

Undersignet Supuran (Bochis) Laura-Nicoleta, I assume the title of the summary
doctoral thesis as the author of it

Rational Emotive Behavior Education Program. Primary school applications

SUMMARY

CONTENT OF THE DOCTORAL THESIS

Introduction

PART I: THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

CHAPTER I: THEORIES AND APPLICATIONS OF RATIONAL EMOTIVE BEHAVIOR EDUCATION IN SCHOOL

I.1. THEORIES OF RATIONAL EMOTIVE BEHAVIOR EDUCATION

I.1.1. Rational emotive behavior education in the education system. Therapeutic perspective

I.1.1.1. The history of the rational emotive behavior therapy

I.1.1.2. Key concepts in the rational emotive behavior therapy

ABC(DE) Model (activating event, cognition, consequences, debate, effect)

Rational cognition vs. irrational cognition in children

I.1.1.3. The purpose of the rational emotive behavior therapy in the intervention in children

I.1.2. Rational emotive behavior education at students

I.1.2.1. Features of the rational emotive behavior education

I.1.2.2. Key concepts in the rational emotive behavior education

I.1.2.3. The purpose of the rational emotive behavior education .

I.2. APPLICATIONS OF RATIONAL EMOTIVE BEHAVIOR EDUCATION IN SCHOOL

I.2.1. Application of rational emotive behavior education concepts through the curriculum and specific lessons systems

I.2.1.1. Educational programs

○ *Rational emotive education: A manual for the elementary school teachers, (Knaus, W.J., 1974)*

○ *Counseling in school. Emotional intelligence development through rational emotive behavior education, Grades I-IV; V-VII;.IX-XII (Vernon, A., 2004)* and the Passport Program for success in the emotional, social, cognitive and self-development of the children/adolescents (Grades 1-5/6-7/9-12 (Vernon, A., 2008)

○ *YES YOU CAN DO IT!* (Bernard, M., 1995, 2001, 2002, 2003a, 2003b, 2004a, 2004c, 2005a)

I.2.2. The integration of the rational emotive behavior education concepts in the various school subjects.

I.2.3. The application of the rational emotive behavior education concepts in solving the difficulties faced by students

I.2.4. Studies on the affectiveness of education programs to students in elementary school

Partial conclusions

CHAPTER II

DEVELOPMENT OF PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR IN STUDENTS

II.1. Conceptual boundaries

II. 2. Types of prosocial behaviors

II.3. Theoretical explanatory models of prosocial behaviors

II. 4. The factors which contribute to the formation and development of the prosocial behaviors

II.4.1. The socialization process and the prosocial behavior

II.4.1.1. Family context

II.4.1.2. School context

II.4.1.4. Media factors: television

II.4.2. The cultural factors and the prosocial behavior

II.4.3. Individual characteristics and the prosocial behavior

II.4.3.1. The age

II.4.3.2. The gender

II.4.3.3. Genetic characteristics of the human species

II.4.3.4. The socio-economic status

II.4.3.5. Personality characteristics

II.4.4. Affective variables

II.4.5 Cognitive variables.

II.4.6. Situational variables

II. 5. Models of good practice in prosocial behaviors on children intervention

II.5.1. Programs to reduce the undesirable and the aggressive behaviors

II.5.2. Programs on the prevention of the appearance of aggressive or problematic behaviors

II.5.3. Programs on training and development of the prosocial behaviors repertoire

Partial conclusions

PART II

The efficiency of a rational emotive behavior education program on the elementary school students

CHAPTER III

THE ANALYSYS OF THE RESULTS APPROPRIATE TO THE ASCERTAINING PHASE OF THE STUDY

III.1. The objectives of the ascertaining phase.

III.2. The stages of the ascertaining demarche.

III.3. Needs analysis studies related to prosocial behavior

III.3.1. The sample of subjects

III.3.2. The procedure for the study on the needs analysis

III.3.3. The workink tool used in the study on the needs analysis

III.3.4. Results from the study on the needs analysis

III.3.4.1. The importance and the time allocated to accomplish the cognitive, affective, social ans psychomotor objectives

III.3.4.2. Results on the prosocial behavior formation in school according to the school subjects, to the lesson stages and to the categories of the lessons

III.3.4.3. The analysis of the results on the determinants of behavior in children

III.3.4.4. The analysis of the results on the ways in which teachers form prosocial behaviors in the elementary school children

III.3.4.5. Conclusions and direction for action from the results on the needs analysis

III.3.5. Investigative approach consisting in the analysis of the school documents

III.3.6. The pretest

III.3.6.1. The sample of subjects

III.3.6.2. Working tools used for the pretest

III.3.6.3. The management procedure in pretest

III.3.6.4. The analysis of the pretest results

III.3.6.4.1. The analysis of the results to the questionnaire on the children behavior

III.3.6.4.2. The analysis of the results obtained from the sociometric test

III.3.6.4.3. The analysis of the results obtained from the scale of interpersonal perception

III.5.2.4. The analysis of the pretest results on the empathy scale

III.5.2.5. The analysis of the results on the rationality vs. irrationality scale

Partial conclusions

CHAPTER IV

A VALIDATION STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE ON CHILD PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR

(Prosocial Behaviour Questionnaire; Weir And Duveen, 1981)

IV.1. The questionnaire description.

IV.2. Implementing, correction and interpretation rules.

IV.3. Romanian population data.

IV.3.1. Factor analysis.

IV.3.2. Indicators of validity and fidelity of the proof.

IV.3.3. Standard of the proof for the Romanian population.

CHAPTER V

STUDY ON REGRESSION ANALYSIS ON THE EXPLANATORY FACTORS OF THE PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS 176

CHAPTER VI

THE ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS PROPER TO THE FORMATIVE STAGE

- The efficiency of a rational emotive behavioral education on the formation and the development of prosocial behaviors to 3rd and 4th grade students

VI.1. Description of the intervention program

VI.1.1. Objective of the program

VI.1.2. Implementation issues

VI.1.3. Program characteristics .

VI.1.4. Time of the program

VI.1.5. Working methods and procedures used in the program

VI.1.5.1. Collaboration games

VI.1.5. 2. The educational story

VI.1.6. Methodological suggestions on the implementation of the activities

VI.2. The objectives of the formative stage

VI.3. The research hypotheses

VI.4. Variables involved

VI.5. Stages of the formative component

VI.6. Methods and instruments

VI.7. The sample of subjects

VI.8. The sample of content

VI.9. Formative experiment results

VI.9.1. The posttest. Intergroup comparisons

VI.9.1.1. The analysis of the results to the questionnaire on prosocial behavior of children in posttest

VI.9.1.2. The analysis of the results obtained by students in the sociometric test in posttest

VI.9.1.3. The analysis of the results obtained in the posttest on the interpersonal perception scale

VI.9.1.4. The analysis of the results obtained in the posttest on the empathy level scale

VI.9.2. The re-test. Intergroup comparisons

VI.9.2.1. The analysis of the results to the questionnaire on prosocial behavior of children in the re-test

VI.9.2.2. The analysis of the results obtained by students in the sociometric re-test

VI.9.2.3. The analysis of the results obtained in the re-test on the interpersonal perception scale

VI.9.2.4. The analysis of the results obtained in the re-test on the empathy level scale

VI.9.3. The analysis of the results obtained on the analysis of variance with repeated measurements. Intra-group comparisons

VI.9.3.1. The analysis of the results to the questionnaire on the prosocial behavior of the children

VI.9.3.2. The analysis of the results obtained on the interpersonal perception scale

VI.9.3.3. Intra-group analysis results on the empathy level scale

VI.9.4. The results of the weekly evaluation file on the prosocial behavior of students at school

Partial conclusions

FINAL THOUGHTS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANNEXES:

ANNEX 1: Needs analysis questionnaire on the elementary school children prosocial behavior

ANNEX 2: The set on the assessment tools used in the evaluation of the affectiveness of the rational emotive behavior education program in pretest-posttest-re-test

ANNEX 3: Sequences of rational emotive behavior learning activities for the *ART* classes

ANNEX 4: Sequences of rational emotive behavior learning activities for the *EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING* or for the *HEALTH EDUCATION* classes

ANNEX 5: Sequences of rational emotive behavior learning activities for the *ROMANIAN* classes, *4th GRADE*

ANNEX 6: Sequences of rational emotive behavior learning activities for the *ROMANIAN* classes, *3th GRADE*

ANNEX 7: Sequences of rational emotive behavior learning activities for the *MUSIC* classes, *4th GRADE*

ANNEX 8: Sequences of rational emotive behavior learning activities for the *CIVIC EDUCATION* classes, *3rd GRADE*

TERMS AND KEYWORDS: rational emotive behavior education, rational emotive behavior therapy, mental health program, prosocial behavior, explanatory factors of prosocial behavior, regression analysis, inter and intra-group analysis results

SUMMARY

Once, two men were going to make a pyramid. They started to build it. When the others saw how well they understand each other, a lot of people have joined them. The pyramid was ready in a few weeks. They called that pyramid The Pyramid of our Generosity.

