COMPETITIVE CLASSROOM NORMS AND EXCLUSION OF CHILDREN WITH ACADEMIC AND BEHAVIOR DIFFICULTIES

Luciano Gasser, Jeanine Grütter, Loredana Torchetti, Alois Buholzer

University of Teacher Education Lucerne, Switzerland

Author Note

This study was funded by The Swiss National Science.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Luciano Gasser, Institute for School and Diversity, University of Teacher Education Lucerne, 6004 Lucerne, Switzerland. Electronic mail maybesentto luciano.gasser@phlu.ch

Abstract

We investigated effects of classroom-level norms and individual competitive attitudes on children's exclusion of hypothetical peers with behavior or academic difficulties. Upper elementary school children ($N = 1,009$) from Switzerland were presented with four scenarios about social exclusion at two time points (fifth and sixth grade). These scenarios varied according to difficulty type of exclusion target (low-achieving vs. hyperactive) and context of exclusion (academic vs. social). Multilevel analyses revealed that children were more likely to exclude hypothetical hyperactive peers than low-achieving peers for reasons of effective group functioning. When children transferred to the sixth grade, they became more likely to coordinate the type of difficulty of the exclusion target with the context of exclusion. Moreover, competitive classroom-level norms and individual attitudes positively predicted the exclusion of low-achieving children. To improve social inclusion, teachers can encourage learning environments, where children learn to integrate effective academic group functioning with fairness principles.

Keywords: social exclusion, moral development, classroom norms

3 EXCLUSION OF CHILDREN WITH ACADEMIC AND BEHAVIOR DIFFICULTIES

Children with low academic achievement or behavior problems frequently experience social exclusion by their peers. Research indicates that compared to typically developing children, both academic and behavior problems are associated with social rejection and being involved in bullying or victimization (e.g., Estell et al., 2008; Mikami et al., 2015; Welsh, Park, Widaman, & O'Neil, 2001). In order to promote inclusion of children with low academic achievement or behavior problems, it is important not only to focus on the *excluded children* but also to develop an understanding of the perspective of *excluding children* and how they balance concerns about fairness and welfare with concerns about peer group functioning. How do children understand social exclusion of peers with academic or behavioral problems? What are children's decisions in hypothetical peer exclusion contexts and which concerns do they prioritize? Is it more important that students with academic and behavior difficulties are treated fairly or that the group can achieve its goals?

In this two-wave study (T1: fifth grade, T2: sixth grade), we investigated upper elementary grade students' exclusion decisions and justifications in hypothetical scenarios, which described low-achieving and hyperactive students. The upper elementary grades may represent a challenging developmental phase in countries like Switzerland whose secondary school systems distinguish between several performance levels. During the upper elementary grades, children are selected and streamed according to their grades; thus, students are under growing pressure to perform. This increasing pressure may have negative implications for the social inclusion of children who do not conform to academic and behavioral norms at school (Wettstein, Ramseier, Scherzinger, 2016).

To improve educational practices for social inclusion it is further important to investigate how social-contextual factors such as classroom norms contribute to children's thinking and reasoning about social exclusion. Therefore, we also explored how classroom-level competitive norms contributed to children's exclusion decisions and their social reasoning, above and beyond children's individual competitive attitudes. To our knowledge, this is the first study including

longitudinal data as well as social-contextual measures to investigate how competitive classroom norms and individual attitudes are related to children's exclusion decisions.

Decision Making and Social Reasoning About Social Exclusion

The present study was guided by the social reasoning developmental (SRD) perspective (Killen, Elenbaas, & Rutland, 2015; Killen & Rutland, 2011; Rutland & Killen, 2015) that aims to integrate social domain theory (Turiel, 1998) and social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). According to the social identity theory, children seek to identify with social groups and define themselves by their group-membership; therefore, they view their groups as more positive than other social groups, which can lead to in-group bias. In-group bias serves important functions such as supporting children's self-worth and contributing to children's identity development. However, in-group bias also implies that children expect group members to conform to group norms which might result in unfair exclusion of individuals who do not fit group criteria. According to social domain theory, children and adolescents not only use group-based considerations, but also refer to moral criteria when reasoning about peer group exclusion. Therefore, children's developing understanding about fairness enable them to coordinate moral concerns with group concerns and to critically evaluate exclusionary group norms from a moral point of view. In sum, one important goal of the SRD perspective is to investigate how children and adolescents weigh *moral concerns* about fairness with *group concerns*.

Research from the SRD perspective revealed that children's weighting of moral and group concerns depends on the specific characteristics of the context in which social exclusion takes place (Killen & Rutland, 2011). First, children are more likely to accept hypothetical exclusion in forced-choice contexts than in straightforward contexts. Forced-choice contexts require children to choose to include either an in-group or an out-group member. In contrast, straightforward contexts require children to choose between including or not including an out-group member. As the forced-choice context necessitates the exclusion of a peer and the straightforward context does not, the former

5 EXCLUSION OF CHILDREN WITH ACADEMIC AND BEHAVIOR DIFFICULTIES

entails greater ambiguity (Brenick & Killen, 2014; Gasser, Malti, & Buholzer, 2014; Theimer, Killen, & Stangor, 2001). Second, hypothetical exclusion based on concerns about group functioning is most likely to occur when the inclusion of the out-group child would negatively affect the attainment of peer group goals (e.g., the group would not be able to solve a difficult math task if a child with academic difficulties joined the group). In contrast, children prioritize moral concerns over concerns about group functioning if the inclusion of the out-group child does not conflict with effective group functioning (Killen & Stangor, 2001; Richardson, Hitti, Mulvey, & Killen, 2014).

Besides the situational context in which social exclusion takes place, age differences play an important role in children's thinking about social exclusion. With age children become increasingly sensitive to situational issues and are more competent in coordinating multiple considerations in their reasoning about peer group exclusion (Killen & Stangor, 2001; Malti, Killen, & Gasser, 2012). For example, in a study by Gasser, Malti and Buholzer (2014) 6-, 9-, and 12-year-old children were asked to predict exclusion of hypothetical children with disabilities in situations which varied according to the disability type of the exclusion target (mental vs. physical disability) and the type of group activity (academic, social, athletic). Results revealed that older children were more likely than younger children to consider group functioning in situations where inclusion of the child with the disability would have negative impact on effective group functioning (e.g., inclusion of a child with mental disability into an academic group activity compared to a social group activity). These findings suggest an increasing understanding in older children that effective group functioning represents an essential condition that groups can achieve their group goals and interests.

Social Exclusion Based on Academic and Behavior Difficulties

To date few, if any, studies investigated children's reasoning about exclusion of peers with *low academic achievement* and of peers with *hyperactive behavior*. Both children with academic and children with behavioral problems frequently experience social rejection (e.g., Mikami et al., 2015; Wentzel & Asher, 1995). Recent research focuses on how the social context affects these children's

victimization and rejection experiences, highlighting the role of stereotypes and peer group norms (Hinshaw & Cicchetti, 2000; Hoza, 2007; Mikami, Lerner, & Lun, 2012). From this perspective, it is important to deepen an understanding of how children think and reason about social exclusion of children with behavioral or academic difficulties.

A study by Richardson et al. (2014) investigated adolescents' moral judgments about exclusion of hypothetical peers with aggressive behavior and with low soccer ability. The study showed that adolescents were more likely to accept exclusion from a soccer club if the hypothetical exclusion target was described as aggressive compared to when it was described as having low soccer ability (Richardson et al., 2014). In addition, hypothetical exclusion of a peer with low athletic competence varied as a function of the competitiveness of the soccer club (i.e., more exclusion in competitive than non-competitive clubs), whereas exclusion of an aggressive peer did not depend on the context of exclusion. These findings suggest that children view aggression as highly aversive and thus expect exclusion of these children independently of the peer group context. In contrast, children's exclusion of a bad soccer player is only legitimate in contexts where inclusion would conflict with effective group functioning. Even though these target groups differ from ours, there are important conceptual similarities: aggression as well as hyperactive behavior are socially aversive behaviors and both low soccer ability and low achievement focus on specific competence deficits. Our study builds on this research by focusing on exclusion of students with hyperactive behavior and low academic achievement. We further extend this study by investigating how classroom-level norms contribute to children's exclusion decisions.

