THE INFLUENCE OF PRIOR SOCIALIZATION ON CHILDREN'S MEMORIES FOR

SOCIAL SITUATIONS

by

Beth Wagoner

Submitted to the Department of Psychology at the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation with Honors in Psychology.

_____
(Dr. Andrea Greenhoot) Faculty Advisor

_____
(_____) Faculty Reader

_____
(Dr. Paul Atchley) Honors Program Director

Abstract

This study was designed to explore the relationships between kindergartners' prior socialization, their impressions of a fictional story character, and their memories for the character's behaviors. The children's prior socialization was measured based on their parents' and teachers' views of their behaviors and their own social expectations and person knowledge. The children's impressions of the fictional character were measured after each time they were read one of three stories about the character, and their memories for the character's behaviors were assessed after they heard all three stories. The results indicated that the parent and teacher behavioral measures were related to the children's social expectations and general person knowledge. The children's person knowledge was related to their impressions of the character during the first two sessions of the study, and their impressions at all three sessions were related to their memories of the character's behaviors. These findings suggest that there is an indirect link between prior socialization and memories for the character's behaviors, through general person knowledge and the specific impression of that character.

The Influence of Prior Socialization on

Children's Memories for Social Situations

Think back to your most recent class reunion when you and your high school classmates gathered for the first time in several years. While you were there, you probably caught up on the last few years of each other's lives and reminisced about past-shared experiences. During your conversations, you probably found yourself disagreeing with someone about what had occurred at a particularly memorable event. For example, you may have spoken with a classmate about what happened when Suzy was crowned homecoming queen and found that the two of you had very different memories for the same occurrence. She insisted that Suzy had received the crown fairly and was a good representative of the school. You, on the other hand, recalled that Suzy had stolen the crown from a good friend of yours who was also vying for the crown by stuffing the ballot box. The two of you have formed distinctly different memories for the exact same event. It is hard to say which of you is correct because both of you could be distorting your recollections of what actually took place. Why do different people have highly contrasting memories for the same experience? This is the primary question that the present research will consider.

Previous research suggests that knowledge can have a profound effect on what a person remembers (Chi, 1978; Ornstein, 1998). The developing knowledge system in children is of particular interest because the memories that are put in place during childhood may continue to have an effect on the way that information is processed and remembered into adulthood. Research on knowledge and memory has shown that

knowledge can often enhance people's memories. For example, Chi (1978) found that chess experts had better memories for the locations of pieces on a chessboard than novices, thus indicating that having more knowledge about chess improved one's memory for information related to chess. What was especially intriguing about this study was that the chess experts were children and the novices were adults. Thus, increased knowledge eliminated and overcame the age differences typically associated with learning and memory. However, sometimes knowledge can lead to distortions in memory. Ornstein, Merritt, Baker-Ward, Gordon, Principe, and Furtado (1998) discovered that after a 12-week delay children distorted their memories for a "mock" physical checkup that included many unusual procedures so that they were more consistent with what would occur in a typical checkup. These results suggest that children may distort or fill in gaps in their memories by making inferences based on their knowledge.

It is also important to consider that there are different categories of knowledge. The main focal point in this study was social knowledge and experience because the literature indicates that these factors may affect the way that children process and remember social situations. When children are provided with explicit descriptions of other people, their memories of events involving those people are dramatically influenced by the descriptions (Crick & Dodge, 1994; Dodge & Frame, 1982; Greenhoot, 2000; Leichtman & Ceci, 1995). For example, Leichtman and Ceci (1995) found that stereotypes and repeated suggestions over long periods of time had effects on preschooler's memories for an event in which a man named Sam Stone entered their classroom, walked around, said hello to their teacher, and left. Children who were led

to believe that Sam was a kind but clumsy person before he came to their classroom were more likely to make errors in their recall of Sam Stone's visit to their classroom than children who were not given a stereotype. Those children who were given a stereotype about Sam Stone and also interviewed using suggestive questions were especially likely to make inaccurate reports about Sam Stone's behaviors. This study suggests that children's memories are highly vulnerable to suggestion when combined with stereotypes.

As a further example of the effect of social knowledge on memory, Greenhoot (2000) learned that manipulating children's views of a story character affected their memories for the character's behaviors. She led kindergartners to believe that a fictional child was either a nice child or a bully before reading them a series of three stories describing social situations involving the character. The children were then asked to recall the three stories they heard. The children's memories of the story character's behaviors were biased by the information that they heard in the knowledge manipulation. She found that children who were told that a story character was a bully interpreted the character's behaviors more negatively and recalled more negative behaviors than those children who were told that the character was a kind child.

