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Abstract

Peer exclusion is when a group of children exclude another child or reject his or her request to join them (Gazelle & Druhen, 2009). Peer exclusion affects the child’s wellbeing and academic achievement. A number of studies have examined how children evaluate peer exclusion based on group membership, for example of the basis of gender and ethnicity, in the US and Europe. However, little work has been done in the Middle East. Moreover, no work has included parents with their children to test the relationship between parents and children. This thesis examined how Saudi children and their mothers evaluate religion-based exclusion.

Five studies were carried out to achieve the aim of this thesis. The main aim of these studies was to examine how Saudi children evaluate the exclusion of in-group members (Muslim, Sunni) and out-group members (Shia, non-Muslim) when the perpetrator of the exclusion was their father or their peers. In the first study, Saudi children (N= 92) residing in Saudi Arabia were interviewed. Children were more likely to accept exclusion of out-group members than in-group members. Also, they were more likely to accept exclusion when it was ordered by their father than if it was ordered by a group of peers. In the second study, mothers (N= 60) residing in Saudi Arabia and children were interviewed. There was a significant mother-child relationship only when discussing the exclusion of out-group members. In the third study, Saudi children residing in the UK were interviewed (N= 76) and the findings were similar to the first study; children were more likely to accept the exclusion of out-group members than in-group members and exclusion by their fathers than by peers. In the fourth study, Saudi mothers and children residing in the UK were interviewed. There was no significant mother-child relationship in the evaluation of religion-based exclusion. The final study compared Saudi children and their mothers in Saudi Arabia with Saudi children and their mothers in the UK. Saudis in Saudi Arabia were more accepting of exclusion than
Saudis in the UK. Children in Saudi Arabia and in the UK were more likely to accept exclusion than their mothers. Generally, children and their mothers in Saudi Arabia and in the UK were more likely to accept exclusion by the father than by their peers.

In summary, the results of this thesis suggest that Saudi fathers play a vital role in affecting children’s and mothers’ attitudes. Mothers seem to hold more tolerant attitudes than their children. The findings are discussed in relation to Saudi culture and the literature on transmission of attitudes and intergroup contact.
I dedicate this thesis to my beloved parents, Mohammed Alsamih and Norah Alhumaied who are sadly no longer with us.
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1. Chapter: 1

1.1. Overview and General Introduction

Peer exclusion based on group membership (e.g., ethnicity, gender, nationality) has received considerable attention from researchers (for a review, see Killen & Rutland, 2013). Research related to peer exclusion started in the US and Europe and mostly focused on exclusion based on race, ethnicity, gender, and religion (e.g., Killen, Lee-Kim, McGlothlin, Stangor, & Helwig, 2002; Møller & Tenenbaum, 2011). The findings of previous research found that several factors can influence children’s evaluation of peer exclusion, such as development, group status (majority, minority), and the perpetrator of exclusion (parents, teacher) (Killen et al., 2002; Møller & Tenenbaum, 2011).

The current thesis adds to this literature by examining parents (mothers) along with children in the evaluation of peer exclusion to examine whether there is relation between parents and children in their judgements of exclusion (i.e., transmission of attitudes from parent to child). Although some researchers have studied peer exclusion in the Middle East (e.g. Brenick, Lee-Kim, Killen, Fox, Raviv, & Leavitt, 2007; Brenick et al., 2010), they do not ask about the religious exclusion of real groups. Thus, the current thesis aims to fill this gap in the literature by examining Saudi children’s and mothers’ evaluation of religion-based exclusion.

Saudi Arabia is a country with high cultural homogeneity and strong religious identity (Islam) where religious conversion (i.e., leaving Islam or converting from Islam to a different religion) is forbidden. In addition, until recent time, religious school textbooks included materials that warn against communicating with non-Muslims and rejecting other sects to maintain Islamic religious identity (Alnafjan, 2012). Thus, it is important to shed some light on Saudis’ evaluation of religion-based exclusion.
1.2. **Thesis Aims**

The main aim of this thesis is to extend research in peer exclusion to a different cultural context by examining how Saudi children evaluate religion-based exclusion. A further aim is to examine mother–children relationship regarding the evaluation of exclusion. Also, it compares the evaluations of peer exclusion in Saudi citizens residing in Saudi Arabia to Saudi citizens residing in the UK.

Moreover, this thesis has the following specific aims:

- To examine differences in children’s evaluation of exclusion based on the identity of the exclusion target (ingroup member versus outgroup member).
- To examine differences in children’s evaluation of exclusion based on the identity of the perpetrator of exclusion (peers versus father).
- To explore if there are age differences in children’s evaluation of exclusion.

1.3. **Thesis Outline**

**Chapter 1.** This chapter provides a general overview of the current thesis, theoretical framework, and literature review that are relevant to understanding religion-based peer exclusion and Saudi culture.

**Chapter 2 (Part I).** The first empirical study in the current thesis is presented in this chapter. Saudi Sunni children in Saudi Arabia were interviewed to explore what they thought of exclusion based on religion whether the perpetrator was a father or peers.

**Chapter 2 (Part II).** A small sample of Saudi Shia (minority group) in Saudi Arabia were interviewed to provide a further understanding of the evaluation of peer exclusion by a minority group.

**Chapter 3.** This chapter extends previous research in peer exclusion by interviewing children and their mothers to examine mother–child associations in the evaluation of exclusion. Allport (1954) argues that parents are the prime social agents who transmit their
intergroup attitudes to their children. Children can indirectly acquire social norms and attitudes by observing adults, especially parents (Killen & Rutland, 2013). This study examined mothers as well as children to compare their evaluations of peer exclusion for the first time.

**Chapter 4.** Based on the results of the second and third chapters, this chapter was motivated to examine Saudi children outside Saudi Arabia (UK) to see if their contact with outgroup members shapes their attitudes regarding peer exclusion and whether Saudi children residing outside Saudi Arabia also defer more to fathers than peers in their evaluation of exclusion.

**Chapter 5.** This chapter examines children and their mothers residing in the UK to see if living outside Saudi Arabia has a significant influence on in the evaluation of peer exclusion.

**Chapter 6.** The aim of this chapter is to compare Saudi mothers and their children in Saudi Arabia with Saudi mothers and their children residing in the UK. This chapter considers intergroup contact in comparison between the two groups.

**Chapter 7.** The final chapter presents a general discussion of the thesis where the most significant results of the five studies are presented. In addition, it includes discussion of the contribution, general limitations of the research, and recommendations for new research. Finally, the general conclusion of the thesis is provided.

1.4. **Peer Exclusion**

Peer exclusion is behavioural rejection that happens when peers avoid a certain child in their activities or reject his or her request to join them (Gazelle & Druhen, 2009). The issue of peer exclusion is prevalent in children’s social life and extends to adulthood. A large body of literature in peer exclusion has found that exclusion affects children negatively. Children who are rejected by peers tend to avoid school and avoid involvement in class. They also
report loneliness and low academic performance (Buhs & Ladd, 2001; Buhs, Ladd, & Herald, 2006; Herald-Brown, 2008). Thus, peer exclusion significantly predicts poor school adjustment (Coie, Lochman, Terry, & Hyman, 1992). Exposure to peer exclusion motivates children to believe that their ability is not sufficient to be involved with peers and they develop low social self-efficacy (Gazelle & Druhen, 2009). In addition to academic influence, peer exclusion negatively affects children’s well-being. Indeed, all levels of peer exclusion are related to high behavioural problems (DeRosier, Kupersmidt, & Patterson, 1994). Prinstein and Aikins (2004) found that peer exclusion is a significant predictor of depression in adolescents, especially given the importance of peer status. Another longitudinal study indicated that there is a correlation between the experience of peer exclusion in elementary school and befriending antisocial peers (Laird, Jordan, Dodge, Pettit, & Bates, 2001). Taken together, exposure to peer exclusion in childhood is related to lower academic and psychological adjustment, violence, and depression. It causes behavioural problems and stable patterns of disorder in adolescents (Coei, Lochman, Terry, & Hyman, 1992; Coie, Terry, Lenox, Lochman, & Hyman, 1995; DeRosier et al., 1994; Graham & Juvonen, 1998; Rubin, Bukowskii, & Parker, 1998).

1.4.1. **Social-Cognitive Domain Model**

Children’s evaluations of peer exclusion have been often studied from the social domain theory. Social domain theory (Turiel, 1983) illustrates that from early childhood, individuals start to build social knowledge about their social world depending on interactions with others. Unlike other developmental theories, social domain theory considers morality as one domain of a child’s building social knowledge but not the only one (Smetana, 2006). Turiel (1983) proposed that a child builds knowledge about social events, which is concentrated around three main categories: (1) personal category, which is related to psychological system of the person (psychological domain), (2) social category, which is
related to social relationships and organization (social domain) and (3) moral category, which is related to justice and right (moral domain). Children at an early age take into account the self, the group, and justice in the evaluation of social events (Killen & Rutland, 2013). These three categories are applied simultaneously by individuals in social judgements and evaluations (Killen & Rutland, 2002; Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 1983). Thus, focusing on fairness, justice, welfare, and rights in the treatment of others (moral issues) coexists with thinking of social authority, customs and group function (social conventional issues) and considering personal choice, privacy and preferences (psychological domain issue).

Over 100 empirical studies have found that individuals of different ages apply the three domains (moral, social, and psychological domain) in social judgements (Smetana, 2006). Moral evaluation is based on intrinsic consequences that consider a transgression as wrong generally regardless of the culture where the action happened according to the domain theory. In contrast, social conventional evaluation is based on social customs and traditions that differ from one culture to another. For psychological evaluation, the transgression is considered as a personal matter that could not be regulated by intrinsic or social convention (Nucci, 2001). Previous research from the perspective of social domain theory has found that, with age, children are able to use multiple domains to evaluate one social scenario (Killen & Rutland, 2013). From an early age, children can use and distinguish between different types of transgressions based on the social domain. For example, a number of studies have found that preschool children (4– to 5-year-olds) and in some research children around 3 years are able to distinguish between two transgressions, hitting someone and wearing pyjamas in school. Children evaluated the first transgression (hitting someone) as wrong because of causing harm to someone (moral evaluation), whereas the second transgression (wearing pyjamas) was considered as wrong by children because it is against traditions (social
Social events are typically complex and contain different social aspects that are related to morality, social conventional, and personal issues simultaneously. With age, the ability to weigh up multiple social domains in the evaluation of social events is increased. To some extent, children from childhood to adolescence become more able to evaluate complex social context using different social domains (Killen & Rutland, 2013; Smetana, 2006).

However, the evaluation of certain social issues varies from one culture to another culture, for example, dress code and causing harm (e.g., wearing a veil and beating people from a specific class). The role of culture in the evaluation of social events appears clearly in cultural groups when using social conventional reasons to judge social scenarios that are related to important social traditions (Wainryb, 1991). For example, excluding a student based on group membership from a private religious school and from religious celebrations would considered as a social conventional matter for some religious groups (Brenick, 2009; Wainryb, 1991, 1995).

1.4.1.1. Culture

As described above culture is an important aspect that affect the evaluation of complex social events, like the evaluation of social exclusion. A number of studies focused on culture in peer exclusion. For example, Park, Killen, Crystal, and Watanabe (2003) examined three different cultural groups of children and adolescents (American, Japanese, Korean) regarding peer exclusion. Although there was an expectation of similar results between the Asian groups (Japanese, Korean), there was a significant difference in the evaluation of exclusion between Japanese and Korean children. Generally, Korean children were less accepting of exclusion than American and Japanese children who were similar to each other. Despite both Korean and Japanese children coming from a collectivistic culture,
Korean children were less likely to accept exclusion based on gender than Japanese and American children. A number of explanations were provided. For example, cross-gender behaviours in the vignettes that used in this study was not related to the traditional gender roles. A further explanation was that the recent Korean educational system supports gender equality, which in turn may affect children’s intergroup-gendered play.

Brenick’s work also extends social domain studies to different cultural groups and nations (Middle Eastern) to examine children’s attitudes towards exclusion and inclusion based on cultural groups that are involved in conflict (i.e., Arab and Jewish children). In one study, Brenick and colleagues (2010) examined cultural stereotyping and evaluation of peer exclusion based on language and country among Palestinian, Jordanian, Israeli-Palestinian, and Israeli-Jewish children. Children were told to imagine children who spoke different languages and came from different countries; neither language nor country was identified. Those children (except Jordanian) live in a region with a long history of violence and religious conflict. The findings indicated that living with religious conflict and tension is related to using stereotypes in intergroup attitudes. In another study, Brenick et al. (2007) analysed the effects of an educational TV programme (Sesame Street) that was developed to promote tolerance and reduce prejudice among children in different cultural groups (Israeli, Palestinian, and Jordanian). Palestinian, Israeli-Palestinian, Israeli-Jewish, and Jordanian preschool children were interviewed to examine cultural stereotyping and the evaluation of peer exclusion. The main findings were that as a result of living in a region with deep tension, children attributed negative stereotypes to outgroup members. However, children from all cultural groups evaluated exclusion based on language as wrong. Israeli-Palestinian, Israeli-Jewish, and Jordanian evaluated exclusion based on country and customs as less acceptable than Palestinians did. Palestinians used social conventional reasoning such as group
functioning to justify their evaluations. Importantly, previous work in peer exclusion in the Middle East has not looked at peer versus parental authority.

Given that culture is a wide category that involves different categories, paying attention to culture in relation to exclusion is a persistent need but also it is complex.

1.4.1.2. Gender and Race

As mentioned earlier, gender and race are the main dimensions that have been investigated in the literature of peer exclusion. A number of studies have examined how children reason about exclusion (not allowing someone to join a group) and inclusion (allowing someone to join a group) based on gender (e.g., Killen & Stangor, 2001; Killen et al., 2002; Møller & Tenenbaum, 2011). Killen and colleagues (2001) interviewed preschool children (4- and 5-years-old) from different ethnic backgrounds. All children judged straightforward exclusion (e.g., girls excluding a boy from doll play) as wrong and used moral reasons to justify their judgement while they evaluated an inclusion scenario (e.g., choosing a boy or a girl to join the group) using stereotyped expectations, especially younger children.

Indeed, social exclusion is a multifaceted issue that is difficult to examine from one context or without influential factors. Killen and colleagues (2002) examined how children and adolescents evaluate peer exclusion based on gender and race in three different social contexts for exclusion: friendship, peer, and school. In addition, the study examined the influence of authority and culture by including the evaluation of children from four minority groups. The findings supported the social domain model by confirming that peer exclusion is a multifaceted issue involving different social domains. Children used multiple types of reasoning when judging peer exclusion. More specifically, children evaluated exclusion based on race as more unacceptable than gender and were more likely to use moral reasoning for the former than the latter. The use of moral reasoning was especially marked by children.
from minority groups. With age, there was a difference in the type of reasoning used by children also depending on the context. For example, with age there was an increase in referencing personal issues in the friendship context. Another study by Killen, Crystal, Ruck, Henning, and Kelly (2007) interviewed US majority and minority children and adolescents about race-based and non-race peer exclusion in two contexts: home and school. The vignettes varied by whether children shared interests, and whether parental discomfort or peer pressure was present. Children evaluated race-based exclusion as more wrong than non-race based exclusion. However, minority ethnic children evaluated non-race-based exclusion as more wrong than did majority ethnic children. Children tended to invoke moral reasoning to justify their evaluations of exclusion, except in the home context vignettes related to parental discomfort, where children used social conventional reasons.

Møller and Tenenbaum (2011) also compared peer exclusion based on ethnicity and gender from the perspective of social domain theory in majority Danish children. Two different perpetrators of exclusion (peer, teacher) were used. Children reported it more acceptable to exclude based on gender than ethnicity. They applied moral reasoning for exclusion based on ethnicity more than on gender. In addition, Danish children were less accepting of exclusion by teacher than by peers.

1.4.2. Social Identity Theory

Children weigh up different complex factors in the evaluation of peer exclusion. Social identity is realised by shared interests and activities is one of these factors. To understand how social identity affects children’s evaluation, developmental psychologists have focused on social identity theory among children (Killen & Rutland, 2013). Social identity theory by Tajfel (1970) proposed that belonging to a certain group is a source of pride and self-esteem; it is also important for how an individual recognises himself within a social world. When an individual identifies her/himself with a certain group, the identity of
this group will be the main component in her/his self-concept. Based on social identity theory, categorizing individuals into groups is enough to produce ingroup bias to gain or retrieve self-esteem (Tajfel & Turner, 1985). Note rating ingroup members as better than outgroup members in social contexts will be reflected in an individual’s personal feeling about his self. Some researchers have suggested that ingroup bias maybe a simple result of applying favourable traits to ingroup members more than to outgroup members (i.e., ‘what is similar to me is good’), or a result of derogating the outgroups; also, it could be a mix of these two processes (Bennett, Lyons, Sani, & Barrett, 1998; Brewer, 1979).

Another argument has suggested that ingroup preference is related to less social distance between ingroup members compared with outgroup members (Verkuyten, 1991). In addition, it is important to consider cultural routines in daily life, including communicating with ingroup individuals, hearing good things about ingroup members, reading positive materials about the ingroup, and attending religious services play significant roles for ingroup preferences (Bennett et al., 1998; Marks, Sazacha, Lamarre, Boyd, & Coll, 2007). Although ingroup favouritism may not reflect hostility against outgroups, it is still an initial type of discrimination (Bennett et al., 2004; Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002; Nesdale, 2004).

1.4.2.1. Social identity developmental theory

Although social identity theory was developed without an account of applying the theory to children, many have applied this theory to children taking into account development. Similar outgroup preferences to those in adults emerge in children following the awareness of social categorizing and comprising process, so with age ingroup bias is developed in children (Nesdale, 2001). Social identity developmental theory proposes that there are four sequential developmental phases for ethnic prejudice in children. An undifferentiated phase emerges before the age of 2–3 years. Prejudice does not emerge in this phase and children respond to whatever attracts their attention. Then, ethnic awareness
emerges in children from age 3 years especially those who grow up in multicultural societies. At this point, children can distinguish between different ethnicities based on skin colour for example. However, the social categories used by children in this phase exist already in the children’s environment. Thus, children follow what is told to them by adults. Ethnic preference will appear in children when they show preference of in-group members based on the similarities (ingroup members are similar to me so I prefer them), but not based on prejudice against outgroup members. There is overlap between this phase and the ongoing previous phase, which extends to age 6 to 7 years. Thus, the main critical difference between social identity theory and social identity development theory is that social identity theory emphasizes that ethnic categorizations are enough to produce ingroup bias and prejudice against the outgroup. In contrast, social identity development theory proposes that the awareness of ethnic categorizations leads to ingroup preference and focus on ingroup more than prejudice against other groups. The fourth phase, ethnic prejudice, may start around age 7 years, where children begin to show prejudice against the outgroup depending on whether children identify themselves strongly with their own ethnic group or feel threatened by other ethnic groups (Nesdale, 2004; 2007; 2008). Importantly, children may believe that showing ethnic prejudice is consistent with group norms (i.e., it is acceptable based on the expectations of ingroup members). Thus, children tend to exclude outgroup members if they believe this kind of behaviour is considered appropriate by ingroup members (Killen & Rutland, 2013).

To examine social identity developmental theory, Nesdale, Maass, Durkin, and Griffiths (2005) designed a minimal group study with inclusion and exclusion norms for the group. They conducted this study on Anglo-Australian children aged 7–9 years old. In line with social identity development theory, children were more likely to exclude outgroup members and show prejudice when they were informed that their group had exclusion and
inclusion norms and also when they were threatened by the outgroup. In further evidence of the effect of group norms regarding inclusion and exclusion, Nipedal, Nesdale, and Killen (2010) found that group norms directly influence children’s attitudes towards included and excluded outgroup members. A similar study by Nesdale and Lawson (2011) examined the effect of group norms and school norms in children aged 7–10 years. Children reflected their own group’s norm in exclusion and inclusion of outgroup members. However, with age, children showed more liking of the outgroup and less liking of the ingroup. This result suggests that children’s increasing cognitive ability allows them to consider more social aspects with age.

1.5. Peer Exclusion and Intergroup Contact

Intergroup contact may moderate children’s reasoning about peer exclusion. Intergroup contact theory suggests that positive contact between an individual and other individual from another group reduces prejudice against outgroup members (Allport, 1954; Killen & Rutland, 2013; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Further, contact with the outgroup can promote moral reasoning such as fairness about excluding outgroup members and motivate children to challenge negative stereotypes about outgroup based on their own contact with outgroup members (Killen & Rutland, 2013).

Intergroup contact theory proposes that prejudice against the outgroup members arises from the lack of knowledge and familiarity with the outgroup. Thus, contact with the outgroup could provide the individual with real information about outgroup members and confirm the wrongfulness of negative stereotypes, which leads to a positive attitude about the outgroup (Allport, 1954). Allport suggests four conditions for optimal contact. First, equal group status is needed in which both groups in contact situation have the same value. Second, the authority figure supports positive contact and encourages individuals from both groups to contact each other. Third, the groups need common goals, which they work to reach when
they contact. Finally, outgroup members and ingroup members need to work on something where they cooperate with each other, which will affect their attitudes towards each other. Although these four conditions facilitate contact between groups, it is not required (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008; Pettigrew, Tropp, Wagner, & Christ, 2011).

Research from the perspective of intergroup contact theory works to identify the moderators between intergroup contact and reducing prejudice against outgroup members to figure out how intergroup contact can reduce prejudice. A meta-analysis by Pettigrew and Tropp (2008) included 500 studies that built on the base of intergroup contact theory to test whether intergroup contact reduces prejudice. The meta-analysis examined the three most common mediators between intergroup contact and prejudice. First, increasing knowledge about outgroup members by contact with them as friends or in structured contact (e.g. school), reduces prejudice against the outgroup (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 2004; Pettigrew & Tropp 2008). Second, intergroup contact reduces anxiety and the expectation of threat by the outgroup, which leads to reduce prejudice against the outgroup members (Blascovich, Mendes, Hunter, Lickel, & Kowai-Bell, 2001; Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008; Voci & Hewstone, 2003). Third, empathy towards the outgroup is increased through intergroup contact so the prejudice against outgroup members will decrease (Batson, Lishner, Cook, & Sawyer, 2005; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). Pettigrew and Tropp (2008) found that there is a significant effect of the previous mediators and compared with each other. Anxiety and empathy were stronger mediators than increasing knowledge.

In fact, reducing intergroup prejudice is not limited to direct contact (e.g., friendship, mixed-ethnicity schools). There are different forms of indirect contact that can reduce prejudice. For example, extended contact (i.e., knowing that a member of the ingroup has a friend in the outgroup) reduces prejudice and helps to change the individual’s biased attitudes towards the outgroup to be more positive and more accepting. It is a kind of reassurance by
providing evidence of friendship between the ingroup members and outgroup (Dovidio, Eller, & Hewstone, 2011; Killen & Rutland, 2013; Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, & Ropp, 1997). Another form of indirect intergroup contact is observing others’ attitudes, especially those who have influence over children, such as parents and peers. Further, media, television, and internet are important sources for information about outgroups that can reduce prejudice against the outgroup by presenting positive intergroup contact (Mutz & Goldman, 2010; Schiappa, Gregg, & Hewes, 2005). Bar-Tal and Tichman (2005) found that 87% of preschool Israeli-Jewish children learn and gain their knowledge about Arabs from television programmes.

Recently, intergroup contact theory has been examined with children to see if contact between groups can reduce peer exclusion. For example, Crystal, Killen, and Ruck (2008) found that children who had a high level of contact with outgroup members were less accepting of exclusion of outgroup members than those children with a lower level of contact with outgroup members. Brenick (2009) examined the influence of intergroup contact on the evaluation of peer exclusion among Jewish-American, Arab-American, and American adolescents. Adolescents with a high level of intergroup contact were less accepting of peer exclusion.

Interestingly, a number of developmental studies have designed intervention programmes based on intergroup contact theory to promote intergroup tolerance. Cameron, Rutland, Brown, and Douch (2006) examined the influence of extended contact on White English children’s attitudes towards refugees. Stories showing an ingroup member (White English child) as a friend of a refugee were read to children. Children in the intervention group showed an increase in their positive attitudes towards refugees more than the control group. So, using extended contact stories that include friendship could reduce anxiety about real communication with the outgroup (Cameron, Rutland, & Hossain, 2007).
Media as well has been used to promote intergroup tolerance in children as one form of intergroup contact. One of the most famous media intervention programmes was Sesame Street television programme. Sesame Street collaborates with local podcasters in regions with tension around the world to produce a television program for children to promote tolerance and reduce prejudice. In the Middle East, Sesame Street designed a TV show called Shara’a Sesame/Rechov Sumsum for Palestinian, Israeli-Palestinian, and Israeli-Jewish children. Indeed, children in this region frequently gain negative stereotypes about the outgroup from the media (Bar-Tal & Tichman, 2005). Sesame Street aimed to use media to change these stereotypes and spread tolerance. In Sesame Street’s episodes, children exposed to extended contact by seeing ingroup children interact with outgroup children (e.g. playing, laughing, and visiting each other’s houses). Israeli-Palestinian and Israeli-Jewish showed a significant increase in positive intergroup attitudes after watching Sesame Street. In addition, Israeli-Jews showed a decline in negative stereotypes about the outgroup (Brenick et al., 2007; Cole et al., 2003). It is an approach to reduce anxiety about the outgroup by highlighting intergroup contact and cross-groups friendship. While research from the perspective of intergroup contact has emphasized the importance of having cross-race friendship to reduce prejudice, a number of developmental studies found that, with age, children tend to same-race friendship, similarities seems to be priority for children (Aboud, Mendelson, & Purdy, 2003; McGlothlin, Killen, & Edmonds, 2005; Rubin et al., 1998). Most intergroup contact research has been conducted on children’s racial attitudes, but there is no doubt intergroup contact can reduce prejudice towards other categories such as gender, nationality and religion (Killen & Rutland, 2013).

1.6. Peer Exclusion and Parents

From the perspective of social domain theory, moral evaluations of social events is an active cognitive process of social experiences with parents and peer groups (Smetana, 2015).
Parent–child conversations about behaviours and attitudes offer children the basics of morals, social norms, and cognitive development (Aznar & Tenenbaum, 2015; Segall, Birnbaum, Deeb & Diesendruck, 2016; Tenenbaum & Hohenstein, 2016). In addition, as mentioned previously, children can indirectly acquire social norms and attitudes by observing adults, especially parents. Clark and Ladd (2000) found that parents’ behaviour is related to children’s social relationships and communication with peers. Based on the hypothesis that suggests the important role of parents’ attitudes, a number of studies have examined the relationship between children and parents in intergroup attitudes.

Parents are the prime social agents who transmit their intergroup attitudes to their children. Children from an early age learn the attitudes towards outgroup memberships mainly from home by absorbing and adopting parents’ attitudes. (Allport, 1954; Brown, 2010). It is commonly hypothesized that children’s attitudes are affected directly by how adults, especially parents, categorize groups or indirectly through non-verbal behaviours and, in the absence of direct and indirect parental behaviours, intergroup attitudes may develop from the observation of parents' intergroup attitudes (Bigler & Liben, 2007; Dovidio, Kawakami, & Gaertner, 2002). A number of studies have examined the relationship between children and parents in intergroup attitudes and the transmission of intergroup attitudes from parents to children. The results of these studies are not consistent, some have found a significant relationship and others have found no relationship. For example, Aboud and Doyle (1996) examined children and their mothers to test the hypothesis that children acquire intergroup attitudes from their parents. The relationship between children and their mothers was weak. As a result, Aboud and Doyle suggest that parents may influence children’s intergroup attitudes indirectly. However, White and Gleitzman (2004) found a significant relationship in children’s and parents’ racial prejudice attitudes. In addition, they found that the mother–child relationship was stronger than father–child relationship and moderated by
open communication and emotional closeness. Castelli, De Dea, and Nesdale (2008) found that a high level of implicit prejudice in mothers was related to children preferring outgroup classmates less and applying more negative traits to outgroup peers than when mothers’ implicit prejudice was low. It seems that mothers influence their children indirectly through nonverbal behaviours.

