, emotion regulation, positive emotionality and positive peer and parental relationship. However, and despite the interest in human strengths, and given the importance to understand behaviors that benefit society, surprisingly, only a few measures are available for studying prosocial behaviors, particularly in regard to adolescence (Carlo & Randall, 2002). Furthermore, stringent tests of psychometric properties relative to prosocial behavior are sparse (Mestre et. al, 2015) and consequently there has been little focus on the multidimensional nature of prosocial behaviors (Carlo, Knight, McGinley, Zamboanga, & Jarvis, 2010). The few existing measures on prosocial behavior, and most scholars, conceptualize such behaviors as a relatively global construct, homogenous and unidimensional, rarely distinguishing between distinct forms of prosocial behaviors (Carlo & Randall, 2002). Moreover, existing research also suggests that prosocial behaviors should be conceptualized as a multidimensional construct (e.g. Carlo et. al, 2010). Prior theory and research (e.g. Latané & Darley, 1970; Staub, 1978) showed that there are different types of prosocial behavior, all having different situational and personal correlates. Eisenberg et. al, (1981 cit. in Carlo & Randall, 2002) had also presented evidence that there are differences between individuals who help others when they are asked to do so and those who do it

spontaneously. Recent groundbreaking work on moral exemplars (e.g. Walker & Frimer, 2007) also highlights the importance of person-situation interaction. Accordingly to Carlo et al (2010) there is much interest in understanding individual differences in prosocial behaviors and also a growing recognition for the need to study and conduct research on their distinct forms.

Prosocial Tendencies Measure (PTM)

In light of this evidence, Carlo and Randall (2002) developed and validated an objective multidimensional measure of prosocial behaviors, the Prosocial Tendencies Measure (PTM), which is a 23-item self-report measure to assess different types of prosocial behavior in late adolescents and adults, later revised (PTM-R) for early and middle-age adolescents (Carlo, Hausmann, Christiansen, & Randall, 2003). The PTM was designed to address six types of prosocial tendencies, including altruistic (prosocial tendencies that provide aid to others without anticipating self rewards); anonymous (unidentified helping); dire (helping in crisis or emergency situations); emotional (an orientation toward helping others under emotionally evocative circumstances); compliant (helping others in response to a verbal or nonverbal request); and public prosocial tendencies (behaviors that benefit others in front of an audience) (Carlo & Randall, 2002).

Accordingly to the authors, typically, the study and measure of prosocial behaviors, which have been done so far, have been weak and inconsistent, much because they have been done through the use of global assessments, rather than situation-specific assessments of prosocial behaviors (Carlo & Randall, 2002). Furthermore, there isn't a paper-and-pencil measure of specific types of prosocial behaviors to use with late adolescents, and although observational and behavioral assessments of these behaviors may be considered more ecologically valid than paper-and-pencil measures, there are limitations regarding their use. These measures are susceptible to observer and coding biases, and most of them require individual assessment, which may be costly in time, since the study of prosocial behaviors is conducted in applied settings and in longitudinal studies. In addition, it should also be referred that the evidence of the psychometric qualities of these types of measures is often limited to the evidence presented in the particular study for which it was designed. As pointed out by Padilla-Walker and Carlo (2014) despite the interest in specific forms of prosocial behaviors, progress in this field is relatively slow due to the lack of measures that demonstrate strong psychometric properties. The standardization of measures is necessary, in order to enable researchers to compare and integrate findings across studies (Carlo & Randall, 2002). Both the Prosocial Tendencies Measure (PTM) and the Prosocial Tendencies Measure-revised (PTM-R), were not designed to characterize all possible types of prosocial behaviors, but rather to realize the

individual's disposition to engage in six relatively common types of prosocial behaviors (Mestre et. al, 2015). PTM validation has been documented across samples of European Americans, Mexican adolescents (e.g. Carlo et. al, 2010), Argentina (McGinley, Opal, Richaud, & Mesurado, 2014), in youth from Spain (Mestre et. al, 2015) and in Persian context (Azimpour, Neasi, Sheni-yailagh, & Arshadi, 2011). Further validation of the PTM is desirable, not also could facilitate comparative research in different countries but psychometric adequate measures allows for more rigorous tests and can bring some insight of the generalizability of multidimensional models of prosocial behaviors across cultures (Mestre et. al, 2015).

