



(RESEARCH ARTICLE)



Development and standardization of a prosocial behaviour scale among adolescent students in West Bengal

Amit Das *

(Education), Faculty of Education, University of Kalyani, India.

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2026, 29(03), 2154-2164

Publication history: Received on 21 February 2026; revised on 28 March 2026; accepted on 31 March 2026

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2026.29.3.0789>

Abstract

The present study aimed to develop and standardize a Prosocial Behaviour scale among adolescent students in West Bengal. Keeping in view the need for a context specific and reliable measurement tool, the researcher constructed a scale based on five dimensions. The study followed a systematic procedure of tool development which included identification of dimensions, item construction, expert validation, pilot testing, item analysis and standardization. Initially, 50 items were developed and administered to 100 students. After item analysis using the p value method, 37 items were retained. The reliability of the scale was established using Cronbach's Alpha, indicating good internal consistency. Validity was ensured through face, content and intrinsic methods. Norms were developed using mean, standard deviation and Z scores to classify students into low, average and high levels of prosocial behaviour. The findings of the study indicate that the developed Prosocial Behaviour Scale is a reliable and valid instrument for assessing prosocial tendencies among adolescents. The scale can be effectively used by researchers, educators and psychologists for academic and research purposes. It is expected that the tool will contribute to the promotion of positive social behaviour and the overall development of students.

Keywords: Adolescents; Prosocial Behaviour; Reliability; Scale Development; Standardization; Validity

1. Introduction

Prosocial behaviour has emerged as a significant area of interest in the field of educational psychology, particularly in understanding the social and emotional development of adolescents. It refers to voluntary actions intended to benefit others, such as helping, sharing, cooperating, and showing empathy. Prosocial behavior refers to voluntary work that benefit others persons. It includes various actions or behaviour such as donating to a charity, helping, sharing, donating, community center, volunteering, cooperating and giving up your seat on public transportation for someone who needs it more. It involves unselfishly acting in ways that promote the well-being and welfare of others, without any expectation. These types of social work provide own well-being and happiness to every individual. Prosocial behavior is essential for building and maintaining positive relationships to each other in society. Mainly various helping acts indicated the prosocial behaviour, there are some specific terms used to describe this behaviour. Prosocial behaviours can be grouped into three distinct categories such as Sharing (dividing up or bestowing), Helping (acts of kindness, rescuing, and removing distress) and Cooperation (working together to reach a goal) (Marion, 2003). Prosocial Behaviour can take many forms: direct help, intervention emergencies, volunteer work, co-operating with others, working to save the environment (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002), political activities aimed at bringing about positive social change, assisting people to develop skills or standing up for others who are being bullied (Bergin, Talley & Hamer, 2003). Prosocial is 'any act performed with the goal of benefiting another person' (Aronson, Wilson, & Akert, 2004). Prosocial Behaviour refers to actions carried out to assist other people without being motivated by external incentives (reward or fear of negative consequences for not helping) (Alcock & Sadava, 2014).

* Corresponding author: Amit Das; ORCID: 0009-0007-4593-0817

Adolescence is a crucial developmental stage characterized by rapid physical, emotional, and social changes. During this period, individuals begin to form their identity, values, and social attitudes. The development of prosocial behaviour among higher secondary students is especially important, as it contributes to the formation of responsible citizenship, moral reasoning, and social adjustment. Students who exhibit higher levels of prosocial tendencies are more likely to engage in cooperative learning, demonstrate empathy towards peers, and contribute positively to society.

2. Review of related studies

Jackson (2010) studied "Is prosocial behaviour a good thing? Developmental changes in children's evaluations of helping, sharing, cooperating, and comforting." The purpose of this study was to examine children's thinking about four different prosocial behaviours, specifically, helping, sharing, cooperating, and comforting. The results revealed age and prosocial behavioural differences as well as an interaction between age and prosocial behaviour type (e.g. curvilinear relationships are reported).