In real life, children are often not given explicit information about other people. Could other pre-existing factors potentially influence their memories for the other peoples' behaviors? It appears that something else does. Greenhoot (2000) also found that children who were not given descriptions of characters prior to hearing the stories formed either distinctly positive or negative impressions of the characters on their own, and their memories were then consistent with their impressions. This suggests that the

children's own past social experiences and personalities might have affected their interpretations and memories for the stories, but Greenhoot (2000) did not measure these factors. In the present study, to follow-up on Greenhoot's findings, these factors were measured and related to children's memories for the stories.

An understanding of these factors has important implications for the real lives of children. In the social situations that children encounter everyday, they are often not given descriptions of any of the new people that they meet prior to coming into contact with these people. The children must form their own impressions of others based on their perceptions of their behaviors. Research suggests that children will store these impressions for later use so that the next time they encounter a person they can use the information they have acquired (Crick & Dodge, 1994). But what happens if this information is not stored accurately because the child's own prior social experience influences what information they attend to and remember? This might cause children who have had positive past experiences to have more positive memories of the person and children with negative past experiences to remember more negative information. The outcomes for this are obviously good for children who have had positive experiences because they will continue to have good social relationships and to engage in appropriate social behaviors. For the child with negative experiences, the outcomes are the opposite. Hopefully, the information found will eventually lead to the answer about how to stop this cycle and increase pro-social experiences for children.

The relation between children's social knowledge and their memories also has relevance in court cases where children are called upon as witnesses to testify against someone charged with a crime. Leichtman and Ceci (1995) have argued that members

of the child's family and other adults will often speak to the child about the event that they are testifying about and suggest that they are testifying against a terrible person. If the child has also previously engaged in negative social situations with this person or in general, their memories for an event involving this person may be distorted by this social knowledge.

The purpose of the present study is to learn more about how kindergartners' prior socialization (including their social knowledge, past social experiences, and behavioral characteristics) affects their views of other children and their interpretation and recall of their behaviors. To do this, the parents and teachers of the participating children provided information about the children's behaviors and social experiences and the children were asked about their knowledge and expectations in social situations. The experiment was conducted in three sessions over the course of about one week. During each session, the participants were read a story describing a series of interactions between two child characters. All of the children were given very little information about the protagonist prior to hearing the stories, allowing them to form their own unique impressions of the character based on the stories. Brief Person Impression Interviews were given after reading the story during all three sessions to determine the change in the children's views of the protagonist. To determine the impact of their views on their recall of the protagonists' behaviors, the children's memories of the stories were assessed at the end of the third and final session.

It was hypothesized that kindergartners would form impressions of the story characters that were consistent with their prior socialization. Children whose experiences have been positive and who had engaged in pro-social behaviors were

expected to view the characters positively and his or her behaviors' positively. If their

experiences have been negative, and they have engaged in antisocial behavior, their

views of the protagonist and their memories for his or her behaviors will be negatively

biased. Such findings would suggest that social knowledge and social experiences

have important effects on children's memories.

<div align="center">Method</div>

<u>Participants</u>.

A sample of 28 kindergartners was recruited from three permitting public

elementary schools or after-school programs in Lawrence, Kansas. Two of the 28

children whose parents gave consent and began to participate in this study were

dropped from the sample because they were not present for one of the three

experimental sessions. Thus, the final sample included 26 participants.

The sample consisted of 5- and 6-year-olds (M= 71 months) with their ages

ranging from 66 to 77 months. Half the children were male (50%). The children came

from a variety of ethnic origins; 42% were Caucasian, 12% were African-American, 8%

were Native-American, 23% were mixed, and 15% of parents did not specify their child's

ethnicity. The three participating schools were located in lower-middle- and middle-

class neighborhoods. Consistent with the locations of the schools, the participants were

primarily from in lower-middle- and middle-class families, as shown by their parents'

years of education (M=13.76, range 9-18 years).

<u>Design</u>.

<u>Overview</u>. The experimental design involved the participants meeting individually

with the experimenter for a series of three sessions over a 3- to 8-day period (M=5

days). All of these sessions were videotaped. At the beginning of the first session, the

children were interviewed regarding their general social knowledge. Then during each

session the children were read one of three stories about two children, a protagonist

and another child, who were taking part in a variety of social activities together.

Children's knowledge of the main character was assessed after each story. At the end

of the third session, the children were asked to recall what took place in all three stories.

     Prior Socialization. Children's background knowledge about social situations

was measured in a Social Knowledge Interview (see Appendix A). The interview

measured the children's "Social Expectations" by asking them about what usually

happens in various situations at school. It included questions about seven types social

encounters that were similar to those described in the stories used in the present study.

