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Introduction

This study investigated children’s evaluations of disloyal in-group members in low to high-need situations.

Do children think loyalty to one’s group is a moral obligation? Past research shows children disapprove of disloyal in-group members who support the outgroup (Abrams & Rutland, 2008), while other research indicates out-group helping is tolerated when the out-group needs help. Little is known about the tipping point from intolerance to tolerance of disloyal acts. The current study examines whether children think loyalty to one’s group is a moral obligation, by evaluating their perceptions of varying levels of disloyalty (low-high) to the in-group in low to high need situations.

Method

- 53 4th and 8th graders
- (64% Female, M_age = 12.77)
- Children and adolescents read and responded to hypothetical stories about peer groups that varied in their need for a resource (water) and the disloyalty of an in-group member.

Participants responded to three stories about two groups that need water: 1) in-group and out-group have equal need for water, 2) in-group needs more water than the out-group, 3) out-group needs more water than the in-group. In these stories, children responded to a disloyal member who gave a little water to the out-group (2 of 6 bottles), a lot of water to the out-group (5 of 6 bottles), or distributed the water equally (3 of 6 bottles). Participants evaluated the disloyal act and evaluated the importance of helping the in-group and out-group.

Measures

- How okay/not okay was it for Jeremy to do what he did? 1 = Really not okay, to 6 = Really Okay
- How important is it that Jeremy give water to in-group/out-group? 1 = Very not important, to 6 = Very important

Results

1) When evaluating the disloyal act, there was a Need X Distribution interaction effect, (F(4, 100) = 21.556, p<.001, \( \eta^2 = .463 \)). When the in-group had high need, participants tolerated a low level of disloyalty (2 bottles to the out-group). The mid- and high- disloyalty situations (3:3 and 5:1 distributions) were least tolerated when the in-group had high need. The high disloyalty situation (5 bottles to the out-group) was most tolerated when the in-group had low need (out-group had high need).

2) A repeated measures ANOVA indicated significant differences between levels of need for: 1) evaluating the importance of helping the in-group, (F(2, 100) = 15.112, p<.001, \( \eta^2 = .232 \)), and 2) evaluating the importance of helping the out-group (F(2, 100) = 13.028 p<.001, \( \eta^2 = .207 \)).

3) Paired t-tests indicated that helping the out group (M = 5.038, SD = 1.143) was more important than helping the in-group (M = 4.057, SD = 1.447) when the in-group had low need (t(52) = -4.68, p < .001), the opposite was also true for when the in-group had high need.

Discussion

Children think loyalty to one’s group is not obligatory. Helping the out-group is sometimes a moral necessity, if it comes at a low cost to one’s in-group. Children also view disloyalty as more acceptable if the out-group has high need. Future research should explore other factors which may influence the moral obligation of group loyalty, such as loyalty to one’s family.

Abbreviations: SD, Standard Deviation; M, Mean; \( \eta^2 \), Partial Eta-Squared
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