Habibi (2021) examined "Effect of Parenting Style on Prosocial Behavior of Adolescents." The study aimed to assess the relationship between different parenting styles and prosocial behavior among adolescents in India, focusing on how authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting approaches influence adolescents' social development. Findings revealed that authoritative or positive parenting styles were strongly associated with higher levels of prosocial behavior.

Sharma and Tomer (2018) studied "Psychosocial antecedents of prosocial behaviour among late adolescents." This examined how prosocial tendencies relate to their subjective well-being. The findings revealed that multiple psychosocial factors contributed meaningfully to prosocial tendencies, with variables such as empathy, perceived social support, and positive family relationships emerging as significant predictors.

George and Showmiya (2022) studied "Empathy in relation to prosocial behaviour among college students." The study aimed to investigate how empathy contributes to prosocial behaviour among college students in the Indian context. The results highlight empathy as an important psychosocial factor shaping prosocial actions in Indian college students.

Vidyashri et al. (2022) studied "Prevalence of Behavioural Disorders and Its Correlates Among Adolescents in Uttara Kannada, Karnataka -A Cross Sectional Study." The study aimed to assess the prevalence of behavioural, emotional, and social difficulties among Indian school adolescents. The study suggested that reduced prosocial behaviour is closely tied to wider psychosocial risks, highlighting the importance of early school- and family-based socio-emotional interventions.

Afsina & Basistha (2025) studied "Resilience and Prosocial Behaviour Among Young Adults." The aim of the study was to understand the nature of the relationship between resilience and prosocial behaviour and to explore how social support functions as both a mediator and moderator in this association. Their findings indicated that resilient young adults are more likely to show prosocial behaviours, as resilience enables them to cope with challenges, regulate emotions, and maintain positive social interactions.

Padilla-Walker et al. (2018) studied "Longitudinal Change in Adolescents' Prosocial Behavior Toward Strangers, Friends, and Family." The study aimed to examine developmental patterns of prosocial behaviour toward different social targets across adolescence. The findings also indicated that predictors of both initial levels and developmental change differed across targets, demonstrating that adolescents' prosocial development depends strongly on social context and the nature of their relationships with different recipients.

Van der Graaff et al. (2018) studied "Prosocial Behavior in Adolescence: Gender Differences in Development and Links with Empathy." The study also aimed to identify gender differences in these developmental patterns. The study found that girls consistently showed higher prosocial behaviour than boys, and that empathic concern (emotional empathy) was the strongest predictor of increases in prosocial behaviour during adolescence.

Kaya (2020) studied "Investigation of the Relationship Between Children's Prosocial Behaviour and Self-Regulation Skills." The study to examine how young children's helping tendencies relate to their ability to regulate emotions and behaviours. The study found that girls and older children showed higher prosocial behaviour and self-regulation than boys and younger children. Overall, the study suggests that early prosocial tendencies support better self-regulation in children.

Memmott-Elison et al. (2020) studied "Associations between Prosocial Behavior, Externalizing Behaviors, and Internalizing Symptoms during Adolescence: A Meta analysis." The findings of the meta-analysis showed a clear and consistent pattern. Adolescents who displayed higher levels of prosocial behaviour also showed lower externalizing problems and lower internalizing symptoms.

Petruta & Stanculescu (2025) studied "The Benefits of a School Intervention for Prosocial Behaviour and Psychological Well Being in Early Adolescents." The purpose of the study was to evaluate how a structured school-based program can enhance prosocial behaviour and psychological well-being. The findings showed that school interventions that incorporate cooperative activities, emotional understanding, and supportive peer interactions bring clear improvements in helping behaviour, empathy, and overall socio emotional functioning.

2.1. Statement of the problem

The present study area has been considered to be unique and different from earlier reviewed research. After studying and analysing the above-mentioned studies, the researcher found a research gap and identify the title as "Development and Standardization of a Prosocial Behaviour Scale Among Adolescent Students in West Bengal".

2.2. Objectives of the study

The Researcher has framed the following objectives:

- To develop a Prosocial Behaviour Scale (PBS) for adolescent students in West Bengal.
- To standardize the Prosocial Behaviour Scale (PBS).