Method

Participants

Participants were drawn from a convenience sample of 20 classes, 1457 students of public schools from the North of Portugal in the city of Braga and Espinho. Adolescents were in the 10th ($n=533$), 11th ($n=508$), and 12th grades ($n=412$); the overall participants were predominantly girls ($n=827$) and the remaining 630 participants were boys. The year's range of the participants is between 14-23 years old (M age= 16.59 years).

Procedures

Letters explaining the study aims and procedures were sent to students' parents. Signed informed consent from the parents was required to participate. The signed consent forms were returned in a sealed envelope to the schools and then collected by the experimenters. The assessments took place during one class period with the presence of the teacher who provided an explanation to the students about the study aims/procedure and participation rights. To assure confidentiality, the questionnaire was nameless. Once all protocol procedures and participation rights were explained, students provided their assent to partake in the study and then completed the 23-item self-report questionnaire (PTM), designed to assess how likely they were to engage in prosocial behaviors across a variety of situations (Carlo & Randall, 2002).

Prosocial Tendencies Measure (PTM)

The 23 items that integrate the PTM were selected from previously developed prosocial disposition and behavior scales (Johnson, Danko, Darvill, Bowers, Huang, Park, Pecjak, Rahim & Pennington, 1989; Rushton, Chrisjohn, & Fekken, 1981 cit. in Carlo & Randall, 2002) and from responses to prosocial moral reasoning interviews with college-aged students (Eisenberg, Carlo, Murphy & Van Court, 1995 cit. in Carlo & Randall, 2002). The 23-items

were used to assess the 6 referred subscales, which compose the PTM: altruistic (example item: I feel that if I help someone, they should help me in the future.); anonymous (example item: I tend to help needy others most when they do not know who helped them.); dire (example item: I tend to help people who are in a real crisis or need.); emotional (example item: I tend to help others particularly when they are emotionally distressed.); compliant (example item: When people ask me to help them, I don't hesitate.); and public (example item: I can help others best when people are watching me.). Participants were asked to rate the extent each statement describes themselves accordingly to a 5 Likert scale from 1 (Does not describe me at all) to 5 (Describes me greatly).

There is increased use of the PTM, the 23-item version developed by Carlo & Randall (2002) which had provided evidence of its six-factor structure, and internal consistencies of each scale: public (4 items, *alpha de Cronbach* =0.80), anonymous (5 items, *alpha de Cronbach* =0.88), dire (3 items, *alpha de Cronbach* =0.54), emotional (4 items, *alpha de Cronbach* =0.77), compliant (2 items, *alpha de Cronbach* =0.87) and altruism (5 items, *alfa de Cronbach* =0.62).

The adaptation and validation of this scale that composes the HIP assessment protocols were performed with the help of English teachers. The PTM, originally developed in English, was translated into Portuguese, later the Portuguese version was translated back into English by different English teachers (back-translation). Then, the research team confronted the two versions and checked whether there were any major differences between them correcting any items that showed a semantic discrepancy from the original version. Given the transcultural nature of the contents, there was no need for any other major cultural adaptation. The final version of the measure is presented in the Appendix.

Results

Exploratory Factor Analysis

All analyses were conducted using statistical software SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). Firstly, we tested the proposed six-factor model using exploratory factor analysis, as shown in table 1, employing similar procedures to the pilot study (Carlo & Randall, 2002).

