

Character Strengths and Prosocial Behavior: A Study with Volunteers from in Social Actions

Ana Paula Porto Noronha, Marcela Hipólito de Souza, Giovanna Magliocca Friedenreich,
Joao Lucas Dias-Viana, Sandra Prandini, Carolina Milena Mioralli, and Andréia Maria de
Britto Campos

São Francisco University (Universidade São Francisco [USF]), Campinas, São Paulo, Brasil

Received: January 30th, 2022.

Accepted: July 20th, 2023.

Section editor: Rosane Lowenthal.

Author Note

Ana Paula Porto Noronha  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6821-0299>

Marcela Hipólito de Souza  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8519-5713>

Giovanna Magliocca Friedenreich  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6456-2326>

Joao Lucas Dias-Viana  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7626-3937>

Sandra Prandini  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0882-2821>

Carolina Milena Mioralli  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5717-2610>

Andréia Maria de Britto Campos  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5859-3265>

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ana Paula Porto Noronha,
Rua Waldemar César da Silveira, 105, Jardim Cura D'ars, Campinas, SP, Brasil. CEP: 13045510. Email:
ana.noronha8@gmail.com

Abstract

Prosociality is a characteristic of people's behaviors aimed at the benefit of others. Character strengths are positive personality traits that enable people to overcome the challenges of everyday life. This study identified relationships and predictions between character strengths and prosocial behaviors present in those involved in social actions as volunteers and non-volunteers. The participants were 784 people aged between 18 and 69 years ($M = 36.70$; $SD = 12.90$) from all Brazilian regions, the majority being female (77.30%). Of all participants, 34.94% did some volunteer work. A sociodemographic questionnaire was used, and two scales in the Portuguese version: the Pro-Sociability Scale and the Character Strengths Scale, answered the online survey. To analyze the data obtained, Pearson's correlation and linear regression using the Enter method were performed, and a t -test was used to compare the groups. The results showed significant and positive associations between the variables investigated. Interpersonal and intellectual character strengths tended to be more closely associated with prosocial behaviors. The model that was extracted by the linear regression was statistically significant, with a prediction in 64.40% of the cases. Ultimately, the group that performed social actions showed higher averages in character strengths and prosocial behaviors. The results were discussed considering the current literature.

Keywords: volunteering, positive psychology, prosociality, prosocial behavior, character strengths

FORÇAS PESSOAIS E PRÓ-SOCIABILIDADE: UM ESUTDO COM VOLUNTÁRIOS DE AÇÕES SOCIAIS

Resumo

A pró-sociabilidade tem sido compreendida como a característica presente em pessoas com comportamentos voltados para o benefício do próximo. As forças de caráter, por sua vez, são reconhecidas como traços de personalidade positivos, que apoiam na superação de desafios da vida cotidiana. O presente trabalho visou identificar relações e predição entre as forças de caráter e comportamentos pró-sociais presentes em voluntários e não voluntários de ações sociais. Participaram 784 pessoas com idades entre 18 e 69 anos ($M = 36,70$; $DP = 12,90$), sendo a maioria do sexo feminino (77,30%) e de todas as regiões brasileiras. Desses, 34,94% declararam participar de voluntariado. Utilizou-se um questionário sociodemográfico para caracterização da amostra e duas escalas: Escala de Pró-Sociabilidade (EPS) e Escala de Forças de Caráter (EFC), tendo sido respondidos de maneira virtual. Para analisar os dados obtidos, realizou-se correlação de Pearson, regressão linear pelo método *Enter* e teste *t* para comparação entre os grupos que realizavam ou não ações sociais. Os resultados demonstraram associações significativas e positivas entre as variáveis investigadas, sendo que as forças interpessoais e intelectuais estiveram mais associadas à pró-sociabilidade. Na regressão linear, o modelo foi estatisticamente significativo, sendo registrada predição de 64,40% dos casos. Por fim, o grupo que realiza ações sociais apresentou maiores médias nas forças pessoais e comportamentos pró-sociais. Os resultados foram discutidos à luz da literatura.

