



CREaTE

Canterbury Research and Theses Environment

Canterbury Christ Church University's repository of research outputs

<http://create.canterbury.ac.uk>

Please cite this publication as follows:

Palmer, S. B. and Abbott, N. (2017) Bystander responses to bias-based bullying in schools: a developmental intergroup approach. *Child Development Perspectives*. ISSN 1750-8592.

Link to official URL (if available):

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12253>

This version is made available in accordance with publishers' policies. All material made available by CReaTE is protected by intellectual property law, including copyright law. Any use made of the contents should comply with the relevant law.

Contact: create.library@canterbury.ac.uk



Bystander Responses to Bias-Based Bullying in Schools:

A Developmental Intergroup Approach

Sally B. Palmer

University College London, Institute of Education

Nicola Abbott

Canterbury Christ Church University

Key words: *childhood and adolescence, intergroup processes, bystanders and bullying*

Abstract

Research on bystanders' responses to bullying shows the valuable contribution that prosocial or defender behaviors can have in reducing bullying in schools. In this article, we propose that a developmental intergroup approach (i.e., a developing understanding of social identities and related intergroup processes) is required to understand fully when and why children and adolescents help bullied peers in diverse contexts. First, we review theory and evidence on intergroup social exclusion to demonstrate the strength of a developmental intergroup approach when understanding responses to complex social scenarios in childhood and adolescence. Then, we review recent evidence that demonstrates the importance of examining group membership, group identity, and group norms to understand children's and adolescents' responses as bystanders in the context of bias-based bullying. Finally, we consider implications for school-based interventions and next steps for research.

Anti-bullying programs (e.g., 1) focus on the role of peer bystanders (i.e., students who witness bullying) since peers are present during most bullying incidents (2). Bystanders can support the bully or ignore the act (thus reinforcing the acceptability of bullying), challenge the bully, report the incident to a teacher, garner support from friends, or comfort and support the victim in other ways (e.g., 3, 4). When bystanders challenge bullying, they can reduce it and reinforce an anti-bullying ethos in schools (1, 5-8); however, defending the child or adolescent who is bullied becomes less likely with age (9).

Researchers have identified many important predictors for defending behaviors. Confidence, self-efficacy, popularity, and empathy predict helpful responses (2, 3). Anti-bullying programs have been shaped around these findings, and meta-analyses show the benefits of programs that support bystanders to challenge and intervene during bullying (10, 11). For example, the KiVa program, which develops the socioemotional skills of students and provides training in how to respond as a bystander, reduces bullying in schools in Finland (e.g., 3, 4). However, these programs may be less effective in diverse communities (6). We propose that additional influences need to be considered in the context of *bias-based bullying*.

First, we review bias-based bullying and describe how it differs from interpersonal forms of bullying. Next, we describe a *developmental intergroup approach* to understanding children's and adolescents' attitudes and behaviors. Then we present evidence for this approach in the context of bystanders' responses to bias-based bullying, focusing on intergroup membership and identification, intergroup norms, loyalty and repercussions, and social-moral reasoning. Finally, we consider the implications of this work for anti-bullying programs.

Bias-Based Bullying

Bias-based bullying is an intergroup context (i.e., involving ingroup and outgroup members) in which someone is bullied because they belong to a particular group (e.g., one defined by race or ethnicity, nationality, religion, gender, sexual orientation or disability; 12-14). Typically, bias-based bullying is perpetrated by a member of a social group with majority status toward a member of a social group with minority status (e.g., White bully, Black victim) and constitutes discrimination. This form of bullying is rife in childhood and adolescence, and is more harmful for the victim than interpersonal bullying (14-17).

Bias-based bullying differs from interpersonal bullying because of underlying issues of prejudice and discrimination (15, 16, 18). Therefore, bystanders' responses to bias-based bullying are likely affected by intergroup concerns. In line with this interpretation, in a recent review, anti-bullying programs were more effective in homogenous groups than in more diverse groups (6). This is problematic because children in diverse settings are more at risk of bias-based bullying. Thus, intergroup processes (i.e., group identity, group membership, group norms, social-moral reasoning) and understanding the developmental nature of these processes may inform children and adolescents' responses to bias-based bullying (see also 13).