The end. (Filip)

The story above belongs to a 9 years old little boy who was part of the study on an effectiveness evaluating rational emotive behavior education program on the development of the prosocial behavior in students. Even if the story was built on a less 'sophisticated' vocabulary, we can not refer to the final metaphor that focuses a positive model of interaction between people related to the peers self-help.

In everyday life, most of us devote a considerable time and effort for helping the others. Through behaviors such as: *providing information to a person, working as an active member in a team, consoling a friend who suffers, donating goods or money to the charity institutions and so on*, we demonstrate that we are concerned on the welfare of our fellows.

Despite the cultural patterns that promote individualism, we considered that the formation and development of the prosocial behavior is a matter of current students, because the train company needs positive role models, one of them being the concern and care for the others.

Interest in this field has been noticed since Antiquity. The Greek philosophers, Plato and Aristotle, were among the first that tried to answer questions concerning the reasons for which people manifest positive or negative behaviour in relation to one another. But the modern concern for the prosocial behaviour is of recent date. According to John F. Dovidio (apud Chelcea, 2004, p. 183), more than 98% of its psychosociological research was published after 1960, several stages being noticeable in its evolution:

- in the mid '60s, the research was focused on the norms of responsibility and reciprocity;

- at the beginning of the '70s, the studies were centered on understanding (reading) the spectator's apathy;
- in the mid '70, the main focus of the research were the factors that inhibit the outgoing direction of prosocial behaviour;
- in the '80s, the main conditions and determinant factors of supportive (of helping others) behaviours were analyzed;
- the research after the '90s have been focused in identifying the motivation of prosocial behaviour.

This work addresses the prosocial behavior of the school children and tries to provide answers to the next questions:

- Is it possible to enrich the repertoire of the prosocial behaviors to the students in primary grades through rational emotive behavior education?
- Are there any differences between the prosocial behavior of the school children compared to the behavior shown at home?
- What are the explanatory factors of the prosocial behavior of students in school?

In terms of work structure, it contains seven chapters:

CHAPTER I

Theories and applications of the rational emotive behavior education in school

Chapter I deals with rational emotive aspects of education and behavior from history, key concepts, dedicated to presenting programs that have proven effective in mental health training.

Because the program is based on the rational emotive behavior education this first chapter aims at theoretical and practical aspects of the specialty literature related to the rational emotive behavior therapy and to the rational emotive behavior education with emphasis on their applicability in working with students.

For an effective understanding of the information contained in the first chapter, it is important the development of national boundaries about: *rational emotive behavior therapy, rational emotive behavior education, rational vs. irrational cognition.*

Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy – REBT –is the first form of cognitive-behavioral psychotherapy, being developed by the psychologist Albert Ellis from SUA. He issued a comprehensible theory which postulated that people develop rational vs. irrational cognition from the interpretation that they assign to the events they cross .REBT theory focuses on the relationship between cognition, emotion and behavior but also on the intervention techniques for restructuring of the irrational beliefs. Identifying and modifying irrational cognition that generate pathology and suffering, as well as the assimilation of rational beliefs, which generates a good mental health is the therapy fundamental points.(Ellis și Bernard, 2007).

Applying the concepts promoted by Ellis through REBT in education is achieved through *Rational Emotive Behavior Education – REBE*. Ellis (1979, 1985 apud Opre și Vaida, 2008) outlines the applicability on this theory with the *ABC(DE) model (activating event, cognition, consequences, dispute, effect)*. This model is easy to understand so that anyone can use it to identify and to control their own cognition in terms of adopting those functional or adaptive.

More precisely, Ellis (1979, 1985 apud Opre and Vaida, 2008) explains his theory with the use of the acronym *ABC(DE) (activating event, beliefs, consequences, disputing, effect)*.

This model is easy to understand, so anyone could use it to identify and control one's own thinking and actions in order to increase one's abilities to choose more functional and adaptive thinking and behaviours. This ABC(DE) model uses the first letters of the alphabet to assure its simplicity by abbreviating the basic concepts:

A = activating event – the event that initiates the feelings and thinking for a person;

B = beliefs - cognitions of a person that result from a person's evaluations and interpretations of the activating event;

C = consequences of the cognitive analysis of the activating event. These consequences can be observed through the person's emotions and behaviours and they can be adaptive and non-adaptive. Ellis (1967 apud Ellis, A., Dryden, W., 2007) thinks that emotional and behavioural disorders are not the consequence of the events but rather are a consequence of the way people evaluate the event (namely of the B of the set model). D. David (2006) emphasizes the idea that all psychological consequences – C – (emotional, cognitive, behavioural, psychophysiological) are determined not by everyday events – A –, but by the way one interprets life events – B. If the interpretations are irrational then the consequences will more likely be emotional sufferings and

non-adaptive behaviours. If the interpretations are rational then the consequences will more likely be adaptive emotions and behaviours.

D = disputing – questioning the dysfunctional and irrational cognitions.

E = effects - represent the effects of the cognitive rethinking that results in a more rational life philosophy.

When children experience negative events in their lives they sometimes develop the negative feelings and thinking that lead to dysfunctional relationships in their lives (Ellis and Bernard, 2007). In terms of the ABC model the negative results could look as follows:

Activating events: social rejection, teasing, lack of play dates or party invitations, loss of a partner.

Beliefs:

- Interferences (conclusions, predictions): “Everybody is against me”, “Everybody teases me, nobody likes me”, “I won’t ever have friends”, “I can’t be happy without his/her love”.

- Generalizations (should, need to, have to, ought to, it’s of absolute importance): “I need people to like and approve me”.

- Evaluations: “It’s awful to be criticized, to be laugh at or to be alone”. “I can’t stand it”. “This shows that I am a hopeless person”.

Consequences (emotional, behavioural): depression, crying, periods of inactivity, avoiding people and tasks, tiredness, irritability.

Another boundary that we wish to accomplish in this chapter is related to the irrational cognition in relation to the rational cognition.. *Irrational cognition* are logically incorrect, incongruous with the objective reality and block individual goals achieving (Maultsby, 1991 apud Macavei, 2002). These ones appear in absolutist forms (*should, must, it is absolutely necessary*). Derived from the absolutist (Ellis and Bernard, 2007) are: the catastrophe (for example : „It is terribly when you make a mistake”), low frustration tolerance (for example : „People that treats me bad is bad and they deserves severe punishment”) and global assesment (for example. „I am stupid.”). Instead, *rațional cognition* is based on the empirical reality, it facilitates individual goals and aspects the principles of logic (Maultsby, 1991 apud Macavei, 2002). Rațional cognition (Ellis and Bernard, 2007) are expressed in terms of preferences, not orders, and load to higher levels of emotional and adaptive behavior.

We continue to bring some clarifications regarding the application of REBD in school.

Rational emotive education was initially promoted in Living School where in 1974, W.J.

Rational Emotive Education was initially promoted by Living School, in 1974, when W.J. Knaus wrote the first educational materials and a guide for teachers (Vernon, 1990). Based on the philosophy of the school about the use of efficient strategies of thinking, emotion and behaviour Knaus (1974) developed a curriculum that educated children in the spirit of the ABC model of REBT. The common goal of any Rational Emotive Behaviour Education program is to help students develop ways to think and behave that lead to strong psychological and mental health.

There are well known programs and resources in use in the field:

The programme drawn up by Knaus, W.J.: Rational Emotive Education: A Manual for Elementary School Teachers (1974)

The programmes designed by Vernon: “Thinking, Feeling, Behaving”, 1989 and “The Passport Programme. A Journey through Emotional, Social, Cognitive and Self-Development. Grades 1-5/6-8/9-12, 1998”. These were also translated into Romanian and offer teachers, school advisors and psychologists, and social assistants a comprehensive curriculum that they can use to help children and adolescents to learn the concepts of mental health.

The programme developed by Michael Bernard (1995, 2001, 2002, 2003a, 2003b, 2004a, 2004c, 2005a): Education „You Can Do It!” (YCDI); it is a system that intends to help all students develop positive educational, social, emotional and behavioural status.