Table 1: Results of the exploratory factor analysis

Denomination of factors	Degree of commonality
Factor 1 Emotional / Dire	
2. It is most fulfilling to me when I can comfort someone who is very distressed.	0,538
6. I tend to help people who are in a real crisis or need.	0,366
9. I tend to help people who hurt themselves badly.	0,325
12. I tend to help others particularly when they do not know who helped them.	0,770
14. It is easy for me to help others when they are in a dire situation	0,831
17. I respond to helping others best when the situation is highly emotional	0,867
21. Emotional situations make me want to help needy others.	0,699
Factor 2 Anonymous	
8. I prefer to donate money anonymously	0,811
11. I tend to help needy others most when they do not know who helped them	0,820
15. Most of the time, I help others when they do not know who helped them	0,757
19. I think that helping others without them knowing is the best type of situation	0,791
22. I often make anonymous donations because they make me feel good.	0,531
Factor 3 Public	
1. I can help others best when people are watching me	0,837
3. When other people are around, it is easier for me to help needy others.	0,779
5. I get the most out of helping others when it is done in front of others	0,725
13. Helping others when I am in the spotlight is when I work best	0,453
Factor 4 Compliant	
7. When people ask me to help them, I don't hesitate.	0,910
18. I never hesitate to help others when they ask for it.	0,902
Factor 5 Altruism	
4. I think that one of the best things about helping others is that it makes me look good.	0,280
10. I believe that donating goods or money works best when it is tax-deductible.	0,498
16. I believe I should receive more recognition for the time and energy I spend on charity work.	0,540
20. One of the best things about doing charity work is that it looks good on my resume.	0,695
23. I feel that if I help someone, they should help me in the future.	0,788

The exploratory factor analysis is one of the most frequently used psychometric procedures in the construction and evaluation of psychological instruments, and it is specially useful when applied to scales composed with items used to measure personality, behaviors and attitudes, being this analysis also fundamental in the validation process of psychological instruments (Laros, 2012), as in the case of the present dissertation.

The exploratory factor analysis provided useful information, especially regarding the items aggrupation. Based on these results, we claim that the PTM is reliable and presents a heterogeneous structure from which 5 distinct factors emerged (emotional/ dire; anonymous; public; compliant; altruism), accounting for 56,37% of the variance.

Secondly, we tested the internal consistency. As stated by Cronbach (1996, cit. in Rueda, Lamounier, Sisto, Bartholomeu, & Noronha, 2006) in order to use a psychological instrument for diagnoses or measure purposes it is crucial to consider if in fact it evaluates what it aims to evaluate. The Cronbach alpha calculated for the five factors, as shown in table 2, has revealed adequate internal consistency. The alpha coefficient ranges in value from .64 and .83.

Internal Consistency

Table 2: Cronbach's alpha reliability of the 5 factors

Factors	Prosocial Tendencies Measure Scale Itens	ALPHA
Factor 1	2, 6, 9, 12, 14, 17, 21	0,83
Factor 2	8, 11, 15, 19, 22	0,80
Factor 3	1, 3, 5, 13	0,71
Factor 4	7, 18	0,81
Factor 5	4, 10, 16, 20, 23	0,64

Discussion

Consistent with the original study (Carlo & Randall, 2002) the results of the present study support the conceptualization of prosocial behaviors as a multidimensional rather than a global, unidimensional construct. Overall, and accordingly to the pilot study, our findings enhance the existence of different types of prosocial behaviors and support the need to study specific forms of such behaviors. Regarding the PTM six-factor structure, although the proposed model has demonstrated good fit in prior work (e.g. Carlo et. al, 2010; Mestre et. al, 2015) our analysis has allowed us to aggregate the 23-items into five factors, with factor loadings for this model being all very positive and significant, ranging from .280 to .910 (see table 1). As a result, the emotional and dire factor was converged into only one factor.