Competitive Classroom Norms and Competitive Individual Attitudes

Recent research highlights the role of group norms in children's social relationships and inclusion (e.g., Chen et al., 2008; Gasser & Malti, 2012; Mikami et al., 2010; Nipedal, Nesdale, & Killen, 2010). In middle childhood children increasingly attend to group norms and as a consequence, peer groups exert growing influence on children's social interactions (e.g., Abrams,

Rutland, & Cameron, 2003; Rubin, Bukowski, & Parker, 1998; Rutland, Cameron, Milne, & McGeorge, 2005). Group norms can be defined as the group members' shared expectations about attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors that group members should display (Nipedal et al., 2010). Several studies support the assumption that classroom or school norms affect children's behavioral socialization (e.g., Henry et al., 2000). For example, Salmivalli and Voeten (2004) related individual attitudes towards bullying and students' expectations of social sanctions of bullying in the classroom (classroom norms) to their individual bullying behavior and found that classroom norms predicted unique variance in bullying behavior, after controlling for individual attitudes. Moreover, research on children's intergroup attitudes revealed that inclusive school norms have positive effects on children's out-group attitudes (Nesdale & Lawson, 2011), especially in contexts where peer groups hold exclusionary norms (McGuire, Rutland, & Nesdale, 2015).

To date, there has been little research to investigate how classroom norms affect children's hypothetical exclusion decisions and reasoning about social exclusion. The present study investigated how competitive norms on the classroom level relate to children's exclusion decisions. We focused on competitive classroom norms because competitive classroom norms may enhance the salience of effective group functioning and relate to higher exclusionary behavior among children. We assessed competitive norms according to the social interdependence theory (Johnson & Johnson, 2009), in which individuals coordinate actions in order to achieve their goals in either positive (cooperative) or negative (competitive) ways. Cooperation exists when the actions of individuals support the attainment of joint goals. In contrast, competition exists when the actions of individuals impede the attainment of each other's goals. Cooperation and competition can be conceptualized as a contextual, relational or individual variable (Roseth, Johnson, & Johnson, 2008). As contextual variables they represent norms that are made salient in the school or classroom setting which might influence children's inclusion and exclusion decisions. Research revealed that cooperative compared to competitive goal structures have a positive effect on various social

outcomes, such as more advanced moral reasoning and prosocial behavior (Tichy, Johnson, Johnson, & Roseth, 2010), more interethnic interactions (Johnson & Johnson, 1981) and less victimization and aggression (Choi, Johnson, & Johnson, 2011).

As an individual variable competitive attitudes may also be expected to relate to children's exclusion decisions. To date, only the study by Richardson et al. (2014) investigated relations between individual competitive attitudes and hypothetical social exclusion. The study revealed that competitive adolescents were more likely to accept exclusion of a bad soccer player from a soccer club than non-competitive adolescents. We extend this study by focusing on academic and social school contexts and by additionally including classroom-level competitive norms.

The Upper Elementary Grades in Switzerland

Most or all of the research on children's understanding of social exclusion focused on general age differences and relied on cross-sectional designs. What has not been studied so far is how children's exclusion decisions and social reasoning relate to specific developmental tasks. The present study included children from the upper elementary grades because these grades represent a critical period with regard to children's wellbeing and academic career in countries such as Switzerland or Germany (Lohaus, Elben, Ball, & Klein-Hessling, 2004). In contrast to the American secondary school system, the Swiss or German system is characterized by "vertical differentiation", (i.e., differentiation between two or three different achievement levels). Upper elementary grade teachers decide on the basis of school tests and grades which secondary level a student will attend. Thus academic performance in the fifth and sixth grade has serious consequences for students' future academic and occupational career. As a consequence, the upper elementary grades are characterized by increasing levels of school distress which might have negative implications for classroom social relationships (Wettstein et al., in press) and students' psychological health (Ball, Lohaus, & Miebach, 2006). Therefore, the upper elementary grades in Switzerland represent an important developmental context to investigate changes in children's thinking about exclusion of

students who do not conform to academic and behavioral norms. The present study included two waves of data (fifth and sixth grade), in order to test the hypotheses within a longitudinal design.

Study Design and Hypotheses

This study had two main goals: The first main goal was to investigate how children's exclusion decisions and justification preferences (group functioning vs. fairness) change during the upper elementary grades. The second main goal was to examine how children's individual competitive attitudes and classroom-level competitive norms shape children's exclusion decisions. Children were presented with four hypothetical situations which required a decision between a child with a difficulty and a child without a difficulty. These situations were varied by difficulty type of the exclusion target (low-achieving vs. hyperactive) and (2) context of exclusion (academic vs. social). Following their decision, children had to select different types of justifications for their decision.

The study included three dependent variables: (1) *Exclusion decisions from the perspective of the story protagonist*, (2) *exclusion decisions from the perspective of self* and (3) *group preference*. We assessed exclusion from two perspectives, because previous research highlighted the importance to assess moral and psychological judgments from both the perspective of others' and the perspective of self (Krettenauer, Malti, & Sokol, 2008; Mulvey & Killen, 2015). Particularly, it has been argued that judgments from the perspective of self may be more likely to measure children's own motives, whereas judgments from the perspective of others are more likely to represent children's understanding about their peers' decisions and motives. The group preference dependent variable represented a difference score between moral- and group-related justifications and therefore indicated how children prioritize considerations about fairness with considerations about effective group functioning.

The study design further included several independent variables which pertained to three different hierarchical levels (level 1: repeated measures, level 2: child measures, and level 3: classroom measure).

The first level (L1) consisted of three *repeated measure variables* which represented a difficulty type (low-achieving vs. hyperactive) x context (academic vs. social) x grade (fifth vs. sixth grade) factorial design. First, we expected that children would be more likely to exclude hyperactive peers than low-achieving peers, because children perceive hyperactive behavior – similar to aggressive behavior – as highly negative (hypothesis 1) (e.g., Hoza et al., 2007). Second, based on previous research (Gasser et al., 2014; Killen & Stangor, 2001), we expected that children would increasingly coordinate the type of difficulty with the context of exclusion as they move from the fifth into the sixth grade (as indicated by a grade x difficulty type x context interaction). More specifically, we hypothesized that children in the fifth grade would differentiate for difficulty type (i.e., would be more likely to exclude hyperactive than low-achieving peers), but would be less likely to consider the context of exclusion. In contrast, we expected that children in the sixth grade would be more likely to exclude low achieving peers in academic compared to social contexts, because of the negative costs for academic group functioning. Still, we expected that in the sixth grade children would strongly exclude hypothetical peers with hyperactive behavior, independent of the context, because of the negative perception of hyperactive peers. This hypothesis was based on the assumption that increasing academic stress in the upper elementary grades enhances children's sensitivity of how inclusion of peers with academic and behavior difficulties might negatively affect effective group functioning. Therefore, children should more carefully consider the situational context of exclusion as they moved into the sixth grade (hypothesis 2).

At the second level (L2) we further included three *child measures*: self-rated competitive attitudes and teacher-rated academic and behavior problems. With regard to children's competitive

attitudes we expected that the effect of individual competitive attitudes would depend on the situational aspects of social exclusion. More specifically, we hypothesized that children would frequently exclude hyperactive peers, irrespective of their competitive attitudes (hypothesis 3a), because children generally hold negative attitudes towards peers with hyperactive behavior (Hoza, 2007). In contrast, we expected that children with high compared to low competitive attitudes would be more likely to exclude low-achieving peers (hypothesis 3b). We also expected that competitive attitudes would exert stronger influence in academic compared to social group contexts (hypothesis 3c), because competition is more likely to occur in school contexts than during leisure time.

We controlled for students' own academic and behavior difficulties, because children with and without these difficulties might have different inclusion and exclusion preferences. Children tend to affiliate with peers with similar behavioral and academic characteristics (e.g., Ryan, 2001). As a consequence, high-achieving and behaviorally adjusted children might be more likely to include peers who conform to school norms. In contrast, low-achieving and hyperactive children might prefer peers with similar academic and behavior difficulties.

