

Title	The Construction of the Prosocial Personality Battery for High School Students
All Authors	Aye Thida
Publication Type	Local Publication
Publisher (Journal name, issue no., page no etc.)	Taunggyi University Research Journal, Vol.9, No.1 (93-100)
Abstract	The present study reports the results of an attempt to modify Penner L.A. (2002) Prosocial Personality Battery (PSB) to suit Myanmar cultural setting. The PSB developed by Penner assesses prosocial personality for high school students. The PSB scale contains 30 items, which can be answered in a five-point scale. This scale was subjected to standard item analysis procedure. The PSB was administered to 194 high school students from No.2, BEHS at Magway. After being item analysis, 26 items were significant and remaining 4 items were not significant. The reliability of the PSB was determined by the method of internal consistency. The value of Cronbach alpha was .66. The validity coefficient was found to be .78, significant at .01 levels. The Myanmar version of the PSB is quite satisfactory in reliability as well as in validity. So, this scale is ready to use for Myanmar population.
Keywords	Prosocial Personality, Psychometric Properties
Citation	
Issue Date	2018

## **The Construction of the Prosocial Personality Battery for High School Students**

**Aye Thida\***

### **Abstract**

The present study reports the results of an attempt to modify Penner L.A. (2002) Prosocial Personality Battery (PSB) to suit Myanmar cultural setting. The PSB developed by Penner assesses prosocial personality for high school students. The PSB scale contains 30 items, which can be answered in a five-point scale. This scale was subjected to standard item analysis procedure. The PSB was administered to 194 high school students from No.2, BEHS at Magway. After being item analysis, 26 items were significant and remaining 4 items were not significant. The reliability of the PSB was determined by the method of internal consistency. The value of Cronbach alpha was .66. The validity coefficient was found to be .78, significant at .01 levels. The Myanmar version of the PSB is quite satisfactory in reliability as well as in validity. So, this scale is ready to use for Myanmar population.

**Key Words:** Prosocial Personality, Psychometric Properties.

### **Introduction**

Helping others is viewed as one of the most highly respected displays of human behaviour. Helping as an act of kindness, is revered as a virtue in many cultures and religious traditions. In the scientific realm however, helping has been subject to continuous inquiry with respect to the motivations that lead to it. Some of the questions examined are: Why do people help? Are people's helping motivations influenced by personality traits? Prosocial behavior includes ". . . actions that are intended to aid or benefit another person or group of people without the actor's anticipation of external rewards" (Mussen and Eisenberg, 1977: 3-4). Thus, prosocial personality may include social responsibility, perspective taking, empathic concern, personal distress, mutual moral reasoning, other oriented moral reasoning and self reported -

---

\* Dr., Lecturer, Department of Psychology, Taunggyi University

altruism. In other words, prosocial behavior generally is defined as voluntary behavior intended to benefit another (Eisenberg, 1986).

One type of prosocial behavior is social responsibility. A social norm to the effect that each of us has a responsibility to do our best to help other, taking care of those in need. In perspective taking, the ability to understand a situation from someone else's point of view is also basic to cognitive - developmental explanations of prosocial behavior. Perspective taking can take several forms, including physical, social and affective perspective taking. Physical perspective taking simply involves taking another's physical point of view. Research on social perspective taking - the ability to identify the thoughts and attitudes of someone else - has produced somewhat stronger results. For example, in several studies, children who were better at telling a story from another person's point of view were more often altruistic with classmates (Chalmers & Townsend, 1990; Froming, Allen, & Jensen, 1985). There has been only a little research on children's affective perspective taking, which involves understanding the feelings and emotions of another person. It, too, appears to show a positive correlation with altruism (Bryant, 1987; Moore & Eisenberg, 1984).