We will not give further details about these programmes but we want to emphasize that A. Ellis, M.E. Bernard (2007) think that the integration of the key concepts of Rational Emotive Behaviour Education can be implemented during common class activities. It is less direct than a systematised lesson, but it is a real method of enforcing rational concepts and of integrating them into the normal educational structure. For example, when a teacher has a literature class, he/she can choose to analyse stories and poems that have characters that solve problems rationally and express their emotions in healthy ways. Teachers can be encouraged to use study questions and essay topics based on the model designed by A. Vernon (1989, 1998). In addition, instructors can assist students with the use of vocabulary enriched with phrases and words that cover emotions and adequately express them in positive behavioural terms.

Besides common features contained in any rational emotive education program, each has distinct features that customize intervention.

On the first chapter of the work, we conclude that in order to identify the characteristic elements of the rational emotive behavior therapy and of the rational emotive behavior education, it provides answers to the next questions:

- Which are the basic concepts of REBE?
- How to apply these concepts to the class?
- Are the irrational beliefs present in children?
- What are the results of the research on the effectiveness of REBE in school?
- How do REBE folds on the needs of schools in our country?

CHAPTER II

The development of prosocial behavior in students

Chapter II covers fundamental issues related to: prosocial behaviors delimitation types, highlighting the theoretical and explanatory models of these types of behaviors, comparing factors determining the formation and development of prosocial behaviors, describing models of good practice in the intervention on prosocial behaviors in children.

In an attempt to provide a rigorous theoretical framework with reference to prosocial behavior, we faced the problem as clear and comprehensive definition of the term.

Because in the abroad literature have been circulated at least four terms that are closely related to the prosocial behavior, namely: *self-help*, *cooperation*, *altruism* and *pro-sociability*. In some works, these terms are used as synonymous for prosocial behavior. Instead, in others they refer to distinct realities or complementary. Currently, altruistic and prosocial behavior are the two terms that prevail in the literature (specialty works). But there is a trend of increasingly emphasized not only by the growing number of works focused on the term prosocial, but especially for the fact that the distance between the two terms deepens (for example the use of the term of altruism decreases from his appearance in 999 research papers published in the years 1989-1991 to 499 publications between the years 1999-2001. Instead prosocial increases from 924 to 1189 at the same time.

The term of “prosocial behaviour” is encountered in the works of some psychologists, like: Baron and Byrne, 1974–1981; Bar-Tal, 1976; Baum, Fischer and Singer, 1985; Bierhoff and Klein, 1988; Feldman, 1985 (apud Chelcea, 2004, p. 184). Still, our intent of precisely marking the major aspects of prosocial behaviour met some limitations in defining the

motivation a person manifests when he/she is involved in supportive actions. Once we have identified the nature of motivation, we are able to set a mark between prosocial behaviour and altruism.

In some works, the notion of prosocial behaviour was overlapped by altruism. We underline that by altruism we understand “a behaviour that it is manifested for helping another, without expecting an external reward” (Macaulay and Berkowitz 1970, p. 3), being “set against one’s own self interest” (Moscovici, 1994, 1998 apud Chelcea, 2004, p. 184). Other authors postulate that prosocial behaviour implies a pattern of activity, while altruism is the motivation of helping others out of pure consideration for their needs.

In one of the first studies on prosocial behaviour, Mussen and Eisenberg, (1977, p.3-4) state that it *refers to actions set for helping others or for others’ benefit, without the doer’s intent of gaining external rewards. These repeated actions of the doer imply some costs, self-sacrifice and even taking some chances.* In an almost similar manner, Baum, Fisher, Singer (1985 apud Chelcea, 1996) consider that prosocial behaviour are those *intentioned acts that might have positive consequences for others, without anticipating any reward.*

Being a complex concept, in some works of international importance, the prosocial behaviour it is not referred to as prosocial behaviour, but as “altruism” (Albrecht, Thomas and Chadwick, 1980; Meyers 1983, 1987; Michener, DeLamater and Schwartz, 1986; Moscovici 1994, 1998 apud Chelcea, 2004), “supportive behaviour” (Dovidio, 1995; Raven and Rubin, 1976; Saks and Krupat, 1988 apud *ibidem*, 2004) or “positive social action” (Gergen, Gergen and Jutras, 1981, 1992 apud *ibidem*, 2004). Although that between these terms there are some similarities, to understand the essence of prosocial behaviour, some authors refer to two categories of positive social behaviours:

- (a) prosocial behaviours that lead to a mutual gain for each of the involved parties;
- (b) prosocial behaviours that lead to the gain of only one of the involved parties.

Starting from this classification, we encounter the dichotomy altruist motivation vs. non-altruist in the prosocial behaviour of one person. Thus, Garaigordobil (2005, p. 45), by prosocial behaviour, understands *positive social behaviour that is performed in favour of others, with or without altruist motivation.* Bar-Tal (1982) sets the defining notes of prosocial behaviour, like: intentionality, freedom of choice – not job requirement –, performed in the absence of some external rewards.

Nowadays, the studies in this field agreed upon two categories of prosocial behaviours: *specific prosocial behaviour* and *global prosocial behaviour* (Carlo și Randall, 2001). Specific prosocial behaviours refer to those behaviours that are triggered in a specific circumstance, when help (support) is asked, while global prosocial behaviours refer to *altruistic prosocial behaviour, compliant prosocial behaviour, emotional prosocial behaviour and public or socially desirable prosocial behaviour*.

In the existing bibliography, the most researchers include for the manifest prosocial behaviour actions like: *to offer goods to others, to help, to respond empathically to the situation others experience and to cooperate* (Eisenberg, Cameron, Pasternack, Tryon, 1988, Caprara and colab., 2000; Kerr, Beck, Shattuck, Kattar, Uriburu, 2003; Diener, Kim, 2004; Scourfield, Bethan, Neilson, McGuffin, 2004; Hastings, McShane, Parker, Ladha, 2007 apud Moraes, 2009). This last delimitation on prosocial behaviour is mainly used in the research, because there have been encountered major difficulties in setting the intention behind the specific and global prosocial behaviours.

Another difficulty that we encountered in this chapter was to identify, as possible, the more types of behaviors, considered prosocial, and then depending on the classification provided by several authors, to identify prosocial behaviors in early childhood.

In analyzing the factors that explain people prosocial behavior, we described them separately, namely: the factors influence involved in child socialization process, individual characteristics that influence the people behavior, affective variables, cognitive variables, individual variables and variables related to the cultural environment in which the person develops himself/herself. But we can not emphasize the existence of a lot of courses; in other words, the probability that a prosocial behavior is likely to initialize can not be attributed to an only one factor, but rather we must keep in mind the interrelations that can be established between the various factors.

Another aspect of this chapter is related to the types of the intervention programs implemented and their results in the formation and development of the prosocial behavior. Most of the experimental groups mainly included adolescent subjects and the activities were carried out in the school environment. Thus, programs have been implemented whose major objective was to reduce antisocial and undesirable behaviors while increasing the frequency of manifestation of the prosocial behaviors (*Programa del Pensamiento Prosocial*, López și colab, 2002; *Prosocial*

Family Therapy, Blechman și Vryan, 2000); others focused on aggressive behaviors prevention (Martínez, 1993; *Positive Peer Reporting*, Cashwell, 2001; *Classwide Positive Peer Reporting: Tootling*, Skinner, 2002) and not in the least, those that aim to develop the repertoire of the prosocial behaviors in children and young people (Hertz-Lazarowitz² Sharan, 1984; Solomon, 1990; Watson, 1998; López, 1994c; Garaigordobil, 1994, 1995, 2003, 2004; Roche, 1995, 1998, 1999).

CHAPTER III

The validation study of the prosocial behavior questionnaire of students on Romanian population

Chapter III covers the study of the prosocial behavior questionnaire of students on Romanian population. It was elaborated in 1981 by Weir și Duveen. The validation study contains data about the factor structure, validity indicators, respectively of the fidelity proof and a standard on the Romanian population.

CHAPTER IV

The analysis of the results corresponding to the ascertaining stage of the study

Chapter IV refers to the research methodology, presenting the data obtained in the ascertaining stage of the study. At this stage, we made an investigative demarche consisting of: realizing the study on analysis of needs in the prosocial behavior of the students on the basis of a questionnaire for teachers; studying the curriculum for the 3rd and 4th grades to highlight its provisions on the establishment of the prosocial behaviors of students in school; pretest achievements for the four groups surveyed.

Starting from here, we formulated the following **specific objectives**:

- O1:** Highlighting teachers' attitude about the main aspects related to the training and development of the prosocial behaviors in primary school children
- O2:** Curriculum analysis at the next subjects: *Romanian, Music, Art, Educational and Vocational Guidance and Counseling and Civic Culture* about its recommendation on the formation of prosocial behaviors to students of 3rd and 4th grades;

O3: The sample content composition, respectively the selection of the subjects and the development of a program for rational emotive behavior education consisting of sequences of activities to be carried out in class;

O4: The subjects sample composition – establishing experimental and control classes – through the administration of evidences to highlight the need for intervention in the experimental classes.

