

# Promotion of prosociality and social justice in primary school: a preliminary experience

**Miguel Ángel Albalá Genol<sup>1</sup>, Jesús Guerra Gamero<sup>2</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> International University of Valencia, Valencia.

<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychological Evolution and Education, Autonomous University of Madrid.

---

**España**

*Correspondence: Miguel Ángel Albalá Genol, Universidad Internacional de Valencia.  
E-mail: miguelangel.albala@campusviu.es*

---

© Universidad de Almería and Ilustre Colegio Oficial de la Psicología de Andalucía Oriental (Spain)

## Abstract

**Introduction.** For decades the Social Justice concept in education has been studied alongside and the possible implications of its use as a tool to promote more prosocial societies. Based on Nancy Fraser's multidimensional Social Justice Model, a program was designed to promote prosociality in 6th grade primary school students. The main objectives of this research were to become acquainted with the student's representations of Social Justice and to promote prosociality through a preliminary implementation of a designed educational program.

**Method.** The methodology was based on eminently participative workshops inspired by cooperative learning. After an initial evaluation of the students' representations of Social Justice, a preliminary implementation of a socio-educational program was carried out with 84 students from various educational schools in Madrid (Spain). This program was structured in three main modules: 1) Discovering Social Justice; 2) Skills to discover and solve social injustices; and 3) Creating a common framework of Social Justice to coexist prosocially. At the end of the program, the changes in the Social Justice representations of the students were quantitatively evaluated.

**Results.** The results showed improvements in the Social Justice representations that were evaluated at the beginning of the preliminary program, as well as in the ability to identify social injustices derived from the various dilemmas analyzed. Furthermore, significant improvements were evidenced in most of the dilemmas evaluated, showing that the students demonstrated a greater prosociality in their approach. Thus, the socio-educational program was effective regardless of gender and type of school to which the participating students belonged.

**Discussion and Conclusion.** Based on this applied preliminary experience, the scope of the socio-educational methodology is discussed in order to promote prosociality through the principles based on Education for Social Justice. We concluded these kinds of programs are capable of promoting a more prosocial coexistence of the students inside and out of the classroom, promoting a greater understanding of the injustices lived by other people. Finally, some detected limitations and possible improvements for the definitive implementation of the program in the future are also discussed.

**Keywords:** Prosociality, Citizenship, Education, Socioeducational Intervention.

## Resumen

**Introducción.** Desde hace décadas se ha estudiado el concepto de Justicia Social en la educación y las posibles implicaciones que tiene como herramienta para promover sociedades más prosociales. A partir del modelo multidimensional de Justicia Social de Nancy Fraser, se diseñó un programa para promover la prosocialidad en estudiantes de 6º curso de educación primaria. Los principales objetivos de estudio fueron conocer las representaciones de Justicia Social que tenía el alumnado y promover la prosocialidad mediante la implementación preliminar de un programa socioeducativo diseñado.

**Método.** La metodología se basó en talleres eminentemente participativos e inspirados en el aprendizaje por cooperación. Después de una evaluación inicial de las representaciones de la Justicia Social del alumnado, se realizó una implementación preliminar de un programa socioeducativo diseñado en 84 estudiantes de diversos centros educativos de Madrid (España). Dicho programa se estructuró en tres módulos principales: 1) Descubriendo la Justicia Social; 2) Habilidades para descubrir y solucionar injusticias sociales; y 3) Creando un marco común de Justicia Social para convivir prosocialmente. Al finalizar el programa fueron evaluados cuantitativamente los cambios producidos en las representaciones de Justicia Social del alumnado.

**Resultados.** Los resultados mostraron mejoras en las representaciones de Justicia Social evaluadas al inicio del programa preliminar, así como, en la capacidad de identificación de injusticias sociales derivadas de los diversos trilemas planteados. Además, se evidenciaron mejoras significativas en la mayoría de los trilemas evaluados, mostrando el alumnado una mayor prosocialidad en el abordaje de estos. Así, el programa socioeducativo se mostró eficaz independientemente del sexo y el tipo de centro educativo al que pertenecía el alumnado participante.

**Discusión y conclusiones.** En base a esta experiencia preliminar aplicada se discuten los alcances de la metodología socioeducativa de cara a promover la prosocialidad mediante los principios basados en la Educación para la Justicia Social. Se concluye que programas de este tipo pueden promover una convivencia más prosocial del alumnado fuera y dentro de las aulas, fomentando en estos una mayor comprensión de las injusticias vividas por otras personas. Por último, exponen algunas limitaciones detectadas y posibles mejoras para la implementación definitiva del programa en el futuro.

**Palabras Clave:** Prosocialidad, Ciudadanía, Educación, Intervención Socioeducativa.

## Introduction

Numerous disciplines have studied and developed the concept of Social Justice as well as its possible implications as a tool for advancing towards more prosocial, equitable societies. Furthermore, these studies have contributed to the development of fields including philosophy, psychology, sociology and politics. However, this powerful academic arsenal have been less important upon being implemented in the field of applied education. Notwithstanding, intervention programs have been developed that, through the development of social and emotional skills, have sought the social adjustment of students and faculty, as well as fomenting empathy and prosociality (Spinrad & Gal, 2018). In the current educational climate marked by the increased presence of diverse minority groups in classrooms, the development of proposals inspired by the principals of inclusion, prosociality, multiculturalism and Social Justice are becoming more important (Jiménez, Lalueza & Fardella, 2017). Thus it has become evident that these theoretical contributions need to be incorporated into practice with the aim of advancing the field. For this reason, the authors of this study have sought to make the focus on Education for Social Justice (Murillo & Hernández-Castilla, 2014) a fundamental tool when it comes time to fight against inequality, exclusion, discrimination and/or social marginalization (Jacott & Maldonado, 2012).