In a meta-analysis of 131 studies including 45,000 parent–child dyads, Degner and Dalege (2013) found a significant medium effect between parents and children in intergroup attitudes. However, the effect size of the parent–child relationship was related to a number of different variables, such as who reports the parental attitudes (child vs self), the social desirability based on the situation of assessment (public vs private) and conceptual overlap between scales. In addition, they found significant moderations of group status (minority vs majority) and child age, but no significant effect of child and parent gender. A four-year longitudinal study of 213 children with their parents found that the influence of parents’ intergroup attitudes is moderated by parenting style (i.e., mothers’ parenting focuses on controlling and pressure). In addition, the parent–children relationship is stronger in children of supportive parents than for children of non-supportive parents. Children of supportive parents tend to respect and please their parents so the relationship between parents’ and children’s attitudes among those children will be stronger than when parents are less supportive (Miklikowska, 2016). Also, the influence of parents on children’s attitudes was found when there were similarities in parental attitudes (Jugert, Eckstein, Beelmann, & Noack, 2016).

In terms of this relationship, attention needs to be paid to distinguishing between the influence of parents in explicit and implicit intergroup attitudes. For example, Castelli, Zogmaister, and Tomelleri (2009) found that mothers’ attitudes (but not fathers’) predicted children’s attitudes, but only at the implicit level (there was no relationship for explicit
attitudes). In another study, Castelli et al. (2008) demonstrated that parents’ biased implicit attitudes strongly affected their children’s attitudes more than parents’ explicit tolerant attitudes. Children’s identification with their parents may also moderate the relationship between parents’ and children’s intergroup attitudes. A strong parent–child correlation was found in children who highly identify with their parents, whereas such a correlation was weaker in those who identify with them less (Miklikowska, 2016; Sinclair, Dunn, & Lowery, 2005). In addition, the social networks of parents are related to shaping children’s intergroup attitudes. Indeed, when parents have cross-race friendships, their children report low levels of racial prejudice (Pahlke, Bigler, & Suizzo, 2012).

Although parent–child discussion about intergroup attitudes could be a direct source of building children’s intergroup attitudes, some parents avoid this kind of discussion. Simpson (2007) conducted a study on 99 children aged 5–7 years with their parents to investigate the effectiveness of intervention programmes on children’s attitudes towards intergroup attitudes. The programme includes parent–child conversation about race. The majority of parents were unwilling to discuss the issue of race with their children. Only 33% of mothers and 20% of fathers said that they have discussions with their children about race issues. Some parents believed that it is not an important topic to have a conversation about it. Other parents preferred their children to be colour-blind. In addition, they did not know how they should manage this type of discussion. Even those parents who had discussions about race with their children, most of them discussed it briefly and only 10% of them discussed it deeply. Following the intervention program, children in the intervention group showed more awareness about their parents’ intergroup attitudes. Indeed, this result can be used positively to increase acceptance towards outgroup members in children.

In addition to discussion with parents about intergroup attitudes, perception of parents’ outgroup norms also can influence children’s intergroup attitudes. Brenick and
Romano (2016) examined cultural identities and the perception of parents’ and peers’ outgroup norms in Jewish-American adolescents in relation to the evaluation of exclusion of Arab-Americans. Children evaluated exclusion in two contexts: home and peer groups. Parents were the perpetrator of exclusion in home context and peers were the perpetrator of exclusion in the peer group context. There was a strong relationship in the evaluation of exclusion by children and the perceptions of parents’ and peers’ intergroup norms. More specifically, when children perceived that their parents and peers held positive attitudes towards outgroup members, the children were likely to evaluate exclusion as unacceptable. Nevertheless, when children perceived that their parents and peers held negative attitudes towards outgroup members, the children were likely to include in-group members rather than outgroup members.

1.7. Peer Exclusion and Child Age

The ability of children to weigh up multiple perspectives in their reasoning increases from childhood to adolescence. Children become more able to evaluate complex contexts with age (Killen, 2002). While younger children tend to use fairness and equality, adolescents can use different reasoning based on conventional norms, such as group functioning (Horn, 2003; Killen & Rutland, 2013). Along with more evolved reasoning, there is a concomitant decrease in ingroup bias in older children compared with younger children (Abrams, Rutland, Pelletier, & Ferrell, 2009;). Although Killen et al. (2002) found that 15-year olds condone peer exclusion based on gender and ethnicity more than 9- or 12-year olds, there was no significant difference between 10 and 12-year olds. Killen and colleagues (2002) found that young children aged 10 years used moral reasons, especially empathy, more than children aged above 13 years old. In other research, however, age was not strongly associated with children’s judgements of exclusion (Møller & Tenenbaum, 2011).
Indeed, children at a young age may assimilate parents’ intergroup attitudes, but they would not treat it as their own attitudes. The assimilation of parents’ attitudes reflects the limited ability of cognition in children in early age, which leads them to adopt parents’ attitudes (Aboud, 1988; Nesdale, 2004). According to Allport (1954), with age there is a prediction of dissimilarity of intergroup attitudes between children and their parents. Taken together, the influence of parents in early childhood is greater than in late childhood and adolescence, while the influence of different social agents such as peers on children’s attitudes in late childhood and adolescence is greater than parents (Bigler & Liben, 2006).

1.8. Peer Exclusion and Group Status

The evaluation of peer exclusion may depend on group status (i.e., majority vs minority members). Previous research in the US found that ethnic minority group members was more sensitive and condemnatory towards peer exclusion than ethnic majority group members. This sensitivity may be a result of personal experiences of being excluded by members of the ethnic majority group in intergroup interactions (Killen et al., 2002; Killen et al., 2007).

Parent–child similarity in intergroup attitudes is expected to be affected by group status. Children’s attitudes were more similar to parents’ attitudes in majority groups more than in a minority group (Degner & Dalege, 2013). The researchers suggested that the majority group members may have a parent–children discussion about intergroup attitudes more than the minority group members. Alternatively, they suggest that minority group members built their own intergroup attitudes, which are different from their parents’ attitudes based on their intergroup contact.

1.9. Saudi Arabia

To examine the role of culture and reasoning about exclusion, this thesis was conducted on Saudi children and mothers inside and outside (UK) Saudi Arabia. Generally
speaking, Saudi society has high cultural homogeneity, which is reflected in its people having the same religion, language, and ethnicity (Metz, 1992). Importantly, the cultural homogeneity of Saudi Arabia is centred on the values and attitudes that relate to family and Arabian tribal culture (Alhareth, Alhareth, & Aldighrir, 2015).

The official and dominant religion in Saudi Arabia is Sunni Islam. Thus, Saudi Arabia’s practices, laws, and educational curriculums are built on Sunni Islam. Islam has a strong influence on Saudi citizens as a national and social identity (Nevo, 1998). Because the education system and curricula in Saudi Arabia are built on the basis of Sunni Islam, Saudis study the Quran, jurisprudence and theology from the early years to higher education (Alsallom, 1994).

The majority of Saudis are Sunni Muslims with around 5–7% being Shia Muslims (Matthiesen, 2014; Metz, 1992, 2006). Although both Sunni and Shia are Muslims and hold the same Islamic beliefs, there are some religious and political differences between these two groups (James, 2015). Because of their names, birthplaces, accents and religious practices, Saudi Arabians can distinguish Shia and Sunni Muslims (Matthiesen, 2014). Sometimes differences between Sunni and Shia promote intolerance and conflict among these two groups (Blanchard, 2009). In general, sects that are numerical minorities (i.e. either Sunni or Shia) often face discrimination in the Middle East (BBC, 2016).

Although nearly 100,000 individuals, including non-Muslims, move to Saudi Arabia for work each year (Metz, 1992; 2006), there is an absence of religious freedom in Saudi Arabia (e.g., non-Islamic worship is forbidden in public). According to Country Reports on Human Rights Practices (2003), all citizens in Saudi Arabia must be Muslims. Converting to a different religion is considered as apostasy, which is punishable by death. However, one of the Saudi government centres that fight prejudice and seek diffusion of moderation have started posting a series of tweets on Twitter discussing the punishment of apostasy (Fekerksa,
The tweets argue that there is controversy in the evidence of religious legitimacy that supports the punishment of apostasy. For example, one of the tweets states that ‘This dialectical argument also indicates that the killing of the apostate is contrary to the religious texts that decided religious freedom, and not coercion’ (Fekerksa, 2017). This may reflect the new orientation of the Saudi government, which focusses on fighting religious prejudice.

The power of religion in Saudi Arabia is not limited to legislation and practices but also includes education. As mentioned previously, Saudi schools teach Islamic subjects from an early age. These subjects include nearly four separate Islamic subjects that cover a third of the weekly school hours (Doumato, 2003). Based on critical reading of religious textbooks that centre on Islamic culture (i.e. jurisprudence, theology, hadith), Doumato (2003) found that there is warning against communicating with non-Muslims. This warning was motivated by defence and to protect Islam from the western threat. However, the criticism against Saudi Islamic textbooks regarding promoting intolerance motivated the Saudi education ministry to commit to reforming religious textbooks. Most of the extremist religious materials were removed and around 2000 religious extremist teachers were fired (Alnafjan, 2012).

Another dimension of Saudi Arabia central to this study is that Saudi Arabia is considered a collectivist culture where the group is more important than the individual (Abdel Razek, 2012; Al-Ruwaiteea, 2004; Darwish & Huber, 2003; Heyn, 2013; Nevo, 1998). In a collectivist culture, individuals consider themselves as part of a whole (e.g. nation, tribe), and many individuals hold the same beliefs, attitudes and norms that motivate them more than their personal rights, needs and preferences (Triandis, 1995). As with other Islamic Arabic countries in the Middle East, a collective identity for Saudi society contains three main elements: Islam, Arab, and local identity such as tribe and extended family. However, it is not necessary for these elements to be homogeneous; for instance, tribe may accept some acts that are not accepted by religion (Nevo, 1998). Compared with individualistic cultures,
ingroup belonging and maintaining group identity is a priority in collectivist cultures (Hofstede, 1980). Such caring about ingroup members exists among individuals who belong to a collectivist culture (Iyengar, Lepper, & Ross, 1999). Thus, collectivism is expected to influence intergroup contact and social relationships even in Saudis who are residents abroad (Alyami, 2015; Razek & Dayton, 2013). Saudi students in the US consider helping and supporting ingroup members a duty and part of their personality as collectivistic individuals; these beliefs indeed could affect their interactions with outgroup members as a result of a marked preference for ingroup members (Abdel Razek, 2012).

Al-Zahrani and Kaplowitz (1993) examined the attributional biases in individualist and collectivist cultures. Compared with American university students, Saudi students showed more ingroup bias and outgroup derogation. Indeed, the high priority of collectivism in Saudi culture is supported by religion and traditions. The Quran in different places highlights the importance of ingroup, solidarity and sacrificing of own preferences for the group’s goal (Alyami, 2015) and Saudis are very keen to follow Quran.

Finally, in Saudi society, the family is the main social institution and is considered the basis of individuals’ identity and status (AlFadhel, 2012; Alsaggaf, 2004). The structure of the family is derived from Islamic law with the husband serving as the leader of the family. He has the main responsibility for financial expenses also the prime decision maker (Alanazi, 2008). So, in Saudi Arabia, Islamic family laws support the dependent position of women, while promoting patriarchy and the independence of men. As Allah says in the holy Quran ‘Men are in charge of women by [right of] what Allah has given one over the other and what they spend [for maintenance] from their wealth’. In the past, Saudis have preferred sons because men can earn money and take responsibility for the family (Al-Rajraji, 2010). Although many changes have happened in Saudi Arabia in recent years, the father has maintained his authority and there is loyalty to family (Alsaif, 1997, Pharaon, 2004). Men
have more power than women in all spheres in Saudi Arabia. In addition, men have the final word over women with a guardianship system operating for women (Pharaon, 2004; Renard, 2008). According to the guardianship system, each Saudi woman has a man, such as a father, husband, or brother, who makes critical decisions for her (Watch, 2016).

Even when individuals move from Saudi Arabia to live for a period of time in a different culture, family values and the authority of men control their behaviours. Alyami (2015) interviewed 9 Saudi female students to test the role of cultural values in Saudi students’ lives in the UK. Seventy-three per cent of students think that men (e.g., father, husband, brother) have the right to control women’s behaviour even when women study abroad. This was illustrated by one student who expressed her fear of interaction mingling with outgroup members in parties because this kind of interaction would destroy her religious beliefs and way of dressing, which would be punished by her husband. Indeed, Saudi females are not permitted to study abroad without being accompanied by a male guardian (e.g., father, husband, adult brother) or at least obtaining the consent of a male guardian to study abroad alone (Alyami, 2015). Thus, the power of Saudi men in family life is confirmed by Saudi laws and often extended by females themselves to control their social life and intergroup communication when they move abroad to study.

1.9.1. Studying Abroad

Immigration for Saudis is rare and limited to certain situations. Thus, in such fieldwork where there is need to examine Saudis in different cultural conditions, Saudis who study abroad constitute the largest population. In 1960, the Saudi government started sending students abroad (e.g., to European countries, US, Canada, Australia) mostly to obtain higher degrees, such as masters and PhDs in different majors. According to the Saudi Ministry of Education (2017), there are around 114,518 scholarship students who study abroad with 74,753 dependents. The United Kingdom is one of the most popular destinations for Saudi
students with their families (dependents) who are funded by Saudi scholarship programmes to study abroad. There are about 14,108 scholarship students in the UK with 16,152 dependents. The aim of Saudi scholarships, in general, is to provide the country with highly qualified individuals based on studying in well-known western universities. Another important aim is to provide an opportunity for individuals to be open to other cultures and communicate with outgroup members from different backgrounds (Alyami, 2015).

There are a number of studies from fieldwork studies conducted on Saudi students studying abroad. Interestingly, some of these studies reported that Saudi students maintained their original Saudi culture (e.g. Alhazmi, 2010). Other research showed that the new culture affects Saudi’s values and beliefs (e.g. Hill, 2013; Heyn, 2013). Akhtarkhvari (1994) found that studying and living in the US motivated Saudi students to change some of their beliefs and values. For example, students reported that they become more open-minded, accepting of others and treated individuals fairly and equally. Hill (2013) found that male Saudi students in the US believed that studying abroad allowed them to have contact with outgroup members with whom they did not typically have contact in Saudi Arabia, like Shia Muslims and women. Such contact can lead to improving attitudes towards individuals from outgroups. When Heyn (2013) interviewed Saudi students at a midwestern university in the US, they mentioned that studying abroad helped Saudi students to reshape some of their beliefs and attitudes towards others. A number of students in Heyn’s study reported that interacting with individuals from different backgrounds motivated them to respect outgroup members and look at them as equals. In addition, they confirmed that their attitudes towards Americans had changed after living and studying in the US. However, a pilot study by Alhazmi (2010) interviewed two Saudi students (male and female) in Australian universities to examine how the Saudi culture of gender segregation affects Saudi students regarding social interaction within the Australian society. Alhazmi found that the Saudi culture of
gender segregation affects Saudi students in Australia especially in regard to peer relationships, being in a mixed gender environment for the first time was a difficult experience especially for the Saudi female student, so she tended to isolate herself from her classmates. It seems clear that the origin culture has great influence on Saudis who reside abroad.
Chapter 2

Study 1. Saudi Arabian Children’s Reasoning About Religion-based Exclusion (part I)

Group affiliation and membership of a specific national, ethnic, or religious group can produce ingroup bias among children (Dunham, Baron, & Carey, 2011; Killen & Rutland, 2011; Rutland, Killen, & Abrams, 2010; Tajfel, 2010). One issue pertaining to ingroup bias is peer exclusion based on the membership of a group. Children’s peer exclusion based on group identity (Brenick & Romano, 2016; Killen et al., 2002; Malti, Killen, & Gasser, 2012; Møller & Tenenbaum, 2011) is related to lower academic and psychological adjustment (Coei, Lochman, Terry, & Hyman, 1992; DeRosier, Kupersmidt, & Patterson, 1994; Hughes, Del Toro, Harding, Way, & Rarick, 2016).

Previous research on peer exclusion has focused on children in the United States and Europe. This line of research has mostly investigated children’s reasoning based on ethnicity and gender (e.g., Hitti & Killen, 2015; Killen et al., 2002). However, little work on peer exclusion has been conducted in Arab nations. In the one study conducted in the Middle East (Brenick et al., 2010), children were asked whether it was acceptable to exclude others based on custom, language, or country. The specific customs, languages and countries were not identified by authors and thus, children did not reason about pre-existing groups in the Middle East.

To extend this line of research to different cultures, the current study focuses on children’s reasoning about the acceptability of peer exclusion based on religion (Muslim and non-Muslim) and sect (Sunni and Shia) by peers and fathers among children in Saudi Arabia. By doing so, such work offers insight into how the construction of different social outgroups can influence reasoning (Hopkins & Moore, 2001). Secondly, by focusing on exclusion in a collectivist society, such as Saudi Arabia (Al-Ruwaitea, 2004; Nevo, 1998), this study
extends past research on reasoning about authority figures, and in particular, how perpetrators of exclusion influence children’s decision making in collectivistic cultures.

In sum, this study differs from previous work on peer exclusion in two ways. First, it extends social domain theory by contributing to the understanding of how the salience of categories (religion) influences children’s reasoning. Second, no work in this area has compared social exclusion initiated by peers versus authority figures in a collectivist culture.

2.1. Social Domain Theory

This study combines social domain theory and social identity theory to understand how children reason about social exclusion. From the perspective of social domain theory (Turiel, 1983; 2015), individuals distinguish between multiple domains of social knowledge, a differentiation that emerges in early childhood. Turiel (1983) posits that individuals evaluate social events using three domains: the moral domain (focusing on fairness, justice, and rights in the treatment of others), the social conventional domain (reflecting the social authority and group functioning), and the psychological domain (relating to personal choice). Reasoning about peer exclusion pits children’s endorsement of fairness and equality against cultural norms, such as group functioning and thus, constitutes an ideal paradigm for understanding how children negotiate multiple understandings, beliefs, and values.

Using the domain model, past work on social exclusion has examined children’s reasoning and indicates that children tend to justify their evaluation of exclusion using moral knowledge and social conventions. Children’s use of these three domains differs based on the context in which exclusion is embedded (Killen et al., 2002; Møller & Tenenbaum, 2011).

2.2. Social Identity Theory

In addition to social domain theory, social identity theory also informs the current study. According to social identity theory, categorising individuals into groups is enough to produce ingroup favouritism (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Tajfel, 2010). Evidence suggests that
ingroup preference is related to less social distance between ingroup members compared with outgroup members (Verkuyten, 1991). Individuals also tend to apply favourable traits to ingroup members more than to outgroup members (i.e., “what is similar to me is good”). This tendency motivates individuals to prefer ingroup members (Bennett, Lyons, Sani, & Barrett, 1998).

Past work in intergroup attitudes in the US suggests children show such ingroup biases based on religion. For example, bullying against Muslim and Jewish students is more common than for other religious groups in the US (Wessler & De Andrade, 2006). Similarly, Elisha, Mills, and Grant (2010) found that US Muslim children endorsed negative attributions for non-Muslims more than for Muslims and also showed ingroup preferences. After September 11, 2011, many adult British Muslims reported increased discrimination (Sheridan, 2006). Thus, bias exists generally between Muslim and non-Muslim groups in Western countries. However, work has not looked at children’s judgements and reasoning about social exclusion in Arabic countries with Muslim majorities.

Similar to many Arabic countries with Muslim majorities in the Middle East, Saudi Arabia’s practices, laws, and educational curriculum are built on Islam (Metz, 1992; 2006). The official and dominant religion in Saudi Arabia is Sunni Islam (Metz, 2006). In Saudi Arabia, all citizens are Muslims and 95% of the citizens are Sunni Muslims while 5% are Shia Muslims (Metz, 2006). Shia and Sunni can be distinguished on the basis of names, birth places, accents, and religious practices (Matthiesen, 2014). Both sects hold the same beliefs; however, they differ on some religious and political practices (James, 2015). Many conflicts in the Middle East derive from this sectarian division (Blanchard, 2009).

Frequently, the sect that is in numerical minority in a particular nation-state experiences discrimination (BBC, 2016). Given that religion is a salient social dimension in Saudi Arabia,
the current study focused on how children evaluate peer exclusion based on religion and sect (i.e., being Muslim or non-Muslim, Sunni or Shia).

2.3. **Group Membership**

Based on the social identity literature, it is expected that Muslim majority children in Saudi Arabia would judge that the exclusion of ingroup members (Muslim or Sunni peers) is worse than the exclusion of outgroup members (non-Muslim or Shia peers) (Bennett, et al., 1998). Similar to judgments, how children reason in regard to exclusion may also vary depending on whether they are considering the exclusion of an ingroup or an outgroup member. When reasoning about non-Muslims, Muslim parents in Wales were concerned about the impact that such peers could have on their children (Scourfield, Gilliat-Ray, Khan, & Otri, 2010). For example, parents were worried about damage to their daughters’ morals and preferred individuals who shared the same religion. Based on these findings, it is expected that the children might condone the exclusion of outgroup members using social conventional reasoning more frequently than other reasons like moral or psychological ones because of concerns that contact could negatively affect the ingroup.

2.4. **The Authority of Father**

This study also will examine how children’s judgements and reasoning varied with the perpetrator of the exclusion. Past work in social domain theory has found that children’s evaluations of social events vary based on the legitimacy of the authority. According to Smetana et al. (2005), children tend to maintain authority in personal decisions, while conferring authority on issues related to moral and social conventions to their parents. Moreover, past work has found that, children as young as 7 years of age judge that it is better to abide by a moral act ordered by a peer than an immoral act ordered by a principal (Kim, 1998; Kim & Turiel, 1996; Laupa & Turiel, 1986). Indeed, Møller and Tenenbaum (2011) found that children judged exclusion as less acceptable and invoked more moral reasoning
when advocated by a teacher than a peer. However, Møller and Tenenbaum (2011) interviewed children in Denmark, a society that is far more individualistic than Saudi Arabia, which is a collectivist society (Al-Ruwaitea, 2004).

This lack of attention to peer exclusion ordered by an authority figure in collectivist cultures limits our understanding of the contextual nature of exclusion. In collectivist cultures, the authority of parents (and in particular fathers) plays a significant role in family life (Al-Simadi & Atoum, 2000; Chao & Tseng, 2008). In contrast to individualistic societies, collectivistic societies reinforce respect and the obedience to authority in children (Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2007). For example, parental control and authority by Asian parents (i.e., Indian, Filipino, Japanese, and Chinese parents) is greater than by European-American parents (Chao & Tseng, 2002). Similarly, Lin and Vu (1990) found that Chinese and Chinese-American parents emphasised obedience to authority and parental control more than European-American parents did.

Within Saudi society, like other collectivist cultures, the family is the main social institution and is considered the basis of individuals’ identity and status so family relationships are a priority (Alsaggaf, 2004; AlFadhel, 2012). Based on Arabic cultural traditions in Saudi Arabia, the father is at the top of the authority pyramid while the mother plays the role of caregiver (Abi-Hashem, 2008; Barakat, 1993). The structure of family is derived from Islamic Law with the husband serving as the leader of the family and the prime decision maker (Alanazi, 2008). Although many changes have happened in Saudi Arabia in recent years, the authority of the father and loyalty to family still exist (Alsaif, 1997, Pharaon, 2004).

Although mothers are close to their children, they socialize them to respect and obey their father; typically, mothers use the father to threaten children when they behave badly (Barakat, 1993). Given the lack of developmental research conducted on reasoning about
rights and freedom in Saudi Arabia, research in other Arabic communities informs the current study. As such, a study conducted on the Israeli Druze found a higher level of respect for men and obedience to them than to women by children (Turiel & Wainryb, 2000; Wainryb & Turiel, 1994). For this reason, children were asked about fathers’ decisions. Unlike past work conducted in individualistic cultures, it is expected that the children would be less likely to condemn exclusion sanctioned by an authority figure than a peer and that they would perceive the accepting of exclusion that ordered by father as belonging to the social conventional domain more than the moral domain.

2.5. **Age Differences**

Age may also influence judgments and reasoning, so children aged 8, 10, and 12 years were included. Consistent with previous research on social exclusion (e.g., Møller & Tenenbaum, 2011), children aged 8 were chosen to be the youngest group because they can understand and evaluate the concept of exclusion easily. The ability of children to weigh up multiple points in their reasoning increases from childhood to adolescence so children become more able to evaluate complex contexts with age (Killen, 2002). While younger children tend to use fairness and equality, adolescents can use different reasoning based on conventional norms, such as group functioning (Horn, 2003; Killen & Rutland, 2013).

Along with more evolved reasoning, there is a concomitant decrease in ingroup bias in older children compared to younger children (Abrams, Rutland, Pelletier, & Ferrell, 2009; Møller & Tenenbaum, 2011). In relation to authority, younger children would tend to be more obedient to authority than do older children; thus, their judgments might be affected by the father. A study on Druze and Israeli children, for instance, found that younger children have a greater tendency to obey authority than older children (Wainryb, 1995). In the current study, it is predicted that younger children (aged 8 years) would tend to accept exclusion
more than older children. Meanwhile, older children (aged 10-12) would tend to apply social conventional reasons.

2.6. The Present Study

The central goal of the current study is to examine how Saudi children judge and evaluate peer exclusion based on religious groups (Muslim and non-Muslim, Sunni and Shia) in two scenarios: when the perpetrator of the exclusion was a peer and when the perpetrator was a father. Two sets of hypotheses were developed based on theoretical frameworks, past work on children’s reasoning about exclusion and the cultural context of Saudi Arabia. The first set of hypotheses focused on children’s judgments. First, it is expected that children would be less accepting of exclusion when the excluded child was a member of their ingroup (Tajfel, 2010). Second, because of the fundamental role of authority in collectivist societies (Al-Simadi & Atoum, 2000), it is expected that the children would find a father’s exclusion of a child more acceptable than a peer’s exclusion. Third, based on decreased ingroup bias in older children aged 10-11 years (Abrams et al., 2009), it is predicted that older children would be less accepting of exclusion than 8-year-old children.

The second set of hypotheses focused on children’s reasoning. First, it is hypothesised that children would be more likely to view the exclusion of an outgroup vs ingroup child as a social issue (Khan & Ecklund, 2012; Scourfield, Gilliat-Ray, Khan, & Otri, 2010). Second, it is hypothesised that children would justify the exclusion following fathers’ instructions as a social issue more than when they followed their peers’ instructions (Turiel & Wainryb, 2000; Wainryb & Turiel, 1994; Barakat, 1993). Finally, it is hypothesised that the 8-year-old children would invoke more moral reasons compared to other reasons whereas 10-12-year old children would use more social issues (Horn, 2003; Killen & Rutland, 2013).
2.7. Method

2.7.1. Participants

The participants comprised 92 Sunni children (63 girls, 29 boys). There were 32 children in Grade 4 ($M = 8.53$ years, $SD = .51$), 30 in Grade 6 ($M = 10.53$ years, $SD = .51$), and 30 in Grade 8 ($M =12.40$ years, $SD = .50$). The researcher contacted a number of Saudi families and sent emails explaining the research to them and asking for volunteer participants, and then asking them to refer friends and family. Participants’ parents provided written permission and children provided verbal assent. The interviews took place in participants’ home.