To the study on the analysis of needs there have been evaluated 110 teachers from rural and urban education system (Bihor and Salaj counties) .Concerning the obtained results, the analysis of needs has allowed capturing a not insignificant aspect for the current study, namely: teachers believe that the disciplines that enable the formation and the development of the prosocial behaviors of students are those areas: *Language and Communication*, and *Man and Society*. Therefore, the composition program will take into account this aspect meaning that proper disciplines will be selected corresponding to these areas, even more as the program is intended to be an adjunct for the teachers in the educational process.

The obtained results in the ascertaining study opened the horizon for the action directions corresponding to the formative stage related to:

- the sample of subjects that will be subjected to the study;
- the most difficult methods for the implementation of the rational emotive behavior education program in school, in students class.

CHAPTER V

Study on the regression analysis of the explanatory factors of the prosocial behavior in primary school students.

In **chapter V** we have tried to identify the explanatory factors of the prosocial behavior of students in school. The present study tries to identify the explanatory factors of prosocial behaviour of pupils in school, focusing on the identification of the relation it is set between prosocial behaviour of children in school, in relation to their classmates, and the one at home, in relation to their siblings.

At this study it has participated a number of 75 pupils of third and fourth grades from urban and rural areas to test the hypothesis according to which the prosocial behaviour of pupils in relation to their classmates is influenced by their prosocial behaviour in relation to their siblings, at home, when variables like: background, characteristics related to gender affiliation, empathy, interpersonal perception for three dimensions: sympathetic, good friend, intelligent; are kept constant.

The method used in analysing the data is hierarchic regression for an explaining purpose, trying to analyze the factors with a significant influence on the prosocial behaviour of students, at school. The study could have also had a mix purpose, explanatory and predictor, but the small number of subjects did allow only an explanatory analysis paradigm, the obtained data helped only to explain the factors that influence the prosocial behaviour of the pupils involved in this study. In addition to that, we would further on show on the analysis of the obtained results that the values of adjusted R^2 are approximately 5-6 percent higher than those obtained for R^2 , a fact that triggers the impossibility of generalizing or extrapolating the results, in a predictor purpose, for any other subjects than those involved in this study.

The following lines show the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the obtained data.

In what the relations established between the prosocial behaviour scored by the teacher and the criterion variables of the study are concerned, we show the correlation matrix in *table V.1.*

Table V.1. Correlation matrix for the variables involved in the model

	m	a.s.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Prosocial behaviour scored by the teacher	44,23	6,20	-							
Gender affiliation	.45	.50	.239*	-						
Background	.53	.50	.016	-.096	-					
Level of empathy	2,25	.19	.195*	.189*	-.092	-				
Sympathetic	3,17	.54	.467*	.143	.494*	.146	-			
Good friend	3,32	.46	.528*	-.026	.553*	.126	.824*	-		
Intelligent	3,26	.59	.380*	.073	.290*	.073	.653*	.728*	-	
Prosocial behaviour scored by the parents	47,19	8,51	.470*	-.149	.126	.200*	.358*	.415*	.184*	-

Note: ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

According to the correlation matrix, there is a direct relation, statistically significant, between the prosocial behaviour and the variables connected to: gender affiliation ($r=.23$, $p<.01$), the classmates' perception as being sympathetic ($r=.46$, $p<.01$), good friend ($r=.52$, $p<.01$), intelligent ($r=.38$, $p<.01$), level of empathy, global score ($r=.19$, $p<.05$), prosocial behaviour scored by the parents, at home ($r=.47$, $p<.01$).

At the ANOVA global test of significance have been achieved values of F that match some thresholds of significance lower than .01, thus we reject the hypothesis of the independent variables lack of significance in favour of the hypothesis that the regression patterns (models) are significant, meaning that the regression is adequate for the set purpose in the following way:

- for model 1, $F_{\text{change}}(6,68)=9,193$, $p=.00$ (F_{change} compares in step 1 the tested model with Intercept model)
- for model 2, $F_{\text{change}}(1,67)=6,903$, $p=.01$.

Then, we have tested each variable from the two models with t Student test.

The obtained results allow us to draw a conclusion upon the significant variables for our model, those being presented in *table V.2*.

Table V.2. Regression analysis on explaining factors of prosocial behaviour of primary education pupils

<i>Variables</i>	<i>R²</i>	<i>R²ajust.</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE b</i>
STEP 1	.448**	.399**			
Gender affiliation			.451*	.196	.223
Background			-.799**	.231	-.394
Level of empathy			1,665E-02	.095	.017
Sympathetic			5,557E-02	.168	.056
Good friend			.815**	.197	.814
Intelligent			-.154	.139	-.152
STEP 2	.499**	.447**			
Gender affiliation			.490**	.188	.242
Background			-.701**	.225	-.346
Level of empathy			-1,553E-02	.092	-.015
Sympathetic			1,891E-02	.161	.019
Good friend			.659**	.198	.657
Intelligent			-7,642E-02	.136	-.075
Prosocial behaviour at home			.331**	.126	.262

Note: ** $p<.01$, * $p<.05$

In *table V.2.* the dependent variable is represented by the *prosocial behaviour of children in school, scored by the teacher*, and the factors that could explain this behaviour are, in the first step, variables connected to gender affiliation, pupils' background, interpersonal perception for three categories: sympathetic, good friend and intelligent, and in the second model there has been included, in addition to the factors mentioned for model 1, the prosocial behaviour of children at home, scored by the parents.

The obtained **results** enforce the hypothesis according to which the prosocial behaviour of children at home influences their prosocial behaviour in school, thus:

- **For step 1**, that includes the variables connected to gender affiliation, the pupils' background, empathy and interpersonal perception, it has been obtained an $R^2_{\text{ajust.}}=.399^{**}$, which means that these variables, together explain 39% of the variance concerning prosocial behaviour of pupils in school, the rest of 61% of the variance is due to other factors that have been included in our regression model.

In this model only the demographic variables connected to gender affiliation and background, and interpersonal perception referring to the quality of good friend have an influence on the dependent variable. Thus, when we refer to gender affiliation, being a dummy variable, B coefficient represents a measure of how much it increases versus decreases the dependent variable when the criterion variable changes the response category, from 0 to 1 (Sava, 2004) from boys (taken as base/reference category) to girls, in this study. In this way, the expected level for the prosocial behaviour of girls is .451 higher than that expected for the boys ($b=.451$). In what the correlation between the affiliation to a certain gender variable and the prosocial behaviour is concerned, after the elimination of the variance due to the other predictors included in the model, this is a positive one, ($\beta=.223$) and significant, a threshold $p<.05$.

In what the other dummy variable, connected to pupils' background, is concerned, we have found that the value of the unstandardized coefficient b is negative $b=-.799$, which means that the expected level of prosocial behaviour of pupils from the urban educational system is .799 units lower than that obtained by the pupils from the rural educational system, taken as base/reference category in our data base.

In what the interpersonal perception for the dimension of good friend is concerned, we have found that when we succeed to increase with a standard deviation its results, the manifestation

ratio of prosocial behaviour would increase with .814 standard deviations, the level of the other variables included in our study being kept constant. Being a partial coefficient in the regression equation (in the case of having more than one V.I.), the value of b corresponding to the quality of good friend indicates the fact that, between the level of prosocial behaviour and this variable, after the elimination of the variance due to others V.I., it remained a correlation of -.815. In other words, if our study had had enough arguments to be conducted in a predictor purpose, we could have claimed that among the groups in which there is friendship among the pupils, this characteristic could be considered a significant predictor, extremely important, of prosocial behaviour in school.

By ruling out the simultaneous influence of the independent variables on the dependent one, we point the value of the coefficients of semi partial correlation for each of the independent variables, taken separately, in relation with the dependent variable:

- for the gender affiliation variable ($r_{sp}=.208$), the coefficient of specific determination is 4% (which means that 4% of the scatter of prosocial behaviour in school could be explained by the inter-individual differences in what the gender affiliation of the subjects variable is concerned);
- for the background variable ($r_{sp}=.387$), the coefficient of specific determination is 14% (which means that 14% of the scatter of prosocial behaviour in school could be explained by the inter-individual differences in what the background of the subjects is concerned);
- for the good friend variable ($r_{sp}=.448$), the coefficient of specific determination is 20% (which means that 20% of the scatter of prosocial behaviour in school could be explained by the inter-individual differences in what the nature of friendship among the subjects is concerned).

