



# Differences in Prosocial Behavior of Male and Female Students in Inclusive Elementary School

<sup>1</sup>Desvi Yanti Mukhtar , <sup>2</sup>Elisabeth Prisda Magdalena Situmorang

<sup>1,2</sup>Universitas Sumatera Utara Medan, Indonesia  
[desvi.yanti.mukhtar@usu.ac.id](mailto:desvi.yanti.mukhtar@usu.ac.id)

**Abstract.** This study aims to determine the differences in prosocial behavior of male and female students in inclusive elementary schools. This study involved 90 grade 5 and 6 students in one of the public elementary schools in Padang Genting, Batu Bara Regency, North Sumatra. This research is a mixed method research with sequential explanation method. In the first stage, quantitative data collection was collected by using Scenario-Based Prosocial Intention Questionnaire (SBPIQ) made by Ampuni and Buwono (2022) based on Jackson and Tisak's theory [1]. Quantitative analysis was conducted using an independent sample t-test, and it was found that the prosocial behavior of female students ( $M = 81.89$ ) was higher than of male students ( $M = 75.63$ ), with a value of  $t = 3.336$ ;  $p = 0.001$  ( $p < 0.05$ ). The second stage, an interview is conducted. Through the results of the interview, it is known that prosocial behavior between male and female students is mainly different in the form of helpful, sharing and comforting behavior, while in cooperation it is no different. Through the results of this study, it is recommended for inclusive schools to involve female students in assisting students with special needs and providing education to male students so that their prosocial behavior will increase.

**Keywords:** Prosocial Behavior, Student Gender, Inclusive Elementary School

## 1 Introduction

In accordance with the mandate of the 1945 Constitution, every child has the right to education, including children with special needs. Children with special needs (ABK) are children who have different characteristics from most other children and therefore require special education services [2]. Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System defines children with special needs (ABK) as: (1) children who have physical, emotional, mental, intellectual and/or social disorders; (2) children who have special intelligence and talent potential; and (3) children in remote or underdeveloped areas and remote indigenous communities, who have the right to receive special education services. One of the special education services that can be provided to children with special needs is inclusive education. Inclusive education is an educational service system that places children with special needs to study in public schools [3]. In schools that implement inclusive education, children with special needs not only participate in the learning process together, but also play and interact with other normal children. Inclusive education involves the transformation of the entire education system, starting from creating laws and policies, systems for financing, administration, learning design, educational monitoring, and how schools are managed. One of the transformations that schools need to carry out is to create a safe and inclusive environment, where children with special needs will not experience intimidation and bullying, either from teachers or peers [4]. Considering that students with special needs generally have limitations, they also need an environment that is willing to provide assistance, especially from their normal friends. Normal students have an important role in helping ABK to be able to interact and socialize well, such as accepting ABK's shortcomings, being willing to help, being willing to cooperate, and being willing to teach ABK in learning [5].

In reality, the problems that often occur in inclusive schools are related to the lack of prosocial behavior of normal students, such as ignoring and not wanting to be friends with ABK students [6] [7] or bullying them [8] [9]. This shows that it is important for inclusive schools to develop prosocial behavior in normal students. Prosocial behavior is the act of providing help to others who need it voluntarily without coercion. Children who have high prosocial behavior can adapt well to their environment, control themselves from negative emotions, and can find appropriate solutions to the problems they face [10]. Also explains that prosocial behavior will help students not show negative behavior or ignore other people and will increase behavior that can build social inclusivity, such as inviting friends to join groups [11]. High prosocial behavior in students can also reduce or even stop bullying at school [12].

There are four forms of prosocial behavior [1]. First, helping, namely the act of responding to other people who are experiencing difficulties, both in emergency and non-emergency situations, for example picking up fallen objects, helping with tasks, or making donations. Second, sharing, which is the act of handing over one's resources to benefit others. Although helping and sharing have similarities in

© The Author(s) 2024

N. Hidayat et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference Da'wah and Communication Disruptios Era 5.0 (ICDCDE 2024)*, Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research 862,  
[https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-285-9\\_22](https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-285-9_22)

the form of an element of concern for the welfare of others, they are different. Helping behavior is usually carried out because of a victim or person experiencing an unpleasant situation, while sharing behavior usually involves hope or an element of reciprocity [13]. Third, working together (cooperating), shows how individuals coordinate with other individuals to achieve certain goals together. And fourth, comforting, is the act of helping other people by improving the negative mood experienced by other people into a positive mood.