3. Methodology

Research Method: The present study adopted a descriptive survey method for the development and standardization of a Prosocial Behaviour Scale (PBS) among adolescent students in West Bengal.

Population and Sample: The population of the study comprised higher secondary school students of West Bengal. A sample of 100 adolescent students was selected from different schools of Uttar Dinajpur district using a convenient sampling method. The sample included both male and female students from rural and urban areas.

Development and Standardization Procedure: The researcher followed a systematic sequence of steps for the development of the scales, which included: analysis of the problem and identification of the purpose of the tool; selection of dimensions; construction of items; expert review and subsequent modification of items; conducting a pilot study; and finally, item analysis and standardization.

3.1. Objective 1: development of prosocial behaviour scale (PBS)

This objective was achieved by a systematic and scientific procedure involving the development of the research tool. In this study, the researcher used self-constructed research tools. How these tools were designed and developed is discussed below-

3.1.1. Prosocial Behaviour Scale (PBS)

At the most generic level, Prosocial Behaviour is any action that benefits another (Dovidio et al., 2006). Prosocial Behaviour scale was constructed by the investigator himself for higher secondary students. He verified the scale repeatedly based on some related materials. He enriched his knowledge about this from various research theses, articles, books, and internet resources. There was a total of 50 test items in the scale. The test items were related to the day-to-day various social activities of the adolescents.

3.1.2. Dimension of Prosocial Behaviour Scale (PBS)

Dimension is one of the main determinants of formulating a scale. In developing a scale, each dimension is one of the important pillars, which strengthens the scale. The dimensions are-

Responsibility: In this study, responsibility indicated social responsibility. This assistance expressed the belief that each person is responsible for doing his or her best to help those in need in society. Responsibility also prescribes that individuals should help other people who are dependent on their help.

Empathy: It is one kind of feeling tendency to experience an emotional response that is congruent with the emotional state of another person. It comes from adopting the perspective of the other and compassionately understanding his or her emotions.

Sacrifice: The sacrifice is an act of personal volunteerism for the sake of others' needs to help and well-being. It is the giving up of one's own interests or wishes in order to help others. Sacrificial Prosocial Behaviour refers to actions that benefit others at a totally personal cost which is volunteering for a hazardous or difficult task. This type of help acts for the benefit of others without any expectation of glorification and reward.

Dire Responses: Dire is defined as the act of helping someone occurring in crisis or emergency circumstances. Such critical conditions require us to take immediate action. This behavioural tendency is positively correlated with perspective-taking, empathic accuracy and sympathy.

Positive Feelings: Positive Thinking is a type of stimulant that inspires and reinforces a willingness to help others. Positive feelings draw an individual's attention to the needs of others, which makes prosocial work more likely.

Table 1 Dimension-wise Items of the Prosocial Behaviour Scale (PBS)

Dimensions (PBS)		Number of Items	Total Number
1.	Responsibility	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10	10
2.	Empathy	11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20	10
3.	Sacrifice	21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30	10
4.	Dire Responses	31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40	10
5.	Positive Feelings	41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50	10

Table 2 Positive and Negative Items of the PBS

Nature of Items	Number of Items	Total
Positive Items	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 45, 47, 50	33
Negative Items	5, 9, 10, 15, 17, 18, 24, 27, 29, 30, 32, 38, 42, 44, 46, 48, 49	17

3.1.3. Tool designing and scoring

The researcher initially formulated 50 items and each item indicated attitudes towards Prosocial Behaviour with five alternative responses of the adolescent students. These are-

- Strongly Agree (SA)
- Agree (A)
- Undecided (U)
- Disagree (D)
- Strongly Disagree (SD)

Respondents are instructed to read each item carefully and put a tick (✓) mark against either of the five alternatives that they think are most appropriate to them. It is also advised that please do not consult your classmate in answering items. Answer confidently, your answers will be kept secret.