For model 1 we may conclude that:

- a higher level of prosocial behaviour of the pupils included in our study has been observed mainly among girls, from the rural areas, among who there is a well consolidated friendship;
- among the independent variables designed to explain in our study the variance of prosocial behaviours in school, the quality of good friend has the highest influence ($\beta=.814$), followed by background ($\beta=.395$) and gender affiliation ($\beta=.223$).

For step 2 are verified the independent variables included in step 1 and, in addition to those, in the second block the scores of the prosocial behaviour of children given by the parents, at home, has been introduced. Thus, our model is statistically significant, and the value of $R^2_{\text{ajust.}}=.447$.

At the analytic level, the final estimative model suggests that empathy level, interpersonal perception on the characteristics of sympathetic and intelligent do not influence the prosocial behaviour of children in school, the values of β are not statistically significant. But for the demographic variables (gender affiliation and background), the variable connected to the inter-individual perception on the characteristic of good friend and the one connected to the prosocial behaviour at home, the values of coefficient β are statistically significant, as it is presented in *table V.2*.

A significant part (contribution) in understanding the prosocial behaviour in school is given to the knowledge of frequency and ratio of manifestation of prosocial behaviour at home. The value of the standardized β coefficient shows that when the ratio of prosocial behaviour at home increases with a standard deviation, the level of prosocial behaviour in school increases with .262 standard deviations. The correlation between the prosocial behaviour in school and that seen at home, after the elimination of the variance due to the other factors included in the model, is of .331 ($b=.331$). This increase is not as important (the value of $R^2_{\text{change}}=.052$), but we should be aware that it is statistically significant, because we could explain the prosocial behaviour of children in school through their prosocial behaviour at home, on one hand, and in a predictor purpose we could mention that, after an intervention programme, increasing the ratio and frequency of manifestation of prosocial behaviours of children at home, we could increase the ratio and frequency of manifestation of such a behaviour in school, too.

In this type of model, we underline the share each independent variable has in explaining the scatter of the prosocial behaviour in school:

- for the gender affiliation variable, $\text{rsp}=.225$, which means that it explains 5% of the scatter of prosocial behaviour in school;
- for the background variable, $\text{rsp}=.27$, which means that it explains 7% of the scatter of prosocial behaviour in school;
- for the good friend variable, $\text{rsp}=.287$, which means that it explains 8% of the scatter of prosocial behaviour in school;

- for the prosocial behaviour of children at home variable, $r^2=.227$, which means that it explains 5% of the scatter of prosocial behaviour in school.

We may conclude that the ratio and frequency of manifestation of prosocial behaviour of pupils in school is higher among the pupils' groups where there is a close friendship ($\beta=.657$), among the pupils from the rural area ($\beta=-.346$), in classes of mainly girls ($\beta=.242$) and who have an increased level of prosocial behaviour at home ($\beta=.262$).

The obtained data enforces the idea that beyond the demographic variables and the nature of relationships set (established) among the classmates, the prosocial behaviour of children at home, in relation to their siblings, has a significant influence on their prosocial behaviour in school. Thus, it is once more underlined the need of a close collaboration between school and family, between teacher and parents, in the way of supporting one another for shaping the children's prosocial behaviour.

On the other hand, the study has presented information that support the results of some previous studies on the influence of demographic factors on prosocial behaviours, but also on the influence the family and the relations among the family has on shaping the prosocial behaviour in children. Thus, we may conclude that in the circumstances in which in school we see (meet) pupils of the same age, gender and among who there is friendship, but who have at home different levels of prosocial behaviour, they would show different levels of this type of behaviour in school, too. So, the teachers in primary school could implement activities or work with the school psychologists to elaborate programmes for shaping prosocial behaviour, by selecting the target groups according to their needs.

This study has also allowed a new path of action, more precisely, the identification from small ages, in the kindergarten, of the aspects concerning the prosocial behaviour of children at home for the possibility of being able to predict (estimate) from the very beginning of the scholar life whether the pupils in a newly formed class would involve themselves in prosocial behaviours in school.

CAPITOLUL VI

Analiza rezultatelor corespunzătoare etapei formative a studiului

Chapter six is the most important part of research and intervention includes training conducted for the purposes of pro-social behavior and development in primary school.

Activities designed for **formative stage objectives** in this program, are aimed to form and develop pro-social behaviors by assimilating students learning specific concepts Rational Emotive Behavioral about:

- personal development: positive attitude towards self and others
- and emotional development empathy.

The **specific objectives** of the formative study are:

O1: Training, development and maintenance of pro-social behavior manifestation rate among students.

Pro-social behavior indicators for operationalization are: *to assist, to borrow, accept and tolerate the colleagues, to collaborate, to forgive, to ask forgiveness, to address praise, to encourage each other to console.*

O2: socio-emotional development of students in the following aspects:

O2.1: modification of the existing relationships within classes to increase the acceptance of all members;

O2.2: changes in interpersonal perception of students on the three categories The characteristics (compassionate and understanding, good and friendly, smart) towards a more objective evaluation and acceptance of strengths and weaknesses in themselves and to others;

O2.3: increasing students' empathy

Research hypotheses

The general hypothesis

If the general hypothesis: educational activities aimed to train a positive attitude to the teachers about themselves and others and to develop empathy for students through a program of education Rational Emotive Behavioral, we will see an increasement of manifestation of pro-social behaviors in students.

Specific hypothesis no. 1

By leveraging the content of texts in school manuals of Romanian language and civic education, implementing in the educational activities in class, the educational tales, games in collaboration as a result of Rational Emotive Behavioral Educational approach, the increase is reached through the frequency and pro-social behavior manifestation rate among the students.

Null hypothesis: Differences between results obtained by students on pro-social behavior is due to chance.

Specific hypothesis no. 2

By leveraging the content of texts in school manuals of Romanian language and civic education, implementing in the educational activities in class, the educational tales, games in collaboration as a result of Rational Emotive Behavioral Educational approach, to achieve system of relationships between students.

Null hypothesis: Differences between results obtained by pupils socio-metric test and interpersonal perception is due to chance.

Specific hypothesis no. 3

By leveraging the content of texts in school manuals of Romanian language and civic education, implementing in the educational activities in class, the educational tales, games in collaboration as a result of Rational Emotive Behavioral Educational approach, increase is reached on empathic level of students.

Null hypothesis: Differences between results obtained by students on empathy level is due to chance.

Program effectiveness is evaluated by measuring the results and the experimental control group in pretest, posttest, and retest the questionnaire on pro-social behavior of children and parents addressed the teacher and set of assessment tools to the students: Socio-metric test, interpersonal perception, the level of empathy scale. Formative evaluation of the program for variable of the pro-social behavior was achieved by monitoring the rate and frequency of pro-social behaviors shown with a weekly evaluation sheets to the teacher of the experimental lots. From our findings we obtained important information about the effectiveness and usefulness an

educational program of pro-social behavior intervention for students in pro-social behavior repertoire enrichment purposes.

The Rational Emotive Behavioral education Program was implemented on a sample of 44 students from the third and the fourth class by the teachers from classes, for a period of 10 weeks in four disciplines. In the third class, the subjects of study were Romanian, civic education, arts, health education, and at the fourth grade, there was Romanian, art education, music education, counseling and school and professional. During the activities conducted under the program, the teacher gave attention to the pro-social behavior of students in relation to their peers promoted based on pro-sociality each new rule of conduct and follow the formation of a positive attitude towards the students themselves and to others, pro-sociality promoted among them based on new rule of conduct and sought to form a positive attitude of students towards themselves and towards others, and emotional awareness and empathy training.

Below the **results** obtained in our study to capture the extent that specific assumptions have been validated or not.

In the validation of a **specific hypothesis no 1** of the study, the questionnaire results on the assessment of children's pro-social behavior in pre-test, test comparison of independent samples indicated no differences between the four samples included in the survey - experimental classes and control classes - which eliminate possible sampling errors, thus obtaining two by two homogeneous groups in terms of pro-social behavior in the pretest level. Thus, compared with the control group, we've got to the fourth class, the experimental group, a very high effect size, which means that 75% of the variance results related to pro-social behavior at school is due to experimental manipulation. We obtained very similar results for the third grade, which implemented the program led to significantly higher for the experimental group compared with the control, 58% of the variance results could be explained by the involvement of students in program activities.

In the retest, the rate of pro-social behavior differences remain in the school environment, since the evaluation made by the teacher, higher averages are recorded for participants in the experimental groups and the results are statistically significant inter-group comparisons, resulting in large sizes the effect of third and fourth class.

In the evaluation of the parents for pro-social behavior of children at home, posttest and retest we obtained statistically significant differences between the groups that were studied, but the size effect in lower retest.