Currently, there are numerous injustices that can be observed in our immediate surroundings (on a local or state level) as well as more far-removed contexts (on a European or international level). On the one hand, these injustices are composed of forms of discrimination and marginalization that have oftentimes affected society for centuries (racism, chauvinism, homophobia, classism, etc.). On the other hand, new types of injustices related to more recent developments are continuously emerging, such as aporophobia (Martínez, 2002), the exclusion of the poorest in society, and, more based in the field of education, bullying (Olweus, 1994; Mateu-Martínez, Piqueras, Rivera-Riquelme, Espada & Orgilés, 2014) and, most recently, cyberbullying (Di Lorenzo, 2012). Reducing and preventing behaviors and attitudes related to the aforementioned injustices must be objectives to be considered if future generations are expected to stop marginalizing an important part of society. Furthermore, there is another powerful reason that highlights the need to work on those principles: bettering communal life at schools. Reviewing existing studies has revealed that mistreatment among peers in Spain is a phenomenon that exists among all social classes and types of schools (Garaigor-

dobil & Oñederra, 2008) and is considered to be a social reality that maintains a steady pattern of behavior (Monjas, Martín-Antón, García-Bacete & Sanchiz, 2014).

According to Nocito Muñoz (2017), the majority of interventions concerning bullying are focused on adolescence, however, on a European scale, data indicates that the most vulnerable victims are schoolchildren between ages 8 and 11 (Rajmil, Alonso, Analitis, Detmar, Erhart, Klein, Ravens-Sieberer, Herdman & Berra, 2009), a period which coincides with the last year of primary school. Along these same lines, there are studies that make it clear that conflicts and other problems with coexistence among the student body aren't exclusive to secondary education but rather begin in earlier ages (Sánchez, 2009). Furthermore, authors such as Eisenbraun (2007) point out the need to confront these situations through prevention and promotion programs. Beginning with their closest context, primary school students can begin to build the basis for coexistence and respect for others.

The role of education in the promotion of equality and social justice is one of the principal concerns of politicians who play key roles when it comes time to decide what is taught at our schools (Smith, 2018). However, education is still a political project integrated in a network of social institutions that often reproduce inequality (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017). Over the last few decades in the field of education, two important landmarks have been produced that deal with the tremendously subjective concept of Social Justice. One of which is the fact that more and more schools and institutes have come to agree upon the necessity of introducing this concept into their education. (García-Lastra, 2013). And the other has been the creation of a solid basis upon which Social Justice can be worked using a three-dimensional perspective (Fraser, 2008) based on the three dimensions of Redistribution, Recognition and Representation in search of inclusive education (Simón, Barrios, Gutiérrez & Muñoz, 2019). Based on this conception, the first concept of Redistribution (Rawls, 1971; Sen 2012), refers to the need for a better distribution of material goods and cultural resources. Secondly, Recognition (Fraser, 1997; Irvine, 2003) focuses on the necessity of an absence of social domination and the respecting and valuing all social groups and people. And thirdly, Representation or Participation (Bell, 1997; Lee & Hipólito-Delgado, 2007) refers to the necessity of participation and representation as a means for all people and groups to have decision-making capacity in aspects which affect their own lives and society in general. Thus, neither the redistribution of wealth nor the recognition of diversity makes much sense without real

representation, being three interconnected factors, that, independently, would be insufficient for a just society. (Fraser, 2008).

This three-dimensional focus may be helping to diminish a few of the obstacles that had traditionally appeared in working with this concept. One of the difficulties with Social Justice lies in the fact that, as a consequence of its highly political nature, it doesn't have any singular meaning (Murillo & Hernández-Castilla, 2011). Based on this perspective, some studies have already shown that differences exist between the representations of each of the three dimensions of Social Justice that students and faculty have. According to Juanes, García, Maldonado and Jacott (2016) it can be concluded that the female sixth grade girls have a more prosocial representation than males of the same grade in the redistribution and recognition dimensions. At the same time, it is the male students of the same grade that have more prosocial representations in the representation and participation dimensions, just like students that come from a less favorable socioeconomic background. At higher education levels too, (such as in secondary school) differences between the sexes of the students were also found (Sainz & Jacott, 2020), specifically that female students showed more prosocial representations.

For psycho-educational analysis related to prosocial behavior, a complex approach that takes into account the multitude of interrelated factors (Garaigordobil, 2003) is required. In recent years, prosocial attitudes and behaviors have been the object of study in psychology and education, fields that have taken into account not only the context of school, but also that of family, culture and other factors linked to personality or biology. Currently, there is evidence concerning mediation that suggests that young people internalize diverse sociocultural factors (such as sociocultural norms, values and society's standards) during socialization that are related to the enactment of prosocial behaviors towards their peers (Garaigordobil, 2014). In certain eastern cultures prosocial conduct is more valued by society and there is more cooperative interaction between young people. Currently, it is accepted that that each culture promotes different socio-moral values that play a key role in the frequency of prosocial conduct of different groups as well as in the justification and reasoning found in the reasoning for helping or not helping other people (Duque, 2017). In this sense, before western societies and education systems that frequently demand competitive individualism for success, educational culture (both scholastic and familial) has a critical part to play in the promotion of prosociality. In this process, family may play an important role, but the acquisition of prosocial behav-

iors truly plays out in the context of school, which, according to Garaigordobil (2014), “has moral development as a critical goal, with emphasis on teaching cooperation with others through the use of educational programs and practices that promote prosociality through models of conduct” (p. 153).

Along these lines, through their leadership and work, education professionals are role models for the student body and, as such, have the capacity to change the way reality is perceived (Jornet-Meliá, Sancho-Álvarez & Bakieva, 2015). According to McAuliffe, Hubbard and Romano (2009), the professor’s cognitions (positive image of the students versus an image of them as aggressive people) and his or her corrective or negative behaviors towards students, mediate prosocial and aggressive behavior. So, it may be critical that, beginning with primary school, the students already know information related to the level of social justice and injustice that they live with (on an international level) in general terms and in personal terms (on a national level, as well as a regional or local level), that is, Education on Social Justice (Murillo & Hernández Castilla, 2011). To establish fair participation strategies, a good preliminary step might be to understand the social injustices of our reality and how best to confront them. For example, a clear relationship has been found between student’s ideas concerning Social Justice and its implication and commitment within schools (Miller, Williamson, George, King, Charest, Bieler & Bolf Beliveau, 2011). Similarly, the importance of family and the limitations of participative educational policies have also been demonstrated, which reflects the shortcomings in the analysis of family strategies that are behind the reproduction of social inequality (Morgade, Poveda & González-Patiño, 2014). In addition, some programs have used games to introduce complex topics relating to the connected global economy (related with economic justice or with redistribution of wealth) in a playful manner (Wartenweiler, 2018). Also, various psycho-educational intervention programs (Cerchiaro-Ceballos, Barras-Rodríguez & Vargas-Romero, 2019; Lozano & Lechuga, 2019), have found better prosocial development in students that are involved with them, reaching levels of prosocial reasoning of greater complexity.

