With a Little Help From My Friends: Bystander Context and Children's Attitude Toward Peer Helping

Jellie Sierksma [a] , Jochem Thijs [a] & Maykel Verkuyten [a]

[a] Utrecht University
Accepted author version posted online: 13 Dec 2013.Published online: 13 Dec 2013.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

With a Little Help From My Friends: Bystander Context and Children's Attitude Toward Peer Helping

JELLIE SIERKSMA

JOCHEM THIJS

MAYKEL VERKUYTEN

Utrecht University

ABSTRACT. This experimental vignette study examines children's perception and evaluation of helping a peer in the context of friendships and in the presence of by-standing peers. A total of 1246 children (8 to 12 years) reported their attitude towards helping when either friends of the helper, friends of the recipient of help, or no bystanders were present. In agreement with the competitive altruism model, children most strongly endorsed helping when friends of the helper were present compared to the other two situations. This indicates that children take reputation concerns into account when evaluating helping situations. However, in contrast to lower prosocial children, the evaluations of higher prosocial children were not influenced by the presence of by-standing peers. These children seemed to base their evaluation on increasing the recipient's welfare and less on reputation concerns of the helper.

Address correspondence to Jellie Sierksma, Utrecht University, Ercomer, Padualaan 14, Utrecht 3584CH, The Netherlands; j.sierksma@uu.nl (e-mail).

IN CONTRAST TO THE EXTENSIVE RESEARCH on children's out-group stereotypes and prejudices (see Brown, 2010; Levy & Killen, 2008) little is known about how children evaluate out-group helping. Furthermore, existing research focuses on the perception and evaluation of 'isolated' group members by asking children to use trait adjectives for evaluating out-group members and by using stories and pictures in which an out-group peer or an interpersonal interaction is presented (Killen & Rutland, 2011). However, real-life social behavior often occurs in the presence of others and by-standing children can influence behavior towards out-group members (e.g., Aboud & Joong, 2008).

During late childhood and early adolescence children experience important socio-cognitive changes (Aboud, 2008; Quintana, 1998). They develop increased awareness about the responsibility to help, but also learn that prosocial behavior is not always necessary or socially appropriate (see Hay, 1994; Hay & Cook, 2007). From the age of 5, children are aware that onlookers might influence behavior (Banerjee & Yuill, 1999), and helping behavior is based on inferred expectations about what other's think or expect (e.g., Fischer et al., 2011; Levine, Cassidy, Brazier, & Reicher, 2002). This means that children's evaluation of helping might not only depend on the peer group membership of the recipient of help, but also on who the by-standing peers are.

The current study goes beyond previous research by examining how by-standing friends of the helper and of the recipient of the help, influence children's (8 to 12 years old) attitude towards

out-group helping. We focus on out-group helping because it is less normative and common than helping of in-group members (e.g., Fehr, Bernhard, & Rockenback, 2008; Warneken & Tomasello, 2009), and little is known about the psychological processes underlying children's evaluation of out-group helping. We portrayed and examined out-group helping in the context of friendships because this relational context is familiar and realistic for children.

An experimental vignette study was conducted in which children indicated their attitude towards helping a non-friend (out-group peer) when either friends of the helper or of the recipient of help were present. To examine whether children's attitude depends on the need of the recipient we also systematically varied the recipient's level of need (low versus moderate). Theoretically, we used two frameworks for deriving contrasting hypotheses. First, moral foundations theory (Graham et al., 2011) argues that children will use the principle of group loyalty to define a moral obligation to help one's friends. Second, the competitive altruistic model (Hardy & Van Vugt, 2006; Roberts, 1998) argues that reputation concerns might inform children's attitude towards helping. An overview of the contrasting predictions is presented Table 1 and discussed next.

Children's cognitions about prosocial behavior become morally informed around the pre-school and middle-school years (see Hay & Cook, 2007). According to moral foundations theory (Graham, et al., 2011), group loyalty is a central moral obligation and research in different countries has revealed the moral importance of loyalty to one's group (Fiske, 1992). This is particularly true for relational groups that are based on personalized bonds, such as friendships (Brewer & Gardner, 1996). Therefore, it is generally expected that individuals will take care and

feel responsible for members of their own relational group. This is in line with research on the subjective group dynamics that shows that children tend to disapprove of disloyal group members (Abrams, Rutland, & Cameron, 2003).