In terms of intra-group comparison of results to highlight the effect of pro-social behavior rated program on the teachers in pretest, posttest and retest results we obtained statistically significant at the two experimental groups. For control groups, pro-social the opposite behavior, so there is no difference from one stage to another. The analysis contrasts for the students enrolled in the experimental groups, there were significant differences between pretest and posttest, the average upward pro-social behavior and high effect sizes.

The intra-group comparisons in the pro-social behavior of children at home, valued by parents, we obtained statistically significant differences for any of the four groups studied, which means that there has been a change in the frequency and the rate of manifestation of pro-social behavior of children at home, from one stage to another and that the results of testing high school students registered on this aspect could not be generalized and home in relation to siblings.

A more detailed analysis of the extent to which certain categories of pro-social behaviors have changed or maintained their rate of expression over the program, could be seen from the analysis results at the weekly evaluation form. According the results obtained by processing Friedman test, there is a confirmation of the existence of statistically significant differences regarding the frequency changed and pro-social behaviors event rate from week to week intervention both in third class, as and fourth grade. We have found that for the fourth class, in the eight week we have obtained the best results in the intervention, and for the third class, the seventhweek, and in relation to the activities of the program, so these are corresponding to the objectives related to emotional development and empathy. For both classes, the poorer results were obtained at the beginning of the program, in the first and the second week, when the activities were focused on developing a positive attitude towards self, however, once with the introduction of targets aimed to form a positive attitude towards others, in the third week of intervention, we obtained much better results.

Regarding the changes that were brought with the program for each of the nine pro-social behavior categories, there was found that they had a different development, that was confirmed when processing with the Friedman test. In fourth grade, according to average rank, behaviors which increased the rate and frequency of the event were: *help the one who need it, cheer a*

colleague who is sad, share goods he belongs with the others, and for the third class: When wrong he apologizes, he encourages teammates, doing everything he can to help the team.

The second specific hypothesis of the study aims the relations between students towards greater acceptance of each member in the group to which it belongs. The results were obtained by processing the socio-metric test, in one hand, and on the perception scale interpersonal on the other hand.

Regarding the third specific hypothesis of the study, the results of the Empathy Scale allows us to conclude that the intervention program designed by us had the effect of altering the level of empathy to students in the experimental group in the posttest, and retest as compared to the control group. In this way, the size effect obtained by intergroup comparisons match the posttest and retest correspond by convention to a medium effect, for both the third class and the fourth grade.

Regarding the **third specific hypothesis** of the study, the results of the Empathy Scale allows us to conclude that the intervention program designed by us had the effect of altering the level of empathy to students in the experimental group in the posttest, and retest as compared to the control group. In this way, the size effect obtained by intergroup comparisons match the posttest and retest correspond by convention to a medium effect, for both the third class and the fourth grade.

The results for the subscales didn't suggest statistically significant differences in inter-group comparisons, in posttest and retest, only for the imaginary subscale the effect size obtained corresponds by convention to a high level in both experimental groups. Such a result can be explained by the fact that the programs was based on nine educational stories specially designed, which encouraged students from the experimental group to translate them into imaginary, to take models of behavior and thinking. K Dunlop (apud Volosky, L., 1995), distinguish three stages of development in children: rhythmic stage, imaginative stage, heroic stage. Students enrolled in the study are at the age that correspond to the heroic stage (8-12 years). At this stage, the student is looking to his own adventures and is interested in details that describe the characters' psysical features and the soul which, in fact, in often being identified.

For the other subscales, there were no statistically significant differences in retest, which leads us to believe that the program made by us was incomplete for the subscales of the empathy level development tool we used in this study. However, the overall objective of our study is to develop the pro-social behavior to the students, and the means of achieving such an objective is to develop empathy. The results obtained from intra-group comparisons have revealed an improvement of the environment and statistically significant results for empathic concern subscale and imaginary subscale.

Adding obtained data by processing the results of this scale with those already mentioned in the presentation of pro-social behavior results from the scale on the students (of a hypothesis of the study), we believe that the program demonstrates its effectiveness as on the objectives for which it was built.

Limits to the study:

Could not be part of the study results of students in the posttest and retest scale designed and proposed by us to assess the level of rationality and irrationality, as we obtained alpha coefficients below .70 Cronbach to assess test-retest fidelity items of the scale.

- the empathy scale is not validated on the Romanian population and the adaptation made by us in this study does not provide assurance that the classification items in the subscales, according to the original version, has accepted validity coefficients for the Romanian population.

Depending on the impact of conditional program included in the quantitative results of the study and discussions with teachers from experimental plots, we could establish some strengths but also its weaknesses, which we present below.

Strengths of the program:

It is suitable for teachers and schoolmasters, who want to improve the climate class, the relationship between students and pro-social behaviors that want to promote the teaching class, so may therefore be a good practice model for a wide audience.

Give teachers a practical model to formulate class rules to promote pro-social behavior among students;

Teacher Provides good practices related to the use of games together, the stories and the possibility of recovery educational texts in Romanian language manual based on pro-social behaviors to form questions from students;

Familiarize teachers with specific concepts Rational Emotive Behavioral education, rational and irrational cognitions related and provide models for the encouragement and development of type rational cognitions.

Weaknesses of the program:

Speaking to teachers practicing in primary school, the program contains no irrational cognitions stage fixture of the students, whereas this study believe that training is needed in this area.

Implementation made with the whole collective of students, the program does not take account of particular cases of some students, such as excessive shyness pupils, pupils with special educational needs that some activities are included in program efficiency since no specific methods are needed intervention.

Regarding the content of the stories that we created, we encountered difficulties related to the type of stories that the teacher can apply in class, so we thought that rational therapeutic stories are tools that could be used only by an specialist or a psychologist, so, the only possibility remained were the educational story that applied to class the teacher would not endanger the scientific and ethical rules of regular use of educational activities in the classroom.

Taking into account all theoretical and practical aspects in the paper circulated, we believe that are important some details about the **implications for future research:**

- studying the factors that contribute to the pro-social behavior in primary school and design a program of intervention based on the data obtained, so that factors that contribute to pro-social behavior continued to be strengthened;
- studying aggression level in three stages: pre-test and post-test and re-test to measure captures the frequency and manifestations of aggressive rate changes as a result of implementing a program aimed at increasing pro-social behavior manifestation rate among students;
- pro-social behavior study at different ages, including preschool and preadolescent;
- longitudinal study on the dependent variables taken into account new;
- validation studies on the Empathy Scale.

The last chapter, the seventh, contains the **final conclusions.**

To keep the same frame in the final, like the one that we have began, the storz frame, we conclude that our efforts were concentrated towards the study to identify strategies by which we

shape and develop pro-social behavior of students in school, trying to offer both: to the students and teachers a useful tool in overcoming such situations: *Once upon a time, there was a hedgehog and a bear that were mortal enemies, nor speak, nor forgive, neither loved (Francesca, 9 years).*

Bibliografie

- 1.Bar-Tal, D. (1976). *Prosocial Behavior: Theory and Research*. Hemisphere Publishing, Washington, D.C.
- 2.Bar-Tal, D. (1982). Sequential Development of Helping Behavior: A Cognitive-Learning Approach. *Developmental Review*, 2; 101–124.
- 3.Benga, O., Opre, A., Cristea, I.A. (2006). The Comparative Efficiency of a Rational Emotive Educational Intervention for Anxiety in 3rd Grade Children: An Analysis of Relevant Developmental Constraints. *Cogniție, Creier, Comportament*, 10, 4; 637–657.
- 4.Bernard, M. E. (2005). *The You Can Do It! Education images resource CD program*. Oakleigh, VIC (AUS): Australian Scholarships Group.
- 5.Bernard, M.E., Ellis, A. și Terjesen, M. (2006). Rational Emotive Behavior Approaches to Childhood Disorders: History, Theory, Practice and Research, în A. Ellis și M.E. Bernard (eds.), *Rational Emotive Behavioral Approaches to Childhood Disorders. Theory, Practice and Research*. Springer Science + Business Media, New-York.
- 6.Bernard, M.E., Joyce, M.R. (1990). Using RET Effectively with Children and Adolescents, în Bernard, M. E. (Ed.), *Using Rational-emotive Therapy Effectively: A Practitioner's Guide*, Plenum Press, New York.
- 7.Bijou, W.S. (1982). *Psicología del Desarrollo Infantil: La Etapa Básica de la Niñez Temprana*. Vol. 3, Editorial Trillas, México.
- 8.Bogdan-Tucicov, A. (1981). *Dicționar de psihologie socială*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București.
- 9.Bonchiș, E. (2004). *Psihologia copilului*. Editura Universității din Oradea, Oradea.
10. Bora, C.H. (2010). *Educație rațional-emoțiv comportamentală pentru cadre didactice*. Rezumatul tezei de doctorat, accesat la data: 12.08.2011, sursa: http://doctorat.ubbcluj.ro/sustinerea_publica/rezumate/2010/psihologie/bora_carmen_hortensia_ro.pdf.