Table 3 Scoring of the items of PBS

Nature of Items	SA	A	U	D	SD
Positives Items	5	4	3	2	1
Negative Items	1	2	3	4	5

3.1.4. Preparation of the tool

Pilot Study: The researcher at a first draft of the test before going the systematic item analysis was administered to the government- aided Secondary school students to understand their reaction with respect to i) Instruction of the test ii) Meaningfulness of the test items and iii) Time examining for completion of the test For the pilot study the Boys and Girls adolescent students were selected from the 4 schools in a district, their distributions are -

Table 4 Sample Distribution for the Pilot Study by Gender and Location

Gender	Rural	Urban	Total
Male	24	23	47
Female	28	25	53
Total	52	48	100

Item Generation: For the preliminary, the researcher initially generated 50 items for Prosocial Behaviour scale through relevant literature review, scholarly discussion, consultation with the supervisor and two experts.

Item Analysis: Item analysis is an essential step in test construction. The preliminary draft was administered to 100 Higher Secondary students (both boys and girls). After scoring, response sheets were arranged in descending order, and 'p' values were computed using the top 27% and bottom 27% groups to examine item discrimination. Based on the results, 37 out of 50 items were retained for the final form. The results are presented in the following table.

Table 5 Item Analysis of the PBS

Item No.		P Value	Item No.		P Value
Before Analysis	After Analysis		Before Analysis	After Analysis	
1	1	0.001**	26	21	0.000**
2	2	0.000**	27	22	0.000**
3	3	0.001**	28	23	0.000**
4	4	0.000**	29	24	0.000**
5	5	0.000**	30	-	0.012*#
6	6	0.000**	31	25	0.000**
7	7	0.001**	32	26	0.000**
8	8	0.000**	33	27	0.037*
9	-	0.131 ^{NS}	34	28	0.000**
10	9	0.050*	35	-	0.065 ^{NS}
11	-	0.151 ^{NS}	36	-	0.182 ^{NS}
12	10	0.000**	37	29	0.000**
13	11	0.000**	38	30	0.000**
14	12	0.001**	39	31	0.000**
15	-	0.731 ^{NS}	40	32	0.000**
16	13	0.046*	41	33	0.036*
17	14	0.000**	42	-	0.000**#
18	15	0.020*	43	34	0.004**
19	16	0.001**	44	-	0.410 ^{NS}

20	17	0.001**	45	35	0.013*
21	-	0.000**#	46	36	0.000**
22	18	0.000**	47	-	0.689 ^{NS}
23	19	0.006**	48	-	0.217 ^{NS}
24	20	0.000**	49	37	0.000**
25	-	0.002**#	50	-	0.441 ^{NS}

Note: *Significant 0.05 level; **Significant 0.01 level; ^{NS} Not significant; #rejected by researcher observation

Table 6 Dimension-wise Statements of the Prosocial Behaviour Scale (PBS)

Sl. No.	Statements	P Values	Retained /Rejected
1.	Standing by others in times of need is considered a social duty.	0.001**	Retained
2.	I participate in cleanliness (sanitation) drives organized in educational institutions.	0.000**	Retained
3.	I encourage children in the locality to become self-reliant.	0.001**	Retained
4.	I motivate my friends to participate in social activities.	0.000**	Retained
5.	I pretend to stand by people in times of sorrow and distress.	0.000**	Retained
6.	I stand by others in times of danger even without receiving appreciation.	0.000**	Retained
7.	I want to work for the education of socially disadvantaged students.	0.001**	Retained
8.	I help my friends to continue their studies.	0.000**	Retained
9.	I do not mind even if my happiness becomes a cause of sorrow for others.	0.131 ^{NS}	Rejected
10.	I do not protest even when injustice occurs to someone.	0.050*	Retained
11.	I do not want to hurt others' emotions and feelings.	0.151 ^{NS}	Rejected
12.	I console and encourage people to move forward when they fail.	0.000**	Retained
13.	I give my old books to those who need them.	0.000**	Retained
14.	I feel guilty when I think about poor and hungry people.	0.001**	Retained
15.	I am not willing to spend my valuable time on others' work.	0.731 ^{NS}	Rejected
16.	Helping others does not mean inviting trouble for oneself.	0.046*	Retained
17.	I believe that following the path of truth does not lead to personal progress.	0.000**	Retained
18.	I like to play aggressive mobile games (e.g., PUBG, Free Fire).	0.020*	Retained
19.	I feel guilty if someone is hurt due to my actions.	0.001**	Retained
20.	I voluntarily take care of stray animals (dogs, cats, etc.).	0.001**	Retained
21.	I give my own tiffin if a friend does not bring any.	0.000**#	Rejected
22.	I try to save someone in danger even at the cost of my life.	0.000**	Retained
23.	I skip class to take care of a classmate who suddenly falls ill.	0.006**	Retained
24.	I do not give my belongings even when someone needs them.	0.000**	Retained
25.	I help friends by giving my books if they forget to bring theirs.	0.002**#	Rejected
26.	I am ready to extend a helping hand in any situation.	0.000**	Retained

