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CHAPTER I

Theoretical Rationale

Peer relationships are an important context for children’s development (Piaget, 1932; Rubin, Bukowski, & Parker, 1998, in press). These relationships are believed to provide a constellation of experiences that foster the social skills needed for effective functioning within a social world and that nurture a growing awareness and mutual understanding of the social roles, norms, values, and processes involved in interpersonal relationships (Rubin, et al., 1998; in press). Positive peer relationships are believed to serve affective functions by providing reassurance to the child in novel situations, and by providing a favorable context for the differentiation and validation of the self-concept (Harter, 1998).

Given the significant role of peer relationships for the developing child, it follows that difficulties in relating to peers can negatively influence child development. In developmental psychology, much of the research on negative peer relationships has focused on friendship rejection (Asher & Coie, 1990) and, more recently, on peer harassment (Graham & Juvonen, 1998; Hodges & Perry, 1996). Studies in the area of children's social competence have demonstrated that children who are rejected from social groups experience a wide range of negative consequences that bear on children's
trajectories for healthy social development (Rubin, et al., 1998).

While much of the research on peer relationships has focused on the behaviors and characteristics of perpetrators or victims, little is known about how children evaluate peer relationships in terms of social and moral reasoning. The model guiding the present study, referred to as social-cognitive domain theory, provides a theoretical framework for examining the multiple forms of moral reasoning children use to evaluate peer relationships. According to this model, three conceptually distinct domains of social knowledge develop out of an individual’s interactions: moral, societal, and psychological (see Tisak, 1995; Turiel, 1998; Turiel, Killen, & Helwig, 1987). The moral domain includes conceptions of equality, fairness, justice, rights, and welfare (e.g., hitting). The societal domain includes conceptions about social groups, social conventions, and social customs. The psychological domain is concerned with psychological systems, including conceptions such as personality, self, person, and identity, which are considered outside the jurisdiction of moral or social concerns.

The present study examined children’s and adolescents’ reasoning about peer relationships using social-cognitive domain theory as a guide. The goals of this study were three-fold. The first goal was to investigate children’s and adolescents’ evaluation of peer relationships in three contexts: 1) choice of friendship, 2) group exclusion, and 3)
victimization. Second, this study aimed to understand how children and adolescents evaluate four target traits: 1) aggression, 2) shyness, 3) gender, and 4) nationality for each of the three contexts mentioned above. The third goal was to examine how other variables, such as age, gender, cultural background, experience with rejection, and psychological perception of target traits, impact children’s and adolescents’ interpretations of negative peer relationships in Korea and the U.S.

The three contexts for the first goal—choice of friendship, group exclusion, and victimization—were chosen because extensive research in the area of children’s peer relationships has shown that friendship choice, group exclusion, and victimization are central aspects of children’s social experiences, and that these experiences are fundamentally related to children’s general healthy development (Asher, & Coie, 1987; Killen, McGlothlin, Lee-Kim, & Stangor, 2002; Rubin, et al., 1998). Although the importance of these contexts in social development has been acknowledged, no single study has compared these three contexts directly. The findings from comparing three contexts of peer relationship directly will provide a comprehensive understanding of the ways in which children evaluate the different levels of peer rejection in terms of harm associated with the rejected child to previous research on social moral reasoning.
In this study, how children evaluate these three contexts in terms of their social reasoning was investigated using social-cognitive domain theory. To briefly summarize the studies based on social-cognitive domain theory, regarding friendship, have shown that children and adolescents use reasoning based on personal choice when evaluating friendship decisions (Nucci, 1996; Smetana, Killen, & Turiel, 1991). When judging situations involving group exclusion, however, children and adolescents use social-conventional reasons (Killen, et al., 2002). Reasoning based on moral concerns is demonstrated for evaluations of victimization (Astor, 1998). Although these findings reveal the utility of social-cognitive domain theory in research on peer relationships, no one study has simultaneously examined these three contexts of peer relationships. In the next section, each context will be discussed using social-cognitive domain theory.

*Choice of friendship.* Those children with whom a child associates most will provide the bulk of social contingencies, modeling experiences, support, and aid that the child derives from the peer group. Previous research supports that children report differential preference for peers and selectively distribute the time they associate with peers (Hinde, Titmus, Easton, and Tamplin, 1985). Previous research suggests that children seek out and prefer compatible peers. Initially, they choose peers who are similar
in external, surface characteristics such as age (e.g., Rodgers, Billy, & Urdry, 1984), gender (e.g., Asher & Hymel, 1981), and ethnicity (e.g., Singleton & Asher, 1984).

After initial contacts, children make more refined choices about peer associates and develop peer preferences on the basis of similarities in behavior, such as styles of play (Rubin, Lynch, Coplan, Rose-Krasnor, & Booth, 1994) and aggression (Cairns et al., 1988). Children also tend to associate with peers who share similar group sociometric status (Ladd, Price, & Hart, 1990). The importance of various behaviors in making peer choice varies with age (Gottman, 1986). These descriptive data suggest that a person-environment linkage operates in friendship choice such that children selectively seek out peers who are compatible with their own characteristics.

In the field of social-cognitive domain theory, Nucci and his colleagues have shown that individuals use personal reasoning when discussing choice of friends and interpersonal relationships (Nucci, 1981; Nucci, 1996). Choosing friends may not only be a matter of personal choice, however, in complex situations. For example, a child may view potential friendship with an aggressive child as involving moral considerations, such as harm to self and others. Further, making a decision about friendship based solely on one’s nationality, ethnicity, or culture may be viewed as wrong using reasons such as unfairness. What was of interest in the present study was how children and adolescents
evaluate the legitimacy of peer rejection when the reason for rejection may have moral implications. This interest led to two questions. When is choice of friendship viewed as a personal decision because it is about the child’s preferences? When is choice of friendship viewed as a moral transgression because it is about treating someone in such a way as to not hurt their feelings (psychological harm) or about using unfair reasons for refusing to get to know them (prejudicial treatment)?

*Group exclusion.* The group exclusion context for this study involved peer relationships at the group level, which was distinct from the dyadic friendship context. Children conceptualize social groups in social-conventional terms, such as focusing on what makes a group work well (i.e., group functioning) (Killen et al., 2002b). As Turiel (1983) articulated, social conventions are behavioral regularities designed to promote the smooth functioning of social groups. Individuals who impede the goals of the group are treated in ways that minimize their participation in the group. In fact, such individuals are often actively forced out of the group. While smooth group functioning is a legitimate aim, this process could also be regarded as group exclusion. On the basis of the social-cognitive domain model, Killen and her colleagues (Killen, et al., 2002) have hypothesized that decisions about the appropriateness of excluding children from social groups involves at least two forms of social reasoning—*moral reasoning* about the
wrongfulness of group exclusion and social conventional reasoning about social group processes and group functioning. There are times when individuals must consider group dynamics and peer pressure, as well as fair treatment of someone else in their decision-making about group exclusion. For example, excluding a child from a running contest because he is a slow runner may be a legitimate decision. But is it all right to exclude individuals from a contest because of their race, religion, or nationality? In order to understand how children evaluate such issues of group exclusion, it is necessary to investigate the reasons children use and how they weigh competing claims.

Victimization. Peer victimization, an extreme form of group exclusion, has earned considerable attention in social developmental research. Much of our knowledge about peer victimization comes from large-scale studies by Olweus (see Olweus, 1978). According to Olweus (1994), children are considered victims of peer harassment when they are repeatedly exposed to negative actions on the part of one or more peers. The experience of being harassed by one’s classmates is associated with a wide range of adjustment difficulties (Alsaker, 1993; Boulton & Underwood, 1992; Bukowski, & Sippola, 2001; Hodges, & Perry, 1996; Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1996; Olweus, 1978, 1993; Perry, Kusel, & Perry, 1988; Teglasi & Rothman, 2001). This research further
suggests that victimization is highly stable. There is, however, little empirical data to show how children evaluate this phenomenon in terms of its moral implications.

Victimizing a child is a severe moral transgression because victimization involves harm to another. Although victimization is a prototypic example of a moral transgression, peer victimization is a common type of harassment in childhood. Recent studies about children’s attitudes regarding peer victimization have shown that children’s cognitive evaluations of negative peer relationships are remarkably more complex than assumed by many cognitive and skill-building interventions (Astor & Behre, 1997; Guerra, Huesmann, & Hanish, 1995; Tisak, 1995; Turiel, 1998). In fact, Astor (1998) suggests that peer victimization entails more complexity than a straightforward moral transgression. These studies suggest that children’s social reasoning about peer relationships is often intertwined with the unique social characteristics of specific contexts. Therefore, the present study was designed to disentangle the social characteristics of the contexts in which peer victimization happens, thus enabling an examination of how children and adolescents conceptualize peer victimization from a moral reasoning viewpoint.

In sum, while the three contexts (choice of friendship, group exclusion, victimization) are central aspects of children’s peer relationship experiences, no studies to
date have directly compared how children evaluate social exchanges within each of these contexts. The present study seeks to discern whether children see these types of exchanges as similar or different and why.

One factor that affects children’s evaluation of peer relationship contexts (choice of friendship, group exclusion, victimization) is the individual traits of the target of rejection. For example, children may say that it is okay to not be friends with a “shy” child but that it is not okay to reject friendship with a child just because he is from another country. In other words, evaluations of the wrongfulness of rejection will be differentiated by the target child’s personal traits as well as by the context. A significant amount of research has examined who is likely to be rejected by their peers and why. These studies have focused on the rejected child’s individual deficits (Hymel, Wagner, & Butler, 1990). Individual deficits can be categorized as internal deficits (e.g., shyness) and external deficits (e.g., aggression). In addition, recently, researchers (Graham & Jovonen, 2000; Killen et al., 2002b) have alternatively shown that the target child’s group membership (i.e., race, ethnicity, or gender) also influences the likelihood of peer rejection without any particular social skill deficit on the part of the target child.

Although both approaches are valid and important, no known studies have investigated
the two approaches together and examined how individual traits interact within the contexts of peer relationships.

Thus, the second goal of this study was to investigate how children evaluate four target traits within each of and how these traits interacted with the three peer relationship contexts. The four target traits were aggression, shyness, gender, and nationality. These traits were chosen because they are salient features of the social interactions of children and adolescents. These traits are commonly used in children’s evaluations of social interactions and peer relationships, but there are qualitative differences between the traits. Two are individual traits (aggression, shyness), and two are group membership categories (gender, nationality).

One external individual deficit factor extensively studied for rejected children is aggression (Rubin et al., 1998). In a review of the research on peer rejection, Parker and Asher (1987) set the stage for what has become a commonly accepted view of the relationship between peer acceptance and aggressive status. Parker and Asher’s (1987) review suggested that aggressive children are at risk for a variety of negative outcomes in adolescence and that these negative outcomes are in part mediated by low peer acceptance. Other developmental researchers have offered similar analyses. For example, Coie, Dodge, and Kupersmidt (1990) reviewed a large body of literature on social
behavior and peer status and concluded that, at least before adolescence, “aggression is the primary correlate of rejection” (p.30). Rubin et al. (1998) also pointed out that aggression, from very early in childhood, is a highly salient determinant of peer rejection. Yet, little is known about how children view decisions to reject an aggressive friend, or to reject a group member for reasons of aggression, or to harass someone who is aggressive. In other words, how children view decisions to reject an aggressive child in different peer relationship contexts remains to be investigated.

A second trait associated with peer-rejected children is shyness or social withdrawal. Shyness is an internal individual deficit factor for rejected children. Similar to aggression, this trait is strongly correlated with peer rejection and unpopularity (Boivin, Hymel, & Bukowski, 1995). Unlike their aggressive counterparts, however, shy children rarely get into trouble by acting out at home or school. Yet, given their reticence to explore their environments, these children may demonstrate difficulties in asserting themselves or resolving interpersonal problems. The relatively slow development of social competence, when combined with wariness and insecurity may lead to peer rejection and to the development of negative self-appraisals of competence, which in turn exacerbate withdrawal from peers (Asendorpf, 2000; Hymel, Bowker, & Woody, 1993). Thus, shyness in initial encounters may mark a child as an “easy target” and hence
increase the risk of persistent harassment (Graham & Juvonen, 1998). These studies of
the characteristics of rejected children have contributed to the understanding of who is
likely to be rejected. Again, however, little is known about how children evaluate the
rejection of a shy friend in terms of the different peer relationship contexts regarding
choice of friendship, group exclusion, and victimization.

The second set of individual traits to be explored in the present study represents
group membership categories. While children may become victims of rejection because
of personality and behavior patterns, there may also be times when individuals or groups
reject others merely because of their group membership, i.e., their gender, ethnicity, race,
religion, or social class. In other words, a child may be rejected just because he is Black
or just because she is a girl. This form of rejection may be a result of stereotypic attitudes.
In fact, recent studies (see, Killen, et al., 2002c) have shown ways in which group
membership constitutes a reason that children focus on when evaluating peer exclusion
and rejection. Therefore, in the present study, group membership traits (in this case
gender and nationality), in addition to individual social deficits, were examined. Gender
and nationality were chosen because these traits are highly salient features of individuals
for children living in the United States. Gender and nationality are sources of stereotypic
expectations as well as categorization, bias, discrimination (for gender, see Ruble &
Martin, 1998; for race, see Fisher et al., 1998). However, there has been little research examining how gender and nationality affect children’s decision-making in peer relationship contexts. Thus, the aim of the second goal, varying the target of friendship, group exclusion, and victimization, is to determine how this dimension affects the type of reasoning children use when evaluating peer relationships.

In addition to children’s evaluations of peer relationships, another measure of moral responsibility for obligations is the bystanders’ reactions. Most peer interactions do not happen in a vacuum, and most interactions are observed by other peers. Even though children may evaluate a given situation as unacceptable, some studies have shown that actual responses are not always consistent with judgments. In fact, few children actually defend or even consider defending a victim. For example, less than 5 percent of boys were identified by their peers as taking the side of the victim and as attempting to stop bullying (Salmivalli et al, 1997). In a study of Whitney and Smith (1993), while about one-third of the secondary school students in the study reported that they would try to help victims, one-fifth also disclosed that they would join the bullying. These behavioral observations, however, do not take into account distinctions in the contexts (choice of friendship, group exclusion, victimization) or the reason for the rejection (aggression, shyness, gender, nationality). Through assessing bystanders’ reactions in the
present study, how children differentiate contexts and individuals’ traits in terms of
obligations were examined. This research on children’s conceptualizations of these types
of interactions and whether bystander intervention is warranted will help shed light on the
mixed findings of previous research.

The last research goal of this investigation was how participants’ age, gender and
cultural background influenced perception and evaluation of peer relationships. If
decisions about peer relationships involve judgments about the relationship between the
individual and the group, it is reasonable to expect that such decisions would vary widely
by culture. Triandis (1995) has characterized cultures as either individualistic or
collectivistic. According to this cultural theory frame, Asian cultures, such as Korea, have
been described as collectivistic, in contrast to the individualistic orientation of the U.S.
(Triandis, 1995). In fact, the construct of individualism-collectivism has been used quite
frequently as an explanatory model for human thought, emotion, and behavior. However,
the validity of these dichotomous categorizations as a general means of characterizing
cultures, and as applied to Korean culture in particular, has been challenged by recent
conceptual and empirical critiques (Oyerson, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002; Park,
Killen, Crystal, & Watanabe, 2003; Shin, 2003). Although several studies have examined
cultural influences on judgments about peer exclusion (Crystal, Watanabe, Chen, & Chin.
2000; Killen, Crystal, & Watanabe, 2002; Park, et al., 2003), further investigation is warranted. The present study constituted a cross-cultural investigation of social reasoning about peer relationships in Korea and the United States. These two cultures were chosen because they reflect different ends of the individualism-collectivism continuum.

In addition to cultural differences, developmental differences were also expected in children’s evaluations about peer relationships. Research indicates that the moral concerns emphasizing strict equality between persons that are prevalent in middle childhood (Nucci, 2001) are transformed in preadolescence into an understanding that fair treatment may entail unequal treatment when considering individual differences in needs and status (Damon, 1980; Nucci, 2001). Thus, moral reasoning during adolescence becomes both more generalizable across situations and better able to take situational variations into account. These findings suggest that middle-childhood students’ moral concepts can be understood in terms of coordination between developing concepts of morality, social convention, and personal jurisdiction (Nucci & Turiel, 2000). In this present study, students at 5th and 8th grade were surveyed regarding their evaluations of peer relationships. While 5th graders are not fully developed in terms of their ability to coordinate situational variations, 8th graders are in their peak period in terms of considering group functioning (Horn, Killen, & Stangor, 1999). Thus, how age difference
in middle childhood (5th and 8th grade) affects the evaluations and justifications of peer relationships in terms of morality and group dynamics were examined in this study.

In terms of gender differences regarding evaluations of peer relationships and group exclusion, there are mixed findings. Killen and Stangor’s (2001) study with American students indicated that girls were more consistently concerned with fairness and equal access than were boys when evaluating exclusion from peer groups. These findings are in contrast to Gilligan’s (1982) hypothesis that concerns with fairness characterize the moral orientation of boys rather than girls. In addition, a study with Korean students showed that there were no gender differences in terms of their judgments about group exclusion (Park et al., 2003). Because of these mixed findings, investigating gender difference in reasoning about peer relationships in Korea and the U. S. has important meaning.

Another factor that may have contributed to the findings in this proposed study was participants’ personal experiences in peer relationships and psychological perceptions of target traits. It was hypothesized that past experiences with group exclusion might contribute to individuals’ social reasoning by increasing sensitivity to the wrongfulness of group exclusion (Killen et al, 2002). Likewise, Youniss and Yates
(1997) have asserted that adolescents’ experiences led to increased compassion, greater interdependence, and broader conceptions of justice.