11. Botiș, A., Mihalca, L. (2007). *Despre dezvoltarea abilităților emoționale și sociale ale copiilor, fete și băieți, cu vârsta până în 7 ani*. Ghid pentru cadrele didactice din învățământul preșcolar, Editura Alpha MDN, Buzău.
12. Brody, M. (1974). The effects of the rational-emotive affective education approach on anxiety, frustration tolerance, and self-esteem with fifth grade students. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences & Engineering*, 35 (6-A), 3506.
13. Calvo, A., González, R. Martorell, C. (2001). Variables relacionadas con la Conducta prosocial en la infancia y la adolescencia: personalidad, autoconcepto y género. *Infancia y Aprendizaje*, 93, 95–111.
14. Carlo, G., Randall, B. A. (2001). The Development of a Measure of Prosocial Behaviors for Late Adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 31, 31–44.
15. Chadha, N., Misraand, G. (2006). Prosocial Reasoning and Behavior among Indian Children: A Naturalistic Study. *Psychology Developing Societies* 18, 167–199.
16. Chacón, F. (1986). Una aproximación al concepto prosocial del altruismo. *Boletín de Psicología*, 11, 41–62.
17. Chelcea, S. (1996). Comportamentul Prosocial, în Necolau, A. (coord.), *Psihologia socială. Aspecte contemporane*, Editura Polirom, București.
18. Chelcea, S., (2004). *Un secol de cercetări psihosociologice*, Editura Polirom, Iași.
19. Crick, N.R. (1996). The Role of Overt Aggression, Relational Aggression, and Prosocial Behavior in the Prediction of Children's Future Social Adjustment. *Child Development*. 67, 5; 2317–2327, adresa web: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1131625>, material accesat la data de 15.10.2008
20. Coie, J.D., Dodge, K.A., Coppotelli, H. (1982). Dimensions and types of social status: A cross-age perspective. *Developmental Psychology*, 18, 557-570.
21. Covey, R.S. (1989). *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*. New York: Simon & Schuster Inc.
22. David, D. (2006). *Tratat de psihoterapii cognitive și comportamentale*, Editura Polirom, Iași.
23. Opre, A., David, D. (2006). Dezvoltarea inteligenței emoționale prin programe de educație rațional-emoțională și comportamentală (EREC). În I. Berar (Ed.), *Alexandru*

Roșca 1906-1996; Omul, savantul, Creatorul de Școală. Editura Academiei Române: București.

24. Darley, S., Latané, B. (1968). Bystander Intervention in Emergencies: Diffusion of Responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8, 377–388.
25. Dearing, E., McCartney, K., Taylor, B. A. (2001). Change in Family Income-to-needs Matters More for Children with Less. *Child Development*, 72, 1779–1793.
26. Dishion, T. J. (1990). The Family Ecology of Boy's Peer Relations in Middle Childhood. *Child Development*, 61, 874–892.
27. Duncan, S., Duncan, E., Strycker, L. y Chanmeton, N. (2002). Relations between Youth Antisocial and Prosocial Activities. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 25(5), 425–438.
28. Eagly, A. H., Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and Helping Behavior: A Meta-analytic Review of the Social Psychological Literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 100, 283–308.
29. Ellis, A. (1971). An experiment in emotional education. *Educational Technology*, 11, 61-64
30. Ellis, A. (1973). Emotional education in the classroom: The Living School. *Journal of Child Psychology*, 1, 19-22.
31. Ellis, A., Dryden, W. (2007). *The Practice of Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy*, 2nd edition, Springer Publishing Company, LLC.
32. Ellis A., Bernard, M.E. (2007). *Terapia rațional emotivă și comportamentală în tulburările copilului și adolescentului. Teorie, practică și cercetare*, Editura RTS, Cluj-Napoca.
33. Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R.A. (1998). Prosocial Development, în Damon, W., Eisenberg, N., *Handbook of Child Psychology. Social, Emotional and Personality Development*. John Wiley. New York, vol. III, cap. 11.
34. Eisenberg, N., Wentzel, M., Harris, J.D. (2001). *The Role of Emotionality and Regulation in Empathy-Related Responding*. Unpublished manuscript, Arizona State University.
35. Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R., Spinrad, T. L. (2006). Prosocial Development, în W. Damon, R. M. Lerner, N. Eisenberg (coord), *Handbook of Child Psychology: Social, Emotional, and Personality Development* (Vol. 3, pp. 646–718), Wiley, New York.

36. Etxebarria, I., Apodaka, P., Eceiza, A., Ortiz, M.J., Fuentes, M.J., Lopez, F. (1994). [Design and Evaluation of a Programme to Promote Prosocial-Altruistic Behavior in the School](#). *Journal of Moral Education* 23 (4): 409–425
37. Fabes, R. A., Eisenberg, N. (1999). *Meta-Analysis of Age and Sex Differences in Children's and Adolescents' Prosocial Behavior*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University.
38. Franz, D., Gross, A. M. (1996). Parental Correlates of Socially Neglected, Rejected, and Average Children: A Laboratory Study. *Behavior Modification*, 20, 170–182.
39. Franz, D., Gross, A. M. (2001). Child Sociometric Status and Parent Behaviors: An Observational Study, *Behavior Modification*, 25, 3, *adresa web:* <http://bmo.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/25/1/3>, material accesat la data de 13.03.2010.
40. Garaigordobil, M. (1994). Diseño y evaluación de un programa lúdico de intervención psicoeducativa con niños de 6–7 años. Basque Country University, Bilbao, Spain.
41. Garaigordobil M (2005). *Diseño y evaluación de un programa de intervención socioemocional para promover la conducta prosocial y prevenir la violencia*. Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, Madrid.
42. Garaigordobil, M. (2003). *Programa juego 8–10 años. Juegos cooperativos y creativos para grupos de niños de 8 a 10 años*, Pirámide, Madrid.
43. Garaigordobil, M. (2004). *Programa juego 10–12 años. Juegos cooperativos y creativos para grupos de niños de 10 a 12*, Pirámide, Madrid.
44. Garaigordobil, M. (2009). A Comparative Analysis of Empathy in Childhood and Adolescence: Gender Differences and Associated Socio-emotional Variables, *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*, 9, 2; 217–235.
45. Garton A.F., Gringart, E. (2005). The Development of a Scale to Measure Empathy in 8- and 9-year Old Children. *Australian Journal of Education and Developmental Psychology*, 5, 17–25.
46. Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence: Why it Can Matter More than IQ*. Bantam Books, New York.
47. González Portal, M^a D. (1992). *Conducta Prosocial: Evaluación e Intervención*. Ed. Morata.

48. Guijo Blanco, V. (2002). *Estudio multifactorial de la conducta. Prosocial en niños de cinco y seis años*, material accesat la data de 23.10.2010, adresa web: http://dspace.ubu.es:8080/tesis/bitstream/10259/60/1/Guijo_Blanco.pdf.
49. Hall, C., Hall, E., Hornby, G. (2002). *Counselling Pupils in Schools Skills and Strategies for Teachers*, Routledge Falmer, New-York.
50. Hardy, C.L., Bukowski, W.M., Sippola, L.C. (2002). Stability and Change in Peer Relationships during the Transition to Middle-level School. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*; 22; 117.
51. Hastings, P. D., McShane, K. E., Parker, R., Ladha, F. (2007). Ready to Make Nice: Parental Socialization of Young Sons' and Daughters' Prosocial Behaviors with Peers. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 168, 177–200.
52. Hoffman, M.L. (1975). Developmental Synthesis of Affect and Cognition and Its Implications for Altruistic Motivation. *Developmental Psychology*, 11, 607–622.
53. Hoffman, M.L. (1982). Development of Prosocial Motivation: Empathy and Guilt, in Eisenberg-Berg (ed.). *The Development of Prosocial Behavior*. Academic Press, New York.
54. Holden, G., Miller, P. (1999). Enduring and Different: A Meta-analysis of the Similarity in Parents' Child Rearing. *Psychological Bulletin*, 123, 223–254.
55. Holdevici, I. (2007). *Strategiile psihoterapiei cognitiv-comportamentale*, Dual Tech, București.
56. Huffman, K., Vernoy, M., Vernoy, J. (1997). *Psychology in Action*, 4th edition, John Wiley and Sons, New York.
57. Kenny, D.A. (1994). *Interpersonal perception: A social relations analysis*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
58. Knaus, W. J. (1974). *Rational-emotive Education: A Manual for Elementary School Teachers*, New York: Institute for Rational-Emotive Psychotherapy.
59. Knaus, W.J. (2004). Educația rațional emotivă: orientări și tendințe, în *Romanian Journal of Cognitive and Behavioral Psychotherapies*, 4, 1; 9–22.
60. Knaus, W. J., Bokor, S. (1975). The effect of rational-emotive education lessons on anxiety and self-concept in sixth grade students. *Rational Living*, 10, 7-10.