27.	I help only those from whom I have received or expect help in the future.	0.000**	Retained
28.	I am ready to help even an unknown person in need.	0.000**	Retained
29.	I try to gain personal benefit while helping others.	0.000**	Retained
30.	I believe that there is no such thing as selfless help.	0.012*#	Rejected
31.	I try to stand by neighbors in times of medical or blood-related needs.	0.000**	Retained
32.	I do not help people affected by natural disasters.	0.000**	Retained
33.	I break social superstitions and customs when necessary.	0.037*	Retained
34.	I help a girl if she is in danger at night.	0.000**	Retained
35.	I rush to provide care when I see an accident involving animals on the road.	0.065 ^{NS}	Rejected
36.	I jump in to help others in danger without hesitation.	0.182 ^{NS}	Rejected
37.	I give up my seat for elderly and weak persons while traveling by bus or train.	0.000**	Retained
38.	I do not have time to think about how people are living or their conditions.	0.000**	Retained
39.	I help a blind person to cross the road.	0.000**	Retained
40.	I stand by people in danger regardless of the situation.	0.000**	Retained
41.	I believe that one should fight for the right to education.	0.036*	Retained
42.	I do not get involved in social activities.	0.000**#	Rejected
43.	I try to respect other religions.	0.004**	Retained
44.	I prefer to help only known persons.	0.410 ^{NS}	Rejected
45.	I feel happy when someone achieves success because of my contribution.	0.013*	Retained
46.	I help others only when there is personal benefit.	0.000**	Retained
47.	I believe that working for self-interest is not important.	0.689 ^{NS}	Rejected
48.	I do not help someone who wishes harm to me.	0.217 ^{NS}	Rejected
49.	I do not like to help people of other castes or religions.	0.000**	Retained
50.	I consider someone a friend even if that person considers me an enemy.	0.441 ^{NS}	Rejected

Table 7 Dimension-wise Items of the PBS (After Analysis)

Dimensions (PBS)		Retained Items	Renumbered Items	Total
1.	Responsibility	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9	09
2.	Empathy	12,13,14,16,17,18,19,20	10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17	08
3.	Sacrifice	22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29	18,19,20,21,22,23,24	07
4.	Dire Responses	31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40	25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32	08
5.	Positive Feelings	41, 43, 45, 46, 49	33,34,35,36,37	05

Table 8 Positive and Negative Items of the PBS (After Analysis)

Nature of Items	Items	Total
Positive Items	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35	28
Negative Items	5, 9, 14, 15, 20, 22, 30, 36, 37	09

Out of the total 50 items, only 37 items were retained (✓) out of which 28 are positive and 9 are negative items. Also, 13 items were rejected (✗) as per the ‘p’ value levels of significance formula and due to researcher observation.