In light of this evidence, one possible explanation might be linked to an arousal of emotion responding in crisis or emergency situations (dire) that can be interpreted as being highly charged emotionally. Even though the respondents of the pilot study (Carlo & Randall, 2002) have distinguished between helping in crises or emergency situations (dire prosocial behaviors) from helping in situations with emotionally evocative cues (emotional prosocial behaviors), one might reflect that in times of distress, such as in emergency circumstances, crying is often a reaction that individuals have in responding to a vulnerable state, because psychological changes occur both in the crier and in those who witness them crying (Hendriks, Nelson, Cornelius, & Vingerhoets, 2008). In this sense, an orientation toward helping others in crises or emergency situations (dire factor) merged with helping others under emotionally evocative circumstances (emotional factor). That arousal of emotional empathy often leads to helping behavior (Hendriks et. al, 2008) once it activates mechanisms that reduce the emphasis on the self and its interests, and encourage prosociality (Piff, Dietze, Feinberg, Stancato, & Keltner, 2015). The fact that we found a distinct pattern of relations among PTM items might also be explained based on individual and cultural differences. As noted by Lim & Desteno (2016) the types and frequency that individuals engage in prosocialness may vary across gender, ethnicity, social-economic status, and life experiences. Therefore, we should consider that there are a variety of motivations and approaches people use towards others, in times of need, leading them to embracing others warmly or rejecting them when faced with the opportunity to intervene. Barford, Pope, Harlow, and Hudson (2014) emphasize that the mechanisms motivating prosocialness tend to be influenced by individuals differences associated with empathy; also personality factors have been found to partially determine emphatic responding (Nikitin & Freund, 2010). When attempting to explain and discuss the results obtained, we believe one should also reflect that there is evidence pointing out that there seems to be a link between adverse life experiences and prosocial behavior (e.g. Barford et. al, 2014; Lim & Desteno, 2016) and that compassion and

altruistic tendencies may be enhanced by adversity. Vollhardt and Staub (2011) suggest that the individual's past adversity is associated with prosocial attitudes and emphatic responding towards individuals in distress. Consistent to our findings, Carlo et. al (2010) presented evidence of a five factor model, since the emotional and dire factors were highly correlated, consequently all the emotional and dire items were loaded into one factor and then tested, revealing adequate fit.

In order to better understand and contextualize the five-factor model resultant from our adaptation and validation of the PTM, is also important to note that our participants were drawn from a convenience sample, not probabilistic, and therefore are not representative of the population. Such findings cannot be statistically generalized, what should be identified as a limitation to our study.

In respect to the loading factors (see Table 1), items 6 and 9 had higher values in the Compliant factor (0,434 and 0,379) but we decided to still aggregate them on the emotional/dire factor, because removing these items would interfere with the internal consistency (alpha values would decrease to 0,81 and 0,82 respectively). Also, item 4 exhibited higher value on the Public Factor (0,609), but we also decided to keep this item in the altruistic factor because if we removed it, the internal consistency would not be adequate (alpha value would decrease to 0,58).

Regarding the internal consistency of the PTM, our findings showed positive adequate values for each factor (see Table 2), allowing us to state that the Portuguese version of the measure is internally consistent and fit for its purposes. Our results for the Cronbach Alpha, calculated for each factor, were very similar to the pilot study, as previously mentioned. Note that the altruistic factor revealed a lower value (Cronbach Alpha = 0,64), however we consider it acceptable because when compared to the Carlo & Randall (2002) results (Cronbach Alpha = 0,62), our value was even more significant. Our findings also seem to be consistent with previous validations, (e.g. Azimpour et. al, 2012) presented a Cronbach Alpha = 0,59 for the altruistic factor; 0,69 for emotional; 0,70 for dire; 0,87 for anonymous; 0,72 for public; and 0,77 for compliant. Carlo et. al (2010) had similar results as well, Cronbach's Alphas ranged from 0.63 to 0,84. Our findings, together with prior work, provide evidence for the utility of the PTM to be used with late adolescents in future studies in Portugal.

Conclusion

The present dissertation has provided useful insights concerning prosocial behaviors and how they should be conceptualize and evaluated. It has also contributed to the development of measures that demonstrate strong psychometric properties, and to facilitating comparative

research in different countries, both desirable and needed as literature points out. Despite the strong psychometric properties of our findings, some caution is needed regarding its interpretation. The sample is not fully representative of late adolescents across Portugal and therefore further validation efforts might be necessary to replicate the results and evaluate the PTM within a probabilistic sample. Nevertheless, the present findings suggest that the PTM is useful as a multidimensional measure of prosocial behaviors within Portuguese youth. Finally, the present study conducted us a step closer to our ultimate goal of implementing the HIP and evaluating its effectiveness. We strongly believe in the potential of the project and expect to encourage everyday heroic actions, challenging the way we think, the way we approach others, and humanizing our society by making helpfulness a social norm. Encouraging a philosophic perspective, we could say that some people choose to see the ugliness in this world; we choose to see the beauty. As stated by the recently elected secretary general of the United Nations, António Guterres (2016) “*the dramatic problems of today's complex world, can only inspire a humble approach*”. It is our belief and strong conviction that the Heroic Imagination Project may provide us with such an approach.