Palavras-chave: voluntariado, psicologia positiva, pró-sociabilidade, comportamento pró-social, forças de caráter

FUERZAS DEL CARÁCTER Y CONDUCTA PROSOCIAL: ESTUDIO CON VOLUNTARIOS DE ACCIONES SOCIALES

Resumen

La prosociabilidad ha sido entendida en la literatura como la característica presente en las personas con conductas orientadas al beneficio de los demás. Las fuerzas del carácter, en turno, se reconocen como los rasgos positivos de la personalidad, que ayudan a superar los desafíos de la vida cotidiana. El presente trabajo tuvo como objetivo identificar relaciones y predicciones entre las fortalezas de carácter y las conductas prosociales presentes en personas voluntarias y nones voluntarias en acciones sociales. Participaron 784 personas con edades entre 18 y 69 años ($M = 36,70$; $SD = 12,90$), en su mayoría del sexo femenino (77,30%) y de todas las regiones brasileñas. De estos, 34,94% declararon participar en trabajos voluntarios. Se utilizó un cuestionario sociodemográfico para caracterizar la muestra y dos escalas: Escala de Prosociabilidad (EPS) y Escala de Fortalezas del Carácter (EFC), respondieron la encuesta de forma virtual.

Para analizar los datos obtenidos se realizó correlación de Pearson y regresión lineal mediante el método Enter y la prueba t para comparar los grupos que realizaron o no acciones sociales. Los resultados mostraron asociaciones significativas y positivas entre las variables investigadas, siendo las fortalezas interpersonales e intelectuales más asociadas con la pro-sociabilidad. En regresión lineal, el modelo fue estadísticamente significativo, con una predicción del 64,40% de los casos. Finalmente, el grupo que realiza acciones sociales mostró mayores promedios en fortalezas personales y conductas prosociales. Los resultados fueron discutidos a la luz de la literatura.

Palabras clave: trabajo voluntario, psicología positiva, prosociabilidad, conducta prosocial, fuerzas del carácter

Introduction

The increasing concentration of income in a small part of the world's population and the growing concern with the direction of development of public policies have triggered, among other reflections, questions regarding the impact of sociodemographic characteristics on prosocial behavior. Studies on pro-sociality date back to the 1970s but did not gain traction at the time. However, from the 1990s, with the advent of the movement of positivist psychology and neutralization of the supremacy of the investigation of aspects of pathological functioning, themes of prosocial behavior began to be more emphasized, such that pro-sociality, empathy, compassion, altruism, and cooperation returned as a focus of research (Andreoni et al., 2021; Eisenberg, 1982; Freidlin & Littman-Ovadia, 2020).

According to Eisenberg (1982), prosocial behavior understood as voluntary action aimed at benefiting another, is relevant to the quality of interpersonal relationships. Eisenberg et al. (2015) defined prosocial actions as those that involve helping behaviors, aimed toward other people such that they generate favorable consequences for individuals or groups. Pro-sociality is manifested by verbal actions or expressions regarding situations in which individuals are led to position themselves or make decisions in which moral dilemmas are involved (Eisenberg et al., 2015). In addition, Simpson et al. (2017) state that beneficent actions represent a cost to benefactors, act like this.

Andreoni et al. (2021) discussed how wealth could reduce empathy, but the authors found no evidence that higher socioeconomic status impacts decreased prosocial behavior. Using another measure, Armstrong-Carter and Telzer (2021) found that young people with high levels of prosocial behavior tend to be more engaged, share more, and have better academic performance and well-being than those with low prosocial behavior. Kanakry et al. (2021), investigating societies that exclude and those that generate conflict, state that it is indispensable to identify the human strengths that promote greater cohesion between different social groups.

Previously, Eisenberg (1982) indicated that volunteering can be considered prosocial behavior and it impacts logical and socio-cognitive capacities, also understood as personal strengths, that develop in adult life. This action of volunteering belongs to the class of prosocial behaviors because it is associated with acts of help that have positive social consequences (Batson et al., 2003), in addition to being a factor that promotes well-being, with positive effects on health (Becchetti et al., 2018). Volunteering differs from other prosocial behaviors, as it is spontaneous assistance aimed at another (Pilati & Hees, 2011; Wilson, 2000), which may or may not involve direct or indirect benefits and acts (Goldstein, 1983).

In a recent survey of people from China, Chile, Spain, the United States, and Italy, Kanakry et al. (2021) found a relatively stable pattern of pro-sociality, although differences have been found between intention to act pro-socially in different cultural contexts. The significant relationships between pro-sociality, positive youth development, and subjective well-being that were found in the authors' results justify the urgency to carry out research that

clarifies the associations with other positive characteristics, such as the present one, which includes character strengths.