At the third level (L3), we included competitive norms as a *classroom variable*. Peer relation research revealed that hyperactive children often experience social rejection irrespective of classroom norms (Stormshak et al., 1999). In contrast, low-achieving children are more likely to experience social rejection in groups or classrooms where high-achieving norms are salient (Chen, Chang, & He, 2003; Chen, Chang, Liu, & He, 2008; Dijkstra & Gest, 2015). Thus, we expected that children with low achievement would be more likely excluded in classrooms with high competitive norms (hypothesis 4a), but that classroom norms would not significantly predict the exclusion of children with hyperactive behavior (hypothesis 4b). Finally, as for individual attitudes, we expected that competitive classroom norms more clearly relate to social exclusion in the academic than the social context (hypothesis 4c). As children's hypothetical exclusion decision is conceptually closely

related to children's preference for group functioning (Killen & Rutland, 2011), the same hypotheses were tested for group preference as for other- and self-related exclusion decisions.

Method

Sample

The sample included 1,009 upper elementary school children (50% girls) from Switzerland who were educated in inclusive classrooms (i.e., classrooms with at least one child who received additional assistance from a special needs educator). Children were drawn from 55 classrooms. The study included two waves of data collection: students were first assessed in the fifth grade ($M_{\text{age}} = 11.54$, $SD = 0.56$) and again in the sixth grade ($M_{\text{age}} = 12.58$, $SD = 0.56$) in spring 2013 respectively, spring 2014. Thirty-nine percent of the participants were of non-Swiss nationality (Kosovo: 21%, Portugal: 11%, Serbia: 10%, Germany: 9%, Italy: 7%, Macedonia: 7%, Turkey: 5%, other nationalities: 30%). The average number of students per classroom was 19.6 at wave one and 20.1 at wave two.

1,209 children participated in the first wave (17% dropout). This dropout was mainly due to seven teachers who declined participation in the second wave. The Little's MCAR test (Little, 1988) was conducted in order to investigate if this dropout was systematic. As the test was significant, for each study variable we investigated if it predicted participation at wave two. Results showed that children who participated in the second wave were more cooperative and less competitive. Moreover, children who referred to group functioning in the social group activity were less likely to participate at the second wave. All other decisions and justification variables did not significantly predict study participation at the second wave.

Parents were informed about the goals of the study and were asked to sign and return a form if they did not want their child to participate. Parent letters were translated into the most common immigrant languages in Switzerland. Participation rate was 99% at wave one and wave two. Student teachers visited the classes for two hours at both time points and used standardized instructions.

First, they informed the children about the goals of the study (e.g., how children think about specific social situations) and instructed them that there were no right or wrong answers to the study questions. Moreover, the children were informed about the procedure (e.g., duration, what to do when finished) and they were ensured that their answers would stay anonymous. Children received a student magazine in appreciation of their participation in the study.

Measures

Exclusion decision (other and self). The scenarios were adapted from (citation withheld for blind-review) and have been validated in previous research (citation withheld for blind-review). Children were presented with four social exclusion scenarios which varied according to difficulty type of the hypothetical exclusion target (hyperactive vs. low achieving) and context of exclusion (academic vs. social) at both time points (fifth and sixth grade). Separate versions for boys and girls were used and matched for the child's sex. In the two scenarios about the academic group activity, students have to solve difficult mathematical tasks in groups of three; the protagonist and his friend are looking for someone to complete their group and two children ask to participate (i.e., one with and one without difficulty). In the two scenarios about the social group activity two children have a remaining cinema ticket and again two children ask to be included. In both situations, the group protagonist has to decide whether to include the child with a difficulty or the child without a difficulty. The exclusion target was either described as hyperactive or as low achieving. The descriptions of the difficulties were adapted from research on children's understanding of disabilities (e.g., Smith & Williams, 2005). For example, the academic group activity scenario with a hyperactive exclusion target (a) and the social group activity with a low-achieving exclusion target (b) were described as follows:

- (a) "During a math lesson children have to work on difficult tasks in groups of three. Lars and his friend want to work together and are looking for a third child to complete the group. Thomas and Michael both want to join the group. Thomas gets angry easily and has difficulties in sitting

quietly. He often interrupts the teacher and talks without being asked. In contrast, Michael has no difficulties to stay quiet and does not get angry quickly.”

(b) “Christian and his friend want to go to the cinema in the afternoon. Christian has one remaining cinema ticket and is looking for a third child to join the group. Frank and Peter want to join the group. Frank has academic difficulties. He needs more time and help to complete academic tasks. In contrast, Peter is good at school.”

Children were first asked to predict inclusion or exclusion from the perspective of the protagonist (“Who do you think Lars will select?”) and then from their own perspective if they were the protagonist (“If you were Lars, how would you decide?”).

Group preference. Subsequently, children were asked for their preferences for different types of justifications (“Why would Lars choose Thomas/ Michael?”). The same justification items were used for the two targets (child with and without difficulties), except that the names were replaced. However, the child was directed to respond only to those items which matched the child’s prior decision. For example, if the child chose Michael (the typical child), it was asked why he or she chose Michael. We presented children with four items representing four justification types (moral, group functioning, group identity, or personal) (Killen & Rutland, 2011): (a) “because it would be unfair otherwise and Thomas/ Michael could be sad” (moral), (b) “because one cannot work well with Thomas/ Michael” (group functioning), (c) “because Thomas/ Michael doesn’t fit into the group well” (group identity), and (d) “because everyone can decide on his own with whom to work” (personal). More than one justification could be chosen. To limit the length of the questionnaire, we only assessed justification preferences for exclusion from the perspective of self.

Only moral justification and group functioning showed moderate relations to exclusion decision ($r = -.39^{***}$ and $r = .48^{***}$). Moreover, previous research on social exclusion (as outlined above) revealed that the conflict between morality and group functioning is most important to explain children’s exclusion decisions, because it reflects how children weight considerations about

the harming consequences of exclusion with consideration about necessary conditions that peer groups can achieve their goals (Brenick & Killen, 2014; Gasser et al., 2014; Park & Killen, 2010). In order to create a score which represented children's preference for either moral concerns or group functioning, we combined the two justifications to a single measure by subtracting moral justifications from group functioning. Therefore a positive score indicated that children prioritized group functioning over moral concerns.

Individual competitive attitudes and competitive classroom norms. The scales to assess competitive and cooperative attitudes were adapted from Johnson and Norem-Hebeisen (1977) and consisted of three items each (e.g., "I like to help other students learn", "I like to do better work than other students"). The scales were measured at both waves. The Cronbach's alphas' were $\alpha = .78$ (T1) and $\alpha = .77$ (T2) for cooperative attitudes and $\alpha = .71$ (T1) and $\alpha = .73$ (T2) for competitive behavior, respectively. The scales were significantly correlated between wave one and wave two (cooperative attitudes: $r = .38^{***}$, competitive attitudes: $r = .52^{***}$) supporting retest reliability of the scales. As we included the attitudes scales as predictors for children's exclusion decisions we averaged the scales across time. Research revealed that the two scales represent a multidimensional rather than a unidimensional measure and as a consequence the same student may negatively or positively value both competition and cooperation (Johnson & Norem-Hebeisen, 1977). In order to create a score which indicates children's preference for competition over cooperation, we subtracted cooperative attitudes from competitive attitudes. Thus, positive scores indicated preference for competition, whereas negative scores indicated preference for cooperation. The reliability of this difference score was .75. In order to create a score for classroom competitive norms, we aggregated children's competitive attitudes at the classroom level. In order to standardize these classroom norms, we centered this variable at the grand-mean of the sample. As we were simultaneously analyzing children's individual competitive attitudes, this variable was centered on

the class mean level. This procedure allowed us to disentangle within-class and between-class effects of student's individual competitive attitudes with respect to classroom competitive norms.