Based on these concepts and findings, this study attempts to incorporate Education for Social Justice through the design of a socio-educational program based on a cooperative methodology oriented toward inclusive education (Cabrera & Davyt, 2015) which is considered to be research for the transformation of socio-educational intervention. This methodological focus is analytical concerning the reality in which it is practiced and looks frequently to-

ward the promotion of critical thinking. From this perspective, an important tool for students would be the introduction of participation as a strategy of action for resolving daily problems and also for achieving a medium-to-long term transformation for the creation of a just and more democratic society. This participation should be transmitted as a basic mechanism for the acquisition of command and control that is associated with the possibility of having an influence in one's environment (Rappaport, 1977). In this way, participation offers opportunities to learn, perfect and put into practices skills related with decision-making and problem-solving (Zimmerman, 2000).

The principal objective of this study was the preliminary implementation of the socio-educational program “*ESOJU: Education in Social Justice*”, with the aim of learning about changes in prosociality in 6<sup>th</sup> grade primary school students. In this sense, the study attempts to analyze, both before and after the invention program, students' capacity for just resolution of trilemmas that require prosocial attitudes. This program had two main objectives: 1) to analyze initial representation, knowledge and ability concerning social justice; 2) to learn about changes in the students' prosocial thinking and representations of Social Justice after the intervention. The hypotheses of the planned study were:

- Hypothesis 1: “The socio-educative program will be effective in bettering the three dimensions that promote social justice.
- Hypothesis 2: “After the preliminary intervention, the students will demonstrate more prosocial representation of social justice, independent of their sex”
- Hypothesis 3: “After the preliminary intervention, the students will show more prosocial representations of social justice, independent of the school to which they belong”.

## **Method**

### *Participants*

In this preliminary study, 84 students of 6<sup>th</sup> grade primary school participated, consisting of 38 female students and 46 male students that belonged to two public schools (30 participants from CEIP Guindalera and 20 participants from CEIP San Ildefonso) and one private school (34 participants from Escuela Privada Ideo) in Madrid, Spain. These schools did not have any kind of education programs related to prosocial education or Social Justice. In the



preliminary application, both public and private schools were sought out with the aim of forming heterogeneous groups of students. The three schools agreed to participate voluntarily in the program, upon being informed about the program's content and after acquiring the signatures of parents and/or legal guardians.

### *Instruments*

At the beginning and end of the preliminary program, the “*Scale on Representation of Social Justice in Primary Students*” or “*SRSJ*” (Juanes, 2018) was used, a tool previously designed and tested for exploring representations of Social Justice, which can be understood to be “the capacity for analyzing and fairly resolving moral trilemmas that contain unjust situations related to the dimensions of distribution, recognition, and representation”. This survey contains 21 trilemmas concerning the three dimensions of Social Justice (redistribution, recognition and representation) that are related with prosocial analysis and resolution of injustices related to the school and daily issues for the students. This survey has been validated by earlier works (Jacott, Maldonado Sainz, Juanes, García-Vélez & Seguro, 2014) that carried out a validation process with a panel of experts in which each of the three alternatives of the dilemmas was validated using the Likert scale of social justice, showing a good intraclass correlation coefficient ( $CCI = .97$ ) just as in relation to other validation indexes ( $CVRt = 0.67$ , Kendall's  $W = 0.62$ , Cohen's Kappa coefficient = 0.48). Furthermore, the scale showed adequate fidelity in its validation, as analyzed through Cronbach's alpha index ( $\alpha = .74$ ). First, in each trilemma, a problem or situation related to the dimensions of social justice was described and then the primary students were able to choose among three possible answers: one that promotes social justice, one that is neutral or promotes Social Justice less than the previous answer, and another that goes against Social Justice. With this survey a global index of the representation of Social Justice and a specific index for each of the three dimensions can be obtained. These indexes are then adapted to have a range from 1 to 100. As an example, what follows is trilemma from the survey related to the redistribution dimension. The most just option is A, C, a less just option and, finally, B is the least just option of the three:

*“Pablo is a boy in the 6th grade who is constantly bothered and harassed by a group of people in his class. Santiago knows what his friends are doing and he wants to stop it. What should he do?”*

- A) *Tell them that they can't do this to Pablo and that if they don't listen to him, ask an adult for help.*
- B) *Not get involved in the dispute to not lose friends*
- C) *Speak with Pablo to help him avoid these situations.*

### *Procedure*

For this study a quasi-experimental, quantitative research design was proposed in which changes in student prosociality were evaluated through pretest and posttest. Control groups were not possible in this study, given the difficulty of acceding to the schools request that all students participate in the program. The type of sample that was done for the study was incidental non-probabilistic (Sampieri, Fernández & Baptista, 2014) since the sample of students was chosen as a function of the access permitted by their schools. At the beginning of the preliminary implementation of the program, the students' initial representation of Social Justice was evaluated through SRSJ. The program consisted of three main modules, with 50 minutes long sessions comprising activities and workshops, approximately the same duration of a normal class at each school. The implementation took place over eight sessions, distributed over eight consecutive weeks. After completing the three modules of activities and workshops, the representation of Social Justice was evaluated again with the same tool used at the outset with the aim of analyzing the possible changes and effectiveness of the program.

The socio-educational intervention program consisted of three main modules: 1) Approximating the Social Justice Concept, 2) Discovering What Is and Is Not Social Justice and 3) Concluding a Common Framework of Coexistence in Social Justice. For this phase, facilitating factors of the implementation process were especially considered (Murillo & Krischesky, 2012) with the aim of balancing between three pairs of contrasting points: simplicity versus complexity, flexibility versus rigidity and fidelity versus adaption. Concerning the contents of the socio-educational program, the first module centered on exploring the 6<sup>th</sup>-grade students' concept of Social Justice. Beginning with this first module, the three-dimensional model of Social Justice is presented through two activities. The first consists of a "Social Justice Contest", focused on seeking cooperation between the participants as a necessary condition for effective participation. In the beginning, three working groups were formed with each one given the task of assessing a dimension of Social Justice. To this end, each group was given information related to defining questions of the dimension they represented

that the other two groups would also have to answer during the course. As a contest, each group was asked a series of questions related with one of the two dimensions of Social Justice they were not provided information for. In this way, though time is limited, each group must depend on others group that have information they are lacking related to the dimension of the question. The helping team may give clues relating to the question according to the information that they possess. Though there are three different working groups divided by the corresponding dimension of Social Justice, they share a common objective: to answer as many questions as possible as a group.