In this context, the character strengths construct, also called personal strengths, concerns the set of stable positive personality characteristics, manifested by thoughts, feelings, and actions (Noronha & Reppold, 2021; Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Peterson and Seligman (2004) elaborated a theoretical classification, resulting from intense research in historical documents, sacred works, and psychological science itself, identifying 24 character strengths grouped into six virtues. Among these are wisdom, the strengths of creativity, curiosity, critical thinking, love of learning, and reasonableness. The strengths of bravery, persistence, authenticity, and vitality make up the virtue of courage. Humanity is the virtue in which the strengths of love, kindness, and emotional intelligence are inserted. In the virtue of justice are the strengths of impartiality, teamwork, and leadership. In addition to the virtue of temperance are the strengths of forgiveness, modesty, prudence, and self-regulation, and the virtue of transcendence includes the strengths of appreciation of beauty, gratitude, hope, humor, and spirituality (Peterson & Seligman, 2002).

To update and improve the study and evaluation of personal strengths considering the sociodemographic characteristics of the Brazilian population, Batista (2020) elaborated the OBE – Brief Force Scale. The author started with the Character Strengths Scale, elaborated in 2016 by Noronha and Barbosa, consisting of 71 items, distributed on a 4-point Likert scale. While the OBE gathered various types of evidence for its validity (Batista et al., 2022; Noronha & Reppold, 2021), the number of items made it difficult to apply use in research with related constructs. That said, new analyses were conducted, with a view to reduction. The best model indicates two factors for the Brief Force Scale, namely, Intrapersonal Strengths (hope, gratitude, spirituality, appreciation of the beautiful, love of learning, and vitality), and Intellectual and Interpersonal Strengths (emotional intelligence, critical thinking, creativity, authenticity, teamwork, bravery, modesty, leadership, reasonableness, humor, prudence, and impartiality), grouping 18 strengths.

Although strengths are individual characteristics, they are also socially practiced; that is, they are co-constructed in observable processes and established through social interaction (Noronha & Reppold, 2021; Peterson & Seligman, 2004). The individual whose character strengths are developed, although this requires agency, individual ability, and a prerequisite biological basis, tends to develop pro-sociality, as this is a cooperative achievement that requires the collaboration of others (Clement & Bollinger, 2016). Thus, it is worth noting that it is not important for us to address individual-collective dualism, but rather to contribute to an understanding of the individual as a social actor. As suggested by Peterson and Seligman (2004), the classification Values in Action (VIA) allows us to evaluate the character strengths and, in some way, the involvement of individuals in social practices. Its measurement currently occurs through an instrument built using such premises (Batista, 2020).

Investigations of strengths in distinct contexts and samples are necessary and are an important research agenda (Noronha & Reppold, 2021). It is also relevant to be aware of the

mechanisms that mediate relationships between personal strengths and other psychological constructs (such as pro-sociality) to support the search for evidence of incremental validity and to build measures to aid safer intervention.

This study addresses pro-sociality, understood as the characteristic of people who behave generously, usefully, and considerately and who consider the rights and well-being of others (Eisenberg et al., 2015). The central question of the article deals with advancing empirically and conceptually, through the investigation of the relationships between the concepts (objective 1) and the predictive power of pro-sociality and personal strengths about the performance of social actions (objective 2), while also examining the differences in the means of the scores of both constructs between the group that carries out and the one that does not carry out volunteer actions (objective 3). Thus, can it be assumed that certain character strengths predict pro-sociality and that involvement in social activities/volunteering is a relevant variable?

Method

Participants

The study sample was acquired in a non-probabilistic, convenience-sampling manner. The Brazilian population is about 203 million people, and if we take a confidence interval of 95%, the sample size calculation suggests that 216 cases are sufficient. Thus, 784 people were participants in this research, with ages ranging from 18 to 69 years ($M = 36.70$; $SD = 12.90$), and the majority were female (77.30%; $n = 606$). The participants came from all five regions of Brazil: the southeast ($n = 542$; 69.13%), the northeast ($n = 182$; 23.21%), the middle-west ($n = 28$; 3.57%), the south ($n = 28$; 3.57%) and the north ($n = 4$; 0.5%). Part of the sample, 34.94% ($n = 274$), of the participants participated in social action, and the remainder did not. Two subjects were removed from the database because they were not old enough to participate.