Developmental Intergroup Approach

Research examining the development of children's attitudes toward and evaluations of intergroup social exclusion, aggression, and helping (e.g., 15, 19-21) has consistently identified the importance of intergroup processes when interpreting youth's changing attitudes and behaviors toward members of different groups. This *developmental intergroup approach* (e.g., 19, 22, 23) shows how intergroup processes shape the way children and adolescents reason about, and respond to, social situations. Moreover, they influence how

attitudes and behaviors *develop* across childhood and adolescence because of changing social cognitions and experiences of intergroup contexts (19, 24, 25).

Early on, children become aware of social categories, and they affiliate with people they see as similar (ingroup) and differentiate from people they view as different (outgroup) (26). At this stage, preference for ingroups guides attitudes and behaviors in intergroup contexts. From middle childhood, as youth develop perspective-taking skills, they also evaluate others based on whether their behavior conforms with or deviates from group norms such as loyalty (22, 27).

Children also recognize that challenging ingroup norms can result in negative evaluations and other social repercussions. With increased experience of groups, what might be perceived as morally wrong in early and middle childhood (e.g., it is never acceptable to exclude another person) can be viewed as relatively more acceptable from later childhood into adolescence (e.g., it is acceptable to exclude Sarah from soccer practice because she's a girl and probably isn't good at soccer). In this way, negative social interactions can be justified through perceived knowledge of groups and group expectations (19, 22).

Together with social experience, developing social cognitions (i.e., perspective taking, understanding group norms, group loyalty, and group-related repercussions) influence evaluations and social-moral reasoning about social incidents such as social exclusion and aggression (22, 24, 25). We propose that these same group processes influence when children and adolescent bystanders help victims of bias-based bullying. Because of the developmental nature of such processes, we propose that they can also help explain the developmental decline in defending responses.

Bystanders and a Developmental Intergroup Approach

Intergroup Membership and Identification

Children's and adolescents' responses as bystanders are influenced by intergroup processes (9, 28-30). In one study, when an ingroup member behaved aggressively toward an outgroup member, youth who belonged to the same group as the aggressor (as opposed to being unaffiliated with the group) had less negative attitudes toward the perpetrator (31). Extending these findings, another study (9) examined the responses of children and adolescent bystanders to bias-based verbal bullying: With age, youth were more likely to help when the victim was an ingroup member than when he or she was an outgroup member. This finding was mediated by increased social identification; a bystander could not simply view him or herself as belonging to the same category, but also had to identify with [AU: Please clarify "find meaning" by replacing that phrase with something more specific and concrete.] that social category. This highlights the importance of intergroup processes for bystanders' intentions and demonstrates how these processes become increasingly influential with age, as social cognition and the importance of identity increase (24, 25).

Further demonstrating the importance of group membership to bystanders' responses, in a recent study of adolescent bystanders, stronger ingroup bias (preference for one's own group) was negatively related to helping an immigrant peer in an outgroup who was bullied (28). Consequently, when examining bystanders' responses, the relative ingroup-outgroup affiliations between parties could indicate when helping is most or least likely. On this premise, a bystander who identifies with the bully would be more likely to support and less likely to challenge the bully (31). If the bystander identifies with the victim, he or she would be more likely to help (see Figures 1a and 1b).

[Insert Figure 1a and 1b here]

Intergroup Norms, Loyalty, and Repercussions

The developmental intergroup approach extends beyond the relative group memberships of those involved. Research on social exclusion shows the strength of group norms on children's evaluations of peers over and above group membership (19, 27). In the intergroup context, group norms refer to the expectations affiliated with one group that differ from those affiliated with another. In this way, they differ from classroom norms (e.g., an anti-bullying ethos), which also predict defenders' responses to interpersonal bullying (e.g., 2, 7, 8).