2.7.2. Materials

Eight vignettes consisting of short stories about exclusion were read to the children. In half of the vignettes the perpetrator of the exclusion was the main character (father) and in the other half the perpetrator was a group of peers. There were four targets of exclusion based on religious group (Muslim and Sunni versus non-Muslim and Shia). Table 1 lists the vignettes. The order of the vignettes was counterbalanced. After each vignette, the children were asked whether or not it was ok to exclude a child. They were then asked whether they thought this “a lot” or “a little”. The children’s answers were scored as (1 not ok a lot- 2 not ok a little- 3 ok a little- 4 ok a lot). Then for the open-ended question, the participants were asked “why” to justify their judgment. The interviews were audiotaped, and transcribed.

Table 1. Vignettes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer</th>
<th>Father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussein, a Shia boy, is playing football with his friends. Omar wants to play with them, but they say they don’t want to play with him because he is a Sunni.</td>
<td>Ali (a Shia boy) wants to play football with a group of Sunni boys, but his father does not allow him because the boys are Sunni.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reem wants to join a group of non-Muslim girls who play in the park, but the non-Muslim girls say that only non-Muslim girls can join the group. Her father does not allow her because the girls are non-Muslim.

Outgroup

A group of Muslim girls plays in the park. Maria wants to play with them, but they say they do not want to play with her because she is not Muslim.

A group of Sunni boys plays football each weekend in the park. One day, a Shia boy wants to play with them, but they say they don’t want to play with him because he is a Shia.

Maria (a non-Muslim girl) wants to join a group of Muslim girls who play in the park, but her father doesn’t allow her because the girls are Muslim.

Muath wants to play a football with a group of Shia boys, but his father does not allow him because the boys are Shia.

### 2.7.3. Procedure

The Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences at the University of Surrey granted the study “Saudi children’s reasoning regarding exclusion based on religion” (UEC/2015/041/FAHS) ethical approval. After obtaining parental permission, the children were interviewed individually for approximately 15-20 minutes in a quiet room at their home. Children were informed that the interviews would be audio recorded, confidential, and that there were no right or wrong answers. The answers of the open-ended question were transcribed and coded by the researcher and then entered into SPSS.

### 2.7.4. Coding Categories

The children’s justifications were coded using a coding system adapted from Killen et al. (2002) and Ruck et al. (2002). This coding system has been used to analyse social reasoning in previous research (Killen et al., 2002; Killen & Stangor, 2001; Møller and Tenenbaum, 2011). The coding categories included moral (fairness, empathy, and integration), social conventional (group functioning, authority, social influence, religious influence, and stereotype), and psychological (personal choice) reasons. Each time children
invoked a category, it was coded a 1 in the data set and a 0 when it was not used. Because psychological reasoning occurred less than 10% of the time in the data set, it is not included in analyses. Table 2 gives examples of the coding in more detail. To check that the coding scheme was appropriate, ten transcripts were translated into English and checked by the first supervisor. After discussion, a new subcategory (religious influence) was added to the social conventional category.

Table 2. Justification Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Definition and Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>Focus on fairness and equality. “They are equal, so they should allow to him to play.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Focus on feelings of the individuals and caring about them. “Shame on girls to exclude Maria. I feel that she is upset, sad, and crying.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Refers to wrongfulness of discrimination and consequences of prejudice. “It is discrimination, children should play together and love each other to avoid wars and problems”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Conventional Group function</td>
<td>Need to make the group function well. “They should let Omar play with them. It is better to have more members in case one of them is injured.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Focus on parental jurisdiction, religious and governmental authority and jurisdiction. “Maybe their fathers do not want them to play with this boy so if they let him play, their fathers will get sad or punish them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/ Religion influence</td>
<td>Related to influencing others. “They must allow Maria to play with them and teach her Islam to be a real Muslim.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social tradition</td>
<td>Appealing to stereotypes and labels attributed to an individual based on group membership. “They do not let Reem play with them because they think all Muslims are terrorists.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Personal choice</td>
<td>Focus on the character’s rights to individual preferences of prerogatives. “The girls have a choice. They are free. They do not want to play with her.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.7.5. Reliability Coding

The researcher and an Arabic-speaking colleague coded 30% (34 transcripts) of the interviews independently. The overall Kappa was $K = .80$.

2.8. Results

2.8.1. Analytic Plan

First, a one-sample $t$-test comparing to 2.5 was run to examine the acceptance of exclusion generally in children. Second, a $3 \times 2 \times 2$ (Age: 8, 10, 12) × (Perpetrator: Peer, Father) × (Group: ingroup, outgroup) mixed-design ANOVA was conducted to examine judgments about the acceptability of exclusion. The first factor was between-subjects and the final two factors were within-subjects factors. Children’s ratings on each vignette ranged from 1 (no agreement with exclusion) to 4 (high agreement with exclusion). Third, a $3 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$ (Age: 8, 10, 12) × (Perpetrator: father, peer) × (Group: ingroup, outgroup) × (Reason: moral, social conventional) mixed-design ANOVA was conducted on children’s reasoning. The first factor was between-subjects and the last three factors were within-subjects factors. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) models were used to examine the dichotomous justification data. Part of the reason is that we used three repeated factors. These procedures are preferable to log-linear analytical procedures when analysing dichotomous and repeated measures designs) and can be used when the degrees of freedom for the error terms are greater than 40 (Lunney, 1970). Fuller explanations (Posada & Wainryb, 2008; Wainryb, Shaw, Laupa, & Smith, 2001) and uses of their procedure can be found in developmental studies (e.g. Smetana, 1981; Corenblum & Wilson, 1982; Sayöl, 2001; Yau & Smetana, 2003; Wainryb, Shaw, Langley, & Lewis, 2004; Conry-Murray, 2013; Malti, Killen, & Gasser, 2012; Tenenbaum & Ruck, 2012; Conry-Murray, Kim, & Turiel, 2015; Nelson & Mondloch, 2018). Follow-up tests were conducted to examine all significant interaction effects. Only significant main and interaction effects related to the hypotheses are reported.
2.8.2. Exclusion Judgments

Generally, children showed less acceptance to the exclusion ($M = 2.04$, $SD = .73$). On average, the acceptance of exclusion was less than 2.5, $t(91) = -.50$, $p < .001$, $d = .64$.

**Group membership.** As expected by the first hypothesis, children thought it was more acceptable to exclude an outgroup member ($M = 2.30$, $SD = 1.09$) than an ingroup member ($M = 1.80$, $SD = 1.08$), $F(1, 89) = 37.13$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .30$.

**The Authority of Father.** Confirming the second hypothesis, children thought it was more acceptable when exclusion was ordered by a father ($M = 2.20$, $SD = 1.04$) than a peer ($M = 1.90$, $SD = 1.08$), $F(1, 89) = 18.54$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .17$.

**Group x Perpetrator.** The main effects were qualified by a significant Group x Perpetrator Interaction effect, $F(1, 89) = 12.52$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2_p = .12$. Two follow-up repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted with a protected alpha level of .025. When discussing the exclusion of ingroup members, children did not differ in their acceptability judgements as a function of the perpetrator, $F(1, 91) < 1$. However, when discussing the exclusion of outgroup members, children thought it was more acceptable to exclude an outgroup member when ordered by a father ($M = 2.58$, $SD = 1.12$) than by a peer ($M = 2.00$, $SD = .95$), $F(1, 91) = 27.83$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .23$.

**Age Differences.** The third hypothesis was not supported, there was no significant main effect of age, $F(2, 89) = 1.82$, $p = .17$, nor were there any significant interactions with age. Age $\times$ Group, $F(2, 89) = 2.52$, $p = .08$. Age $\times$ Perpetrator, $F(2, 89) = .15$, $p = .86$, $\eta^2_p = .23$, $\eta^2_p = .03$.

2.8.3. Exclusion Reasoning

**Group Membership.** There was a significant Group $\times$ reason interaction effect, $F(1.98) = 10.25$, $p = .002$, $\eta^2_p = .10$. To examine the interaction, two repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted for each reason with group (ingroup, outgroup) with a protected
alpha of .025. As hypothesised, children tended to use moral reasoning to justify exclusion of ingroup members \((M = .44, SD = .34)\) more than to justify outgroup members \((M = .40, SD = .33)\), \(F(1.91) = 12.80, \ p = .001, \ \eta_p^2 = .13\). As expected, children used social conventional reasoning when outgroup members were excluded \((M = .42, SD = .30)\) more than when ingroup members were excluded \((M = .34, SD = .30)\), \(F (1.91) = 9.92, \ p = .002, \ \eta_p^2 = .10\).

**The Authority of Father.** There was a significant Perpetrator × Reason interaction effect, \(F (1.89) = 12.80, \ p = .001, \ \eta_p^2 = .13\). To examine the interaction, two repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted for each reason, children tended to use social conventional reasoning to justify exclusion by fathers \((M = .50, SD = .34)\) more than the exclusion by peers \((M = .31, SD = .31)\), \(F (1, 91) = 12.60, \ p = .001, \ \eta_p^2 = .12\). In contrast, children used more moral reasoning when the perpetrator of exclusion was peer \((M = .50, SD = .40)\) than when it was father \((M = .40, SD = .40)\), \(F (1.91) = 8.80, \ p = .004, \ \eta_p^2 = .10\).

**Age Differences.** There was a significant Reason × Age interaction effect, \(F (2.89) = 5.53, \ p = .005, \ \eta_p^2 = .11\). Contrary to the final hypothesis, eight-year-old children did not differ in their reasoning patterns, \(F (1.31) = 2.11, \ p = .15\), nor did 12-year-old children, \(F (1.29) = 2.83, \ p = .10\). As hypothesised, 10-year-old children tended to use more social conventional \((M = .51, SD = .24)\) than moral reasoning \((M = .28, SD = .24)\), \(F (1.29) = 7.20, \ p = .012, \ \eta_p^2 = .20\).

2.9. **Discussion**

The current study examined how Saudi children evaluate and justify peer exclusion based on religion depending on whether the perpetrator of the exclusion was the father or a peer. Children’s judgements and reasoning varied as a function of both target’s group and the source of exclusion. Supporting social identity theory, children believed that it was more acceptable to exclude an outgroup member than an ingroup member (Tajfel, 2010). Children
tended to use social conventional reasoning more when discussing the exclusion of outgroup than ingroup members. In contrast to past research (Møller & Tenenbaum, 2011), the participants were more likely to support exclusion when ordered by a father than a peer and used more social conventional reasoning in these cases. In terms of age, no age differences were found in the children’s judgement of exclusion, but 10-year-old children used more social conventional than moral reasoning.

**Group Membership.** In line with expectations drawn from social identity theory, the attitudes of the children reveal ingroup bias as they accepted the exclusion of an outgroup member more than an ingroup member (Tajfel, 2010). Children may distinguish ingroup members from outgroups in order to protect their group identity from threats and maintain their self-esteem (Breakwell, 2015); this in turn leads to discrimination against outgroup members. The findings contrasted with past studies (Møller & Tenenbaum, 2011), in which children judged it worse to exclude outgroup members than ingroup members.

When discussing the exclusion of outgroup members, children tended to invoke social conventional reasoning. The majority of this reasoning focused on the social and religious influence of an outgroup member. Previous research on intergroup exclusion based on gender and ethnicity has shown that children are concerned about group functioning when justifying the exclusion of an outgroup (Killen et al., 2002). Judging exclusion based on religion, children frequently used social conventional reasoning that explicitly mentioned religious influences to justify the exclusion of the outgroup. For example, a 10-year-old boy expressed the following judgement on exclusion of non-Muslims: ‘When a Muslim child plays with non-Muslims, they will encourage her/him to leave Islam and the God will punish him/her’. Another 12-year-old girl mentioned that ‘a non-Muslim could affect Muslims girls’ beliefs regarding wearing a hejab (veil) and abaya (cloak)’. Justifications about dress reflect the social and religious conventions that are rooted in societies (Turiel, 2002). It seems that
children’s reasoning reflected the fear of negative effects of non-Muslims on Muslim children’s religion and behaviours (Scourfield, Gilliat-Ray, Khan, & Otri, 2010).

Another reason children may have believed it was more acceptable to exclude non-Muslims compared to Muslims is because of little contact with the outgroup. Limited interaction with outgroup members may affect children’s judgments of exclusion. For example, Killen (2007) found that children in non-diverse schools believed it was more acceptable to exclude outgroup members than children in diverse schools.

When children argued for including outgroup members, occasionally the children did so for the purpose of spreading Islam, which was a type of social conventional reasoning. Children used this type of reasoning about 10% of the time to justify their answers. Supporting this view, a 10-year-old girl asserted: ‘They must allow a non-Muslim girl to play with them, teach her Islam, and convince her to convert to Islam. This is the best way to spread Islam around the world’. This category of social conventional reasoning has not been found in previous research.

The Authority of Father. Living in a collectivist society may also have influenced how children evaluated the perpetrator of peer exclusion (Turiel, 1998). Contrary to Møller and Tenenbaum (2011), but in line with expectations drawn from the literature on fathers’ authority in patriarchal and patrilineal societies, children perceived exclusion as more acceptable when an authority figure was the perpetrator than when it was a peer (Al-Simadi & Atoum, 2000; Turiel & Wainryb, 2000). Given the high degree of obedience and respect for authority in collectivist societies (Lin & Vu, 1990; Chao & Tseng, 2002; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2007), it is not surprising that children would respect their fathers’ instructions and admonishments. Moreover, in Islamic culture, Muslims consider obedience to parental authority as a duty. Indeed, children noted that they were afraid of God’s punishment if they disobeyed their fathers and used social conventional reasoning in this context. As an eight-
year-old boy remarked: ‘The child should obey his father; otherwise, Allah will punish him and send him to hell’ and ‘everyone must obey his parents to gain good deeds’. Thus, children’s patterns of judging the perpetrator of exclusion differed from previous research.

**Age Differences.** The findings regarding age confirm previous research (Møller & Tenenbaum, 2011; Killen et al, 2002) that has shown that age is not strongly associated with children’s judgments. Although Killen et al (2002) found that 15-year-olds condone peer exclusion based on gender and ethnicity more than nine- or 12-year-olds, there was no significant difference between nine- and 12-year-olds. However, the 10-year-old children tended to use social conventional reasons to justify their judgements about exclusion.

Consistent with previous work, with age the children became more able to invoke different and more complicated reasons related to social conventional norms (Horn, 2003; Killen & Rutland, 2013).

The increase in social knowledge with age makes children more understanding of the meaning of being a member of a certain social system, which can affect their social interactions and judgments (Nucci, 2001). Thus, awareness of religious identity and the feeling of affiliation to a specific religious group may encourage children aged 10 years to rely on social conventional reasoning, such as social and religion influence or stereotyping in their judgement of exclusion. Indeed, around age 10 years, children use stereotyping and prejudice to justify why someone may not like to be a member of their ethnic group, so they are aware of others’ stereotyping and make judgments using this stereotype (McKown & Weinstein, 2003; Quintana & Vera, 1999). Often, adolescents become more nuanced in their reasoning (Killen & Rutland, 2011), which may account for why this difference did not persist in the older age group. In the current study, all of the participants were 12 years old or younger. Thus, future research is needed to examine the influence of age on religion-based peer exclusion with older age groups.
2.9.1. Limitations and Future Directions

One limitation was the vignettes we used. The peer versus father vignettes differed because the father excludes his own child. Also, following Malti et al. (2012), a group of peers excludes rather than a single perpetrator. Second, because some snowball sampling was used, participants could be from similar backgrounds. Third, the researcher was not blind to the study design when coding the interviews. Future research is needed to examine the relationship between socialization and children’s judgments, such as how mothers socialize children to understand peer exclusion.

2.9.2. Conclusions and Implications

In sum, this study extends social domain theory by demonstrating that children’s judgements and reasoning are embedded within the socio-cultural values of their communities. In more collectivistic cultures, such as Saudi Arabia, adults’ authority may be stronger than in more individualistic cultures, such as the Danish one.

There are also practical implications of this research. Given the negative effects on young people of ethno-political violence especially in Middle Eastern countries (Niwa, Dubow, Shikaki, Boxer, Huesmann, & Landau, 2016), the results of the current study could support the current efforts of the Saudi government to promote tolerance and reduce prejudice (Alrassi, 2014). Indeed, in 2003, King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia began a series of semi-public National Dialogues to discuss socio-political issues, such as tolerance between different sects and religions (Thompson, 2011). Thus, such research focusing on religious exclusion could support the vision of Saudi government to reduce prejudice and enhance tolerance. Given the obedience children demonstrate toward fathers in moral judgement and reasoning, it seems that any intervention will need to involve fathers. One solution might be to find ways of increasing fathers’ awareness of the negative impact that exclusion has on society in Saudi Arabia, where non-Muslims coexist with Muslims.
2.10. What do Saudi Shia Think of Religious-based Exclusion? (Part II)

In the previous study in this chapter, Sunni children were more likely to accept exclusion when the target was an out-group member than an in-group member. Also, they accepted exclusion by father more than by peers. There were no age differences in the evaluation of exclusion.

Although the original plan of this thesis was to include a larger sample of Shia children and compare them with the majority (Sunni), it became too difficult after the terrorist attacks in the Shia mosques in Saudi Arabia to obtain the required sample. Individuals became more cautious to hosting strangers from different sects in their homes. As a result, only a small group of Shia families agreed for their children to take part, so the Shia data are analysed in this chapter separately from (and not in comparison with) the Sunni data.

Past research on peer exclusion mostly has focused on the majority’s attitude towards minorities (Boud & Amato, 2001; Killen, Margie, & Sinno, 2006; Møller & Tenenbaum, 2011). However, Killen and colleagues (2002) included both majority and minority members of groups in their research. They found that both majority and minority members condemned exclusion, but the minority used empathy-based moral reasoning more than the majority did. Similarly, Killen and colleagues (2014) found that minorities tend to use more moral reasons, such as empathy, to condemn exclusion, than do majority group members.

2.10.1. The Authority of Father

As mentioned previously, fathers in Saudi Arabia have control over family members and have a strong influence on children’s decisions. The previous part of this chapter found that Saudi children were more likely to accept exclusion by their fathers than by their peers and they tended to use social conventional reasoning when the perpetrator was father. Regarding group status, Killen and colleagues (2002) found that parental authority has an influence on the judgement of peer exclusion among minority groups in the US.
2.10.2. The Current Study

The aim of this short study is to examine how Shia children in Saudi Arabia evaluate religion-based exclusion whether the perpetrator of exclusion is father or peer. Also, this study will examine if there are age differences in children’s evaluation. Three hypotheses were proposed. First, in line with social identity theory and similar to the first part of this chapter, Shia children were expected to accept the exclusion of out-group member. Second, based on the previous literature in the authority of father in Saudi Arabia and in minority group, the Shia children were expected to accept exclusion when ordered by their father. Third, based on previous literature (Killen et al., 2002; Killen et al., 2014), children would use moral reasoning more than social reasoning to justify their judgment of exclusion.

2.10.3. Method

2.10.3.1. Participants

The participants were comprised of 24 Saudi Shia children (9 girls and 15 boys). There were 5 children in Grade 4 \((M = 10.71 \text{ years}, SD = 1.30)\), 13 in Grade 6 \((M = 10.54 \text{ years}, SD = .52)\), and 6 in Grade 8 \((M =12.50 \text{ years}, SD = .55)\). Nearly 70 % of them attended international schools. A number of Shia mothers contacted the researcher after hearing about the study from other Saudi families. Participants’ parents provided written permission and children provided verbal assent. The interviews took place in participants’ home, and both children and their mothers were interviewed. However, mothers were asked to leave the child alone with the researchers during the interviews.

2.10.3.2. Materials

Eight vignettes consisting of short stories about exclusion were used. Table 1 displays these vignettes. See part I for the interview procedure.

2.10.3.3. Procedure
This project received ethical clearance from the University of Surrey Ethics Committee (UEC/2015/041/FAHS).

2.10.3.4. Coding Categories

Table 2 gives examples of the coding in more detail. Reliability is described in part I.

2.10.4. Results

Exclusion Judgements

Using one-sample t-tests, children’s scores were compared to 2.5 on whether they were accepting of exclusion.

**Group Membership.** In contrast to the first hypothesis, children did not accept the exclusion of out-group members ($M = 1.50, SD = .71$) when compared to the midpoint of 2.5, $t (24) = -7.13, p < .001, d = -.82$. Also, children did not accept exclusion of in-group members ($M = 1.50, SD = .72$) when compared to the midpoint of 2.5, $t (24) = -6.92, p < .001, d = .98$.

**The Authority of Father.** In contrast to the second hypothesis, children did not accept exclusion by fathers ($M = 1.60, SD = .60$) when compared to the midpoint of 2.5, $t (24) = -5.20, p < .001, d = -.97$. Also, children did not accept exclusion by peers ($M = 1.40, SD = .70$) when compared to the midpoint of 2.5, $t (24) = -8.50, p < .001, d = -.99$.

**Reasoning Judgments**

Generally, children used moral reasoning more than social conventional reasoning, $\chi^2 (1) = 49.70, p = .02$. There was no difference in the justification when the Shia child was excluded by Sunni peers, $\chi^2 (1) = 3.64, p = .13$. Children used moral reasoning to justify their judgment of exclusion when the Muslim child was excluded by non-Muslim peers, $\chi^2 (1) = 6.72, p = .02$ but there was no difference in the justification when the non-Muslim child was excluded by Muslim peers, $\chi^2 (1) = 3.43, p = .13$. However, children used moral reasoning to justify their judgment of exclusion when the Sunni child was excluded by the Shia father, $\chi^2$
Also, children used moral reasoning to justify their judgment of exclusion when the Shia child was excluded by a Sunni father more than social conventional reasoning, \( \chi^2 (1) = 18.24, p < .001 \). Moreover, children used moral reasoning to justify their judgment of exclusion when a Muslim child was excluded by a non-Muslim father more than social conventional reasoning, \( \chi^2 (1) = 12.63, p = .001 \). Finally, there was no difference in the justification when the non-Muslim child was excluded by Muslim father, \( \chi^2 (1) = 3.43, p = .14 \).

**Discussion**

The current study examined Shia children’s judgments and justifications regarding religious-based exclusion. The findings support past work on peer exclusion (Killen et. al, 2002; Ruck et al., 2015). Shia minority children did not accept exclusion whether the victim was an ingroup or outgroup member and whether the perpetrator was father or peers. They used moral reasoning reasons to justify their judgement for most of the vignettes.

Previous research has suggested that peer exclusion depends on group status of children who evaluate the exclusion (minority or majority) (Killen et al., 2002; Killen et al., 2014). Shia children in this study did not show significant difference in their judgment of exclusion based on the group membership (ingroup-outgroup) or based on the perpetrator identity (father, peer) and their justifications were centred on moral reasons. In the US, ethnic minority group members tended to be condemn peer exclusion more than majority group members. This difference between minority and majority group members may result from personal experiences of being excluded by the members of majority groups in intergroup communication (Killen et al. 2002; Killen et al. 2007). Indeed, numerical minorities are more likely to condemn exclusion because of their first-hand experience of discrimination and they develop empathy towards the victims of exclusion (Killen et.al, 2002; Killen et al. 2007Killen & Rutland, 2011). For example, a 12-year-old Shia boy expressed his judgement
about the exclusion of a Shia child: “It is discrimination, they should not do such things. Sunni and Shia are equal. Both are Muslim brothers. I did not tell my friends in school that I am Shia, but I was a witness to a case of bullying where one of the pupils laughed at a Shia boy, it was painful”.

Another possible interpretation of this finding comes from research on the contact hypothesis (for a review see Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Killen & Rutand, 2013; Killen, Yip, & Rutland, 2016). It is notable that 70% of the Shia participants attended international schools with a multicultural environment, so they had contact with children from different backgrounds. Indeed, previous research has found that intergroup contact reduces prejudice against outgroup members (e.g., Brenick et al., 2010; Ruck et al., 2015). A Shia girl who attended an international school reported: “For example, in my school, there are a lot of people from all around the world. We have people from Spain, Pakistan, and Korea, and we are bound to respect each other. We have people with different religions from all over the world, and we should respect each other equally. No one cares what your religion is as long as you are a good person”.

On the other hand, the fact that the majority of the Shia participants attended international schools was a limitation of the study. As a result, we could not tease apart whether the Shia children were more sensitive to discrimination because of their minority status, or because of their contact with people from a variety of backgrounds. Thus, future research should be conducted with Shia children who attend state schools.

It is also important for any future research to have a balanced number in each age group.

In conclusion, confirming the past work on minority groups, the Shia children condemned peer exclusion using moral justifications, such as equality and empathy. Shia children were more accepting of exclusion when the perpetrator was their father. Thus, the
findings of this study provide clear evidence of how authority can influence children’s beliefs. This study shows that children obey their fathers’ instructions even when the acts may be deemed immoral. From the findings of this study, different kinds of interventions including fathers and children could be designed.

The main limitation of the current study is the small sample size. Thus, future research should include a larger sample and compare Shia children with children from the Sunni majority.
Chapter: 3


The previous chapter found that children were more accepting of the exclusion of outgroup members than ingroup members. Additionally, that chapter provided strong evidence that children accept the authority of their fathers on their decisions. Some scholars attribute children’s intergroup attitudes in general to their parents (i.e., they assume that children assimilate their parents’ attitudes towards others) (Allport, 1954; Degner & Dalege, 2011; Doosje et al., 2011; Raabe & Beelmann, 2011). This chapter will look at Saudi children’s and their mothers’ evaluation of exclusion to understand whether there are differences and correspondences in intergroup attitudes between mothers and children. Although previous work has examined the relation between children’s perceptions of parents’ attitudes toward exclusion (e.g., Killen at el., 2002), no study has yet examined the relation between mothers’ and children’s attitudes toward exclusion.

3.1. Parental Socialization of Intergroup Attitudes

Allport (1945), in his seminal book, The Nature of Prejudice, argues that children learn attitudes towards outgroup members from home and adopt their parents’ attitudes. It is commonly hypothesised that children’s attitudes are affected directly by how adults categorize groups or indirectly through nonverbal behaviours and, in the absence of direct and indirect parental behaviours, intergroup attitudes may develop from the observation of parents’ intergroup attitudes (Bigler & Liben, 2007; Dovidio, Kawakami, & Gaertner, 2002).

Supporting the previous argument, a meta-analysis of 45,000 parent-child dyads found a medium sized effect across 131 studies of parents’ and children’s intergroup attitudes (Degner & Dalege, 2013). However, the influence of parents on children’s intergroup
attitudes is not always simple and direct. For example, a four-year longitudinal study of 213 children and their parents by Jugert Eckstein, Beelmann and Noack (2016) found a modest influence of parents on in-group bias. The influence of fathers’ in-group bias on children was greater than that of mothers. The result suggested that fathers’ opinion and voice are more powerful than mothers’. The influence of fathers’ attitudes was higher on grade 3 and 4 children than on grade 2 children. However, the transmission of parental in-group bias to children was moderated by parental style and parental similarities. Control and a pressured parenting style by mothers increased mothers’ influence on in-group bias in children. Also, parents holding similar attitudes positively affected the transmission of in-group bias to children.