To illustrate, the children were asked what they thought would happen if a child was

playing with a really neat toy and another child also wanted to play with it. The interview

also questioned children about their "Person Knowledge" by having them describe what

kinds of things bad boys or girls do and what good boys or girls do.

     To provide information regarding the children's behavioral characteristics and

social experiences, their parents and teachers were asked to complete questionnaires

about the children. Parents were asked to complete a questionnaire adapted from the

Child Behavior Checklist, a widely used assessment for evaluating children's

competencies and problem behaviors. (CBCL; Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1983). The

CBCL lists statements about children's behaviors, and parents were asked to indicate

whether the items accurately described their child within in past 6 months, on a scale of

0 (not true) to 2 (very true or often true). An example of an item from the CBCL is

"Destroys things belonging to his/her family or others". Items included on this questionnaire were taken from four sub-scales of the CBCL; Aggression, Attention Problems, Social Problems, and Withdrawn. For this study, only the Aggression and Social Problem scales were analyzed because both are closely related to the types of negative behaviors implied in the stories.

The children's teachers were asked to complete the Teacher-Child Rating Scale (T-CRS; Hightower et al., 1986) and a Behavioral Checklist (adapted from the SEQ-P by Crick & Bigbee, 1998) for each of the participating students in their class. The Teacher-Child Rating Scale presented statements about children's behaviors (e.g. Disturbs others while they are working) and asked teachers to rate on a scale of one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree) how well each sentence described the child. This scale yields a score on two sub-scales, Social Competence and Social Problems. The Behavioral Checklist asked teachers to indicate whether they had observed the child engaging in a variety of behaviors (e.g. Pushes and shoves others) by circling yes or no. The Behavioral Checklist yields scores on Aggression ,Victim, and Pro-social scales.

Stories. The stories were used in previous research by Greenhoot (2000). Each story describes seven encounters between a protagonist (Anne for female participants, or Eric for male participants) and another child (Nancy for female participants or Charlie for male participants). In each of the encounters, the behavior of the main character, Anne or Eric, could be interpreted in a variety of ways. For example, an encounter between Eric and Charlie describes how Charlie cannot find his lunchbox. Eric then appears with Charlie's lunchbox in his hand. Thus in this situation, the main character's

behavior could be interpreted and remembered as being hostile (e.g. stealing the lunch), pro-social (e.g. finding the lunch), or neutral. The stories were illustrated with two cartoon illustrations for each of the seven encounters. The characters were colored to be ambiguous with respect to ethnicity.

Person Impression Interviews. After each story was read, a Person Impression Interview (Greenhoot 2000) was administered to assess the children's views of the protagonist. It asked a series of six questions about the protagonist's personality and behavioral characteristics. For example, the children were asked "What kind of a boy/girl is Eric/Anne, and Does Eric/Anne like Charlie/Nancy?"

Memory Interview. The Memory Interview (Greenhoot 2000) consisted of open-ended questions about each of the encounters in the three stories. An example of one of these questions was, "What happened when it was time for lunch?". This interview was used to provide a measure of the children's memories for the social interactions that occurred in the stories.

Procedure. Session 1 began with the Social Knowledge Interview. The children were then read one of the three stories. The order of the stories was counterbalanced across children. After the story, the children's knowledge of the protagonist was assessed with the Person Impression Interview. Session 2 took place one to six days (M=2 days) after Session 1. During this session, the children were read a second story and then given the Person Impression Interview. Finally, Session 3 was conducted one to six days (M=3 days) after Session 2.   The children were read a third story to start this session, and then a third Person Impression Interview was administered. At the end of Session 3, the children were asked to recall stories in the Memory Interview.

Coding.

     Social Knowledge Interview. At the first session, the children's responses to the questions they were asked during the Social Knowledge Interview were coded either as positive, negative, or neutral. To illustrate, the response to a question on the Social Expectation scale, "The children share the toy," was considered positive, the statement "The other child stole the neat toy from him," was categorized as negative, and the response "The other child waits for his turn," was coded as neutral. A similar positive-negative-neutral coding scheme was used for the Person Knowledge scale. For example, the response, "Nice boys share", was considered positive and the statement, "Mean boys hit others," was coded as negative. When the children gave several responses to the same question, their answers were broken into idea units or propositions and each was counted and coded separately. For example, the answer, "The other child steals the toy and hides it where they won't find it," was coded as two idea units each of which were coded as negative. Positive and Negative Social Expectation scores were calculated as the ratio of the child's positive or negative responses to the total number of responses to Social Expectation questions. Thus a positive score of greater than 0.5 (and therefore a negative score of less than 0.5) indicated that most of the child's social expectations were positive and a negative score of greater than 0.5 was evidence that the child's Social Expectations were mostly negative. Similarly, positive and negative Person Knowledge scores were calculated as the ratio of positive or negative responses to the total number of responses to Person Knowledge questions.