The presence of by-standing others might lead children to use group loyalty as a principle for evaluating helping, but only when the recipient's friends are present. These friends are expected to be loyal and help the peer in need and thereby lower the perceived obligation of a non-friend to offer help. Therefore, following moral foundations theory it can be expected that children will less strongly endorse the need to help when recipient' friends are present compared to a situation in which there are friends of the helper.

Apart from loyalty considerations, reputation concerns might influence children's perception and evaluation of helping behavior. The well-known bystander effect indicates that individuals are less likely to help in ambiguous situations when other people are around as compared to when they are alone. However, our study examines explicit helping situations and several studies and real-life examples indicate that sometimes more help is provided in the presence of by-standing others compared to when one is alone (e.g., Fischer et al., 2011; Fischer & Greitemeyer, 2013). This stronger helping behaviour in public situations is attributed to self-presentational motives and reputation concerns of the helper, for which there is experimental evidence among adults (Bereczkei, Birkás, & Kerekes, 2007; Van Bommel, Van Prooijen, Elffers, & Van Lange, 2012). Research, for example, shows that subtle eye cues as well as imagining being watched are sufficient to trigger self-presentational concerns (Jaeggi, Burkart, & Van Schaik, 2010). The competitive altruism model (Hardy & Van Vugt, 2006; Roberts, 1998) argues that altruism is an

effective way to assert oneself in the group because it signals trustworthiness and competence and consequently enhances the reputation of the helper. Helping is especially likely to boost one's reputation when it is public, costly and reflective of an underlying characteristic (Hardy & Van Vugt, 2006). Helping someone who does not belong to your group of friends will enhance one's reputation because it is more unexpected and costly than helping a friend, making it more diagnostic of one's virtuous character (Reicher & Haslam, 2010).

From kindergarten on, children are concerned about their self-reputation and understand how impression management might influence behavior of other's (e.g., Banerjee, Bennett, & Luke, 2010; Hatch, 1987; Sluckin, 1981). They are also able to attribute self-presentational motives to others and to provide spontaneous explanations for others' self-presentational behavior (Banerjee & Yuill, 1999). If reputation concerns inform children's evaluation of helping, the friendship context is expected to influence their evaluation. It is likely that an audience of friends more strongly increases perceived reputation benefits compared to the presence of non-friends. Friends are important significant others and signs of virtue and trustworthiness as a friend can improve one's peer reputation in the long run. In contrast, bystanders who are not friends are less significant for one's reputation, for one thing, because one might never see them again. Therefore, following the competitive altruism model it can be expected that children will more strongly endorse helping when friends of the helper are present compared to the situation in which there are friends of the recipient.

As shown in Table 1, both loyalty considerations and reputation concerns lead to the prediction of stronger endorsement of helping when friends of the helper are present as opposed to friends

of the recipient. However, the underlying reasons are different because group loyalty implies a less strong endorsement of help when friends of the recipient can intervene, and reputational considerations imply a stronger endorsement of help when friends of the helper are present. One way to disentangle these two mechanisms is by extending the research design with a situation in which no bystanders are present. When group loyalty informs children's attitude, it is expected that they will less strongly endorse helping a peer when friends of the recipient are present compared to the situation in which there are no bystanders. In addition, there should not be a difference between the situations of 'no bystanders' and 'friends of the helper' because group loyalty concerns are not relevant in both these situations. In contrast, when reputation is the main principle used for evaluating helping, children should more strongly endorse helping a peer when friends of the helper are present compared to when there are no bystanders. Moreover, no difference should be found between the situations in which friends of the recipient or no bystanders are present (see Table 1).

Individual differences in prosociality might influence the perception and endorsement of helping (Simpson & Willer, 2008). Children differ in the degree to which they tend to behave prosocially and research shows (modest) individual consistency over time and contexts in prosocial behavior (Eisenberg, Fabes, & Sprinrad, 2006). This prosocial tendency indicates an other-directed focus such as a needs-oriented reasoning (e.g., Janssens & Dekovic, 1997; Penner, Fritzsche, Craiger, & Freifeld, 1995) and feelings of empathy (Davis, Luce, & Kraus, 1994). This might mean that high prosocial children will focus more on the recipient's welfare and therefore feel that those who are in need should be helped. This would mean that high prosocial children's evaluation of helping a peer will not be influenced by the presence of by-standing peers with the related

considerations of group loyalty or peer reputation. In contrast, low prosocial children are more sensitive to and preoccupied with their own performances in social situations (Penner et al., 1995) and therefore might focus less on the recipient's need and more on the bystander context. This reasoning means that the expectations for group loyalty and peer reputation will apply to low rather than high prosocial children.

