

## Comparison Affective Perspective Taking in Bully, Prosocial and Rejected Students

Zahra Mohammadi<sup>1</sup>, Shole Amiri<sup>2</sup>, Gholamreza Manshaee<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>. MA in General Psychology, Isfahan science of research branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

<sup>2</sup>. Associate professor of psychology, university of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran

<sup>3</sup>. Assistant professor, department of psychology, Isfahan science of research branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

[zahramohammadi\\_psy@yahoo.com](mailto:zahramohammadi_psy@yahoo.com)

**Abstract: Purpose:** The aim of this study was to compare affective perspective taking in bully, prosocial and rejected students. The research method in this study was causal-comparative and population society includes the second and fourth grade students in Isfahan in the 2012-2013 school years. By using a multistage random sampling that includes 740 students selected from 32 classes in different areas of Isfahan city. To determine the social prestige among peer students, sociometric method was used. After using sociometric method on student population, 288 students were elected (144 boys and 144 girls) in three groups, bully, prosocial and rejected. Tools used included a demographic questionnaire form based on affective perspective taking and demographic form. The results were analyzed using descriptive statistics and analysis of variance. **Findings:** results showed significant difference between average of affective perspective taking and among groups. The prosocial group gets the highest and the rejected group gets the lowest average among all groups. There's no significant difference between prosocial and bully groups in average of affective perspective taking and also there's no significant difference among all girls and boys in affective perspective taking. Also, there's significant relationship between affective perspective taking with making perspective and number of children, but there was no significant relationship between education and father's occupation. **Conclusion:** Affective perspective taking is one of the main factors in social cognition improvement success in relationships with peers.

[Zahra Mohammadi, Shole Amiri, Gholamreza Manshaee. **Comparison Affective Perspective Taking in Bully, Prosocial and Rejected Students.** *N Y Sci J* 2014;7(8):70-77]. (ISSN: 1554-0200). <http://www.sciencepub.net/newyork>. 13

**Keywords:** Affective Perspective Taking, Bully, Prosocial and Rejected

### 1. Introduction

Qualifications or competencies students interact with others will be affected and vice versa. One of the key competencies is social competency, including the ability to successfully apply social cognitive skills, social interaction, ways of responding positively to peers, conflict between their self and others (Coie Dodge & Kuper smith, 1990). Successful social interaction requires understanding the interpretation of people and events from around the world and events would not be exactly the same. Different expectations and motivations can lead to very different interpretations of interpersonal relationships and failure to recognize these differences and conflicts in relationships can lead to a bad outcome and conflict in relationships (Pronin, Pakiou and Rose, 2002).

In the field of social cognition, several structures have been considered among which one could be mentioned is the affective perspective taking. Affective perspective taking acts as an umbrella that children's understanding (to the other person) is depending to it (Flavell, 1992). Affective perspective taking represents the ability to recognize the emotional state of another person, especially when that person's emotional state (to the other person) is

different. In other words, affective perspective taking is defined as the ability to understand the feelings of others based on their conditions (Harris et al, 1989). Previous studies have shown that affective perspective taking starts from pre-school (Wellman, Phillips and Rodriguez, 2000). Therefore, before the development of these skills, children tend to believe that their perception of the world reflected precisely what they and others perceive (Perinor, 1991). But older children understand that there are different views than their point of view (Wellman, Phillips and Rodriguez, 2000).

In addition, children who rely solely on their own desires and beliefs to predict and argument about the behavior of others and do not consider others belief, usually are unsuccessful in affective perspective taking; while children who are successful in these tasks, probably have a subtle sense of harmony and desire. In this case, children rely less on their desires and to predict behaviors, uses both the desire and the belief (Wellman, 2006). For example, children with affective perspective taking skills win in a race and are happy would be able to recognize their friend upset state. The ability to diagnose mental and emotional states of other people is an important aspect

of positive social interaction (Hughes and Dunn, 1998).

Experts believe that affective perspective taking prerequisite for understanding the social environment and involvement in social behavior. People want to understand the beliefs of others, in order to anticipate explain and make adjustments others' behavior (Jenkins and Astington, 2000). One of the environments that they create relationships with their peers is schools. These skills are important for success in relationships with peers because of social and communication skills of students is associated with academic achievement (Kloo and Pernor, 2008).

