Social exclusion and culture: The role of group norms, group identity and fairness

Aline Hitti*, Kelly Lynn Mulvey, and Melanie Killen

University of Maryland

Título: Exclusión social y cultura: El papel de las normas grupales, la identidad grupal y la justicia.
Resumen: Este artículo revisa la literatura sobre la exclusión social en la infancia y la adolescencia, con un enfoque sobre la exclusión basada en la cultura en la que las normas, la identidad y la justicia son factores importantes. La investigación reciente ha examinado las opiniones del niño acerca de la imparcialidad de la exclusión en diferentes contextos sociales, identificando los factores que contribuyen a legitimar o rechazar la exclusión de los miembros de los grupos externos. En todas las culturas, los factores de importancia son el sexo, la raza, la etnia y la cultura. Se revisan los resultados actuales y se apuntan las posibles áreas de investigación.
Palabras clave: Exclusión social; infancia; adolescencia; cultura; intercultural; identidad de grupo**.**

Abstract: This paper reviews the literature on social exclusion in childhood and adolescence, with a focus on exclusion based on culture in which norms, identity, and fairness are salient factors. Recent research has examined children's views about the fairness of exclusion in different social contexts, identifying the factors that contribute to legitimizing or rejecting the exclusion of members of out-groups. Across cultures, factors of relevance include gender, race, ethnicity, and culture. We review current findings and point to areas for new research.
Key words: Social exclusion; childhood; adolescence; culture; cross-cultural; group identity.

Introduction

Children and adolescents often experience social exclusion in their everyday lives. Social exclusion has been studied in a range of different contexts, though most research to date has centered on research in North America and Europe and has focused on exclusion based on gender, race, and ethnicity. A burgeoning area of research focuses on the cultural context of exclusion, and this new line of research is the focus of this paper. We will review the different types of social exclusion that have been studied in various social and cultural contexts, examining the conceptual frameworks, methods and measurements, and current findings regarding exclusion in childhood.

Exclusion from social groups is complex. Exclusion is not uniformly "negative" in the same way that bullying behavior is considered necessarily bad due to the harm that a bully inflicts on a victim. There are many contexts in which exclusion is viewed as legitimate, such as when it is necessary to make groups work well (Horn, 2006; Killen, Sinno, & Margie, 2007). An individual may be excluded from a group for practical reasons such as the manageable size of the group, or meritorious reasons such as ability necessary for admission. There are times when exclusion is harmful or hurtful, and often this negative consequence is of a psychological rather than a physical one (like that which occurs for physical aggression). Even within the category of harmful exclusion, there are a number of differentiations. The main differentiation is exclusion based on personality traits, such as when children exclude a "shy" or "awkward" child, and exclusion based on group membership, such as when children exclude a peer because of his membership in a group with a different identity status (e.g., based on gender, culture, race, religion).

Exclusion based on group membership has been referred to as intergroup exclusion because the target of exclusion is an individual from a different group. This is due to the pattern of in-group/out-group differentiations and distinctions that result from this type of discrimination. There is a long history of research in social psychology on intergroup attitudes (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998; Dovidio, Glick, & Rudman, 2005), and intergroup exclusion is a more specific focus within this larger body of research (Abrams, Hogg, & Marques, 2005).

Recently, developmental psychologists have studied intergroup exclusion in childhood and adolescence, drawing on definitions from social psychology (Levy & Killen, 2008). Developmental research is unique in that the science addresses questions of origins, change, acquisition, and social influence relevant to social exclusion. Moreover, the methodologies in developmental psychology are often quite different from social psychology due to the different considerations that arise when measuring social cognition and social attitudes in children in contrast to adults. These differences necessitate a close examination of the terminology and constructs that pertain to intergroup exclusion from a developmental perspective (Killen, Richardson, & Kelly, 2010).

In general, developmental intergroup attitudes examine the origins of prejudice, tolerance, and group identity. There are many theoretical approaches that have guided developmental intergroup attitudes, and most of these have focused on children's explicit and implicit attitudes, judgments, and biases. Research examining intergroup exclusion, specifically, has been guided by several developmental theories, including Social Domain Theory (examining the forms of reasoning used by children when they evaluate exclusion decisions) as well as Social Identity Theory (examining how one's identity as part of a group leads to exclusion) (Rutland, Killen, & Abrams, 2010), which will be described in detail below.

Dirección para correspondencia [Correspondence address]: Aline Hitti, Kelly Lynn Mulvey, or Melanie Killen. Department of Human Development. 3304 Benjamin Building. University of Maryland. College Park, MD 20742. USA.
E-mails: ahitti@umd.edu, klmulvey@umd.edu, mkillen@umd.edu

The methodologies employed by various approaches often use experimentally manipulated hypothetical vignettes. Hypothetical vignettes allow children to respond to scenarios in which unfamiliar or familiar peers are excluded based on an array of experimentally manipulated variables. These variables include the victim's and excluder's identity and characteristics, the context in which the exclusion occurs (e.g., dyadic peer to peer exclusion, exclusion from a peer group activity, exclusion from a family event, or community event), group status (e.g., high versus low social status, majority versus minority representation), and the group norms (e.g., group A does not like to include people from other groups, or group A likes soccer team A but group B likes soccer team B). The scenarios described in these vignettes represent realistic and or developmentally appropriate incidents of exclusion and include actual groups that children are aware of based on their country of residence and the historical relevance of these groups within their society. Other methods include variations of the minimal group paradigm (Tajfel, 1970), which have used actual ethnic group identifiers (Nesdale, Maass, Durkin, & Griffiths, 2005) .

As mentioned, intergroup exclusion with North American children and adolescents has most often focused on groups defined by gender, race, and ethnicity (Killen, et al., 2007). The current exclusion research in Europe is driven by the dynamics between immigrant communities and host societies, given the influx of immigrants from North Africa and Eastern Europe (Castelli, De Amicis, & Sherman, 2007; Verkuyten, 2008). Other exclusion research has focused on groups with histories of violent conflict, such as Arabs and Jews in the Middle East (Bar-Tal & Teichman, 2005; Brenick, et al., 2007), Catholics and Protestants in Ireland (Hewstone, et al., 2005; Muldoon, McLaughlin, & Trew, 2007; Trew, 2004), or Serbs and Croats in Eastern Europe (Ajdukovic & Biruski, 2008). Most research conducted in these contexts investigates children's awareness of the dynamics between groups, experiences with exclusion, stereotyping, and conflict resolutions. Thus, exclusion research has taken shape in a wide range of cultures and contexts, focusing on many types of intergroup encounters.

Theoretical Framework for Studying Exclusion

While exclusion research has been approached within many different contexts, several complementary frameworks have been consistently drawn upon when studying inclusion and exclusion: Social Domain Theory, which distinguishes between the social-conventional, moral and psychological domains of knowledge used in making judgments (Turiel, 1983), and Social Identity Theory (SIT), which argues that individuals strive to maintain their in-group identity by viewing their own social group more positively than other social groups, and that individuals identify with social groups having a positive social status (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). SIT has formed the foundation for several developmental theories including Social Identity Development Theory (SIDT:

Nesdale, 1999, 2004; Nesdale, et al., 2005) and Developmental Subjective Group Dynamics (DSGD: Abrams, Rutland, & Cameron, 2003; Abrams, Rutland, Cameron, & Ferrell, 2007; Abrams, Rutland, Pelletier, & Ferrell, 2009).

While research about exclusion has historically drawn on one or the other of these two theories, little research has considered integrative frameworks. However, children simultaneously develop moral beliefs about issues such as welfare, fairness and justice (Smetana, 2006) and develop a sense of group identity (Rutland, et al., 2010). In some instances, children turn to in-group bias and prejudicial attitudes in making decisions to exclude others based on group membership. Thus, in understanding instances of exclusion when group identity and norms as well as issues of fairness are at play, research has drawn from both Social Domain Theory and Social Identity Theory.