Hyperactive Behavior and Academic Achievement. To assess hyperactive behavior, teachers responded to five items on the hyperactivity scale from the SDQ (Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire; Goodman, 1997) for teachers (e.g., "Often loses temper," "Restless, overactive, cannot stay still for long"). The items were answered on a three-point scale (not true, somewhat true, certainly true) and Cronbach's alpha was $\alpha = .88$ for T1 and $\alpha = .85$ for T2. Academic performance was measured by three items ("Performing academically at grade level," "Able to read grade level material and answer questions about what he/she has read," "Able to solve grade level math problems") (Hughes, Dyer, Luo, & Kwok, 2009). Teachers responded to these items on a five-point response scale (almost always - almost never). Cronbach's alpha was $\alpha = .94$ for both T1 and T2. The scales had high retest-reliability (hyperactive behavior: $r = .78^{***}$, academic achievement: $r = .89^{***}$) and thus were aggregated across grade.

Data Analytic Approach

The data structure consisted of three levels: (1) the repeated measures, (2) the individual, and (3) the classroom. We analyzed three dependent variables: Two dichotomous exclusion measures (decisions from the perspective of other and self) and one continuous measure (preference for group functioning). For the dichotomous measures, we used hierarchical binary logistic models and for the continuous measure, we used hierarchical linear model. As it is likely that the three repeated measures of a person are more similar within that person than between different children, we first tested for each dependent variable, whether the result depended on characteristics of the child. The $ICC(1)$

values that reflect the proportion of the overall variance that is explained by characteristics of the child (Bliese, 2000) were $ICC(1)_{\text{Peers}} = 0.11^1$, $ICC(1)_{\text{Self}} = 0.13$, $ICC(1)_{\text{Group functioning}} = 0.18$.

Moreover, we investigated whether the children of a specific classroom were more similar in their exclusion decisions and their reasoning than children between different classrooms. Again, we calculated the $ICC(1)$ values that express how much of the total variance can be explained by characteristics of the classrooms. This value was only $ICC(1) = 0.01$ percent for each dependent variable; however, as we were analyzing cross-level interactions with predictor variables at the classroom levels, we still included the third level in our analysis. As we also had specific assumptions regarding children's changes in their decisions and reasoning from the fifth to the sixth grade, we tested, whether there was significant variance in these changes between the children. As this was the case for all our dependent variables, we chose a basic model with varying intercepts and slopes represented to analyze our data.

To analyze our data, we used the software HLM, and for each of the three dependent variables, we tested our hypothesis in a stepwise approach. In all analyses, we controlled for teacher-rated hyperactive behavior and academic achievement. Thereby, hyperactive behavior was excluded from all analyses, because none of the effects were significant. Moreover, as sex only significantly predicted group preference ($b = 0.06$, $SE = 0.06$, $p < .05$), we present the results of the model without children's sex. Therefore, the final model for each of the three dependent variables (see Table 2) only included significant effects. With regard to the effect sizes of the hypothesized interaction effects, for the two dichotomous dependent variables (exclusion decisions from the perspective of other and self) we report the odds ratios (OR) of the significant simple slopes as measures of the

¹ For logistic link models with binary outcomes, the $ICC(1)$ is calculated with the formula $\sigma^2 / (\sigma^2 + \pi^2/3)$, as this reflects the variance of a standard logistic distribution (Skron dal & Hesketh, 2004).

effect sizes of the interaction effects. For the continuous dependent variable preference for group functioning we report partial η^2 . Descriptive statistics are displayed in Table 1.

Results

Exclusion from the Perspective of Other

Level-1: Repeated Measures. The results of the hierarchical binary logistic analysis supported hypothesis 1 (see Table 2): Hyperactive peers were more likely to be excluded than low achieving peers. In line with hypothesis 2, there was a significant three-way interaction between grade, difficulty type of the exclusion target and context of exclusion. In order to better understand the nature of this interaction, we plotted the different slopes following the procedure of Aiken and West (1991). As we conducted multiple slopes tests for each hypothesis, we applied the Bonferroni correction to adjust the alpha level to the number of simple slope analyses that were used to test a specific hypothesis. Figure 1 shows that, over time, low-achieving peers were increasingly excluded in the academic context ($B = 0.85$, $SE = 0.12$, $p < .001$, $OR = 2.34$, $CI[95\%] = 1.87, 2.93$), but not in the social context. Thereby, low achieving peers were twice as likely to be excluded from a math task in the sixth grade as in the fifth grade, as the odds ratio indicates. In contrast, hyperactive peers were more likely excluded over time (academic context: $B = 0.46$, $SE = 0.15$, $p = .003$, $OR = 1.59$, $CI[95\%] = 1.18, 2.14$; social context: $B = 0.63$, $SE = 0.16$, $p < .001$, $OR = 1.89$, $CI[95\%] = 1.39, 2.57$), but their probability for being excluded was independent of the context (fifth grade: $B = -0.06$, $SE = 0.14$, $p = .68$; sixth grade: $B = 0.12$, $SE = 0.16$, $p = .47$) (see Figure 1). Consequently, these findings support hypothesis 2, that – over time – children would increasingly coordinate the type of difficulty of the exclusion target with the context of exclusion.

Level 2: Child measures. The findings (see Table 2) further showed that exclusion not only depended on the context of exclusion and type of difficulty of the exclusion target, but also on the individual competitive attitudes of the child. A significant two-way interaction between difficulty

type and individual competitive attitudes and the subsequent slopes tests indicated that, in line with hypothesis 3a, exclusion of hyperactive peers was independent of individual competitive attitudes ($B = -0.12$, $SE = 0.07$, $p = .10$) (see Figure 2). In contrast, individual competitive attitudes significantly predicted exclusion if the exclusion target was low-achieving ($B = 0.17$, $SE = 0.06$, $p = .002$, $OR = 1.19$, $CI[95\%] = 1.06, 1.33$), supporting hypothesis 3b (see Figure 2). Hypothesis 3c was not supported, as the effect of individual competitive attitudes on children's exclusion decisions was not moderated by the context of exclusion (see Table 2). Finally, teacher-reported academic achievement significantly predicted social exclusion (see Table 2): children with higher academic achievement were more likely to exclude hypothetical peers with difficulties.

Level-3: Classroom Measure. No significant effects of competitive classroom norms were found (see Table 2); thus, hypotheses 4a, 4b, and 4c were not supported.

Exclusion from the Perspective of Self

Level-1: Repeated Measures. In line with hypothesis 1 we found that hyperactive peers were more likely to be excluded than low-achieving peers (see Table 2). The analysis further revealed a significant three-way interaction between grade, type of difficulty and context. The plot of this interaction (see Figure 3) and the results of subsequent simple slopes analyses suggest that peers with low-achievement were less frequently excluded in the social context over time ($B = -0.46$, $SE = 0.10$, $p < .001$, $OR = 0.63$, $CI[95\%] = 0.52, 0.77$). Furthermore, while children in the fifth grade did not differentiate between the context, children in the sixth grade were less likely to exclude low-achieving targets in the social context than in the academic context ($B = -0.44$, $SE = 0.10$, $p < .001$, $OR = 0.64$, $CI[95\%] = 0.53, 0.78$). In contrast, exclusion of peers with hyperactive behavior was high, independent of context (fifth grade: $B = -0.18$, $SE = 0.12$, $p = .13$; sixth grade: $B = 0.03$, $SE = 0.12$, $p = .81$), and did not significantly change over time (academic context: $B = -0.10$, $SE = 0.12$, $p = .40$; social context: $B = 0.10$, $SE = 0.12$, $p = .39$). Taken together, these findings support hypothesis 2 that children increasingly coordinated type of difficulty with context of exclusion.

Level 2: Child Measures. Children's competitive attitudes significantly predicted their exclusion decisions: Supporting hypothesis 3a and 3b, children with higher competitive attitudes were more likely to exclude low-achieving peers than children with low competitive attitudes ($B = 0.38$, $SE = 0.06$, $p < .001$, $OR = 1.47$, $CI[95\%] = 1.31, 1.64$), but did not differ with regard to hypothetical peers with hyperactive behavior ($B = 0.01$, $SE = 0.06$, $p = .95$) (see Figure 4a). Hypothesis 3c that individual competitive attitudes would predict higher exclusion in academic contexts was not supported (see Table 2).