In the second activity of this first module, the students use collaborative games to define the following concepts in their own words: feminism, racism, sexism, classism, equality, poverty, integration, democracy, freedom, etc. Meanwhile, another task in this activity is to associate each concept with one or more dimensions of Social Justice through discussion, thereby contrasting the originally given definitions with those currently generally accepted.

In the second module of the program, the objective is to identify kinds of social injustices and their origin, both individually and collectively with the aim of redressing them. Different activities are developed based on role-play that should actively include the identification and resolution of real or hypothetical situations that occur in everyday life. With each situation, participants ought to acquire different points of view that occur in situations of injustice, fomenting the identification of injustices and empathy for those who suffer them as social skills while resolving these injustices through participation. Finally, methods of resolving the proposed injustices are consensually formed based on the three dimensions of Social Justice.

In the program's third module, the participants representations of Social Justice are evaluated to test if they've changed compared to the beginning of the module (a pretest-posttest of each trilemma using SRSJ). Then, a discussion is led where the students transmit the main concepts that they have learned in the previous sessions. In this phase, the goal is to encourage students to express their own definitions of the concepts that were worked through these activities, as well as the way in which they propose to enact them into reality, inside and out of the classroom. To finish, all this is synthesized through a group mural creation activity which incorporates a concept of Social Justice that has been agreed upon by all participants. This mural will demonstrate the commitment of the group to improving and maintaining a just

atmosphere of coexistence in the classroom. Upon finishing this module, the student's representation of Social Justice is evaluated again through the same survey that was done at the outset.

### *Data Analysis*

For data analysis, SPSS version 23 for Windows 10 was used. First, the Social Justice representation index was obtained for each of the three dimensions evaluated through the Survey of Representation of Social Justice, calculating descriptive statistics ( $M$ ;  $DT$ ) for each trilemma. Then, a *Student T-Test* was employed for related samples with the aim of learning the change in pre-test and post-test prosocial resolution capacity for each trilemma. To learn more deeply about changes in student prosociality, the differences between pre-test and post-test for each specific student involved in the trilemma were analyzed. Lastly, a *Student T-Test* was applied for independent samples with the objective of statistically analyzing the different possible pre- and posttest differences as a function of sex and the type of school. The level of differences was determined to be  $p < .05$ .

## **Results**

First, the results showed changes between pre-test and post-test in the prosociality of the study in each of the dimensions of Social Justice that were analyzed. In this sense, there is evidence that statistically significant improvement in the prosocial resolution of trilemmas related to the dimensions of Recognition and Participation follow the implementation of the program (post-test). As observed in Table 1, the students' post-test evaluation shows higher average scores in all cases compared to the pre-test.

*Table 1. Average Scores in Students Before and After the Intervention.*

	Redistrib. Pre	Redistrib. Post	Sig.	Reconog. Pre	Reconog. Post	Sig.	Partic. Pre	Partic. Post	Sig.
<i>M</i>	16.35	16.93	$p = .34$	16.40	17.38	$p = .037$	15.69	17.38	$p < .001$
<i>SD</i>	2.18	2.05		1.77	1.71		2.19	1.89	

Source: Compiled by the authors based on the results of research.

Regarding the relationship between intragroup comparisons and the pre-test and post-test phases, the results indicate that the participating students obtained significantly higher

scores in the posttest phase of Recognition ( $t_{(84)}= 3.65; p=.037$ ) and Participation ( $t_{(84)}= 5.88; p<.001$ ). These scores show that improvements in the redistribution dimension ( $t_{(84)}= 2.18; p=.34$ ) were not significant when compared to the pre-test.

Afterward, differences between pretest and posttest were analyzed individually in each of the 21 dilemmas that underwent study. As is shown in Table 2, significant statistical differences were evident in the average in the pretest-posttest scores in 12 of the 21 dilemmas analyzed. These differences were found to be heterogeneously distributed in the three dimensions of Social Justice, showing greater changes in prosociality in the Participation dimension, followed by the Recognition and Redistribution dimensions. First, concerning the Redistribution dimension, significant pretest-posttest differences were found ( $p<.05$ ) in dilemmas 14 and 19. In these dilemmas, prosociality as it relates to scholarships and inequality of resources among students was evaluated. Secondly, concerning the Recognition dimension, significant pretest-posttest differences were found ( $p<.05$ ) in dilemmas 1, 2, 16 and 18. These dilemmas are related to tolerance towards: immigrant populations, students with reduced mobility, sexual diversity, and gender among families of the students. Thirdly, the Participation dimension was the one in which significant pretest-posttest differences ( $p<.05$ ) were found in the greatest number of dilemmas (dilemmas 4, 8, 9, 10, 12 and 15). These dilemmas were specifically related to participation in the democratic process, the participation of the students inside and out of the classroom and the participation of the students and teachers towards the resolution of situations of harassment in schools.

*Table 2. Averages scores and differences before and after intervention in each dilemmas evaluated after the preliminary implementation of the educational program.*

	Pre		Post		<i>t</i> ( <i>df</i> )	<i>Sig.</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Redistribution						
Trilema 3	2.27	.71	2.41	.62	-1.31 (84)	.11
Trilema 5	2.69	.57	2.77	.45	-1.14 (84)	.26
Trilema 7	2.79	.55	2.85	.43	-1.16 (84)	.25
Trilema 11	2.20	.72	2.26	.68	-.66 (84)	.51
Trilema 14	1.52	.66	1.64	.71	-2.00 (84)	.049*
Trilema 19	2.47	.83	2.58	.68	-2.04 (84)	.045*
Trilema 20	2.36	.85	2.43	.81	-1.09 (84)	.28