In terms of psychological perceptions of target traits, Wainryb (2003) demonstrated that factual beliefs influence social reasoning and judgments. In other words, even though most children take into account moral reasons to evaluate the wrongfulness of peer relationships, they make decisions based on their factual beliefs and psychological perception. Therefore, it was expected that individuals’ psychological perceptions about whether the traits are adaptable (e.g., Do you think that A can change himself?) or about conformity (e.g., Do you think that A should change himself?) might affect their social judgments. No research, however, has directly investigated the relationship between experience and perceptions and reasoning. Therefore, it is important to investigate how individuals’ experiences and perceptions contribute to social reasoning and evaluations.

In sum, the present study aimed to investigate how context (choice of friendship, group exclusion, victimization) and individual traits (aggression, shyness, gender, nationality) influenced, independently and dependently, children’s evaluations about social interactions. In addition, these evaluations were directly compared in terms of social reasoning using social-cognitive domain theory. Also, the impact of participants’
age, gender, cultural background, personal experience, and psychological perceptions on children’s evaluation was investigated.

To examine the aims of this study, a within-subject design was used such that all scenarios were described to all participants for their evaluations. The between-subject variables included the age of the participants (5th grade, 8th grade), gender of the participants (male, female), and country of the participants (Korea, U. S.). Since all participants received the same survey, within-subject independent variables were: 1) twelve scenarios (combination of three contexts (friendship, group exclusion, and victimization) and four target traits (shyness, aggression, gender, nationality)). In addition, questions regarding participants’ psychological perceptions and personal experiences were also administered to all participants. (For a summary of the design, see Appendix A). The dependent measures included: 1) evaluation; 2) justification; and 3) bystander’s reaction. The justification responses are coded with a justification system (For justification coding responses, see Appendix E).

There were several hypotheses for this study. These hypotheses fall under three categories: 1) hypotheses concerning children’s evaluations and justifications about peer relationship contexts; 2) hypotheses concerning children’s evaluations and justifications about target traits of peer relationship; and 3) hypotheses concerning children’s
evaluations and justifications about bystander’s reactions. Hypotheses concerning age-related, gender, and cultural differences also fall under these three categories. (For an overview of the hypotheses, see Appendix B)

_Hypotheses on evaluations and justifications about contexts._ Based on previous research using individual interviews to assess children’s social reasoning of contexts (Killen et al., 2002b; Nucci, 2001; Smetana, 1995), it was hypothesized that children would evaluate all acts in the contexts of choice of friendship, group exclusion, and victimization as wrong. Researchers from the social-cognitive domain model have demonstrated that the majority of children use moral reasons to evaluate these types of social actions. However, participants would differentiate their evaluations of peer relationship decisions across the three contexts (victimization, group exclusion, friendship) in terms of the harm associated, and the negative consequences for the recipient of the actions taken by the protagonist. Victimization was expected to elicit the most negative judgments, followed by group exclusion and then friendship.

In terms of using justification, children would consider victimization as the most serious moral transgression (fairness, empathy) compared to the other contexts (Astor, 1998). In the case of group exclusion, participants would use social conventional reasons, such as stereotypes, peer pressure, and group functioning, as well as moral reasons like
how fairly we treat others (Killen et al., 2002b). The friendship decision would be considered the least severe moral transgression. More children would reason that choosing a friend was a personal choice rather than a moral transgression, in contrast to reasoning within the other contexts, like group exclusion and victimization. This pattern would apply to both Korean and American students regardless of gender and age.

It was expected that there would be interaction effects of participants’ gender and country. Prior studies concerning judgments about peer relationships with Western, mostly North American, children showed gender differences (Killen, et al., 2002). Generally, more girls than boys evaluate that it is not okay to exclude a child from a group. In contrast, a few studies recently conducted with Korean students demonstrated that there were no gender differences in terms of judgment (Park, et al., 2003; Shin, 2003). Therefore in this study, it was expected that gender differences would be found for American participants but not for Korean participants.

It was also expected that there would be developmental differences in evaluations and judgments. Social cognitive domain theorists have argued that the developmental differences of social reasoning occur in how children weigh and coordinate their different reasons (Turiel, 1998). In this proposed study, 8th graders would be more likely to take into account social-conventional reasons than fifth graders.
Personal experiences would also affect the participants’ evaluations (Smetana, 2003). When participants had similar experiences with a child in the scenario, they would believe that it was not okay to reject a child more so than someone who did not have any similar peer relationship experiences.

*Hypotheses on evaluation and justification about target traits.* Overall, participants would judge that it was most acceptable to reject an aggressive child (Killen, et al., 2002, Park et al., 2003), because a majority of children considered aggression as the most harmful moral transgression. Participants’ judgments based on the other *target traits* (shyness, gender, nationality) would be differentiated by their age, gender, nationality, and peer relationship contexts.

For the shyness trait, it would be interesting to investigate cultural differences. Shyness was interpreted differently by the different cultures (Chen & Rubin, 1992; Rubin, 1998). Researchers have argued that children from East Asian countries, like China and Korea, evaluate shyness as more acceptable than children from Western countries like the U.S. These different perceptions might influence individuals’ evaluations of rejecting a shy child in Korea and the U.S. In other words, Korean children might evaluate rejecting a shy child as less acceptable than American children would.
In the different gender scenarios, it was expected that cultural and age differences would be found. From the results of Killen et al. (2002) and Park et al. (2003), it was expected that Korean participants would be less willing to reject or exclude a child who displayed gender-specific behavior than would American participants. American children would be more likely to reject a child based on his/her gender than would Korean children. There would also be age differences in evaluating peer rejection based on gender. It was expected that older children would be more likely to think that it was not okay to reject a different gender child than young children would.

Peer rejection based on nationality would be evaluated as least acceptable across all the age groups, gender, nationality, and contexts. This was because rejecting someone based on one’s nationality was viewed as a form of prejudice. Perceptions about target traits would affect the evaluation of peer rejection (Levy, & Dweck, 1999). When participants thought that a target trait was adaptable, they would evaluate the scenario involving these types of traits as less tolerable.

**Hypotheses on bystanders’ reaction.** No research that we know of has been conducted on children’s evaluations of bystanders’ reaction to peer rejections. Therefore it was an open question as to whether responses would vary by peer relationship contexts, participants’ age, gender, and nationality. It was hypothesized that peer rejection contexts
and target traits, however, would make a difference when children’s and adolescents’ had to make a decision about what to respond when witness an act of peer rejection.
CHAPTER II

Background Literature

In this chapter three areas of literature relevant to the design of this study will be analyzed. First, the findings from research on peer relationships will be reviewed. This section will concentrate on the three contexts which are used in this study: friendship, exclusion, and peer victimization. In the friendship section, an overview of the conceptions of friendship and review of the literature will be discussed. In the subsequent section, children’s judgments of exclusion, including an overview of the conceptions of exclusion and review of the literature and individual traits (group membership) will be presented. In the last section, on peer relationships, in addition to summarizing past studies of peer victimization, other individual traits (individual deficits) that are the risk factors of victims will be discussed.

Second, the theoretical framework of social cognitive domain theory will be reviewed. This section will include an overview of the theory and a review of studies of Korean children’s social reasoning. Finally, the role of culture, as well as cultural theories, will be reviewed. This section will include a review of studies conducted with Korean children about peer relationships.
Peer Relationships

Choice of Friendship

Overview of past studies on friendship

Getting along with peers and establishing friendships are major developmental tasks of early childhood that predict later outcomes (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000). A recent review on school readiness, for example, concluded that many children who enter kindergarten without the requisite social and emotional skills are often plagued by behavioral, academic, and social problems that can persist into adulthood if untreated (The Child Mental Health Foundations and Agencies Network [FAN], 2001). Despite the growing awareness of the importance of early peer experiences on children’s adjustment, researchers have not reached consensus on a framework for understanding peer relations and the implications of this information for helping children who encounter difficulties in forming and maintaining friendships.

The different ways that are used to define and understand children’s peer relations stem from different lines of research and theoretical traditions. Within the social psychology tradition, for example, peer relations have been conceptualized in terms of typologies of children’s social acceptance (e.g., popular, neglected, rejected, controversial, average), various types of friendships and social relationships (e.g.,
acquaintances, unilateral relationships, just friends, good friends, best friends), levels of
social structure (e.g., social interactions, mutual friendships, peer networks, or cliques),
and the functions that children’s friendships serve (e.g., companionship, intimacy and
affection, emotional support, social comparison; see for example, Coie, Dodge &
psychologists generally view friendship as a reflection of a child’s level of cognitive and
language development, with rudimentary forms of sociability emerging in infancy (e.g.,
social gazing, social gestures, peer-directed smiling, and vocalizations) and more
advanced forms of friendship evident during the preschool period (e.g., the ability to
name one’s best friends and articulate reasons for liking others and selecting them as
playmates or friends; Parker, Rubin, Price, & DeRoiser, 1995). Within the genre of
ethnography, anthropologists generally view friendships as central to children’s social
lives, primarily because friendships influence the ways in which children negotiate social
participation, resolve conflict, struggle to achieve equality and harmony, and construct
social meaning and identities among their peers (Corsaro & Miller, 1992; Deegan, 1996).

The different ways of defining and understanding children’s peer relations and
friendships have led to a variety of methods of assessment in terms of general liking,
reciprocal friendship, and playmate preferences. These methods generally have involved
observing social interactions and using a behavioral criterion for determining friendship status (Guralinick & Groom, 1988; Hartup, Lausen, Stewart, & Easternson, 1988), as well as conducting ethnographies to produce in-depth descriptions of friendship processes within the broader social experience of peer culture (Peters, 1990; Preisler, 1993), documenting children’s social choices through peer ratings and nominations using sociometric techniques (Musun-Miller, 1990), asking parents and knowledgeable caregivers to report children’s friendships and playmate preferences through questionnaires or interviews (Buysse, 1993; Price & Ladd, 1986), as well as combinations of these approaches.

**Friendship selection**

A unique property of peer relationships is that they occur in an open field. Children can and do make choices about which peers they prefer and with whom they associate. These choices strongly influence the amount of time spent interacting with peers of various characteristics and, consequently, the nature of the social interactional environment experienced and the developmental effects of that environment. Those children with whom a child associates most will provide the bulk of social contingencies, modeling experiences, support and aid that the child derives from the peer group. From
this perspective, assessment of the unique dyadic niches children establish within a larger peer setting, and identification of the processes by which they select and develop those niches are central to understanding between-individual variation in developmental outcomes. The choice of peer associates represents an important vehicle by which children are active agents in their own development (Buss, 1987).

Previous research supports the hypothesis that children are selective in their association with peers. Hinde, Titmus, Easton, and Tamplin (1985) reported that the distribution of children’s observed association time with an array of peers shows a highly positive skewed distribution; children spend most of their time with a few peers and very little time with others. The majority of children appear to have at least one “strong associate” or “friend” as defined by association time with a specific peer or by mutual preference, regardless of their group sociometric standing, social competence, or deviance (Cairns, 1983; Cairns, Cairns, Neckerman, Gest, & Gariepy, 1988; Dishion, Andrews, & Crosby, 1995; Howes, 1990; Warr & Stafford, 1991). Additionally, there is considerable temporal continuity in these close relationships even in preschool-aged children (Hinde et al., 1985; Howes, 1983; Ladd, Price, & Hart, 1990).

Given that children report differential preference for peers and selectively distribute the time they associate with peers, the next question concerns the basis on
which these differential preferences and selective associations are established. Previous research suggests that children seek out and prefer compatible peers. Initially, they choose peers who are similar on external, surface characteristics such as age (e.g., Rodgers, Billy, & Urdry, 1984), gender (e.g., Asher & Hymel, 1981), and ethnicity (e.g., Singleton & Asher, 1984).

After initial contacts, children make more refined choices about peer associates and develop peer preferences on the basis of similarities in behavior such as styles of play (Rubin, Lynch, Coplan, Rose-Krasnor, & Booth, 1994), aggression (Cairns et al., 1988; Dishion et al., 1995), drug use (Kandel, 1978), sexual activity (e.g., Rodgers et al., 1984), and school motivation (Kinderman, 1993). Children also tend to associate with peers who share similar group sociometric status (Ladd, 1983; Ladd, Price, & Hart, 1990). The importance of various behaviors in making peer choice varies with age (Gottman, 1986). For preschool-aged children targeted in this study, peer choice appears to be most closely tied to how “nice” (or reinforcing) peers are toward a child (Youniss, 1986). These descriptive data suggest that a person-environment linkage operates in peer choice such that children selectively seek out peers who are compatible with their own characteristics.
To investigate the role of children’s perspectives on group functioning, the literature on group exclusion will be described in the next section. This context involves peer relationships at the group level, which is distinct from the dyadic context.

**Group Exclusion**

*Judgments of exclusion*

In social psychology, exclusion has been conceptualized as a moral transgression (Opotow, 1990). Opotow defines moral exclusion as “when individuals or groups are perceived as outside the boundary in which moral values, rules, and considerations of fairness apply” (p.1). In addition to social psychology, legal theory also describes exclusion as a moral construct (Minow, 1990). Minow, a legal theorist, states that “the particular labels often chosen in American culture can carry social and moral consequences while burying the choices and the responsibility for those consequences” (p.4). Thus, research in social science and the law has typically assumed exclusion to be a moral transgression and has examined, in detail, the negative consequences for those excluded.

In the past several years, Killen and her colleagues have examined children’s social reasoning about inclusion and exclusion (Horn, Killen, & Stangor, 1999; Killen,
Crystal, & Watanabe, 2002a; Killen, Lee-Kim, McGlothlin, & Stangor, 2002b; Killen & Stangor, 2002; Park, Killen, Crystal, & Watanabe, 2003; Schuette & Killen, 2002; Theimer, Killen, & Stangor, 2001). These researchers have investigated how individuals conceptualize exclusion in a wide range of contexts. For instance, what types of reasons do children use to reject or condone exclusion? When do children give priority to certain types of reasoning when evaluating exclusion?

Overall, findings from these studies have established that children’s reasoning about exclusion is multifaceted. In other words, as might be expected, exclusion was not unilaterally viewed as wrong in all circumstances. Instead, when evaluating exclusion, children used different forms of reasoning. For example, at times exclusion was rejected due to issues of fairness, and at other times, exclusion was condoned for social conventional reasons, such as group functioning or stereotypic reasons (e.g., Killen et al., 2001, Killen et al., 2002b).

So far, the type of stereotype (gender or race), the nature and context of exclusion (e.g., straightforward versus complex exclusion; friendship versus peer group; home contexts versus different cultures), and external social influences (e.g., peer pressure versus authority influence) have been the focus of various studies (Killen, Crystal, & Watanabe, 2002; Killen et al., 2002b; Killen & Stangor, 2001; Killen et al., 2001; Shin,
Collectively, the studies have included children ranging from preschool to high school age, as well as from diverse ethnic backgrounds in the United States, such as African-Americans, Asian-Americans, European-Americans, Hawaiians, and Latin-Americans. As a result, there have been several important findings relevant to understanding the nature of children’s conceptions of fairness, stereotypes, and other types of reasoning with respect to social reasoning about exclusion. With the exception of two studies, however, children’s judgments about exclusion from a non-U.S. sample, particularly a traditional culture, have not been examined (for Japan, see Killen, Crystal, & Watanabe, 2002c; for Korea, see Park, Killen, Crystal, & Watanabe, 2002).

**Target children’s traits: group membership**

In a study with preschool-aged children (Killen et al, 2001b), participants were asked to evaluate whether it was okay for a group of girls playing a stereotypic activity (playing with dolls, playing teacher) to exclude a boy; and similarly, whether it was okay for a group of boys playing a stereotypic activity (playing with trucks, playing firefighter) to exclude a girl. One of the significant findings of this study showed that, despite the strength of stereotypes evident in young children’s play activities, when presented with
an exclusion scenario involving gender stereotypes, children judged exclusion to be wrong.

In a following study, older children, from elementary to high school age (1st, 4th, 7th grades), were asked to evaluate exclusion based on gender and race in peer group contexts (Killen & Stangor, 2001). Here, children were asked about decisions made by after-school clubs (ballet, baseball, math, basketball) to include or exclude individuals that did not fit the stereotype of the club. The results from this study also showed a similar pattern as the previous study. Additionally, this study added the dimension of qualification (equal or unequal) of the child being chosen. For example, in the equal qualifications condition, children were told, “A boy and a girl want to join the club but there is room for only one more person to join and the boy and girl are equally good at ballet? Whom should the club pick? Why?” In the unequal qualifications condition, the child that did not fit the stereotype was more qualified to join the clubs than the child who fit the stereotype. Overall, findings indicated that when reasoning about inclusion and exclusion in these contexts, children made stereotypical considerations when condoning exclusion based on gender or race.

Overall, these studies together found significant contextual, gender, and developmental differences. As children become older, a variety of issues are weighed
when making judgments about social issues. For example, children have considerations for the group as well as for the individual being excluded. Thus, an interesting question to consider is, under what circumstances does the individual take priority over the group, or when does fairness take priority over social conventions, such as stereotypes? In a subsequent study, this question along with others regarding exclusion, were carefully considered and investigated.

In a recent study, Killen et al. (2002b) expanded the study of children’s social reasoning about exclusion by examining different contexts of exclusion, external sources of influence on exclusion, and ethnic group differences. Children from elementary to high school age and from various ethnic groups were asked to evaluate gender- and race-based exclusion of children from three different contexts (friendship, peer group, school). These contexts reflected three levels of social exclusion: individual (friendship), social (peer group), and societal (school).

Consistent with earlier findings, the majority of children rejected exclusion using fairness reasons. Depending on the context, however, children used varying forms of reasoning. For example, children viewed exclusion in the friendship context as a matter of personal choice (“It’s Tom’s decision whom he wants to be friends with”) and thus more of a legitimate context for exclusion. Whereas for the peer group context, children
considered group functioning and stereotype reasons for condoning exclusion (“If a girl joins, then the boys in the club won’t be able to talk about what they want”). However, in the school context, in which a child was excluded from attending school due to his gender or race, the vast majority of children viewed this context of exclusion as wrong due to issues of fairness and equality.