Next to individual differences, situational factors might influence children's attitude towards helping. We therefore varied the degree of help needed by the recipient (i.e., low and moderate). It is likely that children more strongly endorse helping a peer when the need for help is higher. However, the additional question that concerns us here and that will be explored empirically is whether the level of need has an influence on considerations of group loyalty or peer reputation.

In sum, this research examines how by-standing friends of the helper and of the recipient of the help, influence children's attitude towards out-group helping. In addition, individual differences in children's prosociality were taken into account as well as the recipient's level of need.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Participants were 1246 children (grades 4 through 6) attending 22 primary schools from different cities in the Netherlands. After listwise deletion for missing data, 1221 children were included in the present analysis. These children were between 8 and 12 years of age ($M = 10.73$, $SD = 1.00$),

with 47.9 % boys. Participation in the study was voluntary and anonymous, and parental permission was obtained.

The children were given a short booklet in the context of their classroom and under supervision of their teacher and a research assistant. The booklets were randomly divided over the children in the classrooms. Children read the stories alone and answered the questions independently. In a first section at the beginning of the booklet children were presented with four stories to assess their attitude towards helping. After various other, unrelated questions and in a separate section at the end of the questionnaire, children responded to questions about their prosocial behavior.

Material

Stories. Four different stories were developed and presented to the children using a 3 (bystander-context) by 2 (need) between-subjects design. Thus, there were 6 versions of the booklet, in which bystander-context (friends of helper, friends of recipient, no bystanders) and level of need (low versus moderate) was systematically and randomly varied between children and within classrooms. The between-subject design allowed us to create a more extensive measure of children's attitude towards helping by averaging their responses across four comparable situations. Because helping a friend is normative and common, in all stories the helper was not a friend of the one asking for help. Furthermore, because our aim was to test two theories that can explain why bystanders increase helping we tried to diminish the role of diffusion of responsibility that underlies the common bystander effect of decreased helping. Therefore, in each of the stories the recipient of help explicitly asked a non-friend for help.

For the situation of moderate need and friends of the recipient being present, the stories were: "Susan is playing outside with her friends. Emma is *not a friend* but also participates. Suddenly Susan feels very sick. She asks Emma to go to her house as fast as she can and get her mother" (1), "Bas is playing soccer with his friends. Jeroen is *not his friend*, but is also playing. Then Bas sprains his ankle. It really hurts a lot. He asks Jeroen to help him to the side of the soccer pitch" (2), Marcel is doing homework with his friends. Kevin sits with them but is *not a friend*. Marcel has to give a speech tomorrow but has no idea how to do that. He is very scared. He asks Kevin to help him with the speech" (3), Lisa is at a children's farm with her friends. Anne is also at the farm but is *not a friend*. Lisa has lost her little brother and she is scared. She asks Anne to help her find him" (4).

The level of need was varied such that for low need the recipient of help felt a little tired (story 1), the ankle hurt a little (story 2), he did not know how to prepare the speech (story 3), the recipient had not seen her brother for a little while (story 4). For the bystander context the relation between helper and by-standing peers was described such that the recipient of help was with his or her friends, the helper was with his or her friends, or there were no bystanders with helper and recipient not knowing each other.

All stories were followed by the statement "Some children think (*name helper*) should help, but others do not". This statement was used to indicate that helping in these situations is not self-evident or common. Subsequently the attitude towards helping was assessed by asking "Do you think (*name helper*) should help?" Children could answer on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*no*), to 3 (*in between*) to 5 (*yes!*). This format avoids positive self-presentations and socially desirable

responding and invites children to indicate their own attitude towards helping rather than a perceived social norm (see Harter, 1999). Principal component analysis showed that the answers to the four vignettes loaded on one factor and explained 45.51 % of the total variance, and thus they were included in a single score with a Cronbach's alpha of .59. The alpha is not very high but the four stories are used as one index of helping instead of a latent variable (see Streiner, 2003). Moreover, additional analyses for each story separately yielded the same pattern of results.