The concept of empathy has been central to some theories of prosocial development, in particular that of Martin Hoffman (1982, 1984 a). Hoffman believes that empathy is involved in altruistic behavior in two ways. First, the empathic child experiences emotional distress when observing another person in need. The child can often relieve this distress by helping or sharing with that person. Second, when a prosocial act produces joy or happiness in the other person, the empathic child can also experience these positive emotions. Personal distress involves the egoistic motive of alleviating one's own aversive negative state (Batson, 1991). Personal distress is also defined as aversive, self focused emotional reaction to the apprehension or comprehension of another's emotional state or condition (Eisenberg, Shea, Carlo, & Knight, 1991). Altruistic behaviors are those that benefit someone else but offer no obvious benefit and may even involve some cost - to the individual performing them. Giving money to a charity, sharing a candy bar, and risking one's life to save someone else's are examples. Prosocial moral reasoning is defined as thinking about situations in which one's needs are in conflict with the needs of others in a context that is relatively free of formal rules, guidelines, or regulations (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998).

The present study is concerned with the construction of the prosocial personality battery (PSB) Scale. Firstly, the present paper is to adapt the prosocial personality Battery (PSB) scale to Myanmar socio-cultural milieu. The original scale of (PSB) Scale was

developed by Penner L.A. (2002). In performing an adaptation of the (PSB) Scale into our cultural milieu not merely the original scale will taken and translated into Myanmar but also a new scale will be constructed by carrying out an item analysis, reliability and validity determination, step by step.

### Item Analysis

#### Writing the Items and planning the test

First, the original test, the Prosocial Personality Battery (PSB) Scale developed by Penner, L.A.(2002) was taken and translated the test items into Myanmar. The Myanmar version of the PSB Scale were organized as 5-point scale like the original PSB Scale (see Table 1).The new scale can be used as a group test. After writing the items and planning the test, an item analysis was conducted.

Table 1. The original items of PSB Scale and the items translated into Myanmar

ItemNo	Description of items
1 ၁။	When people are nasty to me, I feel very little responsibility to treat them well. မိမိအပေါ်မကောင်းသူများအားကောင်းကောင်းဆက်ဆံရန်မိမိတွင်တာဝန်မရှိဟုယူဆသည်။
2. ၂။	I would feel less bothered about leaving litter in a dirty park than in a clean one. အမှိုက်ရုတ်နေသည့်နေရာတွင်နောက်ထပ်အမှိုက်ပစ်ချရန်ကျွန်ုပ်အတွက်ဝန်လေးမည်မဟုတ်ပါ။
ItemNo	Description of items
3. ၃။	No matter what a person has done to us, there is no excuse for taking advantage of them. လူတစ်ယောက်ကကျွန်ုပ်အပေါ်မည်သို့ပြုလုပ်ထားသည်ဖြစ်စေ၊သူ့အပေါ်အခွင့်အရေးယူစရာအကြောင်းမရှိဟုယူဆသည်။
4. ၄။	With the pressure for grades and widespread cheating in school nowadays, the individual who cheats occasionally is not really as much at fault. စာမေးပွဲကိုအမှတ်ကောင်းကောင်းနှင့်အောင်ရန်အတွက်နည်းမျိုးစုံအသုံးပြုနေကြချိန်တွင် တစ်ခါတစ်ရံ ခိုးချခြင်းသည်အပြစ်မကြီးဟုယူဆသည်။
5. ၅။	It doesn't make much sense to be very concerned about how we act when we are sick and feeling miserable. နာမကျန်းဖြစ်ပြီးစိတ်မသက်သာသောဖြစ်နေချိန်တွင်မိမိအပြုအမူအတွက်အလွန်အမင်းသတိထားနေခြင်းသည် အဓိပ္ပာယ်မရှိဟုယူဆသည်။
6. ၆။	If I broke a machine through mishandling, I would feel less guilty if it was already damaged before I used it. မူလကတည်းကမကောင်းသည့်စက်သည်ကျွန်ုပ်၏ လွဲမှားသောကိုင်တွယ်မှုကြောင့်