In the past decade, the assumption proposed that students who are not accepted by their peers are at risk. Many researches showed the impact of abnormal relations with the peers has vital role in their success and have concluded that poor relationships with peers are associated with subsequent development of undetected compromised behaviors. So based on these relationships, present and future problems can be evaluated (Amiri, 2004). Peers relationships involving prosocial behavior, bully and rejected behavior. Prosocial behaviors means concern about the welfare and rights of others, feeling concern and empathy with them and act in a way those they make benefit (Eisenberg & Miller, 1987). Another type of relationships is bully of this kind of persons. Bully is physical, verbal, psychological and social assaults or those who are in positions of authority and with the intent to cause anxiety or make their own benefit and pleasure (Besag, 1989). Rejected children are clearly not interested by their peers of and constantly have the feeling of being intrusive. Thus, children with this condition are rejected (Land and Milich, 1985).

Research in the area of social functioning of children and the effects on their growth indicate the importance of identifying relevant variables. In this regard, a number of scholars have shown that affective perspective taking (Wellman, Phillips and Rodriguez, 2000) is the most important parameter for predicting children's relationships with peers in the wider social interaction. But some of the top professionals in the results of the study showed that having a sense of empathy and understanding of others' feelings would make popularity (Astington, 2003) and were not associated in understanding of ethical violations in children (Dunn, 2000). Thus the need for a massive study in children will be felt with different social behavior and to determine the status of inconsistencies and ambiguities in this area.

So as mentioned above, social status of different groups was based on affective perspective taking, so the study was to compare three different approaches in affective perspective taking for sociometric issues in bully and prosocial and rejected students. Also, due to

the limitations of the studies related to these perspectives, the groups listed determined by measuring the amount of affective perspective taking because it can address areas for future basic and applied research to provide better results. Therefore, the aim of this study was to evaluate and compare the views of students in affective perspective taking for bully, prosocial and rejected in Isfahan city which designed to answer the following questions.

1- Is there any difference among bully, prosocial and rejected children based on affective perspective taking?

2- Is there any difference among performance of male and female students in affective perspective taking?

3- Is there any relationship between affective perspective taking of students with demographic variables (number of children, education of father and father's occupation)?

**Method:**

**Research Plan:** This study is descriptive and causal-comparative.

**Participants:** The population society consisted of all second and fourth grade students of elementary schools in the Isfahan city in the 2012-2013 academic years. This study was a multi-stage cluster sampling, which was conducted between 6 areas of education. This was the case at the beginning of the six districts, two districts were selected randomly. In the next step of the eight schools (four boys and four girls' schools) were selected and from each school second and fourth graders was selected who participated in a total of 32 classes. The next step was a survey of all students in classes (740 students). After the survey, the numbers of 9 students per class by the three groups (bully, prosocial and rejected) were selected and the final sample of 288 students was formed.

**Data collection tools in this study include:**

**Demographic form:** demographic form used in this study by the researcher to measure the demographic characteristics in included age, gender and grade student, father's education, father's occupation and number of children in the family.

Sociometric questionnaire of peers' relationships: The Data (Amiri, 2007) are provided based on the method Coie Dodge et al., for the prosocial, bully and rejected groups. Test of questionnaires are as follows: Write name of three of your classmates in your class to help many others, write the names of three classmates bully others and say and write the names of three of your classmates. Others have no interest in friends and play with them. Grading will be based on the higher number of votes in each case.

**Affective Perspective Taking Questionnaires:** To measure the ability of students in affective perspective taking in different groups, affective perspective taking

test was used to measure it. Under this test, including test tools available in the field of view of making an affective perspective taking Harwood and Farrar (2006) as well as interviews with experts was created.

Thus the test is executing the initial evaluation, participants should feel portrayed, and the facial expression (happy and sad) as the sample is presented to identify them. The examiners instructions on the test questionnaires to measure affective perspective taking declares and explains the student, his best friend and began to anticipate certain questions during her own feelings and affective perspective taking on different situations. The questionnaire is comprised of 24 stories or scenarios, and after each story, the child and asks him how he felt on this occasion. The stories of four hypothetical situations were detecting cases of child-like joy and sadness. First position: the child and his friend are both happy (eg, between a painting and staining your teacher tells you how well you did your job. How do you feel?...