How an individual's prosocial behavior is influenced by several things such as socialization experience, empathy, age, gender, and characteristics of the recipient of assistance [10]. In this study, prosocial behavior was associated with gender. Several studies show different results regarding the relationship between prosocial behavior and student gender. There is research that shows that the development of prosocial behavior is different in boys and girls [14] and there is also research that shows that prosocial behavior in boys and girls is almost the same or there is no difference [15] [16] There is research that finds girls have higher levels of prosocial behavior than boys [17] [18] but there are also those who find the opposite, boys have higher prosocial behavior [19]. Considering that the existence of peers has an important role in supporting the success of inclusive education, researchers consider that prosocial topics associated with gender still need to be researched Through the results of this research, it is hoped that inclusive schools can have an overview of students' prosocial behavior in terms of gender and provide more appropriate guidance to them so they can provide support to students with special needs [20].

## 2 Metode Penelitian

This research was conducted at one of the State Elementary Schools which was recently designated by the Batu Bara Regency Government as an inclusive school. The research was carried out using a combination method, namely using quantitative and qualitative methods. The mixed methods model used is an explanatory sequential design type, namely prioritizing quantitative results and followed qualitative results [21]. Mixed research methods which emphasize quantitative methods and are supported by qualitative research, are carried out simultaneously with a deductive theoretical direction [22].

This research was carried out in three stages, in the first stage, data collection was carried out quantitatively using a scale, namely the Scenario-Based Prosocial Intention Questionnaire (SBPIQ). SBPIQ was developed by Ampuni and Buwono (2022) based on the forms of prosocial behavior proposed by Jackson and Tisak (2001) [24]. This scale has relatively good construct validity ( $p < 0.001$ ; SRMR = 0.036; RMSEA = 0.044 (90% CI = 0.042-0.047); CFI = 0.929; TLI = 0.919), as well as reliability ( $\alpha_S = 0.90$ ). There are four forms of prosocial behavior revealed in this scale, namely helping, sharing, entertaining and collaborating, with a background of 9 themes of prosocial situations in everyday life. The subjects involved in this first stage of research were 90 students, consisting of 41 male students and 49 female students. Subjects are in the age range of 10 – 12 years and are in class V or VI. The quantitative data obtained was then analyzed using the independent sample t-test technique using SPSS. Before carrying out the t test, the existing data was first tested for normality using the one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and homogeneity was tested using Levene's Test. The test results showed that the data obtained were normal ( $p = 0.200$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ) and homogeneous ( $p = 0.956$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ).

In the second stage, the research was conducted qualitatively using a semi-structured interview method. This method involves a number of open-ended questions based on the topic area the researcher wishes to cover, but provides the opportunity for the interviewer and interviewee to discuss some topics in more detail. Interviews were conducted with 3 male students and 3 female students from grades 5 and 6, 1 homeroom teacher for class 5, and 1 homeroom teacher for class 6. The data analysis technique used in this research was coding, data raw materials are organized into categories based on certain themes or concepts [23]. The final stage of this research is combining quantitative and qualitative data to be interpreted together.

### 3 Hasil dan Pembahasan

#### A. Results of quantitative data analysis

The results of the descriptive analysis show that the subjects of this research, both female students ( $\bar{X} = 81.898$ ) and male students ( $\bar{X} = 75.734$ ) had a total social behavior score average (empirical average) that was higher than the hypothetical SBPIQ score average ( $\bar{X} = 60$ ). The results of the descriptive analysis as shown in table 1 also show that the average social behavior score of female students is higher than that of male students, both in the total average score and the average score for each form of prosocial behavior. The standard deviation value of female students' prosocial behavior scores appears to be lower than that of male students. This shows that the variation in the prosocial behavior scores of female students is lower than that of male students.

**Table 1.** Results of quantitative data analysis

Gender	Score Total prosocial behavior		Score Helping behavior		Score Sharing behavior		Score Collaborative behavior		Score Entertaining behavior	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
Female	81.89	8.853	21,47	1,927	16,90	2,248	12,29	1,708	31,24	4,733
Male	75.63	8.893	19,73	2,748	15,41	2,837	11,78	2,242	28,71	4,818

The results of hypothesis testing show that although in general the average social behavior score of female students is higher than that of male students, not all of them show significant differences. Based on table 2. The results of the t-test, it is known that the prosocial behavior scores of female and male students only differ significantly in the total score, helping, sharing and entertaining behavior, while there is no significant difference in cooperative behavior. This means that female students' prosocial behavior is higher than male students, especially in helping, sharing and entertaining behavior.