In terms of developmental changes in judgments, children differed in their reasoning according to their age. Older children (high school students), compared to younger children (elementary school students), were more likely to use multiple forms of reasoning, especially in the friendship and peer group contexts, as evidenced by considerations for personal choice and group functioning.

Summary

In sum, this group of studies has shown that most children view exclusion as wrong and appeal to issues of fairness and equality when justifying their evaluations. When exclusion becomes more complicated and multiple considerations must be weighed, however, children’s reasoning about exclusion becomes multifaceted. In addition, coupled with developmental differences in reasoning, these studies have shown
the complexity and thoughtfulness in children’s evaluations of exclusion involving social stereotypes.

Although children’s reasoning about exclusion has been documented, little is known regarding the differences in how children reason about exclusion compared to other peer relationships such as victimization. Furthermore, most studies of children’s reasoning about exclusion have been conducted in the U.S. Investigations of how children on the other side of the world reason about peer relationships are needed. More studies examining other contexts, cultures, and additional social factors are needed to fully explore the multifaceted nature of exclusion based on social stereotypes.

**Peer Victimization**

*Past research on peer victimization*

*Definition.* The basic definition of peer victimization according to Olweus (1978) is that an individual is victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more individuals. To be able to fully understand the phenomenon of peer harassment, we need to examine its many manifestations. Five categories have been frequently used to classify peer harassment: indirect, relational, physical, verbal, and generic victimization (Hawker & Bouldton, 2000). Crick, Werner,
Casas, O’Brien, Nelson, Grotpeter, and Markon (1999) have distinguished between physical and relational victimization. Relational aggression is defined as behavior that causes or threatens damage to peer relationships, particularly to friendship and acceptance (Alsaker, 1993; Crick et al., 1999). Indirect aggression is defined as aggression which is enacted through a third party or so that the aggressor cannot be identified by the victim. Alongside relational and indirect victimization, physical victimization is considered as any form of victimization in which the victim is attacked physically (Boivin & Hymel, 1997; Slee & Rigby, 1993). Verbal victimization is considered victimization in which the victim's status is attacked or threatened with words or vocalizations. There are some conceptual difficulties in labeling this form of victimization as “verbal,” in that words are also used to exclude victims (relational victimization) or to harm them through third parties (indirect victimization) (e.g., Bjorkgvist, 1994; Perry, Kusel, & Perry, 1988). Finally, generic victimization denotes nonspecific descriptions of victimization experiences that could include any of the other forms of victimization (Boivin & Hymel, 1997).

Development. Important developmental changes occur as the result of exposure to both the prevalence and the nature of victimization. There appears to be a decrease in the prevalence of victimization from childhood to adolescence (Olweus, 1993; Smith,
Shu, Madsen, 2001). Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, and Peltonen (1988) report that direct aggression, which can be either physical or verbal, is common in young children. With age, physical aggression tends to decrease, and verbal aggression increases as children develop language skills. The trend is consistent in different countries, such as Norway, Sweden, South Australia, Ireland, Belgium, Canada, Italy, Japan, Spain, and Switzerland (Smith, Shu, & Madsen, 2001). The mechanism of developmental trends needs to be investigated in terms of the reasoning behind why children decide to harass or not to harass.

Outcomes. Studies of difference in mean scores of victims and nonvictims have been used to demonstrate the associations between one or more forms of peer victimization and adjustment. The experience of being harassed by one’s classmates is associated with a wide range of adjustment difficulties, including anxiety, depression (Gilbert, 1992), loneliness (Baumeister and Leary, 1995), low self-esteem (Alsaker, 1993; Bjorkvist, Ekman, & Lagerspetz, 1982; Boulton & Underwood, 1992; Olweus, 1978, 1993), dislike and avoidance of school (Kochenderfer, 1995; Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1996), poor academic performance (Olweus, 1978), rejection by peers (Perry et al., 1988), and a lack of friends (Bukowski, & Sippola, 2001; Hodges, Malone, & Perry, 1997). The research suggests that victimization is highly stable. Given the stability and
negative consequences of harassment by peers, it is essential to understand how and why children become victims (Olweus, 1978).

**Measurement.** Although many efforts have attempted to assess the experience of victims, the victimization measurements scaling practices confound the source and scaling of the construct. Self-report measures tend to tap children's perceptions of the frequency with which they have been victimized, whereas peer-report measures typically index group members' consensus as to the identities of victimized children. Like peer reports, the nomination format of extant teacher-report measures typically does not yield frequency data. Objective observation of children’s behaviors is consistently correlated with children’s perceptions of victimization (Pellegrini, 2001). A potential explanation is that cross-informant data may not provide equivalent information about peer victimization and, thus, may correlate differently with putative validity indices or outcome criteria (Graham & Juvonen, 1998). The measurement concerns argued here are possibly explained by the multifaceted nature of peer victimization.

*Target children’s traits: individual deficits*

Due to the negative consequences of peer victimization, there have been studies about the characteristics of victims. The results have shown that victims’ personality
traits, such as shyness, or aggressiveness, are significant risk factors. Victims may lack certain social skills that result in their being disliked or rejected from peer groups. In addition, they may have different physiological bases and share some typical types of parent-child relationships. The studies of characteristics of victims are very important to note here for understanding what individuals’ traits can lead a child to be victimized.

_Intrapersonal factors._ Prior research on the personal qualities of victimized children suggests that sometimes their own behavior provokes or reinforces attacks. However, victimized children are not a behaviorally homogeneous group. Some victimized children are labeled “passive victims” (Olweus, 1978) because they do little to provoke their attackers directly; rather, they are socially withdrawn and appear anxious and depressed to their peers. This cluster of attributes, which may be called “internalizing behavior,” probably signals vulnerability to aggressive children (Hodges et al., 1997; Olweus, 1978; Perry, Williard, & Perry, 1990; Rubin, et al., 1998; Schwartz et al., 1993). Internalizing tendencies almost certainly interfere with children’s abilities to defend themselves from attack and, therefore, probably serve to reinforce aggressors’ attacks against them. Several longitudinal studies have shown that children who are socially isolated and exhibit other internalizing problems become increasingly victimized over time (Boulton, 1999; Egan, & Perry, 1998; Hodges, Boivin, Vitaro, & Bukowski, 1999).
Other victimized children have been called “provocative victims.” This is because they irritate peers with attention-seeking, disruptive, restless, hot-headed, and argumentative behavior (Olweus, 1978; Rubin, et al., 1998). These children tend to exhibit antisocial conduct, such as lying and stealing, and they are also inclined to be aggressive. However, because their aggression tends to be unskilled, disorganized, and accompanied by debilitating emotional arousal, it is usually ineffective. These children’s disruptive and antisocial tendencies, which collectively may be referred to as “externalizing behaviors,” probably antagonize their peers, especially aggressive peers. It is important to note that although externalizing behaviors are a salient feature of provocative victims, these children also possess many of the internalizing symptoms that characterize passive victims.

*Interpersonal factors.* Prior work has shown two social conditions to be associated with peer victimization: a lack of friends and peer rejection (Bukowski et al., 2001; Hodges et al., 1997; Rubin, et al., 1998). Victimized children tend to have few friends and their relative friendlessness may contribute to their victimization (Boulton, Trueman, Chau, Whitehand, & Amatya, 1999; Schwartz, Dodge, Pettit, & Bates, 2000). Children know very well who is friends with whom (Cairns, Cairns, Neckerman, Gest, & Gariepy, 1988), and aggressive children probably prefer to attack peers who lack
supportive and protective friends because they can do so without worrying about retaliation or ostracism from the victims’ friends. In addition to lacking friends, victimized children tend to be generally disliked (rejected) by peers, and their low position in the status hierarchy is also likely to contribute to their victimization. Rejected children may be perceived as fair game by aggressive children, because the knowledge that a child is widely devalued by peers may legitimize subjecting the child to abuse. Even nonaggressive, mainstream peers tend to express negative attitudes toward rejected classmates (Dodge, et al., 1986; Hymel, 1986), and this may lead aggressive children to anticipate that their attacks on rejected children will go unpunished by the peer group.

Summary

The studies of the characteristics of victims are important because these findings help to illustrate the phenomenon of peer victimization. Most of this work has been conducted from an individual social deficit model (Hymel, Wagner, & Butler, 1990), however, there are times when researchers have considered group dynamics and peer pressure, which are independent of the individuals’ traits.

Next, the theoretical framework enabling this work, referred to as social cognitive domain theory, will be described in detail. Research based this theory will be described in
order to understand the way in which children use social conventional reasons as justifications for moral decision-making.

**Social Cognitive Domain Theory**

*Overview*

Children’s moral reasoning about social events, like exclusion based on gender, is well conceptualized within the theoretical approach of the social cognitive domain model (Tisak, 1995; Turiel, 1983, 1998). Methodology for the present study stems from this theoretical perspective. The social cognitive domain model proposes that there are three domains of knowledge: the moral, the societal, and the psychological (Tisak, 1995; Turiel, 1983, 1998).

Social cognitive domain theory offers a theoretical framework for examining the development of moral and social reasoning in children and adolescents (Turiel, 1998). Unlike stage models of moral development (Kohlberg, 1969; Piaget, 1932), which have narrowly defined the development of children’s moral reasoning as hierarchical and global, social cognitive domain theory has posited that children develop three distinct domains of social knowledge: moral, societal, and psychological (see Tisak, 1995; Turiel, 1983, 1998). Distinct features characterize each of these three domains. The moral
domain addresses how individuals ought to behave toward one another and includes issues such as those pertaining to equality, fairness, justice, rights, and welfare (e.g., hitting, stealing). The *societal* domain includes conceptions such as social groups, social conventions, and social relations; most of the research in this domain has focused on “social-conventional” reasoning: rules that are arbitrarily constructed and assist in coordinating social interactions and promoting social order (e.g., taking turns speaking by raising hands, wearing uniforms to school). Social customs that are often used to characterize social traditions in various cultures (e.g., formal bowing to elders in the family and community) are also included in this domain. In contrast, the *psychological* domain is concerned with psychological systems and includes conceptions such as personal decision-making, personality, self, and identity, all of which are outside the jurisdiction of moral or social concerns. Much of the research in this domain has focused on issues of personal choice (e.g., choosing one’s own friends, issues of autonomy).

Over the past twenty years, numerous studies have demonstrated that these domains of social and moral judgments are, in fact, conceptually distinct and considered to develop independently of one another (Smetana, 1995; Tisak, 1995; Turiel, 1998). They are constructed out of the individual’s interactions with the environment (e.g., social interaction) from which knowledge about these domains are formed (Turiel, 1983,
In having these distinct domains, the theory presupposes that individuals have differential social experiences that relate to qualitatively distinct conceptions about morality, social practices, and personal issues. So, children may begin to form basic conceptions of equality in the moral domain from experiencing it for themselves and abstracting from their personal experiences. For example, from not having a turn playing with a toy (i.e., from a discrete experience of inequality), a child may come to understand that individuals should be treated equally.

Early research guided by the social cognitive domain model focused on the criteria and content of these separate domains, as well as developmental aspects and contextual differences in social reasoning. In interviews, researchers employing this model asked children and adolescents to evaluate a transgression and then justify, or provide reasons for, their judgments. By using this methodology, researchers assessed that children and adolescents reason differently about moral and non-moral domains of social knowledge. For example, when asked about harming another child (moral transgression), children respond that it is wrong even when an authority figure or a group of peers decide that it is acceptable, and it would be wrong even in another country; whereas, when asked about wearing pajamas to school (social conventional transgression), children respond that it is okay if a teacher, a classroom of peers, or a
culture decides that it is all right (Tisak & Turiel, 1984). Therefore, moral issues were found to be obligatory, not contingent on authority, rules, or social (group) practices; while social-conventional issues were considered to be contingent on rules, authority, social customs, and coordination. Moreover, research examining the psychological domain has shown that personal issues are regarded to be within the individual jurisdiction and considered separate from social regulation (e.g., choice of friends) (for a review, see Nucci, 2001; Turiel, 1998).

Developmentally, these domain distinctions have been shown to begin as early as age 3, at which point children are able to judge moral transgressions to be more wrong (e.g., hitting is wrong because you get hurt) than social conventional ones (Smetana, 1995), indicating that young children have a rudimentary distinction between moral and non-moral domains of knowledge with a concentration on physical consequence of moral issues (Killen, 1991). With age, children have been shown to evaluate social knowledge with increased flexibility and complexity. For example, children between the ages of 5 and 7 are mainly concerned with moral and social issues with which they have had direct experience. Children at this age focus on upholding social regularities as a way to organize and understand their social world (e.g., upholding gender stereotypes) (Turiel, 1983; Nucci, 2001), whereas children around 8 to 10 years of age do not hold strictly to
social regularities (e.g., cross-gendered behavior is okay; Carter & Patterson, 1982) and are not limited to making distinctions in their social judgments to only issues they have experienced. Instead, around age 8, children are able to apply their judgments to unfamiliar issues (Davidson, Turiel, & Black, 1983). Yet, children in this age group still have difficulty coordinating various aspects of social reasoning when evaluating multifaceted social issues. In instances of evaluating complex issues, such as evaluating the exclusion of a daughter from helping her dad fix the car because of her gender (having to coordinate issues of fairness, authority, gender roles), children between 8 and 10 years old often resort to using social knowledge with which they are familiar (“Sons usually help their father with the car; daughters can help their moms”) (Schuette & Killen, 2002).

In more recent years, research studies have moved away from establishing domain distinctions using prototypic moral and non-moral transgressions and have instead examined various areas of social development (e.g., autonomy; Nucci, 2001) using a social cognitive domain perspective. Additionally, more recent studies have examined complex and ambiguous social issues (e.g., drug use; Nucci, Guerra, & Lee, 1991) that require children and adolescents to weigh and coordinate different forms of reasoning. Other examples of issues that have been studied are parental and adolescent
conflict in the home (Smetana, 1989); children’s conceptions of personal choice and autonomy in the school, home, and cultural contexts (Nucci, 1981, 1996, 2001); religion (Nucci & Turiel, 2000); children’s conceptions of affective consequences (Arsenio & Lemerise, 2001); adolescents’ and young adults’ conceptions of civil liberties (e.g., freedom of speech) (Helwig, 1997); reasoning about social conflicts, such as subordination, in cultures such as the Druze and Jewish children of Israel (Wainryb, 1993, 1995; Wainryb & Turiel, 1994); and conflict resolution in young children in varying contexts (e.g., home and school) and cultures (e.g., Colombia, Japan) (Ardila-Rey & Killen, 2001; Killen & Sueyoshi, 1995). Children and adolescents predominately evaluated given situations using multiple forms of reasoning, thus reiterating the multifaceted nature of social and moral reasoning from a social cognitive domain perspective.

**Korean Children’s Social Reasoning**

As can be seen from this sample list of research areas, domain theory has examined how children and adolescents evaluate a diversity of important social issues. In particular, this framework has been useful for examining various contexts, such as children’s social reasoning in different countries.
Similar domain distinctions were also found in Korean children’s reasoning. Song, Smetana, and Kim (1987) examined Korean children’s conceptions of moral and conventional transgressions. They found that older children (6, 9, and 12th grade) judged social conventional transgressions as more permissible than younger children (kindergarten and 3rd grade). The results indicated that children’s developmental pattern of social judgments in non-Western culture, like Korea, is similar to children in Western culture. As such, social judgments of Korean children were found to be heterogeneous from early childhood through late adolescence. Compared to American children’s reasoning, there was more emphasis on social status, social roles, social coordination (e.g., appropriate gender role behavior), and cultural traditions (e.g., social courtesy) by Korean children. This suggests that cultural ideologies (e.g., customs) may play a role in the content of Korean children’s social conventional reasoning. This study, however, focused on prototypical moral and social conventional issues.

Other studies have been conducted to examine how Korean children judged non-prototypical issues, in which two or more issues in a domain or different domains coexist (Kim, 1998; Kim & Turiel, 1996). In one study, Kim (1998) interviewed children from 1st through 5th grades about authority commands involving ambiguous moral issues such as “lost property”, “sharing candy”, and “disposing of trash”. Results indicated that Korean
children’s reasoning took various factors into consideration when making judgments about the legitimacy of adult authorities. Therefore, Korean children have been found to take context into account when evaluating authority related issues.

Taken together, these few studies on Korean culture have shown that children and adolescents conceptually distinguish between the moral, social conventional and personal domains of social knowledge, in addition to having differentiated concepts of adult authority. Even though Korea and Western countries are generally categorized differently, it is interesting to find the similarities of social reasoning of children. In the following section, theories of culture will be discussed for a better understanding of cultural influences on children’s social reasoning.

**Role of Culture**

*Theories of Cultural Influences*

To what extent does culture have an influence on when children focus on an individual concerns or the groups’ concerns? Recent studies based on social-cognitive domain theory (Killen, et al., 2002b; Killen & Wainryb, 2000) have shown that peer relationships, specifically exclusion, is relevant for general theories of culture. They have shown that individual and group considerations are both integral dimensions of decisions
about peer relationships. Further, they have shown the importance of context. Exclusion in one context is evaluated quite differently from exclusion in another context. Therefore, assessments of cultural differences in the evaluation of social issues need to be sensitive to the context. At times, however, measures of cultural orientations have been very general, relying on generalized statements about values to demonstrate differences between cultures.

A common conceptualization of the relation between culture and social development is based on the assumption that cultures can be characterized as either individualistic or collectivistic (Shweder, 1995; Triandis, 1995). Most theorizing and research within this perspective has been on the study of the attributes of individualistic and collectivistic cultures, and of the consequences of individualism/collectivism for the development of individuals and their interpersonal and intergroup relation. Typically, cultures with an individualistic orientation are said to value the person as detached from relationships and from the community, as independent from the social order, and as motivated to give priority to the individual, by contrast, collectivistic cultures value individuals according to their interdependent roles within the social system and give priority to the group. Individual social development is presumed to consist of the acquisition of the main cultural orientation. In fact, the construct of individualism-
collectivism has been used quite frequently as an explanatory model for human thought, emotion, and behavior. These descriptions of cultural orientations are overly general and do not take into account contextual differences within cultures.