Second situation: the child is happy, but her friend is sad (like when you play the game you all want and no one want to play with.....? No one wants to play how you feel?..... How does it feel?).

Third situation: the sorrow and love of her children to be happy (eg: if your classmate's birthday party and did not invite you and..... invite. Would you feel?... How does it feel..?).

Fourth position: following the child and his friends are sad (eg..... you wanted to go out and play together when suddenly the rain starts to rain and you can stay at home all day. Would you feel?... How does it feel?)

Automatic scoring of view is such that the child's emotional feelings for each correctly predicted would be a bonus. In addition, each child can get 48 points, 24 points for correctly predicting their emotions at four hypothetical situations and also to predict feels like he is 24 points. For validation test method was used to test face and content validity was confirmed by experts and the teachers. To estimate the reliability of the test, the Cronbach's alpha was used to test the alpha which obtained 0.78.

**The implementation of the research:** In connection with the method of data collection, community groups and surveys to determine the names of all the students in the class, students and they were asked to name three people who most bully in the classroom, helping others and the names of those who have no desire for friendship with them to determine and finally, three people who had gained the highest score in each question as a group of friendly, bully and exclusion were considered. After selection in the three groups, prosocial, rejected and bully questionnaire was administered demographic and affective perspective-taking and they were asked to ensure the preservation of private data to question the sincerity of the respondents were in the Data Mining. Finally, the data were analyzed by SPSS 19 based on one-way ANOVA and Tukey tests.

**Findings:**

Mean and standard deviation scores of affective perspective taking in three groups of participants include bully; prosocial and rejected is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Mean and standard deviation scores of affective perspective taking

mean total	The mean and standard deviation	No.	Variables			affective perspective taking
43.41	42.91±2.50	24	Second	Boys	Community-friendly	
	43.91±1.21	24	Fourth			
43.56	43.83±1.65	24	Second	Girls		
	43.29±1.92	24	Fourth			
43.08	42.54±2.18	24	Second	Boys	Bully	
	43.62±1.66	24	Fourth			
42.16	41.50±2.57	24	Second	Girls		
	42.83±2.21	24	Fourth			
31.79	30.33±2.11	24	Second	Boys	Rejected	
	33.25±1.87	24	Fourth			
32.83	31.41±4.08	24	Second	Girls		
	34.25±4.49	24	Fourth			

Before performing variance one-way ANOVA analysis assumes normal distribution of scores in the sample group in society using Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was evaluated based on the test results, the null hypothesis of normal distribution of scores for the

group of variables is confirmed. Also, to check the assumption of equal variances of groups in the community, Levin was used to test the results, the null hypothesis for equality of variances was rejected scores of several variables.

Table 2. The results were analyzed by one-way ANOVA of affective perspective taking of different groups

Sig.	The test statistic	The mean square	d.f.	The sum of squares	Source of variation
0.000	505.477	3712.358	2	7424.715	Between groups
		7.344	285	2093.115	Within groups
			287	9517.830	Total

The results (one-way ANOVA analysis) in Table 2 showed that there is significant difference among average of affective perspective taking in bully, prosocial and rejected children ( $F=505.477$ ,

$P<0.05$ ). To examine how different groups in post hoc tests were used, the results in Table 3 have been reported.

confidence interval 95%		Sig	Standard error	Mean difference	Second Group	first group	Tukey Test
Upper Limit	Lower Limit						
1.7862	-0.0570	0.071	0.39116	0.86458	Bully	Community-friendly	
12.0987	10.2555	0.000	0.39116	11.17708	Rejected		
0.0570	-1.7862	0.071	0.39116	-0.86458	prosocial	Bully	
11.2341	9.3909	0.000	0.39116	10.31250	Rejected		
-10.2555	-12.0988	0.000	0.39116	-11.17708	prosocial	Rejected	
-9.3909	-11.2341	0.000	0.39116	-10.31250	Bully		

According to Tukey's test, homogeneous subgroups (Table 4) are shown.