An important distinction to take into account in the analysis of parent-child relationship concerning intergroup attitudes is the one between explicit and implicit attitudes. Castelli, Zogmaister, and Tomelleri (2009) found that mothers’ attitudes (but not fathers’) predicted children’s attitudes, but at the implicit level. In contrast, there was not a relationship for explicit attitudes. In another study, Castelli, De Dea, and Nesdale (2008) demonstrated that parents’ implicit attitudes strongly affected their children’s attitudes more than Parents’ explicit tolerant attitudes.

Children’s identification with their parents may also moderate the relationship between parents’ and children’s intergroup attitudes. A strong parent-child correlation was found in children who highly identify with their parents, whereas the correlation was weaker in those who identify with them less (Sinclair, Dunn, & Lowery, 2005; Miklikowska, 2016). In addition, the parent-children relationship is stronger in children with supportive parents than in children with non-supportive parents. Children of supportive parents tend to respect and please their parents so the relationship between parents’ and children’s attitudes among those children will be stronger than when parents are less supportive (Miklikowska, 2016).
So, studying parents’ and children’s intergroup attitudes is not simple or direct because of the number of variables and moderators that could affect this relationship.

3.2. Mother-Child Relationship

Given that mothers spend more time with their children than fathers do, mothers are expected to play a crucial role in the transmission of intergroup attitudes to children (Abi-Hashem, 2008; Barakat, 1993; O’Bryan, Fishbein & Ritchey, 2004). Castelli, De Dea, and Nesdale (2008) found that a high level of implicit prejudice in mothers is related to children preferring outgroup classmates less and applying more negative traits to outgroup peers. Mothers indeed can influence their children even indirectly through non-verbal behaviours (Castelli, De Dea & Nesdale, 2008). Providing evidence of the relationship between mothers and their children regarding intergroup attitudes, a study of 3- to 6-year-old children found that children’s implicit racial attitudes were significantly related to all measures of their mothers’ attitudes, but not with their fathers’ attitudes (Castelli, Zogmaister, & Tomelleri, 2009). However, the association between mothers’ and children’s judgements disappears when social desirability motivates mothers to hide their attitudes. In contrast, children are often less aware of social desirability and therefore more honest (Doyle, Beaudet, & Aboud, 1988; Degner & Dalege, 2011). Baron and Banaji (2006) found that adults reported an equal preference for outgroup and ingroup members in explicit bias, while children aged 6 years showed intergroup bias. Ten-year-old children showed an intermediate level of explicit ingroup bias. On the other hand, in the same study, no difference was found in implicit race bias between children and adults.

Note, the transmission of parents’ intergroup attitudes to children may differ depending on intergroup domains. However, there seems to be a lot of work on parents’ and children’s ethnic intergroup attitudes, but not as much (if anything) on religious intergroup attitudes.
3.3. **Parent-Child Religious Intergroup Attitudes**

Parents play an important role in transmitting religious beliefs and religious practices to children. In a parent–child relationship, religion is expected to be discussed often, especially in a religion such as Islam that considers the transmission of religious beliefs to children as a religious duty. Muslim parents not only transmit their religious beliefs to their children, but they try as well to protect their children from being affected by other religions. As mentioned earlier, Muslim parents in Wales reported concerns about the impact that peers from other religions could have on their children (e.g., damages to their daughters’ morals). Thus, they preferred Muslims peers who shared the same beliefs to be friends with their children (Scourfield, Gilliat-Ray, Khan, & Otri, 2010).

Modood and colleagues (1997) found that religion is the centre of self-definition for most Muslims, and when asked about how important religion was to the way individuals lead their lives, the majority of Muslims (95%) stated either very important or important. In addition, Franceschelli and O’Brien (2014) found that parents and their children perceive Islam as ‘more than religion’, and report that the effect of Islam extends to social relationships. Taken together, the strong influence of Islam on Muslims’ daily life and the normal preference for ingroup members (i.e., based on social identity theory, categorising individuals based on any domains will lead to ingroup bias) should affect parent’s intergroup attitudes, which may be transmitted to children.

3.4. **The Authority of Men**

The influence of religion on parent-child intergroup attitudes cannot be understood without referring to the authority of fathers. In general, Islamic family laws support the dependent position of women, whilst promoting patriarchy and the independence of men. As Allah says in the holy Qur’an: “Men are in charge of women by [right of] what Allah has given one over the other and what they spend [for maintenance] from their wealth”.
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Moreover, obedience to one’s father and a father’s satisfaction is related to God’s obedience and a way to paradise in Islamic culture (Douki, Nacef, Belhadj, Bouasker, & Ghachem, 2003; al-Hibri, 1997; Sultán, 1999). The authority of men supported by Islam may lead to a high influence of father’s religious attitudes on children and their mothers. Thus, research is needed to bring together the child-parent relationship in intergroup attitudes, religion, and the authority of father.

3.5. The Present Study

This study aims to extend the literature of parent-children intergroup attitudes by examining how Saudi children and their mothers evaluate religion-based exclusion when the target is an ingroup (Muslim, Sunni) or outgroup member (non-Muslim, Shia). Also, this study investigates whether the authority of father affects mothers’ and children’s judgements of exclusion. Five hypotheses were developed based on theoretical frameworks, past work and the cultural context of Saudi Arabia.

First, based on the literature reviewed (Castelli et al., 2009; Degner & Dalege, 2013; Jugert et al., 2016), it is expected that there will be a significant relationship between mothers and children in terms of their evaluation of religion-based exclusion. Second, it is expected that children and their mothers will be more accepting of the exclusion of outgroup members than ingroup members. Third, based on the power of father over children and mothers in Saudi society (Le Renard, 2008), it is expected that both children and their mothers will rate exclusion by fathers as more acceptable than when suggested by peers. Fourth, similar to the results of Chapter 2, children and their mothers will use social conventional reasoning when discussing the exclusion of outgroup members. Fifth, based on the previous chapter in which children in the previous chapter used social conventional reasoning (e.g., authority) to justify the exclusion by fathers more than by peers, we expect a similar pattern.
3.6. Method

3.6.1. Participants

The participants consisted of 60 Saudi Sunni children (one child was picked from each mother from Study 3 and the other siblings were excluded when more than one child from a family participated) and their mothers. There were 20 children in grade 4 ($M = 8.50$, $SD = .51$), 20 children in grade 6 ($M = 10.55$ years, $SD = .51$ months), and 20 children in grade 8 ($M = 12.40$, $SD = .50$). Twenty-four children were boys, and 36 were girls. The mean age of the mothers was 41.33 years, $SD = 7.30$. Of the mothers, 38% had a university degree, three held a postgraduate degree, nearly 31% of them had finished high school, four attended middle school, and one had no formal education. Forty-five mothers worked outside home, and the rest were stay-at-home mothers.

3.6.2. Materials

Eight vignettes consisting of short stories about exclusion were used. Table 1 displays these vignettes. In half of the vignettes the perpetrator of the exclusion was the main character’s father and in the other half the perpetrator was a group of peers. There were four targets of exclusion based on religious group (Muslim and Sunni versus non-Muslim and Shia). Thus, there were two ingroup types of vignettes Muslim and Sunni, and the outgroup included non-Muslim and Shia. The order of the vignettes was counterbalanced. There were two questions on a 4-point Likert scale after each vignette: whether or not it was ok to exclude a child and whether they thought this “a little” (“1”) or “a lot” (“4”). After answering the closed-ended question, the participants were asked “why” to justify their judgment.

3.6.3. Procedure

This project received ethical clearance from the University of Surrey Ethics Committee (UEC/2015/041/FAHS). After obtaining the family’s consent, a home visit was
arranged by the researcher to interview the mothers and their children. Each participant was interviewed individually for approximately 15-20 minutes. Participants were informed that the interviews would be audio recorded, confidential, and that there were no right or wrong answers. The eight vignettes were read to the participants in counterbalanced order. After each vignette the participants were asked whether or not it is ok to exclude a child and why. The children’s answers were scored as 1 (not ok a lot), 2 (not ok a little), 3 (ok a little) and 4 (ok a lot). The answers of the open-ended question were transcribed and coded by the researcher and then entered into SPSS.

3.6.4. Coding Categories

This study used the same coding system as in Study 1. The coding categories included moral (fairness, empathy, and integration), social conventional (group functioning, authority, social influence, religious influence, and stereotype), and psychological (personal choice) (Table 2). Each time a participant invoked a category, it was coded a 1 in the data set and a 0 when it was not used. Because psychological reasoning occurred less than 10% of the time in the data set, it is not included in the analyses.

3.6.5. Reliability Coding

The researcher coded all transcripts and an Arabic-speaking colleague (the same as in Study 1) coded 12 transcripts (20% of the data set) independently. The overall Kappa was .70 (fairness, $K = .90$; empathy, $K = .78$; integration, $K = .78$; Religious influence, $K = .79$; Authority, $K = .70$; personal choice, $K = .75$).

3.7. Results

3.7.1. Mother-Child Relationship

Correlational analyses were conducted to test the relation between mothers and children in their judgments of exclusion. Supporting the first hypothesis, there was a significant relationship between mothers and children when the target of exclusion was an
outgroup member, \( r = .31, N = 60, p = .015 \). In contrast, when the target of exclusion was an ingroup member, the correlation was not significant, \( r = .04, N = 60, p = .72 \).

3.7.2. Judgements of Exclusion

A 3 (Age: 8, 10, 12) \( \times \) 2 (Participants: Mother, Children) \( \times \) 2 (Group: In-group, outgroup) \( \times \) 2 (Perpetrator: Peer, Father) mixed-design ANOVA was conducted to examine judgements about the acceptability of exclusion. The first factor was between-subjects and the final three factors were within-subject factors.

**Mother-Child Differences.** Mothers (\( M = 1.61, SD = .71 \)) were less accepting of exclusion than children (\( M = 1.98, SD = .67 \)), \( F (1,57) = 11.35, p = .001, \eta^2_p = .20 \).

**Group Membership.** Supporting the second hypothesis, both mothers and children were more likely to accept exclusion of outgroup members (\( M = 1.93, SD = .70 \)) than ingroup members (\( M = 1.86, SD = .77 \)), \( F (1, 57) = 13.77, p = .001, \eta^2_p = .20 \). The Participants \( \times \) Group interaction effect was not significant, \( F (1,57) = 3.48, p = .06, \eta^2_p = .10 \).

**The Authority of Father.** Supporting the third hypothesis, mothers and children accepted exclusion by fathers (\( M = 1.91, SD = .60 \)) more than by peers (\( M = 1.70, SD = .57 \)), \( F (1,57) = 15.03, p = .01, \eta^2_p = .21 \).

The main effect of perpetrator was qualified by two significant interaction effects. First, there was a significant (but unexpected) Participant \( \times \) Perpetrator interaction effect, \( F (1,57) = 13.30, p = .001, \eta^2_p = .20 \). Second, there was a significant Group \( \times \) Perpetrator interaction effect, \( F (1,57) = 14.06, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .21 \). To explore the Participant \( \times \) Perpetrator interaction effect, two repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted separately for father and peer to compare mothers’ and children’s responses with a protected alpha of .025. Children (\( M = 1.91, SD = .61 \)) were more accepting of exclusion by fathers than were mothers (\( M = 1.70, SD = .80 \)), \( F (1, 59) = 13.60, p = .001, \eta^2_p = .20 \). However, mothers (\( M = \)}
1.60, SD = .80) and children (M = 1.83, SD = .71) did not differ in their judgements of exclusion by peers, $F (1,59) = 5.15, p = .03$, $\eta^2_p = .10$.

To explore the Group $\times$ Perpetrator interaction effect, two repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted separately for ingroup and outgroup exclusion to compare the acceptability of exclusion by fathers and by peers with a protected alpha of .025. Participants thought that it was more acceptable to exclude an outgroup member when the perpetrator was a father ($M = 2.20, SD = .82$) than when the perpetrator was a peer ($M = 1.70, SD = .67), $F (1, 59) = 29.20, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .33$. When discussing the ingroup, participants did not differ in their judgements whether the perpetrator was father ($M = 1.65, SD = .65$) or peer ($M = 1.71, SD = .70), $F (1,59) = .40, p = .53, \eta^2_p = .01$.

### 3.7.3. Justifications of Exclusion

To examine the hypotheses related to reasoning, a 3 (Age: 8, 10, 12) $\times$ 2 (Participant: Mothers, Children) $\times$ 2 (Group: In-group, outgroup) $\times$ 2 (Perpetrator: Peer, Father) $\times$ 2 (Reason: moral, social conventional) mixed-design ANOVA was conducted on participants’ reasoning. The first factor was between-subjects and the last four factors were within-subject factors. Follow-up tests were conducted to examine all significant interaction effects. Only significant main effects results that related to the hypotheses will be reported below.

Mother-Child Differences. There was no significant difference in reasons based on participant (Mother, Child), $F (1, 57) = .30, p = .60$.

Group Membership. There was a significant Group $\times$ Reason interaction effect, $F (1, 57) = 15.10, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .21$. To explore the interaction, two repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted with a protected alpha of .025. Confirming the fourth hypothesis, children and their mothers used social conventional reasoning when discussing exclusion of outgroup members more than when discussing exclusion of ingroup members, $F (1, 59) = 11.35, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .41$. In contrast, children and their mothers used moral reasoning when
discussing exclusion ingroup members ($M = .43, SD = .24$) more than when discussing exclusion of outgroup members ($M = .34, SD = .24$), $F (1, 59) = 13.10, p = .001, \eta^2_p = .20$.

The Authority of Fathers. There was a significant Perpetrator × Reason interaction effect, $F (1.57) = 9.73, p = .003, \eta^2_p = .15$. To examine the interaction, two repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted separately for moral and social reasons to compare between father’s vignette and peer’s vignettes with a protected alpha of .025. Children were more apt to use moral reasoning when discussing exclusion by peers ($M = .43, SD = .30$) than exclusion by fathers ($M = .33, SD = .25$), $F (1, 59) = 9.02, p = .004, \eta^2_p = .13$. Contrary to the sixth hypothesis, there was no significant difference in social conventional reasoning for vignettes involving fathers vs peers, $F (1, 59) = 3.70, p = .06$.

3.8. Discussion

The contribution of this study lies in the examination of children along with mothers in regard to the evaluation of religion-based peer exclusion. Previous studies in the literature have looked at the influence of parents’ intergroup attitudes on the development of children’s intergroup attitudes, but mostly with a focus on ethnic intergroup relations (e.g. Castelli, Zogmaister, & Tomelleri, 2009; Jugert Eckstein, Beelmann & Noack, 2016; Baron & Banaji, 2006), while there is scant (if any) evidence concerning religion-based attitudes.

A number of noteworthy results were found in the current study. First, the results partially supported the hypothesis that centres on the relationship between mothers and their children in terms of their judgement of exclusion. When discussing the exclusion of outgroup members, a significant mother-child relationship was observed, but no relationship was seen in regard to the exclusion of ingroup members. Second, although not hypothesised, children were more accepting of exclusion than their mothers. As predicted by the second hypothesis, children and their mothers were more likely to accept the exclusion of outgroup than ingroup members. As expected by the fourth hypothesis, children and their mothers justified their
judgement using social conventional reasoning for the outgroup. Finally, supporting the third hypothesis the mothers and children thought that exclusion by fathers was more acceptable than that by peers. The results are discussed in more detail below.

**Mother-Child Relationship**

Concerning relations between mothers’ attitudes and children’s attitudes toward peer exclusion, this study found a significant correlation about excluding outgroup members. This result is in line with developmental intergroup theories that suggest that parents play a role in the development of their children’s attitudes towards outgroup members (Alport, 1954; Bigler & Liben 2007; Degner & Dalege, 2011; Doosje et al., 2011; Gauvain, 2001; Raabe & Beelmann, 2011; Jugert et al., 2016; Pahlke, Bigler, & Suizzo, 2012). These results are also consistent with previous research on intergroup attitudes that found a relationship between mothers and children generally or only in regard to implicit attitudes (Degner & Dalege, 2011; Castelli, De Dea & Nesdale, 2008; Castelli et al., 2009; Jugert et al., 2016). Previous research suggests that the time mothers spend with their children plays an important role in affecting children’s attitudes and behaviours (Castelli, De Dea, & Nesdale, 2008; Castelli et al., 2009). Other ways that mothers influence children is through direct discussion and the structuring of contact with outgroup members (i.e., mother has a friend who is an outgroup member) (Pahlke, Bigler, & Suizzo, 2012). Although several studies found that some parents refuse to discuss racism with their children and adopted colour-blind socialization in regard to ethnic attitudes (Pahlke, Bigler, & Suizzo, 2012; Simpson, 2007), religion is often a topic that can be discussed openly, especially by Muslim parents, which in turn can lead to children appropriating the attitudes towards religious groups from mothers (Bao, Whitbeck, Hoyt, & Conger, 1999; Franceschelli & O’Brien, 2014; Scourfield, Gilliat-Ray, Khan, & Otri, 2010).

Regarding the exclusion of ingroup members, there was no significant mother–child relationship. Although this finding is consistent with some research that did not find a parent–
child relationship (e.g. Aboud & Doyle, 1996; Castelli, Zogmaister, & Tomelleri, 2009; Simpson, 2007) in attitudes, more examination is needed to understand why the relationships differed for ingroup and outgroup members.

**Group Membership**

Children and their mothers in this study showed ingroup bias by being less accepting of exclusion of ingroup members than of outgroup members. In line with the social identity theory, the attitudes of the children and their mothers reveal ingroup bias (Tajfel, 2010; Bennett et al., 1998). Indeed, self-categorising as a member of a certain group extends trust and positive traits to ingroup members so the finding of ingroup bias is understandable (Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002). In addition, distinguishing ingroups from outgroups could be a way to protect group identity from threats and maintain self-esteem (Breakwell, 2015); this, in turn, leads to discrimination against outgroup members.

We need also to discuss this finding in relation to the Muslim religion. From the perspective of Islam, Muslims should support other Muslims and consider them as brothers and sisters. Prophet Mohammed said: “The relationship of the believer with believers with another believer is like (a brick of) building each strengthens the other” (al-Bukhari, 1993). This indeed provides a further possible explanation for ingroup bias. Mothers and children consider including Sunni Muslims a moral obligation and express compassion and empathy towards their other brothers and sisters.

When discussing the exclusion of outgroup members, the influence of outgroup members on Sunni Muslims’ morals was the main concern for the mothers and children, taking into consideration the social conventional reasons used by mothers and children, which focus on religious influence. As an example, one girl (12-year-old), in her justification of excluding outgroup members, said, “non-Muslims girls will negatively affect the Muslim girl and incite her to disobey her father, they will introduce her to bad TV shows then she will
start watch them and become a Kaferah (non-believer)”. The mother of this girl said in her justification of the same vignette: “the Muslim girl may learn from non-Muslims then she will change and deviate, they will destroy her morals... for example non-Muslims do not say the name of Allah (God), they do not thank God.... etc.”. The child seems to have appropriated her mother’s concern and ended up with the same evaluation.

A positive concern was revealed in both the mothers’ and children’s justification when they considered whether the ingroup should include outgroup members. Spreading Sunni Islam and encouraging outgroup members to convert to Sunni Islam was a motivation to include outgroup members for both the mothers and their children. A mother of an 11-year-old girl said: “I have a Christian home assistant and people said to me do not allow her to carry your baby! On the contrary, I allow her to carry my baby and to stay close to me always to show her that I love her, I taught her to say the name of Allah (God) before doing anything, she started praying with my daughters and copying them even when she travelled back to her country. I gave her gifts and food and keep sending money to her. Now she has converted to Islam and changed her name. The same happened with my sister and her Christian home assistant. So, here (in the vignette) Muslim girls should include the non-Muslim girl and treat her very well, then maybe she will love Islam”. In regard to excluding Shia Muslims, the same mother also said: “it is not acceptable at all, we should include them try to make them love Sunni, I told my son to talk to Shia and hang out with them but do not eat their food! I met a Shia in alharam (Makkah/Mecca). I gave them coffee and gifts to show them that as Sunni we do not hate them.” Similarly, the daughter of this mother said in her evaluation of the exclusion of the non-Muslim girl by Muslims: “Maybe the non-Muslim girl will decide to be Muslim like the Muslim girls so they should not reject her, they should warmly welcome her and let her read the Quran to be Muslim”.
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In fact, the qualitative data are rich in the unique justifications that were frequent in mothers’ evaluations of exclusion. For example, a number of mothers were concerned about the negative consequences of exclusion and the serious issues that could happen in the future as a result of exclusion. A mother of an 8-year-old boy provided an example about how exclusion can lead to serious negative issues. For example, she said: “This exclusion here will lead to discrimination then hostility, then as is happening now, attacks in Shia mosques and Shias holding demonstrations against Sunni... this will lead to disintegrating the Saudi society”. Also, a mother of a 12-year-old girl said: “It is not acceptable at all because we saw the negative effect of hate and exclusion: bombings, killing, destroying... all this started from things like this scenario (exclusion) in childhood”. Another mother explained how the exclusion of outgroup members can negatively affect children: “A father who does not allow his kid to play with other children because of their religion or sect will teach his kid how to hate others... then the kid will grow up to be a terrorist and member of ISIS”.

**The Authority of Father**

As the mother in the previous example aptly notes, fathers’ authority is central in Saudi society. For this reason, fathers’ authority is one of the factors that examined in terms of its influence on children’s and mothers’ judgements of exclusion. Consistent with the previous chapter and as expected, both the children and their mothers showed more respect for the fathers’ decision than peers’ decisions. Although most of the mothers had university degrees or had at least completed high school and were employed, they deferred to fathers’ authority for them and their children. As mentioned previously, mothers in patriarchal cultures are responsible for socializing their children, but fathers are the prime decision makers in the family (Abi-Hashem, 2008; Barakat, 1993).

In a society like Saudi Arabia, discussing the authority of fathers and interpreting the findings of this study cannot be done without reference to Islamic culture and the religious
background of the Saudis. Obedience to one’s father and a father’s satisfaction is related to God’s obedience and a way to paradise in Islamic culture (Douki, Nacef, Belhadj, Bouasker, & Ghachem, 2003; al-Hibri, 1997; Sultán, 1999). Thus, a possible interpretation of the findings of this study is that Saudi women and children are under pressure to obey fathers, regardless of their actions or morals. An alternative explanation is that mothers and children think that fathers have enough knowledge and experience about outgroup members to make decisions regarding peer exclusion. For example, one mother said: “Maybe the father personally faced problems with non-Muslims, so he wants to protect his daughter and avoid her facing the same problems because the daughter is still young... he had this kind of experience, so he decided not to allow her to play with non-Muslims”. Again, the fear of the negative influence of outgroups on Muslim children was considered as a reasonable justification to accept the father’s decision about exclusion. For example, a 12-year-old child said: “In fact the father is afraid that if his daughter plays with them, she will follow their religion, so he wants her stay with girls like her (Muslims)”. The mother of this girl gave a similar justification: “Honestly I can understand the father’s point as I feel afraid of their influence on my children... this father is afraid for his daughter”.

Although the vignettes used in this study were created by the researcher, conversations during the interviews with the mothers revealed that similar scenarios could happen in daily life. For example, one mother said: “The same story happened to me when I was living in the East of Saudi Arabia, I was with my daughters in the park, they were playing with another girl, then a Sunni girl came up to my daughters and said the girl you are playing with is Shia so do not play with her! My daughters came back to me and said we do not want to play with that girl because she is Shia and she will kill us”.
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3.8.1. Limitations and Future Research

It is necessary to note one main limitation of the current study. This study did not examine mother-child religious discussion (i.e., it did not ask mothers if they ever have discussed religious attitudes with their children). Future research is needed to examine parent-child discussions regarding religious intergroup attitudes. Also, because few of these mothers know non-Muslims, it is important to conduct research to examine how interactions with non-Muslims may influence their views. Future research needs to investigate Saudi mothers and their children outside Saudi Arabia where they can communicate with outgroup members.

3.8.2. Research Implications and Conclusion

Examining similarities and differences between mothers’ and children’s attitudes was the main aim of this study. Considering the relationship between mothers and children in accepting exclusion when the target is an outgroup member, a practical implication of this study is that religious tolerance should be taught to mothers alongside the promotion of the concept of religious freedom. As the answers to the open-ended questions revealed some incorrect beliefs about the religious practices of outgroup members, one implication is that work is needed to correct these beliefs in order to promote tolerance towards other religions and sects.

As we saw in previous chapters, the participants in this chapter were influenced by their father’s viewpoint. A further implication of this study is that not only mothers but also, and to a greater degree, fathers should be taught religious tolerance and freedom as they have the strongest influence in the Saudi society. Given the limited communication with outgroup members in Saudi Arabia, it is important to investigate Saudi families in different conditions where they have communication with outgroups. Finally, this chapter shed light more
generally on similarities and differences between mothers and children in their evaluations of exclusion for the first time.
Chapter: 4


Saudi scholarship programmes annually fund thousands of Saudis to study abroad often to the UK and US. These Saudis often come to the UK with their families and dependent children. As such, they form a natural comparison to Saudi children living in Saudi Arabia. Thus, understanding how Saudis in the UK, especially children, think of religion-based peer exclusion is important to improve their social integration as it will be explained in the next section. The second chapter found that Saudi children in Saudi Arabia were more accepting of exclusion of outgroup members than ingroup members and showed more acceptance towards exclusion ordered by a father than by peer. The current study examines how Saudi children in the UK evaluate religion-based peer exclusion.

4.1. The Importance of Religion

Islam has a strong influence on Saudis as a national and social identity (Nevo, 1998). Given that the education system and curriculum in Saudi Arabia are built on the basis of Sunni Islam and Saudis study the Quran, jurisprudence, and theology from the early years to higher education (Alsallom, 1994), moving to live in a non-Muslim country and interacting with individuals from different religious backgrounds may not be easy in terms of integration. Generally speaking, by moving from Saudi Arabia to live in a completely different society such as the UK, children will encounter for the first time other religions and sects in daily life. The importance of Islam could influence children’s social relationships and communication in the new culture. Al Musaiteer (2015) found that Saudis in the US tend to reject and avoid interacting with anyone who shows disrespect towards Islam and Muslims.

In regard to how religion is important for Saudis, Abdel Rezak (2012) found that Saudi students in the US avoid social activities and interacting with non-Muslim students
because of Islamic beliefs in regard to eating pork, drinking alcohol and wearing a hijab. Students feel unwelcome and excluded in these activities that go against their beliefs. In fact, religion could be a significant factor that positively or negatively affects Saudis’ attitudes towards a new culture. Alyami (2015) found that Saudi students in the UK are impressed by religious freedom and the provision in mosques, even in universities, for Muslim students. Family and friends in Saudi Arabia encourage individuals who study abroad to positively represent Islam and Saudi values so that students abroad feel they are responsible for maintaining Saudi identity in the new culture.