Many researchers have proposed that dichotomies used to characterize cultures are too simplistic and that heterogeneity, rather than homogeneity, is more often the case (Killen & Wainryb, 2000; Turiel, 1998; Wainryb & Turiel, 1994). As one illustration, research on traditional (collectivistic) cultures has found that children, adolescents, and adults give priority to the individual by asserting personal choice and self-reliance, a typically “individualistic” value. This includes Brazilian (Nucci, Camino, Milnitsly-Sapiro, 1996) and Colombian (Ardila-Rey & Killen, 2000) children in Latin America, Japanese (Killen & Sueyoshi, 1995) and Korean (Kim & Turiel, 1994; Song & Smetana, & Kim, 1995) children in Asia, and Jewish and Druze (Wainryb & Turiel, 1994) children in the Mid-East. Interviews with children in these cultures has shown that children classify certain decisions, such as choice of friends, clothes, and activities, as within their personal jurisdiction, and not a matter of authority mandates or regulations. These children view personal goals as a matter of entitlement and a right due to the individual. These findings can be extended to decisions about exclusion such that there may be times when members of traditional cultures would view exclusion as wrong on the basis of
rights denied to the individual. Similarly, studies have demonstrated the many ways in which persons in “individualistic” cultures value interpersonal duties and obligations, such as making sacrifices for others, and fulfilling familial duties (Killen & Turiel, 1998; Turiel, 1998; Turiel et al., 1987). Thus, evidence indicates that children and adults in diverse cultures simultaneously hold multiple concerns about the individual and the group. Individuals of often times are both individualistic and collectivistic in their social orientations.

**Korean Culture**

Korean society has been characterized as more traditional, conforming, authoritarian, and status-oriented than other Asian countries as well as Western culture (Park & Johnson, 1985). Cultural researchers have contended that the Confucian value system has contributed to collectivism in East Asian countries including Korea (Triandis, 1995). For example, Hofstede’s (1983) classic work on international difference in work-related values in 1970 indicated that among the 53 countries and regions studied, Korea scored as strongly collectivist on the Individualism-Collectivism dimension. It is assumed that Koreans are interrelated and are conceived to be embedded and situated in particular roles and status. They are bound by relationships that emphasize a common fate. Duties
and obligations are prescribed by roles, and individuals lose “face” if they fail to fulfill these duties and obligations (Kim & Choi, 1994). In order to promote the collective welfare and social harmony, individuals are encouraged to suppress any individualist desires. As a result, interdependency, support, nurturance, common fate, and obedience are important aspects of Korean collectivism (Kim & Choi, 1994).

Recent socio-cultural changes in Korea may have influenced Koreans’ traditional values. Korean society has experienced many changes, not only in technology and industry, but also in cognitive and value systems. Indeed, recent research about the value system of the family argue that the traditional orientation is found together with the modern orientation of the family (Cho & Shin, 1996). Korea may be characterized as a society where the Western democratic principle of equality and the traditional Confucian ideology contradict each other and complicate the behavioral rules.

Even though Confucian ideology has been valued in Korea, it is unknown whether all individuals in Korea subscribe the ideology. There are mixed findings in studies conducted in Korea.

*Recent Studies of Korean Children*
There are recent studies that have simply considered Korea as a prototypical collectivistic culture, thereby emphasizing interdependence among individuals as well as the importance of adherence to social roles (Farver, Kim, & Lee, 1995; Farver, Kim, & Lee-Shin, 2000; Farver & Lee-Shin, 2000). These studies found that Korean children showed different types of play behaviors from American children and found that Korean-American children displayed more social group play and less solitary play than American children. They explained the findings from Korean culture values which de-emphasize individuality. That is, Korean values may have influenced children’s expression of social play. Further, they argued that Korean children were expected to obey and respect authority such as teachers. Taken together, it could be true that Korean children showed different types of social play behaviors; however, it may not be possible to apply the results of this kind of social play behaviors to more complex issues like children’s social decision-making.

In contrast to the above results showing that Korean children displayed different social behaviors from American children, other research has found that Korean children distinguish the difference between morality and social conventions similar to American children (Song et al., 1987). As noted above, Korea has been considered as a collectivistic society, which emphasizes respect for authority, social harmony, and
traditional social roles. However, previous studies have shown that children in Korea do not take a unilateral orientation to parental authorities or unquestioningly accept authority directives in many contexts (Kim, 1998; Kim & Turiel, 1996). The findings show that Korean children develop several types of judgments including moral judgments, which children apply in evaluating authorities.

Other studies found that there was considerable similarity in the social processes underlying peer group victimization across Korea and Western cultural settings. Schwartz, Farver, Chang, and Lee-Shin (2002) studied 10 to 12 year old students in Korea. They hypothesized that the meaning of shy behavior is influenced by culturally defined values. From this perspective, children who are quiet, timid, or shy are expected to be relatively well liked by their peers, insofar as restrained or inhibited behavior reflects the dominant values held by the society as a whole. Nonetheless, they found that Korean children, who are characterized by shyness, tend to emerge as frequent victims of bullying.

In addition, children’s and adolescents’ evaluative judgments (e.g., “Is it all right to exclude?”) have been examined in East Asia (Killen, Crystal, & Watanabe, 2002a; Park, Killen, Crystal, & Watanabe, 2002). In the first study, Killen, Crystal, and Watanabe (2002a), surveyed children from 4th through 10th grades, from the U.S. and Japan, on their evaluations of excluding a peer from a group for six reasons (being
aggressive, unconventional appearance, acting like a clown, cross-gender behavior, slowness in sports, and sad personality). Results indicated that children’s overall evaluations, irrespective of culture, judged it wrong to exclude. However, there were some differences regarding age, gender and culture. Younger children (4th graders), compared to older students were more likely to judge exclusion as wrong for two contexts considered to be under the jurisdiction of adults (being aggressive, slowness in sports). In addition, overall, females were more likely to judge exclusion as being wrong than were males. More specifically, American females were the most likely to judge exclusion as wrong, compared to Japanese males and females; whereas, American males were most likely to judge exclusion as being legitimate. Finally, a few cultural differences indicated that Japanese students judged excluding someone who dyed their hair green as more wrong compared to U.S. students and American students were less willing to exclude a child from a peer group because of their personality (e.g., being sad).

In a subsequent study, Park, Killen, Crystal, and Watanabe (2003) extended this work by examining exclusion judgments of Korean and Japanese children and adolescents on the same survey. Findings were contrary to predictions that Korean and Japanese students would be similar in their judgments. In fact, Korean students’ evaluations differed from Japanese students. Overall, Korean students rated exclusion as
more wrong than Japanese or American students. More specifically, Koreans evaluated exclusion of children with disruptive behavior (aggressive children, and children acting like a clown) as the most legitimate. Interestingly, Korean students were found to be tolerant of cross-gender behavior, given the traditional gender roles present in Korean culture. In addition, gender differences were not found in Korean children’s judgments, which the authors found surprising considering that gender differences were found in the U.S. and Japanese cultures.

Thus, one purpose of this proposal was to extend this work by investigating Korean and American children’s evaluations of multifaceted issues such as peer relationships. It was of interest to explore Korean children’s judgments of more complex issues, such as peer relationship based on cultural background, as well as contexts, and individual’s traits, since their cultural orientation is often characterized as collectivistic, or entailing traditional orientations to harmony.
CHAPTER III

Methodology

Pilot Study

Purpose

In order to refine and test both the feasibility of the measurements and the cultural validity of the measures to be used in this proposal, preliminary work, in the form of a survey study, was conducted in Korea in the summer of 2003.

Participants

Participants were 24 fourth through eighth grade Korean national students, attending elementary and middle schools. All participants were recruited from a church in a predominantly middle-class suburb area of Seoul, Korea. Participants were evenly divided by gender (11 males, 13 females).

Procedure

The procedure involved three steps. In the first step, a Korean graduate research assistant engaged each participant in an informal discussion about peer rejection, group exclusion, and victimization behavior and victim’s target traits during a free period of
Sunday School (e.g. Have you ever been victimized? Have you ever seen someone being harassed? What was it? Does it happen frequently? Who do you think are easily rejected and harassed?). Overall, these informal discussions indicated that most of the participants have experienced witnessing a child being rejected, excluded, or victimized. Moreover, five of the participants had experienced being a target of victimization.

Second, the researcher explained the purpose of the survey which was then distributed to all of the children. Children were allowed to raise their hands and ask questions at any time during the session. All names referenced in the survey were specific to Korean culture and matched the gender of each participant. Children were told that their answers would be confidential and anonymous, that their participation was strictly voluntary, and that they could stop at any time. Additionally, they were instructed to fill out the survey as completely as possible and that there are no right or wrong answers. The survey took approximately 15 minutes.

In the third and final step, after completing the survey, participants were asked to convey how they felt about the survey, for example, whether it was too hard or complicated to understand.
Results

In the pre-survey conversations, the majority of the participants indicated reasons for why a certain child may have negative peer relationships from their peer include: 1) being tactless, 2) being timid, 3) tattling on a child to a teacher, 4) being aggressive, and 5) because of their gender. These reasons confirmed that the target traits (aggression, shyness, gender, nationality) used in this study had validity. This pilot study showed that all students except 4th graders, understood the stories and questions without major difficulties. Fourth graders, compared to fifth through eighth graders, were less likely to have completed the entire survey. Based on the participants’ responses for the justification question (why?), justification coding categories were refined.

The results of this pilot survey ensured the validity and feasibility of the methodology. Moreover, there was preliminary evidence supporting the hypotheses of the proposed study (For the mean table of results, see Table 1).

Present study

Participants

Participants were 399 Korean and 333 U. S. children from 5th grade and 8th grade (N = 732) children. Korean participants consisted of 199 5th graders (99 boys and 100
girls) and 198 8th graders (100 boys and 98 girls). U.S. participants consisted of 189 5th graders (88 boys and 101 girls) and 144 8th graders (50 boys and 94 girls). Korean children were recruited from similar schools in a suburban area of Seoul, Korea and U. S. children were recruited from elementary and middle schools in the mid-Atlantic area in the U.S. The ethnic composition of the American children were representative of the U. S population (66 % of European-American, 10% of African-American, and 24 % others). The ethnic composition of the Korean sample was 100% Korean. All children in both cultures were from middle class backgrounds. Also, only children receiving parental consent were surveyed (for parental consent form, see Appendix C).

**Procedure**

The parental consent form were distributed and collected by classroom teachers a week before the survey. A research assistant read aloud the assent form to the children, explained the purpose of the survey and then distributed them to all children during special class time sessions devoted to the survey administration. Children who did not want to participate or who did not have parental consent were given an alternative task by the classroom teacher. For Korean version of the survey, the principal investigator of this
study was fluent in both Korean and English and supervised the translations of the survey and all materials.

Children were allowed to raise their hands and ask question at any time during the session. All names were specific to the country and match the gender of each participant. Children were told that their answers were confidential and anonymous and that their participation is strictly voluntary. Also, children were told that there were no right or wrong answers, and it did not affect their school grades. Additionally, they were instructed to fill out the survey as completely as possible. The survey took approximately 20 minutes.

**Measures: Social Reasoning of Peer Relationships**

All instruments used in the study were developed specifically for this study. Previous work in social cognitive domain theory provides evidence of the reliability and validity of this method of developing instruments. Survey form in the current project has distinct advantages for meeting the study’s research objectives. First, it permits data to be obtained from a larger number of participants than by interview mythologies, ensuring better representativeness and allowing for more extensive comparisons to be conducted among samples from the different countries. Second, because participants do not give
their names, they may express themselves more freely on these topics than they might have in face-to-face interviews. Social desirability, which may have been generated in face-to-face situations, also may be reduced, given that Korean children have been found to be more sensitive to social expectations in interactional situations than some other ethnic groups (Park, Upshaw, & Koh, 1988)

Each participant first was asked to provide responses to basic demographic information (grade, school, class, gender, and ethnicity). Next, participants were presented a survey that contains three sections. The first section asked participants to evaluate short stories about peer relationships. In the second section, participants were asked to fill out their psychological perceptions on target traits. In the final section, participants were asked to describe past or present personal experiences of peer relationship (see Appendix D, for the survey)

(1) Evaluations on peer relationships

Story. The three Contexts (friendship, group exclusion, victimization) and four Target Traits (shyness, aggression, gender, nationality) used in this study were drawn from previous work in this area and verified from the pilot study. The survey consists of 12 stories. There are three contexts of judgment: Friendship (e.g. Peter doesn’t want to be
friends with Joe because he pushes others around – aggressive trait), group exclusion (e.g. George watches a group of kids playing softball and wants to join. But they do not let him join because he is quiet – shy trait), and victimization (e.g. Sam’s other classmates pick on him and call him mean names. This happens everyday). Each context involves four target traits of judgment: Shyness (e.g. Adam is quiet and plays by himself. Most of his classmates do not pay attention to him), aggression (e.g. Joe is bossy and pushes around his classmates and gets into fights often), gender (e.g. Susan is a girl), and nationality (e.g. Inchul is from Korea). For example, for the Friendship/Aggression story, children will be asked to evaluate “Joe is bossy and pushes around his classmates and gets into fights often. Peter doesn’t want to be friends with Joe because he pushes others around”.

The presentation of target traits (shyness, aggression, gender, nationality) were counterbalanced to minimize story order effects. However, the order of the contexts was fixed as friendship, group exclusion, and victimization. Research has shown that in the friendship context, rejection is the least severe moral transgression and victimization is the most severe moral transgression. Thus, the order of contexts was decided to minimize the participants’ sensitivity to a moral transgression that may occur after a severe
transgression. After reading each short story, which involves a *context* and a *target trait*, participants were asked to respond to three questions (for each of the twelve stories).

**Dependent measures.** Each situation has three assessments: (A) Evaluation of *Peer Relationships*; (B) *Justifications*; and (C) *Bystanders’ Reaction*. The first set of dependent measures was the *Evaluation of Peer Relationships Assessments* and *Justification*. Participants were asked to rate the peer interaction in each story, based on how they feel about the act (e.g. Do you think it is okay for the kids to not let Arthur join the softball game?). The Likert scale ranges from 1 = very much not okay to 6 = very much okay. Following the evaluation, participants were asked to give reasons supporting their judgments.

The second set of dependent measures was the evaluation of the *Bystanders’ Reaction*. Participants were asked what a bystander should do when he or she observed the peer interactions. Participants were asked to choose one of six options on how the bystander should respond (e.g., A bystander hears that the kids don’t let him join the softball game. What should the bystander do?). The six options were including: 1) do nothing; 2) make the victim feel better; 3) tell the victim to change his/her behavior; 4) confront the situation; 5) support the situation; and 6) tell the teacher.

(2) *Changeability and conformity about target traits.*
The second section of the survey consisted of asking children about their perceptions about the target traits: shyness, aggression, gender, and nationality. Participants were asked to evaluate how much they agree with the following statements; (1) Do you think that Billy can change himself?, and (2) Do you think that Billy should change himself? The Likert scale ranges from 1 = very much agree to 4 = do not agree at all.

(3) Personal experience

In the last section of the survey, participants were asked to think about their personal experiences regarding the peer relationships that were used in this study. Using a Likert scale (1 = always to 4 = never), children were asked to evaluate three questions: 1) Whether they have not been able to be friends with someone they like, 2) Whether they have not been allowed to join to a sports game they like; and 3) Whether they have ever been picked on.

Justification Coding Responses

Justification responses (reasoning) were coded using a coding category system based on previous research used to analyze social reasoning (Killen et al., 2001; Killen et al., 2002b; Smetana, 1995a; Tisak, 1995; Turiel, 1983) and on the results of pilot data.
The categories that will be used to code the justifications are: (1) Moral (prosocial, fairness/discrimination) (e.g., “They have the right to play softball, even though they may not be very good at it.”); (2) Social-conventional (group functioning/stereotypes, peer pressure) (e.g., “If I play with that kid, I may also be excluded from my friends.”); (3) Personal choice (e.g., “If he doesn’t want to be friends with the kid, it’s okay. It’s his choice.”); and (4) Undifferentiated (unreadable, incomplete). (For a complete description of the coding categories, see Appendix E).

Reliability

Reliability was calculated using two coders who independently coded 40 surveys (6% of the surveys). Inter-rater agreement was determined by the percentage of agreement between the coders. Inter-rater percent agreement was 92%. In addition, Cohen’s kappa statistic was .89.
CHAPTER IV

Results

Multivariate Analyses of Variance (MANOVAs) with repeated measures were used to test hypotheses pertaining to judgment, justification, bystanders’ reactions, and perceptions about target traits. Personal experience responses were tested with multivariate ANOVA. Follow-up analyses included univariate ANOVAs for between-subjects effects and t-tests for within-subjects interactions effects. To test the hypotheses pertaining to relationships between perception and dependent variables, judgments, justifications, and bystanders’ reactions, multivariate ANOVAs were used. Also, relationships between personal experience and dependent variables were tested using multivariate ANOVAs. When conducting follow-up analyses on main effects for context and trait, responses were collapsed across traits in order to examine context effects, and responses were collapsed across contexts in order to examine trait effects. In cases where sphericity was not met, corrections were made using the Huynh-Feldt method.

All responses were analyzed with nationality of participant, gender of participant, grade of participant, contexts and traits as independent variables. The repeated-measures factors were context (friendship, group exclusion, victimization) and target traits (aggression, shyness, nationality, gender).
Judgment responses were coded using a 6-point Likert scale from 1 = very much not okay to 6 = very much okay. Justifications (reasons why) were analyzed as proportions of responses for each coding category (see Appendix for coding categories) and treated as repeated measures within-subjects variables. Bystanders’ reactions were analyzed as proportions of responses for each choice (see Appendix for choices) and treated as repeated measures within-subject variables. Perceptions about traits and personal experience responses were coded using a 4-point Likert scale.