References

- Almeida, S. L., & Freire, T. (2003). *Metodologia da Investigação em Psicologia e Educação* (3ª ed.). Braga: Psiquilíbrios.
- Almeida, T. (2010). *Perspetivas de cidadãos portugueses sobre a violência de Estado: uma análise à luz da teoria do desenvolvimento moral*. (dissertação de mestrado não publicada). Faculdade de Educação e psicologia da Universidade Católica, Porto, Portugal.
- Asch, S. E. (1956). Studies of Independence and Conformity: I. A Minority of one against an Unanimous Majority. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 70 (9), 1-70.
- Ata, A. Y., & Arvas, M. A. (2011). Determinants of economic corruption: a cross-country data analysis. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(13), 161-169.
- Azimpour, A., Neasi, A., Shehni-Yailagh, M., & Arshadi, N. (2011). Validation of “Prosocial Tendencies Measure” in Iranian University Students. *Journal of Life Science and Biomedicine*, 2(2), 34-42.
- Bandura, A. (1990). Mechanisms of Moral Disengagement. In W.Reich (Ed.), *Origins of Terrorism: Psychologies, Ideologies, Theologies, States of mind* (pp. 161-191). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bandura, A. (1999). Moral Disengagement in the Perpetration of Inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3(3), 193-209.
- Bandura, A. (2002). Selective moral disengagement in exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Moral Education*, 31(2), 101-119.
- Bandura, A. (2004a). The role of selective moral disengagement in terrorism and counterterrorism. In F. M. Moghaddam & A. J. Marsella (Eds). *Understanding terrorism: psychological roots, consequences and interventions* (pp. 121-150). Washington, DC: American psychological Association Press.
- Bandura, A. (2004b). Selective Exercise of Moral Agency. In T. A. Thorkildsen & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Nurturing morality* (pp. 37-57). Boston: Kluwer Academic.
- Bandura, A., Barbarelli, C., Capara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Mechanisms of moral disengagement in exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 364-374.

- Barbosa, M. (2014). *Violência de Estado: dos discursos Sociais às leituras individuais*. Tese de doutoramento não publicada. Escola de psicologia: Universidade do Minho.
- Barbosa, M., Matos, R., & Machado, C. (2013). A Psicologia Da Paz. *Psicologia*, 17(1), 47-61.
- Barford, K. A., Pope, J. B., Harlow, T. F., & Hudson, P. (2014). Predicting Empathy and Prosocial Behavior: Who Cares and When? *Psi Chi Journal of psychological research*, 19(4), 202-213.
- Carlo, G. (2014). The development and correlates of prosocial moral behaviors. In M. Killen, & J. G. Smetana (eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (pp. 208-234). New York: Psychology press.
- Carlo, G., & Randall, B. A. (2002). The development of a Measure of Prosocial Behaviors for Late Adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 31(1), 31-44.
- Carlo, G., Hausmann, A., Christiansen, S., & Randall, B. A. (2003). Sociocognitive and behavioral correlates of a measure of prosocial tendencies for adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescents*, 23, 107-134.
- Carlo, G., Knight, G. P., McGinley, M., Zamboanga, B., & Jarvis, L. H. (2010). The Multidimensionality of Prosocial Behaviors and Evidence of Measurement Equivalence in Mexican American and European American Early Adolescents. *Journal of Research On Adolescence*, 20(2), 334-358. doi:10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00637.x.
- Desteno, D. (2015). Compassion and altruism: How our minds determine who is worthy of help. Obtido em Dezembro de 2015, de <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2015.02.002>
- Detert, J. R., Trevino, L. K., & Sweitzer, V. L. (2008). Moral disengagement in ethical decision making: A study of antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 374-391.
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., & Spinrad, T. L. (2006). Prosocial development. In N. Eisenberg, W. Damon, & R. M. Lerner (eds.), *handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 646-718). Hoboken, Nj: Willey
- Franco, Z., & Zimbardo, P. (2006). The banality of Heroism. Obtido em Dezembro de 2015, <http://lucifereffect.com/articles/heroism.pdf>