4.2. Collectivism and Individualism

In addition to religious differences between the host country and Saudi Arabia, there are also differences in cultural values. Saudi Arabia is considered a collectivist culture and collectivism has an important influence on Saudis (Al-Ruwaitea, 2004; Abdel Razek, 2012; Heyn, 2013; Nevo, 1998). Compared to individualistic cultures, ingroup belonging and maintaining group identity is a priority in collectivist cultures (Hofstede, 1980). Also, in contrast to individualistic cultures, collectivist cultures tend to reinforce the obedience of children towards authority (Al-Simadi & Atoum, 2000; Chao & Tseng, 2008; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2007). It is expected that collectivism will influence intergroup contact and social relationships in Saudis who study abroad (Alyami, 2015; Razek & Dayton, 2013). Saudi students in the US consider helping and supporting ingroup members as a duty and part of their personality as collectivistic individuals; these beliefs indeed could affect their interactions with outgroup members as a result of preferring ingroup members. The Saudi students considered themselves part of the group rather than independent individuals; this interconnection between Saudi students sometimes impedes their interaction with outgroup members (Abdel Razek, 2012).
4.3. **Saudi Students Abroad**

According to the Saudi Ministry of Education (2017), there are around 114,518 scholarship students who study abroad with 74,753 dependents. Saudi male students in the US reported that studying abroad allowed them to have contact with outgroup members with whom they do not typically have contact in Saudi Arabia, like Shia Muslims and women; this in turn leads to improving attitudes towards individuals from outgroups (Hill, 2013). When Heyn (2013) interviewed Saudi students at Midwestern University, the students mentioned that studying abroad helped Saudi students to reshape some of their beliefs and attitudes towards others. A number of students in Heyn’s study reported that interacting with individuals from different backgrounds motivated them to respect outgroup members and look at them as equals. Their attitudes towards Americans had changed after living and studying in the US. In the UK, Alqahtani (a Saudi scholarship student) interviewed 15 Saudi students in order to examine intercultural communication and found that students’ experience varied from negative to positive. The findings revealed that, on the one hand, some Saudi students reported facing discrimination from outgroup members. On the other hand, students encountered equality and religious tolerance (Alqahtani, 2015). In regard to interacting with their peers, Hoffer (2009) found that Saudi students in the US prefer the kind of activities that allow them to interact with peers from different backgrounds. These activities are an opportunity to introduce the Saudi culture to others. Furthermore, Saudi students desire English speakers as friends to improve their English. So, studying abroad somehow can shape Saudis’ attitudes positively towards outgroup members (Heyn, 2013).

4.4. **The Authority of Father**

Although studying abroad and communicating with outgroup members can shape Saudi children’s intergroup attitudes positively, some factors can influence children’s attitudes and may have more sway than children’s personal experience with outgroup
members. The authority of Saudi father is one of the factors that can strongly influence children’s decisions regarding social relationships. For example, previous chapters found that children accepted exclusion of peers when ordered by fathers more than when ordered by peers. Thus, there is need to examine Saudi children in a different cultural context and different group status to see if father retains this power over children or not. Brenick (2009) examined peer relationships among Arab-Jewish adolescents in the US. Similarly, Jewish and Arab adolescents were less accepting of exclusion by peers than exclusion by parents in the home context. Also, Killen and colleagues (2002) found that parental authority has an influence on the judgement of peer exclusion among minority groups in the US. So, parental authority in particular father for Saudis is one factor that can influence children’s evaluation of peer exclusion.

4.5. The Influence of Age

The age of the child is another factor that could affect how children evaluate peer exclusion (Killen et al., 2002; Killen & Rutland, 2013; Møller & Tenenbaum, 2011). In a meta-analysis, Raabe and Beelmann (2011) found a decrease in ingroup bias among children aged 10 years. However, when looking at reasoning about peer exclusion more specifically, Brenick (2009) did not find an age effect in children’s evaluations. Similarly, Møller and Tenenbaum (2011) also did not find an influence of age on the evaluation of peer exclusion in children. If anything, older children become more concerned about group functioning as well as morality, so they sometimes endorse exclusion more than younger children (Killen & Rutland, 2002). However, chapter 2 found no age effect on the evaluation of peer exclusion in Sunni children, while Shia children aged 10 and 12 years were less accepting of peer exclusion than were children aged 8 years. These inconsistent findings motivated the current study to examine the age differences in children’s evaluation of peer exclusion.
In terms of the justification of exclusion, Enesco, Navarro, Paradela, and Callejas (2002) found that children aged 9 to 10 years-old tended to use social conventional reasoning, such as authority, more than did adolescents. Enesco and colleagues (2002) attributed that to the nature of younger children, who are motivated to obey their parents even though they do not accept exclusion. In Chapter 2, Sunni children did not show age differences in reasoning about exclusion, whereas 10-year-old Shia children used social conventional reasons to evaluate exclusion more than moral reasoning. In contrast, 12-year-old Shia children used moral reasoning more than social conventional reasons. Thus, we need more data on the effect of age on the evaluation of peer exclusion in children to help us understand these discrepancies.

4.6. The Present Study

The present study examines how Saudi children residing in the UK evaluate religion-based exclusion. Furthermore, this study evaluates, whether similar to Saudis in Saudi Arabia, children report acceptance of fathers’ more than peers’ influence. Finally, this study examines age-related changes in judgements and reasoning. The current study specifically focused on Saudi children residing in the UK because such an examination allows us to understand what happens when children from a homogenous society interact in a society in which they are a minority. The UK is one of the most popular destinations for Saudi students with their families. According to the Saudi Ministry of Education (2017), there are about 13,752 scholarship students in the UK with 16,152 independents.

There are five hypotheses that drive the current study. First, based on the Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 2010; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and previous literature of Saudi culture, it is anticipated that Saudi children will be less accepting of the exclusion of an ingroup member compared to an outgroup member. Second, consistent with the previous finding of Chapters 2 and 3, it is expected that children will be more accepting of exclusion
by a father than by a peer. Third, consistent with Shia’s findings in chapter 2, it is expected that older children (10 to 12 years-old) will be less accepting of exclusion than younger children. Forth, based on the findings of Chapters 1 and 2, children will use social conventional reasoning to justify the exclusion of outgroup members more than moral reasoning. Fifth, children aged 8 to 10 years will invoke social conventional reasoning more than children aged 12 years (Enesco, Navarro, Paradela, & Callejas, 2002).

4.7. Method

4.7.1. Participants

The participants comprised 76 Saudi Sunni children (41 boys, 35 girls) residing in the UK.¹ There were 16 children in Grade 4 ($M = 8.41$ years, $SD = .50$), 35 in Grade 6 ($M = 10.43$ years, $SD = .50$), and 24 in Grade 8 ($M = 12.50$ years, $SD = .50$) Saudi grade system. Twenty-five children had lived in the UK for 1 to 2 years. Thirty-one children had lived in the UK for 3 to 5 years and 20 children had lived in the UK for 6 to 8 years. The participants attended state schools in the UK. To recruit the participants, a number of Saudi students and Saudi clubs in the UK were contacted to explain the research to them and ask for volunteer participants.

4.7.2. Materials

Eight vignettes consisting of short stories about exclusion were used. Table 1 displays these vignettes. In half of the vignettes the perpetrator of the exclusion was the main character’s father and in the other half the perpetrator was a group of peers. There were four targets of exclusion based on religious group (Muslim and Sunni versus non-Muslim and Shia). So, there were two ingroup types of vignettes including Muslim and Sunni, and the outgroup included non-Muslim and Shia. The order of the vignettes was counterbalanced. There were two questions on a 4-point Likert scale after each vignette: whether or not it was

¹ One or both of their parents study in the UK.
ok to exclude a child and whether they thought this “a lot” (“4”) or “a little” (“1”). Then for the open-ended question, the participants were asked “why” to justify their judgment.

4.7.3. Procedure

This project received ethical clearance from the University of Surrey Ethics Committee (UEC/2016/012/FHMS). After obtaining the family’s consent, the interviews were conducted in different places depending on the participants’ preference (e.g., home, Saudi club, university). Each participant was interviewed individually for approximately 15-20 minutes. Participants were informed that the interviews would be audio recorded, confidential, and that there were no right or wrong answers. The eight vignettes were read to the participants in a counterbalanced order. After each vignette, the participants were asked whether or not it is ok to exclude a child and why. The children’s answers were scored as 1 (not ok a lot), 2 (not ok a little), 3 (ok a little) and 4 (ok a lot). The answers of the open-ended question were transcribed and coded by the researcher and then entered into SPSS.

4.7.4. Coding Categories

The children’s justifications were coded using a coding system adapted from Killen et al. (2002) and Ruck et al. (2002). This coding system has been used to analyse social reasoning in previous research (Killen et al., 2002; Killen & Stangor, 2001; Møller and Tenenbaum, 2011). The coding categories included moral (fairness, empathy, and integration), social conventional (group function, authority, social influence, religious influence, and stereotype), and psychological (personal choice). Because psychological occurred less than 10% of the time in the data set, it is not included in analyses. Table 2 gives examples of the coding in more detail.

4.7.5. Reliability Coding

The researcher and an Arabic-speaking colleague (the same one in Study 1) coded 20% (15) of the interviews independently. The overall Kappa was $K = .85$. 
4.8. Results

Judgment of Exclusion

Children believed that exclusion is not acceptable ($M = 1.22$, $SD = .42$), on average, the acceptance of exclusion was less than 2.5, $t (75) = -1.30$, $p < .001$, $d = 2.89$.

To examine judgments of exclusion, a 3 (Age group: 8, 10, 12) × 2 (Group: ingroup, outgroup) × 2 (Perpetrator: Father, Peer) mixed-design ANOVA was conducted. The first factor was a between-groups factor and the last two factors were within-subjects factors. Only significant effects results that related to the hypotheses will be reported below.

Group membership. Supporting the first hypothesis, children were less likely to accept the exclusion of an ingroup ($M = 1.20$, $SD = .34$) member than an outgroup member ($M = 1.30$, $SD = .60$), $F(1, 73) = 5.80$, $p = .02$, $\eta^2_p = .10$.

Perpetrator of exclusion. Supporting the second hypothesis, children were more accepting of exclusion by fathers ($M = 1.30$, $SD = .60$) than by peers ($M = 1.20$, $SD = .40$), $F (1, 73) = 6.30$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2_p = .10$. There was no significant Perpetrator × Group interaction effect, $F (1, 73) = 2.54$, $p = .12$, $\eta^2_p = .03$.

Age differences. In contrast to the third hypothesis, there was no difference in the judgment of exclusion based on age, $F (2, 73) = .54$, $p = .60$, $\eta^2_p = .01$. Also, there was no significant Age × Perpetrator interaction effect, $F (2, 73) = .20$, $p = .83$, $\eta^2_p = .01$ and no significant Age × Group interaction effect, $F (2, 73) = .42$, $p = .65$, $\eta^2_p = .01$.

Justifications of exclusion

To examine justifications of exclusion, a 3 (Age group: 8, 10, 12) × 2 (Group: outgroup, ingroup) × 2 (Perpetrator: teacher, peer) × 2 (Justification: Moral, Social Conventional) mixed-design ANOVA was conducted. The first factor was a between-groups factor and the last three factors were within-subjects factors. Only significant main effects results that related to the hypotheses will be reported below.
Generally, children used moral reasoning ($M = .70, SD = .30$) more than social conventional reasoning ($M = .10, SD = .20$), $F(1,73) = 152.60, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .80$.

**Group membership.** In contrast to the fourth hypothesis, there was no difference in the justification of exclusion based on group membership, $F(1,73) = .09, p = .91, \eta^2_p = .00$.

**Perpetrator.** There was no difference in the justification of exclusion based on the perpetrator of exclusion, $F (1,73) = 2.51, p = .12, \eta^2_p = .03$.

**Age.** In contrast to the fifth hypothesis, there was no difference in the justification of exclusion based on age group, $F (2,73) = .99, p = .40, \eta^2_p = .03$. Also, there was no significant Age $\times$ Perpetrator $\times$ Reason interaction effect, $F(2,73) = .11, p = .89, \eta^2_p = .003$ and no significant Age $\times$ Group $\times$ Reason interaction effect, $F(2,73) = .10, p = .91, \eta^2_p = .003$.

### 4.9. Discussion

The main aim of the current study was to see how Saudi children who reside in the UK evaluate religion-based peer exclusion. Consisted with chapter 2, children did not accept the exclusion in general. There were three significant findings, which were related to group membership of the excluded child, the protagonist of the vignettes (i.e., the perpetrator of exclusion), and moral justifications for the acceptability judgements. In contrast, there were no significant differences based on children’s age or in reasoning.

Children in general did not condone peer exclusion. As a result of living in a multicultural society, Saudi children may become tolerant and able to accept peers from different backgrounds. Furthermore, as a minority group in the UK, Saudi children may face discrimination by their peers. This in turn leads them to be more sensitive towards the exclusion of others (Killen et al., 2002; Killen et al., 2007). However, religious identity has a crucial role in their attitudes towards outgroup members (Bennett et al., 2004). Compared to ingroup exclusion, children were more accepting of the exclusion of outgroup members.
Group membership

In line with Social Identity Theory, the attitudes of the children reveal ingroup bias (Tajfel, 2010; Bennett, et al., 1998). Self-categorising as a member of a certain group extends trust and positive traits to outgroup members so the finding of ingroup bias is understandable (Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002). Also, distinguishing ingroup from outgroups could be a way to protect group identity from threats and maintain self-esteem (Breakwell, 2015); this in turn leads to acceptability of discrimination against outgroup members.

One further possible explanation relates to the Islamic culture insofar Islam emphasises the solidarity and brotherhood among Muslims. Allah says in the Qur’an, “believers are brothers. So make peace and reconciliation between your brothers”. Also, the prophet Mohammed, in a number of speeches, confirmed that true belief is strongly related to the loving of ingroup members (Muslims). Thus, it is understandable that children who grow up in Islamic culture and are raised by Muslim parents will be less accepting of the exclusion of ingroup members.

There is an alternative explanation, which is that living in a diverse society and having contact with outgroup members may increase the need of belonging (Alqahtani, 2015; Abdel Rezak, 2012). Saudi children are used to live in a collectivistic Muslim Sunni society (Saudi Arabia), which is different from the individualistic non-Muslim society; children may expect ingroup members to be more understanding of their feelings and attitudes than outgroup members. Thus, they tend to reject the exclusion of ingroup members more than outgroup members. For collectivistic individuals, caring about outgroup members is part of their collectivist identity (Iyengar, Lepper, & Ross, 1999). Although some scholars argue that outgroup favouritism is still an initial type of discrimination (Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002), the tendency to include ingroup members in peers’ contexts does not necessarily reflect outgroup derogation or hostility (Bennett et al., 2004; Nesdale, 2004; Brenick
&Killen, 2014). Preferring ingroup members comparing to outgroup members could be a strategy to protect the original identity or a kind of support for ingroup members (Abdel Razek, 2012; Scourfield, Gilliat-Ray, Khan, & Otri, 2010).

One important issue for Muslims that cannot be separated from the judgement of excluding outgroup members is the fear of negative effects. The second chapter found that there is fear among Saudi children in Saudi Arabia of accepting exclusion of outgroup members. Previous research has also reported that Saudi students avoided socialization and integration with their peers in the US to protect their religious identity (Abdel Rezak, 2012). In a qualitative study of Saudi students in the UK, Alyami (2015) interviewed 11 Saudi students at UK universities. In his study, one Saudi student said: “How could he or she be a good Muslim while living and surrounded by all evil motives (women’s different way of dressing, alcohol, drugs...)” (Alyami, 2015, p.94).

The Authority of Father

Even though the Saudi children in the current study live away from the culture that promotes obedience towards their father, they showed the influence of their fathers on their judgement of exclusion. Children considered exclusion by a father more acceptable than by a peer. This result is consistent with previous research by Killen and colleagues (2002), who found that minority group’s attitudes about peer exclusion fluctuate after hearing their parents’ opinion. In Killen’s study, parental authority influenced children’ evaluation of exclusion based on race in three different contexts (school, friendship, and peer group), while in the evaluation of exclusion based on gender, parental authority influenced children only in a peer group context. However, the 12-year-olds were the oldest group in the current study so on possible explanation for the current result is that children may still have been too young to go against their fathers’ orders (Enesco et al., 2002). Another important reason why children seem more accepting of exclusion by a father than by a peer is that children believe that
protection and safety is an understandable reason why their parents exclude other children (Killen et al. 2007) and children under 14 years are more likely to endorse nurturance than self-determination rights for themselves (Ruck, Keating, & Abramovitch, 1998) and for other children (Ruck, Tenenbaum, & Willenberg, 2011). In a new society with different values and traditions, fathers often show a more protective parenting style and expect their children to respect them (Scourfield, Gilliat-Ray, Khan, & Otri, 2010).

The previous findings reflect how collectivistic values can coexist with individualistic values. Although children live in an individualistic society that encourages autonomy, they supported including in-group members more than out-group member and obeying father. Previous research suggests that parents and children who move from a collectivistic culture to an individualistic culture tend to hold dual goals such as relatedness and autonomy (Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2007). Lin and Fu (1990) examined child-rearing practices in Chinese, Chinese-American and Caucasian-American parents. They found that Chinese and Chinese-American parents encouraged parental control and obedience to authority and simultaneously encouraged independence in their children more than the Caucasian-Americans did. Similarly, Dominican, Chinese-American, and African-American parents encouraged their children to be obedient and assertive (Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2007). This is consistent with the previous finding that Saudi children are more similar to their peers in Saudi, who show obedience to authority, in chapter 2.

**Justifications**

Saudi children residing in the UK tended to invoke moral issues more than social conventional reasoning when discussing exclusion. Killen and colleagues (2002) found that young children aged 10 years used moral reasons, especially empathy, more than children aged above 13 years. Moral reasons were also used by African-American minority children more than majority children. Indeed, numerical minorities are more likely to condemn
exclusion because of their first-hand experience of discrimination, which may help them develop empathy towards the victims of exclusion (Killen et al., 2002; Killen et al. 2007; Killen & Rutland, 2011). Thus, in the current study children may have personal experience with peer exclusion or prejudicial intergroup attitudes, and thus, as a result, they become more understanding of others’ feelings and rights. Qualitative data supported this argument. For example, a 12-year-old girl said: “I have witnessed many cases of bullying. Outside the school when I go to the town centre I hear that you are a Muslim! One day, a man shouted to my mother and said: why did you wear Abaya why did you wear headscarf? We do not want people like you here.”

Additionally, living in such a multicultural society where their classmates and neighbours are from different backgrounds may motivate children to be morally sensitive to peer exclusion. Friendship with individuals from different religions may lead to a focus on moral principles in peer interactions rather than social conventional reasoning such as stereotypes. For example, a 12-year-boy said: “It is unfair, my best friend is a non-Muslim and we have been many birthdays together. Muslims should not exclude the boy just because he is a non-Muslim”.

In fact, the researcher noticed that children clearly tended to use reasons like equality, rights, fairness, and discrimination. The result suggests that using moral issues to justify peer exclusion may reflect the priorities of the new culture (UK). For example, one of the most impressive things that Saudis appreciated in the US and the UK was equality (Alqahtani, 2015; Heyn, 2012).

### 4.9.1. Limitations and Future Research

There were two limitations to the current study. First, we need a larger sample that includes children from different social statuses to generalize the results of this study. It should be noted that the Saudi parents came to the UK in order to get a Master’s or doctoral...
degree, so they are from the same educational level and one or both parents in each family work in academia in Saudi Arabia. Also, this study did not measure intergroup contact in children or compare them with another group of children who had no contact with outgroup members to see if the contact affected their judgment of exclusion. Future research should look at how intergroup contact influences the judgement of exclusion in Saudi children.

4.9.2. Conclusion and Implications

In sum, this study provided insight into religion-based exclusion among a group of Saudi children who reside in the UK. The significant findings indicate that although children do not accept exclusion generally, they judged it as more acceptable when the perpetrator was the father than a peer or when the target was an outgroup member than an ingroup member. Moving from Sunni Muslim society to live in a mixed society and interact with non-Muslims peers is not enough to eliminate the difference in children’s judgement of exclusion based on religious identity. In more detail, children in this study showed ingroup bias which has shown also by Saudi children in Chapters 2 and 3. Furthermore, living in an individualistic society for a number of years seems not to be enough to reduce the influence of fathers’ authority on children’s decisions. This study found influence of father’s authority on the evaluation of peer exclusion in children which is similar to the previous finding in Chapters 2 and 3 in Saudi Arabia. However, as mentioned under the limitations, there is a need to compare the sample from this study with another sample of children living in Saudi Arabia to understand how moving to a different culture can influence reasoning.
Chapter: 5


Chapter three found a significant mother-child relationship in religion-based exclusion of outgroup members. Moreover, mothers and children demonstrate ingroup bias regarding religion-based exclusion, and they are more accepting of exclusion when ordered by a father rather than a peer. However, that research was conducted in Saudi Arabia. The current study, therefore, examines UK-based Saudi mothers’ and children’s evaluation of religion-based exclusion.

5.1. Majority-Minority Status

Whether there is a statistically significant mother-child relationship regarding intergroup attitudes may rely upon the group status (majority versus minority). Parents from minority groups in the US raise their children to be aware of discrimination against ingroup members and negative images of minority groups in society (Hughes & Chen, 1997). As a result of this type of socialisation, children from minority groups are cognisant of their parents’ attitudes, which increases the potential for parent-child similarity in intergroup attitudes. In a study of 45 Mexican children and their mothers (minority families) in the US, Knight et al. (1993) identified a relationship between mothers’ teaching of Mexican culture, ethnic pride, and discrimination, and children’s ingroup preferences. Verkuyten (2002) examined the influence of parents on the ethnic attitudes of Dutch majority children and Turkish minority children residing in the Netherlands. Compared with Dutch children, Turkish children showed more obedience to parents and their evaluation of ingroup was significantly related to their parents’ ethnic attitudes. However, Degner and Dalege (2013) found that majority children were similar to their parents’ intergroup attitudes more than were
minority group children. The researchers suggested that majority group members may have more parent-child discussions about intergroup attitudes than do minority group members. Alternatively, minority group members may build their own intergroup attitudes which are different from their parents’ attitudes based on their experiences with outgroup members.

As suggested, parents are not the only source of minority children’s intergroup attitudes. Children may build their own attitudes based on different sources such as their own contact with outgroup members in the host culture, their peer group’s attitudes, extended contact, and media (Dovidio, Eller, & Hewstone, 201; Feddes, Noack, & Rutland, 2009; Killen & Rutland, 2013; Mutz & Goldman, 2010). The multiple sources of intergroup attitudes may lead to a lack of correlation between parents’ and children’s attitudes.

5.2. The Role of Culture

Culture is an important factor that can influence the evaluation of peer exclusion, as mentioned earlier. When moving to live in a different culture parents are expected to transmit to their children values regarding the origin of the culture, the religion and the native language (Diane et al., 2006; Ruble & Fuligni, 2006; Thornton et al., 1990;). Although Indian fathers showed a preference for speaking in English and had American friends, they strongly emphasised politeness and respecting authority as the most important traditions for their daughters (Patel, Power, & Bhavnagri, 1996). As described above, Chinese and Chinese-Americans also encouraged parental control and obedience to authority and simultaneously encouraged independence in their children (Lin & Fu, 1990). Similarly, Dominican, Chinese-American, and African-American parents encouraged their children to be obedient and assertive (Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2007). So, family plays an important role in maintaining identity and values in children, especially values related to ethnicity and religion (Vadher & Barrett, 2007).
5.3. **The Role of Islam in Family Life**

For many Muslims, even when they live in a non-Muslim country, Islam strongly influences the way individuals live their lives and communicate with others. Research on ethnic minorities in the UK identified religion as the centre of self-definition for most Muslims, and when asked about how important religion was to the way individuals lead their lives, the majority of Muslims (95%) stated either very important or important (Modood et al., 1997). Based on interviews with a number of Muslim families in the UK, parents and their children perceive Islam as ‘more than religion’, and report that the effect of Islam extends to social relationships (Franceschelli & O’Brien, 2014). The same research also suggests that parents use Islam to maintain control over their children. As mentioned previously, Muslim parents worry about damage to their children’s morals so they prefer for their children peers who share the same religion (Scourfield, Gilliat-Ray, Khan, & Otri, 2010). Thus, the role of Islam for Muslims who live in a mainly non-Muslim country is not exclusive to daily practice but includes controlling individuals’ relationships and preferences for ingroup members.

5.4. **Group Membership**

Generally speaking, self-categorising as a member of a certain group extends trust and positive traits to ingroup members (Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002). Supporting this argument, Abdel Razek (2012) found that Saudi students in the US consider helping and supporting ingroup members as a duty and part of their personality as collectivistic individuals. These beliefs might affect their interactions with outgroup members as a result of preferring ingroup members. Accordingly, a combination of religion and culture of origin may influence Saudis’ intergroup attitudes in any new culture. Saudis may avoid some social activities and interacting with non-Muslim students based on Islamic restrictions, which can cause them to feel excluded by outgroup members in some situations (Abdel Razek, 2012). In
the UK, a number of Saudi University students revealed their concern about mixing with outgroup members because this could change their religious beliefs. Additionally, for some female students, the authority of men in their culture of origin was a strong factor that prevented them from interacting with outgroup members. (Alyami, 2015).

5.5. The Authority of Men

Moving from patriarchal society does not guarantee a reduction in the power of men over family members. Alyami (2015) interviewed 20 Saudi students to investigate the role of cultural values in Saudi students’ lives in the UK. Seventy-three per cent of students think that men (e.g., father, husband) have the right to control women’s behaviour even when women study abroad. This was illustrated by one student who expressed her fear of interaction mingling with outgroup members in parties because this kind of interaction would destroy her religious beliefs and way of dressing, which would be punished by her husband. Indeed, Saudi females are not permitted to study abroad without being accompanied by a male guardian (e.g., father, husband, adult brother) or at least obtaining the consent of a male guardian to study abroad alone. Thus, the power of Saudi men in family life is confirmed by Saudi laws and extended by female themselves to control their social life and intergroup communication when they move to live abroad (Alyami, 2015).

5.6. The present study

The current study examines whether there is a mother-child relationship in the evaluation of religion-based exclusion amongst Saudis based in the UK. Furthermore, it examines how Saudi children and their mothers based in the UK evaluate religion-based exclusion. Finally, this study evaluates whether, similar to Saudis in Saudi Arabia, fathers have a greater influence on participants’ judgement of exclusion more than do peers. There are five hypotheses that drive the current study. First, based on previous chapters and existing
literature on outgroup bias (Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002), it is expected that the exclusion of ingroup members will be rated as less acceptable than exclusion of outgroup members. Second, based on the status of men in the Saudi family (Alyami, 2015), it is likely that exclusion by the father will be rated as more acceptable than exclusion by peers. Third, based on the previous literature on mother-child similarity in minority groups (Hughes & Chen, 1997; Knight et al., 1993), it is anticipated that there will be a relationship between mothers and children in the evaluation of religion-based exclusion. Fourth, due to concerns about behaviours changing through interaction with outgroup members (Scourfield, Gilliat-Ray, Khan, & Otri, 2010), it is expected that social conventional reasoning, like religious influence, may be used when judging the exclusion of outgroup members. Finally, based on previous studies (Alyami, 2015) and the findings described in the previous chapters, it is expected that participants will use social conventional reasoning, such as authority, when the perpetrator is a father as opposed to a peer.

5.7. Method

5.7.1. Participants

The participants consisted of 58 Saudi Sunni children (one child was picked for each mother from Study 3 and the other siblings were excluded) and their mothers in the UK. There were 16 children in year 4 ($M = 8.44 \text{ years, } SD = .51 \text{ months}$), 25 children in year 6 ($M =10.48 \text{ years, } SD = .51 \text{ months}$), and 17 children in year 8 ($M =12.35, SD = .50$). Twenty-eight of the children were girls, and 30 were boys. The mean age of the mothers was 35.68 years, $SD = 3.38 \text{ months}$ and all of them are married. Of the mothers, 63% held a postgraduate degree, 30% of mothers had a university degree and five mothers finished only high school. Forty of the mothers worked outside home, and the rest of mothers were stay-at-home mothers. Of the mothers, 37 study in UK universities while 21 mothers (who do not study) are companion with their husbands who study in the UK. The length of staying in the
UK was varied: 19 families have been in the UK for 1 to 2 years, 17 families for 3 to 4 years, 9 families for 5 to 6 years and 13 families for 7 to 8 years.