When evaluating others, children focus increasingly on group-specific norms, in part because of the development of cognitive perspective-taking abilities (e.g., 24, 27) and increasing social experience (e.g., 25, 32). With age, relative group norms influence ingroup and outgroup evaluations more strongly. For example, children endorse ingroup aggression when doing so fits an ingroup norm (33). Furthermore, youth are more likely to endorse bias-based acts (e.g., telling a racist joke) in the presence of a specific-group norm for doing so (19).

Evaluations of ingroup members who challenge ingroup norms (e.g., deviants or dissenters) become increasingly negative with age, and evaluations of outgroup members who behave in line with ingroup norms become more positive (27). This happens even in the context of negative group norms: In one study, across adolescence, youth became increasingly concerned about group-based repercussions for bystanders who challenged a group norm for telling race-based jokes, expecting it to result in exclusion from the peer group (29). Consequently, an increasing knowledge of group dynamics can reduce the likelihood of a bystander defending someone.

Additionally, children evaluate members of an outgroup with an *exclusive* norm (not liking and excluding other members) more negatively, whereas those outgroup members with an *inclusive* group norm (liking and including other group members) are viewed more

positively (32). Consequently, bystanders' responses to bias-based bullying likely depend on group-specific norms (actual or perceived). For example, if a British child is a bystander to a bullying incident in which another British child bullies an immigrant child, and the British group holds an inclusive norm, the likelihood of the bystander helping the outgroup member should increase (since the ingroup bully is dissenting from the group inclusion norm) compared to when the British group holds an exclusive group norm (see Figures 2a and 2b). If the British group holds an exclusive ingroup norm, ingroup bystanders should support their own group, resulting in less outgroup helping. Extending this logic, when bystanders perceive outgroups as exclusive, victimized members of these outgroups may be seen as less in need, or less wanting or deserving of help (e.g., 34), which would likely result in less helping. Perceptions of and stereotypes about victimized groups may drive bystanders' responses regardless of a bystander's own affiliations (e.g., as a member of the perpetrator's group or an unrelated third party).

[Insert Figure 2a and 2b here]

Generic norms (i.e., expectations held by society generally) are also important for defenders' behavior, and research in interpersonal and intergroup contexts supports their influence (e.g., 7-9). Behaving in line with these societal or broader group-level norms can mediate the developmental decline in bystanders' prosocial intentions to bias-based bullying; for example, older children who perceive a norm for helping among their peer group are more likely to help than those who do not (9). Broader generic norms interact with group-specific norms during intergroup contexts (32). More research is needed to determine when generic-level norms override group-specific norms, and vice versa, in the context of bystanders, and how this effect differs across childhood and into adolescence.

Social-Moral Reasoning

Children's and adolescents' reasoning about responses to bias-based bullying further demonstrates the social-cognitive processes underpinning bystanders' responses. With age, children become more adept at weighing competing concerns in response to social scenarios (e.g., 15, 19, 24). Although bias-based bullying is viewed overwhelmingly as unacceptable and can always be considered a moral issue (i.e., someone is being harmed, injustice and inequality are present), as children get older they become more aware of additional group-related concerns (i.e., norms, repercussions) and sometimes prioritize these over their moral judgments of transgressions (e.g., 19, 22).

Younger children typically justify negative evaluations of social exclusion by focusing on the morality of a situation (i.e., it is unacceptable because it is unfair, wrong, causes harm to someone). With age, the moral component is still acknowledged, but children become more cognitively adept at weighing moral concerns against competing concerns, such as social-conventional issues (i.e., is there a rule or group norm that suggests this behavior is acceptable or unacceptable?) or psychological issues (i.e., is this my responsibility; is there anything I can do about this; do I want to help; is it that big of a deal?).

In one study that asked youth to reason about their responses as bystanders (9), younger children, who also reported helping intentions more often than adolescents, presented moral justifications more frequently. Adolescents were slightly more likely to draw on social-conventional concerns and significantly more likely to draw on psychological concerns when reasoning about their decision to help. In a separate study, older adolescents were more likely than younger adolescents to play down the negative nature of a bias-based act (29), which was also related to perceiving the act as relatively more acceptable. Thus, social-moral reasoning sheds light on the way social experience and group processes affect

young people's choices as bystanders, and is important when considering the age-related trends in bystander defending (6, 11).

