

**SOCIAL, EMOTIONAL, AND PERSONALITY
DEVELOPMENT IN CONTEXT**

Kenneth H. Rubin, *Series Editor*

Handbook of Peer Interactions, Relationships, and Groups

*Edited by Kenneth H. Rubin, William M. Bukowski,
and Brett Laursen*

The Development of Shyness and Social Withdrawal

Edited by Kenneth H. Rubin and Robert J. Coplan

Socioemotional Development in Cultural Context

Edited by Xinyin Chen and Kenneth H. Rubin

**SOCIOEMOTIONAL
DEVELOPMENT
IN CULTURAL
CONTEXT**



Edited by

**Xinyin Chen
Kenneth H. Rubin**



THE GUILFORD PRESS
New York London

© 2011 The Guilford Press
A Division of Guilford Publications, Inc.
72 Spring Street, New York, NY 10012
www.guilford.com

All rights reserved

No part of this book may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording, or otherwise, without written permission from the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Last digit is print number: 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

The authors have checked with sources believed to be reliable in their efforts to provide information that is complete and generally in accord with the standards of practice that are accepted at the time of publication. However, in view of the possibility of human error or changes in behavioral, mental health, or medical sciences, neither the authors, nor the editor and publisher, nor any other party who has been involved in the preparation or publication of this work warrants that the information contained herein is in every respect accurate or complete, and they are not responsible for any errors or omissions or the results obtained from the use of such information. Readers are encouraged to confirm the information contained in this book with other sources.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Socioemotional development in cultural context / edited by Xinyin Chen and Kenneth H. Rubin.

p. cm. — (Social, emotional, and personality development in context)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-60918-186-4 (cloth: alk. paper)

1. Child psychology. 2. Child development. 3. Emotions in children.

4. Culture—Psychological aspects. I. Chen, Xinyin. II. Rubin, Kenneth H.

BF721.S5737 2011

155.4—dc22

2011001077

About the Editors

Xinyin Chen, PhD, is Professor of Psychology in the Applied Psychology-Human Development Division, Graduate School of Education, at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia. He is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association and the Association for Psychological Science and a member of the Executive Committee of the International Society for the Study of Behavioral Development. Dr. Chen has received a William T. Grant Scholars Award, a Shanghai Eastern Scholars Award, and several other academic awards. His primary research interest is children's and adolescents' socioemotional functioning (e.g., shyness-inhibition, social competence, and affect) and social relationships from a cultural-contextual perspective. He has coedited the books *Peer Relationships in Cultural Context* (2006) and *Social Change and Human Development: Concepts and Results* (2010), and published a number of articles in major journals such as *Child Development*, *Developmental Psychology*, and *Annual Review of Psychology* and book chapters concerning culture, children's social behaviors and peer relationships, and parental socialization practices.

Kenneth H. Rubin, PhD, is Professor of Human Development and Director of the Center for Children, Relationships, and Culture at the University of Maryland in College Park. He is a Fellow of the Canadian Psychological Association, the American Psychological Association, and the Association for Psychological Science. In 2008, Dr. Rubin received the award for Distinguished Contributions to the International Advancement of Research and Theory in Behavioral Development from the International Society for the Study of Behavioral Development. In 2010, he received the Developmental Psychology Mentor Award from the American Psychological Association.

CHAPTER 10



Morality, Exclusion, and Culture

MELANIE KILLEN *and* ALAINA BRENICK

Conceptual Overview

Children's social, emotional, and moral development occurs in a cultural context. Over the past two decades, research in developmental science has demonstrated the vast and myriad ways in which culture plays an important role in how children form concepts, acquire language, develop social competence, and construct morality. How culture plays a role is quite complicated and varies for each phenomenon under investigation. The goal of this chapter is to review current literature on how culture plays a role in children's evaluations of peer exclusion, and particularly exclusion that involves intergroup attitudes. Recently, developmental psychologists have studied children's intergroup attitudes, defined as judgments, beliefs, and biases that exist about members of outgroups, and how these judgments are related to group identity (Bennett & Sani, 2004) and peer exclusion (Killen, Sinno, & Margie, 2007).

Culture is relevant for the topic of intergroup peer exclusion in several ways. First, cultural membership, in the form of social identity, has been shown to contribute to patterns of peer exclusion. Social identity theory proposes that as children develop an identification with their group, then peers from different groups, such as those based on culture, become members of the "outgroup"; rejecting members of the outgroup enhances and reinforces the identity of the ingroup (Nesdale, 2004; Rutland, 2004). This

type of rejection has been shown to manifest itself in the context of everyday peer exclusion in school and home settings (Killen, Sinno, et al., 2007). Second, cultural membership is a significant factor affecting why children exclude others based on culture.

Societal and cultural expectations contribute to the formation of ingroup identity. When children hear negative messages about members of other cultures, the distinctions between the ingroup and outgroup are reinforced. Studying how messages from parents reinforce peer exclusion reflects cultural influences on children's exclusion of one another. Third, how children develop group identity and the factors that contribute to peer exclusion need to be understood from diverse cultural perspectives (Rutland, Killen, & Abrams, 2010). What constitutes legitimate reasons for exclusion in one culture may be viewed as negative reasons in another culture. For example, exclusion based on gender in one culture has different connotations in another culture, particularly when gender expectations (stereotypical and nonstereotypical) have unique cultural meanings. In fact, an important question is, To what extent does exclusion based on gender or other group categories generalize across cultures? This question may be usefully posed for any group membership category, such as gender, race, ethnicity, and particularly for "cultural" identity.

To address these issues, in this chapter we review the literature on peer exclusion in a range of cultural contexts. As we discuss in more detail later, we apply a social cognitive domain model to understanding issues of social exclusion (Killen, Sinno, et al., 2007; Hitti, Mulvey, & Killen, in press), which proposes a "culture by context by domain" theory. This interactive theory holds that comparisons of children from different cultural backgrounds requires detailed analyses of the context of interactions as well as the domain of social issues under investigation. Rarely does "culture," alone, account for differences between groups of children from two different parts of the world. This is so because other factors, such as the context of interactions or the domain of social judgments, contribute to how individuals make judgments (Turiel, 2002). This situation is the case "within cultures," and it is also the case "between cultures." Further, other variables such as gender, age, and socioeconomic status (SES) play a role in contributing to cultural comparisons. Thus, when comparing how Koreans and Americans evaluate peer exclusion, for example, it is necessary to analyze how the context of exclusion (for example, rejection, exclusion, victimization) and the domain of exclusion (is it reasoned about in terms of fairness, group identity, or personal choice?) bear on how Koreans and Americans evaluate exclusion (Park & Killen, 2010). For these reasons, which are spelled out in more detail in this chapter, we view culture as a multifaceted construct, requiring extensive analyses that include the context and domain of interactions and judgments.

In general, the cultural context of exclusion is an understudied but much needed focal point for understanding children's social development as well as patterns of peer rejection and exclusion. Because much of the research on cultural exclusion has been conducted from an intergroup perspective, a brief review of developmental intergroup attitudes follows next.