Instruments

A *sociodemographic questionnaire*. Developed for the present study. It characterizes the sample in terms of gender, age, education, and whether the subject participates in volunteer actions or social movements.

A *Pro-sociality Scale* (EPS; Noronha et al., 2020). A self-report instrument that measures the prosocial behavior of adults. The EPS has 18 items in vignette format, which describe behaviors performed by individuals. Examples of items are: "Maria made her neighbors aware not to throw garbage in the street" and "Adriana is an organ donor." Respondents must indicate if they have already carried out such actions and are willing to do so in a dichotomous answer of Yes or No. Next, the respondents are asked to assign importance to the action presented in a vignette on a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Not important) to 4 (Very important). The score is obtained from the sum of the sections (having done the action, whether you feel like doing it, and the importance you attach to it). The estimated internal consistency of the instrument was $\alpha = 0.85$ and $\omega = 0.86$.

Character Strengths Scale – short version (OBE-brief; Batista, 2020). A self-report instrument that assesses positive personal characteristics. The Brief OBE has 18 items, distributed in two factors. The first, Intrapersonal Strengths (hope, gratitude, spirituality, appreciation of the beautiful, love for learning, and vitality), has six items that measure experiences that represent an orientation toward the future, with energy and appreciation for beauty and education. Examples of items are: “Good things await me in the future” and “I can find in my life reasons to be grateful.” The precision estimate for this factor in this sample was $\alpha = 0.83$. The second factor, or Intellectual and Interpersonal Strengths (emotional intelligence, critical thinking, creativity, authenticity, teamwork, bravery, modesty, leadership, wisdom, humor, prudence, and impartiality), has 12 items referring to the cognitive strengths that help in coping with difficulties, solving problems, and establishing interpersonal relationships to create healthy living environments. Examples of items are: “I know what to do to make people feel good” and “I create useful things.” The internal consistency was estimated by Cronbach’s alpha in the present sample, producing a coefficient of $\alpha = 0.87$.

Procedures

The project was submitted to the Research Committee of the University of São Francisco and was approved under opinion number 3,636,232. The instruments were inserted into the Google Forms platform, and the access link was made available across social networks (e.g. WhatsApp, Facebook, LinkedIn, and e-mail). It should be noted that participation in this study required agreement with the Term of Free and Informed Consent (ICF), respecting the ethical aspects required by resolution 510/2016 (National Health Council [CNS]) for research involving human beings. The order of application of the instruments was as follows: sociodemographic questionnaire, Strengths of Character-Brief Scale, and Pro-Sociability Scale. The average response time was 20 minutes. The data collection was carried out during the second half of 2021.

Data Analysis

To investigate the associations of scores for personal strengths in pro-sociability and participation in volunteering/social movements, a Pearson’s correlation analysis was performed using the following criteria for the interpretation of magnitudes: weak ($r \leq 0.30$), moderate ($0.30 \leq r \leq 0.49$), and strong ($r \geq 0.50$) (Cohen, 1988). To examine whether personal strengths are predictors of pro-sociability and participation in volunteer actions/social movements, linear regression analysis was performed using the Enter method. Student’s t-test was performed with Cohen’s d calculation (effect size) to determine whether the variable for participation in volunteer actions/social movements could influence the levels of character strengths and pro-sociability. The analyses were performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, version 25.

Results

[Concerning objective 1, the results indicated that the two factors of the Brief OBE presented significant and positive associations with the variables investigated. In addition, interpersonal and intellectual strengths were more associated with pro-sociability, and intrapersonal strengths showed a higher correlation of participation in social actions. These data indicate that an increased in the levels of different strengths are associated with increased pro-sociability and participation in social actions. However, it is necessary to highlight the low magnitudes of the coefficients, except for the strengths. The investigation of the variables by groups showed that in the sample that did not participate in social actions, intrapersonal strengths presented greater variance, shared with the pro-sociability, than the group that participated. Interpersonal and intellectual strengths showed twice the variance shared with pro-sociability, and correlations increased in magnitude, from low to moderate. Thus, among people who participate in social actions, the greater their interpersonal and intellectual strengths, the greater their social participation, and the opposite is also true. The results of the analysis can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1