	ပျက်စီးသွားသည် ဆိုပါကမိမိတွင်တာဝန်မရှိဟုယူဆသည်။
7. ၇။	When you have a job to do, it is impossible to look out for everybody's best interest. လုပ်စရာအလုပ်တာဝန်တစ်ခုမိမိတွင်ရသည်ဆိုပါက၊လူတိုင်းအတွက်ကောင်းကျိုးကိုကြည့်ရန် မဖြစ်နိုင်ဟုယူဆသည်။
8. ၈။	I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the "other person's" point of view. တစ်ပါးသူ၏ရှုထောင့်မှကြည့်ရန်မိမိအတွက်တစ်ခါတရံ မဖြစ်နိုင်ဟု ယူဆသည်။
9. ၉။	When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them. အခွင့်အရေးယူခံရသူတစ်ဦးကိုမိမိမြင်တွေ့ရပါကထိုသူအားအကာအကွယ်ပေးလိုစိတ် ဖြစ် ပေါ်လာသည်။
	<b>Description of items</b>
10. ၁၀။	I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective. သူတို့ရှုထောင့်မှကြည့်မြင်ခြင်းဖြင့်မိတ်ဆွေများအပေါ်ပိုပြီးနားလည်လာအောင်ကျွန်ုပ်ကြိုးစားသည်။
11. ၁၁။	Other people's misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal. သူတစ်ပါး၏ ကံမကောင်းသည့်အကြောင်းကိစ္စများကမိမိအားစိတ်အနှောက်အယှက်များစွာမဖြစ်စေပါ။
12. ၁၂။	If I'm sure I'm right about something, I don't waste much time listening to other people's arguments. မိမိမှန်သည်ဟု သေချာပေါက်သိပါက တခြားသူများ၏စကားကို နားမထောင်တော့ပါ။
13. ၁၃။	When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very much pity for them. မျှမျှတတဆက်ဆံမခံရသူကိုကျွန်ုပ်မြင်တွေ့ရသော်လည်းသနားကြင်နာစိတ်များစွာဖြစ်ပေါ်မလာပါ။
14. ၁၄။	I am usually pretty effective in dealing with emergencies. အရေးပေါ်ကိစ္စများကိုကျွန်ုပ်ကိုင်တွယ်ဖြေရှင်းရာတွင်အများအားဖြင့်ထိရောက်မှုရှိသည်။
15. ၁၅။	I am often quite touched by things that I see happen. ကိုယ်တိုင် ကြုံတွေ့လိုက်ရသည့် ဖြစ်ရပ်များက ကျွန်ုပ်စိတ်ကို များစွာ ထိခိုက်စေသည်။
16. ၁၆။	I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both. ပြဿနာတိုင်းတွင်သူတစ်ပါးရှုထောင့်နှင့်မိမိရှုထောင့်ဟူ၍ရှိရာ၊နှစ်ဖက်စလုံးမှကျွန်ုပ်ကြည့်ရှုလေ့ရှိသည်။
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Description of items</b>
17. ၁၇။	I tend to lose control during emergencies. အရေးပေါ်ပြုလုပ်ရမည့် အခြေအနေတွင် ကျွန်ုပ် ပြာယာခတ် နေလေ့ရှိသည်။
18. ၁၈။	When I'm upset at someone, I usually try to "put myself in their shoes" for a while. တစ်စုံတစ်ဦးအားကျွန်ုပ်စိတ်ပျက်ရသည်ဆိုလျှင်သူ့နေရာတွင်ကျွန်ုပ်ဝင်ကြည့်လေ့ရှိသည်။
19. ၁၉။	When I see someone who badly needs help in an emergency, I go to pieces. အရေးပေါ်အကူအညီအလွန်အမင်းလိုအပ်နေသူကိုကြုံတွေ့ရပါကမိမိမှာခြေမကိုင်မိ၊လက်မကိုင်မိဖြစ်သွားသည်။
20.	My decisions are usually based on my concern for other people.