Developmental Intergroup Attitudes

Research on intergroup attitudes stems from social psychology, which has devoted more than 50 years to understanding the outcomes of intergroup attitudes that reflect prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination (Dovidio, Glick, & Rudman, 2005; Dovidio, Hewstone, Glick, & Estes, 2010). While children's prejudice has been investigated for more than two decades (see Aboud, 1988), the topic of intergroup attitudes has recently awarded a more expansive role in child development research, focusing on the developmental origins of intergroup attitudes and how these attitudes reflect the emergence of prejudice, discrimination, and stereotyping as well as exclusion (Aboud & Amato, 2001; Abrams & Rutland, 2008; Levy & Killen, 2008; Quintana & McKown, 2007).

What makes child developmental intergroup research different from adult intergroup research is the necessity of determining the ways in which children's social cognitive and cognitive abilities constrain their responses, judgments, and intentions toward others, and particularly regarding the relationship between the ingroup and the outgroup. To accomplish these aims, developmental psychology researchers analyze children's interpretations of a number of dimensions, including the social context (where does prejudice or bias occur?), types of relationship (who is involved? peer, adult, or family?), the forms of identification with the ingroup (am I a member of this group, what is the nature of my affiliation, and how much do I value it?), social experiences (what is the nature of my history of intergroup contact and experiences with discrimination?), social categorization (who is a member of the ingroup or the outgroup?) and the social construal (what meaning do I give to the situation?). This type of contextual analysis has been applied to peer exclusion as well as the general area of childhood prejudice (Killen, Richardson, & Kelly, 2010).

For the most part, developmental intergroup research has demonstrated how negative biases about others are often maintained by attitudes from the "majority" group, that is, the dominant social, ethnic, or gender group, in a given social context. As articulated by political and social theorists, hierarchical relationships within and between cultures are often maintained by conventions and stereotypical expectations, which too often

perpetuate power and status relationships (Nussbaum, 1999; Turiel, 2002). Using both explicit (judgments, evaluations) as well as implicit (reaction times, ambiguous pictures tasks) methodologies, research has shown how status differences in peer relationships (which contribute to prejudice and exclusion) begin in early childhood and evolve throughout childhood, adolescence, and into adulthood (for reviews, see Abrams & Rutland, 2008; Killen, Sinno, et al., 2007; Levy & Killen, 2008). As we subsequently describe, research on peer exclusion from an intergroup perspective complements research on peer rejection from a peer relations perspective (Chen & French, 2008; Rubin, Bukowski, & Parker, 2006).

Peer Rejection and Exclusion

Over the past decade, research has demonstrated that there are times in which children exclude others for reasons that do not pertain to the behavioral characteristics of the individual children but to their group membership (Abrams & Rutland, 2008; Killen, Sinno, et al., 2007; Nesdale, 2004, 2008). This finding is in contrast to the bulk of research on peer relationships in childhood, which focuses on individual behavioral characteristics that put children at risk for rejecting others or being rejected (Asher & Coie, 1990; Bierman, 2004; Rubin et al., 2006). Typically, research has focused on individual differences in social skills, demonstrating that children who lack social skills (e.g., ones who are fearful, socially anxious, and shy) put themselves at risk for being rejected by others, and treated as "victims." In addition, children lacking social skills, such as being aggressive or insensitive to social cues, put themselves at risk for rejecting others, that is, becoming "bullies." This research makes predictions about the relationships between social deficits and peer rejection and has been important for understanding patterns of aggression, social withdrawal, anxiety, and depression in childhood (Rubin et al., 2006). Social deficits that contribute to negative social outcomes include limitations on interpreting social cues, judging the intentions of others, resolving conflicts constructively, and acquiring the basics of peer group entry rituals (Boivin, Hymel, & Hodges, 2001; Dodge et al., 2003; Parker & Asher, 1987).

Research on social competence from a peer relations perspective has called attention to the cultural meaning of personality traits that contribute to peer rejection (Bierman, 2004; Chen & French, 2008). For example, Chen and his colleagues have conducted extensive research on how cultural norms and values affect how one exhibits sociability (Chen & French, 2008), and they have demonstrated that how peers respond to peer rejection varies by culture, at least in their research studies conducted in China and Canada (Chen, DeSouza, Chen, & Wang, 2006). While children in

Canada and China both displayed reticent behavior in peer situations, for example, Canadian children responded with overt refusal, whereas Chinese children responded more positively. These findings indicate that the bases for peer rejection may vary by culture such that what counts as a reason to reject in one culture (e.g., reticence) would not be viewed as a basis for rejection in another culture. This analysis tells us that even behaviors that have a biological basis, such as temperament, need to be understood in a cultural context. Group membership, the focus of intergroup peer exclusion research, reflects societal expectations and norms as well, that both define an individual and at the same time often serve to justify exclusion.

Peer exclusion based on group membership often reflects prejudice, stereotyping, and bias. This perspective differs from the typical peer rejection approach because implicit intergroup biases are pervasive in society and exist among socially well-functioning individuals; thus, the focus is less on clinical diagnoses of children at the extremes of peer social competence and is more on how cultural expectations of inclusion and exclusion manifest themselves in children's interactions, judgments, and relationships (Abrams, Hogg, & Marques, 2005; Baron & Banaji, 2006; Killen, Sinno, et al., 2007; Rutland, Cameron, Milne, & McGeorge, 2005). Further, the "intervention" focus would not be on social competence training programs for outliers (shy and fearful or aggressive children) but rather on prejudice-reduction programs targeted at the majority groups (i.e., broadly, all children). The theoretical models that guide this research stem from social-cognitive theories as well as social identity theories that are described in the next section.

Social-Cognitive Domain Theory

Social-cognitive domain theory provides a theoretical framework for examining social reasoning about exclusion, prejudice, stereotyping, and intergroup bias in childhood (Killen, Richardson, & Kelly, 2010). This model has identified three categories of social reasoning—the moral (fairness, justice, equality, rights), the socially conventional (traditions, customs, etiquette, rituals), and the psychological (personal individual discretion, autonomy, theory of mind)—that coexist within individual evaluations of social issues (Smetana & Turiel, 2003; Turiel, 1983; Turiel, 2002) and that are reflected in social reasoning about gender and racial exclusion (Killen, Henning, Kelly, Crystal, & Ruck, et al., 2007). For example, exclusion may be viewed as wrong and "unfair" (morally), or as legitimate to make the group work well (conventional), or as legitimate owing to personal prerogatives and choice (psychological). The social-cognitive domain model differs from Kohlberg's global stage theory of moral development (Kohlberg,

1971) in that these types of justifications exist in parallel in development, emerge at a very early age, and change in terms of their breadth, criteria, and nature. This approach is consistent with many domain-specific views in cognitive development (Keil, 2006).

With age and experience, adolescents become more aware of the roles of social conventions in maintaining structure and order in society. In middle adolescence, social conventions are prioritized owing to a strict acceptance of the importance of social structure (Turiel, 1983), reflecting the increased importance of social identity and group functioning. When evaluating intergroup exclusion among youths from different social cliques (Horn, 2003) and ethnic groups (Killen, et al., 2007; Killen, Lee-Kim, McGlothlin, & Stangor, 2002), middle adolescents rate exclusion as more acceptable in peer and group contexts than do younger children, particularly for reasons relating to autonomy and personal choice in friendship, group identity, norms, and functioning. Their previously prosocial and inclusive attitudes toward intergroup interaction are subordinated to group norms.