Franco, Z., Blau, K., & Zimbardo, P. (2011). Heroism: A Conceptual Analysis and Differentiation Between Heroic Action and Altruism. *Review of General Psychology*. doi: 10.1037/a0022672.

Freud, S. (2000). *Textos Essenciais da Psicanálise* (2ª ed.). Portugal: Publicações Europa-América.

Galtung, J. (2007). Peace by peaceful conflict transformation – the TRANSCEND approach. In C. Weibel & J. Galtung (Eds.). *Handbook of peace and conflict studies* (1st ed., Vol. 1, pp. 14-32). USA: Routledge.

Goetz, L.J., Keltner, D., & Thomas, E. S. (2010). Compassion: An evolutionary Analysis and Empirical review. *Psychol Bull*, 136(3), 351-374. doi:10.1037/a0018807.

Hendricks, M. C. P., Nelson, J. K., Cornelius, R. R., & Vingerhoets, A. J. J. M. (2008). Why crying improves our well-being: An attachment-theory perspective on the functions of adult crying. In A. J. J. M. Vingerhoets., I. Nyklíček & J. Denollet (Eds), *Emotion regulation: Conceptual and clinical issues* (pp. 87-96). New York: Springer Science + Business Media.

Hilberg, R. (1993). *Perpetrators, victims, bystanders*. New York: harper Collins.

Jayawickreme, E., & Chemero, A. (2008). Ecological moral realism: An alternative theoretical framework for studying moral psychology. *Review of General Psychology*, 12(2), 118-126.

Jayawickreme, E., & Stefano, D. P. (2012). How Can We Study Heroism? Integrating Persons, Situations and Communities. *Political Psychology*, 33(1), 165-178. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2011.00861.x

Kapoor, M., & Ravi, S. (2012). Determinants of Corruption: Government Effectiveness vs. Cultural Norms. *The BE Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 12(1).

Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). Bystander “Apathy”. *American Scientist*, 2(57), 244-268.

Lim, D., & DeSteno, D. (2016). Suffering and Compassion: The Links Among Adverse Life Experiences, Empathy, Compassion, and Prosocial Behavior. Obtido em Novembro de 2016, de <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/emo0000144>

Laros, J. A. (2012). O uso da Análise Fatorial: Algumas Diretrizes para Pesquisadores. In J. A. Laros (eds.), *Análise Fatorial para pesquisadores* (pp. 141-160). Brasília: Luiz Pasquali.

Mandi, L., White, A., & Krisane, B. (2014). Situational Context Moderates the Relationship Between Moral Disengagement and Aggression. *Psychology of Violence* 4(1), 90-100. doi:10.1037/a0031728.

Martins, C. (2011). *Manual de Análise de Dados Quantitativos com Recurso ao IBM SPSS* (1ª ed.). Braga: Psiquilibrios.

Mcalister, A., Bandura, A., & Owen, S. (2006). Mechanisms of moral disengagement in support of militar force: the impact of Sept. 11. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 25(2), 141-165.

Mestre, M. V., Carlo, G., Stamper, P., Tur-Porcar, A. M., & Mestre, A. L. (2015). Psychometric Evidence of a Multidimensional Measure of Prosocial Behaviors for Spanish Adolescents. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 176(4), 260-271. doi:10.1080/00221325.2015.1052726.

Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to Authority: an experimental view* (1st ed.). London: Tavistock.

MacGinley, M., Opal, D., Richaud, M. C., & Mesurado, B. (2014). Cross-cultural evidence of multidimensional prosocial behaviors: An examination of the prosocial tendencies measure (PTM). In L. M. Padilla-Walker & G. Carlo (eds.), *Prosocial behavior: A multidimensional approach*. (pp.XXX) New York: Oxford University Press.