Extensive research within Social Domain Theory (Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 1983) reveals that children distinguish three domains in reasoning about social issues, including exclusion (Killen, Lee-Kim, McGlothlin, & Stangor, 2002); 1) the moral domain; which includes concerns with welfare, fairness, justice and rights; 2) the social-conventional domain; which includes situations contingent on socially agreed upon rules that are able to be changed and that, in their absence, will cause no direct harm to be inflicted on another; and 3) the psychological domain; which includes personal preferences and choices (Smetana, 2006). Research on exclusion has shown that children use moral reasons such as unfairness ("It's not fair to not let her join"), conventional reasons such as references to the norms of the group ("We can't let her in the club because she's different"), and psychological reasons such as personal choice ("I don't want her to join and it's up to me"). Social Domain Theory has guided research revealing the importance of examining children's reasoning when studying exclusion decisions and has provided support for the recognition that children distinguish, from a very early age, between decisions which inherently center on issues such as fairness and justice and those which, drawing on conventions, promote group functioning and social interactions (for a review see Killen, et al., 2007).

Social Domain Theory has been a primary framework for the study of intergroup exclusion, particularly in the United States. Exclusion based solely on group membership, including race and gender, is, for the most part, seen as unfair and judged as wrong by most children (Killen, Lee-Kim, et al., 2002). However, in complex or ambiguous situations, children will often make exclusion judgments based on stereotypes about group identity (Killen, Pisacane, Lee-Kim, & Ardila-Rey, 2001). Three general findings are that: 1) in exclusion situations in which children's intentions are complex and involve multiple reasons for exclusion, ethnic minority children are more likely to reject exclusion decisions in moral terms, such as harm to the excluded child, and ethnic majority children are more likely to justify exclusion decisions in conventional terms, such as lack of common

shared activities; 2) while ethnic majority children evaluate peer group exclusion based on gender and race as wrong, they continue to show in-group bias in interracial dyads in which the intentions are ambiguous, and are less likely to view interracial peer dyads as being friends than are ethnic minority children; and 3) contact with members of out-groups reduces prejudice, such that ethnic majority children who have cross-race friends use fewer stereotypes when evaluating what it is that makes interracial interactions uncomfortable. These findings indicate that children's reasoning about, and interpretation of interracial peer encounters provide a window into what makes exclusion complex. Ethnic minority and majority children bring different orientations to interracial encounters, and these orientations may contribute to potentially negative expectations and interactions.

Exclusion has also been examined by drawing on Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), particularly for developmental studies in Europe and Australia. Attempts to see the in-group in increasingly positive ways can lead to prejudice towards members of out-groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Self-categorization Theory (SCT; Turner, et al., 1987) extends this concept of self identification on the basis of cognitive grouping (Nesdale, 2004). Thus, people place themselves in a group that they view as most similar to themselves based on a classification label, which is cognitively contrasted with another classification. Such self-categorization emphasizes positive similarities between individuals of the in-group, thus promoting in-group bias, while also focusing on the negative differences of the out-group, which may lead to out-group prejudice. This process, then, creates opportunities for the development of stereotypes and acts of exclusion based on group membership (Abrams & Rutland, 2008). One extension of Social Identity Theory, Developmental Subjective Group Dynamics (DSGD), proposes that individuals differentially evaluate and include others based on their adherence to or deviance from group norms (Abrams & Rutland, 2008). Research drawing on DSGD finds that children prefer out-group members who deviate from their group norms and thus espouse the child's in-group norms more than they like in-group children who deviate from in-group norms (Abrams, et al., 2003; Abrams, et al., 2007; Abrams, et al., 2009).

A further extension of SIT, Social Identity Development Theory (SIDT) focuses specifically on the development of ethnic prejudice and provides a foundation for thinking about intergroup contact and conceptions of the in-group and out-group in relation to the self (Nesdale, 1999, 2004; Nesdale, et al., 2005). SIDT proposes that children move through four phases as they develop ethnic prejudice: undifferentiated, ethnic awareness, ethnic preference and ethnic prejudice (Nesdale, 1999). According to SIDT, as children enter the ethnic preference phase, they exhibit a concern with maintaining membership in the in-group and a strong focus on the identity of that in-group (Nesdale, et al., 2005).

SIDT would predict, then, that children in the ethnic preference phase would adhere tightly to in-group norms, including any in-group norms of exclusion, which may lead to both stereotypes and prejudicial attitudes towards the out-group thus transitioning them into the ethnic prejudice phase. The theory proposes that the development of out-group derogation is dependent on several factors: the level of identification that a child has with his/her in-group, the extent to which prejudice is an in-group norm and the extent to which the in-group members perceive the members of the out-group as a threat (Nesdale, et al., 2005). Thus, the framework of Social Identity Theory has emerged as a way to focus exclusion research towards attending to group norms and group identity.

While both Social Domain Theory and Social Identity Theory (and its variants) have proven fruitful frameworks for studying exclusion, researchers have rarely considered both frameworks in approaching exclusion. Recently, a Social Reasoning Developmental (SRD) perspective has been proposed, which draws together both theories in identifying a way to understand the formation of both strong concepts of fairness and justice as well as prejudicial attitudes in early childhood (Rutland, et al., 2010). This new perspective argues for the integration of research recognizing the domain specificity of children's reasoning and research examining the influence of group identity and group norms on exclusion decisions. As children make inclusion and exclusion decisions, SRD proposes that they weigh considerations of group identity and group processes with an understanding of morality (what is just and fair). Thus, social reasoning in children can be assessed using methods that recognize domain-specificity, and that children may view some issues as moral and others as conventional, as well as recognize the importance of group norms and group functioning to children. An area that has been investigated extensively, and bears on children's interpretations of exclusion based on groups has to do with group identity. When do children identify with groups, and how does this identification relate to their evaluations of exclusion?

Group Identity in Exclusion Research

Group identity, the extent to which children identify with a group, plays a pivotal role in understanding intergroup and intragroup exclusion (i.e., Exclusion of an in-group member who does not adhere to a group norm). These types of exclusion are often measured with the underlying assumption that children identify with groups being studied. Minimal group identification has been simulated using minimal group paradigms (Tajfel, 1970), whereby children are arbitrarily assigned to a group they have had no prior experience with. Studies using minimal group paradigms have found that children identify with these novel groups and express in-group bias (Abrams, Rutland, Ferrell, & Pelletier, 2008; Bigler, Brown, & Markell, 2001; Nesdale, et al., 2007; Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971).

Also of interest when studying intergroup and intragroup exclusion are the dynamics of the relationship between the excluder and the excluded that are driven by differences in status (e.g., high and low social status, majority and minority representation), level of perceived threat (e.g., unequal distribution of resources, high conflict) and norms (e.g., adherence to or deviance from a group established norm). These variables provide a relevant social context (e.g., historical or cultural) for the types of interactions between two groups and help researchers assess the importance of these variables in children's cross-group and within-group attitudes and behaviors. Another relationship that is of importance and has been manipulated in many intergroup exclusion experiments is the relationship between the participant's identity and the identity of the target of exclusion as represented or manipulated by the experimenters. As described in the studies included in this review, contrasting the participants' identity with the target's identity may lead to different evaluations of exclusion.

While some studies have assessed links between children's levels of identification with a group and their intergroup attitudes (Bennett, Lyons, Sani, & Barrett, 1998; Pfeifer, et al., 2007; Phinney, Jacoby, & Silva, 2007; Verkuyten, 2001), fewer studies have looked at children' social identification levels in relation to their evaluations about exclusion (Abrams, et al., 2008). Measuring children's identification with a social group is a complex task given the developmental and contextual considerations when trying to assess the extent to which children incorporate the characteristics of a social group into their own self-concepts.