Data Correlation Matrix

Total (N = 784)	1 (r ²)	2 (r ²)	3(r ²)
Intrapersonal strengths (1)	—		
Interpersonal and intellectual strengths (2)	0.64 (0.41)*	—	
Pro-Sociability (3)	0.26 (0.08)*	0.27 (0.07)*	—
Social Actions (4)	0.20 (0.04)*	0.17 (0.03)*	0.21 (0.04)*
Does not participate in social actions (n = 510)			
Intrapersonal strengths (1)	—		
Interpersonal and intellectual strengths (2)	0.66 (0.45)*	—	
Pro-Sociability (3)	0.25 (0.06)*	0.23 (0.05)*	—
Participates in social actions (n = 274)			
Intrapersonal strengths (1)	—		
Interpersonal and intellectual strengths (2)	0.54 (0.29)*	—	
Pro-Sociability (3)	0.19 (0.04)*	0.31 (0.10)*	—

Note. *p < 0.001

Regarding the second objective, that is, the investigation of the explanatory potential of personal strengths and pro-sociability (independent variables) concerning participation in social actions (dependent variable), a binary logistic regression model was tested. The results indicated that the model was statistically significant [$\chi^2 (3) = 54.25; p < 0.05$], able to adequately predict 64.40% of the cases. As can be seen in Table 2, only intrapersonal strengths and pro-sociability

were explanatory in the model. Increased scores in these factors lead an increased probability of the person participating in social actions, by 1.07 and 1.05, respectively.

Table 2*Character Strengths and Pro-sociability Predicting Participation in Social Actions*

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	p	Exp(B)
Model	Intrapersonal strengths	0.071	0.024	8.457	1	0.004	1.07
	Interpersonal strengths	0.010	0.016	0.398	1	0.528	1.01
	Pro-sociability	0.047	0.011	18.209	1	<0.001	1.05
	Constant	-6.588	1.000	43.433	1	<0.001	0.001

Note: Intrapersonal strengths [hope, gratitude, spirituality, appreciation of the beautiful, love of learning, vitality]; Interpersonal strengths [emotional intelligence, critical thinking, creativity, authenticity, teamwork, bravery, modesty].

Finally, regarding objective 3, we investigated whether participation in social actions could influence levels of personal strengths and prosocial behavior. According to the data in Table 3, people who participate in some volunteer activity have higher scores regarding personal strengths and prosocial behavior.

Table 3*Descriptive Statistics of the Variables Character Strengths and Pro-Sociability*

	Social Actions	Intrapersonal Strengths	Interpersonal and Intellectual Strengths	Pro-Sociability
N	No	510	510	508
	Yes	274	274	272
Average	No	17.6	33.4	88.8
	Yes	19.4	35.8	92.5
Median	No	18.0	33.5	91.0
	Yes	20.0	36.0	93.0
Standard deviation	No	4.58	6.99	9.29
	Yes	3.89	5.79	6.52
Minimum	No	3.00	3.00	45.0
	Yes	3.00	17.0	73.0
Maximum	No	24.0	48.0	107
	Yes	24.0	48.0	107

To identify whether the differences observed are statistically significant, a group comparison test was performed for independent samples. As can be seen in Table 4, statistically significant differences were identified in the three variables analyzed. Thus, people who participate in volunteer activities endorse character strengths more and perceive themselves to be more pro-social than people who do not participate in volunteer activities.

Table 4*Group Comparison Test Considering the Variable of Participation in Social Actions*

	Statistic	df	p	Difference in Means	Cohen d
Intrapersonal strengths	-5.72	782	< 0.001	-1.86	-0.43
Interpersonal and intellectual strengths	-4.72	782	< 0.001	-2.33	-0.35
Pro-sociability	-5.84	778	< 0.001	-3.70	-0.44