As an illustration of empirical research from the social-cognitive domain model on children's reasoning about exclusion, Killen and Stangor (2001) investigated the forms of reasoning used by children and adolescents when evaluating exclusion from activity-based peer groups who share interests (e.g., ballet, baseball). The role of group membership (gender and race) was introduced by asking children about exclusion of an individual who did not fit the stereotypical expectations of the group (e.g., gender: excluding a boy from ballet, a girl from baseball; race: excluding a white student from basketball or a black student from a math club) (Killen & Stangor, 2001). For straightforward exclusion decisions (e.g., "Is it all right or not all right to exclude a boy from a ballet club?"), the vast majority of first, fourth and seventh graders evaluated such exclusionary acts as unfair and morally wrong. Shared interests were viewed as more important than stereotypical issues.

When asked to make judgments that were complex, however, such as who the group should pick when only one space was available and two children wanted to join—one who matched the stereotype and one who did not (e.g., "A boy and girl both want to join ballet—who should the group pick?")—with increasing age, participants focused more on group functioning considerations and picked the child who best fit the stereotype. Despite using moral reasoning to evaluate the straightforward exclusion vignette, the older sample used more social conventional reasoning than did their younger counterparts when picking a new group member in the inclusion/exclusion scenario. Thus, with increasing age, adolescents' awareness of group functioning considerations were given priority to their own concerns

about fairness or equal opportunity in the more straightforward contexts (Horn, 2003; Horn, 2006).

These findings also indicated that multiple forms of reasoning coexist within individual thinking about an issue. Adolescents did not use only one form of reasoning (as would be characterized in a general stage model) but instead used forms of reasoning from different domains of knowledge (moral and social-conventional). The contextual aspect of social cognition has been validated by many studies. Adolescents will give priority to morality and fairness, even in complex situations. Thus, the task for research is to identify the salient contextual factors that contribute to children's and adolescents' decision making. The salience of reasoning for interpreting children's and adolescents' decision making has been demonstrated in many aspects of children's and adolescents' lives (Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 2006). The research discussed here provides evidence for the importance attached to reasoning about peer exclusion and peer rejection.

What remains to be better understood is what underlies group functioning considerations in exclusion situations. On the one hand, a concern for making groups work well could be a legitimate issue as it relates to social coordination and group cohesiveness. On the other hand, a concern for group functioning could be merely a proxy for stereotypical assumptions and outgroup bias. When all-male executive board rooms of the past century were asked to include women, many members balked at the idea, citing the need to preserve the group and to maintain "group order." The idea of admitting women was viewed as disruptive and unconventional. Most likely, both forms of group functioning were operative—both a concern for a lack of precedents, and an underlying set of stereotypes about women. To some extent, these two dimensions are related in that stereotypical views about women's business knowledge or personality traits, if true, would be disruptive as well as incompatible with a business approach, and the outcome would be that including women would be unlikely to help to make the group "work well." Yet, when challenged and shown that the assumptions are false (as a group category label), then the notion of what makes the group function well changes. As change comes about, individuals are differentiated from norms so that eventually women who espouse the norms of the group (i.e., probusiness and assertive) come to be preferred over men who espouse norms of the outgroup. This example also illustrates what happens when expectations about personality traits are confused with stereotypical expectations about groups and group functioning. Thus, stereotypical expectations about personality traits assigned to women interfere with expectations about group functioning. Exclusion based on personality traits can be argued as legitimate as a basis for exclusion when the personality traits interfere with group functioning. Do individuals evaluate

exclusion based on group membership as different from exclusion based on personality traits? Further, as alluded to earlier, to what extent is this distinction culturally unique or generalizable?

In a recent study, Park and Killen (2010) investigated whether children's evaluations of peer rejection based on personality traits differed from rejection based on group membership, and the extent to which these judgments were culturally generalizable. In this study, Korean ($N = 397$) and U.S. ($N = 333$) children and adolescents (10 and 13 years of age) evaluated personality (aggression, shyness) and group (gender, nationality) characteristics as a basis for peer rejection in three contexts (friendship rejection, group exclusion, victimization). Children evaluated 12 scenarios in all: three peer rejection scenarios (friendship rejection, peer group exclusion, and peer victimization) in which there were four different types of exclusion: two based on personality traits (shy, aggressive) and two based on group memberships (different nationality, different gender). The friendship rejection context was one in which one child did not want to be friends with another child; the exclusion context was one in which a group did not want a child to join them in their club, and the victimization context was one in which a group repeatedly teased and taunted a child. For each context, the excluded child was alternatively shy, aggressive, of a different nationality, or of a different gender.

Overall, peer rejection based on group membership was viewed by this study's respondents as more unfair (reflecting moral reasons) than peer rejection based on personality traits, supporting both social domain research as well as social identity research on peer exclusion (Killen, Sinno, et al., 2007; Nesdale et al., 2007). Social domain research has proposed that group membership would be viewed as unfair (moral reasons), in contrast to exclusion based on personality characteristics, which could be viewed either in terms of group functioning (socially conventional reasons) or personal choice (psychological reasons) (Killen, 2007). Social identity theory has proposed that rejection in the context of group membership is more similar to prejudice than rejection in the context of personality characteristics; group identity reflects a complex interaction among ingroup and outgroup members (Nesdale, 2008).

Additionally, a closer examination of the responses in the Park and Killen study (2010) indicated that participants viewed it as most legitimate to reject a peer who was aggressive and least legitimate to exclude one based on nationality. Rejecting a peer based on shyness was not considered as legitimate as rejecting one based on aggression (and rated about the same as rejection based on gender). The findings for context indicated that children viewed friendship rejection as more legitimate than group exclusion or victimization and used more personal choice reasoning for friendship

rejection than for rejection in any other context, again supporting social domain theory. Social domain theory would predict that friendship rejection would be justified based on personal decisions about friendship choice. In contrast victimization is viewed as wrong based on moral reasons such as harm to the victim.

The findings also provided support for the culturally generalizable nature of social reasoning about peer exclusion; Korean and U.S. children were not significantly different on most measures of peer rejection. In fact, the only significant cultural differences were that Korean children viewed exclusion based on nationality as more legitimate than did U.S. children, and Korean children viewed exclusion based on aggression as more legitimate than did U.S. children. These findings support our "culture by context by domain" theory because culture, taken alone, did not account for the differences in evaluations of exclusion across the board but rather only with respect to two factors. Surprisingly, Korean children did not view shyness as a less legitimate reason to exclude than did U.S. children, contrary to cultural theorizing about shyness as a more "normative" behavior in Korea than in the United States. This finding could be attributable to several factors. First, this study included children who were 10 and 13 years of age; much of the previous data on reticence as a positive behavior in Chinese children reflected research conducted with younger children. Second, shyness was described as "a quiet child who reads by him- or herself and is ignored by other children." This form of shyness describes a different quality, potentially, from "reticence," which is a form of social withdrawal. Thus, further research is required to fully understand the role of culture in defining various forms of shyness as a basis for peer exclusion and rejection. For the most part, the findings confirmed the generalizability of social reasoning about peer rejection, and particularly regarding the distinction between exclusion based on personality traits as more legitimate than exclusion based on group membership.