၂၀။	ကျွန်ုပ်၏ ဆုံးဖြတ်ချက်များသည် တခြားသူများ၏ အလေးထားစရာကိစ္စများအပေါ် အခြေခံလေ့ရှိသည်။
21. ၂၁။	My decisions are usually based on what is the most fair and just way to act. ကျွန်ုပ်၏ ဆုံးဖြတ်ချက်များသည် တရားမျှတမှုအမြင့်ဆုံးဖြစ်မှုအပေါ် အခြေခံသည်။
22. ၂၂။	I choose alternatives that are intended to meet everybody's needs. လူတိုင်း၏လိုအင်အား ဖြည့်ဆည်းပေးနိုင်သည့် နည်းလမ်းများကို ကျွန်ုပ် ရွေးချယ်ဆောင်ရွက်သည်။
23. ၂၃။	I choose a course of action that maximizes the help other people receive. လိုအပ်နေသူများအတွက် အထောက်အကူအများဆုံး ဖြစ်စေမည့် နည်းလမ်းနှင့် ကျွန်ုပ်ဆောင်ရွက်သည်။
24. ၂၄။	I choose a course of action that considers the rights of all people involved. ပါဝင်ပတ်သက်နေသူများအဖို့ ရပိုင်ခွင့်များရစေမည့် နည်းလမ်းနှင့် ကျွန်ုပ်ဆောင်ရွက်သည်။
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Description of items</b>
25. ၂၅။	My decisions are usually based on concern for the welfare of other. လူများ၏ ကောင်းကျိုးချမ်းသာဖြစ်စေမှုအပေါ် အခြေခံပြီး ကျွန်ုပ် ဆုံးဖြတ်သည်။
26. ၂၆။	I have helped carry a stranger's belongings (e.g., books, parcels, etc.). သူစိမ်းတစ်ယောက်၏ ဝန်စည်စလှယ်များကို ကျွန်တော် ကူသယ် ပေးဖူးသည်။
27. ၂၇။	I have allowed someone to go ahead of me in a line (e.g., supermarket, copying machine, etc.). တန်းစီနေစဉ် တစ်စုံတစ်ယောက်က ခွင့်တောင်းလာပါက ကျွန်တော့်ရှေ့က ကြားဖြတ်တန်းစီခွင့်ပေးဖူးသည်။
28. ၂၈။	I have let a neighbor whom I didn't know too well borrow an item of some value. (e.g., tools, a dish, etc.). ကျွန်တော်နှင့် ကောင်းကောင်းမသိသေးသည့် အိမ်နီးနားချင်းကို အသုံးအဆောင်ပစ္စည်းများငှားပေးဖူးသည်။
29. ၂၉။	I have, before being asked, voluntarily looked after a neighbor's pets or children without being paid for it. အိမ်နီးနားချင်း၏ ခွေးကလေး၊ ကြောင်ကလေးတွေကို သူတို့ခရီးထွက်နေစဉ် ကျွေးမွေးစောင့်ရှောက်ထားဖူးသည်။
30. ၃၀။	I have offered to help a handicapped or elderly stranger across a street. ကိုယ်အင်္ဂါချို့တဲ့သူ (သို့) သူစိမ်း သက်ကြီးရွယ်အိုတွေကို လမ်းဖြတ်ကူးရာမှာ အကူအညီပေးဖူးသည်။

**Method**

## Participants

A group of 194 high school students from No.2, BEHS at Magway, participated as research participants in the item analysis study.

## Procedure

The preliminary test which included 30 items was given to the group of 194 participants, the test instruction was read to them. The responses of the participants were scored to calculate the total score for each participant. The total scores of 194 participants were arranged in descending order. Of these scores, the upper 27% (52 respondents) was taken as high group and lower 27% (52 respondents) as low group. Next, item scale correlation was then computed using Chi square correlation for each item.

## Results and Discussion

This analysis left us with 26 items out of 30 items from the preliminary test. Of the total 30 items from the preliminary test, 4 items were not significant at any levels (Table 2). According to the results, all of the Social Responsibility items on the scale were significant at .001 levels. 4 items of Empathic Concerns and 3 items of Personal Distress were significant at .001 levels. All of the Perspective Taking items on the scale were significant at .01 or .001 levels. Then, 3 items of Other Oriented Moral Reasoning and Mutual Moral Reasoning were significant at .001 levels. All of the Self-Reported Altruism items on the scale were significant at .001 levels.