Discussion

This study had three main objectives. These included determining whether character strengths predict pro-sociability and whether involvement in social actions/volunteering is also a relevant variable. More particularly, we sought to identify how far personal strengths and pro-sociability explain engagement in social activities/volunteering. Data analysis demonstrated an association between intrapersonal strengths and intellectual/interpersonal strengths. This association suggests besides the strengths being grouped (with a high-magnitude correlation between the factors of the OBE – Breve) (Batista, 2020) they also interact with each other. These findings are also seen in the work of Padilla-Walker et al. (2020), who found that intrapersonal and intellectual/interpersonal strengths are grouped, indicating, for example, an interaction between the love of learning and creativity, among others. Moreover, it is important to reflect on the positive component provided by the measures that seek to evaluate the strengths, especially in the scales for which the theoretical classification of Peterson and Seligman (2004) was not corroborated. In the first analysis, the OBE, derived from the short version we used, did not find the factorial structure of six virtues bringing together the 24 strengths (Noronha & Barbosa, 2016). The authors discussed a general concept of strengths, as evaluated by unifactorial structures; however, as the research advanced, it became necessary to name the elements separately (character strengths) rather than conceiving them as a general whole (Batista, 2020; Noronha & Reppold, 2021). Pro-sociability, as assessed by the Pro-Sociability Scale (Noronha et al., 2020), and intrapersonal and intellectual/interpersonal strengths, measured by the short version of the Character Strengths Scale (Batista, 2020), reveal associations of a low magnitude, both about the general sample and for the groups of practitioners and non-practitioners of social actions. However, the highest coefficients were found in the group of practitioners. These findings can be explained using the assertions of Eisenberg et al. (2015), who noted that prosocial actions generate favorable consequences for individuals who perform them and others. It is also possible to observe that prosocial actions promote increased positive personal characteristics, as highlighted by Padilla-Walker et al. (2020).

However, it is noteworthy that the associations between social actions and intrapersonal strengths and those between social actions and pro-sociability suggest that although character strengths are socially recognized and valued, they are not exhibited by all people (Padilla-Walker et al., 2020). Thus, the Brief Character Strengths Scale may have been sufficiently sensitive to

capture the construct broadly, even using the small number of participants who performed prosocial actions. In general, the items found in the present study endorse the relationships between personal characteristics and the influence of the social context when evaluating the associations between intrapersonal factors, positive future orientation, intellectual/interpersonal strengths, and the establishment of interpersonal relationships. Similar outcomes were identified by Freidlin and Littman-Ovadia (2020).

Regarding the second objective, the findings indicated that the intrapersonal factors of personal strengths and pro-sociability predicted the performance of social actions, and this was in line with the assertions of Noronha and Reppold (2021), in the sense that strengths are positive personality traits, manifested by thoughts, feelings, and actions. It can be inferred that engagement in social activity is related to developing one's strengths. Thus, positive experiences about social movements focus mainly on others and improving of others' well-being increases the chances of a person engaging in social actions.

Although strengths relate to the most frequent experience of positive emotions, impacting interpersonal relationships (Padilla-Walker et al., 2020), only intrapersonal strengths and pro-sociability were found to be explanatory in the model; that is, they determined participation in social actions. However, it is essential to consider that the sample was not restricted to people who performed prosocial actions. One may assume that personal strengths could be adapted to different situations differently with different environments and populations so that individuals can reflect on their qualities, social roles, and the positive outcomes they can generate for society (Schutte & Malouff, 2018).

Regarding the third and final objective, it was found, through the analysis of means, that groups involved in social causes or that perform social actions have higher means in all personal strengths, as well as in the total score of the EPS. This may be related to the fact that prosocial behaviors entail benefits for the individuals themselves (Padilla-Walker et al., 2020) and for the group, when there is cooperation in social causes (Simpson et al., 2017), which can influence the development of personal strengths, confirming previous results. While prosocial actions do not involve expectations of self-benefit or personal rewards (Eisenberg, 1982), a higher score was observed for all scales (pro-sociability and personal strengths) regarding involvement in social causes/social actions.

People committed to social actions have larger averages in interpersonal and intellectual strengths. We suggest that this may have occurred because this factor is linked to cognitive aspects of problem-solving, difficulty management, and the creating and maintaining interpersonal relationships (Batista, 2020), characteristics that can support the emergence of healthier common environments. This result presents similarities with the findings of Bechara and Bernardino (2021), as those authors found that the main stimulus for volunteer work is altruistic motivation (e.g., compassion for those most in need, desire to help others, and willingness to solve the world's problems). This intention may relate to intellectual and interpersonal strengths, as both refer to characteristics that facilitate problem solving and the

development of interpersonal relationships providing healthy coexistence with others (Noronha & Reppold, 2021).