Developmental Subjective Group Dynamics

Understanding the dynamic role of group identity and group membership in the evaluation of social exclusion requires an examination of how children weigh ingroup and outgroup norms (Abrams & Rutland, 2008). At an early age children develop an understanding of the different groups that constitute their social world and begin to identify with these groups (Bennett & Sani, 2004; Ruble et al., 2004; Ruble, Martin, & Berenbaum, 2006). These groups range from broad social categories, such as culture, ethnicity, or gender, to unique groups such as the family and temporary but significant

groups, such as the school class. According to social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), by excluding others from their social group, children are able to bolster their sense of social identity (Nesdale, 2004; Verkuyten & Steenhuis, 2005) and present a positive public self to their peer group (Rutland, 2004; Rutland et al., 2005). An emphasis on bolstering one's own identity is what can lead to the justification of exclusion of others.

The developmental subjective group dynamics model (Abrams & Rutland, 2008; Abrams et al., 2003; Abrams, Rutland, Cameron & Ferrell, 2007) holds that children develop a dynamic relationship between their judgments about peers within groups and about groups as a whole (i.e., intergroup attitudes). As children's social-cognitive development changes and they experience belonging to social groups, they are more likely to integrate their preferences for different groups with their evaluations of peers within groups based on particular characteristics or behaviors (Aboud & Amato, 2001; Nesdale, 2004; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). For example, a group of children identifying with a sports team may begin to change their attitudes about a member of the ingroup "team" who acts like, or prefers, members of a rival team (the outgroup). This change in children's social cognition means they can often both exclude a peer because he or she is from a different social group (i.e., intergroup bias) and exclude a peer from within their own group who deviates from the group's socially conventional norms (i.e., intragroup bias), such as increased liking expressed for an outgroup member. What is interesting, then, is that group membership, alone, is not what contributes to exclusion, but rather the dynamic between group identity and group norms.

Research following this developmental intergroup approach (Abrams & Rutland, 2008; Abrams, Rutland, & Cameron, 2003) has investigated intergroup exclusion by constructing an experimental paradigm to examine how children would evaluate ingroup and outgroup peers who either showed "normative" (loyal) behavior or "deviant" (disloyal) behavior. In experiments using nationality as the group membership factor (e.g., English and German groups), children were first asked to rate how they felt toward the ingroup as a whole and the outgroup as a whole (i.e., intergroup exclusion). Then the children heard descriptions of normative and deviant peers who were either in the same or a different group. Normative peers made two positive statements about the group, while deviant peers made one positive statement about the group but also one positive statement about the other group.

Studies in intergroup contexts that used national groups (Abrams et al., 2003), summer school groups (Abrams et al., 2007), and minimal or "arbitrary" groups (Abrams, Rutland, Ferrell, & Pelletier, 2008) have shown that when evaluating potential targets of exclusion children simultaneously prefer those from other social groups and exclude those within their

peer group that do not threaten the socially conventional norms central to their group. In addition, studies (e.g., Abrams et al., 2003; Abrams et al., 2008) have shown that these different forms of social exclusion are more strongly linked among older children that are more motivated to support their ingroup (i.e., show high intergroup bias or identify more strongly). This finding indicates that both types of social exclusion are related to the children's sense of social identity and their desire to maintain intergroup differences.

Yet, what about when the deviance that threatens the group arises not in the social-conventional domain but in the moral domain? This distinction has been shown to emerge early in development (by age 3 or 4 years) and guides how children interpret rules, transgressions, and responses to peers and adults regarding social interactions and encounters. How do children weigh their concerns about group identity (preserving the group norms) with moral beliefs about fairness and justice? This intergroup and intragroup conflict is central to social life for children and adults, and understanding this developmental trajectory sheds light on exclusion and prejudice in adulthood.

To undertake an examination of the interplay of cultural identity, social norms, and social reasoning, it is first necessary to describe studies that have been conducted on each one of these constructs and to consider specifically how culture plays a role in group identity and social norms.

Culture and Exclusion

As discussed earlier, much of the current developmental research on intergroup inclusion and exclusion has focused solely on gender and race, and relatively little has examined cultural attitudes that invoke stereotypes and negative intergroup opinions. By examining cultural groups rather than gender and race, we move beyond groups that are often defined primarily by stable lifelong categories. Cultural groups and cultural identity include stable, unchanging components as well as those beliefs, conventions, and traditions that group members self-select and choose to identify with. Below we review several recent studies that have systematically examined the intersection between culture and morality in interpersonal and intergroup relations.

Killen, Crystal, and Watanabe (2002) and Park, Killen, Crystal, and Watanabe (2003) examined the influence of the participant's culture and context of exclusion on the exclusion judgments of first, Japanese and American and, second, Korean, Japanese, and American children, respectively. Both of the studies utilized samples of 4th, 7th, and 10th graders and followed the same methodology. In the two studies the children were asked

to evaluate scenarios of exclusion based on one of six factors: (1) aggressive behavior; (2) unconventionality in dress (wearing strange clothes to a fancy restaurant); (3) unconventionality in public behavior (acting like a clown in the movie theater); (4) cross-gender behavior; (5) ineptness in sports; and (6) personality (acting sad or lonely at a picnic). Their evaluations were assessed in terms of an evaluative judgment (is it all right or not all right to exclude?), conformity (should the excluded child change his or her behavior to fit in?), and self-perceived differences (is the participant similar to or different from the excluded child?). The results of both of the studies yielded no overall differences between the exclusion evaluations of the Japanese and American participants. Both groups place priority on group functioning in some scenarios and individual choice in others.

Further, Park et al. (2003) found that Japanese, Korean, and American participants generally found exclusion to be wrong overall, with the Korean participants perceived to be the most tolerant of the three groups. While the Korean children offered similar evaluations of exclusion when it was predicated on the aggressive behavior of the excluded child, amid all of the scenarios, they were most willing to exclude when the exclusion was based on the unconventionality of the public behavior of the excluded child, again supporting our interactional theory about culture and context.

A recent set of studies was designed to examine how Israeli-Jewish and Arab children (in Israel, Jordan, and the Palestinian Territories) evaluate conflict resolution, intergroup peer encounters, and exclusion situations (Brenick et al., 2007; Brenick et al., 2010; Cole et al., 2003). These studies have been framed by the social-cognitive domain model, identifying moral, social-conventional, and psychological reasoning as basic aspects of children's social judgments (see Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 2006). Specifically, these studies have examined the stereotypes and moral judgments related to intergroup relations among Jewish-Israeli, Palestinian-Israeli, and Palestinian-Arab preschoolers (Cole et al., 2003) as well as Jewish-Israeli, Palestinian-Israeli, Palestinian-Arab, and Jordanian preschoolers (Brenick et al., 2010; and see Brenick et al., 2007). This research has found that, while children involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict tend to hold negative stereotypes toward the outgroup, they also make prosocial moral justifications in evaluating potential interpersonal transgressions and certain instances of intergroup exclusion. These studies have also found that children's intergroup judgments vary, depending the context of the intergroup interaction, and are influenced by group membership (Brenick et al., 2007).