Bennett and Sani (2008a) have proposed a framework for measuring subjective group identification (i.e. identifying through internalizing group norms) in children beyond methods of self-labeling. They point to several factors when measuring subjective group identification. The first is the extent to which children feel collective responsibility for an in-group member's behavior. Children begin feeling a sense of responsibility for the actions of other in-group members at around 7 years of age (Bennett, Yuill, Banerjee, & Thomson, 1998). This is measured by asking children about their emotional response to a moral transgression committed by an in-group member as depicted through a hypothetical scenario. Other measures include their willingness to apologize for their in-group member's actions and how they think an out-group member perceives their in-group. The second factor is the extent to which self-stereotyping occurs, whereby children perceive greater similarity with their in-group members and increasing differences with their out-group. Self-stereotyping with members of an in-group is context dependent and occurs when the social identity in question is made salient (Bennett & Sani, 2008c). To assess the extent of self-stereotyping, children are asked to rate how similar and how different they think they are from members of their in-group and out-group and then are asked to judge themselves, in-group members and out-group members on specific traits (at different time intervals).

The third factor is the level of psychological salience a group has to a child, which is assessed by measuring self and group-reference effects through analysis of recall for adjectives about the self and group. Self-referencing is measured by asking whether a given word describes the participants (self-reference question) (Bennett & Sani, 2008b; Symons & Johnson, 1997). Following these questions, children are asked to recall as many words as possible from a list of words they were previously asked about. The self-reference effect occurs when children recall more adjectives with reference to the self, while a group effect occurs when children recall more adjectives with reference to their in-group. Bennett and Sani (2008b) found no encoding differences between children in the self-reference condition and those in the group reference conditions, although differences did exist between the control condition and the two other conditions (self and group reference). Self/in-group confusion can also be measured to assess in-group identification. This is based on the assumption that children are identifying with the in-group when traits rated for the self are confused with traits rated for the in-group more often than traits rated for the out-group. To measure this children are asked to rate whether four traits can be used to describe them, four other traits can be used to describe their in-group and another set of four traits to describe their out-group. Children are then required to recall whether each trait was asked about the self, in-group or out-group (Sani & Bennett, 2009). It was found that children made more errors with traits that were asked about the self and the in-group (gender identity) than with those asked about the out-group and these errors decreased with age (5, 7 and 10 year olds).

Measuring all these aspects of identity brings researchers closer to a more accurate assessment of the extent to which children subjectively identify with their in-groups given the dynamic nature of self-concept. The importance of contextual variability to how children evaluate intergroup behaviors is also relevant to how children subjectively identify with a group. Thus when studying the relationship between groups that differ by status, threat, and norms, having a measure of the extent to which children internalize their in-groups' norms and identity will add to our understanding of their intergroup attitudes. Including measures of group identification in studies about exclusion will help us understand individual differences in children's evaluation of exclusion.

Group identity can be measured in several ways when studying children's attitudes and evaluations about exclusion. It can be measured in terms of subjective identification of individuals with their in-group or experimentally manipulated through variants of the minimal group paradigm or descriptions in hypothetical vignettes. However, when assessing the relationship between two groups, specifically when focusing on the relationship between the participants' responses and the identity of the groups represented, the histories of interactions between the identified groups are often at play. Variables that are often considered in understanding the historical context of groups include levels of

contact, status, power, hierarchy, and threat. Cross-cultural research on intergroup and intragroup exclusion has addressed some of these variables and a summary of select studies will highlight the salience of these variables in developmental intergroup and intragroup research.

Culture and Social Exclusion

Exclusion based on cultural membership has been conducted recently, as patterns of immigration and mobility have led to new sub-categories of culture, existing within established cultures and, at times, contributing to conflict and discrimination. Traditionally, cross-cultural research has often referenced the dichotomized typology of cultures as either individualistic or collectivistic. In the case of morality or intergroup dynamics, which may lead to discrimination against one group, such dichotomization suggests that collectivistic cultures might be more likely to consider familial or community duties and maintenance of social order when making decisions about exclusion and intergroup interactions. Meanwhile individualistic cultures might be more concerned about individual rights. Cultures are more complex than this categorical dichotomization, and many researchers have critiqued this template for understanding culture (Gjerde, 2004; Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002; Wainryb & Turiel, 1994). In the area of exclusion, studies have shown that although culture membership is related to adolescents' evaluations about exclusion, conformity and tolerance, context and gender play a bigger role in their considerations (Killen, Crystal, & Watanabe, 2002; Park, Killen, Crystal, & Watanabe, 2003).

Studying cross-group attitudes across different nationalities, religions, and ethnicities is multi-dimensional, especially when taking into consideration group histories and norms (Turiel, 2002). Histories, traditions and customs are products of different interactions between geography, nationality, religion and ethnicity. Therefore, drawing on anthropological, psychological and sociological cultural indicators, in specific, and research, in general, might provide some basis for understanding cross-cultural differences and similarities in children's responses to intergroup interactions. Within this article, exclusion based on nationality (Park & Killen, 2010), cultural custom (Brenick et al., 2010), and cultural group (Enesco, Guerrero, Callejas, & Solbes, 2008) will be examined. Cultural group membership is increasingly becoming a reason for exclusion: however, as will be shown throughout this review, the conditions under which these forms of exclusion occur differ and the justifications for these types of exclusion vary. While some types of exclusion occur in highly volatile areas of political unrest (e.g., Ajdukovic & Biruski, 2008; Brenick et al., 2010), others occur within much less violent environments (e.g., Nesdale, et al., 2005). The methodologies employed include measures of children's judgments and reasoning about exclusion, favourability about in/out-group members, experiences with personal and cultural exclusion, or spontaneous responses about exclu-

sion. This section reviews a selection of studies conducted about groups in several cultures and with diverse histories, which measure social exclusion.

Intergroup Exclusion in the Spanish Context

While acceptability of exclusion under specific intergroup conditions has been reported by American children and adolescents (Killen, et al., 2001; Killen & Stangor, 2001), Spanish children and adolescents were found to report exclusion as unacceptable under any condition (Enesco, Navarro, Paradela, & Callejas, 2002). Enesco et al. (2002), drawing on Social Domain Theory, surveyed 120 Spanish majority participants aged 9 through 16 about the acceptability of exclusion in different exclusion contexts. Hypothetical vignettes were employed to depict three exclusion scenarios (friendship, peer-group, societal context) in which half the participants judged exclusion of an unfamiliar Gypsy peer and the other half judged the exclusion of an unfamiliar African peer. Justifications for judgments and questions assessing the criteria used for evaluating exclusion (e.g., parent and government authority expectations, peer and other people's social influence and generalizability to other countries) were also collected. Africans are fairly recent immigrants to Spain, and majority children have, thus, had little exposure to African immigrants. Gypsies have a long history of reported tension and discrimination by majority Spanish adults. Thus, differences in children's judgments of exclusion based on the ethnicity of the target were expected. Children were also expected to judge exclusion in the societal context (from a school) as more wrong than exclusion in the peer-group and friendship context.

Overall, participants judged any kind of exclusion as unacceptable, with a majority using moral reasoning to justify their answers across all three exclusion contexts. However, 9 to 10 year olds used more social conventional reasoning in the societal context than did the adolescent participants. Younger children also conformed to the idea of obeying parents while still acknowledging the wrongness of exclusion. Participants rejected social influence or cultural influences that promote exclusion using moral reasoning to justify their responses. However, in the friendship context children tended to use personal justifications more frequently than in the other two contexts, and 9 to 10 year olds used more social conventional reasoning in the peer-group context than the older participants. No differences were found based on the ethnicity of the excluded child.

The authors attributed the strong reaction to the wrongfulness of exclusion to the curricula in the homogenous schools attended by the participants which promotes values of tolerance and respect for diversity. Research conducted in the Netherlands, where there are also high societal values towards respecting diversity has shown that even in highly tolerant environments intolerance towards minority and immigrant groups can emerge (Gieling, Thijs, & Verkuyten, 2010). Thus, more work should be done to understand how

societal and school level values of tolerance impact exclusion decisions in intergroup contexts, as well as to understand how variation in identification with one's group might impact exclusion decisions.