Moore, C. (2008). Moral disengagement in process of organization corruption. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 80, 129-139.

Nikitin, J., & Freund, A. M. (2010) When Wanting and fearing go together: the effect of co-occurring social approach and avoidance motivation on behavior, affect, and cognition. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 40, 783-804. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.650.

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. (n.d). *Special rapporter on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association*. <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/AssemblyAssociation/pages/SRfreedomAssemblyAssociationIndex.aspx>.

Osofsky, M. J., Bandura, A., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2005). The role of moral disengagement in the execution process. *Law and Human Behavior*, 29, 371-393.

- Paciello, M., Fida, R., Transmontano, C., Lupinetti, C., & Caprara, G. V. (2008). Stability and change of moral disengagement and its impact on aggression and violence in late adolescence. *Child Development, 79*, 1288-1309.
- Pelton, J., Gound, M., Forehand, R., & Brody, G. (2004). The moral disengagement scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavior Assessment, 26*, 31-39.
- Piff, P. K., Dietze, P., Feinberg, M., Stancato, D. M., & Keltner, D. (2015). Awe, the Small Self, and Prosocial Behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 108*(6), 883-899.
- Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Carlo, G. (2014). Prosocial behavior: Past, present, and future. In L. M. Padilla-Walker & G. Carlo (eds.), *Prosocial behavior: A multidimensional approach*. (pp. 3-16). New York: Oxford University press.
- Rogers, C. (2009). *Tornar-se Pessoa* (1ª ed.). Lisboa: Padrões Culturais Editora.
- Rueda, F. J., Lamounier, R., Sisto, F. F., Bartholomeu, D., & Noronha, A. P. P. (2006). Raciocínio Inferencial e Atenção Sustentada: Construtos Convergentes? In C. Machado., L. Almeida., M. A. Guisande., M. Gonçalves & V. Ramalho (Eds), *XI Conferência Internacional de Avaliação Psicológica: Formas e Contextos* (pp. 943-950). Braga: Psiquilibrios Edições.
- Shepela, S. T., Cook, J., Horlitz, E., Leal, R., Luciano, S., Lutfy, E., Miller, C., & Worden, E. (1999). Courageous resistance: A special case of altruism. *Theory & Psychology, 9*(6), 787-805.
- Shu, L. L., Gino, F., & Bazerman, M. H. (2011). Dishonest deed, clear conscience: when cheating leads to moral disengagement and motivate forgetting. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*, 330-349.
- Staub, E. (1978). *Positive Social Behavior and Morality: Social and Personal Influences* (1ªed.). New York: Academic Press.
- Staub, E. (2003). *The Psychology of Good and Evil: Why Children, Adults, and Groups Help and Harm Others* (1st ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Staub, E. (2011). *Overcoming Evil: Genocide, violent conflict and terrorism* (1st ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Staub, E. (2014). Obeying, Joining, Following, Resisting, and Other Process in The Milgram Studies, and in The Holocaust and Other Genocides: Situations, Personality, and Bystanders. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*, 501-514. doi:10.1111/josi.12074.

Saslow, L. R., Impett, E. A., Antonenko, O., Feinberg, M., Keltner, D., John, O. P., Piff, P. K., Willer, R., Wong, E., Kogan, A., Clark, O., & Saturn, S. R. (2013). The Social Significance of Spirituality: New perspectives on the compassion-altruism relationship. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality, 5*, 201-218.

Simpson, B., & Willer, R. (2015). Beyond Altruism: Sociological foundations of cooperation and prosocial behavior. *Annual Review of Sociology, 41*, 43-63. doi:10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112242.

Trivers, R. L. (1971). The evolution of Reciprocal Altruism. *The Quarterly Review of Biology, 46*(1), 35-57.

Vollhardt, J. R., & Staub, E. (2011). The relationship between adversity and prosocial attitudes and behavior toward disadvantaged outgroups. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 81*(3), 307-315.