Implications for Anti-Bullying Interventions

Anti-bullying programs that focus on promoting helpful interventions by bystanders reduce bullying in schools (1). However, considering the lack of focus on bias-based bullying in such interventions, it is perhaps unsurprising that anti-bullying techniques are less effective in heterogeneous communities (6, 15). Typically, schools have taken a one-size-fits-all, reactive, and bully-victim approach (i.e., one that focuses on bullying as dyadic, rather than involving the wider peer group) [AU: What is a bully-victim approach? Please define briefly.] when tackling all forms of bullying. This can be difficult for practitioners when dealing with bias-based bullying, which is often accompanied by controversial and contentious issues such as xenophobia and immigration, because these approaches ask practitioners to deal with these issues only after a negative act occurred.

We propose that consistently promoting more inclusive attitudes toward a range of social groups may be more useful so practitioners can refer students to these discussions when dealing with specific incidents of bias-based bullying. Indeed, the developmental intergroup approach suggests that addressing anti-bullying interventions more proactively by tapping into wider intergroup phenomenon (i.e., fostering overarching identities while valuing difference and creating inclusive norms) might more constructively encourage prosocial bystander responses to bias-based bullying.

To facilitate these aims, interventions could also draw from research in the intergroup field. For example, interventions that encourage positive interactions between members of ingroups and members of outgroups improve attitudes, intentions, and behaviors toward outgroup members (35, 36). Furthermore, cross-group friendships and other forms of

intergroup contact are related positively to bystanders helping (28) and related negatively to bystanders responding passively (30). Thus, improving attitudes toward others by embedding contact interventions in anti-bullying programs is one way practitioners can improve prosocial and defender responses to bias-based bullying.

Conclusion

In this review, we highlighted the importance of the developmental intergroup context—which is grounded in well-established theoretical and empirical work on social exclusion—in examining bystander responses to biased-based bullying. We hope researchers will use this approach to study *when* and *why* children and adolescents defend victims of biased-based bullying. The evidence we have presented shows that group processes predict bystanders' responses in the context of bias-based bullying. These processes may interact with individual differences such as empathy and openness (28), possibilities that merit further exploration.

The intergroup concepts reviewed here are the tip of the iceberg. Developmental intergroup theories also relate concepts of intergroup status (i.e., 37, 38) and intergroup threat (i.e., 15, 39) to children's evaluations of intergroup scenarios. These remain to be explored in the context of defending intentions and behaviors. Examining bystanders' responses from a developmental intergroup perspective can inform the development and implementation of more appropriate anti-bullying interventions in diverse settings (6), which will more effectively target and tackle bias-based bullying in schools.

Authors' Note

[AU: If you would like to add any acknowledgments, please do so here.] We would like to acknowledge the editor and reviewers for their helpful and constructive feedback on past versions of this manuscript.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Sally B. Palmer, Department of Psychology and Human Development, UCL Institute of Education, WC1 0AH, London, UK; e-mail: s.palmer@ucl.ac.uk.

.References

1. Polanin, J., Espelage, D.L., & Pigott, T.D. (2012). A meta-analysis of school-based bullying prevention programs' effects on bystander intervention behaviour. *School Psychology Review, 41*, 47-65.
2. Salmivalli, C. (2014). Participant roles in bullying: How can peer bystanders be utilized in interventions? *Theory Into Practice, 53*, 286-292. doi:10.1080/00405841.2014.947222
3. Saarento, S., & Salmivalli, C. (2015). The role of classroom peer ecology and bystanders' responses in bullying. *Child Development Perspectives, 9*, 201-205. doi: 10.1111/cdep.12140
4. Karna, A., Voeten, M., Little, T.D., Poskiparta, E., Kaljonen, A. & Salmivalli, C. (2011). A large-scale evaluation of the KiVa antibullying program: Grades 4-6. *Child Development, 82*, 311-330. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01557.x
5. Aboud, F., & 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 through adulthood* (pp. 249-260). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
6. Evans, C.B.R., Fraser, M.W., & Cotter, K.L. (2014). The effectiveness of school-based bullying prevention programs: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 19*, 532-544. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2017.07.004
7. Salmivalli, C., Voeten, M., & Poskiparta, E. (2011). Bystanders matter: Associations between reinforcing, defending, and the frequency of bullying behavior in classrooms. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 40*, 668-676. doi:10.1080/15374416.2011.597090
8. Salmivalli, C., & Voeten, M. (2004). Connections between attitudes, group norms, and behavior in bullying situations. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 28*, 246-258. doi:10.1080/01650250344000488