**Tabel 2.** Test Result

Prosocial behavior scores	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Total prosocial behavior	3,336	88	.001
Helping behavior	3,514	88	.001
Sharing behavior	2,767	88	.007
Collaborative behavior	1,213	88	.229
Entertaining behavior	2,513	88	.014

#### B. Results of qualitative data analysis

The results of qualitative data analysis are generally grouped into 4 themes of forms of prosocial behavior, namely helping, sharing, collaborating and entertaining behavior, both for female and male students as can be seen in table 3.

**Table 3.** Forms of Social Behavior of Female and Male Students

Forms of social behavior	Female student	Male student
Helping behavior	- Want to help others without discriminating. - Showing an altruistic attitude such as being willing to help, still being willing to help even if you are ridiculed or don't receive a thank you.	- It varies, there are those who want to help other people without discriminating, there are also those who choose who they want to help. Reasons for choosing to help include because the person is kind, never mocks, the person asking for help is a parent, or the person being helped is also male.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide more help in the form of activities that do not require energy or physical strength, such as teaching friends, helping sick friends, and cleaning the classroom.</li> <li>- Helping behavior occurs more on one's own initiative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reactions to teasing when helping are different, some continue to help, some stop helping.</li> <li>- Provide more help in the form of activities that require energy or physical strength, such as lifting tables and chairs, repairing damaged items, and breaking up friends who are fighting.</li> <li>- The desire to help varies, some are on their own initiative, some are because they are told to.</li> </ul>
Sharing behavior	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In general, they are willing to share with anyone, but there are also those who only want to share with other women.</li> <li>- Share more in the form of food or stationery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It varies, there are those who want to share with anyone, there are also those who only want to share with close friends or with other men.</li> <li>- There are those who don't want to share in the form of lending goods for fear that the goods will be damaged.</li> <li>- Share more in the form of food or stationery</li> </ul>
Collaborative behavior	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It varies, some are willing to work with anyone, but there are also those who only want to work with fellow women.</li> <li>- Easier to work together on group assignments or studying</li> <li>- Willing to work together when picketing or organizing the class</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It varies, some are willing to work with anyone, but there are also those who only want to work with men.</li> <li>- Some male students are less serious or appear lazy when working together in studying or group assignments.</li> <li>- Willing to work together when picketing or organizing the class</li> </ul>
Entertaining behavior	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Want to entertain all friends without discrimination</li> <li>- Take more initiative to entertain friends.</li> <li>- Want to cheer up a friend who is sad so he isn't sad anymore, even if it takes a long time</li> <li>- Want to cheer up friends even though they are also sad</li> <li>- Entertain by telling stories, playing, buying food, or teaching friends.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prefers to entertain fellow male students.</li> <li>- Lack of initiative to entertain.</li> <li>- Doesn't want to be comforted for a long time, chooses to leave when he has been comforted and still cries.</li> <li>- Comfort by asking the reason why you are sad and asking to stop crying.</li> </ul>

Based on the research results, it was found that the mean prosocial behavior of female students ( $\bar{X} = 81.898$ ) was higher than that of male students ( $\bar{X} = 75.734$ ), with a value of  $t = 3.336$ ,  $p = 0.001$  ( $< 0.05$ ). This shows that female students have higher prosocial behavior than male students. The results of this study are in line with several previous studies which found that girls have higher prosocial behavior than boys [17] [18]. Based on previous research, there are several things that can cause women to be more prosocial than men. Neuroimaging research conducted show that this is due to differences in the neural reward system [24]. Women's reward neural systems are more sensitive than men's, so women tend to show prosocial behavior more easily while men tend to show more selfish behavior. Another reason is that women have greater empathy and compassion than men [25]. According to Eisenberg, Eggum, and Giunta (2010), empathy and/or sympathy make a big contribution to the formation of prosocial behavior. Likewise, found that empathy and compassion will make individuals more likely to show prosocial behavior [26].