Walker, L. J., Frimer, J. A., & Dunlop, W. L. (2010). Varieties of moral personality: Beyond the banality of heroism. *Journal of personality, 78*, 907-942.

Walker, L. J., & Frimer, J. A. (2007). Moral personality of brave and caring exemplars. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 93*, 845-860. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.5.845.

Zimbardo, P. (2004). A Situationist Perspective on the Psychology of Evil: Understanding How Good People Are Transformed to Perpetrators. In A.G.Miller, *The Social Psychology of Good and Evil* (pp. 21-50). New York: The Guilford Press.

Zimbardo, P. (2007). *The Lucifer Effect: How Good People Turn Evil* (1st ed.). London: Random House.

Zimbardo, P. (s.d). Why the World Needs Heroes. *Europe's Journal of Psychology, 3*, 402-407.

Zimbardo, P. G. (2006). The psychology of power: to the person? To the situation? To the system? In D. L. Rhode (Ed), *Moral Leadership: The theory and practice of power, judgment, and policy* (pp. 129-157). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Zimbardo, P. G. (2012). Explosions that imploded America. in M. J. Morgan, Ed., *The Impact of 9/11 on Psychology and Education*, New York:

Zimbardo, P., Haney, C., Banks, W., Jaffe, D. (s.d.) The Stanford Prison Experiment 40-Year Anniversary Retrospective. Obtido em Abril 2015, de <http://heroicimagination.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Stanford-Prison-Experiment-40-Year-Anniversary.pdf>

Appendix

Appendix I- Medida de Tendências Prosociais

Medida de Tendências Prosociais

Carlo & Randall (2002)

Estudo de adaptação para a população portuguesa por Barbosa, Veríssimo, Gábor, Silva & Violas (2016)

Abaixo encontram-se algumas afirmações que podem ou não descrever-te. Por favor indica QUANTO CADA AFIRMAÇÃO TE DESCREVE, usando a seguinte escala:

<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Não me descreve nada</i>	<i>Descreve-me um pouco</i>	<i>Descreve-me até certo ponto</i>	<i>Descreve-me bem</i>	<i>Descreve-me muito bem</i>

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Consigo ajudar os outros melhor quando as pessoas me estão a observar.					
2. É muito gratificante para mim quando posso confortar alguém que está muito aflito.					
3. Quando há outras pessoas em redor, é mais fácil para mim ajudar os outros carenciados.					
4. Penso que uma das coisas melhores em relação a ajudar os outros é que faz com que eu cause boa impressão.					
5. Tiro o máximo proveito de ajudar os outros quando é feito à frente de outras pessoas.					
6. Tenho tendência para ajudar pessoas que estão numa verdadeira situação de crise ou dificuldades.					
7. Quando as pessoas me pedem para as ajudar, não hesito.					
8. Prefiro doar dinheiro anonimamente.					
9. Tenho tendência para ajudar pessoas que se magoam seriamente.					
10. Creio que doar bens ou dinheiro funciona melhor quando é dedutível nos impostos.					
11. Tenho tendência para ajudar mais os outros carenciados quando estes não sabem quem os ajuda.					
12. Tenho tendência para ajudar os outros, em particular quando estão emocionalmente perturbados.					
13. Funciono melhor a ajudar os outros quando sou o centro das atenções.					
14. Para mim é fácil ajudar os outros quando estão numa situação dramática.					
15. A maior parte das vezes, ajudo os outros quando eles não sabem quem os ajuda.					
16. Creio que devia ter maior reconhecimento pelo tempo e pela energia que gasto em trabalho de caridade.					
17. Reajo melhor a ajudar os outros quando a situação é muito emotiva.					
18. Nunca hesito em ajudar os outros quando eles me pedem.					
19. Penso que ajudar os outros sem que eles saibam é o melhor tipo de situação.					
20. Uma das melhores coisas sobre fazer trabalho de caridade é que fica bem no meu currículo.					
21. As situações emotivas fazem-me querer ajudar os outros carenciados.					
22. Faço frequentemente donativos anónimos porque me fazem sentir bem.					
23. Sinto que se ajudar alguém, no futuro devem ajudar-me a mim.					