Researchers using a social-cognitive domain approach to analyzing categorical judgment and justification data have successfully used similar data analysis procedures in their studies (see Nucci & Smetana, 1996; Killen et al., 2002a; Smetana, 1986; Tisak, 1995; Turiel, 1998). A recent review of analytic procedures for this type of data indicated that ANOVA-based procedures are appropriate compared to log-linear analysis for this type of within-subjects design (see Wainryb, Shaw, Laupa, & Smith, 2001, footnote 4).

**Evaluations of Peer Relationships**

**Evaluations by context**

It was hypothesized that peer relationship contexts would make a difference in the way children and adolescents evaluate the peer relationships of an individual. A 2
(nationality) X 2 (gender) X 2 (grade) X 3 (context: friendship, group exclusion, victimization) X 4 (target traits: aggression, shyness, nationality, gender) MANOVA with repeated measure on the last two factors confirmed a main effect for context, $F(2, 1272) = 367.95, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .37$. Follow-up analyses indicated that children and adolescents were more likely to judge the victimization context more negatively than the group exclusion, $t(712) = 19.13, p < .001$, and friendship contexts, $t(712) = 23.95, p < .001$. Students also differentiated between group exclusion and friendship contexts; the friendship context was judged less negatively than the group exclusion context, $t(712) = 6.31, p < .001$. As expected, however, the overall mean rating across all three contexts was 2.23 ($SD = 1.15$), indicating that on average, students viewed rejection across all contexts as wrong. In addition, a Context X Nationality interaction, $F(2, 1272) = 15.68, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .02$, indicated that Korean and American participants evaluated contexts differently. Further analyses revealed that Korean and American participants’ responses differed for the victimization context. American children viewed victimization more negatively than did Korean children, $F(1, 681) = 15.11, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .02$ (for means, see Table 2).

In sum, a majority of children and adolescents did not condone the peer rejections, regardless of the gender, grade, and nationality of participants. Rejecting peers,
however, was not unilaterally viewed as wrong in all circumstances. Participants differentiated their evaluations for the victims. Victimization elicited the most negative judgments, followed by group exclusion and then friendship (See Figure 1).

**Evaluations by target traits**

Analysis of the full design revealed that participants also differentiated among target traits when evaluating peer relationships, $F(3, 1908) = 706.34, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .57$. The hypothesis that children and adolescents would consider rejecting an aggressive child as a legitimate action was held. Participants were most likely to condone rejection of a child with an aggressive trait and least likely to support the rejection of a child of a different nationality (See Figure 2).

A Target X Nationality interaction, $F(3, 1908) = 52.42, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .08$, revealed that Korean and American participants evaluated target traits differently. Against the hypothesis that Korean participants would evaluate rejecting a shy child as less legitimate than American participants, there were no significant differences between Korean and American participants in evaluating the rejection of a shy child. Korean and American participants differed in their evaluations of aggression and nationality traits. American participants viewed rejecting an aggressive child as less wrong than did Korean
children, $F(1, 716) = 43.11, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .06$, and evaluated the rejection of a child because of his nationality as more wrong than did the Korean children, $F(1, 716) = 62.34, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .08$. The hypothesis that Korean participants might be more generous to a shy child was not supported.

A Target X Grade interaction, $F(3, 1908) = 18.47, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .03$, revealed that 5th and 8th grade students evaluated target traits differently. Follow-up analyses revealed that 8th grade students viewed rejecting an aggressive child as more okay than did 5th grade children, $F(1, 716) = 14.52, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .02$. In addition, older children were likely to evaluate rejecting a child of a different nationality as more wrong than younger children, $F(1, 716) = 14.71, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .02$ (for means, see Table 2).

In sum, participants judged that it was most legitimate to reject an aggressive child. Secondly, rejecting a child based solely on the gender of the child was considered more legitimate than the other traits, such as shyness and different nationality. Against past research that shyness is one salient reason for rejection, rejecting a shy child was considered unacceptable. Rejecting a different nationality child was considered as the most negative. Very few gender, grade, or nationality interactions were found in terms of evaluations of peer relationships.
Evaluations by contexts and target traits

A Context X Target traits interaction, $F(6, 3816) = 47.03, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .07$, indicated that although overall context and overall target differences were significant, there were also differences between particular scenarios. Further analyses revealed that for the aggression, shyness, and gender traits, the main effect for the target held. That is, the victimization context was more likely to be viewed as wrong than were the group exclusion and the friendship contexts. Nationality, however, showed a different pattern from the other target traits; participants were more likely to condone rejection of a child based on his or her nationality in the group exclusion context than in the friendship or victimization contexts.

A Context X Target X Nationality interaction, $F(6, 3816) = 14.76, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .02$, revealed that Korean and American participants evaluated the scenarios differently. Further analyses revealed that American students evaluated the rejection of an aggressive child as more acceptable than Korean students did, $ps < .001$, while the Korean students viewed rejection based on a child’s nationality as more acceptable than did American students across all three contexts, $ps < .001$. In addition, Korean participants viewed victimization of a shy, different gender, or different nationality child as less acceptable than did American participants, $ps < .001$ (for means, see Table 2).
**Nationality, grade and gender**

Based on the hypotheses concerning the importance of developmental changes and experiential factors to an individual’s evaluation and reasoning about peer relationships, between-subject factors (nationality, grade, and gender) on judgment were analyzed. In the repeated MANOVA that tested the full design, an overall gender effect was found, $F(1, 636) = 10.97, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .02$. Across all scenarios, girls were more likely than boys to evaluate the rejection of a child as unacceptable ($ps < .001$). There was no significant difference between Korean and American children in terms of the evaluation of peer relationships. In addition, there were no significantly consistent differences between 5th and 8th graders’ judgments (for means, see Table 2).

**Justification for Evaluations of Peer Relationships**

**Justification for evaluations by the context**

For an overview examination of justifications results, five categories (prosocial/empathy, fairness/discrimination, group functioning/stereotypes, external influences, and personal choice) were analyzed. It was hypothesized that context would affect the way children and adolescents reasoned about peer relationships. Results confirmed expectations that justifications varied by context, $F(8, 5096) = 119.76, p < .001, \eta_p^2$
The results support the hypothesis that children would predominately use moral justification to support their evaluation of peer rejections. Participants used prosocial/empathy justification predominately across all contexts; however, it was used most often for the victimization context. The proportions of justifications in the context of friendship were very similar in proportion to the use of justifications in the group exclusion context. In line with the hypothesis that children would use more group functioning/stereotypes and personal choice in the contexts of friendship and group exclusion, the proportions of the personal choice justifications were much larger in both of those than in the victimization context (for means, see Table 3). That is, even though children understood that rejecting a peer in the group exclusion or friendship contexts was a moral transgression, they allowed individuals to have the right to choose a friend for personal reasons such as whom they like to be with (see Figure 3).

As an example, when asked to evaluate a group exclusion/aggression scenario (e.g., Gary is bossy and pushes around his classmates and gets into fights often. He watches a group of kids preparing group projects in school and wants to join. But they do not let him join because he pushes others around.), an 8th grade American girl used both stereotypes and prosocial reasoning in her response:
“This is somewhat not okay because maybe the kids are afraid that Susan may beat them up or push them around, but it is also not okay because they should try to make friends with Susan even though she can be bossy or rude.”

In contrast, an 8th grade American girl appealed to personal choice reasons when asked to evaluate the friendship/shyness scenario: “If she doesn’t feel comfortable around her because she's quiet, she shouldn’t have to be her friend.”

**Justification for Evaluations by Target Traits**

It was hypothesized that participants would differ in their reasoning about rejecting an aggressive child, a shy child, a child of a different gender or a child of a different nationality. As expected, the results revealed that the proportions of using justifications in all four target traits were different, $F(12, 7644) = 326.34, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .34$ (for means, see Table 3). Participants were more likely to use stereotypes/group functioning justifications when evaluating aggressive traits ($M = .53, SD = .32$) and gender ($M = .14, SD = .22$). For example, an 8th grade Korean boy appealed to group functioning reasons in response to the group exclusion/aggression scenario: “This is okay because the group might not want someone to destroy their peace. Also, he was mean to
others and that is a good reason not to be nice to him.” When asked to provide a reason for accepting the rejection of a child of a different gender child in the friendship context, an 8th grade American boy said, “In 8th grade, being friends with a girl means she's your girlfriend, and David just doesn't want a girlfriend yet.”

When evaluating shyness and nationality traits, participants used predominately prosocial/empathy reasoning (shy: $M = .71, SD = .21$; nationality: $M = .54, SD = .37$). As an example, an 8th grade American girl said:

“Not being friends with shy people is not okay. Just because they are shy doesn't mean they are a bad person. I think Brenda should get to know Taylor first. She might be able to pull Taylor out of her shell.”

In contrast, fairness/discrimination justifications were mostly used for a different nationality child, a different gender child, and then a shy child, however, not very often for an aggressive child. For example, for the group exclusion/nationality scenario, an 8th grade American girl said: “Choice for a project or other work should be based on aptitude and ability. Just because she's Korean you shouldn't discriminate her.” A 5th grade American boy also rejected group exclusion of a child based on nationality using fairness/discrimination reasoning:
“You don't know what he's really like. This is the same reason that all those Jews were killed in Concentration Camps, because of where they come from and what they believe. He [Mark] should try being his friend and if it doesn't workout, then he can say it was not because of this background it was just because it didn't work.”

In sum, different patterns of using justifications in all context and traits were found. In victimization contexts, prosocial reasons were predominately used; personal choice reasons were most used in friendship contexts; group functioning reasons were used for aggressive children; and more fairness reasons were used in group membership traits, such as gender and nationality, than individual deficit traits such as aggression and shyness (see Figure 3).

**Nationality, grade and gender**

Between-subject factors (nationality, grade, and gender) on reasoning were analyzed. In the repeated MANOVA that tested the full design, an overall nationality effect, $F(1, 637) = 5.26, p < .05, \eta^2_p = .01$, and gender effect was found, $F(1, 637) = 6.35, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .01$. Across all scenarios, girls were more likely to use prosocial/empathy and personal choice justifications than were boys, $ps < .001$. In
contrast, boys used more fairness/discrimination and group functioning/stereotypes justifications across all scenarios.

When evaluating peer rejection, Korean participants were more likely to appeal to fairness/discrimination and group functioning/stereotypes reasoning, while American participants used more prosocial/empathy and personal choice justifications, $ps < .001$. Overall, there were no significant differences between 5th and 8th graders’ reasoning about their judgments.

A Context X Justification X Nationality interaction, $F (8, 5096) = 8.99, p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$, revealed that American and Korean participants used justification differently for evaluating contexts of relationships. American students were more likely to use personal reasoning when evaluating the contexts of friendship and group exclusion but not for the victimization context, $ps < .01$. As an example, for friendship/shy scenario, an 8th-grade American girl answered using personal choice reasoning: “Because nobody has to be friends with someone they don't want to.” In addition, whereas Korean participants were more likely to refer to stereotypes/group functioning reasons when evaluating the friendship context, American participants were more likely to use stereotypes/group functioning justifications for the group exclusion context, $ps < .01$ (for means, see Table 3).
In sum, in contrast to evaluations, some grade- or nationality-related differences were found in terms of using justification. Interestingly, Korean participants were more likely to appeal to fairness/discrimination reasoning, while American participants were more likely to appeal to prosocial/empathy and personal choice justifications. Despite the viewpoint that Americans are a highly fairness-oriented society, Korean students used more fairness reasons than did Americans.

With regard to developmental changes, 8th graders used more fairness justifications for group membership traits, such as nationality and gender but not in individual deficit traits. The proportions using group functioning increased with age in individual deficit traits and decreased in group membership traits. These findings indicated that as children get older they weigh and coordinate their different reasons more adequately. In other words, older children have more ability to differentiate the situations for applying a general rule.

**Bystanders’ Reactions**

To examine moral responsibility for obligations, participants were asked what a third person, or bystander, should do when he or she witnessed peer rejection. Nationality X Grade X Gender X Context X Target traits repeated measures MANOVAs were
conducted on six bystanders’ reactions: 1) do nothing; 2) make the victim feel better; 3) tell the victim to change his/her behavior; 4) confront the situation; 5) support the situation; and 6) tell the teacher.

**Bystanders’ Reactions by Context**

It was hypothesized that context would make a difference when children and adolescents had to decide about what to respond when observing an act of peer rejection. Supporting the predictions, overall, participants chose bystanders’ reactions by considering the associated harm and the negative consequences for the victim. Analyses confirmed a main effect for context, $F (10, 6390) = 14.81, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .02$. Although across all three contexts participants were most likely to choose “confront the situation” (33% for friendship, 35% for group exclusion and victimization), some variations were found (for means, see Table 4). That is, as the negative consequences for the victim increased, choosing “do nothing,” “tell the victim to change his/her behavior,” and “support the situation” decreased in order from the friendship to the group exclusion and to the victimization contexts. In contrast, choosing “make the victim feel better” and “tell the teacher” increased from the friendship to the group exclusion to victimization contexts (See Figure 4).
**Bystanders’ Reactions by Target Traits**

It was hypothesized that the target traits of victims would affect children’s and adolescents’ decisions to respond when observing an act of peer rejection. Analyses confirmed a main effect for target traits, $F(15, 9585) = 95.39, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .13$ (for means, see Table 4). As expected, for aggression participants chose “tell the victim to change his/her behavior” most often. For the last three target traits—shyness, nationality, and gender—participants chose “confront the situation” significantly more often than all other options.

In sum, participants were most likely to choose “confront the situation.” However, there were some variations. As the negative consequences for the victim increased, choosing “do nothing,” “tell the victim to change his/her behavior,” and “support the situation” decreased in order from the friendship context to the group exclusion context and to the victimization context. In contrast, choosing “make the victim feel better” and “tell the teacher” increased in order of the friendship, group exclusion, and victimization contexts.
Overall, no significant between-subject effects were found, although, as expected, several interaction effects were found. For example, analyses revealed a Context X Bystanders’ reaction X Nationality interaction, $F(10, 6390) = 7.32, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .01$.

More Korean participants chose “telling victim to change their behavior” than did American participants. In contrast, American participants were more likely to choose “do nothing,” “make the victim feel better,” and “support the situation” than did their Korean counterparts (for means, see Table 4).

In sum, Korean participants chose “tell the victim to change his/her behavior” more often than did American participants. In contrast, American participants were more likely to choose “make the victim feel better.” On one hand, these findings support the cultural theory that Koreans practiced more conformity than Americans. On the other hand, the results fall opposite this cultural theory because Koreans were more activist than the Americans. Also, Americans focused more on prosocial and empathy justifications.
Changeability and Conformity of Target Traits

MANOVAs with repeated measures were used to understand participants’ perceptions about target traits. Nationality X Gender X Grade X Target traits X Perception MANOVA with repeated measures on the perception analyses revealed main effects for Target, $F(3, 1977) = 1702.00, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .72$, Perception, $F(1, 659) = 35.52, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .05$, and a Target X Perception interaction, $F(3, 1977) = 51.78, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .07$. As hypothesized, participants had different perceptions of the target traits of aggression, shyness, nationality, and gender. Participants differentiated between all four traits in terms of whether the traits can be changed. Participants agreed on changeability of aggression most and then shyness. Also they disagreed most on the changeability of gender and then nationality (for means, see Table 5). In addition, participants differentiated between all four traits in terms of whether the traits should be changed to be accepted; participants agreed most on conformability of aggression and then shyness. They disagreed most often on the changeability of gender and then nationality (See mean table). Changeability and conformability were significantly related ($r = .33 \sim .62, p < .001$).

In sum, children and adolescents differentiated between all four traits in terms of whether the traits can be changed and should be changed. Participants made distinctions
between individual deficits (aggression, shyness) and group membership traits (gender, nationality).

**Nationality, grade, and gender**

Between-subject factors (nationality, grade, and gender) on perception were analyzed. In the repeated measures MANOVA that tested the full design, an overall nationality effect, $F(1, 659) = 52.75, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .07$, and gender effect, $F(1, 659) = 13.54, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .02$, were found.

As expected, the relationship between perception of target traits and judgment about peer relationships showed significant differences based on participants’ nationality, and gender. Results revealed significant Perception X Target X Nationality, $F(3, 1977) = 19.58, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .03$. Korean participants considered aggression and shyness as more changeable than did American participants. In contrast, American participants considered nationality and gender as more changeable than did their counterparts. In terms of gender, a Perception X Target X Gender, $F(3, 1977) = 3.71, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .01$, interaction revealed that boys were less likely to view the aggression and shyness traits as changeable than were girls. Also boys were more likely to view nationality and gender as not changeable (for means, see Table 5).
In sum, American participants and girls showed more clear distinctions between individual characteristics and group characteristics in terms of changeability and conformity. Korean participants and boys believed that people should change their behavior to be accepted. Given that Korea is theorized to be a culture that emphasizes conformity, it is interesting to find that Koreans do not always emphasize conformity. Most Koreans did not prescribe conformity for the group membership traits like nationality and gender. Also, the context, age, and gender findings indicate that even when the mean response rate is higher for conformity judgments in a traditional culture, like Korea, intracultural differences in conformity clearly exist.

**Relationships with judgment, justification, and bystanders’ reaction**

To investigate the role of individual perceptions about target traits on participants’ judgments, justifications, and bystanders’ reactions, MANOVA with repeated measures were conducted. Initial analyses indicated that there were very few significant differences between participants’ nationality, grade, and gender. Therefore, subsequent analyses were conducted without between-subject variables. To examine the hypothesis that there are relationships between individuals’ perceptions and judgments, follow-up analyses were conducted using one-way ANOVAs. As expected, significant
relationships were found for the traits of shyness, nationality, and gender, \( ps < .001 \). A significant relationship between perception and judgment for aggression was not found.