9. Palmer, S.B. Rutland, A., & Cameron, L. (2015). The development of bystander intentions in an intergroup context: The role of perceived severity, ingroup norms, and social-moral reasoning. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 33*, 419-433.
doi:10.1111/bjdp.12092
10. Merrell, K.W., Gueldner, B.A. Ross, S.W., & Isava, D.M. (2008). How effective are school bullying intervention programs? A meta-analysis of intervention research. *School Psychology Quarterly, 23*, 26-42. doi:10.1037/1045-3830.23.1.26
11. Ttofi, M.M., & Farrington, D.P. (2011). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: A systematic and meta-analytic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 7*, 27-56. doi:10.1007/s11292-010-9109-1
12. Juvonen, J., & Graham, S. (2014). Bullying in schools: The power of bullies and the plight of victims. *Annual Review of Psychology, 65*, 159-185. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115030
13. Mikami, A.Y., Lerner, M.D., & Lun, J. (2010). Social context influences on children's rejection by their peers. *Child Development Perspectives, 4*, 123-130. doi:10.1111/j.1750-8606.2010.00130.x
14. Russell, S. T., Sinclair, K. O., Poteat, V. P., & Koenig, B. W. (2012). Adolescent health and harassment based on discriminatory bias. *American Journal of Public Health, 102*, 493-495. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2011.300430
15. Killen, M., Mulvey, K.L., & Hitti, A. (2013). Social exclusion: A developmental intergroup perspective. *Child Development, 84*, 772-790. doi:10.1111/cdev.12012
16. Killen, M., Rutland, A., & Ruck, M.D. (2011). Promoting equity, tolerance and justice in childhood. *SRCD Social Policy Report, 25*, 1-33. [AU: Please add doi.]

17. Menesini, E., & Salmivalli, C. (2017). Bullying in schools: The state of knowledge and effective interventions. *Psychology, Health & Medicine, 22*, 240-253.
doi:10.1080/13548506.2017.1279740
18. Formby, E. (2015). Limitations of focussing on homophobic, biphobic, and transphobic “bullying” to understand and address LGBT young people’s experiences within and beyond school. *Sex Education, 15*, 626-640. doi:10.1080/14681811.2015.1054024
19. Mulvey, K.L. (2016). Children’s reasoning about social exclusion: Balancing many factors. *Child Development Perspectives, 10*, 22-27. doi: 10.1111/cdep.12157
20. Rutland, A., & Killen, M. (2017). Fair resource allocation among children and adolescents: The role of group and developmental processes. *Child Development Perspectives, 11*, 56-62.
doi:10.1111/cdep.12211.
21. Sierksma, J., Thijs, J., & Verkuyten. M. (2014). Children’s intergroup helping: The role of empathy and peer group norms. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 126*, 369-383.
doi: 10.1016/j.jecp.2014.06.002
22. Rutland, A., & Killen, M. (2015). A developmental science approach to reducing prejudice and social exclusion: Intergroup processes, social-cognitive development, and moral reasoning. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 9*, 121-154. doi:10.1111/sipr.12012
23. Rutland, A., Killen, M., & Abrams, D. (2010). A new social-cognitive developmental perspective on prejudice: The interplay between morality and group identity. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*, 279-291. doi:10.1177/1745691610369468
24. Abrams, D., Rutland, A., Palmer, S. B., Pelletier, J., Ferrell, J., & Lee, S. (2014). The role of cognitive abilities in children’s inferences about social atypicality and peer exclusion and inclusion in intergroup contexts. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 32*, 233-247.
doi:10.1111/bjdp.12034