Among the four forms of prosocial behavior, the research results show that the differences in men's and women's prosocial behavior mainly differ in helping, sharing and comforting behavior, while cooperation behavior does not differ. Women are more willing to help without discrimination, show altruistic attitudes such as being willing to help, still being willing to help even though they are ridiculed or not receiving thanks, and helping more on their own initiative. Meanwhile, some men consider several things or must be asked first before deciding to help. This is because girls' ability to recognize whether someone needs help is better than boys [27]. This is also because women have greater empathy [25] [28] and this greater empathy will encourage individuals to want to help others [29] [30]. The form of helping behavior of students in this study was also different, female students provided more help in the form of activities that did not require energy or physical strength, such as teaching friends, helping sick friends,

and cleaning the classroom, while male students provided more help in the form of activities. which require physical strength or strength, such as lifting tables and chairs, repairing broken items, and breaking up friends who are fighting. This is because the physical conditions of women and men are different. Men are physically stronger so they are often given tasks that require physical strength [31]. The sharing behavior of female students is also higher than male students. Who found that girls consistently shared more with all recipients than boys. Sharing behavior is consistently demonstrated even with people you don't know or don't like [32]. The sharing behavior of female students is higher because women's empathy is also higher. In general, girls are willing to share with anyone, although there are a few who only want to share with other girls. Meanwhile, male students vary, some want to share with anyone, some only want to share with close friends or fellow men, and there are also those who don't want to share. there are two important characteristics that will influence sharing behavior, namely the child's gender and the child's social preferences among peers [32].

The entertaining behavior of female students is also higher than male students. They want to entertain all their friends without distinction, are more active in entertaining, still want to entertain even though it takes longer or they themselves are sad, and show comforting behavior in various ways. Meanwhile, male students do not take the initiative to cheer up, even if they do, they tend to only want to cheer up fellow boys, and tend to only want to cheer up briefly by asking why their friends are sad, asking them to cry, and choosing to leave their friends if they are still sad. which found that girls had higher scores in entertaining than boys [33]. Women have higher motivation and skills in entertaining so that women contribute more to entertaining other people [34]. Women use more smiles, nods, gazes, show facial and gestural expressions, and establish less interpersonal distance, as well as being more accurate in judging emotions and personality through nonverbal cues; remembering other people's nonverbal cues and other people's appearances [35].

This research also found that among the 3 forms of prosocial behavior, only cooperative behavior did not differ between female and male students. Both female and male students tend to be picky about the people they work with. The results of this research are the same as meta-analysis research, which found that there was no relationship between gender and cooperative behavior [36]. Even though the results of quantitative data analysis found no differences in collaborative behavior, the qualitative results showed that there were differences, especially in working together on tasks. Female students tend to work together more easily on group assignments, while male students tend to be less serious and lazy. Who found that women are more willing to cooperate even with certain conditions, while men tend to be more free when required to cooperate [37].

#### 4 Conclusion

The results of the research have the implication that inclusive schools can involve more female students in helping students with special needs. Social participation is an important condition for successful learning in inclusive elementary schools [38]. This social participation is not only expected from teachers, but also from students. Female students can be involved to help, share, or entertain students with special needs. The results of this research are also important for schools to pay attention to so they can create programs to increase students' prosocial behavior, especially male students. This can be done, for example, by creating a positive school climate because a positive school climate is related to prosocial behavior [39], facilitating the formation of inclusive behavior in students [40], and building good relationships. between students and teachers and schools provide interventions to improve students' social skills such as empathy training or techniques for working together in learning [41].

#### References

1. Jackson, M., & Tisak, M. S. (2001). Is prosocial behaviour a good thing? Developmental changes in children's evaluations of helping, sharing, cooperating, and comforting. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 19, pp 349–367.
2. Hallahan, D. P., Kauffman, J. M., & Pullen, P. C. (2014). *Exceptional learners: An introduction to special education* (12<sup>th</sup> Ed). Essex : Pearson Education Limited.
3. Heward, W. L., Alber-Morgan, S. R. & Konrad, M. (2017). *Exceptional children: An introduction to special education*. The ohio State University: Pearson Education, Inc.
4. Unicef (2017). Inclusive education: Including children with disabilities in quality learning, what needs to be done? [https://www.unicef.org/eca/sites/unicef.org/eca/files/IE\\_summary\\_accessible\\_220917\\_brief.pdf](https://www.unicef.org/eca/sites/unicef.org/eca/files/IE_summary_accessible_220917_brief.pdf)
5. Dwi, A. W., Arifiana, I. Y., & Suroso. (2020). Persepsi Mengenai Inklusi & Perilaku Prosocial Siswa Reguler Di Sekolah Inklusi. *Sukma : Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi*, 1(1), pp 81–89.
6. Amka (2017). Problems and Challenges in the Implementation of Inclusive Education in Indonesia. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 7 (10), pp 159-167.
7. Hasan, S. A., & Handayani, M. M. (2014). Hubungan antara Dukungan Sosial Teman Sebaya dengan Penyesuaian Diri Siswa Tunarungu di Sekolah Inklusi. *Jurnal Psikologi Pendidikan Dan Perkembangan*, 3(2), pp 128–135.