Prosociality. To measure children's prosocial tendency we used the self-report version of the five-item prosocial subscale from the Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ; Goodman, 1997). The SDQ is a brief, widely used screening and research instrument, and good psychometric qualities have been reported for the original scale as well as for the Dutch version (Muris, Meesters, & Van den Berg, 2003; Van Widenfelt, Goedhart, Treffers, & Goodman, 2003). Moreover, the self-report SDQ is reliable in children as young as 8 years of age (Muris, Meesters, Eijkelenboom, & Vincken, 2004) and correlates low with social desirability (Muris et al., 2003). The prosocial subscale consists of the following five items: "I try to be nice to others", "I share my toys and candy", "When someone is hurt or ill, I offer to help", "I am nice to younger children", and "I help my parents, the teacher and other children without being asked". Answers were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*never*), to 3 (*sometimes*) to 5 (*always*). Cronbach's alpha was .70 and principal component analysis showed that the items loaded on one factor explaining 45.87 % of the total variance.

Analysis

The data have a nested structure of children in classrooms at different schools. An appropriate way of analyzing this design is multilevel analysis. Three levels were specified: children (level 1), classrooms (level 2) and schools (level 3) with attitude towards helping as the dependent variable (between-subjects). Analysis was carried out with MLwiN 2.21 (Rasbash, Brown, Healy, Cameron, & Charlton, 2004). The multilevel models were estimated using the Iterative Generalized Least Squares (IGLS) algorithm, and relative model improvement was assessed by comparing the fit (deviance) of nested models. Differences between these statistics follow a chi-square distribution with degrees of freedom given by the difference in parameters (Snijders & Bosker, 1999).

For level of need a contrast was specified, representing the difference between low need (coded '-0.5') and moderate need (coded '0.5'). Dummy variables were constructed for the presence of friends of the recipient (versus friends of helper) and no bystanders (versus friends of helper). First an intercept-only model was estimated. Secondly, dummies for the bystander contexts were entered. In the third step prosociality was entered as well as the interactions between prosociality and both dummies. Additionally, we changed the reference category to examine differences between the 'friends of the recipients' and 'no bystanders' contexts.

Results

Preliminary Results

Overall, children endorsed the need to help with a mean score of 4.11 (SD = 0.66), which is significantly above the neutral mid-point of the scale, t (1220) = 58.81, p < .001, d = 3.37. For prosociality a mean score of 4.00 was found (SD = 0.57), which is also above mid-point of the scale, t (1211) = 61.28, p < .001, d = 3.52.

As shown in Table 2, children endorsed helping more strongly in the context of moderate need (M = 4.26, SD = 0.61) compared to low need (M = 3.96, SD = 0.67, p < .001, d = 0.47) which indicates that the experimental manipulation was successful with a medium effect size. However, no significant interactions were found between level of need and the dummy variables or with prosociality. There also was a significant gender difference with a small effect size (see Table 2) showing that girls endorsed helping more strongly than boys (M = 4.19, SD = 0.62, and M = 4.02, SD = 0.69, respectively, d = .18). No significant main or interaction effects were found for age (not in Table 2).

Bystander Context

Results for the bystander context are shown in Table 2 and Figure 1. Multilevel analysis showed a significant effect for the difference between friends of the helper and friends of the recipient. Children more strongly endorsed helping a peer when friends of the helper were present compared to friends of the recipient, signified by a small effect size d = .20. In addition, children

endorsed helping more strongly when the helper's friends were present compared to no bystanders, and this was a small effect size $d = .17$. Compared to Model 0, this resulted in a significant model improvement, $\chi^2 (2) = 7.21$, $p = .03$. We also checked for the difference between the presence of recipient's friends and no bystanders and this difference was not significant ($p = .72$, $d = .04$). Thus, children more strongly endorsed helping when friends of the helper were present, compared to the situation in which there were friends of the recipient and when there were no bystanders. These findings are shown in Figure 1 and support the peer reputation hypothesis.