Person Impression Interviews. At each of three sessions, the children's responses to questions about the protagonist (Anne or Eric) were coded as positive or negative. To illustrate, the assertion that "Anne is a mean girl," was considered negative, while the response that "Anne is very helpful and nice," was classified as positive. For each child, a Positive and a Negative Impression Score was calculated at each of the three sessions. These impression scores were computed by adding the total number of positive or negative responses and dividing by their total number of responses to create proportions of positive and negative responses. A Positive Impression Score between 0.5 and 1 indicated that the child had formed a relatively positive view of the protagonist. A Negative Impression Score that was between 0.5 and 1 was reflective of a negative view of the protagonist.

Memory Interview. Coding of the Memory Interviews was done by assessing the protagonist's role in each of the remembered events. The protagonist's role was coded as positive, neutral, or negative. To depict the children's responses, consider the Woodworking Center feature of the school story: the nails that Nancy was hammering were knocked off the table; and when she returned with a broom to clean them up, they were already picked up and on the table next to Anne. The statement, "Anne picked up the nails for Nancy," was categorized as positive, whereas, "Anne knocked the nails on the floor and Nancy had to clean them up," was considered negative. Responses like, "The bucket of nails was knocked over; and when Nancy came back, the nails were already cleaned up," were considered neutral because Anne had no role in the outcome. The proportion of memory responses that were positive, neutral, and negative were calculated to yield scores for positive, neutral, and negative recall.

The accuracy of the children's responses was also noted. The children's reports were categorized as those that had been stated in the text, or Accurate Recall, and those that were not explicitly stated in the text, or Constructive Recall. Constructive Recall could have been inferred based on what was in the text or could have been a distortion of what was stated in the text. To go back to the example of the Woodworking Center feature, the response, "Nancy's nail bucket was spilled; and when Nancy came back with a broom, the nails were already cleaned up," was considered Accurate Recall. Statements such as "Anne knocked over the nails" or "Anne picked up the nails for Nancy" fell into the Constructive Recall category.

Reliability.

A master coder and a reliability coder coded all of the interviews. The reliability coder coded approximately 40% of the interviews coded by the master coder. Inter-rater reliability was very good on all three of the interviews. On average, the two coders agreed on 98% of the children's responses on the Social Knowledge Interview, 93% of the responses on the Person Impression Interviews, and 96% of the reports on the Memory Interview.

Results

Preliminary analyses suggested that gender and story order might be related to some of the measures. Thus, all analysis controlled for these variables.

Prior Socialization Measures. Correlation analyses were conducted to determine the strength and the direction of the relationships between the various socialization measures. This analysis was done to determine whether the children's parents and teachers agreed on the nature of the experiences the children were involved in and the

behaviors that the children engaged in. It also indicated whether children's social knowledge and expectations were related to their typical experiences and behaviors reported by parents and teachers. Partial correlations between child reports from the Social Knowledge Interview (Social Expectations and Person Knowledge), parent reports on the CBCL (Aggression and Social Problems), and teacher reports on the Teacher-Child Rating Scale (Social Problems and Social Competence) and Behavioral Checklist (Aggression, Victim, and Pro-social) were conducted controlling for story order and gender. The correlation between the various measures, as well as the mean and standard deviation for each measure are displayed in Table 1. The findings indicated that the parents and teachers rated the children's social experiences and behaviors similarly. Thus, parent reports of Social Problems and Aggression were positively related to teacher reports of Social Problems and Aggression and negatively related to teacher reports of Competence and Pro-social behaviors. The correlation also shows that children's social knowledge was related to parent and teacher reports of their experience and behavior. The positive scores on the Social Knowledge Interview were positively correlated with positive scores on the Teacher-Child Rating Scale (Social Competence scale) and Behavioral Checklist (Pro-social scale), and negatively correlated to teacher and parent reports of social problems. The negative scores on the Social Knowledge Interview were positively related to Social Problems and Aggression on the CBCL and Social Problems on the Teacher-Child Rating Scale, and negatively correlated to teacher ratings of competence and pro-social behaviors.