Level-3: Classroom Measure. Classroom-level norms significantly predicted exclusion according to the difficulty type of the excluded peer (see Figure 4b). In support of hypothesis 4a, simple slope tests revealed that classroom competitive attitudes predicted exclusion only if the exclusion target was low-achieving ($B = 0.77$, $SE = 0.18$, $p < .001$, $OR = 2.17$, $CI[95\%] = 1.51, 3.10$). In particular, in classrooms that were one standard deviation above the mean level of competitive classroom norms, peers with low academic achievement were more than twice as likely to be excluded compared to classrooms that were less competitive than average. In contrast, exclusion of hyperactive peers was independent of individual or classroom competitive attitudes ($B = -0.02$, $SE = 0.20$, $p = .93$), supporting hypothesis 4b. However, hypothesis 4c was not supported, as there was no significant interaction of classroom norms and context of exclusion (see Table 2).

Preference for Group Functioning

Level-1: Repeated measures. We further analyzed children's preferences for group functioning as compared to their preferences for moral justifications. Consistent with hypothesis 1, children showed higher preferences for group functioning in situations with a hyperactive exclusion target than in situations with low achieving exclusion target (see Table 2). Moreover, similarly to the results for children's exclusion decisions, there was a significant three-way interaction between grade, difficulty type and context of exclusion ($\eta^2_p = .01$). Figure 5 and the respective simple slopes tests showed that, while children in the fifth grade did not differentiate between the context for low

achieving peers ($B = -0.04$, $SE = 0.03$, $p = .13$), children in the sixth grade were less likely to prefer group functioning in the social context than in the academic context when the exclusion target was low-achieving ($B = -0.08$, $SE = 0.03$, $p = .005$). In contrast, children in the sixth grade did not differentiate between contexts for hyperactive exclusion targets ($B = 0.02$, $SE = 0.03$, $p = .58$). However, and contrary to hypothesis 2, children in the fifth grade were more likely to justify the exclusion of peers with hyperactive behavior with considerations of group functioning in the academic than in the social context ($B = -0.10$, $SE = 0.03$, $p < .001$). Thus, hypothesis 2 was only partially confirmed.

Level 2: Child Measures. In line with hypothesis 3a and 3b, a significant interaction between individual competitive attitudes and difficulty type ($\eta^2_P = .01$) and the subsequent slopes tests revealed that individual competitive attitudes predicted group functioning only if the exclusion target was low-achieving ($B = 0.12$, $SE = 0.02$, $p < .001$) (see Figure 6a). Furthermore, a significant interaction (Table 2) indicated that individual competitive attitudes significantly predicted preference for group functioning ($\eta^2_P = .02$) in the academic ($B = 0.12$, $SE = 0.02$, $p < .001$) and the social context ($B = 0.08$, $SE = 0.02$, $p < .001$), whereby Figure 7a suggests, that this effect was stronger for the academic context. Thus, hypothesis 3c was supported.

In addition, the analysis revealed a significant positive effect of teacher-reported academic achievement on children's preference for group functioning (see Table 2).

Level-3: Classroom Measure. Classroom-level competitive norms significantly interacted ($\eta^2_P = .01$) with the difficulty type of the exclusion target (see Table 2), whereby low-achieving peers were more likely to be excluded in classrooms with competitive norms than in classrooms with less competitive norms ($B = 0.22$, $SE = 0.06$, $p < .001$), while classroom norms did not predict the exclusion of hyperactive peers ($B = 0.11$, $SE = 0.06$, $p = .09$) (see Figure 6b). These findings support hypotheses 4a and 4b. Consistent with hypothesis 4c, a two-way interaction between classroom-level competitive norms and context of exclusion ($\eta^2_P = .02$) and the respective

interaction plot (see Figure 7b) with the slopes tests revealed that competitive classroom norms only significantly and positively predicted group functioning in the academic context ($B = 0.22$, $SE = 0.06$, $p < .001$) while no significant associations between competitive classroom norms and group preferences were found for the social context ($B = 0.01$, $SE = 0.06$, $p = .86$).

Discussion

The present study is the first to compare children's thinking about the exclusion of children with low-academic abilities and hyperactive behavior in two different contexts (academic vs. social). The results of this study indicate that, overall, the hyperactive peer was more excluded than the low-achieving peer. Moreover, children were more likely to prioritize effective group functioning over moral concerns if the exclusion target was hyperactive than if it was low-achieving.

These findings parallel previous research indicating that children hold negative attitudes towards hyperactive peers (e.g., Harnum, Duffy, & Ferguson, 2007; Hoza, 2007). For example, 11-12-year old children often attribute negative characteristics (e.g., careless, crazy) and avoid to engage with them in social or academic activities (Law, Sinclair, & Fraser, 2007). One possible explanation for these findings is that children view hyperactive behaviors such as interrupting others, making noises or fidgeting as disruptive and as conflicting with the smooth and effective functioning of social interactions. Hyperactive children also display higher rates of aggressive behavior such as teasing or hitting, and as a consequence, peer problems arise quickly (Hoza, 2007). In contrast to hyperactive behavior, low achievement is not directly associated with social competence deficits and does not generally have negative consequences for peer group activities.

A second explanation for children's negative views of hyperactive children may lie in their social-cognitive conceptions about disabilities. 11-12-year old children strongly explain hyperactive behavior through social and psychological causes and belief that these behaviors are controllable. In contrast, they explain learning disabilities with biological causes and view them as less controllable (Smith & Williams, 2005). In conclusion, children ascribe more intentionality and

responsibility to children who show hyperactive behavior compared to children who perform low in school.

Extending previous research on social exclusion, the design of our study included two waves, which allowed us to longitudinally investigate children's thinking about social exclusion. As hypothesized, the coordination of difficulty type of exclusion target (low-achieving vs. hyperactive) and exclusion context (academic vs. social) increased when children moved from the fifth to the sixth grade. Children in the fifth grade differentiated between difficulty type (e.g., higher levels of exclusion of the hyperactive compared to the low-achieving peer), but did not consistently consider the context of exclusion. Children in the sixth grade more carefully evaluated if inclusion of the low-achieving peer would negatively impact on academic group functioning. More, specifically, children in the sixth grade expected more exclusion of the low-achieving peer in the academic compared to the social context. In contrast, exclusion of the hyperactive peer was nearly independent of the context (academic vs. social).

These findings support previous research showing that, with age, children and adolescents increasingly consider the specific characteristics of the peer group context (Gasser et al., 2014; Killen & Rutland, 2011; Killen & Stangor, 2001; Nucci & Turiel, 2009). For example, 12-years old children were more likely than 6- or 9-years old children to consider if inclusion of a child with a specific disability (mental vs. physical) negatively affects different types of group activities (cognitive, social, athletic). Similarly, seventh graders, as compared to fourth or first graders, were more likely to differentiate between situations where inclusion of an out-group member would have negative consequences for effective group functioning (Killen & Stangor, 2001). These findings have been explained by children's growing executive and reflective capacities which allow them to consider multiple considerations simultaneously and to respond to moral conflicts in more specific ways (Richardson, Mulvey, & Killen, 2012). Moreover, during late childhood and early adolescence, peer relationships increase in significance, whereby older children and early adolescents

become more sensitive to group concerns than younger children. This developmental trend may explain why older children and early adolescents frequently refer to stereotypes and group concerns in peer exclusion contexts (Killen & Rutland, 2011; Richardson et al., 2014).

Previous research mainly focused on general age effects and did not specifically investigate children's social and moral reasoning with regard to specific developmental tasks, such as coping with the academic pressure during the upper elementary grades. Little is known about the social costs of these increasing levels of academic stress during that period. During the two upper elementary school years in Switzerland, teachers decide about students' assignment to different secondary school types with different achievement levels. As these different academic levels of secondary school closely relate to children's opportunities for participating in higher education, these decisions are highly significant for children's future academic and occupational career. Previous research has shown that upper elementary grade students from Germany experience growing levels of internalizing and externalizing behaviors (Lohaus et al., 2004). Moreover, a recent study from Switzerland revealed that students in the sixth grade reported more student misbehavior, more teacher aggression and less supportive classroom relationships than students from the fifth grade (Wettstein et al., 2016). Therefore, our finding that children's coordination of difficulty type and context increased as children moved to the sixth grade may indicate that children are increasingly sensitive to possible conflicts between academic and social goals during the upper elementary grades.