This study addresses the relationships and predictive powers of personal strengths regarding pro-sociality in people who perform and do not carry out social actions. Individuals engaged in social actions generally have higher levels of interpersonal and intellectual strengths, denoting the importance of intrinsic motivation for engaging in altruistic activity and the possible personal benefit of helping other people or causes. We recommend that future studies differentiate people participating in social movements from those who are engaged in volunteer actions. For a deeper understanding of this theme, we suggest having a greater number of participants perform social actions and use the complete character strengths scale (OBE; Noronha & Barbosa, 2016) instead of the reduced version. For OBE, it would be possible to ascertain causal relationships between which strengths could predict higher levels of pro-sociality. Some authors have already identified the presence of selfish motivations in engaging in volunteering (Bechara & Bernardino, 2021), while others have identified improved academic performance for those with higher pro-sociality (Armstrong-Carter & Telzer, 2021) and superior positive association between pro-sociality, youth development, and subjective well-being (Kanacri et al., 2021). There is a lack of scientific depth in how far strengths could be most responsible for prosocial behavior. It is believed that these measures can bring about results that contribute to the understanding of the prediction of and the relationship between the constructs, encouraging society to engage in altruistic actions due to their ability to promote well-being and positive development.

For further deepening of the theme, as a research agenda, we suggest that new research involve larger numbers of participants who carry out social actions and that the nature of volunteering is matter for analysis, as well as the time dedicated to it. In addition, it is desirable to use a scale that evaluates all strengths separately to expand the possibilities of the theoretical relationships to be established (Noronha & Barbosa, 2016), to the detriment of the reduced version. We also recommend that future studies differentiate people who participate in social movements from people who are engaged in volunteer actions. We believe that this measure may lead to more conclusive results concerning the prediction of and relationship between the constructs and to encourage society to engage in altruistic actions due to the capacity of such actions to promote well-being.

References

- Andreoni, J., Nikiforis, N., & Stoop, J. (2021). Higher socioeconomic status does not predict decreased prosocial behavior in a field experiment. *Nature Communication*, 12, 4266. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-24519-5>
- Anjum, A., & Amjad, N. (2020). Values in Action Inventory of Strengths (VIA-IS): Translation and validation in urdu language. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 35(1), 163–189. <https://doi.org/10.33824/PJPR.2020.35.1.10>
- Armstrong-Carter, E., & Telzer, E. H. (2021). Advancing measurement and research on youth's prosocial behavior in the digital age. *Child Development Perspectives*, 15(1), 31–36. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12396>
- Batista, H. H. V. (2020). Initial psychometric studies of the Scale of Character Strengths–Brief [Doctoral Thesis, Universidade São Francisco]. <https://www.usf.edu.br/galeria/getimage/427/4000302537424220.pdf>
- Batista, H. H. V., Noronha, A. P. P., & Reppold, C. T. (2022). Associations between character strengths and parenting styles in adults. *Psicologia em Estudo*, 16, e32840. <https://doi.org/10.34019/1982-1247.2022.v16.32840>
- Batson, C. D., Van Lange, P. A. M., Ahmad, N., & Lishner, D. L. (2003). Altruism and helping behavior. In M. Hogg & J. Cooper (Eds.). *The SAGE handbook of social psychology* (pp. 279–295). SAGE.
- Becchetti, L., Conzo, P., & Di Febraro, M. (2018). The monetary-equivalent effect of voluntary work on mental wellbeing in Europe. *Kyklos*, 71(1), 3–27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/kykl.12160>
- Bechara, F., & Bernardino, S. (2021). The motivation for the work of volunteers: The case of Associação Vencer. *Portuguese Journal of Finance, Management and Accounting*, 7(13), 95–128. <http://u3isjournal.isvouga.pt/index.php/PJFMA/article/view/531>
- Charities Aid Foundation (CAF) (2021). The Sunday Times giving list 2021. *The Sunday Times*. <https://www.cafonline.org/my-personal-giving/sunday-times-giving-list-2021>
- Clement, S., & Bollinger, R. (2016). Perspectives on character virtue development. *Research in Human Development*, 13(2), 174–181. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427609.2016.1172445>
- Eisenberg, N. (1982). *The Development of Prosocial Behavior*. Academic Press.
- Eisenberg, N., Spinrad, T. L., & Knafo-Noam, A. (2015). Prosocial development. In M. E. Lamb & R. M. Lerner (Eds.). *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science: Socioemotional processes* (pp. 610–656). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118963418.childpsy315>
- Freidlin, P., & Littman-Ovadia, H. (2020). Prosocial behavior at work through the lens of character strengths. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 3046. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03046>
- Goldstein, J. (1983). *Psicologia Social* [Social Psychology]. Guanabara.
- Kanacri, B. P. L., Eisenberg, N., Tramontano, C., Zuffiano, A., Caprara, M. G., Regner, E., Zhu, L., Pastorelli, C., & Caprara, G. V. (2021). Measuring prosocial behaviors: Psychometric properties and cross-national validation of the Prosociality Scale in five countries. *Frontier in Psychology*, 12, 693174. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.693174>
- Noronha, A. P. P., & Barbosa, A. J. G. (2016). Forças e virtudes: Escala de Forças de Caráter [Strengths and virtues: Character Strengths Scale]. In C. S. Hutz (Ed.), *Avaliação em Psicologia Positiva: Técnicas e Medidas* [Assessment in Positive Psychology: Techniques and Measures] (pp. 21–43). CETEPP.
- Noronha, A. P. P., Dias-Viana, J. L., Batista, H. H. V., Souza, M. H., Campos, A. M. B., Theotonio, M., Pio, J. L. S., Vanni, P., Queiroz, L. G., & Corbett, J. S. (2020). Development and evidence of internal structure validity of the Pro-Sociability Scale (EPS) [Manuscript Submitted for Preparation]. Universidade São Francisco.
- Noronha, A. P. P., & Reppold, C. T. (2021). As fortalezas dos indivíduos: O que são forças de caráter [Individual strengths: What are character strengths]? In M. Rodrigues, & D. S. Pereira (Eds.). *Psicologia positiva dos conceitos à aplicação* [Positive psychology from concepts to application] (pp. 68–81). Sinopsys.
- Padilla-Walker, L. M., Millett, M. A., & Memmott-Elison, M. K. (2020). Can helping others strengthen teens? Character strengths as mediators between prosocial behavior and adolescents' internalizing symptoms. *Journal of adolescence*, 79, 70–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2020.01.001>

- Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification. American Psychological Association.
- Pilati, R., & Hees, M. A. G. (2011). Evidence of validity of a Brazilian version of the Volunteer Functions Inventory – VFI. *PsicoUSF*, 16(3), 275–284. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-82712011000300004>
- Ramaekers, M. J. M., Verbakel, E. & Kraaykamp, G. (2021) Informal volunteering and socialization effects: Examining modelling and encouragement by parents and partner. *Voluntas*, 15, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-021-00315-z>
- Schutte, N. S., & Malouff, J. M. (2018). The impact of signature character strengths interventions: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 20, 1179–1196. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-018-9990-2>
- Simpson, B., Willer, R., & Harrell, A. (2017). The enforcement of moral boundaries promotes cooperation and prosocial behavior in groups. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1), 42844. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep42844>

EDITORIAL BOARD**Editor-in-chief**

Cristiane Silvestre de Paula

Associated editors

Alessandra Gotuzo Seabra
 Ana Alexandra Caldas Osório
 Luiz Renato Rodrigues Carreiro
 Maria Cristina Triguero Veloz Teixeira

Section editors**“Psychological Assessment”**

Alexandre Luiz de Oliveira Serpa
 André Luiz de Carvalho Braule Pinto
 Natália Becker
 Juliana Burges Sbicigo

“Psychology and Education”

Alessandra Gotuzo Seabra
 Carlo Schmidt
 Regina Basso Zanon

“Social Psychology and Population's Health”

Enzo Banti Bissoli
 Marina Xavier Carpena

“Clinical Psychology”

Carolina Andrea Ziebold Jorquera
 Julia Garcia Durand
 Ana Alexandra Caldas Osório

“Human Development”

Maria Cristina Triguero Veloz Teixeira
 Rosane Lowenthal

Technical support

Camila Fragoso Ribeiro
 Fernanda Antônia Bernardes
 Giovana Gatto Nogueira

EDITORIAL PRODUCTION**Publishing coordination**

Surane Chiliani Vellenich

Language editor

Andrew Benson & Irina Migliari (Bardo
 Editorial)

Layout designer

Acqua Estúdio Gráfico