Person Impression Interviews. By the third Person Impression Interview the children's responses indicated that 12 of the 26 children had formed distinctly positive

views (i.e. a Positive Score of greater than 0.6) of the story's protagonist while seven had formed negative views (i.e. a Negative Score of greater than 0.6). The seven remaining children formed mixed views that were neither distinctly positive nor negative (i.e. Positive and Negative scores which were both less than 0.6). To determine how the children's views of the main character (Eric or Anne) were related to the general social knowledge and behavioral measures, partial correlation analyses were conducted controlling for gender and story order. The strength and direction of the correlations between the children's socialization measures and their Person Impression Scores are presented in Table 2. Their scores on the three types of socialization measures were correlated with their views of the story protagonist at the first two interviews. The results indicated that the children's Positive Person Knowledge measured by the SKI and teacher ratings of Social Competence were related to positive views of the main character during the first two sessions of the study. The children's Negative Person Knowledge on the SKI was also positively correlated to negative views of the main character in sessions one and two and negatively correlated to negative views. Table 3 shows the correlation between responses at the three Person Impression Interviews. As can be seen, children's views were relatively stable over time.

Memories. On average, the children remembered 18 of the 21 events were depicted in the stories. Broken down into Constructive and Accurate Recall, children reported an average of 13 constructive memories, and five accurate memories. Thus, the children's response accuracy on the memory interviews indicated that they made inferences and distortions regarding the protagonist's behaviors despite any manipulation by the experimenters that was intended to do so.

Correlation analyses were conducted to determine how the children's memories for the three stories were related to their prior socialization and their views of the main character. The magnitudes of the relationships are shown in a correlation matrix in Table 4. It was found that memories of positive actions by the main character's actions were positively correlated to positive views of the main character. Positive memories were negatively correlated to Negative Person Knowledge on the Social Knowledge Interview and to negative views of the main character. Negative memories of the main character's actions were positively correlated to negative views of the main characters, and negatively correlated to positive views of the story's main character. Neutral memories of the main character's actions were only negatively correlated to the Aggression scale on the CBCL.

<div align="center">Discussion</div>

The relationships that were found between the various social experience measures indicate that parent and teacher ratings of children's typical behaviors relate to children's general social knowledge. Given that the parent and teacher reports were strongly correlated, the children probably behave similarly at home and at school. It was not surprising to find that these measuring were related to each other, but it was interesting that they were also connected to the children's responses in the Social Knowledge Interview. In this interview, the children were not asked to report on their own behaviors, but instead were expected to predict the outcome of various social situations involving children and to predict the typical behaviors of good and bad boys or girls. The relation between their responses and the responses of the their parents and teachers to questions about their behavior suggests that the children utilized their own

experiences and behaviors to make predictions about the situations that they were presented with.

These data supported the findings of Greenhoot (2000) in which children whose views were not biased by an experimenter formed their own distinct impressions of the protagonist's personalities and behaviors. The children in the current study were also not provided with biasing information about the story's protagonist, yet some still formed a distinct positive impression and others formed a negative impression of that character despite being presented with the same stories and information about the character. The children's memories for that character's behaviors were consistent with their views. Therefore, the children's views of the protagonist was strongly related to their memories for his or her behaviors. These findings are consistent with other studies in which views for a person or story character were manipulated; however, this study suggests that views the children form on their own can also have an affect on their memory. These findings indicate that something other than the information that is being presented to children has an impact on their views of the stories' protagonist (Anne or Eric).

The children's views of the protagonist and prior socialization were related to each other, but only during the first two sessions of the study. What children knew about bad boys versus good boys was the most strongly correlated to the socialization measure children's views of the protagonist, suggesting that their person knowledge had an impact on the views that they formed of the protagonist. So when they knew a lot about what good children do, children were likely to think that Eric or Anne was a good child. If they were knowledgeable about bad children, then they were more likely to think that Eric or Anne was a bad child. The Social Knowledge Interview was

constructed a lot like the stories because children were asked to report about the behaviors of children other than themselves. This could be the reason that this was the most strongly related of all the socialization measures to the impressions that they formed of the main characters in the stories.

The fact that socialization measures were not related to their impressions at the third interview suggest that something is occurring by the third session of the study that may cause some of the children's views of the protagonist to change. Such changes may be due to the amount of information they have acquired from the stories. It could be that by the time children hear a third story about the same characters they draw less from their own knowledge and experience to form impressions of the characters, and more from the information that they were presented with in the stories. At this point in the study, some of the children were reporting mixed views of Eric or Anne in which they would say that he or she is "kind of nice and kind of mean". There were also a few children who by the third session attributed the negative things that the protagonist did to clumsiness. These children claimed that the protagonist was really a kind child who did not do mean things on purpose but broke things because he or she was always bumping into or knocking over things.