25. Nesdale, D., Zimmer-Gembeck, M.J., & Roxburgh, N. (2014). Peer group rejection in childhood: Effects of rejection ambiguity, rejection sensitivity, and social acumen. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*, 12-28. doi:10.1111/josi.12044
26. Nesdale, D. (2004). Social identity processes and children's ethnic prejudice. In M. Bennett & F. Sani (Eds.), *The development of the social self* (pp. 219-246). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
27. Abrams, D., Powell, C., Palmer, S.B., & Van de Vyver, J. (2017). Toward a contextualized social developmental account of children's group-based inclusion and exclusion: The developmental model of subjective group dynamics. In A. Rutland, D. Nesdale, & C. Spears Brown (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook of group processes in children and adolescents* (pp. 455-471). [AU: Please add city], UK: John Wiley & Sons.
28. Abbott, N., & Cameron, L. (2014). What makes a young assertive bystander? The effect of intergroup contact, empathy, cultural openness, and in-group bias on assertive bystander intervention intentions. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*, 167-182. doi:10.1111/josi.12053
29. Mulvey, K.L., Palmer, S.B., & Abrams, D. (2016). Race-based humour and peer group dynamics in adolescence: Bystander intervention and social exclusion. *Child Development, 87*. 1379-1391. doi: 10.1111/cdev.12600.
30. Palmer, S.B., Cameron, L., Rutland, A., & Blake, B. (2017). Majority and minority-ethnic status adolescents' bystander responses to racism in schools. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*. [AU: Please add volume and page numbers.] doi:10.1002/casp.2313.
31. Nesdale, D., Killen, M., & Duffy, A. (2013). Children's social cognition about proactive aggression. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 116*, 674-692. doi:org/10.1016/j.jecp.2013.07.003

32. Nesdale, D., & Lawson, M. J. (2011). Social groups and children's intergroup attitudes: Can school norms moderate the effects of social group norms? *Child Development, 82*, 1594-1606. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01637.x
33. Nipedal, C., Nesdale, D., & Killen, M. (2010). Social group norms, school norms and children's aggressive intentions. *Aggressive Behavior, 36*, 195-204. doi:10.1002/ab.20342
34. Sierksma, J., Thijs, J., Verkuyten, M., & Komter, A. (2014). Children's reasoning about the refusal to help: The role of need, costs, and social perspective taking. *Child Development, 85*, 1134-1149. doi:10.1111/cdev.12195
35. Cameron, L., & Abbott, N. (2017). Intergroup contact in action: Using intergroup contact to change children's outgroup orientation. In A. Rutland, D. Nesdale, & C. Spears Brown (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook of group processes in children and adolescents* (pp. 455-471). West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
36. Turner, R.N., & Cameron, L. (2016). Confidence in contact: A new perspective on promoting cross-group friendship among children and adolescents. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 10*, 212-246. doi:10.1111/sipr.12023
37. Dunham, Y., Newheiser, A.K., Hoosain, L., Merrill, A., & Olson, K.R. (2014). From a different vantage: Intergroup attitudes among children from low- and intermediate-status racial groups. *Social Cognition, 32*, 1-21. doi:10.1521/soco.2014.32.1.1
38. Feddes, A.R., Monteiro, M.B., & Justo, M.G. (2013). Subjective social status and intergroup attitudes among majority and minority children in Portugal. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 32*, 125-140. doi:10.1111/bjdp.12025.
39. Nesdale, D., Maas, A., Durkin, K., & Griffiths, J. (2005). Group norms, threat, and children's racial prejudice. *Child Development, 76*, 652-663. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00869.x




Figure 1. On the left, the bystander belongs to the same group as the perpetrator and supports the perpetrator. On the right, the bystander belongs to the same group as the victim and supports the victim. Note. Arrow indicates bystander support.




Figure 2. On the left, the bystander supports the outgroup victim, in line with an inclusive ingroup norm. On the right, the bystander supports the ingroup perpetrator, in line with an exclusive ingroup norm. Note. Arrow indicates bystander support.