5% Level		No.	Groups	Tukey Test
2	1			
	32.3125	96	Rejected	
42.6250		96	Bully	
43.4896		96	prosocial	

After taking groups to determine significant differences in affective perspective taking of the Tukey test to evaluate differences between individual groups were used to emotional measured in the test view are considered. If in table shows that the results of these tests was between affective perspective taking among bully, prosocial and rejected groups are

significantly different. Mean view of the society was friendly and there was no significant difference in terms of bully and are on the same level. There is significant difference of perspective taking between bully and rejected students. Also, average of perspective taking in rejected students is less than two others.

Table 5: one-way analysis of variance with gender in relation to affective perspective taking of children

Sig level	test statistic	The mean square	df	The sum of squares	Source of variation
0.894	0.018	0.587	1	0.587	Affective Perspective Taking

According to Table 5, the F index calculated for variable affective perspective taking (0.018) is smaller than the index 0.01,  $df$  for critical F is 1 and

478. This result is obtained between affective perspectives in both sexes; there is no statistically significant difference.

Table 5, the correlation between the components of the test results by demographic characteristics

Number of children	Occupation of father	Father's education	Demographic variables correlation coefficient
861	-0.082	0.05	correlation coefficient
0.001	-0.073	0.271	Sig level

According to the table, there is no significant correlation between affective perspective taking and

education and occupation variables at the 0.01 level, but there is significant correlation between affective

perspective taking and the number of children at the 0.01 level.

### **Discussion:**

The role of affective perspective taking in social cognition is critical because successful engagement depends on understanding emotions, mental states, desires, beliefs and intentions of others. In this regard, the aim of this study was to evaluate and compare the affective perspective taking of students in bully, prosocial and rejected group. Results showed that there is significant difference among bully, prosocial and rejected children of test and the highest average was in the prosocial test group and less belongs to rejected group. Also prosocial, rejected and bully groups are significantly different. Mean affective perspective taking in prosocial and rejected groups are different.

With advantage of affective perspective taking can be aware of how others think and feel and consequently social behavior and relationships with peers that is appropriate. In line with this research, Decouy and Jeris (1994) and Marsh, Kezak and Ambedi (2007) reported that children with prosocial behavior had a better understanding of the mental state and intentions of others. Also, children with higher-level perspective and sensitivity are capable to the concerns of their peers' mental status, behavior, words and even faces, figures (Gronhelm et al, 2012). Perhaps the high scores prosocial groups argue that since this group of children are more able to regulate their affective perspective taking (Eisenberg et al, 1999). And attention to your affective perspective taking and mental state are important between peers (Weisenburg, 2011), thus, they are more successful in interpersonal relationships. This makes children's success in this area which can receive positive reinforcement and repetition to get a social reward, social development fields (Rana, 2006). Also another reason is that more community prosocial behaviors in children with affective perspective taking is higher than other groups of children, social bookmarking and important position and the availability of it (such as the to ask for help thirst's wishes Parental) Most attention must be paid (Bartal, 1982). In addition, the incentive is approved and avoid other reasons, such that children with higher levels of affective perspective taking, because parents understand the situation and mood in social situations once approved and avoidance behaviors toward approval and society tending prosocial and external controls over time becomes intrinsic motivation (Knopf et al, 2009).

In explaining the low scores of children in rejected group can expressed that there is a cyclical pattern of children's relationships among social skills, unpleasant and disturbing lack of

understanding of the circumstances leading to the rejection of others and the behavior among peers, and this led to the rejection of the child's futile efforts to achieve acceptance and social status. Therefore, continuous rejection of peers on children's self-esteem and expectations affect others and they in turn will exacerbate social problems (Esteki et al, 2011). Also, according to the model of cognitive dysfunction in these children is justifiable. Cognitive theorists believe the model attributes, beliefs and expectations about themselves and others, are very important in determining the emotions and behavior of individuals and those of recognition distorted, incorrect and maladaptive self and others, and events in their environment, in determine the feelings of others are in trouble, problem behavior, and feelings of self-creation to occur (Dunn and Smith, 2004; Cazeedi, 1998). In addition, Knafo and Eisenberg (2011) reported that low emotional skills in children-making perspective, the ability to delay the growth of friendly community behavior.