The changes in some of the children's views by the third session could also be due to their having a "good day" or "bad day" that is inconsistent with their typical social experiences, or at least those they have had on the days of earlier sessions. For example, getting into an uncharacteristic fight with a classmate on the day of one of the sessions could cause a child to view the protagonist's behavior more negatively that day. This suggests a direction for future study in which one would look at children's

social experiences and knowledge or each day prior to each session. This would provide a daily measure of social experiences, which could be related to their views of the protagonist during that session of the study.

The results of the present study support the literature that has shown that there is a relationship between social knowledge and memory for social information. However, it is still unclear as to where the social knowledge that is the basis for this relationship comes from because a strong relationship between socialization, the child's view of the protagonist, and their memories for the protagonist's behaviors was not found in the present study. Socialization was primarily related to views at the first two sessions and not at the third session, whereas views at the third session were the strongest predictor of memory.

It appears that the relationship between the children's prior socialization, views of the protagonist, and memories for the protagonist's behaviors may be more indirect than was originally hypothesized. There was no direct link between the children's memories for the protagonist's behaviors and the prior socialization measures. The children's impressions of the main characters during the third session were highly correlated with their memories for the character's behaviors. Views at this session were also correlated with views at the earlier session, which were in turn predicted by the prior socialization measures. This suggests that children's memories, although not directly connected to, were influenced indirectly by their prior social behaviors and social experiences. Thus, children's memory may be indirectly connected to prior socialization through the children's views of the main character, which was related to

their Person Knowledge on the Social Knowledge Interview and ultimately the parent and teacher reports of children's social experiences and social behaviors.

These findings also open up a new area to be considered in research on children's testimony in the courtroom. Previous research by Leichtman and Ceci (1995) found that stereotypes and repeated suggestions have an effect on the impressions that children form of a person. The current research suggests that children's general social knowledge and behavioral tendencies should also be investigated. Those children who knew a lot about bad people had a very negative view of the protagonist, and their memories for the protagonist's actions were consistent with this view. If for some reason, be it suggestions from their parents and lawyers or their own social experiences, the children formed a negative view of the person that they are testifying against, they would be likely to report more negative memories for events involving this person. This suggests that their impressions of the person should also be measured along with their memories for the event involving the person.

There are several limitations of the current research. First all of the analyses were correlations and, therefore, cannot be used to determine causation. Further study should look into the cause of the relationship between the Person Knowledge measured by the Social Knowledge Interview and the children's views of the characters in the Person Impression Interview. It is possible that something other than Person Knowledge per se, such as social knowledge or awareness is what is behind this relationship. Also, to strengthen the results of this study, a larger sample of participants should be recruited. Once the sample size for this study has been increased and the

causation of the relationships that were found has been determined, then research in the present area could take several new paths.

Future directions in this type of research should consider children's interpretations of real life social situations rather than of stories. It is difficult to generalize what occurred in the stories to what actually happens in real life. The real life situations could take any number of forms, from videotapes, to a staged interaction between two confederate children, to observations in the children's classrooms. The most difficult of these three would probably be making observations in the classroom, but it would also be the most useful because it would involve the interactions that they actually see occurring every day. Thus, this research would provide important information about how the children's prior socialization led them to interpret, react to, and remember these social interactions.

APPENDIX A
CHILD SOCIAL KNOWLEDGE INTERVIEW

<u>I. Training</u>
Ask the following:

"When the teacher asks everyone in your class to sit down, do the children do that?"

If child says "yes" then say the following:

"Good. When the teacher asks the class to sit down, the children sit down. I am going to ask you about some other things that might happen at school, and I want you to tell me what happens next. Tell me what usually happens, or what happens most of the time."

<u>II. Interview</u>

(1) Play nice/Play mean:

What happens when two children play together at recess? What do they do?

Follow-up with:
"Anything else?" Or **"How does that happen?"** Or **"Tell me more about that."**

(2) Share/Not Share:

What happens when one child is playing with a really neat toy, and another child wants to play with it?

Follow-up with:
"Anything else?" Or **"How does that happen?"** Or **"Tell me more about that."**

(3) Destroy/Not Destroy:

What happens when one child has just finished working on a project and another child comes over to see it?

Follow-up with
"Anything else?" Or **"How does that happen?"** Or **"Tell me more about that."**

(4) Steal/Find:

What happens when a child can't find his/her toy? (or "how do children's belongings get lost?")