Prosociality

In the third step of the multi-level analysis, prosociality was entered, as well as interactions with both dummy variables. Compared to Model 1, this resulted in a significant model improvement, $\chi^2 (3) = 155.11$, $p < .001$. A significant main effect for prosociality was found (see Table 2) with higher prosocial children more strongly endorsed helping. Effect size was medium sized to large ($\Box^2 = .08$). The interaction between prosociality and the presence of recipient's friends versus helper's friends was not significant. However, there was a significant interaction between prosociality and the presence of friends of the helper compared to no bystanders. Simple slope analysis was performed (Aiken & West, 1991) for children scoring relatively low on prosociality (1 *SD* below the mean) and relatively high on prosociality (1 *SD* above the mean). As expected, among high prosocial children, there was no significant effect of the presence of helper's friends compared to the no bystander situation. Thus, high prosocial children's attitude towards helping was similar when friends of the helper or no bystanders were present ($\beta = -.03$, $p = .69$). A

different pattern was found for children scoring low on prosociality. When there were no bystanders they endorsed helping less compared to the situation in which there were friends of the helper ($\beta = -.21$, $p = .001$).

When no bystanders was used as a reference category, the interaction between prosociality and the presence of recipient's friends versus no bystanders was also significant ($\beta = -.09$, $p = .04$). Simple slope analysis showed that for children scoring relatively high on prosociality, there was again no difference in the endorsement of helping when the recipient's friends were present compared to the no bystander situation ($\beta = -.11$, $p = .08$). In contrast, children scoring relatively low on prosociality had a more positive attitude towards helping when friends of recipient were present compared to no bystanders ($\beta = .13$, $p = .04$). This pattern of findings indicates that low prosocial children more strongly endorsed helping a peer in the presence of others while high prosocial children did not.

Discussion

This research examined how by-standing peers influence children's perception and evaluation of helping behaviour. Overall, children endorsed helping a peer that did not belong to the group of friends but their attitude depended on the presence of by-standing friends. Children endorsed helping strongest when friends of the helper were present compared to the situation in which there were friends of the recipient or when there were no bystanders. In line with the competitive altruism model (Hardy & Van Vugt, 2006; Roberts, 1998) for which there is evidence among adults, these findings are the first to suggest that children also take reputation

considerations into account in their reasoning about helping. From 5 to 6 years onwards, children are not only concerned about their own reputation (e.g., Banerjee et al., 2010; Hatch, 1987; Sluckin, 1981), but they are also able to attribute self-presentational motives for explaining other's behavior (Banerjee & Yuill, 1999). In this study attitudes towards helping a peer were similar for older children and early adolescents (8-12 years), and the bystander effect did not differ by age. This suggests that in evaluating helping, reputation considerations are already relevant for 8 year old children and in a similar way as for early adolescents. The importance of reputation considerations is further indicated by the finding that higher endorsement of helping in the presence of the helper's friends was unrelated to the recipients' level of need. Children endorsed helping more strongly in moderate compared to low need situations, but in both situations the endorsement was similarly affected by the bystanders. This indicates that reputation considerations are independent from the need involved in the helping context.

A further result that supports the importance of reputation consideration for the evaluation of helping a peer is that the attitude of relatively high prosocial children was not influenced by the presence of by-standing friends of the helper or of the recipient (compare Simpson & Willer, 2008). High prosocial children tend to be other-directed (Penner et al., 1995) and therefore focus more on the recipient's welfare rather than the reputation of the helper. A focus on the needs of the recipient leads high prosocial children to endorse helping independent of the bystander context. Future studies could examine this interpretation by directly examining whether high prosocial children focus more on the helper or the recipient.

The findings for low prosocial children suggests that they focused on the reputation implications for the helper and therefore more strongly endorsed helping in the presence of friends of the helper compared to no bystanders. However, these children also had a more positive attitude towards helping when the recipient's friends were present compared to no bystanders. A possible explanation for this is that low prosocial children are more sensitive to other's social approval in general. Low prosocial children tend to focus on the self (Penner et al., 1995) and this self-directed focus might make them more prone to avoid social disapproval. Consequently when helping is public, their attitude towards helping is more positive than in a context without bystanders in which there is no risk of disapproval. This interpretation is in line with research that indicates that children with low perspective taking ability express more positive group attitudes in public compared to private contexts (see Killen & Rutland, 2011). In addition, socially anxious individuals are inclined to help more in the presence of a group because they tend to focus on public performances in social settings (Garcia, Weaver, Darley, & Spence, 2009). Future research should examine low prosocial children's sensitivity to reputation concerns and social approval simultaneously in order to examine the influence of these processes on their endorsement of helping.