Based on the results of this study, there is no significant difference in the mean scores of prosocial and bully groups in affective perspective taking. The affective perspective taking theory of mind is believed that aggressive to certain data processing, receiving the feelings of others, to predict the behavior of others and are unable to regulate their behavior based on other behavior (Astington, 2003). But in keeping with current research Guser et al (2008) showed that people in the field of bully, social skills and the ability to have high affective perspective taking and theory of mind abilities show up and detailed. Perhaps this can be explained as the result of bully that children's ability to predict the mental state of others, behaving relationship with peers, as a do not use the socio, but also as a tool to dominate and control the other children and sacrifice them to benefit. In fact, they are subordinate and obedient, but many users find that homogeneity is a relationship based on intimacy and emotional issues have problems with it, unlike the children of friendly relations. The reason seems to be that the issue of child bully deficiency in moral incentives for making use of the knowledge-based view of mental; this leads to a lack of philanthropic and prosocial behavior in children. Thus, the mere understanding and awareness of the feelings of others do not seem to have an altruistic behavior. Children should be another tool in the development process as well as be equipped to make moral sense of perspective-taking skills results in a process of emotional relationships with their peers.

The lack of significant gender differences in the extent of making an emotional point of view, we can say that there is conflicting literature in this field. In



contradiction with the present results, Hinnant and O'Brien (2007) believe that perspective taking in boys than girls are more mature. Also Bousaki and Astington (1999) raised the boys on spatial tasks were non-functional perspectives are better than girls. But consistent with the results of this study Selmon (1980) and Jenkins and Astington (1996) reported that children's performance on theory of mind tasks, including making an emotional point of view does not correlate with gender. The results Esperling, Valzo and Hill (2000) that the ability of a gender perspective in particular emotional orientation was not a significant difference between boys and girls in terms of performance measures in practice there is no vision in one direction. In this context, recent experts in gender differences in children's cognitive and social functions reduced due to the greater social change, socialization processes, changing cultural context, and to create opportunities for both sexes, know (Eisenberg et al, 1983). It also can be said that the patterns and relationships that exist today, modeled the same in boys and girls can make the most of this current society is changing stereotypical roles. So boys and girls have the same growth stages and the ability to take the perspective of emotional measurement. In this context, Leboni and colleagues (2008) reported today to learn more parents and children to interact and discuss their role and conversations with their children about the mental states of others, is positively correlated with the change in affective perspective taking. Also, Carpendal et al (2008) concluded that the development of emotional perspective, what matters is how much and how to interact with others and experience different perspectives, not sex, and making the correct answers to the homework to understand the perspective view of making the children.

Other findings from this study can be meaningful for family members of children with affective perspective taking and non-significant variables and kind of residence mentioned. In this regard, feet and Homelz - Lonergan (2003) and McAllister and Peterson (2007) also reported that the success rate with the number of siblings in relation to other modes of understanding. Perhaps, given that maturation alone is not sufficient for making the growth outlook and the requisite experience in the field (Leboni et al, 2008), the next sibling of the child hospitalized for having the experience to fit reactions to create mood and other behaviors that result in the initiation and continuation of the child's future relationships with peers are more successful. Indeed, empirical evidence has revealed the fact that they understand the mental states of others in the change process is based on the childhood experiences

learned and child behaviors and reactions of others, particularly sibling learns how to do it (Feshfah, 1969). On the other hand, due to differences in age sister and parents to spend more time with each other than patterns of behavior are informal, behaviors such as caring behaviors, physical and verbal interactions and compassion (Homelz - Lonergan, 2003). The relationship between occupation and education of parents taking children's views, a parallel study found. The explanation of this result can be stated that such person during childhood to adulthood, often alongside their mother, so perhaps the educational and occupational status of mothers than fathers on parenting behavior is an effective one. Hoffman (2000) also reported that the effects of empathic behaviors of mothers than fathers are. The social behaviors of children are mothers first, so most of the parents affect the child's behavior.

In most studies of parenting style as a mediator for the views of children are taken into consideration (Piers and Founder, 2003) and less parental education or occupation has been paid. In a study of non-conformity with the present results, Catting and Dunn (1999) the father rates of children's understanding of mental conditions important. Perhaps the reason for this difference is the result of cultural differences, styles of parenting and parent child interactions as different situation.