Independently from grade when children were assessed, exclusion from the perspective of self was much lower than exclusion from the perspective of other (62% vs. 80%). Children's tendency to expect less exclusion from the perspective of self than from the perspective of other was also found in previous research (e.g., Mulvey & Killen 2015) and reflects the well-known social psychological phenomenon, according to which individual tend to see themselves in a more positive light in order to avoid cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957). Therefore, teachers should take this discrepancy into

consideration when discussing peer group conflicts with their students. In order to enhance children's ability to critically reflect on their own decisions and motivations for social exclusion, it is important that teachers systematically relate social and moral discussions to children's life and personal experiences of peer group exclusion (Nucci, 2009).

The study further revealed that classroom-level competitive norms predicted exclusion and justification preferences beyond and above individual competitive attitudes. These findings are consistent with previous research indicating that peer group or classroom norms predict children's or adolescents' prosocial or aggressive behavior (e.g., Henry et al., 2000; Stormshak et al., 1999). For example, a short-term longitudinal study showed that individual and classroom-level normative beliefs about relational aggression predicted relational aggression 1 year later in late childhood and early adolescence (Werner & Hill, 2010). However, most of this research focused on social behavioral norms (e.g., aggregated aggressive or prosocial behavior) and did not include academic norms such as classmates' preferences for academic competition or cooperation.

Research on the basis of social interdependence theory provides strong support that teachers can influence children's social relationship and classroom climate through different learning instructions (Roseth et al., 2008). For example, a cooperative learning setting resulted in more cross-group interactions between children with and without special educational needs compared to children who received competitive instructions. Moreover, children without disabilities who experienced cooperative learning were more likely to show helping behavior and sympathy towards children with disabilities compared to children who worked in competitive settings (Johnson & Johnson, 1982). Therefore, social acceptance or rejection of children with special educational needs may depend on whether teachers use cooperative or competitive learning instructions. However, due to the low effect size the classroom-level effects should be interpreted with caution. Competitive classroom norms represent only one aspect of children's social environment that can influence their thinking about social exclusion of peers with academic and behavior difficulties. Other social-

contextual variables such as classroom climate or teachers' attitudes towards children with difficulties or disabilities might also relate to children's exclusion decisions (e.g., White & Jones, 2000).

Our study also showed that children's competitive attitudes showed stronger and more consistent relationships with social exclusion than classroom-level competitive attitudes. This is not surprising, because individual goals are more proximal predictors for children's motivation and behavior than classroom-level goals (Meece, Anderman, & Anderman, 2006). Future research is necessary to investigate how classroom-level characteristics (e.g., classroom climate) contribute to the development of individual competitive and cooperative attitudes.

As expected, effects of classroom-level and individual competitive attitudes were context-specific. First, classroom-level competitive norms predicted preference for group functioning only in the academic context and not in the social context. Second, the negative effects of classroom-level and individual competitive attitudes were higher for exclusion of the low-achieving peer than exclusion of the hyperactive peer. Exclusion of the hyperactive peer was less likely to depend on competitive attitudes and classroom norms. Again, this finding indicates that exclusion of hyperactive peers is less likely to depend on social-contextual factors than exclusion of low-achieving peers. This does not mean that the group level is irrelevant for social inclusion of hyperactive children. However, our results might suggest that social rejection of hyperactive children is more difficult to address and that individual social skills training should be combined with group-level interventions (Killen & Malti, 2015). Finally, we found that teacher-rated academic achievement predicted social exclusion and preferences for effective group functioning. This finding might reflect children's preference to affiliate with peers with similar personal characteristics. These selection processes with regard to academic characteristics are well-supported in the literature on the homophily hypothesis (e.g., Ryan, 2001). Thus, low-achieving children might be more willing to include peers with similar academic competences. Furthermore, children with low-achievement and

hyperactive behavior may have more experience with the harming consequences of social exclusion and thus less likely to accept exclusion than children without these difficulties (e.g., Killen & Malti, 2015).

Surprisingly, teacher-rated hyperactivity was unrelated to children exclusion decisions. As hyperactive behavior has a strong negative connotation (Hoza, 2007), children who show high hyperactive behavior may prefer to affiliate with behaviorally adjusted peers. Moreover, research revealed that hyperactive children may overestimate their social performance because of a lack of self-reflection and low social perception (Hoza, Waschbusch, Pelham, Molina, & Milich, 2000). As a consequence, hyperactive children might misperceive their social status in the classroom (Hoza et al., 2005). This bias towards perceiving social relations more positively than they actually are, might explain why children with hyperactive behavior show similar inclusion preferences as peers without hyperactive behavior.

Limitations

The study has several limitations: First, the study included only two waves. More extensive longitudinal studies, which include several measurement points, are necessary to reveal a more comprehensive picture about how children balance social and academic goals with regard to the social exclusion of children who do not conform to relevant school norms. Second, analyses on sample attrition revealed that children from competitive classrooms were more likely to drop out which might have resulted in biased estimations. Third, the present study did not differentiate between different peer groups within classrooms. Peer groups may differ to the degree they identify with competitive or cooperative group norms. Therefore, it is important for future research to investigate how affiliation with specific peer groups influences children's judgments and social reasoning about social exclusion. Forth, our study focused on hypothetical situations and not on real-life contexts. The use of hypothetical scenarios is the most common methodology within moral psychology. It allows to systematically vary situational characteristics and to standardize the

conditions across participants. Moreover, interviews or questionnaires about hypothetical situations allow for insights into children's motives for their (im)moral actions. Even though previous research revealed that children's thinking about hypothetical moral conflicts is related to their social behavior (e.g., Malti & Krettenauer, 2013), one cannot expect a direct link between hypothetical and real-life exclusion. In particular, in addition to children's social reasoning, other social competencies (e.g., emotions such as empathy) may also influence children's decisions in real situations.

Conclusions

Despite these limitations, the study was the first to investigate how classroom-level and individual competitive attitudes relate to children's exclusion decisions and social reasoning low-achieving and hyperactive peers. Moreover, the findings provide insights into how children's exclusion decisions change before the transition from elementary to secondary school. The study is based on a longitudinal design and therefore extends previous research on social exclusion which mostly relied on cross-sectional data (e.g., Killen & Rutland, 2011). Most of the research on moral development focuses on the individual. More research using a contextual analytical approach to moral development is necessary to extend our knowledge about how classmates or teachers contribute to children's moral development, (e.g., Gasser & Malti, 2012).

The findings of this study have implications for teaching practice: In order to prevent social exclusion it is important that teachers are aware of the possible negative effects of academic pressure on children's inclusive attitudes. Thus, the findings suggest that teachers would improve the social participation of their students if they do not focus exclusively on academic goals, but also think about how they can provide social and emotional support to students, especially in times of increasing academic expectations (such as the upper elementary grades in Switzerland). Cooperative learning formats might represent a promising teaching method in order to foster children's experiences that fairness, social inclusion and effective academic group functioning are not exclusive goals. Teachers' role in cooperative learning situations could include modeling

inclusive behavior and supporting children to solve social group conflicts in constructive ways (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Ladd, 2015). In contrast, teachers who focus on competition tend to disentangle academic and social learning (Rose et al., 2008). As a consequence, peer interactions are excluded from the classroom and are transferred to hallways, canteens and home way. In these non-academic contexts children may lack the experience of positive adult models and instructions about how to relate to each other without excluding those who do not conform to academic and behavior school norms.