Children were assessed in terms of their knowledge of Israeli and Arab cultural symbols, their understanding of the cultural similarities between the two groups (Brenick et al., 2007; Cole et al., 2003), their stereotypes of members of the other group (e.g., Israeli-Jewish children were asked

about Arabs, and Arab children were asked about Jews), their social judgments about vignettes detailing dilemmas involving everyday peer conflict resolution, and how these changed after viewing specified *Sesame Street* programming (Brenick et al., 2007; Cole et al., 2003). Cole et al.'s (2003) assessment included the evaluation of everyday scenarios with Jewish and Palestinian peers that involved turn-taking on swings, sharing toys (cars or dolls), and playing a game of hide-and-seek. For example, the swings story would be explained as follows:

Shira, who is Jewish, and Aisha, who is Arab, are playing in the park. Shira is on the swings. Aisha wants to swing, but there is only one swing. What will happen next? Aisha, the Arab girl, will push Shira, the Jewish girl, off the swing and then get on it, or, Aisha, the Arab girl, will say "Can I have a turn on the swing?" and then wait until Shira, the Jewish girl, gets off.

For each vignette, each child selected one of the two possible resolutions and then justified his or her answer. The findings from this study showed that all three groups of children (Israeli-Jewish, Israeli-Palestinian, and Palestinian-Arab) held negative stereotypes about the outgroup and lacked an understanding of the cultural similarities prior to viewing the *Sesame Street* program. At the pretest, both Israeli-Jewish and Palestinian children also lacked knowledge about the cultural symbols of the other group. In terms of their social reasoning, the pretest responses were highly prosocial, indicating that children find these potential moral transgressions as opportunities to offer the benefit of the doubt and attribute positive intentions to outgroup members. In other words, even though these children held negative conceptions of the outgroup, they were not yet applying them to intergroup interactions.

In an extension of the Cole et al. study (2003), Brenick and colleagues (2010) assessed the stereotyped knowledge and social reasoning about intergroup exclusion of Israeli-Jewish, Israeli-Palestinian, Palestinian-Arab, and Jordanian children. Brenick et al. (2010) analyzed how children evaluated and justified their evaluations of exclusion contexts in which a child was excluded based on country of origin (being excluded from a play group because he or she was from a "different country"), cultural stereotypes, (being excluded from a party because he or she was from a culture that typically wore a different type of "party hat"), and language (not being helped and being excluded from getting "ice cream" because he or she spoke a different language). For instance, the vignette titled "Ice Cream" featured a group of children who all spoke the same language, posing the question whether they should first stop and help another child who spoke a different language and had fallen while they were running to the ice cream

truck or whether they should get their ice cream and then help the child. These scenarios coupled the moral considerations of fairness with socially conventional norms and determined the factors that were most salient to the children.

The results varied across contexts and across cultural groups. Stereotyped knowledge results for this sample differed slightly from those of Cole et al. (2003). While both the Palestinian and Jordanian children held negative stereotypes about the other, the Israeli-Jewish children provided more neutral traits, and the Israeli-Palestinian children provided more positive traits. Social reasoning about all three scenarios differed by cultural group. Palestinian children, overall, were the most accepting of exclusion and were more likely to use stereotyped reasoning when justifying exclusion of a child who spoke a different language or came from a different country but group-functioning reasoning when justifying exclusion of a child with different cultural customs. Israeli-Jewish and Israeli-Palestinian children tended to be the least accepting of exclusion and utilized more prosocial and inclusive reasoning. Jordanian children, however, showed both inclusive and exclusive judgments and reasoning; they exhibited concerns for inclusion as well as group functioning.

These findings confirmed that children who hold negative stereotypes about the outgroup will not necessarily appeal to that stereotyped knowledge when weighing the possibilities of intergroup friendships and play. While these children held negative attitudes of members of the outgroup, they did not indiscriminately act on them. This set of findings yielded positive implications for prejudice reduction and coexistence. However, it also warrants further examination of these processes in older children and adolescents to determine whether the relationships between stereotyping and evaluations of intergroup interactions remain constant and, if not, how and when any subsequent differences manifest themselves.

While these studies found that the majority of participating children held negative stereotypes about the other group (though the Palestinian-Israeli group held primarily neutral to positive stereotypes), this perception did not directly carry over into the reasoning the children offered in their evaluations of the intergroup conflict scenarios. The types of justifications provided by the children differed by cultural group. Yet, all groups of children showed prosocial and inclusive reasoning in their responses (Brenick et al., 2007; Brenick et al., 2010; Cole et al., 2003).

In a study with older children in the Netherlands, Gieling, Thijs, and Verkuyten (2010) examined Dutch adolescents' tolerance of the cultural beliefs and practices of the Muslim population in the Netherlands. This study was conducted in the context of an extensive research program by Verkuyten and colleagues to understand Dutch adolescents' views about Muslims, asylum seekers, and recent immigrants from North Africa in the

Netherlands (Verkuyten, 2008). The study by Gieling, Thijs, et al. (2010) took a different approach from research in which participants are asked directly about exclusion of one member of a cultural group, as has been described in most of the studies reviewed in this chapter.

Instead, in this study, analyses were conducted on Dutch-majority adolescents' views of tolerance of, and evaluation of practices of, a minority group (Muslims) that has experienced exclusion by the majority. In addition, the researchers conducted a second study in which they examined whether the view that maintaining one's own minority culture in a majority society was related to evaluations of cultural practices. All participants were asked to evaluate a series of beliefs and practices of the Muslim population in terms of their conventionality, acceptability, wrongfulness, harmful consequences, and personal nature. Four scenarios—a student wearing a headscarf, a teacher refusing to shake hands with a parent of the opposite-sex, an Islamic school for only Muslim children, and an imam making antihomosexual proclamations—were described to participants for their evaluation. The findings for the first study (Study 1) demonstrated that participants evaluated all four practices by using multiple forms of reasoning—personal, socially conventional, and moral. Thus, the issues were multifaceted, drawing on moral (unfairness), conventional (traditions), and personal (choice) domains to evaluate these acts.

In the second study (Study 2), analyses of tolerance revealed that participants were more tolerant of acts considered to be a personal issue and less tolerant of acts that pertained to moral issues (socially conventional acts were in the middle). Furthermore, participants were more tolerant of the particular practices than of campaigns for public support of these practices. One's level of education, in-group identification, and multiculturalism had much stronger effects in the nonmoral than in the moral domain. Older adolescents were less tolerant than younger ones, which also reflected the fact that, with increased age, respondents viewed the issues as more complicated or multifaceted. These findings demonstrated that exclusion of a minority group by the majority is often condoned through cultural expectations about minority groups. Thus, children's lack of tolerance was attributed more to cultural messages than to individual differences in social competence and interaction.

Owing to sociopolitical changes, in some countries peer exclusion exists among respondents sharing the same—as well as a different—ethnic heritage. In Germany, for example, exclusion may pertain to members of the same ethnic groups—former West Germans and former East Germans (reflecting the fall of the Berlin Wall in the late 1980s)—as well as between Germans and Turks—even though Turkish families migrated to Germany for employment several generations ago. Feddes, Noack, and Rutland (2009) conducted a longitudinal study to examine direct and extended

cross-ethnic friendship effects on outgroup evaluations among German and Turkish children (ages 7–11) who were enrolled in ethnically heterogeneous elementary schools. Their results showed that, among ethnic-majority children but not ethnic-minority children, direct cross-ethnic friendship predicted positive outgroup evaluations over time. This longitudinal study demonstrated a causal direction between greater direct cross-ethnic friendship and more positive outgroup attitudes among ethnic-majority children. The effect of increased cross-group friendships on more positive intergroup attitudes and less exclusion was shown in part to result from changes in the children's perceived social ingroup norms about cross-ethnic friendship relations.