5.7.2. Materials

Eight vignettes consisting of short stories about exclusion were used. Table 1 displays these vignettes. In half of the vignettes the perpetrator of the exclusion was the main character’s father and in the other half the perpetrator was a group of peers. There were four targets of exclusion based on religious group (Muslim and Sunni versus non-Muslim and Shia). So, there were two ingroup types of vignettes including Muslim and Sunni, and the outgroup included non-Muslim and Shia. The order of the vignettes was counterbalanced. There were two questions on a 4-point Likert scale after each vignette: whether or not it was ok to exclude a child and whether they thought this “a lot” (“4”) or “a little” (“1”). Then for the open-ended question, the participants were asked “why” to justify their judgment.

5.7.3. Procedure

This project received ethical clearance from the University of Surrey Ethics Committee (UEC/2016/012/FHMS). After obtaining the family’s consent, the interviews were conducted in different places depending on the participants’ preference (e.g., home, Saudi club, university). Each participant was interviewed individually for approximately 15-20 minutes. Participants were informed that the interviews would be audio recorded, confidential, and that there were no right or wrong answers. The eight vignettes were read to the participants in counterbalanced order. After each vignette, the participant was asked whether or not it is ok to exclude a child and why. The participants’ answers were scored as 1 (not ok a lot), 2 (not ok a little), 3 (ok a little) and 4 (ok a lot). The answers of the open-ended question were transcribed and coded by the researcher and then entered into SPSS.

5.7.4. Coding categories
This study adopted a coding system that was used in the previous chapter from Killen et al. (2002) and Ruck et al. (2002). This coding system has been used to analyse social reasoning in previous research (Killen et al., 2002; Killen & Stangor, 2001; Møller and Tenenbaum, 2011). The coding categories included moral (fairness, empathy, and integration), social conventional (group function, authority, social influence, religious influence, and stereotype), and psychological (personal choice) (Table 2). Each time a participant invoked a category, it was coded a 1 in the data set and a 0 when it was not used. Because psychological reasoning occurred less than 10% of the time in the data set, it is not included in analyses.

5.7.5. Reliability Coding

The researcher coded all transcripts and an Arabic-speaking colleague (the same one in Study 1) coded twelve transcripts (20% of the data set) independently. The overall Kappa was .71. Individual kappas were as follows: fairness, $K = .88$; empathy, $K = .75$; integration, $K = .87$; Religious influence, $K = .75$; Authority, $K = 1$.

5.8. Results

Mother-Child Relationship

Correlational analyses were conducted to test the relation between mothers and children in their judgments of exclusion. In contrast to the first hypothesis, there was no significant relationship between mothers and children in the evaluation of religion-based exclusion whether the target of exclusion was an outgroup member, $r = .19, N = 58, p = .14$ or the target of exclusion was an ingroup member, $r = .25, N = 58, p = .06$.

Judgments of Exclusion

A 3 (Age: 8, 10, 12) $\times$ 2 (Participant: Mother, Children) $\times$ 2 (Group: In-group, outgroup) $\times$ 2 (Perpetrator: Peer, Father) mixed-design ANOVA was conducted to examine judgements about the acceptability of exclusion. The first factor was between-subjects and
the final three factors were within-subjects factors. Follow-up tests were conducted to examine all significant interaction effects. Only significant main effects results that related to the hypotheses will be reported below.

**Mother-Child Differences.** There was no difference between mothers \((M = 1.11, \ SD = .30)\) and children \((M = 1.21, \ SD = .40)\) in the acceptance of exclusion, \(F(1, 55) = 3.31, \ p = .07, \ \eta^2_p = .10.\)

**Group Membership.** In contrast to the second hypothesis, overall there was no difference in the judgment of the exclusion based on the group membership of the target as shown by the non-significant main effect, \(F(1,57) = .82, \ p = .40, \ \eta^2_p = .01.\) However, there was a significant Participant \(\times\) Group interaction effect, \(F(1,57) = 7.70, \ p = .01, \ \eta^2_p = .12.\) To explore the Participant \(\times\) Group interaction effect, two repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted separately for outgroup and ingroup to compare mothers’ and children’s responses with a protected alpha of .025. Children \((M = 1.26, \ SD = .50)\) were more accepting of exclusion of outgroup members than were mothers \((M = 1.08, \ SD = .22), \ F(1, 57) = 6.94, \ p = .01, \ \eta^2_p = .11.\) However, mothers \((M = 1.14, \ SD = .34)\) and children \((M = 1.16, \ SD = .34)\) did not differ in their judgements of the exclusion of ingroup members, \(F(1, 57) = .20, \ p = .69, \ \eta^2_p = .03.\)

**The Authority of Father.** Supporting the third hypothesis, mothers and children tended to accept exclusion by fathers \((M = 1.22, \ SD = .33)\) more than by peers \((M = 1.10, \ SD = .20), \ F(1, 55) = 7.90, \ p = .007, \ \eta^2_p = .13.\) The main effect of perpetrator was qualified by a significant Perpetrator \(\times\) Group interaction effect, \(F(1, 55) = 5.93, \ p = .02, \ \eta^2_p = .10.\) To explore the Perpetrator \(\times\) Group interaction effect, two repeated-measures ANOVAs were conducted separately for ingroup and outgroup exclusion to compare the acceptability of exclusion by fathers and by peers with a protected alpha of .025. Participants thought that it was more acceptable to exclude an outgroup member when the perpetrator was a father \((M =\)
1.27, SD = .42) than when the perpetrator was a peer (M = 1.07, SD = .23), F (1, 57) = 16.03, p < .001, ηp² = .22. Where the ingroup was concerned, participants did not differ in their judgements whether the perpetrator was father (M = 1.70, SD = .32) or peer (M = 1.13, SD = .32), F (1, 57) = .66, p = .42, ηp² = .01.

Justifications of Exclusion

To examine the hypotheses related to reasoning, a 3 (Age: 8, 10, 12) × 2 (Participant: Mothers, Children) × 2 (Group: In-group, outgroup) × 2 (Perpetrator: Peer, Father) × 2 (Reason: moral, social conventional) mixed-design ANOVA was conducted on participants’ reasoning. The first factor was between-groups and the last four factors were within-subjects factors. Follow-up tests were conducted to examine all significant interaction effects. Overall, mothers and children used more moral reasoning (M = .72, SD = .20) than social conventional reasoning (M = .10, SD = .10), F(1,55) = 438.11, p < .001, ηp² = .88. Only significant main effects results that related to the hypotheses will be reported below.

Mother-Child Differences. There was a significant Participant × Reason interaction effect, F (1, 55) = 9.14, p = .004, ηp² = .14. To examine the interaction, two repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted separately for moral and social reasons to compare between children and their mothers with a protected alpha of .025. First, mothers (M = .79, SD = .20) were more apt to use moral reasoning than were children (M = .64, SD = .24), F (1, 57) = 12.33, p = .001, ηp² = .20. Second, there was no significant difference in social conventional reasoning between mothers (M = .07, SD = .11) and children (M = .09, SD = .15), F(1,57) = .89, p = .34, ηp² = .02.

Group Membership. There was a significant Group × Reason interaction effect, F(1,55) = 7.53, p < .008, ηp² = .12. To explore the interaction, two repeated-measures ANOVAs were conducted separately for moral and social reasons to compare between outgroup and ingroup with a protected alpha of .025. First, participants tended to invoke
moral reasoning when discussing the exclusion of ingroup members ($M = .75, SD = .16$) more than when discussing the exclusion of outgroup members ($M = .68, SD = .20$), $F (1,57) = 6.48, p = .01, \eta^2_p = .10$. Second, there was no difference in using social conventional reasoning based on the group membership of the target, $F (1,57) = 4.62, p = .04, \eta^2_p = .04$.

**The Authority of Father.** In contrast to the sixth hypothesis, there was no significant Perpetrator $\times$ Reason interaction effect, $F (1,57) = 0.60, p = .49, \eta^2_p = .01$.

5.9. **Discussion**

The main aim of this study was to explore how UK-resident Saudi children and their mothers evaluate religion-based peer exclusion. In contrast to Chapter 3 (Study 2), there was no significant mother-child relationship with regard to religion-based exclusion. Regarding justifications, mothers tended to invoke moral reasoning more than children did. Also, children were more likely to accept the exclusion of outgroup members than were mothers. Confirming the hypothesis concerning the perpetrator of the exclusion, children and their mothers were more tolerant of exclusion by fathers than by peers only when the target was an outgroup member. The results are discussed in more detail below, with qualitative data presented to illustrate key findings and give some examples.

**Mother-Child Relationship**

In contrast to the Saudi children and their mothers in Saudi Arabia in Chapter 3, who were significantly related in their opinions about excluding outgroup members, this study did not find a significant relationship. However, the lack of association is consistent with existing literature that has not found a strong mother-child relationship in racial attitudes (Aboud & Doyle, 1996; Castelli, Zogmaister, & Tomelleri, 2009; Simpson, 2007). Although Allport’s theory (1954), on the nature of prejudice, argues that children absorb parents’ racial attitudes, children’s immature cognitive process may translate parents’ intergroup attitudes incorrectly (Aboud & Doyle, 1996), which in turn influences the relationship between the parent’s and
child’s intergroup attitudes. Indeed, children may adopt the intergroup attitudes of their parent but additionally children’s intergroup attitudes are built upon their personal interests, which may differ from their parents (Degner & Dalege, 2013). As mentioned previously, parents are not the only source of children’s intergroup attitudes. There are multiple influences in children’s social environments that can affect their attitudes such as peers and media (Aboud & Doyle, 1996; Degner & Dalege, 2013; Castelli, Zogmaister, & Tomelleri, 2009; Vittrup & Holden, 2011; Nesdale, 2001; Simpson, 2007). Further, children’s intergroup attitudes may get influenced by group norms (Brenick & Romano, 2016; Nesdale, Maass, Durkin, & Griffith, 2005; Rutland, Cameron, Milne, & McGeorge, 2005; Rutland et al., 2015). Nipedal, Nesdale and Killen (2010) found that group norms directly influence children’s attitudes towards the inclusion and the exclusion of outgroup members.

A further explanation is that the children in the current study attend UK schools where they interact with out-group members (teachers, peers), which gives them the opportunity to build their own attitudes about out-group members. During the school day children communicate with their peers in different activities, so they formulate their own personal attitudes towards peers.

Also, one possible explanation of the previous result (no significant mother-child relationship) is that children and mothers may not discuss peer exclusion which may lead children to develop independent attitudes which are unrelated to mothers’ attitudes. Several studies found that parents avoid any discussion of intergroup attitudes with their children. Either they prefer colour-blind socialization or they do not believe in the importance of this kind of discussions. For example, Pahlke, Bigler and Suizzo (2012) found that all European-American mothers (minority group) adopted colour-blind socialization in regard to intergroup attitudes so children did not predict mothers’ attitudes correctly and there was no mother–child relationship in intergroup attitudes. In another study, Simpson (2007) found that some
parents avoid discussing intergroup attitudes with their children. However, more work is needed to examine mother-child conversation regarding peer relationships.

**Group Membership**

Children rated it as more acceptable than mothers the exclusion of outgroup members. This finding is in line with the three previous chapters. One possibility is that the highly educated mothers (i.e., almost all mothers are postgraduate students in UK universities) who were examined in this study did not wish to disclose any discrimination. Alternatively, mothers may be concerned about social desirability more than children are (Degner & Dalege, 2011; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995). Being aware that the interviewer is a Saudi postgraduate student in the UK may motivate mothers to demonstrate intergroup equality. Even though participants knew that their answers were anonymous, their desire to reflect a tolerant image about Saudi students in the UK may have affected how they discussed intergroup attitudes. Nevertheless, residency in the UK, which includes being surrounded by different cultural groups, attending UK universities, and interacting with academics and colleagues may have shaped participants’ intergroup attitudes based on daily experiences and knowledge.

The qualitative data suggest that studying abroad might somehow force Saudis to accept outgroup members as a sign of respect to the host culture. For instance, one mother said: “Here we are interacting with non-Muslims and live under their authority! I came to their country, no one forced me, so I must adapt to the new culture and maybe I must force myself to accept them because for them if they accept me that is very kind of them, if not they are not forced”. Another mother distinguished between the acceptability of exclusion based upon geographical location. She explained: “It depends, if you talk about here (UK), we are scholarship students, so it is not acceptable because we are in their country, we come to live in their country to study, we are supposed to communicate with them. If the scenario is
in Saudi, Saudi individuals do not experience the same circumstances that scholarship students experience, they did interact with non-Muslims so maybe in Saudi Arabia it is acceptable (the exclusion) because Saudis in Saudi Arabia will think non-Muslims teach us bad customs. Their customs and traditions are different from us. So, it depends on where, in Saudi, it is acceptable based on how people think of non-Muslims, but here we are seeing that there are good and bad non-Muslims, we are here in a place where we can judge individuals (non-Muslim), if he is really good or not”. This suggests that there is a need to compare Saudis in the UK with Saudis in Saudi Arabia.

Indeed, mothers may be more sensitive to the exclusion than their children are because they link it with hostility towards non-Muslims and terrorist attacks around the world. In contrast, children, even if they experience exclusion or witness exclusion, they do not link it with political issues. For example, 12-year-old girl said: “We have a Polish friend. She said to us [a group of Muslim peers], “when I was in my previous city I did not know anything about you Muslims except what I was hearing from my parents which was Muslims are extremists and they kill others, but now after I know you well I found you very different from what my parents told me. When my friend talks about us (Muslims) in this way I feel that we are criminals but why?”. One mother said: “this is what is happening in the reality, hatred! We are accused of killing and bombings in European countries, and because of that children are raised [to think] do not play with others, do not eat their food”. In contrast, some mothers believe that it is acceptable for non-Muslims to exclude Muslim children as a result of their fear. A mother stated: “It happened with my daughters here [in the UK]. My daughters are sociable, they try to interact with other girls, but the girls are keeping them away. Personally, I cannot blame the girls, maybe they are afraid of what they hear about Muslims and terrorism in the media, but at the same time it is annoying, I mean this enmity”. On the others hand, children cannot understand the reason of why outgroup members
sometimes treat them badly or hold some beliefs about them and because of their religion. To conclude, mothers’ opinions are understood in the larger context than are the views of children because they can integrate multiple and complicated issues. This may therefore explain why mothers are less accepting than children of excluding outgroup members.

The Authority of Father

In line with the previous chapters, fathers’ authority has significant power over participants’ judgments. It seems that studying abroad for mothers and children does not lead to freedom to act against a father’s orders (Alyami, 2015). Consistent with previous research, obedience to authority is one of the traditional values that move with individuals from their original culture as a sign of maintaining the identity of the original culture (Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2007; Lin & Fu, 1990; Vadher and Barrett, 2007). One might hypothesise that exclusion by a father is based on his worry about his child, so it is reasonable to exclude peers based on group membership (Brenick, 2010). Also, as mentioned in previous chapters, mothers and children may consider obedience to the father as a religious duty, even in issues like peer exclusion and inclusion. In addition, participants may believe that the father is able to make decisions about excluding and including others based on his experience, while the mother may feel that she lacks knowledge in social issues. For instance, a mother explained: “I do not agree with the father, but I accept his act, maybe he saw a bad sample of non-Muslims”. Another possibility is that mothers may support the fathers’ view in order to avoid any family conflict. So, agreement with the father’s orders prevents any family arguments, and for children, they are too young to act against their father’s wishes.

Justifications for Exclusion

An examination of the reasons for exclusion found that generally mothers tend to invoke moral reasoning more than children. Given that concepts like discrimination, equality, racism, and integration were frequently noted by the mothers, they may be more aware of
their status as international students in the UK, and these concepts are highly important to them. Furthermore, mothers may be concerned about facing discrimination or unequal treatment and may worry about coexistence and being accepted by outgroup members. Some quotes from the interviews clarify this point further. For example, a mother highlighted: “We are in a country where we want to coexist, here in the UK you are with Sunni, Shia, Christian, no problems”. Another mother expressed her concern about the representation of Islam as a racist religion, she said: “We are here in the UK, we interact with non-Muslims a lot in our daily life, we should not reflect the racist image about Islam by excluding others based on their religion and sect”. Finally, a mother said: “If the boy lives here (UK) like us and his father said do not play with them (outgroup peers), I strongly disagree, the father causes problems, he came to live with them (outgroup members) so he is supposed to allow to the boy to play, he should not distinguish and feed the boy discrimination. He will grow up selective and cannot integrate with others, while it is good for him to be sociable regardless of the religion and sect”. Previous research has suggested that members of minority groups tend to justify exclusion through moral issues such as fairness and empathy as a result of being a victim of exclusion (Killen et al., 2002; Killen et al., 2007). Indeed, the qualitative data provides strong evidence for this suggestion. One of the mothers said: “I do not accept it at all, we feel this problem here with some people, it is like they are afraid of us or look at us as inferior. For example, when my daughter moved to a new school, one of her peers was not playing with my daughter, moreover she offended my daughter and called her black spider and this affected my daughter’s well-being”.

5.9.1. Limitations and Future Research

A few limitations merit examination. First, the sample and more specifically its educational level, makes this an unusual sample for Saudi Arabia. Nearly all of the mothers are postgraduate students who worked in academia in Saudi Arabia. Thus, generalising the
results to all Saudis who reside abroad is problematic. Also, the lack of a significant mother-child relationship in judgements of exclusion cannot be considered as evidence that mothers do not influence children’s attitudes because we did not fully investigate whether the participants discuss exclusion and inclusion, or whether mothers prefer colour-blind socialisation (Pahlke, Bigler, & Suizzo, 2012; Simpson, 2007). So, future research should consider asking parents and children directly if they talk about religion-based exclusion. A number of mothers in this study mentioned that their judgments might have been different if they were in Saudi Arabia, suggesting that future research should compare the differences between a sample in Saudi Arabia and another in the UK. Moreover, as a result of some experiences of religion-based exclusion by outgroup members against some interviewees, there is a need to further examine religion-based exclusion amongst individuals from different religions in the UK.

5.9.2. Conclusion and Implications

In conclusion, this study has examined Saudi mothers’ and children’s evaluation of religion-based exclusion to explore the existence of a mother-child relationship. As outlined in Chapter 3, the preference for ingroup members seems to be affected by living as a minority group and daily interactions with outgroup members. Also, the authority of father was clear on children’s and mothers’ attitudes. Important, in this study mothers and children reported many cases where they were the victims of religion-based exclusion. One important implication of the findings, therefore, is that schools in the UK should pay more attention to how children treat each other and emphasise coexistence.

Overall, the previous chapters found that Saudi children in Saudi Arabia and in the UK tended to accept the exclusion of an outgroup member more than the exclusion of an ingroup member. Further, the only significant mother–child relationship was found in Chapter 3 between Saudi children and their mothers residing in Saudi Arabia regarding the evaluation of excluding an outgroup member. All participants were more likely to defer to exclusion ordered by a father than a peer. Finally, there was no influence of age on children’s evaluation of exclusion. Although the previous studies contribute to our understanding of how Saudi mothers and their children residing in Saudi Arabia and the UK evaluate exclusion, we need to compare Saudi families in both communities to gain a greater understanding of how cultural context influences judgements of exclusion. So, this study will compare the two Saudi groups in Saudi Arabia and in the UK.

6.1. Intergroup Contact

One of the most influential factors in peer exclusion is intergroup contact. Positive contact between different groups reduces prejudice (Allport, 1954; Killen & Rutland, 2013; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Further, contact with outgroup can promote moral reasoning such as fairness about excluding outgroup members and motivate adolescents to challenge negative stereotypes about the outgroup based on their own contact with outgroup members (Killen & Rutland, 2013). Intergroup contact theory proposes that prejudice against the outgroup arises from the lack of knowledge and familiarity with the outgroup. Thus, contact with outgroup members could provide an individual with alternative information about
outgroup members and dispel a negative outgroup (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Work with young people supports this supposition. For example, Brenick (2009) examined the influence of intergroup contact on the evaluation of peer exclusion among Jewish-American, Arab-American, American adolescents in the US. Adolescents with a high level of intergroup contact were less accepting of peer exclusion than those with a lower level of intergroup contact. In their study of intergroup contact and the evaluation of race-based exclusion in minority and majority children, Crystal, Killen, and Ruck (2008) found that children who have a high level of contact with outgroup members were less accepting of the exclusion of outgroup members than those children with a lower level of contact with the outgroup. In addition, children with a high level of contact were less influenced by parental authority than children with a low level of contact. Although minority children faced race-based exclusion more frequently than did majority children, minority children evaluated exclusion as less wrong than did majority children.

6.2. Group Status

The first factor that may generate differences in the evaluation of exclusion in Saudis is group status (minority–majority). Saudi citizens residing in Saudi Arabia are the majority group, whereas Saudi citizens residing in the UK constitute a minority group. Previous research in the US found that minority groups were more sensitive and condemnatory towards peer exclusion than the majority group. This result may be based on personal experience of being excluded by members of the majority group in intergroup communication (Killen et al., 2002; Killen et al., 2007). In addition, the parent–child relationship in intergroup attitudes is expected to be affected by group status. As mentioned previously, majority children were more similar to their parents’ intergroup attitudes than the minority group were (Degner and Dalege; 2013). However, Verkuyten (2002) found that compared with Dutch children (majority group), Turkish children (minority group) showed
more obedience to parents and their evaluation of the ingroup was significantly related to their parents’ ethnic attitudes.

6.3. Cultural Context: Saudi Arabia Vs the UK

Parents who move to a different culture might want to retain their primary culture by teaching their children their own culture, religion, customs, and traditions (Dasgupta, 1998; Thornton et al., 1990; Ruble & Fuligni, 2006). For example, a family might move to a new culture, but speak their native language at home and celebrate their own religious holidays (Diane et al., 2006). Cultural socialization highlights the influence of parents in informing group identity and children’s intergroup attitudes (Stevenson, 1994; Thornton et al., 1990). Parents who move to a new culture tend to maintain the identity and the values of their own culture while simultaneously they are modifying some behaviours to adapt to the new culture. This process is especially true for those who move from a collectivistic culture such as the Middle East or Asia to live in a Western individualistic culture (Patel, Power, & Bhavenagri, 1996; Vadher & Barrett, 2007). The Chinese and Chinese-Americans emphasised parental control and obedience to authority and simultaneously they encouraged independence in their children more than the white Americans did (Lin & Fu, 1990). Although Indian fathers showed a high degree of acculturation (i.e., they preferred to speak English and they had few Indian friends), they emphasised the importance of politeness, morals and respect to authority in their girls (Patel, Power, & Bhavnegri, 1996).

6.3.1. The Importance of Religion

As mentioned in the previous chapters, Islam has a strong influence on Saudis as a national and social identity (Nevo, 1998). Whether Saudis live in Saudi Arabia or in the UK, the influence of religion extends to their daily life and their communication with others. Previous chapters demonstrated that mothers and children used a type of social conventional reasoning, religious influence, not found in previous studies. This dimension reflects either
concerns about negative influences of having peers from a different religious background or the willingness to communicate with those peers to change their religious attitudes and convert them to Sunni Islam. In general, Muslims consider Islam as the centre of self-definition when asked about how important religion is to the way individuals lead their lives. The majority of Muslims (95%) stated it was very important or important (Modood et al., 1997). Vadher and Barrett (2007) found British Indian and Pakistani families play an important role in maintaining the connection with their religious background; the Indian and Pakistani adolescents revealed that their religious identity is the dominant identity at home (i.e., prayers, reading Quran). Moreover, the Pakistani adolescents tended to have two or more Muslim friends. Muslim parents and their children in the UK perceive Islam as ‘more than religion’ so the effect of Islam extends to their social relationships (Franceschelli & O’Brien, 2014). Muslim parents in Wales explain that worries about damage to their daughters’ morals lead to a preference for peers who share the same religion (Scourfield, Gilliat-Ray, Khan, & Otri, 2010). In Saudi Arabia, the society supports the power of religion by a focus on religion in school textbooks, practices and laws (Alsallom, 1994; Nevo, 1998). However, in the UK there is no such power for a certain religion. The equality act 2010 confirms that religious discrimination—which includes giving preference to certain individuals based on religion—is unlawful in the UK. The equality act 2010 also condemns sectarian discrimination against individuals from different sects of the same religion, such as Orthodox and Reform Jews, or Shia and Sunni Muslims (Department of Education, 2014).

6.3.2. Collectivism and Individualism

In addition to religious differences between the host country and Saudi Arabia, there are also differences in cultural values. Saudi Arabia is considered a collectivist culture and collectivism has an important influence on Saudis (Al-Ruwaitea, 2004; Abdel Razek, 2012; Heyn, 2013; Nevo, 1998). Compared with individualistic cultures, ingroup belonging and
maintaining group identity is a priority in collectivist cultures (Hofstede, 1980). In addition, in contrast to individualistic cultures, collectivist cultures reinforce the obedience of children towards authority (Al-Simadi & Atoum, 2000; Chao & Tseng, 2008; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2007). Saudi students in the US consider helping and supporting ingroup members a duty and part of their personality as collectivistic individuals; these beliefs indeed could affect their interactions with outgroup members as a result of preferring ingroup members (Abdel Razek, 2012). It is expected that collectivism will influence intergroup contact and social relationships in Saudis who study abroad (Alyami, 2015; Razek & Dayton, 2013). Being born and growing up in a collectivist society such as Saudi Arabia, then moving to an individualist society, might produce a combination of new individualist values and traditional values (e.g., obedience to authority figures) (Patel, Power, & Bhavenagri, 1996). Brenick (2010) found that Middle Eastern children in the United States believed that parental worry is a justifiable reason to exclude other children based on group membership. However, children in an individualistic society such as Danish majority children in Denmark did not show obedience to authority regarding peer exclusion (Møller & Tenenbaum, 2011).

6.4. The Present Study

This study investigates Saudi children and their mothers residing in Saudi Arabia and those residing in the UK in their evaluation of religious-based exclusion. More specifically, it examines whether there is a difference between these two groups in their judgements of exclusion of ingroup and outgroup members. There are five hypotheses that drive the current study. First, based on intergroup contact theory (Allport, 1954; Killen & Rutland, 2013; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), it is expected that Saudis residing in the UK will show less acceptance of exclusion than do Saudis in Saudi Arabia. Second, based on the findings of the previous chapters, it is expected that both groups will rate the exclusion of ingroup member as less acceptable than the exclusion of outgroup members. Third, based on the status of men
in the Saudi family, both groups will accept exclusion by fathers more than by peers. Fifth, based on previous literature on minority groups, as a minority group Saudis in the UK will use moral issues to justify their evaluation of exclusion more than will Saudis in Saudi Arabia.

6.5. Method

6.5.1. Participants

In total 118 dyads participated: 60 Saudis Mothers and their children in Saudi Arabia and 58 Saudis mothers with their children in the United Kingdom. For this study, we included the answers from the mother-child dyads in Studies 2 and 4.

To remind the reader, for the sample residing in Saudi Arabia, the participants consisted of 60 Saudi children and their mothers. The mean age of the mothers was 41.33 years, $SD=7.30$ months. Seventy-five of mothers are married, two are divorced and one is widow. Of the mothers, 5% mothers held a postgraduate degree, 38% had a university degree, nearly 31% had finished high school, four mothers attended middle school, and only one mother did not have formal education. Forty-five of the mothers worked outside home, and the rest of mothers were stay-at-home mothers.