References

- 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. doi: 10.1046/j.1467-8624.2003.00641.x
- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Ball, J., Lohaus, A., & Miebach, C. (2006). Psychische Anpassung und schulische Leistungen beim Wechsel von der Grundschule zur weiterführenden Schule [Psychological adjustment and school achievement during transition from elementary to secondary school]. *Zeitschrift für Entwicklungspsychologie und Pädagogische Psychologie, 38*, 101–109. doi: 10.1026/0049-8637.38.3.101
- Bliese, P. D. (2000). Within-group agreement, non-independence, and reliability: Implications for data aggregation and analysis. In K. J. Klein & S. W. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations* (pp. 349–381). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brenick, A., & Killen, M. (2014). Moral judgments about Jewish-Arab intergroup exclusion: The role of cultural identity and contact. *Developmental Psychology, 50*, 86–99. doi: 10.1037/a0034702
- Chen, X., Chang, L., & He, Y. (2003). The peer group as a context: Mediating and moderating effects on relations between academic achievement and social functioning in Chinese children. *Child Development, 74*, 710–727. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00564
- Chen, X., Chang, L., Liu, H., & He, Y. (2008). Effects of the peer group on the development of social functioning and academic achievement: A longitudinal study in Chinese children. *Child Development, 79*, 235–251. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01123.x
- Choi, J., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (2011). Relationships among cooperative learning experiences, social interdependence, children's aggression, victimization, and prosocial

- behaviors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 41, 976–1003. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00744.x
- Dijkstra, J. K., & Gest, S. D. (2015). Peer norm salience for academic achievement, prosocial behavior, and bullying: Implications for adolescent school experiences. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 35, 79–96. doi:10.1177/0272431614524303.
- Estell, D. B., Jones, M. H., Pearl, R. A., Van Acker, R., Farmer, T. W., & Rodkin, P. R. (2008). Peer groups, popularity, and social preference: Trajectories of social functioning among students with and without learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 41, 5–14. doi:10.1177/0022219407310993
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gasser, L., & Malti, T. (2012). Children's and their friends' moral reasoning: Relations with aggressive behavior. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 36, 358–366. doi:10.1177/0165025412448353
- Gasser, L., Malti, T., & Buholzer, A. (2014). Swiss children's moral and psychological judgments about exclusion of children with disabilities. *Child Development*, 85, 532–548. doi:10.1111/cdev.12124
- Goodman, R. (1997). The strengths and difficulties questionnaire: A research note. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 38, 581–586. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.1997.tb01545.x
- Harnum, M., Duffy, J., & Ferguson, D. A. (2007). Adults' versus children's perceptions of a child with autism or attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 37, 1337–1343. doi: 10.1007/s10803-006-0273-0
- Henry, D., Guerra, N., Huesmann, R., Tolan, P., VanAcker, R., & Eron, L. (2000). Normative influences on aggression in urban elementary school classrooms. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 28, 59–81. doi: 10.1023/A:1005142429725

- Hinshaw, S. P., & Cicchetti, D. (2000). Stigma and mental disorder: Conceptions of illness, public attitudes, personal disclosure, and social policy. *Development and Psychopathology*, 12, 555–598. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004028>
- Hoza, B. (2007) Peer functioning in children with ADHD. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 32, 655–663. doi:10.1093/jpepsy/jsm024
- Hoza, B., Mrug, S., Gerdes, A. C., Hinshaw, S. P., Bukowski, W. M., Gold, J. A., ... Arnold, L. E. (2005). What Aspects of Peer Relationships Are Impaired in Children With Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73, 411–423. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.73.3.411>
- Hoza, B., Waschbusch, D. A., Pelham, W. E., Molina, B. S., & Milich, R. (2000). Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity disorder and control boys' responses to social success and failure. *Child Development*, 71, 432–446. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00155>
- Hughes, J. N., Dyer, N., Luo, W., & Kwok, O. M. (2009). Effects of peer academic reputation on achievement in academically at-risk elementary students. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 30, 182–194. doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2008.12.008
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1981). Effects of cooperative and individualistic learning experiences on interethnic interaction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73, 444–449. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.73.3.444
- Johnson, R. T., & Johnson, D. W. (1982). Effects of cooperative and competitive learning experiences on interpersonal attraction between handicapped and nonhandicapped students. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 116, 211–219. doi:10.1080/00224545.1982.9922773
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2009). An educational psychology success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning. *Educational Researcher*, 38, 365–379. doi:10.3102/0013189X09339057

- Johnson, D. W., &Norem-Hebeisen, A. (1977).Attitudes toward interdependence among persons and psychological health.*Psychological Reports*, 40, 843–850. doi:10.2466/pr0.1977.40.3.843
- Killen, M., Elenbaas, L., &Rutland, A. (2015). Balancing the fair treatment of others while preserving group identity and autonomy.*Human Development*, 58, 253–272. doi: 10.1159/000444151
- Killen, M., Henning, A., Kelly, M., Crystal, D., & Ruck, M. (2007). Evaluations of interracial peer encounters by majority and minority U.S. children and adolescents. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 31, 491–500. doi:10.1177/0165025407081478
- Killen, M., &Malti, T. (2015).Moral judgments and emotions in contexts of peer exclusion and victimization.*Advances in Child Development and Behavior*, 48, 249–276. doi:10.1016/bs.acdb.2014.11.007
- Killen, M., & Rutland, A. (2011).*Children and social exclusion: Morality, prejudice and group identity*. Oxford, England: Wiley-Blackwell. doi:10.1002/9781444396317
- Killen, M., &Stangor, C. (2001).Children's reasoning about social inclusion and exclusion in gender and race peer group contexts.*Child Development*, 72, 174–186. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00272
- Kochenderfer-Ladd, B., &Ladd, G. W. (2016). Integrating academic and social-emotional learning in classroom interactions. In K. Wentzel& G. Ramani(Eds.), *Handbook of Social Influences in School Contexts: Social-Emotional, Motivation and Cognitive Outcomes* (349–366). New York: Routledge.
- Krettenauer, T., Malti, T., & Sokol, B. (2008). The development of moral emotions and the happy victimizer phenomenon: A critical review of theory and applications. *Developmental Science*, 2, 221–235. doi:10.3233/DEV-2008-2303
- Law, G. U., Sinclair, S., & Fraser, N. (2007). Children's attitudes and behavioural intentions towards a peer with symptoms of ADHD: Does the addition of a diagnostic label make a difference? *Journal of Child Health Care*, 11, 98–111. doi:10.1177/1367493507076061

- Little, R. J. A. (1988). A test of missing completely at random for multivariate data with missing values. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 83, 1198–1202. doi: 10.2307/2290157
- Lohaus, A., Elben, C., Ball, J., & Klein-Hessling, J. (2004). School transition from elementary to secondary school: Changes in psychological adjustment. *Educational Psychology*, 24, 161–173. doi:10.1080/0144341032000160128
- Malti, T., Killen, M., & Gasser, L. (2012). Social judgments and emotion attributions about exclusion in Switzerland. *Child Development*, 83, 697–711. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01705.x
- Malti, T., & Krettenauer, T. (2013). The role of moral emotion attributions in children's and adolescents' prosocial and antisocial behavior: A meta-analysis. *Child Development*, 84, 397–412. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01851.x
- McGuire, L., Rutland, A., & Nesdale, D. (2015). Peer group norms and accountability moderate the effect of school norms on children's intergroup attitudes. *Child Development*, 86, 1290–1297. doi: 10.1111/cdev.12388
- Meece, J. L., Anderman, E. M., & Anderman, L. H. (2006). Classroom goal structure, student motivation, and academic achievement. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 487–503. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070258
- Mikami, A. Y., Hoza, B., Hinshaw, S. P., Arnold, L. E., Hechtman, L., & Pelham, W. E. (2015). Cross-situational correspondence of sociometric nominations among children with ADHD. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 23, 52–64. doi:10.1177/1063426613518244
- Mikami, A. Y., Lerner, M. D., & Lun, J. (2010). Social context influences on children's rejection by their peers. *Child Development Perspectives*, 4, 123–130. doi: 10.1111/j.1750-8606.2010.00130.x

