**Replication Proposal**

Prosocial behavior (i.e., acting on behalf of others; Hay, 1994) is associated with a diversity of positive developmental outcomes (e.g., Caprara et al., 2000; Caputi et al., 2012). Yet, despite evidence that children respond to a diversity of needs (e.g., instrumental, material, emotional; Dunfield, 2014) in early childhood, different varieties of prosocial behavior (e.g., helping, sharing, and comforting) frequently do not correlate. The inconsistency of responding across prosocial subtypes in early childhood may be explained by two complementary theoretical frameworks. According to the *social-cognitive constraint* framework, children’s ability to recognize and respond to each distinct type of need relies on the development of unique social-cognitive processes (Dunfield, 2014). Alternatively, the *motivation-based* framework contends that unique underlying motivations predict the various subtypes of prosocial responses (Paulus, 2018).

While previous studies that directly compared children’s responses to instrumental need, material desire, and emotional distress in childhood (e.g., Dunfield & Kuhlmeier, 2013; Paulus et al., 2015; Svetlova et al., 2010) have found no relations across the prosocial subtypes, a recent study conducted by Paz et al. (2023) provided evidence of partial convergence between subtypes in early childhood. Specifically, using a structural equation model (SEM) to examine the relations between responses to three subtypes of needs at 18-months and 36-months, they found support for a two-factor model: scores on the helping and comforting tasks formed a factor they labelled *Instru-Compassionate* while scores on the sharing task formed a factor they labelled *Sharing* (Paz et al., 2023). Considering both theoretical accounts, this finding suggests support for the motivation-based framework. The social-cognitive constraint account (Dunfield, 2014) posits that the social-cognitive abilities required to engage in helping (e.g., an understanding of other’s goals) are in place by 36-months, whereas those required for comforting (e.g., an understanding of other’s emotional states) are still relatively immature, meaning these behaviors should be distinct at both 18- and 36-months. In contrast, the association between helping and comforting may suggest that the motivations underlying these subtypes are shared and distinct from the motivation underlying costly sharing. To date, much of the research that could inform the changing relations between prosocial behaviors has been conducted with young children (e.g., Dunfield & Kuhlmeier, 2013) or adolescents (e.g., Eisenberg et al., 1999) leaving absent important observations in middle childhood; a period in which substantial changes in social-cognition occurs.

The current study aims to further examine the interrelatedness of the three varieties of prosocial behaviors in middle childhood. We aim to conceptually replicate Paz et al. (2023), building off previous work exploring the relations between the three subtypes across childhood (e.g., Dunfield & Kuhlmeier, 2013) by studying a large age-range (i.e., 3.5- to 7.5-year-olds) and administering two prosocial tasks per subtype that differ in their costliness and cognitive complexity. While the data for the proposed project has already been collected (*N* = 187), we aim to replicate Paz et al.’s (2023) data analysis by conducting both a correlation analysis and a SEM to model the relations between subtypes.

The proposed conceptual replication will advance our understanding of the relative influence of social-cognition versus motivation in children’s prosocial responding to various needs. Critically, if a two-factor model is replicated in an older sample, this would provide further support for the motivation-based framework, meaning engagement in the various subtypes of prosocial behavior in middle childhood are influenced by distinct underlying motivations. A deeper understanding of the mechanisms underlying the emergence and development of prosocial behavior will enable us to promote prosociality through the creation of refined interventions.
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