The experience of cross-group friendships encouraged children to think that their ingroup viewed these friendships as normal, and therefore they showed more positive intergroup attitudes. These findings were in line with previous research in the United Kingdom that found that both direct and extended contact promoted more positive social ingroup norms regarding cross-ethnic friendship, which then also resulted in improved intergroup attitudes among majority children (Cameron, Rutland, & Hossain, 2007).

The study by Feddes and colleagues (2009) suggested that in ethnically heterogeneous contexts direct friendship is more effective in changing intergroup attitudes than extended friendship and that social status moderates direct friendship effects. The expectation that cross-race friendships provide important experiences for reducing prejudice and increasing inclusion has been demonstrated in a wide range of cultural contexts. Further, the finding that intergroup contact was more effective for majority (German) than for minority (Turkish) children over the course of 1 year provides further support for the "culture by context by domain" theory because it demonstrates how a specific context of interaction can positively affect children's intergroup attitudes regarding outgroup members in quite different cultural contexts (Germany, the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands).

Cross-Group Friendships and Exclusion

While parents' attitudes toward intergroup friendships play a significant role in defining their children's attitudes toward and engagement in cross-group relationships, high-quality contact with peers (e.g., friendships) has been shown to be significantly related to prejudice reduction (Tropp & Prenovost, 2008). In fact, parental messages have been shown to be significantly related to adolescents' experiences with cross-group friendships. For example, adolescents whose parents are less supportive of cross-group relationships are less likely to engage in cross-group relationships, to achieve

deeper levels of intimacy through their cross-group relationships, and to bring cross-group friends into their homes (Edmonds & Killen, 2009).

Additionally, outgroup attitudes also play a critical role in children's and adolescents' perspectives on intergroup relations. Individuals are often highly concerned with how the outgroup will perceive their character when considering the prospect of engaging in intergroup contact. Those who feel threatened or anxious about how they might be viewed by the outgroup frequently distance themselves from the situation or avoid intergroup contact altogether (Mendoza-Denton & Page-Gould, 2008; Tropp & Prenovost, 2008). The role of anxiety in cross-group friendships has been examined in adult samples (Mendoza-Denton & Page-Gould, 2008) and more recently with children (Nesdale et al., 2007).

The experience of positive cross-group friendships can provide increased levels of intimacy that yield positive outcomes in terms of intergroup attitudes and decreases in prejudice. This circumstance creates an environment in which increases in intergroup closeness may flourish. Unfortunately, however, while youths become more adept in their abilities to understand the heterogeneity within and homogeneity across groups (Doyle & Aboud, 1995), a trajectory that would seemingly promote cross-group relations, by middle childhood a decrease in cross-group friendships becomes apparent (Aboud, Mendelson, & Purdy, 2003; Dubois & Hirsch, 1990). Thus, more research on intergroup contact among children and adolescents and the factors that determine what it is about intergroup friendships that influences a child or adolescent's likelihood of engaging in intergroup contact as well as actual experience with cross-group friendships needs to be conducted.

Given the potentially positive impact of intergroup friendships, it is essential to fully understand the complex nature of these relationships. While these topics have begun to be addressed with adults, a developmental approach is necessary for exploring these social psychological processes throughout childhood. From early on, how and why do children and adolescents choose to engage or not engage in intergroup contact? What influences their desire to engage in intergroup contact as well as the effectiveness of such contact? What is the role of culture in this process?

It is important to examine the variables that influence children's and adolescents' desire to engage in intergroup contact. While it has been demonstrated that friendship choices (i.e., who to befriend) are typically considered matters of personal choice, when those decisions involve crossing group boundaries such as race, ethnicity, and culture, children's and adolescents' reasoning also appeals to the moral and social-conventional concerns, indicating the complex nature of these relationships. This complexity is also reflected in the varying evaluations across different contexts of intergroup relations. The extent to which a child thinks members of his or her own group, family, peers, and outgroup members would be in favor of or against

contact may be related to whether a child would even consider engaging in intergroup contact, spurring such questions as "Is this something that I'm even allowed to do? encouraged to do? told to actively avoid?" Perceived ingroup and outgroup norms for contact are still an understudied topic in the intergroup literature, especially with children and adolescents—yet, one that can fully benefit from the inclusion of developmental perspectives that feature a history of research on peer and parental relationships.

Additional questions of interest include: "How do I think kids from other groups perceive me? Are they interested in getting to know me? Do they want to avoid me? Will they exclude me? How do they perceive my interest in contact or learning about their group? What drives my perceptions about their interest or lack of interest in contact?" Tropp (2006) found that both minority and majority adults report having higher levels of interest in contact than they perceive the outgroup to have. For children and adolescents, this perception can elicit anxiety and avoidance motivation around intergroup contact rather than lessening intergroup bias (as such contact is intended to promote). These questions of perceived interest, motivation, and expectations for engaging in contact require further investigation.

Both the developmental literature on inclusion/exclusion and the social psychological literature on contact effects have found differences regarding perceptions of, engagement in, and effects of intergroup contact (Cameron, Rutland, Brown, & Douch, 2006; Crystal, Killen, & Ruck, 2008; Hewstone et al., 2005; Killen, Crystal, & Ruck, 2007). While intergroup contact is an effective means of reducing prejudice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2005), optimal conditions prove more effective in reducing the prejudices of majority-group members than of minority-group members (Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, & Ross, 1997). The effects of contact, in general, are stronger for majority-status than minority-status groups overall (Tropp & Prenovost, 2008). Additionally, group differences emerge between majority and minority participants' evaluations of intergroup exclusion, with minority participants rating intergroup exclusion as more wrong than majority participants.

Examining the influences of group norms, meta-perceptions, and expectations about intergroup contact in a variety of cultures will help elucidate the varying levels of engagement in intergroup contact and cross-group friendships and of success in achieving positive intergroup attitudes across majority and minority groups as well as help provide guidelines to prevent negative intergroup interactions. Tracing age-related patterns from childhood to adulthood will provide novel insight into how these developmental changes serve as the foundation for both exclusive as well as inclusive social relationships, attitudes, and beliefs.

Conclusions

Understanding the role of culture on exclusion is complex and has been investigated at multiple levels. At the societal level, exclusion based on culture has resulted in civil wars, strife, and conflict (Opatow, 1990). How does exclusion based on cultural membership begin? What are the origins of exclusion based on culture? To address this issue it is necessary to understand how cultural identity emerges, when it becomes a justification for rejecting others, and how it is justified from a conventional perspective. In straightforward contexts, children and adolescents view exclusion based on a range of categories (culture, gender, ethnicity, race) as wrong from a moral standpoint, invoking reasons that primarily stem from a sense of injustice and a lack of fairness. With increasing age, children gradually adopt an identity that can, at times, serve to justify exclusion. Moreover, messages from parents and society often perpetuate these forms of exclusion, owing to traditions and ingroup identification. Further, situations that are complex or ambiguous are the contexts that are most likely to elicit stereotypical responses and to foster exclusionary decision making. Thus, one of the first places to facilitate more inclusive decision making is the complex or multidimensional contexts. By adulthood, stereotypes become deeply entrenched. To make a difference, it is necessary to intervene during early development, and that requires basic knowledge about how children and adolescents are approaching decision making about peer relationships.