Since the affective perspective-taking is essential for human social life and any functional or structural defects in the neural pathways might lead to the ability to be social function, children excluded due to failure to understand the feelings of others and bully in children due to ethical are able to empathize with others. Therefore, it is recommended to those involved in education policy and programs designed to reduce anti-social behavior therapy and life skills training program for children to develop social skills and pay. Since the school culture and social relations between children and create a harmonious relationship between them is proper planning can cause children and teenagers to encourage friendly relations and positive.

Among the limitations of the present study is the lack of control subjects, cognitive intelligence and the selection of students in Isfahan, the generalization of the findings is more limited. Also with regard to the role of verbal skills, parenting style, and maternal characteristics in predicting affective perspective-taking, recommended further study of these variables are taken into account.

**References:**

1. Astington J. (2003). Sometimes necessary, never sufficient: False belief understanding and social competence.
2. Amiri, Sh. 2004. A Developmental Study of Oppositional Disorder in Social Status Groups. *Iranian Journal of Psychology*, 1, 1, pp. 5-16.
3. Amiri, Sh. 2007. study of social skills in four different social status groups, Vol 25, 4, pp. 103-120.
4. Bar-Tal, D. (1982). Sequential development of helping behavior: A cognitive-learning approach. *Developmental Review*, 2, 101-124.
5. Besag, V. (1989). Bullies and victims in schools. A guide to understanding and management, ERIC.
6. Bosacki, S., & Astington, J. W. (1999). Theory of mind in preadolescence: Relations between social understanding and social competence. *Social Development*, 8, 237-255.
7. Coie, J. D. ;Dodge, K. A. &Kuper smidt, J. B. (1990). Peer Group Behavior and Social Stutse. In S. R. asher&J. D. Coie(eds). *Peer Rejection in childhood*. Cambridge: university press.
8. Cassidy KW. 1998. Preschoolers use of desires to solve theory of mind problems in a pretense context. *Developmental Psychology*, 317 (3), 503-511.
9. Cutting AL, Dunn J. 1999. Theory of mind, emotion understanding, language, and family background: Individual differences and interrelations. *Journal Of Child Development*, 70, 853-865.
10. Carpendale, J., Lewis, C., Susswein, N., & Lunn, J. (2008). Talking and thinking: The role of speech in social understanding, In A. Winsler, C. Fernyhough, & I. Montero (Eds.), *Private speech,executive functioning, and the development of verbal self-regulation* (pp. 1-21). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
11. Dekovi M, Gerris J(1994). Developmental Analysis of Social Cognitive and Behavioral Differences Between Popular and Rejected Children. *Journal of applied development psychology*. 15: 367-386.
12. Dunn, J. (2000). Mind reading, emotion understanding, and relationships. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 24, 142-144.
13. Downs A, Smith T. 2004. Emotional understanding, cooperation, and Social behavior in high functioning children with Autism?. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*,314 (6), 625- 635.
14. Eisenberg N, Lennon R, Roth (1983).Pro social development: a longitudinal study. *Development Psychology*. 19, 846-855.
15. Eisenberg, N., and Miller, P. (1987). The relation of empathy to prosocial and related behaviors. *Psychol. Bull.* 101: 91-119.
16. Eisenberg, N., Guthrie, I. K., Murphy, B. C., Shepard, S. A., Cumberland, A., and Carlo, G. (1999). Consistency and development of prosocial dispositions: A longitudinal study. *Child Dev.* 70: 1360-1372.
17. Feshfach, N., & Feshbach, S. (1969). The relationship between empathy and aggression in two age groups. *Developmental Psychology*, 1(7), 102-107.
18. Flavell, J. H. (1992). Perspectives on perspective taking. In H. Beilin & P. B. Pufall (Eds.), *Piaget\_s theory: Prospects and possibilities*. The Jean Piaget symposium series (pp. 107-139). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
19. Foote, R. C., & Holmes-Lonergan, H. A. (2003). Sibling conflict and theory of mind. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 21, 45-58.
20. Gilovich T., W.Griffin D., & Kahneman D. (Eds.), *Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgment* (pp. 636-665). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
21. Gasser L, Keller M, Planck M. 2008. Are the Competent the Morally Good? Perspective Taking and Moral Motivation of Children Involved in Bully. *Social Development*, v18, (4): 43-56.
22. Harris PL, Johnson CN, Hutton D, Andrews G, Cooke T. 1989. Young children's theory of mindandemotion. *Cognition & Emotion*, 3, 379-400.
23. Hughes C, Dunn J. 1998. Understanding mind and emotion: Longitudinal associations with mental-state talk between young friends. *Developmental Psychology*, 34, 1026-1037.
24. Hoffman, M. L. (2000). *Empathy and moral development: Implications for caring and justice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
25. Harwood M, Farrar j (2006). Conflicting emotions: The connection between affective perspective taking and theory of mind. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology* (2006), 24, 401-418.
26. Hinnant B, O'brien M. 2007. Cognitive and Emotional Control andPerspective Taking and Their Relations to Empathy in 5-Year-Old Children. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 168 (3), 301-322.
27. Jenkins W, & Astington W.(1996). Cognitive factors and family structure associated with