Table 2 Showing the Chi-Square values for the Prosocial Personality Battery Scale

Item No.	Item statement	chi-square value	significance level
1.	When people are nasty to me, I feel very little responsibility to treat them well.	21.524	.001
2.	I would feel less bothered about leaving litter in a dirty park than in a clean one.	17.697	.01
3.	No matter what a person has done to us, there is no excuse for taking advantage of them.	10.468	.05
4.	With the pressure for grades and widespread cheating in school nowadays, the individual who cheats occasionally is not really as much at fault.	34.205	.001
5.	It doesn't make much sense to be very concerned about how we act when we are sick and feeling miserable.	10.644	.05

6.	If I broke a machine through mishandling, I would feel less guilty if it was already damaged before I used it.	7.173	ns
7.	When you have a job to do, it is impossible to look out for everybody's best interest.	10.078	.05
8.	I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the "other person's" point of view.	2.241	ns
9.	When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them.	12.713	.05
10.	I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imaging how things look from their prespective.	13.235	.05
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Item statement</b>	<b>chi-square value</b>	<b>significance level</b>
11.	Other people's misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal.	3.781	ns
12.	If I'm sure I'm right about something, I don't waste much time listening to other people's arguments.	12.419	.05
13.	When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very much pity for them.	23.491	.001
14.	I am usually pretty effective in dealing with emergencies.	1.003	ns
15.	I am often quite touched by things that I see happen.	15.843	.01
16.	I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both.	24.057	.001
17.	I tend to lose control during emergencies.	9.579	.05
18.	When I'm upset at someone, I usually try to "put myself in their shoes" for a while.	13.259	.05
19.	When I see someone who badly needs help in an emergency, I go to pieces.	21.184	.001
20.	My decisions are usually based on my concern for other people.	26.033	.001
21.	My decisions are usually based on what is the most fair and just way to act.	21.150	.001
22.	I choose alternatives that are intended to meet everybody's needs.	27.352	.001
23.	I choose a course of action that maximizes the help other people receive.	42.420	.001

Item No.	Item statement	chi-square value	significance level
24.	I choose a course of action that considers the rights of all people involved.	31.680	.001
25.	My decisions are usually based on concern for the welfare of other.	43.235	.001
26.	I have helped carry a stranger's belongings (e.g., books, parcels, etc.).	31.055	.001
27.	I have allowed someone to go ahead of me in a line (e.g.,supermarket, copying machine, etc.)	13.774	.01
28.	I have let a neighbor whom I didn't know too well borrow an item of some value. (e.g., tools, a dish, etc.).	16.205	.01
29.	I have, before being asked, voluntarily looked after a neighbor's pets or children without being paid for it.	17.664	.01
30.	I have offered to help a handicapped or elderly stranger across a street.	27.533	.001

### Evaluation of Test Reliability

#### Method

After carrying out the item analysis, the internal consistency of the PSB scale was also examined.

#### Participants

Participants were a group of 194 high school students from No.2, BEHS at Magway.

#### rocedure

The test administration procedures and scoring method were same as those described in the item analysis study. After scoring of respondents' responses, Cronbach's alpha was computed to examine internal consistency of the scale.

#### Results and Discussion

Cronbach's alpha for the total PSB Scale was .66. In the same way the value of Cronbach alpha for 7 factors were found as mention below (see Table 3).

Table (3) Showing Cronbach's alpha coefficient for Prosocial Personality Battery (PSB)

No.	Description of scale	Cronbach alpha
1.	PSB scale	.66
2.	Social Responsibility	.64
3.	Empathic Concerns	.43
4.	Personal Distress	.65
5.	Perspective Taking	.52
6.	Other-Oriented Moral Reasoning	.77
7.	Mutual Oriented Moral Reasoning	.74
8.	Self-Reported Altruism	.72

### **Determination of Test Validity**

#### **Method**

Before the test is ready to use, its validity must be established to check well the test fullfills its function (Anastasi, 1981). There are at the present time a number of techniques used in the determination of the test validity. The relation between test score and indices of criterion status obtained at approximately the same time is known as a concurrent validity. Among the most common criteria employed for concurrent validation are contrasted group, ratings, and the other test. In this study the method of contrasted group was employed for the determination of the test validity.

#### **Participants**

Participants are of two groups. One group was 30 people who volunteer to participate. Another group was 30 normal adults from general population. So, participants were 60 people in all.