The current patterns of migration during the 21st century pose new challenges for addressing issues relating to exclusion and peer relationships (Malti, Killen, & Gasser, *in press*). Children are attending schools that were previously homogeneous with respect to some categories (such as culture and ethnicity). The new diversity brings opportunities for intergroup dialogue and friendship; at the same time, diversity can create group alliances that result in outgroup threats and ingroup favoritism. To understand these complexities it is necessary to move beyond a unidimensional theory of culture (as a monolithic variable) and to understand how culture interacts with context and the domain of social interactions and judgments. Moreover, developing interventions to take advantage of the diversity through facilitating friendships rather than antagonisms and ingroup bias will go a long way toward fostering a just and fair society.

Acknowledgments

Melanie Killen was supported by an award from the National Science Foundation (No. 0840492) and by a University of Maryland Summer Stipend. We thank Xinyin Chen and Kenneth Rubin for helpful feedback on the manuscript.

References

- Aboud, F. E. (1988). *Children and prejudice*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Aboud, F. E., & Amato, M. (2001). Developmental and socialization influences on intergroup bias. In R. Brown & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup relations* (pp. 65–85). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Aboud, F. E., Mendelson, M. J., & Purdy, K. T. (2003). Cross-race peer relations and friendship quality. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 27, 165–173. Doi: 10.1080/01650250244000164.
- Abrams, D., Hogg, M. A., & Marques, J. M. (2005). A social psychological framework for understanding social inclusion and exclusion. In D. Abrams, M. A. Hogg, & J. M. Marques (Eds.), *The social psychology of inclusion and exclusion* (pp. 1–24). New York: Psychology Press.
- Abrams, D., & Rutland, A. (2008). The development of subjective group dynamics. In S. R. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup relations and attitudes in childhood through adulthood* (pp. 47–65). Oxford, UK: 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.
- Abrams, D., Rutland, A., Cameron, L., & Ferrell, J. (2007). Older but wiler: In-group accountability and the development of subjective group dynamics. *Developmental Psychology*, 43, 134–148.
- Abrams, D., Rutland, A., Ferrell, J. M., & Pelletier, J. (2008). Children's judgments of disloyal and immoral peer behavior: Subjective group dynamics in minimal intergroup contexts. *Child Development*, 79, 444–461.
- Asher, S. R., & Coie, J. (1990). *Peer rejection in childhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baron, A. S., & Banaji, M. R. (2006). The development of implicit attitudes: Evidence of race evaluations from ages 6 and 10 and adulthood. *Psychological Science*, 17, 53–58.
- Bennett, M., & Sani, F. (Eds.). (2004). *The development of the social self*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Bierman, K. L. (2004). *Peer rejection: Developmental processes and intervention strategies*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Boivin, M., Hymel, S., & Hodges, E. V. E. (2001). Toward a process view of peer rejection and harassment. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 265–289). New York: Guilford Press.
- Brenick, A., Killen, M., Lee-Kim, J., Fox, N. A., Leavitt, L. A., Raviv, A. et al. (2010). Social understanding in Young Israeli-Jewish, Israeli-Palestinian, Palestinian, and Jordanian children: Moral judgments and stereotypes. *Early Education and Development*, 21, 1–26.
- Brenick, A., Lee-Kim, J., Killen, M., Fox, N. A., Leavitt, L. A., & Raviv, A. (2007). Social judgments in Israeli and Arabic children: Findings from media-based intervention projects. In D. Lemish & M. Gotz (Eds.), *Children, media and war* (pp. 287–308). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Cameron, L., Rutland, A., Brown, R., & Douch, R. (2006). Changing children's intergroup attitudes toward refugees: Testing different models of extended contact. *Child Development*, 77, 1208–1219.
- Cameron, L., Rutland, A., & Hossain, R. (2007). *Prejudice-reduction through story-reading: Indirect contact in the classroom*. Paper presented at the 37th annual meeting of the Jean Piaget Society, Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- Chen, X., DeSouza, A. T., Chen, H., & Wang, L. (2006). Reticent behavior and experiences in peer interactions in Chinese and Canadian children. *Developmental Psychology*, 42, 656–665.
- Chen, X., & French, D. C. (2008). Children's social competence in cultural context. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59, 591–616.
- Cole, C., Arafat, C., Tidhar, C., Zidan, W. T., Fox, N. A., Killen, M., et al. (2003). The educational impact of Rechov Sumsum/Shara'a Simsim, a television series for Israeli and Palestinian children. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 27, 409–422.
- Crystal, D., Killen, M., & Ruck, M. (2008). It's who you know that counts: Intergroup contact and judgments about race-based exclusion. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 26, 51–70.
- Dodge, K. A., Lansford, J. E., Burks, V. S., Bates, J. E., Pettit, G. S., Fontaine, R., et al. (2003). Peer rejection and social information-processing factors in the development of aggressive behavior problems in children. *Child Development*, 74, 374–393.
- Dovidio, J. F., Glick, P., & Rudman, L. (Eds.). (2005). *Reflecting on the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Dovidio, J. F., Hewstone, M., Glick, P., & Estes, V. (2010). *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Doyle, A. B., & Aboud, F. E. (1995). A longitudinal study of White children's racial prejudice as a social-cognitive development. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 41, 209–228.
- DuBois, D. L., & Hirsch, B. J. (1990). School and neighborhood patterns of blacks and whites in early adolescence. *Child Development*, 61, 524–536.
- Edmonds, C., & Killen, M. (2009). Do adolescents' perceptions of parental racial attitudes relate to their intergroup contact and cross-race relationships? *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 12, 5–21.
- Feddes, A. R., Noack, P., & Rutland, A. (2009). Direct and extended friendship effects on minority and majority children's interethnic attitudes: A longitudinal study. *Child Development*, 80, 377–390. Doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2009.01266.x.
- Gieling, M., Thijs, J., & Verkuyten, M. (2010). Tolerance of practices by Muslim actors: An integrative social-developmental perspective. *Child Development*, 81, 1384–1399. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01480.x.
- Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., Voci, A., Paolini, S., McLernon, F., Crisp, R., et al. (2005). Intergroup contact in a divided society: Challenging segregation in Northern Ireland. In D. Abrams, M. A. Hogg, & J. M. Marques (Eds.), *The social psychology of inclusion and exclusion* (pp. 265–292). New York: Psychology Press.
- Hitti, A., Mulvey, K. L., & Killen, M. (in press). Evaluation of social exclusion: The role of group norms, group identity, and fairness. *Anales de Psicologia* (Special