The results from Perception X Justification MANOVA revealed that there were significant relationships between perceptions and justifications in all four target traits. Specifically, participants who believed that conformity was important used more group functioning justifications for a child with an aggressive trait, \( F(1, 686) = 5.74, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .01 \). Participants who believed that a shy child could change characteristics also used more group functioning justifications, \( F(1, 686) = 5.49, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .01 \). For participants who viewed that a child with a different nationality should change his/her behavior, less fairness and more group functioning reasoning was used. When participants believed that a child could change gender-specific behaviors, they used more group functioning justifications. In sum, participants who believed that a child could or should change characteristics were more likely to use group functioning justifications across all four target traits.

To understand the relationships between individuals’ perceptions and bystanders’ reactions, a Perception X Bystanders’ reactions MANOVA was conducted. The results revealed that there were significant relationships between perceptions and bystanders’ reactions for shyness, nationality, and gender traits. Specifically, when participants
perceived that shyness could be changed and should be changed, they were less likely to choose “make the victim feel better” and more likely to choose “tell the victim to change his/her behavior.” When participants perceived different nationality behaviors as changeable and justifiably conformable, they chose “make victim feel better” less often and “tell the victim to change his/her behavior” more often. When participants perceived that opposite gender behaviors could be changed and should be changed, they chose more often to “do nothing” and “tell the victim to change his/her behavior.”

In sum, when participants believed that the target traits were changeable and conformable, they evaluated the rejections as more legitimate and used more group functioning justifications. These findings provide that even though most children take into account moral reasons to evaluate the wrongfulness of peer rejections, they also make decisions based on their factual beliefs.

**Personal Experience of Peer Rejection**

MANOVAs were used to understand participants’ personal experience of rejection from different peer relationships. The main effects of nationality were found in the friendship context, $F(1, 700) = 17.85, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .03$, and victimization context, $F(1, 700) = 149.75, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .18$ (for means, see Table 6). Compared to their
Korean counterparts, American participants were more likely to report that they had experienced rejection in both friendship and victimization contexts. In addition, a grade effect was found for the victimization context, \( F(1, 700) = 8.82, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .01 \). Fifth graders reported that they had been victimized more than did 8th graders. Also, a Nationality X Grade interaction effect was found for the group exclusion context, \( F(1, 700) = 5.67, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .01 \). Korean participants reported more negative experience in school group projects with age, while American participants showed a decrease of negative experience with age. In addition, a Grade X Gender interaction effect, \( F(1, 700) = 4.16, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .01 \), revealed that boys reported more negative experience in school group projects with age, while girls showed a decrease of negative experience with increase of age.

**Relationships with Judgment, Justification, and Bystanders’ Reactions**

To investigate the role of individual experience of peer rejection on participants’ judgments, justifications, and bystanders’ reactions, MANOVAs were used. Personal experience was the independent variable and the evaluations about peer relationship contexts were dependent variables. A significant relationship between experience and judgment was found with respect to rejection experience in friendship and evaluation.
about victimization, $F (1, 700) = 8.22, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .01$. When participants experienced
more friendship rejection, they were more likely to believe that it is wrong to victimize a
child.

As expected, examination of the relationship between individuals’ experience
and justification revealed that personal experience of rejection was related to justification
use across all three contexts, $ps < .001$. Specifically, participants who had more
experience with victimization used less stereotypes/group functioning reasoning and
more fairness reasoning.

Results from Experience X Bystanders’ reactions MANOVA revealed that there
were significant relationships between personal experience and bystanders’ reactions in
the friendship, $F (3, 700) = 12.04, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .02$, group exclusion, $F (3, 690) = 4.08,$
$p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .01$, and victimization, $F (3, 664) = 6.93, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .01$, contexts.
Participants who experienced more rejection were more likely to choose “support the
situation” and less likely to choose “tell the victim to change his/her behavior” and “make
the victim feel better.”

In sum, participants’ experience of being rejected was pervasive. It is somewhere
between sometimes and almost never. There were very few children who responded that
they had never experienced rejection. It was also investigated how children’s past
personal experiences contribute to individuals’ social reasoning and judgments. When participants experienced more peer rejection, they were more likely to believe that it is wrong to victimize a child, and those who had peer rejection experiences used less stereotypes/group functioning reasoning and more fairness reasoning.
CHAPTER V

Discussion

This study examined Korean and U.S. children’s evaluations about different types of peer relationships regarding different relationship contexts, target children’s characteristics, and perceptions of characteristics and peer rejection experiences.

Participants evaluated stories based on harm to a target child, for example, evaluating victimization as the most unacceptable. Although all participants, regardless of their nationality, grade, and gender, evaluated negative peer relationships as wrong (that is, that it is wrong to victimize and exclude others) significant differences in the reasons that children gave for their judgments, and their views about the role of bystanders, differed depending on the age and gender of the participants as well as on their cultural affiliation.

Overall, the results indicated that no single variable—culture, gender, grade, or context—was an overriding predictor variable for students’ judgments.

Social Reasoning about Context

Judgment. The first goal of this study was to compare three peer relationships contexts: friendship, group exclusion, and victimization. As expected, the results supported the hypothesis that overall, students viewed peer rejection across all contexts
as wrong. These results supported previous findings that children and adolescents reject peer group exclusion (Killen, Pisacane, Lee-Kim, & Ardila-Rey, 2001; Theimer et al., 2001), and findings from these earlier studies additionally have established that children’s reasoning about rejecting peer relationships is multifaceted. In other words, rejecting peers was not unilaterally viewed as wrong in all circumstances. Participants differentiated their evaluations of peer rejection decisions across the three contexts (victimization, group exclusion, friendship) in terms of the harm associated and the negative consequences for the recipient of the protagonist’s actions. Victimization elicited the most negative judgments, followed by group exclusion and then friendship. The findings for the victimization context provided an interesting contrast to the friendship contexts and the group exclusion contexts. Participants stated that it would be wrong for a child to be picked on and gave moral reasons for their answers. In fact, there were few differences between target traits and participants’ background variables due to the ceiling effect for the victimization context.

One interesting difference between the friendship context and the group exclusion context was found in the target trait of shyness. In the friendship context, participants often accepted the rejection of a shy child and used personal choice reasons. For example, a participant used personal choice as a justification in a friendship/shyness
scenario: “If she doesn't feel comfortable around her because she's quiet, she shouldn’t have to be her friend.” In the group exclusion context, however, participants treated the stories of rejected shy children differently than in the friendship context. They believed that it was not fair to exclude children just because they were shy. A 5th grade Korean girl used fairness/discrimination justifications with regard to the group exclusion/shyness scenario. For example, “They should always let everyone join, no matter their personality.”

In sum, participants evaluated the victimization context as the least legitimate under all four target traits. Interestingly only in the friendship context did participants differentiate between individual deficit traits (aggression and shyness) and group membership traits (gender, nationality). They more readily condoned rejecting children because of their individual deficits than rejecting children because of their group membership. In the group exclusion context, however, the dichotomous division between individual deficits and group membership was greatly diminished. Participants considered only aggression as a legitimate reason to be rejected because aggression was a highly disruptive behavior in group functioning.

Justification. Analyses of the reasons used to justify participants’ judgments indicated that the evaluations were not unilateral. Children used a mixture of moral
reasons and group functioning/stereotypes reasons for group exclusion decisions, and a mixture of moral reasons and personal choice reasons for friendship decisions.

Children’s and adolescents’ reasons for rejecting friendships or group exclusion included concerns about group functioning and, to a lesser extent, stereotypes. This was consistent with Killen and colleagues’ past studies on children’s evaluations of group exclusion from peer groups such as ballet, baseball, basketball, and math clubs (Killen & Stangor, 2001). Only a minority of children and adolescents used explicit stereotypes. Typically children gave reasons such as “If all the people in the group are guys, it probably means they don't want a girl in the group” or “This is okay because the group might not want someone to destroy their peace.” It is not clear to what extent children are aware that the assumptions they actually hold might be derived from their experience and not from their stereotypes. The ways in which children’s and adolescents’ use of group functioning or personal choice reasons to justify rejection may reflect implicit stereotypes needs to be further studied.

In addition, children and adolescents evaluated friendship decisions using personal choice reasons much more than they did when evaluating choices in the group exclusion or victimization contexts. That is, even though children stated that rejecting a friend for group membership reasons was wrong from a moral viewpoint, they also
allowed individuals to have the right to choose their personal friends.

**Social Reasoning about Target Traits**

As hypothesized, overall, participants judged that it was most legitimate to reject an aggressive child. A majority of children consider aggression as the most disruptive behavior for group functioning. Recently, Rubin and his colleagues (Rubin, Bukowski, & Parker, in press) found that the most commonly cited behavioral correlate of peer rejection was aggression. Nearly every study that has assessed the association between aggressiveness and peer rejection has revealed a positive correlation (e.g., Hodge, Mallone, & Perry, 1999; Hanish & Guerra, 2004). These findings appear to be culturally universal; thus victimization and aggression have been found to be positively associated in North American, Southern Asian (Khatri & Kupermidt, 2003) and East Asian (Schwartz, Farver, Chang, & Lee-Shim, 2002) samples.

The present findings extend the peer relationship literature by demonstrating when it is that children and adolescents reject the group exclusion of aggressive peers. In this study, participants condoned the rejection of aggressive children in the friendship and the group exclusion contexts but much less so in the victimization context. Participants judged that it was not fair to victimize a child even if he or she was aggressive.
Rejecting a child based solely on the gender of the child was considered more legitimate than rejection based on other traits, such as shyness and differing nationality. These results support the findings of Killen and colleagues that group membership constitutes a reason that children focus on when evaluating peer group exclusion and rejection (Horn, 2003). This form of rejection may be a result of stereotypic/group functioning attitudes. This may be due, in part, to children’s increased opportunities to choose and participate in social activities (e.g., sports) that require the application or use of gender-role knowledge (McHale, Crouter, & Tucker, 1999). For instance, by middle-childhood, children’s peer activities have been identified as tending to be gender-segregated (Eccles, Jacobs, Harold, Yoon, Arbreton, Freedman-Doan, 1993). This would suggest that children in this age group may develop an increased awareness of gender-related stereotypes as they relate to social activities. Adherence to social conventions, such as gender-segregated activities, may be accepted more readily, contributing to gender-related stereotypes.

Rejecting a shy child was considered unacceptable by the majority of children. These findings were unexpected because much of the literature suggests that there is a particular group of rejected children who are characterized by a socially withdrawn demeanor. Rubin et al. (in press) stated some examples. For instance, Olweus (1993) has
referred to “whipping boys”—a group of victimized children perceived as easy marks by peers. Hodges and colleagues have referred to some victimized children as “physically weak” and “withdrawn” (Hodges, Boivin, Vitaro, & Bukowski, 1999; Hodges, Malone, & Perry, 1997; Rodkin & Hodges, 2003). In the present study, children viewed it wrong to reject or exclude a child who was shy. Future research needs to examine subcategories within shyness. Most likely, there are different variants of shy that were not systematically examined in the present study. For example, shy as “physically weak” is different from shy as “bookworm” or shy as “withdrawn.”

Rejecting a child of a different nationality was considered as the most negative, and participants used predominately prosocial/empathy and fairness/discrimination justifications. Research has shown that children and adolescents view ethnicity-based group exclusion by a peer group as unfair (Killen & Stangor, 2001). Although these findings confirm the previous studies, further research is needed to fully understand the multifaceted dimensions of children’s judgments. Children were well aware of ethnic differences and showed some signs of stereotyping about different ethnicities through their justifications. For instance, an 8th grade American boy stated that “In my experience, Asians have their ‘Asian Pride.’ They stick up for one another, if you mess with one you mess with them all, then you pay big time.” Therefore the straightforward stories and
questions of the present study need more complex explorations to detect children’s multi-
dimensional judgment systems.

Again, participants showed clear distinctions between individual deficit traits
(aggression, shyness) and group membership traits (gender, nationality) in terms of
justifications. Prosocial/empathy reasoning was used most often regarding shy children
and aggressive children, while fairness/discrimination reasons were used more often
regarding children of different nationalities and children of the contrasting gender.

**Bystander Obligations**

To examine children’s and adolescents’ obligations to intervene in an ongoing
peer exchange involving group exclusion or victimization, participants were asked what a
third person, or bystander, should do when he or she witnessed peer rejection. Because
there was no previous research about bystanders’ reactions, no hypotheses were listed.
Across all three contexts, participants were most likely to choose “confront the situation,”
although, some variations were found. Most participants, however, differentiated the
contexts and reasons for peer rejection. That is, as the negative consequences for the
victim increased, choosing “do nothing,” “telling the victim to change his/her behavior,”
and “support the situation” decreased in order from the friendship context to the group
exclusion context and to the victimization context. In contrast, choosing “make the victim feel better” and “tell the teacher” increased in order through the friendship, group exclusion, and victimization contexts.

These findings about children’s and adolescents’ intentions are different from some of the previous studies about behavioral observation of peer relationships. For instance, less than 5 percent of boys were identified as taking the side of the victim and as attempting to stop the situation (Salmivalli et al., 1997). These behavioral observations, however, do not take into account distinctions in the contexts or the reason for the rejection. Because this study’s design include 3 levels of peer relationship contexts and 4 different reasons for peer rejection, the findings of this study shed light on the inconsistencies between intentions and behaviors.

In evidence of the multifaceted intentions of children and adolescents, participants made a distinction in the moral responsibility for their different responses. As expected, for aggression, “telling the victim to change his/her behavior” was chosen most often. For shyness, gender, and nationality, however, most participants chose “confront the situation.” This result clearly showed that children and adolescents had distinctions in their moral obligations, mediated situation by situation.
**Changeability and Conformability of Target Traits**

How children and adolescents perceived the target traits was investigated to determine factual beliefs’ influence on social reasoning and judgments. Children and adolescents differentiated between all four traits in terms of whether the traits could or should be changed. The results revealed that most participants made distinctions between individual deficits (aggression, shyness) and group membership traits (gender, nationality). The findings, however, were not unilateral. Participants’ perceptions and beliefs about target traits were differentiated based on their nationality, grade, and gender. American participants and girls showed more clear distinctions between individual characteristics and group characteristics in terms of changeability and conformability. In addition, younger children were more likely to believe that people should change to be accepted while older children did not support this view.

The present study also investigated whether perceptions about traits has an impact on participants’ judgments and justifications (Wainryb, 2003). As expected, when participants believed that the target traits were changeable and conformable, they evaluated the rejection as more legitimate (Levy, & Dweck, 1999). In addition, those who believed that a child could or should change their characteristics were more likely to use group functioning justifications across all four target traits and less likely to use
fairness/discrimination reasoning. These findings provide an explanation for individual differences in social reasoning and judgments. Even though most children and adolescents take into account moral reasons to evaluate the wrongfulness of peer rejection, they make also decisions based on their factual beliefs and psychological perceptions.

*Experiences of Peer Rejection*

How children’s and adolescents’ past personal experiences with peer rejection contribute to individuals’ social reasoning and judgments was investigated. Compared to their Korean counterparts, American participants were more likely to report that they had experienced rejection in both the friendship and victimization contexts. Specifically, many American children and adolescents reported that they sometimes experienced victimization. When we consider that bullies direct their behavior only toward certain peers, comprising approximately 10% of the school population in the U.S. (NICHD, 2001), we can assume that this 10 % of kids has a significant impact on their peers. In addition, a significant relationship between experience, judgment, and social reasoning was found. When participants experienced more peer rejection themselves, they were more likely to believe that it is wrong to victimize a child. Examination of the
relationship between individuals’ experiences and their justifications revealed that participants who had more experience with victimization used less stereotypes/group functioning reasoning and more fairness reasoning. These findings supported the previous research about social reasoning (Smetana, 2003). When children and adolescents have similar experiences to those of a child in a given situation, they develop sensitivity to the wrongfulness of peer rejection. Further study is needed to capture the nature of the relations between peer rejection experiences and the children’s social reasoning and judgments. It would be appropriate to investigate children’s experience in more depth by examining the comprehensive contexts of their experiences.

*Effects of Participants’ Variables on Social Reasoning*

*Gender*

Across all contexts, girls were more likely than boys to negatively evaluate rejecting a child. Several recent studies provide evidence that in situations involving group group exclusion, boys are more likely than girls to evaluate group exclusion as acceptable and to use social-conventional reasoning to justify their evaluations (Killen & Stangor, 2001; Theimer et al., 2001). Similarly, in the present study, boys were more
likely than girls to evaluate group exclusion as tolerable and to provide social-
conventional and personal reasons for their judgments.

One explanation for this difference is that girls may have more experience with
being excluded from peer groups and may thus be more likely to perceive issues of group
exclusion in moral terms. Research on the higher use of relational aggression by girls
provides some support for this explanation (Crick et al., 2001; Owens et al., 2001). That
is, if girls use indirect forms of aggression (excluding, teasing, gossiping) more than do
boys, then girls will have more personal experience with being excluded and thus may be
more sensitive to the inherent moral dimensions of group exclusion. It is possible that this
is not the case. If we take into consideration that the concerns of this present study are
about indirect forms of aggression (excluding), girls are supposed to be more forgiving of
the perpetrators. Future research should investigate the impact that experience with both
being excluded and excluding others has on children’s and adolescents' reasoning about
these issues.

As expected, in terms of justification, overall girls were more likely to use
prosocial/empathy and personal choice justifications than were boys. In contrast, boys
used more fairness/discrimination and group functioning/stereotypes justifications across
all scenarios. These findings support the argument that girls view prosocial and relational
morality (i.e., helping, caring, inclusion, and group exclusion) as more obligatory in certain contexts than do boys (Gilligan, 1982; Killen & Turiel, 1998; Wentzel & Erdley, 1993) and are more sensitive to these issues than are boys (Zahn-Waxler, Cole, Welsh, & Fox, 1995).