61. Lamarine, R. J. (1990). Teaching Children to Think Rationally, în *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 17, 2; 75–86.
62. Lau, W. (2008). Using Singing Games in Music Lessons to Enhance Young Children's Social Skills. *Asia-Pacific Journal for Arts Education*, 6(2), 1–30.
63. López, F., Apodaca, P., Ezeiza, A., Etxebarria, I., Fuentes, M.J., Ortiz, M.J (1994). Propuesta de desarrollo de la conducta prosocial-altruista en la escuela. În F. López (coord.). *Para Comprender la Conducta Altruista*. Verbo Divino, Navarra.
64. López, F., Apodaca P., Etxebarria, I., Fuentes, M.J., Ortiz, M.J. (1998). Conducta prosocial en preescolares. *Infancia y aprendizaje*, 82, 45–61.
65. López, M.J., Garrido, V., Ross, R. (2001). Programa jóvenes competentes: un programa de prevención del fracaso escolar y la inadaptación social en el aula. În M.J. López, V. Garrido, R. Ross (coord.). *El Programa del Pensamiento Prosocial: Avances Recientes*. Tirant Lo Blanch, Valencia.
66. Ma, H.K., Cheung, P.C., Shek, D. (2007). The Relation of Prosocial Orientation to Peer Interactions, Family Social Environment and Personality of Chinese Adolescents. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*; 31; 12.
67. Macavei, B. (2002). Scala de atitudini și cogniții II (ABS II) – date preliminare pentru populația de limbă română, în *Romanian Journal of Cognitive and Behavioral Psychotherapies*, 2, 2; 105–122.
68. Madsen, M.C. Shapira, A. (1977). Cooperative and Competitive Behavior of Urban Afro-American, Anglo-American and Mexican Village Children. *Developmental Psychology*, 3, 16–20.
69. Maganto, C. (1994). Influencia de la familia y la escuela en la socialización y la conducta prosocial. În M. Garaigordobil și C. Maganto (eds.). *Socialización y Conducta Prosocial en la Infancia y la Adolescencia*. Servicio Editorial, Universidad del País Vasco, San Sebastián.
70. Marcus, S., (coord.) (1987). *Empatia și relația profesor–elev*, Editura Academiei, București.
71. McMahon, J., Vernon, A. Trip, S. (2007). Effectiveness of Rational-emotive Education: a Quantitative Meta-analytical Study, în *Journal of Cognitive and Behavioral Psychotherapies*, 7, 1; 81–93.

72. Meichenbaum D.H. (1973). Cognitive factors in behavior modification: modifying what clients say to themselves. In: Franks CM, Wilson GT, editors. *Annual review of behavior therapy, theory, and practice*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
73. Miller, P., Bernzweig, J., Eisenberg, N. y Fabes, R. (1995). El desarrollo y la socialización de la conducta prosocial, în R. Hinde y J. Groebel (coord.), *Cooperación y Conducta Prosocial*. Visor, Madrid.
74. Moraes, S.C. (2009). *Examining the Impact of Child Characteristics and Microsystem Variables on Developmental Trajectories of Prosocial Behavior in Canadian Children: a Longitudinal Study Using the NLSCY*, material accesat la data de 24.07.2011, adresa web: https://circle.ubc.ca/bitstream/handle/.../ubc_2009_fall_moraes_sabrina.pdf.
75. Mussen, P., Eisenberg, B. (1977). *Roots of Caring, Sharing, and Helping. The Development of Prosocial Behavior in Children*. Freeman, San Francisco.
76. Neenan, M., Dryden, W. (1999). *Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy: Advances in Theory and Practice*, Whurr, London.
77. Opre, A., Vaida, S. (2008). Counseling in Schools. A Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy (REBT) Based Intervention – A Pilot Study – *Cogniție, Creier, Comportament*, 12, 1; 57–69.
78. Ortiz, M.A., Apodaka, P., Etxebarria, I., Ezeiza, A., Fuentes, M.J. y López, F. (1993). Algunos predictores de la conducta prosocial-altruista en la infancia: empatía, toma de perspectiva, apego, modelos parentales, disciplina familiar e imagen del ser humano. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 8(1), 83–98.
79. Petermann, F., Petermann, U. (2006). *Program terapeutic pentru copiii agresivi*. Editura RTS, Cluj-Napoca.
80. Pietro, M. (2004). Rational Emotive Education in School, în *Romanian Journal of Cognitive and Behavioral Psychotherapies*, 4, 1; 65–77.
81. Popa, S. (2004). Eficiența unui program de educație rațional emotivă și modificarea cognițiilor iraționale și inferențiale la copii, în *Romanian Journal of Cognitive and Behavioral Psychotherapies*, 4, 1; 53–67.
82. Roche, R. (1982). *Los orígenes de la conducta altruista en niños. Aspectos educativos y televisión en familia*. *Infancia y Aprendizaje*, 19–20, 101–114.

83. Ruiz Olivares, R. (2005). *Estudio e intervención en la conducta prosocial-altruista*. Teză de doctorat accesată la data de 23.11.2010, adresa web: <http://helvia.uco.es/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10396/262/13217562.pdf?sequence=1>.
84. Ștefan, M. (2006). *Lexicon pedagogic*, Editura Aramis, București.
85. Takooshian, H., Haber, S., Lucido, D.J. (1977). Who Wouldn't Help a Lost Child? You, Maybe. *Psychology Today*. 10; 67–68.
86. Travillion, K., Snyder, J. (1993). The Role of Maternal Discipline and Involvement in Peer Rejection and Neglect. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 14, 37–57.
87. Trip, S. (2007). *Educație rațional-emoțională și comportamentală: formarea deprinderilor de gândire rațională la copiii și adolescenți*, Editura Universității din Oradea, Oradea.
88. Vernon, A. (1983). Rational-Emotive Education, în A. Ellis și M. E. Bernard (eds.), *Rational-Emotive Approaches to the Problems of Childhood*. New York: Plenum Press.
89. Vernon, A. (1989a). *Thinking, feeling, behaving: An emotional education curriculum for children*. Champaign, IL: Research Press.
90. Vernon, A. (1989b). *Thinking, feeling, behaving: An emotional education curriculum for adolescents*. Champaign, IL: Research Press.
91. Vernon, A. (1990). The School Psychologist's Role in Preventative Education: Applications of Rational-emoțional Education, în *School Psychology Review*, 19, 3; 322–330.
92. Vernonn, A. (1994). Rational-Emotive Consultation: A Model for Implementing Rational-Emotive Education, în Bernard M.E. și DiGiuseppe, R. (1994). *Rational-Emotive Consultation in Applied Settings*, Hillsdale, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates, pp. 129–164.
93. Vernon, A. (1998). *The Passport Program: a journey through emotional, social, cognitive, and self-development* [grades 1-5, 6-8, 9-12]. Champaign, IL: Research Press.
94. Vernon, A. (2002), *Ce, cum, când în terapia copilului și adolescentului. Manual de tehnici de consiliere și psihoterapie*, Editura RTS, Cluj Napoca

95. Vernon, A. (2004a). *Consilierea în școală. Dezvoltarea inteligenței emoționale prin educație rațional-emoțională și comportamentală. Clasele I – IV*, Editura ASCR, Cluj-Napoca.
96. Vernon, A. (2004b). *Counseling Children and Adolescents* (3rd ed.). Denver, CO: Love Publishing Co.
97. Vernon, A. (2004c). Rational Emotive Education. în *Romanian Journal of Cognitive and Behavioral Psychotherapies*, vol. 4, no. 1, 23–37.
98. Vernon, A., Bernard, M. (1996). Application of REBT in Schools: Prevention, Promotion, Intervention, în Ellis, Albert și Bernard (2006). *Rational Emotive Behavioral Approaches to Childhood Disorders: Theory, Practice and Research*. New York: Springer Science –Business Media.
99. Wallen, S.R., DiGiuseppe, R., Dryden, W. (1992). *A Practitioner's Guide to Rational Emotive Therapy* (2nd ed.), New York: Oxford University Press.
100. www.edu.ro