<i>Recognition</i>	Pre		Post		<i>T (df)</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
	<i>Trilema 1</i>	2.24	.84	2.53		
<i>Trilema 2</i>	1.86	.77	1.99	.70	-1.69 (84)	.005*
<i>Trilema 6</i>	2.85	.40	2.89	.31	-.90 (84)	.37
<i>Trilema 13</i>	2.49	.80	2.54	.71	-.75 (84)	.45
<i>Trilema 16</i>	1.99	.49	2.08	.52	-1.57 (84)	.048*
<i>Trilema 17</i>	2.68	.52	2.69	.53	-.33 (84)	.74
<i>Trilema 18</i>	2.24	.87	2.69	.52	-4.42 (84)	.000*
<i>Participation</i>	Pre		Post		<i>t (df)</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
	<i>Trilema 4</i>	2.65	.65	2.85		
<i>Trilema 8</i>	2.35	.65	2.89	.49	-3.29 (84)	.002*
<i>Trilema 9</i>	2.12	.40	2.35	.58	-3.13 (84)	.003*
<i>Trilema 10</i>	1.92	.79	2.26	.62	-4.11 (84)	.000*
<i>Trilema 12</i>	1.91	.85	2.27	.76	-3.83 (84)	.000*
<i>Trilema 15</i>	2.27	.90	2.50	.67	-2.41 (84)	.018*
<i>Trilema 21</i>	2.47	.78	2.55	.67	-1.14 (84)	.26

Source: Compiled by the authors based on the results of research.

As can be seen in Table 3, significant changes in the Recognition and Participation dimensions were found, especially as a function of the sex of the students. Similarly, results showed pretest-posttest changes among the female students in the Recognition and Participation dimensions.

Table 3. Average scores and pre-post differences according to sex.

		Redist.	Redist.	<i>Sig.</i>	Recog.	Recog.	<i>Sig.</i>	Partic.	Partic.	<i>Sig.</i>
		Pre	Post		Pre	Post		Pre	Post	
<i>Male</i>	<i>M</i>	16.26	16.84	$p=.59$	16.25	17.17	$p=.041$	15.46	17.45	$p<.001$
<i>Students</i>	<i>SD</i>	2.26	2.18		1.75	1.82		2.38	1.90	
<i>Female</i>	<i>M</i>	16.50	17.07	$p=.19$	16.65	17.71	$p=.039$	16.07	17.25	$p<.001$
<i>Students</i>	<i>SD</i>	2.08	1.84		1.80	1.51		1.80	1.89	

Source: Compiled by the authors based on the results of research.

On an intragroup level, male students showed significant pretest-posttest differences in the Recognition dimension ( $t_{(84)}=2.30$ ;  $p=.041$ ) and in the Participation dimension ( $t_{(84)}=4.98$ ;  $p<.001$ ). The data for female students also showed statistically significant differences between pretest and posttest in the Recognition ( $t_{(84)}=4.03$ ;  $p=.039$ ) and Participation dimensions

( $t_{(84)}=3.96$ ;  $p<.001$ ). Though some change was noted in the Redistribution dimension, the pretest-posttest difference was not significant in males ( $t_{(84)}=.76$ ;  $p=.59$ ) or females ( $t_{(84)}=.97$ ;  $p=.19$ ). On an intragroup level, there were no significant findings, being that the data for female students showed more prosocial average representations for the Redistribution and Recognition dimension as the data for males did for the Participation dimension.

Finally, based on the pretest-posttest results as a function of the types of school of the students, as can be seen in Table 4 below, significant differences in the Recognition and Participation dimension were found, but not so for the Redistribution dimension.

Table 4. Average scores and differences before and after the program by type of school.

		Redist.			Recog.			Partic.		
		Pre	Post	Sig.	Pre	Post	Sig.	Pre	Post	Sig.
Private	M	15.65	15.95	$p=.98$	16.86	17.72	$p=.036$	15.36	17.77	$p<.001$
	SD	2.03	1.80		1.67	1.45		2.15	1.84	
Public	M	16.62	17.33	$p=.58$	16.19	17.23	$p=.029$	15.82	17.21	$p<.001$
	SD	2.19	2.02		1.79	1.81		2.21	1.90	

Source: Compiled by the authors based on the results of research.

On an intragroup level, the students from the private education system showed significantly more prosocial representations in the Recognition dimension ( $t_{(84)}=2.18$ ;  $p=.36$ ) after participating in the intervention program. Students from the public education system also showed significantly more prosocial, post-intervention representations in the Recognition ( $t_{(84)}=3.67$ ;  $p=.029$ ) and Participation dimensions ( $t_{(84)}=4.89$ ;  $p<.001$ ). In the Redistribution dimension, though pre-post improvements were found, they were not significant in the data for the private school students ( $t_{(84)}=.12$ ;  $p=.98$ ) or public school students ( $t_{(84)}=.78$ ;  $p=.58$ ). On an intragroup level, significant differences were not found between pretest and posttest scores as a function of the type of school. Regardless, it was public school students that showed better pretest and posttest scores in the Recognition dimension, as well as better posttest scores in the Participation dimension. The private school students showed higher pretest and posttest scores in the Redistribution dimension, as well as better pretest scores in the Participation dimension.

## Discussion and Conclusions

This study contributes to the understanding of the spaces and professionals of education as possible agents for the transformation and improvement of students in terms of their prosociality. In this sense, the preliminary implementation of this socio-educational program has demonstrated its effectiveness in bettering the prosociality in the representations of social justice of 6th-grade, primary school students. From the students' perspective, the teacher modifies their abilities upon when they are employed in academic activities, as much in terms of the student's abilities as in their procedures at work and in their participation in classes (Lobos, Bustos & Díaz, 2019). However, having an educational environment that is explicitly oriented toward the search for social justice is also recommendable. Students don't just understand the educational space as a place to acquire critical lessons but also as a space to develop as people, responsible for themselves and the world they live in (Perines & Hidalgo, 2018). In this sense, the program described in this study has a clear orientation towards the establishment of models of prosocial coexistence in the educational space through activities and workshops (e.g. the group-project coexistence mural or roleplay) that seek to provide examples and strategies for the resolution and prevention of unjust situations.

After the preliminary implementation of this program, changes in prosociality rates for the three dimensions of social justice were found, the most significant of them being in the dimensions of Recognition and Participation. In particular, the students improved their prosociality in the Participation dimension, showing an understanding of the transversality of this dimension for the attainment of redistribution and recognition (Sainz, 2017). In the three intervention modules, participation was proposed as a key element for making the students able to resolve diverse theoretical and practical trilemmas. In this sense, the program showed itself to be consistent with "the principle of participatory parity" (Fraser 2008) according to which social justice is not achieved through the mere transmission of knowledge concerning Redistribution and Recognition but rather requires the effective participation of all implicated parties. It's important to note that, because the novelty of this approach, there are no antecedents of studies that have worked with prosociality as measured through trilemmas based on social justice. Even so, there have been intervention programs that promote prosociality in primary school education, though they were based on variables like empathy and emotional intelligence. So, several previous studies support the importance of the participation dimension as one of the most effective forms of promoting prosociality (Spinrad & Gal, 2018).