#### **Procedure**

The Prosocial Personality Battery was administered to two groups. The responses were scored and a point-biserial coefficient was computed. How high a validity coefficient be? No general answer to this question is possible, since interpretation of a validity coefficient must

take into account a number of concomitant circumstances. The obtain correlation should be high enough to be significant at some acceptable level, such as

Table 4. The value of validity coefficient and significant level

No.	Description of Scale	Value of r	Significant level
1.	PSB scale	.78	.01
2.	Social Responsibility	.74	.01
3.	Empathic Concerns	.55	.001
4.	Personal Distress	.33	.01
5.	Perspective Taking	.58	.001
6.	Other-Oriented Moral Reasoning	.39	.001
7.	Mutual Oriented Moral Reasoning	.43	.001
8.	Self-Reported Altruism	.62	.001

the .05, .01 or .001. So, in order to test the significant level, the relationship between  $t$  and  $r_{pb}$  was also computed.

## 2.4 Results and Discussion

Results of the validity coefficient were shown in (Table 4). According to the results, validity coefficients were found to be .78 for Prosocial Personality Battery (Total), .58 for perspective taking, .55 for empathic concern, .33 for personal distress, .39 for other oriented moral reasoning, .43 for mutual moral reasoning and .62 for self-report altruism. So, we may say that the Prosocial Personality Battery is quite satisfactory in reliability as well as in validity.

## Conclusion

The present study is to contrast the Myanmar Version of the Prosocial Personality Battery (PSB) Scale. Penner L. A.(2002) developed the PSB Scale to measure prosocial personality . However, it is an English expression and may not be appropriate for Myanmar cultural context. Therefore, this study attempted to construct the Myanmar version of the PSB Scale based on the translation of the original instrument.

The PSB Scale consists of 30 items which cover 7 dimensions. There are Social Responsibility , Empathic Concerns , Personal Distress, Perspective Taking, Other-Oriented Moral Reasoning, Mutual Oriented Moral Reasoning , and Self-Reported Altruism. Next these items were organized as a preliminary scale and given to a group of 194 high school students from No.2 BEHS at Magway to carry out an item analysis and reliability coefficient.

According to the results of item analysis the total PSB and each subscale were very good because each can discriminate between high scoring individual and low scoring individual. After carrying out the item analysis, the internal consistency of the PSB (total) and each factor were also examined. Cronbach's alpha for the PSB and each subscale were very good. According to the results, validity coefficients were found to be .78 for Prosocial Personality Battery (Total), and each subscale were very good. So, we may say that the Prosocial Personality Battery is quite satisfactory in reliability as well as in validity. So, the Myanmar version of the PSB is an appropriate measure for the Myanmar cultural setting.

### **Acknowledgments**

I sincerely thank Dr. Mu Mu Myint, Rector, Dr. Nwe Nwe Yin and Dr. Win Win Ei, Pro-rectors of Taunggyi University for permitting the opportunity to present this paper. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Khin Mar Mar, Professor & Head (retired), University of Mandalay, for her essential guidance and close supervision during the course of this research work. I would like to express my gratitude to professor Dr. Soe Soe Nwe, Head of Psychology Department, Taunggyi University, for her permission to carry out this research.

### **REFERENCES**

- Anastasi, A. (1981). *Psychological testing* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.) New York: Macmillian.
- Baston, C. D. (1991). *The altruism question*. Hillsdale, NJ:
- Bryant, B, K. (1987) Mental Health, temperament, family and friends: Perspectives on children's empathy and social perspective taking. In Eisenberg & J. Strayer (Eds.), *Empathy and its development*. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.
- Burton, R. V. (1984). A paradox in theories and research in moral development. In W. W. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Morality, moral behavior, and moral development*. New York: Wiley.

Chalmers, J.B., & Townsend, M.A.R. (1990). The effects of training in social perspective taking on socially maladjustment girls. *Child Development*, 61, 178-190

Eisenberg, N. (1986). *Altruistic Emotion, Cognition and Behavior*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Eisenberg, N., Miller, P. A., Shell, R., McNalley, S., & Shea, C. (1991). "Prosocial Development in Adolescence: A Longitudinal Study." *Developmental Psychology*, 27,849-857.

Mussen, P., & Eisenberg-Berg, N. (1977). *Roots of caring sharing and helping: the development of prosocial behavior in children*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Co. Publishers.

Penner, L. A., (2002). The Causes of Sustained Volunteerism : An Interactionist Perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58, 447-468.