These findings suggest a closer investigation of children's environment must be conducted to try to disentangle the influences of school curricula and the heterogeneity and homogeneity of peer interactions. It has been found that Spanish children are aware of and agree with some of the stereotypic expectations of Gypsies in specific (Enesco, Navarro, Paradela, & Guerrero, 2005), but these stereotypes were not expressed in their evaluation of exclusion of Gypsy children. Perhaps the absence of actual contact with Gypsy children in these schools contributed to the positive view about inclusion, even though children had negative stereotypes. A variation of the minimal group paradigm simulating group competition and identifying the out-group using pictures of children of different ethnicities from the participant, (Nesdale et al., 2005) or further probing in an exclusion context may elucidate why Spanish children might hold stereotypic beliefs but not necessarily draw on them when making decisions about exclusion.

A different study by Monks, Ortega-Ruiz and Rodriguez-Hidalgo (2008) assessed two different cultural groups in examining social exclusion. Whereas Enesco et al. (2005) examined exclusion judgments by Spanish children about a different cultural group within Spain (Gypsies or Africans), Monks et al. (2008) studied exclusion across cultures by surveying both Spanish and English children from diverse ethnic backgrounds about direct relational personal, and cultural victimization. The direct personal victimization scenario used in this study involved a context in which one student excludes another. Because of the dyadic nature of this form of exclusion, direct personal victimization is a form of interpersonal exclusion in this case. In the direct cultural victimization scenario social exclusion occurs between two pupils at school who are "from different cultures and have different color skin," thus describing an instance of intergroup exclusion. Adolescents were asked to evaluate how good or bad they thought the behavior was. They were also asked to report whether a similar incident had happened to them, how they felt about it and why they thought it happened.

Findings indicated that English (18% minority adolescents) as well as Spanish (11% minority adolescents) participants reported experiencing personal and cultural victimization, with a third of the participants reporting personal direct relational victimization (interpersonal social exclusion) while only 4% reported cultural direct relational victimization (intergroup social exclusion). Although participants rated other forms of personal victimization (physical, verbal) as more wrong than direct relational victimization, they disapproved of verbal and direct relational victimization more when it was in a cultural context than when it was personal. Among other forms of victimization, Spanish students disapproved of personal and cultural direct relational victimization sig-

nificantly more than English students. Students also reported that cultural victimization occurred due to the victim being different rather than attributing negative behavior on behalf of the aggressor. While Spanish adolescents might disapprove of most forms of aggression more often than English adolescents, cultural minority adolescents in both cultures did report experiencing cultural victimization more often than majority students. Thus further investigation must be done to understand the link between majority children's attitudes and evaluations about exclusion and their exclusion behaviors towards peers belonging to minority groups.

An interesting phenomenon mentioned by Monks et al. (2008) that ought to be addressed in studies measuring intergroup exclusion is the personal/group discrimination discrepancy (Taylor, Wright, & Porter, 1994). Findings from this line of research have shown that when minority group participants are asked about their own experiences with discrimination they perceive themselves as experiencing less discrimination than other members of their group. This may explain why less cultural victimization was reported altogether. In addition, the finding that more personal victimization was reported by all participants could be an indication that children may not recognize forms of cultural victimization when it is directed at them and interpret it in more personal terms rather than stemming from their cultural affiliation. Research in social psychology has pointed to this type of pattern with adults with the interpretation that individuals are reluctant to view themselves in the "victim" role, and this reluctance to adopt the "victim" role may extend to children. Future research should address this issue of children's and adolescents' own interpretations of experienced peer victimization. This can be done through the use of participant generated definitions of personal and cultural peer exclusion in combination with hypothetical vignettes that incorporate responses to open-ended questions that will capture participants' interpretations. Perhaps participants in this study who did not judge the cultural victimization as being based on cultural identity may have found it difficult to take the perspective of a group when that perspective was so different from their own.

Intergroup Exclusion in the Korean Context

Cultural theorizing has often suggested that children from Asian countries are more similar to one another than to children from the U.S. due to the collectivistic ideology of Asian cultures in contrast to the individualistic culture of the U.S. However, a study on evaluations of exclusion by Korean, Japanese, and U.S. children and adolescents displayed as much diversity between Korean and Japanese as with the U.S. sample (Park, et al., 2003). For example, Korean children were more likely to view exclusion based on personality traits, such as "acting like a clown", as wrong than were Japanese and American children. The findings from this study indicated that more research was warranted to under-

stand how Korean children evaluated different forms of exclusion. Thus, Park and Killen (2010) conducted a study with Korean and U.S. children that assessed different forms of exclusion. The aims of the study included examining whether exclusion based on personality (shy or aggressive) and group characteristics (gender or nationality) varied as a function of social context and type of exclusion. Specifically, the intergroup context was a peer-exclusion scenario where a child is excluded from a group working on a group project in school, the interpersonal context was a friendship-rejection scenario where one child does not want to be friends with another, and the intrapersonal context involved a victimization scenario where one child is picked on because of a group or personality trait. The sample included 10 and 13 year old children from the United States of America and Korea.

All participants received stories presenting all contexts and all personality and group characteristics, with the personality and group characteristics counter-balanced. Using a within-subjects design allowed the researchers to compare effectively across conditions. Participants judged the acceptability of exclusion and provided justifications. Using two assessments (judgment and justification) which have been highly validated within social-cognitive domain research (Smetana, 2006) provided a way to assess both group and personal types of exclusion using the same measures.

The findings were that across all contexts and both cultures girls were less accepting of exclusion than were boys. Additionally, all participants saw the victimization context as the least acceptable form of exclusion. In terms of personality and group characteristics, it was more acceptable to exclude aggressive peers, and Americans were more willing than Koreans to condone exclusion of an aggressive peer. Additionally, perhaps due to greater experience with people from different nationalities, Americans were more inclusive of different nationality peers than were Koreans. Older children were more likely than were younger children to endorse exclusion because of aggression and reject exclusion based on nationality. Findings suggest different degrees of acceptability by context, as well. Friendship rejection was the most acceptable, followed by group exclusion and then victimization. Finally, although not reported in the main study, it was also revealed that prior experience with exclusion led to greater rejection of victimization.

Future research considering exclusion based on either personality characteristics or membership in groups would benefit from examining perspective-taking ability as well as varying the norm of the group in the peer-group exclusion scenario, as was done by Nesdale et al. (2005). Research which aims to examine more clearly both sense of group identity and judgments about exclusion will provide a more complete understanding of under what conditions children view exclusion as acceptable.

Intergroup Exclusion in the Jewish-Arab Context

While the research reviewed thus far examines exclusion in relatively normative environments, exploring exclusion within contexts of more extreme conflicts is also important. It is not clear if children living in areas of high violent conflict interpret interpersonal and intergroup exclusion in similar or distinct ways. Do they make exclusion decisions based on mere affiliation with their in-group or do they incorporate the characteristics of their in-group to become part of their own personal identity? Though exclusion has not been studied in many groups where violence occurs, some research has begun examining this issue in the Middle East. Israeli and Palestinian children who live in a highly violent and conflict-filled environment have been found to be highly affected by their environment. While studies with these populations have mainly looked at clinical psychological issues (Elbedour, ten Bensel, & Maruyama, 1993; Khamis, 2005), some studies have focused on intergroup attitudes and behaviors (Bar-Tal, 1996; Brenick et al., 2010, in press; Teichman, Bar-Tal, & Abdolrazeq, 2007).

Social reasoning about exclusion was analyzed by Brenick et al. (2010) in a sample of 433 preschool and kindergarten children who are Israeli-Jewish, Israeli-Palestinian, Palestinian, and Jordanian. The three Arab groups are different in their socioeconomic status; Jordanians represent a middle-income Arab sample. Palestinians come from more impoverished environments, and Israeli-Palestinians have mixed socio-economic status (SES) backgrounds. In addition, each group is affected by the conflict in different ways depending on their proximity to the violence. In this study, children were interviewed to acquire their knowledge about the out-group. Their judgments, evaluations, and reasoning were also collected for three exclusion vignettes.