Follow-up with
"Anything else?" Or **"How does that happen?"** Or **"Tell me more about that."**

(5) Steal/Find/Destroy:

What happens when one child leaves his/her toy on a shelf or a bench?

Follow-up with
"Anything else?" Or **"How does that happen?"** Or **"Tell me more about that."**

(6) Help/Not Help:

A. What happens when one child is having trouble with his/her work and the teacher is not around?

Follow-up with
"Anything else?" Or **"How does that happen?"** Or **"Tell me more about that."**

B. What happens when two children work together on a class project?

Follow-up with
"Anything else?" Or **"How does that happen?"** Or **"Tell me more about that."**

(7) Tattle/Not Tattle:

What happens when one child does something wrong and another child see him/her?

Follow-up with
"Anything else?" Or **"How does that happen?"** Or **"Tell me more about that."**

(8) Nice kids:

   (a) **How do nice boys/girls act?**

   Follow-up with
   "Anything else?" Or **"How does that happen?"** Or **"Tell me more about that."**

   (b) **How do nice boys/girls treat other boys/girls?**

   Follow-up with
   "Anything else?" Or **"How does that happen?"** Or **"Tell me more about that."**

   (c) **What kinds of things do nice boys/girls like to do?**

   Follow-up with
   "Anything else?" Or **"How does that happen?"** Or **"Tell me more about that."**

(9) Mean kids:

   (a) **How do mean boys/girls act?**

   Follow-up with
   "Anything else?" Or **"How does that happen?"** Or **"Tell me more about that."**

   (b) **How do mean boys/girls treat other boys/girls?**

   Follow-up with
   "Anything else?" Or **"How does that happen?"** Or **"Tell me more about that."**

   (c) **What kinds of things do mean boys/girls like to do?**

   Follow-up with
   "Anything else?" Or **"How does that happen?"** Or **"Tell me more about that."**

References

Achenbach, T.M., & Edelbrock, C. (1983). <u>Manual for the Child Behavior Checklist and revised Child Behavior Profile</u>. Burlington, VT: Queen City Printers.

Chi, M.T.H. (1978). Knowledge structures in memory development. In R.S. Seigler (Ed.), Advances in child development and behavior (Vol. 20, pp. 91-142). Orlando, FL: Academic.

Crick, N. K. & Bigbee, M.A. (1998). Relational and overt forms of peer victimization; A multiinformant approach. <u>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66</u> (2), 337-347.

 Crick, N. R. & Dodge, K.A. (1994). A review of social information-processing mechanisms in children's social adjustment. <u>Psychological Bulletin, 115</u>, 74-101.

Dodge, K.A. & Frame, C.L. (1982). Social cognitive biases and deficits in aggressive boys. <u>Child Development, 53</u>, 620-635.

Greenhoot, A.F. (2000). Remembering and understanding: The effects of changes in underlying knowledge on children's recollections. <u>Child Development, 71</u> (5), 1309-1328.

Hightower, A.D., Work, W.C., Cowen, E. L., Lotyczweski, B.S., Spinell, A.P. Guare, J.C., & Rohrbeck, C.A. (1986). The teacher-child rating scale: A brief objective measure of elementary children's school problem behaviors and competencies. <u>School Psychology Review, 15</u> (3), 393-409

Leichtman, M.D., & Ceci, S.J. (1995). The effects of stereotypes and suggestions on preschoolers' reports. <u>Developmental Psychology, 31</u>, 568-578.

Ornstein, P.A., Merritt, K.A., Baker-Ward, L., Gordon, B.N., Principe, G.F., &

Furtado, E. (1998). Children's knowledge, expectation, and long-term retention. Applied

Cognitive Psychology, 12, 378-405.

Table 1

Correlations between Prior Socialization measures, as well as the mean and standard deviation for each measure.

	Child Reports				Teacher Reports					Parent Reports			
	SKI Pos Exp.	SKI Neg Exp.	SKI Pos Person Know.	SKI Neg Person Know.	BC Aggress.	BC Victim	BC Prosocial	TCR Probs	TCR Comp.	CBCL Social Probs.	CBCL Aggress.	Mean	SD
SKI Pos Expectations	1	**-0.87***	**0.55**	**-0.37**	-0.12	0.15	**0.45***	**-0.52**	**0.53**	**-0.47***	-0.32	0.55	0.24
SKI Neg Expectations		1	-0.31	0.22	0.19	-0.18	**-0.45***	**0.52**	**-0.40***	**0.62***	**0.43***	0.30	0.24
SKI Pos Person Knowledge			1	**-0.65***	-0.24	-0.02	**0.47***	**-0.53**	**0.48***	-0.19	-0.13	0.38	0.15
SKI Neg Person Knowledge				1	0.15	0.05	**-0.43***	0.26	-0.15	0.09	0.19	0.55	0.16
BC Aggressive					1	**0.38**	-0.20	**0.45***	**-0.39**	0.29	**0.69***	0.11	0.14
BC Victim						1	-0.07	-0.14	0.04	**-0.36**	0.03	0.05	0.11
BC Prosocial							1	**-0.62***	**0.49***	-0.33	-0.01	0.37	0.36
TCR Problems								1	**-0.79***	**0.50***	**0.39**	2.09	0.72
TCR Competence									1	**-0.36**	-0.18	3.46	0.78
CBCL Social Probs.										1	**0.65***	0.27	0.30
CBCL Aggress.											1	0.51	0.45