*Developmental differences*

The findings that 5th graders were less likely than 8th graders to judge rejecting an aggressive child as wrong but were more likely than 8th graders to judge rejecting a different nationality child as wrong provide some evidence for age-related differences in individuals' evaluation of multifaceted events. Based on previous research in the area of social cognitive domain theory, older children would use more social-conventional reasons than would younger children (Helwig, 1995; Helwig, Tisak, & Turiel, 1990). This is because adolescents become more aware of social networks and group functioning and what it means to be a member of a group and make the group work. The question of when adolescents give priority to group functioning and conventions over morality requires further investigation.

This study provides evidence for age-related differences in a more detailed way with regard to children’s and adolescents' societal knowledge. Eighth graders used more
social-conventional justifications for individual traits (aggression, shyness) than did 5th graders, and used fewer social-conventional justifications for group membership traits (gender, nationality) than did 5th graders.

The results of the present study may add support to the hypothesis that children’s and adolescents’ social knowledge is not unilateral but multifaceted. As expected older children used more social-conventional reasons to justify their judgments, but this did not hold across all contexts. The 8th graders made more clear distinctions between individual deficit traits (aggression, shyness) and group membership traits (gender, nationality) than did the 5th graders when using social-conventional reasoning.

These results extend research by Killen and colleagues on children's and early adolescents' reasoning about group exclusion (Killen et al., 2002) by providing evidence of age-related differences in children’s and adolescents' decisions and reasoning about their peer relationships based on individual deficit traits beyond group membership.

**Cultural differences**

Based on cultural theory, it could be expected that Korean and American students might evaluate social situations differently. For example, it was hypothesized that Korean children would evaluate the rejection of a shy child as less legitimate than American
children. This hypothesis was based on previous studies about perceptions of shyness in different cultures. Much literature has shown that shyness is interpreted differently within different cultures (Chen & Rubin, 1992; Rubin, 1998). Researchers have argued that children from East Asia (e.g., China and Korea) evaluated shyness as more acceptable than children from Western cultures like the United States. These different perceptions may influence individuals’ evaluations of rejecting a shy child in Korea and the United States.

There were, however, no significant differences between American and Korean evaluations about the situations involving a shy child. The context (friendship, group exclusion, victimization) of the situations had more effect on evaluating rejection of a shy child than participants’ cultural background. These findings are against the dichotomized individualist/collectivist theory of culture.

Interestingly, the finding that Korean participants were more likely to appeal to fairness/discrimination and group functioning/stereotypes reasoning, while American participants were more likely to appeal to prosocial/empathy and personal choice justifications, also suggests that individuals’ social reasoning may not perfectly fit into the dichotomized individualistic/collectivist theory of culture. Despite the viewpoint that Koreans are highly group- or society-oriented, and would thereby be willing to exclude
someone who was disruptive for their group functioning due to their “collectivistic” orientation, Korean students used fewer group functioning/stereotypes reasons than did Americans. This finding may provide some evidence that if there are culturally derived collectivist attitudes, they are not universally applied and may instead be contingent on context.

Regarding perceptions of target traits, Korean participants considered aggression and shyness as more changeable and conformable than did American participants. In contrast, American participants considered nationality and gender as more changeable and conformable than did their Korean counterparts. Given that Korea is theorized to be a culture that emphasizes conformity (see Oyserman, et al. 2002; Triandis, 1995), it is interesting to find that Koreans do not, in fact, always emphasize such conformity. Also, Koreans’ conformity decreased, not increased, with age. The decrease in conformity judgments with age is consistent with research on autonomy that shows autonomy-related judgments to be fairly universal in adolescence (Smetana, 1997). To this extent, the adolescents in this study displayed cultural ideologies of conformity on the one hand, and on the other hand, displayed a valuing of autonomy as reflected in their views that the excluded child should not have to change him/herself to be accepted by the group. The finding that Koreans, overall, supported more conformity than did the U.S. participants
supports cultural theorizing about collectivism. Yet, the context, age, and gender findings indicate that even when the mean response rate is higher for conformity judgments in a traditional culture like Korea, intracultural differences in conformity clearly exist. This suggests that labeling Koreans as oriented towards conformity is inadequate because such an orientation varies by context as well as by age and gender of the individual. Further research on individuals’ reasons for nonconformity in different contexts would clarify when Korean children and adolescents value conformity and when they reject conformity as an appropriate response to group exclusion from social groups.

Another difference found between Korean participants and American participants pertained to their reactions to a bystander’s obligation to do something about an group exclusion situation. Korean participants chose “telling the victim to change his/her behavior” more often than did American participants. In contrast, American participants were more likely to choose “make the victim feel better.” These findings can be interpreted two different ways. On one hand, it is possible to state that Koreans prescribed more conformity than did Americans. This argument would be based on the collectivistic/individualistic cultural theory as I mentioned above. On the other hand, it is possible to view that Koreans were more activist than Americans because Americans focused more on prosocial and empathy reasoning. The later interpretations assigned the
opposite general characteristics to each culture. According to the cultural theory, people from Western culture, such as Americans, are more activist. People from Eastern culture, however, are supposed to be more sensitive to their group members’ emotional well-being and take care of each other. Again, the current findings are evidence that it is limited, and perhaps superficial, to categorize people by uniformly binary distinctions, not considering complex situations (see Gjerde, 2004; Turiel, 2004).

Conclusion

In sum, this study examined Korean and U.S. children’s evaluations about different types of peer relationships regarding different relationship contexts, target children’s characteristics, and the perception of characteristics and peer rejection experiences. Participants evaluated situations based on harm to a target child, for example evaluating victimization as the most unacceptable. Although all participants, regardless of their nationality, grade, and gender, evaluated negative peer relationships as wrong, that is, that it is wrong to victimize and exclude others, significant differences in the reasons that children gave for their judgments, and their views about the role of the bystander differed depending on the age and gender of the participants as well as on their cultural membership. Overall, the results indicated that no one variable, culture, gender, grade,
and scenario, was an overriding predictor variable for students’ judgments.

This study makes an original contribution to the literature on peer relationships in three ways. First, very few studies have systematically examined children’s moral reasoning about peer rejection in different levels of group exclusion contexts. Most research examines correlates of negative peer relationships, such as social competence skills and the personality characteristics of perpetrators and victims. Here, the focus was on the types of reasons that children generated for friendship rejection and why group exclusion and victimization is wrong, as well as the contexts in which these behaviors are particularly detrimental or arguably legitimate.

Second, the findings contribute to the literature on social cognitive domain theory by providing a framework for contrasting individual deficit traits with group membership as reasons for peer rejection. Past research on group exclusion has examined how children may use group membership, such as gender or race groups, as reasons to exclude others (see Killen et al, 2002). This study demonstrates that there are contexts in which children use individual trait deficits (shyness, aggressiveness) as well to legitimize group exclusion.

Third, regarding theories of culture and cultural differences, the findings support the coexistence view of culture espoused by theorists who have moved beyond the use of
dichotomous templates, such as individualism and collectivism, to describe cultures (Killen & Wainryb, 2000; Turiel & Wainryb, 1994). In this study, cultural differences were varied, and did not reflect straightforward “individualistic” or “collectivistic” perspectives.

Future research should examine how children's evaluative patterns change with age in a longitudinal design to understand developmental changes in children’s and adolescents’ moral reasoning about peer rejection. In addition, it would be beneficial to investigate how individual differences of children bear on their social evaluation and reasoning about different forms of peer rejection. Children who are extremely shy or aggressive, when they evaluate the scenarios of children who have similar social traits to their own, may evaluate peer rejection quite differently from those children who are not extreme in their social traits. The new lines of research will shed new light on these important developmental phenomena.
Table 1. *Pilot Study: Means of Judgments on Peer Relationships*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts of peer relationships by Age</th>
<th>Aggression</th>
<th>Shyness</th>
<th>Target Nationality</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th,6th</td>
<td>2.67 (.71)</td>
<td>2.33 (1.41)</td>
<td>1.89 (.78)</td>
<td>3.13 (1.36)</td>
<td>2.50 (.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th,8th</td>
<td>3.64 (1.57)</td>
<td>2.00 (1.26)</td>
<td>1.91 (1.14)</td>
<td>1.55 (1.51)</td>
<td>2.27 (.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.20 (1.32)</td>
<td>2.15 (1.31)</td>
<td>1.90 (.97)</td>
<td>2.21 (1.62)</td>
<td>2.37 (.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th,6th</td>
<td>1.89 (.93)</td>
<td>1.78 (.97)</td>
<td>1.56 (.53)</td>
<td>1.89 (.78)</td>
<td>1.78 (.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th,8th</td>
<td>3.18 (2.18)</td>
<td>1.82 (1.54)</td>
<td>1.09 (.30)</td>
<td>3.45 (1.91)</td>
<td>2.39 (.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.60 (1.82)</td>
<td>1.80 (128)</td>
<td>1.30 (.47)</td>
<td>2.75 (1.68)</td>
<td>2.11 (.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th,6th</td>
<td>1.89 (1.05)</td>
<td>1.67 (.71)</td>
<td>1.33 (.50)</td>
<td>1.78 (.97)</td>
<td>1.67 (.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th,8th</td>
<td>3.00 (2.14)</td>
<td>1.64 (1.29)</td>
<td>1.18 (.60)</td>
<td>1.27 (.65)</td>
<td>1.77 (.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.50 (1.79)</td>
<td>1.65 (1.04)</td>
<td>1.25 (.55)</td>
<td>1.50 (.83)</td>
<td>1.73 (.79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 24. Rating scale: 1 = Very much not okay; 2 = Somewhat not okay; 3 = A little not okay; 4 = A little okay; 5 = Somewhat okay; 6 = Very much okay. Standard deviations are in parentheses.
Table 2. Means for Evaluations of Peer Relationships with Contexts by Target Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality by Grade</th>
<th>Friendship</th>
<th>Exclusion</th>
<th>Victimization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aggrs</td>
<td>shy</td>
<td>ntnlty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Korean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.81)</td>
<td>(1.55)</td>
<td>(1.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.62)</td>
<td>(1.39)</td>
<td>(1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.71)</td>
<td>(1.48)</td>
<td>(1.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.85)</td>
<td>(1.53)</td>
<td>(1.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.52)</td>
<td>(1.41)</td>
<td>(.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.76)</td>
<td>(1.49)</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality by Grade</th>
<th>Friendship</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Context by Target traits</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aggregs</td>
<td>shy</td>
<td>ntnlty</td>
<td>gndr</td>
<td>aggregs</td>
<td>shy</td>
<td>ntnlty</td>
<td>gndr</td>
<td>aggregs</td>
<td>shy</td>
<td>ntnlty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>(1.83)</td>
<td>(1.55)</td>
<td>(1.25)</td>
<td>(1.53)</td>
<td>(1.71)</td>
<td>(1.22)</td>
<td>(1.36)</td>
<td>(1.52)</td>
<td>(1.46)</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>(1.68)</td>
<td>(1.40)</td>
<td>(.99)</td>
<td>(1.38)</td>
<td>(1.55)</td>
<td>(1.23)</td>
<td>(1.21)</td>
<td>(1.35)</td>
<td>(1.67)</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( N = 732 \). Evaluations of peer relationships = “Do you think it is okay or not okay for the kids to reject him?” Evaluation ratings:

1 = Very much not okay; 2 = Somewhat not okay; 3 = A little not okay; 4 = A little okay; 5 = Somewhat okay; 6 = very much okay.

Standard deviations are in parentheses.
### Table 3. Proportion of Justifications for Evaluation of Peer Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target traits</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Friendship</th>
<th>Context by Justification</th>
<th>Victimization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prosc</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggre</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.43)</td>
<td>(.21)</td>
<td>(.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shy</td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(.28)</td>
<td>(.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.47)</td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.48)</td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.27)</td>
<td>(.23)</td>
<td>(.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.32)</td>
<td>(.11)</td>
<td>(.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shy</td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.42)</td>
<td>(.25)</td>
<td>(.21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality by Target traits</th>
<th>Friendship</th>
<th>Exclusion</th>
<th>Victimization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prosc</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.49)</td>
<td>(.29)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.26)</td>
<td>(.19)</td>
<td>(.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggre</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.39)</td>
<td>(.17)</td>
<td>(.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shy</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.44)</td>
<td>(.27)</td>
<td>(.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nation</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.48)</td>
<td>(.47)</td>
<td>(.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.48)</td>
<td>(.41)</td>
<td>(.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.27)</td>
<td>(.22)</td>
<td>(.19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \(N = 732\). Proportions cannot exceed 1.0. “prosc” = Prosocial; “fair” = fairness/discrimination; “group” = group functioning/stereotypes; “outsi” = outsiders impact; “prsn” = personal choice. Standard deviations are in parentheses.
Table 4. *Proportion of Bystanders’ Reactions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Friendship</th>
<th>Exclusion</th>
<th>Victimization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B1 B2 B3 B4 B5 B6</td>
<td>B1 B2 B3 B4 B5 B6</td>
<td>B1 B2 B3 B4 B5 B6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.13 (.31)</td>
<td>.15 (.28)</td>
<td>.37 (.39)</td>
<td>.09 (.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shyness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.08 (.24)</td>
<td>.20 (.30)</td>
<td>.33 (.42)</td>
<td>.29 (.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.17 (.35)</td>
<td>.19 (.31)</td>
<td>.02 (.13)</td>
<td>.44 (.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.05 (.20)</td>
<td>.23 (.31)</td>
<td>.09 (.24)</td>
<td>.50 (.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.11 (.20)</td>
<td>.19 (.20)</td>
<td>.20 (.18)</td>
<td>.33 (.23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: \( N = 732 \). Proportions cannot exceed 1.0. Bystanders’ reactions = “C, another child in the classroom see that the kids are rejecting A. What should C do? B1 = do nothing; B2 = make the victim feel better; B3 = tell the victim to change his/her behavior; B4 = confront the situation; B5 = support the situation; B6 = tell the teacher. Standard deviations are in parentheses.
Table 5. *Means for Changeability and Conformability for Target Traits*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception by Target traits</th>
<th>Changeability</th>
<th>Conformability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agg</td>
<td>shy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Korean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.69)</td>
<td>(.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.66)</td>
<td>(.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.61)</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.63)</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.66)</td>
<td>(.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N = 732. Changeability = “Do you think that B can change himself?” Conformability = “Do you think that B should change himself?” Evaluation ratings: 1 = Very much agree; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree; 4 = very much disagree. Standard deviations are in parentheses.*
Table 6. Means for Personal Experience of Peer Rejections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of peer rejections</th>
<th>Being rejected form friendship</th>
<th>Being excluded</th>
<th>Being victimized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.97)</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.98)</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td>(.98)</td>
<td>(.97)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| American                      |       |        |       |        |       |        |
| 5th                           | 2.35  | 2.32   | 2.14  | 2.24   | 2.46  | 2.51   |
| (1.99)                        | (.95) | (1.09)| (1.02)| (.88)  | (.89) |
| 8th                           | 2.25  | 2.18   | 2.00  | 1.80   | 2.42  | 2.20   |
| (1.93)                        | (.99) | (.87)| (1.03)| (.70)  | (.75) |
| total                         | 2.31  | 2.25   | 2.09  | 2.02   | 2.44  | 2.36   |
| (1.96)                        | (.97) | (1.01)| (1.05)| (.82)  | (.84) |

| Total                         |       |        |       |        |       |        |
| 5th                           | 2.20  | 2.11   | 2.11  | 2.15   | 2.07  | 2.08   |
| (1.00)                        | (.95) | (1.01)| (1.04)| (1.02) | (.98) |
| 8th                           | 2.06  | 2.04   | 2.21  | 1.87   | 1.78  | 1.82   |
| (1.96)                        | (.94) | (.98)| (.96)| (.90)  | (.85) |
| total                         | 2.14  | 2.07   | 2.15  | 2.01   | 1.94  | 1.95   |
| (1.99)                        | (.95) | (1.00)| (1.01)| (.98)  | (.93) |

Note: N = 732. Being rejected = “Have you been rejected?” Evaluation ratings: 1 = Never; 2 = Almost never; 3 = Sometimes; 4 = Always. Standard deviations are in parentheses.
Figure 1. *Means for Evaluations of Peer Relationships with Contexts* (1 = very much not okay; 6 = very much okay)
Figure 2. *Means for Evaluations of Peer Relationships with Target Traits* (1 = very much not okay; 6 = very much okay)
Figure 3. Proportion of Justifications for Evaluation of Peer Relationships
do nothing make victim feel better
telling victim to change their behavior
confront the situation support the situation.
tell the teacher

Figure 4. Proportion of Bystanders’ Reactions
APPENDIX A
Summary of Design

I. List of variables

A. Independent Variables
   Between-subject: Gender of participants (2): male, female
      Age level (2): 5th, 8th
      Country of participants (2): U. S., Korea

   Within-subject: Stories (12):
      Context (3; Friendship, Group exclusion, Victimization)
      BY Traits (4; Shyness, Aggression, Gender, Nationality)
      Personal experience (3): Contexts
      Psychological perception (4); Traits

B. Dependent Variable
   Evaluation
   Bystander’s reaction
   Justifications

II. Interview Design
A. Evaluation and justification
   Stories (12):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Friendship</th>
<th>Group Exclusion</th>
<th>Victimization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual deficit</td>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes</td>
<td>Shyness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Assessments (4)
   1. Evaluation of peer relationship: Do you think it is okay that A doesn’t want to be friends with B?
      Scale: 6-point Likert:
      1 = very much not okay, 2 = somewhat not okay, 3 = a little not okay,
      4 = a little okay, 5 = somewhat okay, 6 = very much okay.
2. Justification of evaluations: *Why?*

3. Bystanders’ reaction: *C, another boy in the classroom hears that A doesn’t want to be friend with B. What should C do?*

B. Psychological perception about Traits
   (1) Do you think that Billy can be changed?
   (2) Do you think that Billy should change himself?
   Scale: 4-point Likert:
   
   1 = very much agree, 2 = agree, 3 = disagree, 4 = very much disagree

C. Experiences:
   (1) *Friendship*: Have you not been able to be friends with someone you like?
   (2) *Group Exclusion*: Have you not been allowed to join to a sports game you like?
   (3) *Victimization*: Have you ever been picked on?
   Scale: 4-point Likert:
   
   1 = never, 2 = almost never, 3 = sometimes, 4 = always
APPENDIX B  
Summary of Hypotheses

*Evaluation and Justifications about Contexts.*

1. Overall, children will evaluate most acts of friendship choice, exclusion, and victimization as wrong (Killen et al., 2002; Smetana, 1995).