- theory of mind development in young children. *Developmental Psychology*, 32, 70-78.
28. Jenkins J, & Astington W. (2000). Cognitive factors and family structure associated with theory of mind development in young children. *Developmental Psychology*, 32, 70-78.
  29. Kloo, Daniela. Perner, Josis. (2008). training-theory of mind and executive control : a tool for improving school achievement? *Jornal compilation, international mind, brin and education*, 2(3), 122-127.
  30. Knafo, A., Zahn-Waxler, C., Davidov, M., Van Hulle, C., Robinson, J., & Rhee, S. H. (2009). Empathy in early childhood: Genetic, environmental and affective contributions. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1167, 103–114.
  31. Knafo A, Steinberg T. 2011. Children’s Low Affective Perspective-Taking Ability Is Associated With Low Self-Initiated Pro-sociality. *Jornal Emotion*, 11 (1): 194-8.
  32. Landau S, Milich R (1985).social status of aggressive and aggressive-withdraw boys: a replication across age and method. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53(1), 141.155.
  33. LaBounty, J., Wellman, H., Olson, S., Lagattuta, K., & Liu, D. (2008). Mothers’ and fathers' use of internal state talk with their young children. *Social Development*, 17, 757-775.
  34. McAlister, A., & Peterson, C. (2007). A longitudinal study of child siblings and theory of mind development. *Cognitive Development*, 22, 258-270.
  35. Marsh AM, Kozak MN, Ambady N. 2007. Accurate identification of fear facial expressions predicts pro-social behavior. *Emotion*, 7, 239–251. Gronholm P, Flynn M, Edmonds C, Gardner M (2012). Empathic and non-empathic routes to visuospatial perspective-taking. *Journal Consciousness and Cognition* 21 (2012) 494–500.
  36. Parker, G., & Asher. R. (1987). Peer relations and later personal adjustment: Are low-accepted children at risk? *Psychological Bulletin*. 102 (3),357 -389.
  37. Perner, J. (1991). Understanding the representational mind. Cambridge,MA: Bradford Books/MIT Press.
  38. Pronin, E., Puccio, C, & Ross, L. (2002). Understanding misunderstanding: Social psychological perspectives.
  39. Pears, K., & Moses, L. (2003). Demographics, parenting, and theory of mind in preschool children. *Social development*, 12, 1-20.
  40. Repacholi B. & Slaughter V. (Eds.), Individual differences in theory of mind (pp. 13–38). New York: Psychology Press.
  41. Rana, Niti. (2006). The experience of being victims of school bully a phenomenological study, Submitted to Kathmandu University, 1-29.
  42. Selman RL. 1980. The growth of interpersonal understanding. New York: Academic Press.
  43. Sperling, R.A., Walls, H., & Hill, A. (2000). Early relationships among self- regulatory constructs: Theory of mind and preschool children’s problem salving. *Journal of child study*, 30(4), 233-252.
  44. Steki-Azad N, Amiri Sh, Molavi H. A comparison of the social status of young children with disruptive behavior disorder and normal children in the school stage. *Journal of Social Psychology Research*. 2011; 1(1):1-15. [Persian]
  45. Wellman, Henry M. Phillips, Ann T. Rodriguez, Thomas. (2000). Young Childrens understanding of perception. desire, and emotion. *child development*, 71.895- 912.
  46. Wellman, H. (2006). Meta-analysis of theory of mind development: The truth about false-belief. *Child Development*, 72,655-684.

7/27/2014