For the UK sample, the participants consisted of 58 Saudi children and their mothers in the UK. The mean age of the mothers was 35.68 years, $SD = 3.38$ months and all of them were married. Of the mothers, 63% held a postgraduate degree, 30% of mothers had a university degree and five mothers had finished high school. Thus, this sample was better educated than the Saudi sample residing in Saudi Arabia, $\chi^2 (1) = 18.35, p < .001$. Forty of the mothers worked outside home, and the rest of mothers were stay-at-home.

6.5.2. Materials

Eight vignettes consisting of short stories about exclusion were used. Table 1 displays these vignettes. See Studies 2 and 4 for the interview procedure.
6.5.3. **Procedure**

This project received ethical clearance from the University of Surrey Ethics Committee (UEC/2016/012/FHMS).

6.5.4. **Coding Categories**

Table 2 gives examples of the coding in more detail. Reliability is described in Studies 2 and 4.

6.6. **Results**

**Mother-Child Relationship**

The correlation between mothers and children in chapter 3 (mothers and children in Saudi Arabia) and 5 (mothers and children in the UK) was compared to test the difference between the two correlations. There was no significant difference between the two correlations in the judgment of exclusion when the target was an in-group member, $z = .67$, $p = .24$. Also, there was no significant difference between the two correlations in the judgment of exclusion when the target was an out-group member, $z = 1.14$, $p = .87$.

**Exclusion Judgments**

Two ANOVA models were conducted to examine the hypotheses. First, a 3 (Age: 8, 10, 12) $\times$ 2 (Location: Saudi Arabia, UK) $\times$ 2 (Participant: mother, children) $\times$ 2 (Group: outgroup, ingroup) $\times$ 2 (Perpetrator: peer, father) mixed-measures ANOVA was conducted to examine judgments about the acceptability of exclusion. The first two factors were manipulated between-groups and the final three were within-subjects factors. Children’s ratings on each vignette ranged from 1 (no agreement with exclusion) to 4 (high agreement with exclusion). Follow-up tests were conducted to examine all significant interaction effects. Only significant main and interaction effects related to the hypotheses are reported.

**Saudi Arabia VS UK.** As expected by the first hypothesis, the main effect of location was significant, $F (1, 112) = 63.02, p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .40$. Saudi participants in Saudi Arabia
were more prone to condone exclusion ($M = 1.80, SD = .55$) than participants in the UK ($M = 1.20, SD = .55$).

**Mothers VS Children.** As expected by the second hypothesis, children were more likely to accept exclusion ($M = 1.60, SD = .80$) than were mothers ($M = 1.40, SD = .60$), $F(1, 112) = 14.20, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .11$. The main effect of Participants was qualified by a significant, Participants x Location interaction effect, $F(1, 112) = 4.70, p = .03, \eta^2_p = .04$.

Four follow-up repeated-measures ANOVAs were conducted with a protected alpha level of .0125 to untangle this interaction. There was no significant difference in the judgment of exclusion between children ($M = 1.21, SD = .40$) and mothers ($M = 1.11, SD = .30$) in the UK, $F(1, 57) = 3.40, p = .10, \eta^2_p = .05$. However, children in Saudi Arabia were more likely to accept exclusion ($M = 1.98, SD = .67$) than were their mothers ($M = 1.61, SD = .71$), $F(1, 59) = 11.40, p = .001, \eta^2_p = .20$. Mothers in the UK were less likely to accept exclusion ($M = 1.11, SD = .30$) than were mothers in Saudi Arabia ($M = 1.62, SD = .71$), $F(1, 116) = 25.70, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .20$. Also, children in the UK were less likely to accept exclusion ($M = 1.98, SD = .67$) than were children in Saudi Arabia ($M = 1.21, SD = .40$), $F(1, 116) = 58.62, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .34$. Figure 1 shows the difference between children and mothers in Saudi Arabia and UK.

**Figure 1.** Participants × Location
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**Error Bars: 95% CI**
**The Authority of Fathers.** Confirming the third hypothesis, it was more acceptable when exclusion was ordered by a father ($M = 1.60, SD = .60$) than a peer ($M = 1.40, SD = .60$), $F(1,112) = 21.04, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .20$. The main effect of Perpetrator was qualified by a significant Participant $\times$ Perpetrator interaction effect, $F(1,112) = 7.09, p = .01, \eta^2_p = .10$.

Two follow-up repeated-measures ANOVAs were conducted with a protected alpha level of .025 to untangle this interaction. Children ($M = 1.73, SD = .81$) were more prone than mothers ($M = 1.41, SD = .65$) to accept exclusion by father, $F(1,117) = 17.50, p > .001, \eta^2_p = .13$. Also, Children ($M = 1.50, SD = .65$) were more prone than mothers ($M = 1.32, SD = .63$) to accept exclusion by peer, $F(1,117) = 5.20, p = .025, \eta^2_p = .04$. Figure 2 shows the difference in children’s and mothers’ judgment of exclusion based on the perpetrator.

**Figure 2.** Participants $\times$ Perpetrator

![Graph](image)

**Error Bars: 95% CI**

**Group Membership.** As expected by the fourth hypothesis, participants thought it was more acceptable to exclude an outgroup member (non-Muslims, and Shia) ($M = 1.60, SD = .63$) than an in-group member (Muslims and Sunnis) ($M = 1.41, SD = .63$), $F (1, 112) = 14.81, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .12$. The main effect of Group was qualified by a significant, Group $\times$ Location interaction effect, $F (1, 112) = 9.12, p = .003, \eta^2_p = .10$. Four follow-up repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted for each location with group (in-out) with a protected alpha level of .0125 to untangle this interaction. In the UK, there was no significant
difference in UK sample’s judgment whether the victim of exclusion was ingroup member $(M = 1.14, SD = .26)$ or outgroup member $(M = 1.17, SD = .29)$, $F(1, 57) = .81, p = .37, \eta^2_p = .01$. However, participants in Saudi Arabia accepted the exclusion of an outgroup member $(M = 1.92, SD = .65)$ more than an ingroup member $(M = 1.68, SD = .53)$, $F(1, 59) = 14.70, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .20$. Participants in Saudi Arabia $(M = 1.70, SD = .54)$ accepted the exclusion of an ingroup member more than participants in the UK did $(M = 1.15, SD = .30)$, $F(1, 116) = 46.21, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .30$. Also, participants in Saudi Arabia $(M = 1.93, SD = .70)$ accepted the exclusion of an outgroup member more than participants in the UK did $(M = 1.20, SD = .30)$, $F(1, 116) = 63.40, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .40$. Figure 3 shows the difference between participants in Saudi Arabia and UK in the judgment of exclusion based on group membership.

Figure 3. Location × Group

![Bar chart showing the difference in judgment between UK and Saudi Arabia](Image)

Error Bars: 95% CI

Also, there was a significant Participants × Group interaction effect, $F(1, 112) = 19.12, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .15$, which was further qualified by a significant Participants × Group × Location interaction effect, $F(1, 112) = 7.02, p = .01, \eta^2_p = .10$. To explore the Participants × Group interaction, two repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted for participants with each group with a protected alpha of .025. There was no difference between children and mothers when discussing the exclusion of ingroup members, $F(1, 117) = 1.40, p = .24, \eta^2_p =$
However, when discussing the exclusion of outgroup members, children were more likely to accept exclusion ($M = 1.80$, $SD = .84$) than were mothers ($M = 1.40$, $SD = .64$), $F (1, 117) = 28.90$, $p > .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .20$. To explore the three-way interaction, four follow-up repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted with a protected alpha level of .0125 to untangle this interaction. Two follow-up effects were significant. First, children in the UK thought it was more acceptable to exclude an outgroup ($M = 1.30$, $SD = .50$) than mothers did ($M = 1.10$, $SD = .22$), $F (1, 57) = 6.94$, $p = .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .11$. There was no significant difference between mothers and children in the exclusion of ingroup member, $F (1, 57) = .20$, $p = .70$, $\eta_p^2 = .00$. Second, children in Saudi Arabia thought it was more acceptable to exclude an outgroup member ($M = 2.23$, $SD = .83$) than mothers did ($M = 1.62$, $SD = .80$), $F(1, 59) = 23.92$, $p < .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .30$. There was no significant difference between mothers and children in the exclusion of ingroup member, $F (1, 59) = 1.22$, $p = .30$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. Figure 4 shows the difference between mothers and children in Saudi Arabia and UK in the judgment of exclusion based on group membership.

**Figure 4.** Participants $\times$ Location$\times$ Group

The main effect of group was further qualified by a significant Perpetrator $\times$ Group interaction effect, $F (1) = 19.40$, $p = .0001$, $\eta_p^2 = .10$. Which was further qualified by a significant Perpetrator $\times$ Group $\times$ Location interaction effect, $F (1, 112) = 7.02$, $p = .01$, $\eta_p^2=$
To examine the two-way interaction, two follow-up repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted with a protected alpha level of .025 to untangle the interaction. When discussing the exclusion of ingroup members, there was no difference in participants’ judgment based on the perpetrator, $F(1, 117) = .05, p = .81, \eta^2_p = .00$. However, participants accepted the exclusion of outgroup members when the perpetrator was a father ($M = 1.73, SD = .80$) more than when the perpetrator was a peer ($M = 1.40, SD = .60$), $F(1, 117) = 41.11, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .30$. To examine the three-way interaction, four follow-up repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted with a protected alpha level of .0125 to untangle the interaction. Two pairwise comparisons were significant. First, participants in the UK accepted the exclusion of outgroup members when the perpetrator was a father ($M = 1.30, SD = .43$) more than when the perpetrator was a peer ($M = 1.10, SD = .24$), $F(1.57) = 16.03, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .22$. Second, participants in Saudi Arabia accepted the exclusion of an outgroup member when the perpetrator was a father ($M = 2.20, SD = .82$) more than when the perpetrator was a peer ($M = 1.70, SD = .70$), $F(1.59) = 29.20, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .33$. However, there was no significant difference based on the perpetrator in the evaluation of excluding in-group member in children in the UK, $F(1.57) = .66, p = .42$, nor in Saudi Arabia, $F(1.59) = .40, p = .52$. Figure 5 shows the difference between participants in Saudi Arabia and UK in the judgment of exclusion based on group membership.
Figure 5. Location × Perpetrator × Group

Reasoning Judgments

A 3 (Age: 8, 10, 12) × 2 (Location: Saudi Arabia, UK) × 2 (Participant: mother-children) × 2 (Perpetrator: father, peer) × 2 (Group: Out-group, In-group) × 2 (Reason: moral, social conventional) mixed-measures ANOVA was conducted on children’s reasoning. The first two factors were between-groups and the last four factors were within-subjects factors. Follow-up tests were conducted to examine all significant interaction effects. Only significant main and interaction effects related to the hypotheses are reported.

Saudi Arabia VS UK. The main effect of reasoning was qualified by a significant Reason × Location interaction effect, $F(1, 112) = 116.42, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .51$. To explore the interaction, four repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted for each reason with participants in each location (UK, Saudi) with a protected alpha of .0125. As expected, participants in the UK were more likely to invoke moral reasoning ($M = .72$, $SD = .20$) than social conventional reasoning ($M = .10$, $SD = .10$), $F(1, 57) = 464.88, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .98$. There was no significant difference for participants in Saudi Arabia, $F(1,59) < 1$. Participants in the UK ($M = .72$, $SD = .20$) were more likely to invoke social conventional reasoning than participants in Saudi Arabia ($M = .40$, $SD = .22$), $F(1, 116) = 87.40, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .43$. However, participants in Saudi Arabia ($M = .40$, $SD = .20$) were more likely to invoke moral
reasoning than participants in the UK ($M = .10, SD = .10), F (1, 116) = 108.20, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .50$.

**Children VS Mothers.** Although there was no significant Participant \times Reason interaction effect, $F (1,112) = .06, p = .80, \eta_p^2 = .00$, there was a significant Participants \times Reason \times Location interaction effect, $F (1, 112) = 4.00, p = .05, \eta_p^2 = .04$. To examine the three-way interaction, four follow-up repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted with a protected alpha level of .0125 to untangle the interaction. There were two significant interactions related to participants’ reasoning in the UK. First, mothers in the UK were more apt to use moral issues to justify exclusion ($M = .74, SD = .20$) than social conventional reasoning ($M = .10, SD = .10), $F(1,57) = 449.60, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .90$. However, there was no significant difference in mothers’ evaluation in Saudi Arabia, $F (1, 59) = .54, p = .50$.

Second, children in the UK tended to invoke moral issues ($M = .70, SD = .20$) more than social conventional reasoning ($M = .10, SD = .12), $F (1, 57) = 255.60, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .90$. However, there was no significant difference in children’s evaluation in Saudi Arabia, $F (1, 59) = .60, p = .60, \eta_p^2 = .01$. Figure 6 shows the difference between mothers and children in Saudi Arabia and UK in the justification of exclusion.

**Figure 6.** Location \times Participants \times Reasons

![Figure 6](image)

**Group Membership.** There was a significant Group \times Reason interaction effect, $F(1,112) = 13.08, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .11$, which was qualified by a significant Participants \times Group
Reason interaction effect, $F(1,112) = 7.30, p = .01, \eta^2 = .10$. To untangle the Group × Reason interaction, two repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted with a protected alpha of .025. Participants invoked moral reasoning when discussing the exclusion of an in-group member ($M = .60, SD = .30$) more than an outgroup member ($M = .51, SD = .30$), $F(1,117) = 11.80, p = .001, \eta^2 = .10$. However, as expected participants invoked social conventional reasoning when discussing the exclusion of outgroup member ($M = .30, SD = .30$) more than in-group member ($M = .21, SD = .20$), $F(1, 117) = 8.40, p = .005, \eta^2 = .10$. To examine the three-way interaction, four follow-up repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted with a protected alpha level of .0125 to untangle the interaction. First, mothers were more apt use moral issues ($M = .61, SD = .34$) to justify exclusion when discussing in-group members than social conventional reasoning ($M = .20, SD = .30$), $F(1, 117) = 56.53, p < .001, \eta^2 = .33$. Also, children used moral reasoning ($M = .54, SD = .30$) more than social conventional reasoning ($M = .23, SD = .32$) to justify exclusion when discussing in-group members, $F(1,117) =24.80, p < .001, \eta^2 = .30$. Second, when discussing outgroup members, mothers tended to invoke more moral reasoning ($M = .50, SD = .30$) to justify exclusion more than social conventional reasoning ($M = .30, SD = .30$), $F (1, 117) = 15.90, p < .001, \eta^2 = .12$. Also, children used moral reasoning ($M =50, SD = .33$) more than social conventional reasoning ($M = .25, SD = .30$) to justify exclusion when discussing outgroup members, $F(1, 117) =23.72, p < .001, \eta^2 = .20$. Figure 7 shows the difference between mothers and children in the justification of exclusion based on group membership.
The Authority of Fathers. There was a significant Perpetrator × Reason interaction effect, $F(1,112) = 7.62, p = .01, \eta_p^2 = .10$. To examine the interaction, two repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted with a protected alpha of .025 to untangle the interaction. Participants were more apt to use moral issues to justify exclusion by peers ($M = .60, SD = .30$) than exclusion by fathers ($M = .51, SD = .30$), $F(1,117) = 9.50, p = .003, \eta_p^2 = .10$.

However, there was no significant difference in social conventional reasoning when discussing peers or fathers as the perpetrator, $F(1,117) = 3.10, p = .10, \eta_p^2 = .02$.

6.7. Discussion

This study compared Saudi children and their mothers residing in Saudi Arabia and those residing in the UK in their evaluations of religious-based exclusion, to see if how living in another country affects judgements around exclusion. It also looked at the influence of fathers’ authority on the dyads’ (mother-child) judgements of peer exclusion.

Differences were found between Saudis living in the UK and those living in Saudi Arabia. For example, Saudi mother-child dyads in the UK were less accepting of peer exclusion than Saudi mother-child dyads in Saudi Arabia. Interestingly, children in Saudi Arabia were more likely to condone exclusion than mothers were, whilst there were no
differences in the judgement of exclusion in Saudi dyads in the UK. In addition, children
living in Saudi Arabia were more likely to condone exclusion than children living in the UK.
Children in Saudi Arabia and in the UK were more prone to accept the exclusion of an
outgroup member than mothers.

**Saudi Arabia VS UK**

Overall, Saudi families in the UK were less accepting of peer exclusion than Saudi
families in Saudi Arabia. Past work from acculturation perspectives reveal that mothers adopt
some values from the host culture with regard to behaviours such as interaction with
outgroup members (Bornstein & Cote, 2006; Patel, Power & Bhavenagri, 1996;
Rueschenberg & Buriel, 1989; Gratier, 2003). These findings provide evidence of how
individuals adjust their behaviours to reflect the host culture with regard to interaction with
others (Berry, 1997; 2005; 2006; Bornstein & Cote, 2006; Patel, Power & Bhavenagri, 1996;
Rueschenberg & Buriel, 1989; Gratier, 2003). One of the most important factors in adjusting
to any culture is respecting and being involved with the individuals in that culture. Saudi
families in the UK may have less bias towards outgroups as a result of contact with
individuals from different cultural and religious backgrounds compared with families in
Saudi Arabia.

Based on intergroup contact theory, contact with outgroup members could reduce
prejudice against the outgroup (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Tadmor, Hong,
Chao, Wiruchnipawan, & Wang, 2012). Schools are the ideal environment for intergroup
contact when Allport’s conditions for optimal contact are achieved (i.e., equal group status,
support by authority, common goals, cooperation). Saudi mothers and their children in the
UK are attending British schools and universities so it expected that they have a high level of
interaction with members of the outgroup (i.e., non-Muslims). Qualitative data supports this
argument, whereby children and their mothers mention that their own contact with different
groups in the UK motivate them to judge religion-based exclusion as unacceptable. For example, a 12-year-old boy said: “It is wrong to exclude him because he is non-Muslim. My friends here are non-Muslims, they are nice, and they always help me to improve my English”. Another boy (10-years-old) said that: “There is no problem playing with others. I have non-Muslim friends, we play together in school, we work together, and we prepare our presentations together. It is normal”. Learning more about an outgroup via direct contact may influence participants’ attitudes and reduce bias in intergroup attitudes. Allport (1954) suggested that interaction with outgroup members provides knowledge. Consequently, the bias against outgroup members will reduce. Given that the majority of Saudi citizens are Sunni Muslims, participants in Saudi Arabia had very little interaction with outgroups. As a result of the absence of intergroup contact in Saudi Arabia, a lack of knowledge about outgroup would be expected.

Transcripts of the interviews reveal another interesting reason that may lead the UK sample to show less bias. A number of participants (mothers and children) highlight the benefits of outgroup inclusion. For example, including members of the outgroup would help improve the English language skills of Saudis who live and study in the UK. Also, interacting with the outgroup would help them to adapt to the new culture and provide Saudis with important information about the education system, lifestyle, and British law. A 12-year-old boy said: “It is good to play with non-Muslims, they will teach the language and help you to speak English”.

Another explanation might be that Muslims in the UK try to enhance a good image for Muslims, by showing their willingness to accept and include outgroup members. So, Saudis may be willing to benefit from interacting directly with the outgroup by explaining that Islam is a religion of love and peace. This may motivate them to find religion-based peer exclusion less acceptable. One Saudi mother in the UK said: “I allow my kids to invite their
peers home, play with them and eat with them whenever they want. I do not talk to the non-Muslim kids about Islam, neither do my kids, but when the kids see my kids pray they try to copy them”. Another mother said: “When we first arrived in the UK I bought my daughter gifts to give to her peers in school as a way to build a nice start with them”.

Finally, the UK’s Equality Act (2010) aims to protect individuals from all types of discrimination. Religion-based exclusion is a type of intergroup discrimination, so it is reasonable to find that the UK sample were less accepting of peer exclusion based on religion than the Saudi sample. All the participants attend British schools and universities where this law is activated. The existence of such an Equality Act of 2010 may make individuals more cautious in their intergroup attitudes.

A further interpretation of the difference between Saudis in Saudi Arabia and in the UK, could be more directly linked to the shift from a majority group (Sunni Muslim in Saudi Arabia) to a minority group (Muslims in the UK) (Killen et al. 2002; Killen et al. 2007). Pfafferot and Brown (2006) found that minority adolescents in German preferred integration strategy in intergroup contact where they can contact outgroup members simultaneously maintain their own culture. Also, as minority, Saudis in the UK may face religion-based exclusion in the UK so they became more sensitive to the evaluation of exclusion. A mother of a 12-year-old Saudi boy in the north of the UK said: “These scenarios happen to my son until he hates going to the school, a group of his peers were calling him (Bin Laden) and he came back home and asked who is (Bin Laden) and why do my peers call me that”. Another mother of a Saudi girl (8-year-old) said: “One day my daughter came back home and said my friend does not want to play with me, her mother said do not play with Nora because she is Muslim! But mum what does it mean by Muslim and why she does not want to play with me because I am Muslim, what is the difference?” In the last situation, the mother visited the school and explained to the teacher what had happened, who then started to talk about
different religions with the students and how they should respect each others’ beliefs and treat each other equally. The mother said: “I noticed how that talk made a positive difference”.

**Justifications of Exclusion**

In terms of reasons given for exclusion, families in the UK tended to justify peer exclusion using moral issues. Typically, moral justifications are used by individuals who are unwilling to exclude outgroup members (Killen et al., 2001; Killen & Stangor, 2001). In this study, our sample in the UK also tended not to accept exclusion so they used moral justifications. The minority status of the UK sample and majority status of Saudi sample may also have affected their justifications. In exclusion scenarios in previous studies, minority participants identify themselves with the victim of exclusion while the majority identify themselves with the excluder (Dovidio, Kawakami & Gaertner, 2002). This in turn motivates the minority to show less acceptance of exclusion, based on their own experience of victimization. The minority usually focuses on empathy and equality to justify their judgement (Killen, 2002). Again, the introduction of the Equality Act of 2010, teaching moral values in British schools to the Saudi sample in the UK, may encourage awareness of rights and equality.

Our qualitative data provides supporting evidence for the first explanation. The majority of participants (children and mothers) in the UK highlighted the wrongfulness of discrimination and prejudice, stating that individuals should treat each other equally. In Saudi Arabia, the greatest concern was the influence of outgroup members on ingroup identity and how including outgroup members can affect the Sunni Islamic identity of ingroup members. For example, a girl in Saudi Arabia said, with regard to excluding outgroup members: “It is acceptable to protect the girl from bad changing and moral deviation when she copies non-Muslim beliefs and morals”. On the other hand, a girl in the UK said: “I will say to the Sunni
Mothers VS Children

With regard to mother-child judgements, children were more prone to exclusion than mothers where outgroup members were concerned. The difference between the two countries is likely to lie in the size of the effect (larger in Saudi Arabia). When families move to live in another culture where they are in the minority, they may become more open to discuss their intergroup attitudes with their children in order to prepare them to face any potential discrimination (Hughes et al., 2006; Ryan, Hunt, Weible, Peterson & Casas, 2007). However, the majority status (Sunnī Muslim) of the Saudis in Saudi Arabia may reduce the need to discuss intergroup attitudes with children which may lead to difference in their attitudes. This was confirmed by most mothers. For example, one mother in Saudi Arabia said: “I haven’t had any conversation with children about individuals from different religion and sects because we have almost no contact with these groups, my children attend school where all their peers are Sunnī Muslims and we live where all our neighbours are Sunnī Muslim”. However, a number of mothers reported that they were not willing to discuss intergroup attitudes with children, but their children tend to open this kind of discussion. For example, one mother said: “when my son watches the news about Sunni and Shia he starts ask me about the difference between the two groups and why they do not like each other”.

Generally, the acceptance of exclusion in children more than mothers suggests that Saudi mothers hold more tolerant attitudes than their children, but it is not clear why these attitudes did not transfer to the children. One possible explanation is that social desirability may affect mothers’ intergroup attitudes. The difference in mothers’ and children’s judgements would appear if social desirability motivates mothers to hide their attitudes;
whilst children are less aware of social desirability and therefore more honest (Doyle, Beaudet & Aboud, 1988; Degner & Dalege, 2011).

The Authority of Father

Confirming the literature on patriarchal authority and the power of the father in the Saudi family, generally children and their mothers showed obedience to fathers’ commands (Alanazi, 2008; Alsaif, 1997, Pharaon, 2004). Children and their mothers were more accepting of the exclusion by fathers than the exclusion by peers. However, children vs mothers were more prone to exclude based on fathers’ requests. Interestingly, Alsaedy (2015) examined Saudi parent-child communication in Khulais city (Saudi City). He interviewed parents and children aged 12 to 14 years and found that the majority of children believed that the father had authority in the family over all family members. The parents in Alsaedy’s study had different opinions from children: they thought society had changed and, as women were becoming educated and financial providers in some families, they therefore had the same authority as the father, and sometimes more. In sum, when comparing fathers with different authority figures such as peers, mothers and children respected the authority of fathers more than peers. When comparing mothers to children in the acceptance of exclusion by father, children were more accepting of exclusion than were mothers.

Given the majority of mothers in our sample are educated and employed, the authority of the father may not necessarily affect mother’s making-decision as much as it does the children’s. At the same time, it is acceptable for mothers to discuss some decisions with fathers. One mother in Saudi Arabia said: “In this situation, I will ask the father why you do not want him to play with his peer? Have you seen any bad behaviours from the children?” Another mother in the UK said: “I will discuss with the father and I will try to convince him and I will explain to him how his act can affect the child psychologically”.
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6.7.1. Limitations and Future Research

Although the current study has reached its aim of examining Saudi mothers’ and children’s attitudes towards religion-based exclusion, there are some limitations. Concerning sampling, the mother serves as the prime caregiver in Saudi society and thus the mothers’ role in socialization is important, but there is a need to include both parents (father, mother) to examine who would be the main influencer. Given the religious and social values and gender segregation in Saudi Arabia (Alsaedy, 2015), it is not possible for me as a female researcher to interview participants of a different gender. However, future research in Saudi Arabia should include female and male researchers to interview both parents. One more limitation is that the socioeconomic status for the two groups (Saudi Arabia and UK) was not exactly the same. Mothers residing in the UK had more education than those residing in Saudi Arabia.

In terms of methods, face-to-face interviews with mothers and asking them to judge intergroup exclusion scenarios was another limitation. Mothers may worry about the researcher’s impression and conceal their biased attitudes.

An important direction for future research will be to examine how Muslim children from other backgrounds (e.g. Pakistani, Indian) and non-Muslim children in the UK evaluate religion-based exclusion. Exposure to bullying based on religion was reported by some participants in the UK as mentioned previously. Further investigation needs to include friends too, to see the influence of peers on intergroup attitudes among children. One of Saudi mothers in the UK reported: “My [7-year-old] daughter’s friend is Muslim, but she transmitted prejudicial attitudes to my daughter, she asked her to stop play with non-Muslim peers. She convinced my daughter that we should not play with anyone who is white because white people are non-Muslims! This affected my daughter and drove her to ask me if I am Christian (the mother) because I am white”.