- Mulvey, K. L., & Killen, M. (2015).Challenging gender stereotypes: Resistance and exclusion.*Child Development*,86, 681–694. doi:10.1111/cdev.12317
- Nesdale, D., & Lawson, M. J. (2011). Social groups and children’s intergroup attitudes: Can school norms moderate the effects of social group norms? *Child Development*, 82, 1594–1606. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01637.x
- Nipedal, C., Nesdale, D., & Killen, M. (2010).Social group norms, school norms, and children's aggressive intentions.*Aggressive Behavior*, 36, 195–204. doi: 10.1002/ab.20342
- Nucci, L. (2009). *Nice is not enough: Facilitating moral development*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Nucci, L.,&Turiel, E. (2009).Capturing the complexity of moral development and education.*Mind, Brain, and Education*, 3, 151–159. doi:10.1111/j.1751-228X.2009.01065.x
- Park, Y., & Killen, M. (2010). When is peer rejection justifiable?: Children's understanding across two cultures. *Cognitive Development*, 25, 290–301. doi:10.1016/j.cogdev.2009.10.004
- Richardson, C. B., Hitti, A., Mulvey, K. L., & Killen, M. (2014). Social exclusion: The interplay of group goals and individual characteristics. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 43, 1281–1294. doi:10.1007/s10964-013-9967-8
- Richardson, C., Mulvey, K. L., & Killen, M. (2012).Extending social domain theory with a process-basedaccount of moral judgments.*Human Development*, 55,4–25. doi:10.1159/000335362
- Roseth, C. J., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2008). Promoting early adolescents' achievement and peer relationships: The effects of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic goal structures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134, 223–246. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.134.2.223
- Rubin, K., Bukowski, W., & Parker, J. (1998). Peer interactions, relationships, and groups. In N. Eisenberg, W. Damon, & R.M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (6th ed., Vol. 3, pp. 571–645). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

- Rutland, A., Cameron, L., Milne, A., & McGeorge, P. (2005). Social norms and self-presentation: Children's implicit and explicit intergroup attitudes. *Child Development, 76*, 451–466.
doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00856.x
- Rutland, A., & Killen, M. (2015). A developmental science approach to reducing prejudice and social exclusion: Intergroup processes, social-cognitive development, and moral reasoning. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 9*, 121–154. doi: 10.1016/bs.acdb.2016.04.004
- Ryan, A. M. (2001). The peer group as a context for the development of young adolescent motivation and achievement. *Child Development, 72*, 1135–1150. doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.00338
- Salmivalli, C., & Voeten, M. (2004). Connections between attitudes, group norms, and behavior in bullying situations. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 28*, 246–258.
doi:10.1080/01650250344000488
- Skrondal, A., & Rabe-Hesketh, S. (2004). *Generalized Latent Variable Modeling: Multilevel, Longitudinal and Structural Equation Models*. Boca Raton, FL: Chapman & Hall/CRC.
- Smith, L. A., & Williams, J. M. (2005). Development differences in understanding the causes, controllability and chronicity of disabilities. *Child: Care, Health & Development, 31*, 479–488.
doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2214.2005.00532.x
- Stormshak, E. A., Bierman, K. L., Bruschi, C., Dodge, K. A., & Coie, J. D. (1999). The relation between behavior problems and peer preference in different classroom contexts. *Child Development, 70*, 169–182. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00013
- 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.

- Theimer, C. E., Killen, M., &Stangor, C. (2001). Young children’s evaluations of exclusion in gender-stereotypic peer contexts.*Developmental Psychology*, 37, 18–27. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.37.1.18
- Tichy, M., Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., &Roseth, C. J. (2010).The impact of constructive controversy on moral development.*Journal of Applied Social Psychology*,40, 765–787. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2010.00597.x
- Turiel, E. (1998). Moral development. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.) & W. Damon (Series Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology*: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development (5th ed., pp. 863–932). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Welsh, M., Parke, R. D., Widaman, K., &O’Neil, R. (2001). Linkages between children's social and academic competence: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of School Psychology*, 39, 463–481. doi:10.1016/S0022-4405(01)00084-X
- Wentzel, K. R., & Asher, S. R. (1995). The academic lives of neglected, rejected, popular, and controversial children.*Child Development*,66, 754–763. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.1995.tb00903.x
- Werner, N. E., & Hill, L. G. (2010). Individual and peer group normative beliefs about relational aggression.*Child Development*,81, 826–836. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01436.x
- Wettstein, A., Ramseier, E., & Marion Scherzinger, M. (2016). Eine konfirmatorische Mehrebenen-Faktorenanalyse zur Schülerwahrnehmung von Störungen im Unterricht der Klassen- und einer Fachlehrperson. Manuscriptsubmittedforpublication.
- White, K. J., & Jones, K. (2000).Effects of teacher feedback on the reputations and peer perceptions of children with behavior problems.*Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 76, 302–326. doi.org/10.1006/jecp.1999.2552

Table 1

Percentage of frequency of exclusion decisions and mean (SD) of group preference by grade, difficulty type, and context

	Low-achieving		Hyperactive		Total
	Academic	Social	Academic	Social	
Exclusion other (%)					
5 th grade	68	64	87	86	76
6 th grade	82	65	91	92	83
Total	75	65	89	89	80
Exclusion self (%)					
5 th grade	44	47	82	79	63
6 th grade	47	38	79	80	61
Total	46	42	80	79	62
Group preference (<i>M</i> , <i>SD</i>)					
5 th grade	-.05 (.78)	-.09 (.72)	.49 (.70)	.38 (.73)	.18 (.77)
6 th grade	-.02 (.74)	-.10 (.66)	.44 (.70)	.46 (.67)	.20 (.74)
Total	-.03 (.76)	-.09 (.69)	.46 (.70)	.42 (.70)	.19 (.75)

Table 2

Parameter estimates (standard errors) of independent variables on exclusion decisions and group preference: Three-level hierarchical modeling

	Other		Self		Group preference	
	Estimate (SE)	z value	Estimate (SE)	z value	Estimate (SE)	z value
Intercept	0.78 (.08)	9.68***	-0.26 (.08)	-3.46***	-0.04 (.03)	-1.75
L1 (Repeated measures)						
Grade (G)	0.85 (.11)	7.39***	0.11 (.10)	1.08	0.03 (.03)	0.86
Difficulty (D)	1.23 (.12)	10.10***	1.87 (.11)	16.88***	0.53 (.03)	19.33***
Context (C)	0.19 (.10)	-1.85	0.13 (.10)	1.35	-0.04 (.03)	-1.51
G*D	-0.39 (.19)	-2.07*	-0.21 (.15)	-1.37	-0.08 (.04)	-1.99*
G*C	-0.76 (.15)	-5.12***	-0.57 (.14)	-4.12***	-0.04 (.04)	-1.03
D*C	0.13 (.17)	0.75	-0.31 (.15)	-2.01*	-0.06 (.04)	-1.55
G*D*C	0.94 (.26)	3.60***	0.77 (.22)	3.59***	0.16 (.05)	2.89**
L2 (Child measures)						
Achievement	0.21 (.04)	5.54***	-	-	0.03 (.01)	2.66**
Competitive Attitudes (CA)	0.17 (.06)	3.07**	0.38 (.06)	6.75***	0.12 (.02)	6.37***
D*CA	-0.29 (.08)	-3.60***	-0.38 (.07)	-5.50***	-0.08 (.02)	-4.54***
C*CA	-	-	-	-	-0.04 (.02)	-2.33*
L3 (Classroom Measure)						
Classroom Norm (CN)	-	-	0.77 (.18)	4.32***	0.22 (.06)	3.54***
D*CN	-	-	-0.79 (.22)	-3.64***	-0.11 (.05)	-2.10*
C*CN	-	-	-	-	-0.21 (.05)	-3.94***

Note.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Figure 1. Exclusion from the perspective of other by grade, difficulty type, and context.

*Figure 2.*Exclusion from the perspective of other by individual competitive attitudes (CA) and difficulty type.

Figure 3. Exclusion from the perspective of self by grade, difficulty type, and context.

(a)

(b)

Figure 4. Exclusion from the perspective of self (a) by difficulty type and individual competitive attitudes (CA) and (b) by difficulty type and competitive classroom norms (CN).

Figure 5. Preference for group functioning by grade, difficulty type, and context.

Figure 6. Preference for group functioning (a) by difficulty type and individual competitive attitudes (CA) and (b) by difficulty type and of exclusion and classroom competitive norms (CN).

(a)

(b)

Figure 7. Preference for group functioning (a) by context of exclusion and individual competitive attitudes (CA) and (b) by context of exclusion and competitive classroom norms (CN).