The findings are also consistent with the results of descriptive studies in primary and higher education levels concerning tendencies regarding the sex of the students (Sainz & Jacott, 2020; Juanes, Jacott & Maldonado, 2017). Once the preliminary program was implemented, both male and female students improved their level of prosociality, resolving on average a greater number of dilemmas in a just way. This data supports the notion that it is possible to promote prosociality through principles based on social justice between the students (and future citizens) with socio-educational interventions independently of their sex. Thus, this type of in-school intervention entails an educational method that manages to improve conflict resolution, prevent harassment and better personal development (Pérez-Albarracín & Fernández-Baena, 2019). In the future, further study of the difference between male and female students in the three dimensions is needed, as well as other psycho-educational variables.

As for the differences related to the types of schools involved in the study, it is noteworthy that in the private school students showed lower prosociality towards dilemmas related to the Redistribution dimension. It is worth pointing out that in Madrid, 77.6% of foreign students are educated in public school and 22.9% in private schools (Goenechea, 2016), which suggests that the profile of private school students may be more homogenous than that of public schools. It would follow that there is greater socioeconomic and cultural diversity in public schools and this could make some issues related to social justice, particularly in the Redistribution dimension, more present in the classrooms of public schools than private ones. Regardless, in the Recognition and Participation dimensions, initial prosociality levels as well as the extent to which they increased were similar independent of the school type. For future studies, it would be recommendable to broaden the implementation of the program to include charter schools, and to achieve greater diversity in participating public and private schools. Furthermore, future studies will need to include diverse family-related factors in their analysis since, according to Garaigordobil (2014), it can be seen that prosocial behavior in children is positively influenced through the attachment, altruism and behavioral model of their parents.

As for the methodology of this study, in order for the program to be more effective and have a greater impact, it would be recommendable to increase the length of its implementation or even include it along with other psycho-educational interventions as a regular activity in schools. Furthermore, the regular inclusion of the program in schools would represent a

great opportunity for methodological advance as its evaluation could be broadened. In this sense, according to Pérez Juste (2006); Pérez-González (2008) we also recommend an evaluation in three distinct moments: an initial evaluation that evaluates the program's adequacy for its intended context and participants; a procedural or continual evaluation that runs along the course of the program and a final or summary evaluation that considers the results or achievements of the program, including a assessment of those results.

In this study, an evaluation was carried out according to a pretest-posttest design that will be complimented in future studies with an evaluation of the implementation. According to Bono Cabré (2012), future studies associated with the implementation of the program will add control groups of participants to increase the internal validity of the results. One limitation of the present study has been the unequal improvement of prosociality towards each dimension of social justice. In this sense, its worth reflecting on the effectiveness of the focus in which participation took on a greater weight as an action for the achievement of prosociality. In future experiences, it would worthwhile to make it more explicit to students that redistribution and recognition are necessary elements for the resolution of social injustices. Also, in future studies the evaluation could be improved by the inclusion of qualitative methodologies, since, according to Morgade, Poveda and González-Patiño (2014) "this would attempt to comprehend how children confront their surroundings, how they adapt and integrate the resources that are offered to them and how they adapt their way of living as function of what they have access to" (p. 764).

For years, socioeconomic crisis has contributed to the creation of societies that are increasingly unequal and unjust (Sotomayor, Merklen & García-Domingo, 2017). Given this, one of the main pillars for bettering and transforming this situation would be including "Education for Social Justice" (Murillo & Hernández-Castilla, 2011). In this way, in the future, students will be able to transform society and redress situations of individual or collective injustice. And so, the three-dimensional model of Social Justice (Fraser, 2008) presents itself as a tool for understanding the origin of these oppressions and for participating in education for social transformation. These ideas span diverse ways of making sense of the role that socio-educational practices play in student's development, along with the systematic involvement diverse spaces in their process: schools, cities, homes and others (Morgade, Poveda & González-Patiño, 2014). Thus, educational institutions must become involved since, for example in terms of economic justice or redistribution, a just system can in no way victimize (or

reward) people for the luck or lack of luck with which they were born (and, therefore, have not chosen), but instead must counteract this tendency (Bolívar, 2012). Therefore, we conclude that engagement in well-grounded, multidisciplinary debate is critical to a platform from which it is possible to take applied educational proposals to promote prosociality, studying diverse factors and psychosocial, socio-educational variables.

## References

- Balsells, M. À., Peláez, N. F., Gomà, M. M., Inchaurredo, A. M., & Hoz, V. V. (2010). Innovación socioeducativa para el apoyo de adolescentes en situación de acogimiento familiar. *Educar*, 45, 133-148. Retrieved from: <https://www.raco.cat/index.php/Educar/article/view/214612>
- Bell, L. A. (1997). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. En M. Adams, L. A. Bell y P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook*. Nueva York: Routledge.
- Bolívar, A. (2012). Justicia social y equidad escolar, una revisión actual. *Revista Internacional de Educación para la Justicia Social*, 1 (1), 9-45. Retrieved from: <http://hdl.handle.net/10486/9162>
- Bono Cabré, R. (2012). *Diseños cuasi-experimentales y longitudinales*. Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona.
- Cabrera, C. y Davyt, A. (2015). Aprendizaje cooperativo en estudiantes de ciencias exactas y naturales: el “Programa Compromiso Educativo”. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, 67(1), 203-216. Retrieved from: <https://rieoei.org/historico/expe/6739Cabrera.pdf>
- Cerchiaro-Ceballos, E., Barras-Rodríguez, R., y Vargas-Romero, H. (2019). Juegos cooperativos y razonamiento prosocial en niños: efectos de un programa de intervención. *Duazary*, 16(3), 40-53. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.21676/2389783X.2967>
- Cole, M. (2000). *Education, equality and human rights: Issues of gender, 'race,' sexuality, special needs and social class*. Londres: Routledge.
- Di Lorenzo, M. (2012). Nuevas formas de violencia entre pares: del bullying al cyberbullying. *Revista Médica del Uruguay*, 28(1), 48-53. Retrieved from: [http://www.scielo.edu.uy/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=S1688-03902012000100007&lng=es&tlng=](http://www.scielo.edu.uy/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1688-03902012000100007&lng=es&tlng=)