2. Participants will differentiate their evaluations of peer relationship decisions across the three contexts (Victimization, Exclusion, Friendship). Victimization is expected to elicit the most negative judgments, followed by exclusion and then friendship choice.

3. There will be interaction effects for participants’ gender and country. It is expected that gender differences will be found for American participants but not for Korean participants. Generally more girls than boys evaluate that it is not okay to exclude a child from a group. In contrast, there will be few gender differences in Korea.

4. In terms of justification, in the case of Victimization, children will use moral reasons, such as fairness, empathy (Astor, 1998).

5. In the case of Exclusion, participants will use social conventional reasons, such as stereotypes, peer pressure, and punishment, as well as moral reasons like how fairly we treat others (Killen et al., 2002).

6. The Friendship decision will be considered the least severe moral transgression. The majority of children will reason that choosing a friend is a personal choice rather than a moral transgression (Nucci, 2000).

7. It is also expected that there will be developmental changes in evaluations and judgments. Eighth graders will be likely to take into account social conventional reasons than fifth graders.

8. Personal experiences also will affect the participants’ evaluations (Smetana, 2003). When participants have similar experiences with a child in the story, they will believe that it is not okay to reject a child than someone who does not have any similar peer relationships.
Evaluation and justification about Target Traits.

9. Overall, participants will judge that it is most okay to reject an aggressive child (Killen, et al., 2002, Park et al., 2003) because a majority of children consider aggression as the most harmful moral transgression.

10. Participants’ judgments based on the other target traits (Shyness, Gender, Nationality) will be differentiated by their age, gender, nationality and the peer relationship contexts.

11. For Shyness, it will be interesting to investigate cultural differences. Korean children may evaluate it as less okay to reject a shy child than American children do. There are no consistent results in gender and age differences.

12. For Gender, it is expected that cultural and age differences will be found. American children are more likely to reject a child based on their gender than are Korean children. It is expected that older children will be more likely to think that it is not okay to reject a different gender child than young children do.

13. Peer rejection based on nationality will be evaluated least okay across all the age groups, gender, nationality, and contexts, because rejecting someone based on one’s nationality is viewed as a form of prejudice.

14. Perceptions about target traits will affect the evaluation of peer rejection (Levy, & Dweck, 1999). When participants think that a target trait is amenable, they will evaluate the story that involving the traits as less okay. When a target trait is changeable and should be changed, participants will judge the story that rejecting a child with the traits as more okay to reject.

Bystanders’ Reaction.

15. There are inconsistent results on the topic of the Bystanders’ Reaction. Responses will vary by peer relationship contexts, age, gender, and country. Specifically, more 5th graders, boys, and American children will respond with confrontation while more 8th graders, girls, and Korean children will respond with subversion and conformity (Rigby and Slee, 1991), due to their sensitivities to the contextual and trait differences than the other children.
APPENDIX C
PARENTAL CONSENT FORM

Project Title
Korean and American children’s evaluations about peer relationships

Parental Consent for a minor
I agree to allow my child to participate in a program of research being conducted by Professor Melanie Killen, Department of Human Development, University of Maryland, College Park.

Purpose
The purpose of the research is to understand how children evaluate peer relationships in different contexts.

Procedure
The procedure involves a one-time survey session lasting approximately 15 minutes. A research assistant will read aloud the accent form to my child and explain the purpose of the survey. My child will fill out a packet of survey forms during special class time sessions devoted to the survey administration. My child will be asked to evaluate twelve stories about peer relationships. My child will be asked to respond about their perceptions of four traits (shyness, aggression, gender, and nationality). In addition, my child will be asked to describe their experiences about peer relationships.

Confidentiality
All information collected in the study is confidential. My child’s name will not be identified. Non-identifiable ID numbers will be assigned. All survey forms will be stored in the research lab in University of Maryland and destroyed at the completion of the study.

Risks
There are no foreseeable risks involved in the participation of this study. Also, children will be told that there are no right or wrong answers, and it will not affect their grade.

Benefits:
Freedom to withdraw and ask questions
My child’s participation in this study is completely voluntary. I am free to ask any questions or withdraw any child from participation at any time without penalty. My child will be told that he/she may stop participating if he/she chooses. Children who do not want to participate or who do not have parental consent will be given an alternative task by the classroom teacher.

Name, Address and Phone
Professor Melanie, Killen
Dept. of Human Development
3304 Benjamin Building
College Park, MD 20742-1131
Off. 301.405.3176

Name of Child                                      Date of Birth
________________________________                 _____________________________
Signature of Parent/Guardian                          Date
Thank you for participating in our survey. This survey has 12 short stories about peer relationships. I want to know what you think about the children’s actions in the stories. After reading the short story, please answer the questions based on what you think. In the next section of this survey, I want to know what you think about some characteristics, like shyness and aggression. Finally, please tell me about your peer relationship experiences. Please fill out the survey as completely as possible. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes.

There are no right or wrong answers, and your answers will in no way affect your grade. You are free to ask any questions at any time without penalty and may stop participating if you choose. No one else will be shown your answers on this survey.

So please answer how you really feel, without thinking or worrying about your answers. Thank you very much for doing this survey.

Yoonjung Park and Professor Melanie Killen
Department of Human Development
University of Maryland
Thank you for participating in our survey. This survey has 12 short stories about peer relationships. I want to know what you think about the children’s actions in the stories. After reading the short story, please answer the questions based on what you think. In the next section of this survey, I want to know what you think about some characteristics, like shyness and aggression. Finally, please tell me about your peer relationship experiences. Please fill out the survey as completely as possible.

There are no right or wrong answers, and your answers will in no way affect your grade. You are free to ask any questions at any time without penalty and may stop participating if you choose. No one else will be shown your answers on this survey.

So please answer how you really feel, without thinking or worrying about your answers. Thank you very much for doing this survey.

Yoonjung Park and Professor Melanie Killen
Department of Human Development
University of Maryland
DATE:__________________________________________

What is your grade level? _________________________

What is your teacher’s name?______________________

What is your school? _____________________________

What is your ethnicity? __________________________
Joe is bossy and pushes around his classmates and gets into fight often. Joe wants to be friends with Peter. But Peter doesn’t want to be friends with Joe because he pushes others around.

Do you think it is okay or not okay that Peter doesn’t want to be friends with Joe? Please put ONE check mark on the box that comes closest to showing how you feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT OKAY</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>OKAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td>A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td></td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why? __________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Henry, another boy in the classroom hears that Peter doesn’t want to be friend with Joe. What should Henry do? You can check as many as you feel right.

_____Do nothing

_____Cheer up Joe and make him feel better

_____Tell Joe not to be bossy and push others around

_____Tell Peter that it isn’t right to not be friends with Joe because he pushes others around

_____Tell Peter that it is okay not to be friends with Joe because he pushes others around.

_____Tell the teacher what happened.
John is quiet and plays by himself. Most of his classmates don’t pay attention to him. John wants to be friends with Daniel. But Daniel doesn’t want to be friends with John because he is quiet.

Do you think it is okay or not okay that Daniel doesn’t want to be friends with John? Please put ONE check mark on the box that comes closest to showing how you feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT OKAY</th>
<th>OKAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Andy, another boy in the classroom hears that Daniel doesn’t want to be friends with John. What should Andy do? You can check as many as you feel right.

_____ Do nothing

_____ Cheer up John and make him feel better

_____ Tell John that not to be quiet

_____ Tell Daniel that it isn’t all right to not be friends John because he is quiet

_____ Tell Daniel that it is okay not to be friends with John he is quiet

_____ Tell the teacher what happened
Inchul is from Korea. Inchul wants to be friends with Mark. But Mark doesn’t want to be friends with Inchul because he is Korean.

Do you think it is okay or not okay that Mark doesn’t want to be friends with Inchul? Please put ONE check mark on the box that comes closest to showing how you feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT OKAY</th>
<th>OKAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why? ____________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Jerry, another boy in the classroom hears that Mark doesn’t want to be friends with Inchul. What should Jerry do? You can check as many as you feel right.

____ Do nothing

____ Cheer up Inchul and make him feel better

____ Tell Inchul that he should try to act more American

____ Tell Mark that it isn’t all right to not be friends with Inchul because he is from another country

____ Tell Mark that it is okay not to be friends with Inchul because he is from another country

____ Tell the teacher what happened
Susan is a girl. Susan wants to be friends with David. But David doesn’t want to be friends with Susan because she is a girl.

Do you think it is okay or not okay that David doesn’t want to be friends with Susan? Please put ONE check mark on the box that comes closest to showing how you feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT OKAY</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>OKAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td>A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td></td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why?_________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Robert, another boy in the classroom hears that David doesn’t want to be friends with Susan.

What should Robert do? You can check as many as you feel right.

_____ Do nothing

_____ Cheer up Susan and make her feel better

_____ Tell Susan that she should act more like a boy

_____ Tell David that it isn’t all right to not be friends with Susan because she’s a girl

_____ Tell David that it is okay not to be friends with Susan because she is a girl

_____ Tell the teacher what happened
Arthur is quiet and plays by himself. Most of classmates do not pay attention to him. He watches a group of kids preparing group projects in school and wants to join. But they do not let him join because he is quiet.

Do you think it is okay or not okay for the kids to not let Arthur join the group project? Please put ONE check mark on the box that comes closest to showing how you feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT OKAY</th>
<th>OKAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Bruce, another boy in the classroom hears that the kids don’t let him join the group project. What should Bruce do? You can check as many as you feel right.

_____ Do nothing

_____ Cheer up Arthur and make him feel better

_____ Tell Arthur not to be quiet

_____ Tell the kids that it isn’t all right to not let him join the group project because he is quiet

_____ Tell the kids that it is okay not to let him join the group project because he is quiet

_____ Tell the teacher what happened
Heidi watches a group of boys preparing group projects in school and wants to join. But they don’t let her join because she is a girl.

Do you think it is okay for the kids to not let Heidi join the group project? Please put ONE check mark on the box that comes closest to showing how you feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT OKAY</th>
<th>OKAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why?_________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Howard, another boy in the classroom hears that the boys do not let her join the school project.

What should Howard do? You can check as many as you feel right.

_____ Do nothing
_____ Cheer up Heidi and make her feel better
_____ Tell Heidi that she should try to act more like a boy
_____ Tell the kids that it isn’t all right to not let her join a school project because she is a girl
_____ Tell the kids that it is okay not let her join a school project because she is a girl
_____ Tell the teacher what happened
Gary is bossy and pushes around his classmates and gets into fights often. He watches a group of kids preparing group projects in school and wants to join. But they do not let him join because he pushes others around.

Do you think it is okay or not okay for the kids to not let Gary join the school project? Please put ONE check mark on the box that comes closest to showing how you feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT OKAY</th>
<th>OKAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why?____________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Paul, another boy in the classroom hears that the kids don’t let Gary join the group project. What should Paul do? You can check as many as you feel right.

_____ Do nothing

_____ Cheer up Gary and make him feel better

_____ Tell Gary to not to be bossy and push others around

_____ Tell the kids that it isn’t all right to not let him join because he pushes others around

_____ Tell the kids that it is all right to not let him join because he pushes others around

_____ Tell the teacher what happened
Subin is from Korea. He watches a group of kids preparing group projects in school and wants to join. But they do not let him join because he is Korean.

Do you think it is okay or not okay for the kids to not let Subin join the group project? Please put ONE check mark on the box that comes closest to showing how you feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT OKAY</th>
<th>OKAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why? __________________________________________

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

Kevin, another boy in the classroom hears that the kids don’t let Subin join the school project.

What should Kevin do? You can check as many as you feel right.

_____ Do nothing

_____ Cheer up Subin and make him feel better

_____ Tell Subin that he should try to act more American

_____ Tell the kids that it isn’t all right to not let him join because he is from another country

_____ Tell the kids that it is all right to not let him join because he is from another country

_____ Tell the teacher what happened
Tom is bossy and pushes around the classmates and gets into fight often. His classmates pick on him and call him mean names. This happens everyday.

Do you think it is okay for the kids to pick on him? Please put ONE check mark on the box that comes closest to showing how you feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT OKAY</th>
<th>OKAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why?_________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

Charles, another boy in the classroom hears that the kids are picking on Tom. What should Charles do? You can check as many as you feel right.

_____Do nothing

_____Cheer up Tom and make him feel better

_____Tell Tom to not be bossy and push others around

_____Tell the kids that it isn’t all right to pick on him because he pushes others around

_____Tell the kids that it is all right to pick on him because he pushes others around

_____Tell the teacher what happened
Adam is quiet and plays by himself. Most of his classmates do not pay attention to him. His other classmates pick on him and call him mean names. This happens everyday.

Do you think it is okay or not okay for the kids to pick on him? Please put ONE check mark on the box that comes closest to showing how you feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT OKAY</th>
<th>OKAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why?_________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

Allan, another boy in the classroom see that the kids are picking on Adam. What should Allan do?

You can check as many as you feel right.

_____ Do nothing

_____ Cheer up Adam and make him feel better

_____ Tell Adam to not be quiet

_____ Tell the kids that it isn’t all right to pick on him because he is quiet

_____ Tell the kids that it is all right to pick on him because he is quiet

_____ Tell the teacher what happened
Jennifer is a girl. Her other classmates pick on her and call her mean names. This happens everyday.

Do you think it is okay or not okay for the kids to pick on him? Please put ONE check mark on the box that comes closest to showing how you feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT OKAY</th>
<th>OKAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why? __________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Philip, another boy in the classroom see that the kids are picking on Jennifer. What should Philip do? You can check as many as you feel right.

_____ Do nothing

_____ Cheer up Jennifer and make her feel better

_____ Tell Jennifer that she should try to act more like a boy

_____ Tell the kids that it isn’t all right to pick on her because she is a girl

_____ Tell the kids that it is all right to pick on her because she is a girl

_____ Tell the teacher what happened
Minsu is from Korea. His other classmates pick on him and call him mean names. This happens everyday.

Do you think it is okay or not okay for the kids to pick on him? Please put ONE check mark on the box that comes closest to showing how you feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT OKAY</th>
<th>OR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OKAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why?
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

George, another boy in the classroom see that the kids are picking on Minsu. What should George do? You can check as many as you feel right.

_____ Do nothing

_____ Cheer up Minsu and make him feel better

_____ Tell Minsu that he should try to act more American

_____ Tell the kids that it isn’t all right to pick on him because he is from another country

_____ Tell the kids that it is all right to pick on him because he is from another country

_____ Tell the teacher what happened
Please circle a number that comes close to how you feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 very much agree</th>
<th>2 agree</th>
<th>3 disagree</th>
<th>4 very much disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Billy is bossy, pushes around his classmates and gets into fight often.

Do you think that Billy can change himself?  1  2  3  4
Do you think that Billy should change himself?  1  2  3  4

Eric is quiet and plays by himself. Most of classmates do not pay attention to him.

Do you think that Eric can change himself?  1  2  3  4
Do you think that Eric should change himself?  1  2  3  4

Sandra is a girl.

Do you think that Sandra can change herself?  1  2  3  4
Do you think that Sandra should change herself?  1  2  3  4

Osung is from Korea

Do you think that Osung can change himself?  1  2  3  4
Do you think that Osung should change himself?  1  2  3  4

Please circle a number in terms of your experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Never</th>
<th>2 Almost never</th>
<th>3 Sometimes</th>
<th>4 Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you not been able to be friends with someone you like?  1  2  3  4
Have you not been allowed to join to a group project in school?  1  2  3  4
Have you ever been picked on?  1  2  3  4

THANK YOU SO MUCH.
APPENDIX E
Justification Coding Categories

A. MORAL Justifications
   1. **Prosocial, Empathy, Reciprocity:** Appeals to the helping and caring of others by including them, to the feelings of the individual being excluded or to the wrongfulness of rejecting individual. Appeals to reciprocity.
   Example: “If we play with him, he can change his behavior and be more active.”
   Example: “It is always wrong to reject friends”
   Example: “He may get hurts in his mind.”
   Example: “You can learn English from him when you play with an American.”

   2. **Fairness, Discrimination:** References to wrongfulness of discrimination just based on the person’s character, sex or ethnicity or to the rights of the individual.
   Example: “We are all equal human beings.”
   Example: “It’s not fair.”
   Example: “You don’t exclude a girl from America. It is discrimination”.

B. NON-MORAL SOCIAL Justifications
   3. **Social customs, Group functioning, Stereotypes:** Appeals to social expectations and traditions, as well as labels attributed to an individual based on group membership. References to making the group function well.
   Example: “She deserves it.”
   Example: “If we play with them we may get bad influences from them.”
   Example: “Boys play with boys, girls play with girls.”
   Example: “Americans are not good at speaking Korean”
   Example: “Aggressive boys are not good at preparing group works.”
   Example: “Shy girls are not good at doing presentations”.

   4. **External influences:** Appeals to other classmates’ opinions on whether or not reject the individual, or afraid of being teased. Appeals to authority figures’ (parents, teacher) opinions
   Example: “If I play with the kid, I may also be excluded from my friends.”
   Example: “If I make friends with a girl, other boys think that I am in love with her”
   Example: “My parents say that it is not alright to exclude a child”
C. PERSONAL Justifications

5. **Personal choice:** Appeals to individual preferences.
   
   Example: “If he doesn’t want to be friend with the kid, it’s okay. It’s his choice.”

6. **Undifferentiated, uncodable**
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