One of the main findings was that although participants displayed negative stereotypes in their knowledge about the out-group, they did not use them in their inclusion or exclusion decisions across all three scenarios. While other studies have shown that, among adolescents, nationality is the least legitimate reason for exclusion, it was found that amongst Palestinian children, nationality plays a salient role in their decisions to include or exclude someone in a peer social situation. It may be the case that the associations between their stressful, impoverished environment and their identity as Palestinians have manifested in their responses to these exclusion vignettes. Therefore, developmental group identity measures, in addition to measures of social stress and adjustment could shed some light on the exclusion decisions of children living under stressful violent conditions.

Intergroup Exclusion in the Croatian and Serbian Context

An example of post-war integration between ethnic groups that were in violent conflict due to ethnic and religious differences is the Croats and Serbs in the city of

Vukovar. In this city Croats are a numerical majority while Serbs are a minority, but post-war inter-ethnic relations deteriorated rapidly despite their good standing prior to the war. In Vukovar, Ajdukovic and Biruski (2008) assessed Croatian and Serbian adolescents' tendency to discriminate against a member of their out-group. Using a summed score of three items to measure participants' tendency to discriminate, the researchers analyzed age, gender and minority/majority status differences. The items represented a form of peer exclusion, for example, asking participants to decide between a Croat and Serb to join the school sport team even if the other was better at the sport. Findings for these items showed that majority (Croats) students were more likely to discriminate against the minority students (Serbs) than were minority students to discriminate against majority students. In addition, boys were more likely to discriminate against the out-group than girls. Age, gender, and majority/minority status interactions emerged and showed that older boys discriminated more regardless of their status, while 14-year-old majority girls discriminated less compared with 14-year-old minority girls who showed more tendencies to discriminate against the out-group.

What was also interesting about this study is that it acquired information from the participants' parents, investigating their level of contact with the out-group and discriminatory tendencies. Significant correlations were found for both majority and minority children between their tendency to discriminate and their parents' level of contact with the out-group. Thus for those parents that had contact with the out-group, their children were less likely to discriminate (exclude an out-group member). This finding adds to the evidence suggesting the importance of incorporating socialization factors and environmental influences in the study of intergroup exclusion. Additionally, assessing reasoning in future studies will enable researchers to suggest potential methods for improving intergroup relations and reducing discrimination.

Intergroup and Intragroup Exclusion in the Australian Context

While intergroup research reveals that exclusion is judged to be acceptable in some instances, intragroup research has attempted to understand what role group identity and group norms may play in this dynamic. Nesdale, Maass et al. (2005) examined the impact of group norms of inclusion and exclusion and out-group threat in a variation of minimal group contexts with 7 and 9-year-old Anglo-Australian children. The researchers' aims were to identify if and when children relied on group norms of exclusion in making inclusion and exclusion decisions and if and when out-group threat impacted their use of these norms. Nesdale, Maass et al (2005) focused on ethnic in-groups and out-groups. This study addressed the specific issue of group norms of inclusion and exclusion in children because while research has revealed the powerful impact of group norms

on adults, little work had examined this same issue in children (Brown, 2000). Nesdale, Maass et al. (2005) drew from methods previously used by Nesdale and colleagues in assessing ethnic attitudes and prejudice. Participants were told to pretend that they were participating in an intergroup drawing contest and were assigned to groups with other children of their same ethnic heritage. The in-groups and out-groups were identified by showing children photographs of children in their drawing group (same ethnicity) and those not in their drawing group (either same or different ethnicity). Both the in-group and out-group members all shared the participant's gender.

While the study aimed to examine intergroup evaluations across ethnic lines, the authors expressed uncertainty as to whether participants noticed the race of the out-group. As the participants only briefly saw the photographs of the in-group and out-group, this may not have been sufficient exposure for them to recognize the ethnicity of the out-group. Thus, perhaps testing similar exclusion measures in an authentic intergroup context may lead to greater awareness of the out-group ethnicity and tap into their conceptions, and perhaps prejudices about ethnicity.

The study contributed to the current research by examining how children understand group norms. After being assigned to their drawing in-group, participants were given information about their group and the out-group. For the in-group, they were either told that their group had a norm of inclusion or a norm of exclusion. For the out-group, they were either told that an out-group threat existed (i.e. "they want your team to come in last in the competition") or were given no further information. Experimental manipulation of these exclusion variables was systematic and effective. This procedure allowed the researchers to identify not only if the participants were influenced by group norms of exclusion, but also to assess what role out-group threat played in their evaluation of these situations.

Nesdale, Maass, et al. (2005) found that children whose in-group had a norm of exclusion expressed dislike for the out-group, and thus the group norm justified exclusion. Additionally, they found that when an out-group threat was present, both age groups identified dislike of the out-group. Thus, prejudicial attitudes were influenced by the presence of norms of exclusion as well as by out-group threat. However, participants only appeared to use the ethnicity of the out-group when determining if they would like to switch groups; participants were less likely to express a desire to switch groups when the other group was a different ethnicity. Finally, the findings reveal the importance of examining a greater range of peer-group contexts (non-minimal groups differing based on membership in different types of groups).

Intergroup and Intragroup Exclusion in the Italian Context

While Nesdale, Maass et al. (2005) examine exclusion across ethnic lines, research on exclusion has also begun to

examine what implications inclusion decisions may have for those who have cross-race friendships. Specifically, Castelli et al. (2007) studied a phenomenon termed the "loyal member effect" whereby children show a preference for and greater inclusivity towards in-group members who have friends who are also in-group members over those who have cross-race friendships. This line of research was conducted with a sample of Italian children between the ages of 4-7 years where the in-group was majority white Italian children and the out-group was represented by non-Italian Black children. Participants were shown images of dyads who were playing together, which were either composed of two in-group members or one in-group and one out-group member. Participants evaluated how friendly they thought the dyads were with each other. They were then asked to evaluate whether they would prefer to be friends with the in-group member who played with another in-group children ("loyal member") or the in-group member who had a cross-race friend. Perceived popularity of the target children was assessed by asking the participants to place the child with their group of friends and providing options which varied based on the number of friends. They also measured intergroup contact of the participants by asking how many Black friends the participants had.

Results revealed a large "loyal member effect" with 74% of participants indicating that their preferred playmate would be the in-group member who had played with another in-group White child and only 26% indicating that they would prefer the playmate who had played with an out-group Black child. While this finding appears to suggest a strong "loyal member" preference, reasoning was not assessed; therefore it is unclear why children chose the child who was shown playing with another in-group member. Additionally, the out-group member was shown visually, however it is not clear what assumptions the participants may have held about the out-group member or the cultural, linguistic and ethnic experiences of these out-groups members. It was also found that participants with higher levels of intergroup contact were less positive about their evaluations of the child who played with the in-group member relative to their evaluations of the child who played with the out-group member. Thus, intergroup contact may provide children with a lens for perceiving possible prejudice in other's behavior.

While this research is important in that it examines exclusion based on race within a different cultural setting than much of the current research has, researchers who engage in this important research should not only ensure that they are carefully contextualizing the cultural groups which they are studying, but also that they fully capture the reasoning used by the participants in making exclusion decisions. Additionally, this research should be examined in light of the extended contact theory which suggests that simple awareness of intergroup friendships reduces prejudice (Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, & Ross, 1997). Finally, in line with the proposed SRD framework, this research is examining conceptions of loyalty to the in-group in making exclusion decisions, but does not also examine potential domain-specific differences. Indeed, while children may show the "loyal member effect" when determining a preferred playmate in an abstract scenario, if children were asked to evaluate hypothetical scenarios within different domains, a more complex picture may emerge of how children perceive those who have and do not have cross-race friendships.