To evaluate the present results, several limitations of the research should be considered. First, we focused on the perceptions of helping peers that did not belong to the helper's friends. We do not know whether the findings also apply to the evaluation of helping a friend and helping in general. Children tend to differentiate between peer groups and treat friends differently than non-friends. In addition, there might be differences in the processes that underlie helping 'insiders' and 'outsiders' with the former being more empathy-based and the latter more self-directed

16

(Stürmer & Snyder, 2010). For example, strategic concerns have been found to underlie helping 'outsiders' in adolescents (e.g., Nadler, Harpaz-Gorodeisky, & Ben-David, 2009) and adults (see Van Leeuwen & Täuber, 2010), and therefore might be relatively specific for this type of behavior. Future studies should examine this.

Second, this study examined the context of friendship because this is highly relevant and familiar to children. Yet, children's reasoning about helping in this context might differ from their reasoning about, for instance, helping in an inter-ethnic context. Judgments and evaluations in the latter situations are typically more affected by social and moral norms whereas children tend to understand friendship issues in terms of individual preferences (Killen, Lee-Kim, McGlothlin, & Stangor, 2002). Helping in an ethnic group context might less strongly trigger reputational considerations compared to a friendship context which is based on personalized bonds (Brewer & Gardner, 1996). Furthermore, we examined low and moderate need situations and future studies should examine whether reputational concerns also play a role in high need situations. High need situations offer an opportunity to show trustworthiness and thereby to enhance one's reputation. However, the moral nature of high need situations might make helping less indicative of an underlying self-characteristic. Helping in situations that are clearly harmful is morally expected, irrespective of rules, regulations and the group context (Miller, Bersoff, & Harwood, 1990).

Third, the children were given written descriptions of social situations and the evaluations of these descriptions can differ from observations of actual interactions and from the children's own behavior. In addition, the significant effects found show a clear and theoretically meaningful

pattern, but they are not very strong. This might be due to the short, written descriptions that were used and that lack vividness. It is possible that the effects are stronger when, for example, images and short films are presented to the children. In addition, stronger effects might be found for other forms of helping in which the costs and benefits of helping are taken into account. We did not consider the trade-off between costs and benefits but this might have an impact on the evaluation of helping behavior (Stürmer & Snyder, 2010). The influence of peer group norms on helping someone that does not belong to that peer group might also be an important factor to consider. Moreover, it is not clear whether the present findings generalize to children from different cultural or national backgrounds. In collectivistic cultures, for example, the stronger emphasis on in-group values and norms might lead children to perceive helping situations differently compared to children from a more individualistic culture. The emphasis in collectivist cultures on the in-group might lead to stronger group boundaries and therefore less out-group helping, but it might also imply that reputational concerns are more salient leading to more out-group helping.

In conclusion, it is important to study why and when children perceive helping as appropriate and necessary because this provides possibilities for stimulating children's prosocial behavior (Barclay, 2012). The findings indicate that children perceive and evaluate helping a peer in terms of reputation concerns. Children endorsed helping more strongly when the helper was surrounded by his or her friends. The presence of friends makes it more important to make a good impression compared to a setting in which these friends are not present or when there are no bystanders. This also implies that children are sensitive to cues that might improve group membership. Moreover, children seem to attribute a signaling function to helping in a public

context. This means that one way to stimulate helping behavior in children is to evoke the opportunity for self-presentation. However, reputation concerns are less important for high prosocial children who tend to focus on the needs of others compared to low prosocial children who focus more on public performances in social settings. This indicates that another way to stimulate positive behavior is to stimulate children's perspective taking abilities and empathic responses. Reputation concerns might be overcome by stimulating children to focus on the peer in need of help rather than the social setting of the helper.

Author Notes

Jellie Sierksma is affiliated with Utrecht University. **Jochem Thijs** is affiliated with Utrecht University. **Maykel Verkuyten** is affiliated with Utrecht University.

References

Aboud, F. E. (2008). A social-cognitive developmental theory of prejudice. In S. E. Quintana & C. McKnown (Eds.), *Handbook of race, racism and the developing child* (pp. 55-71). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Aboud, F. E., & Joong, A. (2008). Intergroup name-calling and conditions for creating assertive bystanders. In S. R. Levy, & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood trough adulthood* (pp. 249-260). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Abrams, D., Rutland, A., & Cameron, L. (2003). The development of subjective group dynamics: Children's judgments of normative and deviant in-group and out-group individuals. *Child Development, 74*, 1840–1856.

Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Banerjee, R., Bennett, M., & Luke, N. (2010). Upsetting others and provoking ridicule: Children's reasoning about the self-presentational consequences of rule-violation. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 28*, 941-947.

Banerjee, R., & Yuill, N. (1999). Children's explanations for self-presentational behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 29*, 105-111.

Barclay, P. (2010), Harnessing the power of reputation: Strengths and limits for promoting cooperative behaviors. *Evolutionary Psychology, 10,* 868-883.

Bereczkei T., Birkás B., & Kerekes, Zs. (2007). Public charity offer as a proximate factor of evolved reputation-building strategy: An experimental analysis of a real-life situation. *Evolution and Human Behaviour, 28*, 277-284.

Brewer, M. B., & Gardner, W. (1996). Who is this "we"? Levels of collective identity and self-representations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 83-93.

Brown, R. (2010). *Prejudice: It's social psychology* (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Davis, M. H., Luce, C., & Kraus, S. J. (1994). The heritability of characteristics associated with dispositional empathy. *Journal of Personality, 62,* 369-391.

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., & Spinrad, T. L. (2006). Prosocial development. In N. Eisenberg & W. Damon (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology. Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development,* (pp. 646–718). New York: Wiley.

Fehr, E., Bernhard, H., & Rockenbach, B. (2008). Egalitarianism in young children. *Nature, 454*, 1079-1083.

Fischer, P., & Greitemeyer, T. (2013). The positive bystander effect: Passive bystanders increase helping in situations with high expected negative consequences for the helper. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *153*, 1–5.

Fischer, P., Krueger, J. I., Greitemeyer, T., Vogrincic, C., Kastenmüller, A., Frey, D., Heene, M., Wicher, M., & Kainbacher, M. (2011). The bystander-effect: A meta-analytic review on bystander intervention in dangerous and non-dangerous emergencies. *Psychological Bulletin, 137*, 517-537.

Fiske, A. P. (1992). The four elementary forms of sociality: Framework for a unified   theory of social relations. *Psychological Review, 99*, 689-723.

Garcia, S. M., Weaver, K., Darley, J. M., & Spence, B. T. (2009). Dual effects of implicit bystanders: Inhibiting vs. facilitating helping behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 19*, 215-224.

Goodman, R. (1997). The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: A research note. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 38*, 581-586.

Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the moral domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*, 366-385.

Hardy, C. L., & Van Vugt, M. (2006). Nice guys finish first: The competitive altruism hypothesis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 1402-1413.

Harter, S. (1999). *The construction of the self: A developmental perspective.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Hatch, J. A. (1987). Impression management in kindergarten classrooms: An analysis of children's face-work in peer interactions. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 18*, 100-115.

Hay, D. F. (1994). Prosocial development. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 35*, 29-71.

Hay, D. F., & Cook, K. V. (2007). The transformation of prosocial behavior from infancy to childhood. In C. A. Brownell, & C. B. Kopps (Eds.), *Socioemotional development in the toddler years: Transitions and transformations* (pp. 100-131). New York: Guilford.

Jaeggi, A. V., Burkart, J. M., & Van Schaik, C. P. (2010). On the psychology of cooperation in humans and other primates: combining the natural history and experimental evidence of prosociality. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *365*, 2723-2735.

Janssens, J. M. A. M., & Dekovic, M. (1997). Child rearing, prosocial moral reasoning, and prosocial behaviour. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 20*, 509–527.

Killen, M., Lee-Kim, J., McGlothlin, H., & Stangor, C. (2002). How children and adolescents evaluate gender and racial exclusion. *Monographs for the Society for Research in Child Development* (Serial No. 271, Vol. 67, No. 4). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Killen, M., & Rutland, A. (2011). *Children and social exclusion: Morality, prejudice and group identity*. Oxford, England: Wiley-Blackwell.

Levine, M., Cassidy, C., Brazier, G., & Reicher, S. (2002). Self-categorisation and bystander intervention: Two experimental studies. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 7, 1452-1463.

Levy, S. R., & Killen, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Miller, J. G., Bersoff, D. M., & Harwood, R. L. (1990). Perceptions of social responsibilities in India and in the United States: Moral imperatives or personal decisions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58,* 33-47.

Muris, P., Meesters, C., Eijkelenboom, A. and Vincken, M. (2004), The self-report version of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: Its psychometric properties in 8- to 13-year-old non-clinical children. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 43,* 437–448.