- Duque, M. C. C. (2017). Aproximaciones epistemológicas y conceptuales de la conducta prosocial. *Revista del Instituto de Estudios Superiores en Educación*, 27, 1-21. Doi: [10.14482/zp.27.10978](https://doi.org/10.14482/zp.27.10978)
- Dworkin, R. (1981). What is Equality? Equality of Resources. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 10 (4), 283-345. Retrieved from: [www.jstor.org/stable/2264894](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2264894)
- Eisenbraun, K. (2007). Violence in School: Prevalence, Prediction, and Prevention. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 12, 459-469. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2006.09.008>
- Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interuptus. Critical reflexions on the "Postsocialist" Condition*. Nueva York: Routledge.
- Fraser, N. (2008). *Scales of Justice*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Garaigordobil, M. y Oñederra, J.A. (2008). Estudios epidemiológicos sobre la incidencia del acoso escolar e implicaciones educativas. *Información Psicológica*, 94, 14-35. Retrieved from: <http://www.informaciopsicologica.info/OJSmottif/index.php/leonardo/article/view/236>
- Garaigordobil, M. (2003). *Intervención psicológica para desarrollar la personalidad infantil. Juego, conducta prosocial y creatividad*. Madrid: Pirámide.
- Garaigordobil, M. (2014). Conducta prosocial: el papel de la cultura, la familia, la escuela y la personalidad. *Revista Mexicana de investigación en Psicología*, 6(2), 146-157. Retrieved from: <https://www.medigraphic.com/cgi-bin/new/resumen.cgi?IDARTICULO=70550>
- García-Lastra, M. (2013). Educar en la sociedad contemporánea: Hacia un nuevo escenario educativo. *Convergencia*, 20(62), 199-220. Retrieved from: <https://convergencia.uaemex.mx/article/view/1042>
- Goenechea, C. (2016). La escuela pública de la España multicultural. *Revista interuniversitaria de formación del profesorado*, 85, 111-119. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.9685/i2863>
- Gómez, E. N. y Alatorre, F. J. (2014). La intervención socioeducativa: Cuando se juega en la cancha del otro. *Sinética*, 43, 01-17. Retrieved from: [http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=S1665-109X2014000200002&lng=es&tlng=es](http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1665-109X2014000200002&lng=es&tlng=es)
- Irvine, J. (2003). *Educating teachers for diversity: Seeing with a cultural eye*. Nueva York: Teachers College Press.

- Jacott, L. y Maldonado, A. (2012). La educación para la ciudadanía: Nuevos retos y perspectivas desde el enfoque de la justicia social. *Revista Internacional de Educación para la Justicia Social*, 2(1), 5-13. Retrieved from: <http://hdl.handle.net/10486/13532>
- Jacott, L., Maldonado, A., Sainz, V., Juanes, A., García-Vélez, T. y Seguro, V. (2014). Representations of social justice amongst Spanish teachers and students. En P. Cunningham y N. Fretwell (Eds.), *Innovative Practice and Research Trends in Identity, Citizenship and Education*. Londres: CiCe.
- Jiménez, F., Lalueza, J. L., y Fardella, C. (2017). Aprendizajes, inclusión y justicia social en entornos educativos multiculturales. *Revista electrónica de investigación educativa*, 19(3), 10-23. Doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24320/redie.2017.19.3.830>
- Jornet-Meliá, J.M. Sancho-Álvarez, C. y Bakieva, M. (2015). Diseño y validación del constructo teórico de Justicia Social percibida por el alumnado de centros escolares. *Revista Internacional de Educación para la Justicia Social*, 4(2), 111-126.
- Juanes, A. (2018). *Representaciones de justicia social en estudiantes de Educación Primaria. Estudio cuantitativo y cualitativo comparado entre España y Argentina* (Tesis Doctoral). Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España. Retrieved from: <http://hdl.handle.net/10486/682707>
- Juanes, A., Jacott, L. y Maldonado, A. (2017). Representaciones de justicia social en profesores en formación. *Revista Internacional de Didáctica y Organización Educativa*, 3(2), 26-45. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15366/riejs2015.4.2>
- Juanes, A., Sainz, V. Garcia, T., Maldonado, A., y Jacott, L. (2016). Social justice: A qualitative and quantitative study of representations of social justice in children of primary education. *SHS Web of Conferences* 26, 1-5. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20162601054>
- Lee, C.C. e Hipólito-Delgado, C. (2007). Counselors as agents of social justice. In C.C. Lee (Ed.). *Counseling for Social Justice*, 13-38. Alexandria: American Counseling Association.
- Lozano, J. S. H., & Lechuga, B. M. (2019). Programa psicoeducativo para desarrollar la conducta prosocial en niños de edad escolar. In *IX Congreso Estudiantil y IV Congreso internacional de investigación en Psicología*. México: FES Zaragoza.
- Martínez, E. (2002). "Aporofobia". En J. Conill (presidente). *Glosario para una Sociedad Intercultural*. Bancaja, Valencia.
- Mateu-Martínez, O., Piqueras, J.A., Rivera-Riquelme, Espada, J.O. y Orgilés, M. (2014). Aceptación /rechazo social infantil: relación con problemas emociones e inteligencia