Theory of Social Mind: Perspective-taking in Social Contexts

The research reviewed thus far establishes how complex children's social reasoning process is when making inclusion and exclusion decisions. Children are weighing information about the context of the exclusion, the personal and psychological characteristics of the target of exclusion, in-group and out-group identity as well as the historical and cultural dynamics at play. However, social-perspective taking ability and an understanding of group processes is yet another important factor which children turn to when making exclusion decisions.

Abrams et al. (2009) has studied the group dynamics of exclusion and specifically an individual's awareness of the relationship between intragroup exclusion, when a group excludes members of their own group and intergroup exclusion, when a group excludes someone who does not fit the identity of the in-group. Drawing on Developmental Subjective Group Dynamics (DSGD) Abrams et al. (2009) examined whether more exclusive children and adolescents had a greater sense of how groups function and a better ability to take the social perspective of others in intergroup contexts. Their aims were to examine whether children with greater social perspective taking abilities—Theory of Social Mind (ToSM) — were more likely to exclude others, to examine if multiple classification skill (the ability to classify individuals using more than one trait or feature) led to decreased intergroup bias and to examine if greater exposure to a variety of groups led to better understanding of group norms. Finally, they aimed to examine age-related changes in these abilities and in exclusion judgments.

Abrams et al. (2009) designed two studies examining group identity in competitive groups, including soccer fans from Britain and France (Study 1) and two imaginary teams (Study 2). Both studies used primarily White British children (5-11 years old). In Study 1, children evaluated normative and deviant soccer fans from both groups. Intergroup bias, intragroup judgments, multiple classification skill and ToSM were measured. In Study 2, children were assessed on multiple classification skill and ToSM, and also assessed to determine to what degree they understood that individuals tend to show in-group bias for their own group members.

Children were given scenarios about different in-groups and out-groups (soccer fans and invented Red and Green teams for Studies 1 and 2, respectively) and asked to make decisions about how much they liked each group (intergroup bias) and how much they would like and thought an individ-

ual and a group would like a group member after they expressed loyal and deviant group norms (intragroup bias and understanding of in-group bias). Abrams et al. 2009 used exclusion measures that related to both how the subjects would evaluate the exclusion target as well as how they thought the group would evaluate the target. This was a strength of their measures, as this captured complexity of group dynamics.

The multiple classification skill task asked children to group objects by their traits. The ToSM task asked children to assess a situation involving a false evaluation of another character (how would a character feel about another character who secretly stole from him). Assessing ToSM is a strong way to approach the potential variation in exclusion decisions based on cognitive abilities as ToSM requires perspective-taking and coordination of multiple sources of information in an authentic context.

Abrams et al. (2009) assessed understanding of group functioning using a variety of tasks and from multiple perspectives. However, while the researchers did ask participants why they made the decisions they did for some measures, they did not systematically assess reasoning in the study. Additionally, the study addressed competitive in-groups and out-groups but did not address how salient peer groups, such as those formed around race or gender, might impact inclusion and exclusion decisions in light of one's awareness of group functioning, nor did they vary the level of competition in the groups.

Abrams et al. (2009) found that social perspective taking was related to understanding group dynamics and, particularly, understanding of social inclusion and exclusion decisions. Interestingly, greater multiple classification skill was related to decreased intergroup bias. Greater exposure to groups led to greater understanding of group norms. However, with age, children gain better multiple classification skill and greater ToSM. These stand in contrast to each other, because greater multiple classification skill leads to decreased intergroup bias, but greater ToSM leads to greater adherence to group norms, and thus greater exclusivity based on group norms. This study indicates future work should examine how exactly ToSM as well as multiple classification ability are used by youth. These findings also suggest that further work should be done to evaluate exactly how understanding of group functioning impacts exclusion decisions, particularly with age. Finally, examining ToSM, as well as other forms of perspective taking skill, is an important new direction for research on exclusion as social forms of perspective taking may aid children in recognizing the acceptability of exclusion in some instances (for group functioning or to preserve group goals, for instance), but may also aid children in perceiving the harmful impacts of exclusion on others who may be potentially excluded. Thus, measuring perspective taking skill as well as reasoning when making exclusion decisions will enable researchers to better understand the relationship between social cognition and moral judgments about inclusion and exclusion.

Future Directions

The study of exclusion in childhood and adolescence has recently expanded into new areas involving multiple aspects of group identity and culture. More research should be conducted across different societies where the tensions and issues in intergroup contexts differ in order to better understand children's reasoning about and experiences with exclusion. Specifically, new research should be undertaken in under-studied areas of the world including areas in Africa where intergroup tensions remain high. Research should further examine the exclusion experiences and judgments of minority group members, as much research has focused on majority group members.

Given that research in Europe has begun investigating cross-group attitudes with Muslim immigrant populations, such as in the Netherlands (Gieling, et al., 2010) and Denmark (Moller & Tenenbaum, 2011), expanding intergroup research with Muslim immigrant populations in other regions such as North and South America might shed light on both Muslim children's own immigrant experiences and majority children's attitudes towards Muslim peers. Heterogeneity within understudied populations (e.g., Muslim, Arab or African) ought to be examined by including measures of cultural and ethnic identification as well as measures of religiosity. In a post-9/11 world when generalized stereotypes and prejudices about Muslims and Arabs are heightened, it is important to acknowledge the ethnic and cultural diversity amongst Muslims and religious and ideological diversity amongst Arabs. Studying such distinctions and disentangling these identities will more accurately help assess cultural and religious influences on children's intergroup behavior.

While religious affiliation may play a role in exclusion judgments made by Jewish-Arab and Croatian-Serbian children, religious affiliation is often only one piece of the picture. This form of exclusion exists primarily in areas where two distinct religious groups with differing values, ideologies, or practices share geographic space and histories, for instance in the Middle East between Muslims and non-Muslims, in Northern Ireland between Catholics and Protestants, and in the former Yugoslavia between Muslims, Catholics, and Orthodox Christians. These forms of exclusion are particularly important to examine as they have often been accompanied by intergroup conflict involving serious violence and other moral transgressions. However, unlike exclusion based on some other forms of group membership, such as gender, exclusion based on religious background often occurs not because of physical differences between the two groups. Rather, a complex set of practices involving searching for cues using names, school, or neighborhood is often involved in determine which group someone belongs to (Hewstone, et al., 2005). Because physical features are not always a defining way to distinguish the in-group and out-group for religious groups, individuals and groups may rely upon stereotypes and generalizations in making determinations of who to include and exclude. Finally, though religion

may be one feature that divides groups, religious differences often also reflect political and ethnic differences (Hewstone, et al., 2005). The development of judgments about exclusion based on religion and children's reasoning about intergroup relations in the context of religious groups has been infrequent, but remains an important research area.

Moral emotions

While children and adolescents have been asked to reason about exclusion in different intergroup contexts, an affective evaluation of the targets has only recently begun to be explored (Abrams, et al., 2009; Malti, Killen, & Gasser, under review). It has been found that children with prosocial tendencies attribute different emotions to victimizers and posit different reasoning for their attributions than aggressive children (Malti, Gasser, & Buchmann, 2009). Thus, emotions serve as a source of information to an individual and can impact one's moral judgments (Turiel & Killen, 2010). Evaluations and judgments about emotional states as well as cognitive states within an exclusion context will further elucidate the role played by children's understandings of emotions (their own and other's) on their exclusive or inclusive behavior. Including assessments for emotional attribution within an intragroup context whereby a group member deviates from moral or social-conventional group norms provides significant insight into how children negotiate peer relations and group processes. Cross-cultural work on emotional and cognitive reasoning could also further disentangle cultural contributions to children's intergroup attitudes.