8. Damayanto, A., Prabawati, W., & Jauhari, M. N. (2020). Kasus *bullying* pada anak berkebutuhan Y. Mukhtar and E. P. M. Situmorang *Ortopedagogia*, 6 (2), pp 104-107.
9. Sakinah, D. N., & Marlina (2018). Perilaku *bullying* terhadap anak berkebutuhan khusus di sekolah inklusif di Kota Padang. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Kebutuhan Khusus*, 6 (1), pp 1-6.
10. Eisenberg, N., & Mussen, P. H. (1989). *The Roots Of Prosocial Behavior In Children In Social & Emotional Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Bergin, C. (2019). Prosocial goals. In M. H. Jones (Ed.), *Social goals in the classroom: Findings on student motivation and peer relations* (pp. 93–110). New York: Routledge.
12. Putri, Y., Tiatri, S., & Heng, P. H. (2020). Penerapan Program The Good Behavior Games (GBG) Untuk Meningkatkan Perilaku Prososial Pada Bystander. *Jurnal Muara Ilmu Sosial, Humaniora, dan Seni*, 4(1), pp 264-274.
13. Tisak, M. S., & Ford, M. E. (1986). Children's conceptions of interpersonal events. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 32 (3), pp 291-306.
14. Graaff, J. D., Carlo, G., Crocetti, E., Koot, H. M., Branje, S. (2018). Prosocial Behavior in Adolescence: Gender Differences in Development and Links with Empathy, *Journal Youth Adolescence*, 47(5), pp 1086–1099.
15. Alivu, A. I., & Kumar, P. (2016). Gender Differences in Prosocial Behaviour, *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 3 (4), pp 171-175.
16. Espinosa, M. P., & Kovárík, J. (2015). Prosocial Behavior And Gender. *Frontiers In Behavioral Neuroscience*, 9(88), pp 1–9, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2015.00088>.
17. Amini, Y., & Saripah, I. (2016). Perilaku Prososial Sekolah Dasar Berdasarkan Perbedaan Jenis Kelamin. *Mimbar Sekolah Dasar*, 3(2), pp 222–230.
18. Kok, R., Prinzie, P., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., Verhulst, F. C., White, T., Tiemeier, H., & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (2018). Socialization Of Prosocial Behavior: Gender Differences In The Mediating Role Of Child Brain Volume. *Child Neuropsychology*, 24(6), pp 723–733.
19. AR, M. M., & Hardiansyah, F. (2022). Prosocial Behavior Of Elementary School Students Based On Gender Differences In Society 5.0. *Journal of Innovation in Educational and Cultural Research*, 3(3), pp 390–396. <https://doi.org/10.46843/jiecr.v3i3.121>.
20. Bond, R., & Castagnera, E. (2006). Peer supports and inclusive education: An underutilized resource. *Theory Into Practice*, 45 (3), pp 224-229.
21. Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
22. Morse, J. M. (2010). Prinsip-prinsip metode campuran dan rancangan penelitian multimetode. Dalam Tashakkori, A., & Tedlie, C. (Eds). *Handbook of mixed methods: In social & behavioral research* (hal 170-187). Alih bahasa: Daryatno. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
23. Hancock, B., Ockleford, E., & Windridge, K. (2009). *An introduction to qualitative research*. The NIHR Research Design Service for Yorkshire and the Humber.
24. Soutschek, A., Burke, C. J., Beharelle, A. R., Schreiber, R., Weber, S. C., Karipidis, I. I., ten Velden, J., Weber, B., Haker, H., Kalenscher, T., & Tobler, P. N. (2017). The dopaminergic reward system underpins gender differences in social preferences. *Nature Human Behavior*, 1, pp 819-827.
25. McDonald, B., & Kanske, P. (2023). Gender differences in empathy, compassion, and prosocial donations, but not theory of mind in a naturalistic social task. *Scientific Reports*, 13, 20748 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-47747-9>.
26. Stevens, F., & Taber, K. (2021). The neuroscience of empathy and compassion in pro-social behavior. *Neuropsychologia*, Aug 20;159:107925. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2021.107925
27. Stolarova, M., & Briemann, A. A. (2014). Does anyone need help? Age and gender effects on children's ability to recognize need-of-help. *Front Psychology*. 27; 5:170. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00170. PMID: 24578698; PMCID: PMC3936112.
28. Taylor, Z. E., Eisenberg, N., Spinrad, T. L., Eggum, N. D., & Sulik, M. J. (2013). The relations of ego-resiliency and emotion socialization to the development of empathy and prosocial behavior across early childhood. *American Psychological Association*, Vol. 13 (5), pp 822–831
29. Batson, C.D., Lishner, D.A., & Stocks, E.L. (2015) The empathy—altruism hypothesis. In: Schroeder, D.A, & Graziano, W.G (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Prosocial Behavior* (pp. 259–281). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195399813.013.023>
30. Xiao, W., Lin, X., Li, X., Xu, X., Guo, H., Sun, B., & Jiang, H. (2021). The Influence of emotion and empathy on decisions to help others. *SAGE Open*, 11 (2), pp 1-9.
31. Wood, W., & Faellv, A.H. (2002). A cross-cultural analysis of the behavior of women and men: implications for the origins of sex differences. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(5): pp 699-727. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.128.5.699.
32. Asscheman, J. S., He, J., Koot, S., Buil, J. M., Krabbendam, L., & van Lier, P. A. C. (2020). Classroom peer preferences and the development of sharing behavior with friends and others. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, Vol. 44(5), pp 412–423.
33. Li, R. Y. H., Wong, W. I. (2016). Gender-typed play and social abilities in boys and girls: Are they related?. *Sex Roles*, 74, pp 399–410, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0580-7>.
34. Burleson, B. R. (2003). The experience and effects of emotional support: What the study of cultural and gender differences can tell us about close relationships, emotion, and interpersonal communication. *Personal Relationships*, 10 (1), pp 1-23.
35. Hall, J. A., & Gunnerv, S. D. (2013). Gender differences in nonverbal communication. In J. A. Hall & M. I. Knapp (Eds.). *Nonverbal communication* (pp. 639–669). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110238150.639>.