6.7.2. Conclusion and Implications

In sum, this study sheds light on the comparison between Saudis citizens residing in Saudi Arabia and those residing in the UK in their evaluations of religion-based exclusion. We examined how their views differed based on cultural context, group status, and intergroup contact. The findings showed that Saudis in the UK are less accepting of religion-based exclusion than Saudis in Saudi Arabia. Saudi children and their mothers either in Saudi Arabia or in the UK showed acceptance of exclusion by fathers more than by peers. This study extends social domain theory by demonstrating that individuals’ judgements and reasoning are embedded within the socio-cultural values of their communities. Finally, this study could support the effort of several Saudi and UK centres that aim to fight discrimination, prejudice, and intergroup bias.
7. General Discussion

7.1 Introduction

The aim of this doctoral thesis was to examine how Saudi children evaluate religion-based exclusion whether the target of exclusion was an ingroup member (Muslim, Sunni) or outgroup member (non-Muslim, Shia). In addition, it varied whether the perpetrator of exclusion was a father or a peer. A second aim that is a main contribution of this thesis was to examine the mothers’ evaluations of religion-based exclusion to investigate if there was an association with children’s evaluations. Finally, the third aim compared Saudis (children and their mothers) residing in Saudi Arabia to those residing in the UK in regard to religion-based exclusion. Five studies were conducted to achieve the research aims. In this general discussion, I will first give a summary of the main findings and discuss them in more detail. In addition, I will discuss the implications of these findings. Finally, I will highlight the limitations of this thesis and provide some recommendations for future research.

7.2 Summary of Findings

Regarding the target of exclusion (outgroup, ingroup), children in Saudi Arabia and in the UK as well as children and their mothers in Saudi Arabia were more likely to accept exclusion of an outgroup member than an ingroup member. For Shia children (minority group) in Saudi Arabia, there was no difference in the judgement of exclusion whether the target was an outgroup member or ingroup member. In comparison with mothers, children were more accepting of exclusion of an outgroup member. There was a significant relationship between children and their mothers in Saudi Arabia only when the target was an outgroup member, while there was no significant relationship between children and their mothers in the UK. Third, Saudi children and their mothers in all the studies were more accepting of exclusion by father than by peers. Fourth, no age differences were found in
children’s judgements of exclusion except in Shia children where younger children aged 8 years were more accepting of exclusion than children aged 10 and 12 years. Finally, children and mothers residing in the UK were less accepting of exclusion than were mothers and children residing in Saudi Arabia. The two main findings related to the reasoning of exclusion were that first moral issues were used by Saudi mothers and children residing in the UK more than Saudis residing in Saudi Arabia and by mothers more than children in both countries. The findings will be discussed below in more detail.

7.2.1 Group Membership

For Saudis residing in Saudi Arabia (children and mothers), the exclusion of an outgroup member (non-Muslim, Shia) was more acceptable than the exclusion of an ingroup member (Muslim, Sunni). However, Shia in Saudi Arabia did not show any difference in their judgement of exclusion based on group membership. The first finding provides support for group identity theory and existing literature in ingroup bias (Bennett et al., 2004; Nesdale, 2004; Tajfel, 2010). The second finding suggests that group status (majority, minority) and intergroup contact (i.e., Shia children attend international school with non-Muslims) can affect positively the evaluation of peer exclusion and decrease outgroup bias. Communication with outgroup members is one of the main sources to build knowledge about outgroup and judge them based on this new knowledge (Allport, 1954). The absence of sufficient contact with outgroup members results in bias about the outgroup; this may explain the negative perception of outgroup members and their influence on ingroup members among Saudi Sunni in Saudi Arabia that was revealed by Study 1.

Although children residing in the UK were more likely to accept the exclusion of an outgroup member than an ingroup member compared with children residing in Saudi Arabia, children residing in the UK generally became less accepting of exclusion. In study 1, children showed a large effect size ($\eta^2_p = .30$) in discussing whether ingroup or outgroup exclusion
was acceptable. In comparison, study 3 found a small effect size ($\eta_p^2 = .10$) based on group. In both of these studies, children thought it was more acceptable to exclude outgroup than ingroup members. Similarly, Møller and Tenenbaum (2011) also rated differences in effect based on which group was excluded. They found that Danish children rated it less acceptable to exclude children who were outgroup members than in-group members (Danish children) also with a medium effect size. Of course the finding was in the opposite direction.

In Study 4 (Chapter 5), mothers residing in the UK stated that the judgement of exclusion would differ depending on where the scenario happened. More specifically, mothers reported that if the situation happened in Saudi Arabia it would be accepted because there is no contact with outgroup members. Thus, it is expected that Saudis would exclude outgroup members. In contrast, in the UK Saudis are a minority group and they communicate with outgroup members in daily life, so it is not acceptable to exclude outgroup members. As we have seen in Chapter 1 (part 2), from the perspective of Shia who attend international schools in Saudi Arabia, interacting with outgroup members has a vital role in shaping children’s attitudes towards outgroup members. Based on intergroup contact theory, structured interaction with outgroup members that happens in multicultural schools could increase unbiased knowledge with empathy and reduce anxiety about outgroup members, which in turn reduces prejudice against outgroup members by seeing them as equal (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 2004; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). Living and studying in a multicultural environment like UK may increase awareness of equality and make individuals sensitive to discrimination. They also often experience discrimination, so they learn how discrimination feels. In addition, the equality principles that are delivered to individuals in the UK by law or school will help as well in regulating intergroup attitudes. The qualitative data from the participants in the UK and from Shia children in international schools in Saudi Arabia confirmed such an approach. For example, the Equality Act 2010 in the UK and the emphasis
on equality by teachers in international schools in Saudi Arabia may encourage individuals to condemn any discrimination behaviour like peer exclusion based on group membership.

7.2.2 The Authority of the Father

Through all the studies, Saudis were more likely to accept exclusion by fathers than by peers. This finding provides evidence for the power of the father in a Saudi family. In addition, it reveals that such social customs are difficult to change under any circumstances. Individuals who grew up in a society promoting the authority of men (father, husband) over women and children (Alsaif, 1997, Pharaon, 2004) continue to comply with fathers’ orders anywhere even though these orders are prejudicial. In line with existing Islamic literature, Saudis in this thesis consider that obedience to father’s word is a religious duty and part of God’s obedience so they get punished by God if they ignore it (al-Hibri, 1997; Douki, Nacef, Belhadj, Bouasker, & Ghachem, 2003; Sultán, 1999). Killen and colleagues (2002) found that younger children’s and ethnic minority children’s attitudes about peer exclusion fluctuate after hearing their parents’ opinion. Qualitative data from children reflected that children believe that father will punish them if they act against him, which motivates them to accept exclusion when it is ordered by fathers. For example, a 10-year-old boy said: “The boy should listen to his father otherwise his father will be angry with him and beat him”. This finding suggests that the authority of the father is strong enough to change children’s and their mothers’ attitudes regarding peer exclusion in Saudi Arabia. Indeed, deference to authority, and in particular, fathers, is a central value of Saudi Arabia (Alanazi, 2008).

Generally, in many collectivist cultures, the authority of parents (and in particular fathers) plays a significant role in family life (Al-Simadi & Atoum, 2000; Chao & Tseng, 2008). However, children do not always defer to authorities in collectivist communities. For example, Druze children in Israel supported justice over authority during social conflicts (Wainryb, 1995). And Korean children did not support parents having gender restrictions
over children (Park, Lee-Kim, Killen, Park, & Kim, 2012). In study 1, children showed a medium effect size ($\eta_p^2 = 0.17$) in discussing whether exclusion by father or by peers was acceptable. In comparison, study 3 found a small effect size ($\eta_p^2 = 0.10$) based on the perpetrator. In both of these studies, children thought it was more acceptable to exclude by father than peers. Similarly, Møller and Tenenbaum (2011) also examined differences in effect based on the perpetrator. They found that Danish children rated it less acceptable to exclude children by the authority figure (teacher) than by peers with large effect size. However, the finding was in the opposite direction.

### 7.2.3 The Role of Culture

The previous two findings show that culture affects Saudis’ evaluation of peer exclusion. Compared to the countries examined in previous peer exclusion research, Saudi Arabia is a more homogeneous, collectivistic, and religious country (Metz, 1993). The characteristics of collectivistic culture may motivate less acceptance of exclusion in Saudis when the victim is an ingroup member than an outgroup member. Even when individuals were residing in a culture that was completely different from Saudi Arabia (UK), they showed obedience and in-group bias. These results are not surprising; they provide further support for previous studies that found that people tend to maintain their traditional values and original identity even when they show high acculturation with the new culture (Lin & Fu, 1990; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2007; Patel, Power, & Bhavenagri, 1996).

As mentioned in previous chapters, Muslim families who live in Western countries adapt to the new culture and simultaneously maintain their original culture and values (Bornstein & Cote, 2006; Patel, Power & Bhavenagri, 1996; Rueschenberg & Buriel, 1989; Gratier, 2003). For Saudis, maintaining the values of Saudi culture and maintaining their religious identity are priorities. Alyami (2015) interviewed 20 Saudi scholarship students in the UK to examine the acculturation strategies used by them. A few students changed some
of their behaviours to socialise and integrate with outgroup members, while the remainder chose to maintain their original identity by avoiding integrating with outgroup members. For example, one student explained how she avoided parties in order to avoid changing her dress style and being punished by her partner. Meanwhile, another student described how she used to drink and share the kitchen with male students in order to interact with them. Although students resided in the UK and attended UK universities, most of the female students showed acceptance of the authority of males, such as their fathers and husbands.

Consistent with previous research, the Saudis in UK in the current study were more accepting of outgroup members than Saudis in Saudi Arabia, but continued to respect their fathers’ authority and tended to include ingroup members more than outgroup members, which is part of their collectivistic culture, as mentioned previously. Indeed, this is an additive process of acculturation in which they do not simply become British.

7.2.4. The Age of Children

Children aged 8 years were chosen to be the youngest group because they can understand and evaluate the concept of exclusion easily (Møller & Tenenbaum, 2011). Children aged 10 and 12 years were included because the ability of children to weigh up multiple perspectives in their reasoning increases from childhood to adolescence (Killen, 2002). Thus, age is an important factor in examining issues such as the evaluation of peer exclusion. However, age in this thesis had little influence on children’s evaluation of exclusion. Indeed, previous research in peer exclusion found age differences between children aged 14 years or over and children aged 9–12 years, but there was little difference within children aged 9 to 12 years. Future research should include older children and adolescents to cast light on the age effect.
7.2.5. Mothers and Children

Study 2 in Saudi Arabia showed a significant relationship between mothers and children in the evaluation of exclusion when the target was an outgroup member. In the UK, Study 4 found no significant relationship between mothers and children in the evaluation of exclusion whether the target was an ingroup member or outgroup member. These inconsistent findings suggest that children do not always absorb parents’ attitudes. Indeed, parents are not the only source of children’s intergroup attitudes. Children may build their evaluation of peer exclusion based on personal experience or maybe they become influenced by social group norms, peers’ attitudes, and media (Aboud & Doyle, 1996; Brenick & Romano, 2016; Harris, 1998; Nesdale et al., 2005; Plomin, 1990; Rutland, Cameron, Milne, & McGeorge, 2005; Rutland et al., 2015). For example, children in the UK had a radical experience in that they were exposed to peers with very different experiences compared to children residing in Saudi Arabia. Thus, they may build their evaluation of out-group members based on their own experience, which may be different from that of their mothers.

In addition, the transmission of parents’ attitudes to children depends on the socialization approach that is used by parents. For example, some parents may discuss their intergroup attitudes directly with their children, while other parents may prefer colour-blind socialization (Simpson, 2007). In addition, the nature of the parent–children relationship (i.e., being supportive parents) can influence the extent of attitude transmission (Miklikowska, 2016). Perhaps one or more of the previous factors affected the relationship between mothers’ and children’s evaluations in this thesis. To conclude, as this thesis provides evidence for the relationship between mothers and children in the evaluation of peer exclusion (Study 2), it also provides other evidence for the independence of children’s attitudes from mothers’ attitudes in some situations. This finding suggests more work is
needed on parent-child relationships in the evaluation of peer exclusion to provide a better understanding of this relationship.

On the other hand, the current research found that generally mothers in Saudi Arabia and in the UK were less accepting of the exclusion of outgroup members than their children. This result may reflect that mothers are more tolerant than children in regard to outgroup members. However, it may also reflect that the awareness of social desirability in mothers is greater than it is in children (Degner & Dalege, 2011; Doyle, Beaudet & Aboud, 1988). Another possible explanation, mentioned previously, relates parent–child conversations about behaviours and attitudes (Aznar & Tenenbaum, 2015; Segall, Birnbaum, Deeb & Diesendruck, 2016; Tenenbaum & Hohenstein, 2016). Saudi, as opposed to UK, mothers may have discussed intergroup attitudes with their children so that their evaluations of out-group members became similar.

7.3. Implications of the Thesis

This thesis has several implications especially in Saudi Arabia. It extends an established literature into an understudied population and sheds light on the most sensitive existing categorization (religion) in Saudi Arabia by examining the new generation’s attitudes towards religion-based exclusion. It is also novel by directly assessing mothers’ views as well children’s views and carefully untangling the effects of living in another culture on children’s as well as mothers’ attitudes.

This thesis extends social domain theory by demonstrating that children’s judgements and reasoning are embedded within the socio-cultural values of their communities. In some collectivistic, homogeneous cultures, such as Saudi Arabia, adults’ authority may be stronger than in more individualistic cultures. Also, this study indicates that beliefs that morality can outweigh authority does not hold cross-culturally. Importantly, it seems that there are contextual differences between cultures that influence children’s reasoning. As mentioned,
including mothers in this thesis is novel in the field of exclusion and has furthered understanding in a way that may open the road to future research to examine this kind of relationship.

There are also applications of this research that the current government of Saudi Arabia may use. Recently, Saudi Arabia established a number of centres that aim to fight prejudice and promote tolerance, especially in relation to religion. Thus, the findings of this thesis could support the current efforts by the Saudi government. Considering the main findings of the five studies, there are a number of implications. First, one of the main findings of this thesis was the acceptance of the exclusion of outgroup member (non-Muslim, Shia) more than ingroup (Muslim-Sunni). Although this finding is understandable from the perspective of group identity theory, where religion is concerned this kind of bias may lead to negative consequences. Thus, more practical steps by Saudi centres that are responsible for fighting prejudice and promoting moderation in Saudi Arabia can start from this finding. These centres can benefit from the two main findings of this thesis (exclusion of outgroup, the authority of the father) and run some sessions for children with their fathers in schools focused on accepting and respecting outgroup members. In addition, as a number of interviewees in this thesis stated that their main concern was being affected negatively by including outgroup members, it is necessary to launch campaigns to increase awareness of the notion that interacting with outgroup members in daily life does not necessarily threaten the original religious beliefs of the individual.

Second, most participants in Saudi Arabia mentioned that it is difficult to judge the exclusion of outgroup members because they do not have sufficient knowledge about them. Thus, increasing unbiased teaching of religion and sects in Saudi schools, religious speeches by imams, and media could be a way to give Saudis the knowledge that they need to judge outgroup members.
Third, this thesis reflected the strong role of religion in Saudi’s life. Thus, there is evidence of the importance of using religion to decrease ingroup bias. In more detail, imams of mosques should moderate their speech about other religions and sects. Importantly, the prophet gently interacted with outgroup members, so imams could encourage individuals to do the same.

Fourth, the results of Studies 3 and 4 showed that some Saudis faced religion-based exclusion and discrimination in the UK based on the negative image of Muslims in the media. Western media can start from this finding and the literature of using TV programmes in improving intergroup attitudes to change the prejudicial images and stereotypes to build unbiased intergroup attitudes in children. As mentioned previously after watching the Sesame Street television programme, Israeli-Palestinian and Israeli-Jewish showed a significant increase in positive intergroup. In addition, Israeli-Jews showed a decline in negative stereotypes about outgroup members (Brenick et al., 2007; Cole et al., 2003).

Fifth, the Saudi Ministry of Higher Education runs events for scholarship students before they go to study abroad. The ministry should consider including children with their parents in these events and provide them with knowledge about outgroups and encourage them to communicate with them and treat them fairly and similar to outgroup members.

7.4. Limitations and Future Research

As with any research, this thesis has a number of limitations. One of the main limitations concerns including Saudi Shia; all the participants in this thesis were Saudi Sunni. Despite the great effort to interview Shia, the number of Shia (Study 1-part II) interviewed in this thesis was not sufficient to include it in a direct comparison with the Sunni majority. However, it is important to examine the minority group (Shia) in Saudi Arabia and compare their evaluation of exclusion with the one of the majority (Sunni). Another limitation was the vignettes that have been used. The peer versus father vignettes differed because the father
excludes his own child. In addition, following Malti et al. (2012), a group of peers excludes rather than a single perpetrator. Another limitation is that face-to-face interview was used in all five studies to examine children’s and mothers’ attitudes. Social desirability is one of the most significant limitations related to direct interviews with adults. Although mothers were informed about confidentiality, they may have been apprehensive about explaining their evaluation of religion-based exclusion honestly.

An additional limitation is that most of the interviews in Saudi Arabia were conducted in the central region of Saudi Arabia, while individuals in other regions of Saudi Arabia like East, South, and West may be more open to outgroup members than individuals in the central region. Indeed, the majority of Shia is located in the Eastern region, where their opportunities for communicating with outgroup members are greater than for individuals in the centre.

One limitation was the sample size. With a medium effect, G*power suggests, for example, that 400 children would have been needed to find an effect on age. However, given the difficulty recruiting children and mothers, it was not possible to increase the sample size. Another reason there might not have been an age difference was because a narrow age range of children was included. This limitation can be solved in future research by including children from older age groups. Nonetheless, the next section will discuss future research in more detail that should be conducted on religion-based exclusion.

The present study was focused on mother-child relationships in the evaluation of peer exclusion, which have not been examined before. However, future research could investigate both fathers and mothers along with children in order to better understand children’s evaluation of exclusion. It might also be possible to determine the role of each parent in children’s evaluation of peer exclusion. As I mentioned throughout this thesis, parent-child conversations about peer exclusion and inclusion might be the reason behind children’s evaluations of exclusion and strong or weak parent-child relationships in the evaluation of
exclusion, so future research could investigate this factor as well. In general, future research in peer exclusion that includes parents could shed more light on the socialization process and how parents can influence their children’s attitudes (Bigler & Liben, 2007; Brown, 2010; Dovidio, Kawakami, & Gaertner, 2002).

Almost all previous studies have taken age (a developmental factor) into account by investigating children from different age groups. However, future research could consider longitudinal studies, for example by investigating a group of children for a number of years. Of particular interest is accurately determining the changes in children’s evaluations of exclusion with age.

The field of peer exclusion is new in countries like Saudi Arabia, so there are many aspects that need to be examined. Peer exclusion based on tribalism (tribe belonging) is one of these aspects. Religion and tribes shape the identity of Saudis and play an important role in their daily lives (Metz, 1993). So, it is important to examine how children evaluate tribalism-based exclusion. Finally, as the current thesis found that Saudis in the UK were less accepting of the exclusion of outgroup members than Saudis in Saudi Arabia, future research needs to work on designing intervention programmes for Saudi children in Saudi Arabia based on providing online contact with outgroup members like non-Muslims, as the direct contact in Saudi Arabia is absent or rare. This kind of programme could be offered to students in schools as part of schools’ activities that aim to promote tolerance and openness to others.

7.5. Conclusions

In conclusion, this thesis contributes to the existing literature of peer exclusion by investigating how Saudi children and their mothers residing in Saudi Arabia and the UK evaluate religion-based exclusion. There are three main findings. There is ingroup bias shown through the acceptance of exclusion when the target was an outgroup member more than when the target was an ingroup member. Thus, ingroup bias could be more important than
applying fairness principles in the judgement of exclusion. Also, exclusion suggested by fathers is more acceptable than by peers, which shows that the authority of the father has a strong influence over children and their mothers. Finally, relationship between mothers and children in the evaluation of exclusion was shown partially in Saudi Arabia (Study 2) while there was no relationship between mothers and children in the UK (study4) which reflects that mothers are one source of children’s attitudes towards religion-based exclusion.

Importantly, this thesis indicates the lower acceptance of religion-based exclusion among Saudis who reside in the UK.
References


Wessler, S. L., & De Andrade, L. L. (2006). Slurs, stereotypes, and student interventions: Examining the dynamics, impact, and prevention of harassment in middle and high


Appendices

Appendix A

Brief report

Saudi Arabian children’s reasoning about religion-based exclusion
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This study examined how Saudi Arabian children (M = 10.50 years, SD = 1.61, Range = 8–10 years) evaluate peer exclusion based on religion when the perpetrator of exclusion was a peer or a father. Children believed that it was more acceptable for fathers than for peers to enforce exclusion and were more likely to use social conventional reasons to justify exclusion when the perpetrator was a father. The discussion focuses on how social domain theory needs to take children’s cultural community into account.

Statement of contribution

What is already known on this subject?
- Research suggests that children do not defer to authority in making decisions about peer exclusion.
- Children tend to believe that authority figures should not order peer exclusion because it is a moral decision.

What does this study add?
- Unlike children in other collectivist countries, children in Saudi Arabia support peer exclusion ordered by a father more than a peer.
- Saudi children use social conventional reasoning to justify fathers’ support for peer exclusion.

Compared to many countries included in research on peer exclusion, Saudi Arabian citizens tend to be collectivist, homogenous with respect to religion and ethnicity, and have a strong Muslim identity (Metz, 1993). In addition, fathers retain authority for the family. Although work from a social domain perspective has been conducted in other Arabic countries (e.g., Brenick et al., 2010), it has not examined exclusion based on religion, a salient social category. Given that religion is central to identity in Saudi Arabia, we focus on how children evaluate peer exclusion based on religion.

Social domain theory posits that individuals evaluate social events, such as exclusion, using three domains: the moral (fairness), the social conventional (authority and group function), and the psychological (personal choice) (e.g., Turri, 1983). Reasoning about peer exclusion pits children’s endorsement of fairness against authority and norms and thus, constitutes an ideal paradigm for understanding how children negotiate multiple understandings (Killen, Lee-Kim, McGlothin, & Stangor, 2002).
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Pertinent to social conventional reasoning, collectivist societies reinforce the obedience of authority in children (and in particular fathers) compared to individualistic societies (e.g., Metz, 1993). Saudi Arabia scores highly on collectivism. Of course, collectivism and individualism are not uncontested constructs with intracultural differences based on individuals’ positions within society (e.g., Turiel, 2004). Children do not always defer to authorities in collectivist communities. For example, Druze children in Israel supported justice over authority during social conflicts (Wainryb, 1995).

The present study
This study is set in a homogeneous cultural context in which deference to fathers, authority is central. Its central goal is to examine how Saudi children evaluate peer exclusion based on religion when the perpetrator of the exclusion was a father or a peer. First, based on social cognitive intergroup theory (Killen & Ristau, 2011), we expected children to believe that the exclusion of in-group members (Muslim) was worse than the exclusion of out-group members (non-Muslim). Second, because of the fundamental role of authority in Saudi culture (Metz, 1993), we expected children to believe that exclusion by fathers is more acceptable than by peers. Finally, we expected that children would justify exclusion by fathers as a social conventional issue more than by peers (Turiel & Wainryb, 2000).

Method
Participants
The participants comprised 116 children (Mage = 10.50 years, SD = 1.61; 72 girls and 44 boys). Children were Saudi Muslim citizens from a middle-income socioeconomic status in four cities. Potential participants were recruited through social media and email lists and asked to refer others. Mothers provided written permission and children provided assent.

Procedure
The children were interviewed individually for approximately 15–20 min. Four vignettes, adapted from Müller and Tencenbaum (2011) consisting of short stories about exclusion, were read to the children. In half, the perpetrator of the exclusion was the main character’s father, and in the other half, the perpetrator was a group of peers. In half, the victim was Muslim, and in the other half, the victim was non-Muslim (see Table 1). The story characters’ and participants’ gender were matched. After each vignette, the children were asked whether or not it was ok to exclude a child from ‘a lot’ or ‘a little’. Children’s answers were scored 1 (exclusion is ok) to 4 (exclusion is not ok). Next, the children were asked to justify their judgement. Interviews were conducted in Arabic.

Coding categories
Children’s justifications were coded using a coding system adapted from Kilien et al. (2002, Table 2). Only moral and social conventional reasoning were used with enough frequency for statistical analysis (over 5%). Ten transcripts were translated into English and checked by the second author. After discussion, a new subcategory (religious influence) was added to the social conventional category.

Table 1. Vignettes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignette</th>
<th>Father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim excluded</td>
<td>Reem wants to join a group of non-Muslim girls who play in the park, but her father does not allow her because the girls are non-Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Muslim excluded</td>
<td>Mara wants to join a group of Muslim girls who play in the park, but her father doesn’t allow her because the girls are Muslim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Justification categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>Fairness: Focus on fairness and equality, the feelings of the individuals, or wrongfulness of discrimination</td>
<td>They are equal so they should play together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social conventional</td>
<td>Group function: Need to make the group function well</td>
<td>It is better to have more members in case one of them is injured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Focus on parental and religious authority</td>
<td>You must obey your father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Religion influence</td>
<td>Related to influencing others</td>
<td>They must allow Maria to play with them and teach her Islam to be a real Muslim. ‘She could learn bad ways by playing with non-Muslims’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social tradition</td>
<td>Appealing to stereotypes</td>
<td>They do not let Reem play with them because they think all Muslims are terrorists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability coding
The first researcher and a Saudi colleague coded 30% (N = 4) of the interviews independently. The overall Kappa was K = .80. The first author coded the remaining interviews.

Results
Analytic plan
We conducted two ANOVA models to examine the hypotheses. First, a 2 (Perpetrator: father, peer) × 2 (In-Group: Muslim, Out-Group: non-Muslim) mixed-design ANOVA was conducted on children’s judgements. Second, a 2 (Perpetrator: father, peer) × 2 (Group: In-Group, Out-Group) × 2 (Reason: moral, social conventional) mixed-design ANOVA was conducted on children’s reasoning. All factors were within-subject factors. Table 3
shows means. Children’s judgements were coded as a 1 when they used moral and/or social conventional reasoning and a 0 when they did not. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) models were used to examine the dichotomous reasoning answers (see Laney, 1970; Wainerb, Shaw, Laupa, & Smith, 2001).

Judgements

Confirming the first hypothesis, children thought it was more acceptable when exclusion was ordered by fathers (M = 2.15, SD = 1.05) than peers (M = 1.85, SD = 1.04), F(1, 115) = 17.03, p = .001, partial $\eta^2_p = .13$. As expected by the second hypothesis, children thought it was more acceptable to exclude an outgroup member (non-Muslim) (M = 2.26, SD = 1.04) than an in-group member (Muslim) (M = 1.80, SD = 0.90), F(1, 115) = 24.10, p = .001, partial $\eta^2_p = .19$.

The main effects were qualified, however, by a significant Group × Perpetrator interaction effect, F(1, 115) = 10.00, p = .002, $\eta^2_p = .09$. To follow-up the interaction, two repeated-measures ANOVAs were conducted. Children accepted the exclusion of outgroup members by fathers (M = 2.50, SD = 1.35), F(1, 115) = 628.150, p < .001, $\eta^2_p = .84$ more than by peers (M = 1.90, SD = 1.14). Children rated exclusion of in-group members similarly by fathers (M = 1.80, SD = 1.08) and peers (M = 1.80, SD = 1.13), F < 1.

Reasoning

There was significant Perpetrator × Reason interaction effect, F(1, 115) = 12.44, p = .001, partial $\eta^2_p = .10$. To examine the interaction, we conducted two repeated-measures ANOVAs for each reason with perpetrator (Father, Peer) with a protected alpha of .025. As predicted, children were more apt to use social conventional reasoning to justify exclusion by fathers (M = 0.50, SD = 0.44) than by exclusion by peers (M = 0.31, SD = 0.40), F(1, 115) = 31.13, p = .0001, partial $\eta^2 = .21$. There was no significant difference in moral reasoning, F(1, 115) = 3.54, p = .06. Although there was significant
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