Table 9 Summary of Item Analysis of the PBS

Sig./ Observation	Not Sig./ Observation	Items Ret./ Rejected	Item No./ Total
$P \leq 0.05$ statistically significant		Items Retained	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46 & 49 = 41
$P > 0.05$ statistically not significant		Items Rejected	9, 11, 15, 35, 36, 44, 47, 48 & 50 = 09
	Researcher Observation	Items Rejected	21, 25, 30 & 42 = 4
	Final Observation	Total Items Rejected	13
	Final Observation	Total Items Retained	37 (Positive = 28 & Negative = 09)

3.2. Objective 2: standardization of prosocial behaviour scale

In this phase of standardization, several essential procedures were undertaken to ensure the reliability, validity and uniform administration of the final form of the test. The details are discussed below-

3.2.1. Reliability of the prosocial behaviour scale

In the present study Cronbach’s Alpha method was applied to check the reliability and interpretation of internal consistency.

Table 10 Reliability of the PBS

Method	Total item (k)	Variance of total score (s^2x)	Sum of item variance ($\sum s^2y$)	Reliability of PBS (a)	Interpretation
Cronbach’s Alpha	37	326.44	57.36	0.84	Internal Consistency is Good

3.2.2. Validity of the prosocial behaviour scale

The researcher was estimated intrinsic validity of this inventory. This validity is indicated by the square root of its reliability. The validity for the test (Prosocial Behaviour) thus determined has been given in the Table-

Table 11 Validity from the Index of Reliability of the Test Scores

Method	Test	r_{tt}	$r_t = \sqrt{r_{tt}}$
Intrinsic Validity	Prosocial Behaviour	0.85	0.92

3.2.3. Norms of the prosocial behaviour scale

The possible range of scores on the attitude scale extends from 37 to 185, where 37 represents the minimum obtainable score and 185 represents the maximum obtainable score. The total score obtained by an individual constitutes the raw score for this scale.

Table 12 Mean and SD of the PBS

Sample	Mean	SD	N
Adolescent Students	146.22	18.07	100

Table 13 Z score Norms of the PBS

Raw Score	Z Score	Raw Score	Z Score	Raw Score	Z Score	Raw Score	Z Score	Raw Score	Z Score
94	-2.95	133	-0.74	143	-0.17	152	0.34	162	0.91
108	-2.16	133	-0.74	143	-0.17	152	0.34	163	0.97
110	-2.04	134	-0.68	144	-0.11	152	0.34	163	0.97
116	-1.70	134	-0.68	144	-0.11	153	0.40	164	1.02
117	-1.65	134	-0.68	145	-0.06	153	0.40	164	1.02
118	-1.59	135	-0.62	145	-0.06	154	0.46	164	1.02
118	-1.59	136	-0.57	145	-0.06	154	0.46	165	1.08
120	-1.48	137	-0.51	146	0.00	154	0.46	167	1.20
121	-1.42	137	-0.51	146	0.00	155	0.51	168	1.25
121	-1.42	138	-0.45	147	0.06	155	0.51	168	1.25
121	-1.42	138	-0.45	147	0.06	157	0.63	169	1.31
122	-1.36	138	-0.45	147	0.06	157	0.63	169	1.31
122	-1.36	139	-0.40	147	0.06	157	0.63	170	1.37
123	-1.31	139	-0.40	149	0.17	157	0.63	171	1.42
123	-1.31	140	-0.34	149	0.17	158	0.68	173	1.54
126	-1.14	140	-0.34	149	0.17	158	0.68	175	1.65
127	-1.08	140	-0.34	150	0.23	158	0.68	177	1.76
128	-1.02	142	-0.23	150	0.23	161	0.85	177	1.76
131	-0.85	143	-0.17	151	0.29	161	0.85	178	1.82
131	-0.85	143	-0.17	151	0.29	161	0.85	183	2.10

Table 14 Interpretation of the PBS

Range of Row Score	Range of Z Score	Prosocial Behaviour
$X \leq 128.15$	$Z \leq -1.00$	Low Prosocial Behaviour
128.16 - 164.29	$-1.00 < Z < +1.00$	Average Prosocial Behaviour
$X \geq 164.30$	$Z \geq +1.00$	High Prosocial Behaviour

4. Conclusion

The present study successfully developed and standardized a Prosocial Behaviour Scale for higher secondary school students in West Bengal, addressing the need for a culturally relevant and scientifically sound measurement tool. The scale was constructed through a systematic procedure involving identification of dimensions, item construction, expert validation, pilot study, and item analysis. From the initial 50 items, 37 were retained based on statistical significance and clarity. The reliability of the scale, established through Cronbach's Alpha, indicated a high level of internal consistency, ensuring the dependability of the instrument. Various forms of validity, including face, content, and intrinsic validity, confirmed that the tool effectively measures prosocial behaviour. Additionally, the development of norms using mean, standard deviation, and Z scores enhanced its practical applicability by enabling the classification of students into different levels of prosocial behaviour.