Theory of Mind in Exclusionary Contexts

Additionally, as important as understanding emotion judgments will be for unraveling the complex picture of exclusion decisions, another key element leading to variation in children's judgments and evaluations of exclusion decisions may be their social perspective taking abilities. While traditional forms of Theory of Mind develop quite early, between the ages of 3 and 5 (Wellman & Liu, 2004), recent research suggests that Theory of Mind skill is related to moral judgments (Killen, Mulvey, Richardson, Jampol, & Woodward, 2011), and that social perspective taking (ToSM), in particular, is related to greater exclusivity (Abrams, et al., 2009). However, more work is needed which addresses how children coordinate their ability to take the perspective of a child who may be excluded with the perspective of the group or individuals who may be the excluders. Within different domains, children may place more weight on their understanding of the perspective of either the excluded or the excluder. Additionally, children who have less experience with groups, social interactions, or with exclusion themselves may show deficits in being able to take the perspective of potential excluders or excluded children. These deficits will likely lead to differences in exclusion decisions. Thus, social perspective-taking should be measured

in a variety of domains, in ways that account for recognition of and coordination of both the perspectives of the excluded and excluders and in a variety of contexts and cultures.

Conclusion

Social exclusion occurs in the everyday lives of children around the world. As outlined in this review, the study of social exclusion has taken many different directions. Exclusion has been studied in environments where intergroup contact is common as well as areas where intergroup contact is complicated by war and violence (Dovidio, et al., 2005). The studies reviewed here reveal that children and adolescents experience exclusion based on a variety of different factors including personality traits, religion, immigration status, ethnicity, nationality, gender, and adherence to or deviance from group norms. The current body of research examining exclusion cross-culturally has begun the important task of delineating how children reason about exclusion: research has begun to identify under what circumstances children may view exclusion as acceptable and to unravel the circumstances in which exclusion is considered to be in the moral, social conventional or personal domain, and to recognize the vital importance of group identity and group norms in the exclusion process.

Across all of the studies reviewed, some general conclusions can be drawn. Experiences with exclusion can lead to greater empathy (Killen, Kelly, Richardson, Crystal, & Ruck, 2010) and more rejection of exclusion under certain conditions (Park & Killen, 2010). Additionally, while children across many cultures and contexts reject exclusion in most instances, there are instances where exclusion is viewed as more legitimate. Specifically, when personality traits or group membership may interfere with group functioning, participants rank exclusion as more acceptable, such as when an individual is aggressive. Additionally, individuals who deviate from group norms may also be excluded because of the potential impact on group functioning. Cross-group contact, status differences between groups and socialization factors play a role in children's responses to exclusion measures.

While the studies reviewed addressed many types of exclusion, there is still a need for better definition of terms. For instance, there are different definitions in the literature regarding constructs such as relational aggression, peer rejection or exclusion. As can be seen from the wide range of measures and the variety of hypothetical vignettes posed to children cross-culturally, future research should include careful consideration of the definition of terms like social exclusion. This is especially important in studies which will involve translation of the measures for different populations of children, as it may not be the case that each language will include words which precisely or clearly define social exclusion.

Additionally, exclusion can be measured in a range of ways, including by measuring outcomes for the excluders

and the excluded, measuring judgments of acceptability of exclusion, and attending to group identity and group norms. More research is necessary which integrates children's own experiences with an awareness of group norms and identity and with clear opportunities to make judgments of exclusion acceptability. There are few problems more pressing in today's world than that of exclusion, as groups that previously did not interact now co-exist in varying degrees of acceptance and integration. Understanding the developmental origins of inclusion and exclusion will provide a means both for identifying the factors that contribute to tolerance and prejudice in the adult world, as well as for creating effective interventions in childhood in order to foster positive healthy social development and a just and civil society.

References

Abrams, D., Hogg, M. A., & Marques, J. M. (2005). A social psychological framework for understanding social inclusion and exclusion. In D. Abrams, M. A. Hogg & J. M. Marques (Eds.), *The social psychology of inclusion and exclusion* (pp. 1-23). New York: Psychology Press.

Abrams, D., & Rutland, A. (2008). The development of subjective group dynamics. In S. R. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup relations and attitudes in childhood through adulthood* (pp. 47-65). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Abrams, D., Rutland, A., & Cameron, L. (2003). The development of subjective group dynamics: Children's judgments of normative and deviant in-group and out-group individuals. *Child Development, 74*, 1840-1856.

Abrams, D., Rutland, A., Cameron, L., & Ferrell, J. (2007). Older but wilier: Ingroup accountability and the development of subjective group dynamics. *Developmental Psychology, 43*, 134-148.

Abrams, D., Rutland, A., Ferrell, J. M., & Pelletier, J. (2008). Children's judgments of disloyal and immoral peer behavior: Subjective group dynamics in minimal intergroup contexts. *Child Development, 79*, 444-461.

Abrams, D., Rutland, A., Pelletier, J., & Ferrell, J. M. (2009). Children's group nous: Understanding and applying peer exclusion within and between groups. *Child Development, 80*, 224-243.

Ajdukovic, D., & Biruski, D. C. (2008). Caught between the ethnic sides: Children growing up in a divided post-war community. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 32*, 337-347. doi: 10.1177/0165025408090975

Bar-Tal, D. (1996). Development of social categories and stereotypes in early childhood: The case of "the Arab" concept formation, stereotype and attitudes by Jewish children in Israel. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 20*, 341-370.

Bar-Tal, D., & Teichman, Y. (2005). *Stereotypes and prejudice in conflict: Representations of Arabs in Israeli Jewish society.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bennett, M., Lyons, E., Sani, F., & Barrett, M. (1998). Children's subjective identification with the group and in-group favoritism. *Developmental Psychology, 34*, 902-909. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.34.5.902

Bennett, M., & Sani, F. (2008a). Children's subjective identification with social groups. In S. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup attitudes and relationships from childhood through adulthood* (pp. 19-31). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Bennett, M., & Sani, F. (2008b). Children's subjective identification with social groups: A group-reference effect approach. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 26*, 381-387. doi: 10.1348/026151007x246268

Bennett, M., & Sani, F. (2008c). Children's subjective identification with social groups: A self-stereotyping approach. *Developmental Science, 11*, 69-75.

Bennett, M., Yuill, N., Banerjee, R., & Thomson, S. (1998). Children's understanding of extended identity. *Developmental Psychology, 34*, 322-331. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.34.2.322

Bigler, R. S., Brown, C. S., & Markell, M. (2001). When groups are not created equal: Effects of group status on the formation of intergroup attitudes in children. *Child Development, 72*, 1151-1162.

Brenick, A., Killen, M., Lee-Kim, J., Fox, N.A., Leavitt, L.A., Raviv, A., Masalha, S., Mura, F., & Smadi, Y. (2010). Social understandings in Young Israeli-Jewish, Israeli-Palestinian, Palestinian, and Jordanian children: Moral judgments and stereotypes. *Early Education and Development.*

Brenick, A., Lee-Kim, J., Killen, M., Fox, N. A., Leavitt, L. A., & Raviv, A. (2007). Social judgments in Israeli and Arabic children: Findings from media-based intervention projects. In D. Lemish & M. Gotz (Eds.), *Children, Media and War* (pp. 287-308). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Brown, R. (2000). *Group processes: Dynamics within and between groups.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Castelli, L., De Amicis, L., & Sherman, S. J. (2007). The loyal member effect: On the preference for ingroup members who engage in exclusive relations with the ingroup. *Developmental Psychology, 43*, 1347-1359.

Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1998). On the nature of contemporary prejudice: The causes, consequences, and challenges of aversive racism. In J. Eberhardt & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), *Confronting racism: The problem and the response* (pp. 3-32). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Dovidio, J. F., Glick, P., & Rudman, L. (Eds.). (2005). *Reflecting on the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Elbedour, S., ten Bensel, R., & Maruyama, G. M. (1993). Children at risk: Psychological coping with war and conflict in the Middle East. *International Journal of Mental Health, 22*, 33-52.

Enesco, I., Guerrero, S., Callejas, C., & Solbes, I. (2008). Intergroup attitudes and reasoning about social exclusion in majority and minority children in Spain. In S. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood* (pp. 105-125). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Enesco, I., Navarro, A., Paradela, I., & Callejas, C. (2002). *Spanish children's and adolescents' judgments about ethnic exclusion: The case of Gypsies and Africans.* Paper presented at the 32nd Annual Meeting of the Jean Piaget Society. Society for the Study of Knowledge and Development, Philadelphia, PA.