36. Spadaro, G., Jin, S., & Balliet, D. (2022) Gender differences in cooperation across 20 societies: a meta-analysis. *Philosophical. Transaction. R. Soc. B* 378: 20210438, pp 1-8.
37. Furtner, N., C., Kocher, M. G., Martinsson, P., Matzat, D., & Wollbrant, C. (2021). Gender and cooperative preferences. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 181, pp 39-48.
38. Loeper, M. X., Schwab, S., Lehofer, M., & Hellmich, F. (2022). The role of students' experiences in attitude formation towards peers with non-compliant classroom behaviour in inclusive primary schools. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 37 (6), pp 921-935.
39. Putri, D. M., Arifiana, I., & Suroso (2023). Perilaku prososial siswa regular di sekolah inklusif: Bagaimana peran persepsi iklim sekolah?, *Psychopedia*, 8 (1), pp 1-13.
40. Sinerstein, G. N., Ballard, S. C., Jacobs, H. F., Rodriquez, J., & Shriver, T. P. (2022). "A place for everybody": Students' perspectives on inclusive behavior in school. *Educational Researcher*, 51(6), pp 387-398.
41. Alexander, P. A., Furlong, M. J., Gilman, R., & Huebner, E. S. (2014). Empathy, prosocial behavior, and positive development in schools. In: Spinrad, T. L., & Eisenberg, N (Eds). *Handbook of Positive Psychology in Schools* (pp 82-98). London: Routledge. S. Jacobs and C. P. Bean, "Fine particles, thin films and exchange anisotropy," in *Magnetism*, vol. III, G. T. Rado and H. Suhl, Eds. New York: Academic, 1963, pp. 271-350.

**Open Access** This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