- issue: Social and developmental aspects of prejudice during childhood and adolescence, Eds. I. Eneso & S. Guerrero).
- Horn, S. (2003). Adolescents' reasoning about exclusion from social groups. *Developmental Psychology*, 39, 71–84.
- Horn, S. (2006). Group status, group bias, and adolescents' reasoning about treatment of others in school contexts. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 30, 208–218.
- Keil, F. (2006). Cognitive science and cognitive development. In W. Damon (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology* (pp. 609–635). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Killen, M. (2007). Children's social and moral reasoning about exclusion. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16, 32–36.
- Killen, M., Crystal, D., & Ruck, M. (2007). The social developmental benefits of intergroup contact for children and adolescents. In E. Frankenberg & G. Orfield (Eds.), *Lessons in integration: Realizing the promise of racial diversity in America's schools* (pp. 57–73). Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Killen, M., Crystal, D., & Watanabe, H. (2002). Japanese and American children's evaluations of peer exclusion, tolerance of difference, and prescriptions for conformity. *Child Development*, 73, 1788–1802.
- Killen, M., Henning, A., Kelly, M. C., Crystal, D., & Ruck, M. (2007). Evaluations of interracial peer encounters by majority and minority U.S. children and adolescents. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 31, 491–500.
- Killen, M., Lee-Kim, J., McGlothlin, H., & Stangor, C. (2002). How children and adolescents evaluate gender and racial exclusion. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development* (Serial No. 271, Vol. 67, No. 4). Oxford, England: Blackwell Publishers.
- Killen, M., Richardson, C., & Kelly, M. C. (2010). Developmental intergroup attitudes: Stereotyping, exclusion, fairness, and justice. In J. F. Dovidio, M. Hewstone, P. Glick, & V. M. Esses (Eds.), *Handbook of prejudice stereotyping and discrimination* (pp. 97–114). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Killen, M., & Stangor, C. (2001). Children's social reasoning about inclusion and exclusion in gender and race peer group contexts. *Child Development*, 72, 174–186.
- Killen, M., Sinno, S., & Margie, N. G. (2007). Children's experiences and judgments about group exclusion and inclusion. In R. V. Kail (Ed.), *Advances in child development and behavior* (pp. 173–218). New York: Elsevier.
- Kohlberg, L. (1971). From is to ought: How to commit the naturalistic fallacy and get away with it in the study of moral development. In T. Mischel (Ed.), *Psychology and genetic epistemology* (pp. 151–235). New York: Academic Press.
- Levy, S., & Killen, M. (2008). *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Malti, T., Killen, M., & Gasser, L. (in press). Social judgments and emotion attributions about exclusion in Switzerland. *Child Development*.
- Mendoza-Denton, R., & Page-Gould, E. (2008). Can cross-group friendships influence minority students' well-being at historically white universities? *Association of Psychological Science*, 19, 933–939.

- Nesdale, D. (2004). Social identity processes and children's ethnic prejudice. In M. Bennett & F. Sani (Eds.), *The development of the social self* (pp. 219–245). New York: Psychology Press.
- Nesdale, D., Maass, A., Kiesner, J., Durkin, K., Griffiths, J., & Ekberg, A. (2007). Effects of peer group rejection, group membership, and group norms, on children's outgroup prejudice. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 31, 526–535.
- Nesdale, D. (2008). Peer group rejection and children's intergroup prejudice. In S. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood* (pp. 32–46). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1999). *Sex and social justice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Opatow, S. (1990). Moral exclusion and injustice: An introduction. *Journal of Social Issues*, 46, 1–20.
- Park, Y., & Killen, M. (2010). When is peer rejection justifiable?: Children's understanding across two cultures. *Cognitive Development*, 24, 290–301.
- Park, Y., Killen, M., Crystal, D. S., & Watanabe, H. (2003). Korean, Japanese, and U.S. students' judgments about peer exclusion: Evidence for diversity. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 27, 555–565.
- Parker, J. G., & Asher, S. R. (1987). Peer relations and later personal adjustment: Are low-accepted children at risk? *Psychological Bulletin*, 102, 352–389.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2005). Allport's intergroup contact hypothesis: Its history and influence. In J. F. Dovidio, P. Glick, & L. Rudman (Eds.), *Reflecting on the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport* (pp. 262–277). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Quintana, S., & McKown, C. (2007). *The handbook of race, racism, and the developing child*. New York: Wiley.
- Rubin, K., Bukowski, W., & Parker, J. (2006). Peers, relationships, and interactions. In W. Damon & R. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology* (pp. 571–645). New York: Wiley.
- Ruble, D. N., Alvarez, J., Bachman, M., Cameron, J., Fuligni, A., & Coll, C. G. (2004). The development of a sense of "we": The emergence and implications of children's collective identity. In M. Bennett & F. Sani (Eds.), *The development of the social self* (pp. 29–76). New York: Psychology Press.
- Rutland, A. (2004). The development and self-regulation of intergroup attitudes in children. In M. Bennett & F. Sani (Eds.), *The development of the social self* (pp. 247–265). New York: Psychology Press.
- Rutland, A., Cameron, L., Milne, A., & McGeorge, P. (2005). Social norms and self-presentation: Children's implicit and explicit intergroup attitudes. *Child Development*, 76, 451–466.
- Rutland, A., Killen, M., & Abrams, D. (2010). A new social-cognitive developmental perspective on prejudice: The interplay between morality and group identity. *Perspectives in Psychological Science*, 5, 280–291.
- Smetana, J. G. (2006). Social-cognitive domain theory: Consistencies and variations in children's moral and social judgments. In M. Killen & J. G. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (pp. 119–154). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Smetana, J. G., & Turiel, E. (2003). Moral development during adolescence. In G. R. Adams & M. D. Berzonsky (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of adolescence*. (pp. 247–268). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.
- Tropp, L. R. (2006). Stigma and intergroup contact among members of minority and majority status groups. In S. Levin & C. v. Laar (Eds.), *Stigma and group inequality: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 171–191). Mahwah, NJ: LEA.
- Tropp, L. R., & Prenovost, M. A. (2008). The role of intergroup contact in predicting children's inter-ethnic attitudes: Evidence from meta-analytic and field studies. In S. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood* (pp. 236–248). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Turiel, E. (1983). *The development of social knowledge: Morality and convention*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Turiel, E. (2002). *The culture of morality*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Turiel, E. (2006). The development of morality. In N. Eisenberg, W. Damon, & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 789–857). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Verkuyten, M. (2008). Multiculturalism and group evaluations among minority and majority groups. In S. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood* (pp. 157–172). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Verkuyten, M., & Steenhuis, A. (2005). Preadolescents' understanding and reasoning about asylum seeker peers and friendships. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 26, 660–679.
- Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ross, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 73–90.

CHAPTER 11



The Cultural Context of Child and Adolescent Conflict Management

DORAN C. FRENCH

All societies must develop mechanisms to manage interpersonal conflict (de Waal, 1996), in part because this function must occur if close relationships such as friendships, romances, and marriages are to develop and be maintained over time (Gottman & Parker, 1986). Further, conflict management is essential for community cohesion, since uncontrolled conflict, even among children, can seriously disrupt adult relationships and communities (Lambert, 1971). For these reasons, it is important to teach children how to manage their current conflicts effectively as well as to socialize them to deal successfully with those they will experience as adults.

Although the study of conflict management among children and adolescents in different cultures has been limited, there now appears to be converging evidence from countries as diverse as Indonesia (French, Pidada, Denoma, McDonald, & Lawton, 2005), the Netherlands (Goudena, 2006), China (French et al., in press), and Columbia (Chaux, 2005) that there are significant variations across cultures in the management of conflict. This chapter, which is divided into four sections, reviews the evidence underlying this assertion. The first section examines the ways in which conflict management is associated with the dimensions of culture. The second section gives a brief overview of the general issues relevant to understanding child and adolescent conflict, while the third section features a discussion of child and adolescent conflict in North America, Indonesia, and China.