Enesco, I., Navarro, A., Paradela, I., & Guerrero, S. (2005). Stereotypes and beliefs about different ethnic groups in Spain: A study with Spanish and Latin American children living in Madrid. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 26*, 638-659.

Gieling, M., Thijs, J., & Verkuyten, M. (2010). Tolerance of practices by Muslim actors: An integrative social-developmental perspective. *Child Development, 81*, 1384-1399.

Gjerde, P. F. (2004). Culture, power, and experience: Toward a person-centered cultural psychology. *Human Development, 47*, 138-157.

Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., Voci, A., Paolini, S., McLernon, F., Crisp, R., et al. (2005). Intergroup contact in a divided society: Challenging segregation in Northern Ireland. In D. Abrams, M. A. Hogg & J. M. Marques (Eds.), *The social psychology of inclusion and exclusion* (pp. 265-292). New York: Psychology Press.

Horn, S. S. (2006). Group status, group bias, and adolescents' reasoning about the treatment of others in school contexts. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 30*, 208-218.

Khamis, V. (2005). Post-traumatic stress disorder among school age Palestinian children. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 29*, 81-95.

Killen, M., Crystal, D., & Watanabe, H. (2002). The individual and the group: Japanese and American children's evaluations of peer exclusion, tolerance of difference, and prescriptions for conformity. *Child Development, 73*, 1788-1802.

Killen, M., Kelly, M. C., Richardson, C., Crystal, D. S., & Ruck, M. D. (2010). European-American children's and adolescents' evaluations of interracial exclusion. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 13*, 283-300.

Killen, M., Lee-Kim, J., McGlothlin, H., & Stangor, C. (2002). How children and adolescents evaluate gender and racial exclusion *Monographs of the*

Society for Research in Child Development. Serial No. 271, Vol. 67, No. 4. Oxford, England: Blackwell Publishers.

Killen, M., Mulvey, K. L., Richardson, C., Jampol, N., & Woodward, A. (2011). The accidental transgressor: Morally-relevant theory of mind. *Cognition, 119,* 197-215.

Killen, M., Pisacane, K., Lee-Kim, J., & Ardila-Rey, A. (2001). Fairness or stereotypes? Young children's priorities when evaluating group exclusion and inclusion. *Developmental Psychology, 37*, 587-596.

Killen, M., Richardson, C., & Kelly, M. C. (2010). Developmental persepctives. In J. Dovidio, M. Hewstone, P. Glick & V. Esses (Eds.), *Handbook of prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 97-114). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.

Killen, M., Sinno, S., & Margie, N. G. (2007). Children's experiences and judgments about group exclusion and inclusion. In R. V. Kail (Ed.), *Advances in Child Development and Behavior* (pp. 173-218). New York: Elseveir.

Killen, M., & Stangor, C. (2001). Children's social reasoning about inclusion and exclusion in gender and race peer group contexts. *Child Development, 72*, 174-186.

Levy, S. R., & Killen, M. (2008). *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Malti, T., Gasser, L., & Buchmann, M. (2009). Aggressive and prosocial children's emotion attributions and moral reasoning. *Aggressive Behavior, 35*, 90-102.

Malti, T., Killen, M., & Gasser, L. (in press). Social judgments and emotion attributions about exclusion in Switzerland. *Child Development*.

Moller, S. J., & Tenenbaum, H. (2011). Danish majority children's reasoning about exclusion based on gender and ethnicity. *Child Development, 82*, 520-532.

Monks, C. P., Ortega-Ruiz, R., & Rodriguez-Hidalgo, A. J. (2008). Peer victimization in multicultural schools in Spain and England. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 5*, 507-535.

Muldoon, O. T., McLaughlin, K., & Trew, K. (2007). Adolescents' perceptions of national identification and socialization: A grounded analysis. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 25*, 579-594.

Nesdale, D. (1999). Developmental changes in children's ethnic preferences and social cognition. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 20*, 501-519.

Nesdale, D. (2004). Social identity processes and children's ethnic prejudice. In M. Bennett & F. Sani (Eds.), *The development of the social self* (pp. 219-245). New York: Psychology Press.

Nesdale, D., Maass, A., Durkin, K., & Griffiths, J. (2005). Group norms, threat, and children's racial prejudice. *Child Development, 76*, 652-663.

Nesdale, D., Maass, A., Kiesner, J., Durkin, K., Griffiths, J., & Ekberg, A. (2007). Effects of peer group rejection, group membership, and group norms, on children's outgroup prejudice. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 31*, 526-535.

Oyserman, D., Coon, H., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*, 3072.

Park, Y., & Killen, M. (2010). When is peer rejection justifiable?: Children's understanding across two cultures. *Cognitive Development*, *25*, 290-301.

Park, Y., Killen, M., Crystal, D. S., & Watanabe, H. (2003). Korean, Japanese, and U.S. students' judgments about peer exclusion: Evidence for diversity. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 27*, 555-565.

Pfeifer, J. H., Rubble, D. N., Bachman, M. A., Alvarez, J. M., Cameron, J. A., & Fuligni, A. J. (2007). Social identities and intergroup bias in immigrant and nonimmigrant children. *Developmental Psychology, 43*, 496-507.

Phinney, J. S., Jacoby, B., & Silva, C. (2007). Positive intergroup attitudes: The role of ethnic identity. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 31*, 478-490. doi: 10.1177/0165025407081466

Rutland, A., Killen, M., & Abrams, D. (2010). A new social-cognitive developmental perspective on prejudice: The interplay between morality and group identity. *Perspectives in Psychological Science, 5*, 280-291.

Sani, F., & Bennett, M. (2009). Children's inclusion of the group in the self: Evidence from a self–ingroup confusion paradigm. *Developmental Psychology, 45*, 503-510. doi: 10.1037/a0014167

Smetana, J. G. (2006). Social-cognitive domain theory: Consistencies and variations in children's moral and social judgments. In M. Killen & J. G. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (pp. 119-154). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Symons, C. S., & Johnson, B. T. (1997). The self-reference effect in memory: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 121*, 371-394. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.121.3.371

Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. *Scientific American, 223*, 96-102.

Tajfel, H., Billig, M. G., Bundy, R. P., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 1*, 149-178. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2420010202

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.

Taylor, D. M., Wright, S. C., & Porter, L. E. (1994). Dimensions of perceived discrimination: The personal/group discrimination discrepancy. In M. P. Zanna & J. M. Olson (Eds.), *The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario symposium, Vol. 7.* (pp. 233-255). Hillsdale, NJ England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Teichman, Y., Bar-Tal, D., & Abdolrazeq, Y. (2007). Intergroup biases in conflict: Reexamination with Arab pre-adolescents and adolescents. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 31*, 423-432. doi: 10.1177/0165025407081470

Trew, K. (2004). Children and socio-cultural division in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Social Issues, 60*, 507-522.

Turiel, E. (1983). *The development of social knowledge: Morality and convention*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Turiel, E. (2002). *The culture of morality: Social development, context, and conflict*. Cambridge, Engalnd: Cambridge University Press.

Turiel, E., & Killen, M. (2010). Taking emotions seriously: The role of emotions in moral development In W. Arsenio & E. Lemerise (Eds.), *Emotions in aggression and moral development*. (pp. 33-52). Washington, D.C.: APA.

Verkuyten, M. (2001). National identification and intergroup evaluations in Dutch children. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 19*, 559-571.

Verkuyten, M. (2008). Multiculturalism and group evaluations among minority and majority groups. In S. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood* (pp. 157-172). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Wainryb, C., & Turiel, E. (1994). Dominance, subordination, and concepts of personal entitlements in cultural contexts. *Child Development, 65*, 1701-1722.

Wellman, H. M., & Liu, D. (2004). Scaling of theory-of-mind tasks. *Child Development, 75*, 502-517.

Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ross, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 73-90.