- emocional. *Avances en Psicología*, 22(2), 205-213. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.33539/avpsicol.2014.v22n2.190>
- McAuliffe, M. D., Hubbard, J. A., & Romano, L. J. (2009). The role of teacher cognition and behavior in children's peer relations. *Journal of abnormal child psychology*, 37(5), 665-677. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-009-9305-5>
- Miller, S., Williamson, P., George, M., King, J., Charest, B., Bieler, D., & Bolf Beliveau, D. (2011). Extending the conversation: Applying the CEE position statement 'beliefs about social justice in English education' to classroom praxis. *English Education*, 44(1), 63-80. Retrieved from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23238723>
- Monjas, M. I., Martín-Antón, L., García-Bacete, F.J. y Sanchiz, M. L. (2014). Rechazo y victimización al alumnado con necesidad de apoyo educativo en primero de primaria. *Anales de Psicología*, 30(2). Doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.6018/analesps.30.2.158211>
- Morgade, M. S., Poveda, D., & González-Patiño, J. (2014). Del hogar a la ciudad como camino de ida y vuelta en el desarrollo de la identidad: El caso de las rutinas de la infancia urbana de clase media/alta en Madrid. *Educação e Sociedade*, 35(128), 761-780. Retrieved from: <http://hdl.handle.net/10486/667078>
- Murillo, F.J. y Hernández Castilla, R. (2011). Hacia un concepto de justicia social. *Revista Iberoamericana sobre Calidad, Eficacia y Cambio en Educación*, 9(4), 7-23. Retrieved from: <http://www.rinace.net/reice/numeros/arts/vol9num2/art1.pdf>
- Murillo, F.J. y Hernández-Castilla, R. (2014). Liderando Escuelas Justas para la Justicia Social. *Revista Internacional de Educación para la Justicia Social*, 3(2), 13-32. Retrieved from: <https://revistas.uam.es/riejs/article/view/337>
- Murillo, F.J. y Krichesky, G.J. (2012). El proceso del cambio escolar. Una guía para impulsar y sostener la mejora en las escuelas. *Revista Iberoamericana sobre Calidad, Eficacia y Cambio en Educación*, 10(10), 1-18. Retrieved from: <http://www.rinace.net/reice/numeros/arts/vol10num1/art2.pdf>
- Nocito Muñoz, G. (2017). Investigaciones sobre el acoso escolar en España: implicaciones psicoeducativas. *REOP-Revista Española de Orientación y Psicopedagogía*, 28(1), 104-118. Doi: [doi.org/10.5944/reop.vol.28.num.1.2017.19361](https://doi.org/10.5944/reop.vol.28.num.1.2017.19361)
- Olweus D. (1994) Bullying at schools: basic facts and effects of a school-based intervention program. *Child Psychol Psychiatry*, 35(7), 1171-1190. Doi: [10.1111/j.1469-7610.1994.tb01229.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1994.tb01229.x)

- Peña, K. L., Bustos, C., & Díaz, A. (2019). Impact of teacher training on academic self-concept and educational outcomes. *Electronic Journal of Research in Education Psychology*, 17(49), 519-540. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.25115/ejrep.v17i49.2219>
- Pérez-Albarracín, A. y Fernández-Baena, J. (2019). Beyond conflict resolution: socio-emotional learning in student mediators. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 17(2), 335-358. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.25115/ejrep.v17i48.2223>
- Pérez-González, J.C. (2008). A proposal for evaluating socio-emotional education programs. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 6 (2), 522-546. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.25115/ejrep.v6i15.1285>
- Perines, H. e Hidalgo, N. (2018). “La escuela confía en que los estudiantes podemos cambiar el mundo”: un estudio de las escuelas que trabajan para la justicia social. *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, 75, 19-38. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.17227/rce.num75-8099>
- Rajmil, L, Alonso, J. Analitis, F., Detmar, S., Erhart, M., Klein, M., Ravens-Sieberer, U., Herdman, M., y Berra, S. (2009). Víctimas de acoso: factores asociados en niños y adolescentes de 8 -18 años de edad en 11 países europeos. *Pediatrics*, 67 (2), 111-118. Retrieved from: <https://www.elsevier.es/es-revista-pediatrics-10-pdf-13134910>
- Rappaport, J. (1977). *Community psychology: Values, research and action*. Nueva York: Rinehart and Winston.
- Rawls, J. A. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sainz, V. (2017). *Representaciones de la justicia social en profesores y estudiantes de Educación Secundaria* (Tesis Doctoral, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid). Retrieved from: <http://hdl.handle.net/10486/680617>
- Sainz, V. y Jacott, L. (2020). What Do Secondary Education Students Understand About Social Justice? Students Representations of Social Justice in Different Regions of Spain. *Interchange*, 51, 1-22. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10780-020-09389-y>
- Sampieri, H., Collado, F., & Lucio, B. (2014). *Metodología de la investigación*. México D.F.: McGraw-Hill.
- Sánchez, C. (2009). *Nivel de implicación en bullying entre escolares de educación primaria. Relación con el estatus sociométrico y la percepción del clima social familiar y escolar* (Tesis doctoral. Murcia, Universidad de Murcia). Retrieved from: <https://www.tesisenred.net/handle/10803/11028#page=1>
- Sen, A. (2009). *The idea of Justice*. Nueva York: Penguin Press. Madrid: Taurus.
- Sensoy, O. y DiAngelo, R. (2017). *Is everyone really equal?: An introduction to key concepts in social justice education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Simón, C., Barrios, Á., Gutiérrez, H., y Muñoz, Y. (2019). Equidad, Educación Inclusiva y Educación para la Justicia Social. ¿Llevan Todos los Caminos a la Misma Meta?. *Revista Internacional de Educación para la Justicia Social*, 8(2), 17-32. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.15366/riejs2019.8.2.001>
- Smith, E. 2018. *Key issues in education and social justice*. London: Sage.
- Sotomayor, E., Merklen, D. y García-Domingo, M. (2017). Transformaciones sociales en la Europa de la crisis: la gestación de la desigualdad social. *Index de Enfermería*, 26(3), 185-189. Retrieved from: <http://www.index-f.com/index-enfermeria/v26n3/2635.php>
- Spinrad, T. L., & Gal, D. E. (2018). Fostering prosocial behavior and empathy in young children. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 20, 40-44. Doi: [10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.08.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.08.004)
- Wartenweiler, T. (2018). Serious play in education for social justice-An exploratory study. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*, 7(1), 61-69. Doi: [10.7821/naer.2018.1.260](https://doi.org/10.7821/naer.2018.1.260)
- Yáñez, S. V. (1996). Preferencias perceptuales de estilo de aprendizaje en cuatro escuelas primarias. *Revista mexicana de investigación educativa*, 1(2), 283-313. Retrieved from: <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=140/14000203>
- Zimmerman, P. (2000). Empowerment Theory: Psychological, Organizational and Community Levels of Analysis. En J. Rappaport y E. Seidman (Eds.), *Handbook of Community Psychology*. Nueva York: Kluwer Academic Plenum.

---

**Received:** 30-03-2020

**Accepted:** 28-05-2020