Bold = 0.05 > 0.10

* = .05

** = .01

*** = .001

Table 2

Correlations between Prior Socialization measures and Person Impression Interviews,
as well as the mean and standard deviation for each Person Impression Interview.

	Child Reports				Teacher Reports					Parent Reports			
	SKI Pos Exp.	SKI Neg Exp.	SKI Pos Person Know.	SKI Neg Person Know.	BC Aggress	BC Victim	BC Prosocial	TCR Probs	TCR Comp.	CBCL Social Probs.	CBCL Aggress.	Mean	SD
PII1 Pos	**0.36**	-0.15	**0.35**	**-0.52****	0.006	0.02	0.28	-0.22	**0.43***	-0.04	0.08	0.45	0.35
PII 1 Neg	-0.27	0.11	-0.31	**0.52****	0.11	0.13	-0.27	0.14	-0.29	0.03	0.007	0.44	0.39
PII 2 Pos	0.28	-0.11	**0.51****	**-.62*****	-0.07	0.001	0.16	-0.18	**0.40**	-0.14	-0.04	0.33	0.34
PII 2 Neg	-0.14	0.05	**-0.40**	**0.53****	0.08	0.08	-0.14	0.14	-0.30	0.09	0.03	0.57	0.37
PII 3 Pos	0.22	-0.08	-0.18	-0.27	0.32	0.30	-0.22	0.14	0.05	-0.09	0.08	0.48	0.35
PII 3 Neg	-0.19	0.14	-0.08	0.26	-0.36	-0.24	0.11	-0.10	0.009	0.08	-0.04	0.40	0.39

Bold = 0.05 > 0.10
* = .05
** = .01
*** = .001

Table 3

<u>Correlations between the Person Impression Interviews at each session.</u>

	PII1 Pos	PII1 Neg	PII2 Pos	PII2 Neg.	PII3 Pos	PII3 Neg.
PII1 Pos	1	**-0.93*****	**0.75*****	**-0.68*****	**0.69*****	**-0.71*****
PII 1 Neg		1	**-0.73*****	**0.69*****	**-0.61****	**0.69*****
PII 2 Pos			1	**-0.94*****	**0.70*****	**-0.65*****
PII 2 Neg				1	**-0.64*****	**0.69*****
PII 3 Pos					1	**-0.92*****
PII 3 Neg						1

Bold = 0.05 > 0.10
* = .05
** = .01
*** = .001

Table 4

Correlations between memories, Prior Socialization measures, and Person Impression
Interviews, as well as the mean and standard deviations for memories.

	Pos. Memories	Neg. Memories	Neut. Memories
SKI Pos Expectations	0.31	-0.28	0.11
SKI Neg Expectations	-0.22	0.10	-0.04
SKI Pos. Person Knowledge	0.12	0.04	-0.03
SKI Neg Person Knowledge	**-0.48***	0.16	-0.03
BC Aggressive	0.05	-0.24	-0.20
BC Victim	0.19	0.05	-0.17
BC Prosocial	0.02	0.19	-0.08
TCR Problems	-0.10	-0.21	0.13
TCR Competence	-0.03	-0.13	-0.09
CBCL Social Probs.	-0.19	-0.08	-0.24
CBCL Aggress.	-0.31	-0.04	**-0.43***
PII1 Pos	**0.47***	**-0.63****	0.10
PII 1 Neg	**-0.39**	**0.52****	-0.28
PII 2 Pos	**0.44***	**-0.52****	0.15
PII 2 Neg	**-0.39**	**0.46***	-0.13
PII 3 Pos	**0.54****	**-0.72****	0.18
PII 3 Neg	**-0.56****	**0.66****	-0.20
Mean	0.21	0.35	0.33
SD	0.13	0.23	0.16

Bold = 0.05 > 0.10
* = .05
** = .01
*** = .001