Overall, the study achieved its objective of constructing a reliable and valid standardized tool, which can be effectively used by researchers, educators, and policymakers for assessment, intervention, and promotion of prosocial behaviour among adolescents.

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

No conflict of interest to be disclosed.

References

- [1] Afsina, & Basistha, S. (2025). Resilience and Prosocial Behaviour Among Young Adults. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)*, 7(4), 1-18. <https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2025/4/51410.pdf>
- [2] Aronson, E., Wilson, T., & Akert, R. (2004). *Social psychology, media and research update (4th edn.)*. Pearson Education.
- [3] Bergin, C., Talley, S., & Hamer, L. (2003). Prosocial behaviors of young adolescents: A focus group study. *Journal of Adolescence*, 26(1), 13-32.
- [4] George, A., & Showmiya, S. H. A. (2022). Empathy in relation to prosocial behaviour among college students. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 10(4), 2296-2302. <https://ijip.in/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/18.01.221.20221004.pdf>
- [5] Habibi, Z. (2021). Effect of parenting style on prosocial behavior of adolescents. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 9(2), 1254-1264.
- [6] Jackson, M., & Tisak, M. S. (2010). Is prosocial behaviour a good thing? Developmental changes in children's evaluations of helping, sharing, cooperating, and comforting. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 19(3), 349-367. <https://doi.org/10.1348/026151001166146>
- [7] Kaya, I. (2020). Investigation of the relationship between children's prosocial behaviour and self-regulation skills. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*, 15(5), 877-886. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v15i5.5071>
- [8] Kollumuss, A., & Ageyman, J. (2002). Mind the gap: Why do people act environmentally and what are the barriers to pro-environmental behaviour? *Environmental Education Research*, 8(1), 239-260.
- [9] Memmott-Elison, M. K., Holmgren, H. G., Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Hawkins, A. J. (2020). Associations between prosocial behavior, externalizing behaviors, and internalizing symptoms during adolescence: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Adolescence*, 80(1), 98-114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2020.01.012>
- [10] Padilla-Walker, Laura M et al. (2018). Longitudinal Change in Adolescents' Prosocial Behavior Toward Strangers, Friends, and Family. *Journal of research on adolescence: the official journal of the Society for Research on Adolescence*, 28(3), 698-710. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12362>
- [11] Petruta, R. T. R., Stanculescu, E. (2025). The benefits of a school intervention for prosocial behaviour and psychological well-being in early adolescents. *Current Psychology*, 44(6), 5216-5226. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-025-07353-6>

- [12] Sharma, S., & Tomer, S. (2018). Psychosocial antecedents of prosocial behavior and its relationship with subjective well-being in adolescents. *Indian Journal of Positive Psychology*, 9(1), 14–21. <https://doi.org/10.15614/ijpp.v9i01.11736>
- [13] Van-der-Graaff, J., Branje, S., Carlo, G., Crocetti, E., Koot, H. M., & Meeus, W. (2018). Prosocial behavior in adolescence: Gender differences in development and links with empathy. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 47(5), 1086–1099. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-017-0786-1>
- [14] Vidyashri, P., Prayag, A., Girish, H. O., Havale, N. G., & Manjula, M. N. (2022). Prevalence of behavioural disorders and its correlates among adolescents in Uttara Kannada, Karnataka: A cross-sectional study. *National Journal of Community Medicine*, 13(7), 430-434. <https://doi.org/10.55489/njcm.13072022383>