Muris, P., Meesters, C., & Van den Berg, F. (2003). The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ): Further evidence for its reliability and validity in a community sample of Dutch children and adolescents. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 12,* 1-8.

Nadler, A., Harpaz-Gorodeisky, G., & Ben-David, Y. (2009). Defensive helping: Threat to group identity, ingroup identification, status stability, and common group identity as determinants of intergroup help-giving. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97,* 823-834.

Penner, L. A., Fritzsche, B. A., Craiger, J. P., & Freifeld, T. R. (1995). Measuring the prosocial personality. In J. Butcher & C. D. Spielberger (Eds.), *Advances in personality assessment* (pp. 147-164). Hillsdale, NJ: LEA.

Quintana, S. M. (1998). Children's developmental understanding of ethnicity and race. *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 7,* 27–45.

Reicher, S., & Haslam, S. A. (2010). Beyond help: A social psychology of collective solidarity and social cohesion. In S. Stürmer, & M. Snijder (Eds.), *The psychology of prosocial behavior* (pp. 289-310). West Susses, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Rasbash, J., Browne, W., Healy, M., Cameron, B., & Charlton, C. (2004). *MLwiN Version 2.0.* New York: Multilevel Models Project Institute of Education.

Roberts, G. (1998). Competitive altruism: From reciprocity to the handicap principle. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, 265*, 427-431.

Simpson, B. & Willer, R. (2008). Altruism and indirect reciprocity: The interaction of person and situation in prosocial behavior. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 71*, 37-52.

Snijders, T. A. B., & Bosker, R. J. (1999). *Multilevel analysis. An introduction to basic and advanced multilevel modeling.* London: Sage.

Sluckin, A. (1981). *Growing up in the playground: The social development of children*. London: Routledge.

Streiner, D. L. (2003). Being inconsistent about consistency: When coefficient alpha does and doesn't matter. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 80*, 217-222.

Stürmer, S. & Snyder, M. (2010). Helping "us" versus "them": Towards a group-level theory of helping and altruism within and across group boundaries. In S. Stürmer & M. Snyder (Eds.), *The psychology of prosocial behaviour* (pp. 33-58). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Van Bommel, M., Van Prooijen, J. W., Elffers, H., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2012). Be aware to care: Public self-awareness leads to a reversal of the bystander effect. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*.

Van Leeuwen, E., & Täuber, S. (2010). The strategic side of out-group helping. In S. Stürmer, *&* M. Snijder (Eds.), *The psychology of prosocial behavior* (pp. 81-99). West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Van Widenfelt, B. M., Goedhart, A. W., Treffers, P. D. A., & Goodman, R. (2003). Dutch version of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ). *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 12*, 281-289.

Warneken, F. & Tomasello, M. (2009). The roots of human altruism. *British Journal of Psychology, 100*, 455–471.

Table 1 *Overview of Expectations for Children's Attitude Towards Helping a Peer When Either Friends of the Helper, Friends of the Recipient of Help, or No Bystanders Were Present*

Theory	Expectations
Moral foundations theory	Friends recipient < no bystanders
	Friends helper = no bystanders
Competitive altruism model	Friends helper > no bystanders
	Friends recipient = no bystanders

Note. = means equal endorsement of helping

> means stronger endorsement of helping

< means less strong endorsement of helping

Table 2 *Beta's and Deviance Components of Multilevel Models for Children's Attitude Toward Helping a Peer*

	Attitude toward helping		
	Model 0	Model 1	Model 2
Explanatory variables			
Friends recipient vs. Friends helper		-.10 (.05)**	-.11 (.04)**
No bystanders vs. Friends helper		-.12 (.05)**	-.12 (.05)**
Prosociality			.17 (.03)***
Friends recipient vs. Friends helper * Prosociality			-.03 (.04)
No bystanders vs. Friends helper * Prosociality			-.09 (.05)*
Need	.32 (.04)***	.32 (.05)***	.32 (.04)***
Gender	.16 (.04)***	.16 (.04)***	.14 (.04)***
Deviance	2408.75	2401.54	2246.43

Deviance difference	7.21*	155.11***

Note. Dummies were used for bystander contexts with friends of the helper as a reference category.

*p ≤ .05, **p ≤ .01, ***p ≤ .001

Figure 1. Children's attitude towards helping a peer when either friends of the helper, friends of the recipient of help, or no bystanders were present