

八卦在未成年人中间传播所带来的影响

石春红

新疆师范大学心理学院, 新疆 乌鲁木齐

收稿日期: 2023年8月2日; 录用日期: 2023年9月18日; 发布日期: 2023年9月28日

摘要

聊天是人们的主要社交方式, 但是聊天的绝大多数内容都与他人相关, 尤其是不在场的第三方, 这种信息交换的过程被称之为八卦。八卦有好有坏, 有时人们会传递积极八卦, 但是消极八卦会占据八卦内容的百分之八十。不好的八卦可能会损害他人名誉, 是一种不道德的行为。尤其是在中小学当中, 当未成年人成为八卦目标时, 还伴随着校园欺凌的发生, 因此我们应该了解八卦对未成年人所产生的影响, 避免恶性事件的发生, 从而更好的为心理健康服务。

关键词

八卦, 未成年, 校园欺凌

The Impact of the Spread of Gossip among Minors

Chunhong Shi

School of Psychology, Xinjiang Normal University, Urumqi Xinjiang

Received: Aug. 2nd, 2023; accepted: Sep. 18th, 2023; published: Sep. 28th, 2023

Abstract

Chatting is the main way people socialize, but the vast majority of chatting relates to other people, especially third parties who are not present, and this process of exchanging information is called gossip. There is both good and bad gossip, and sometimes people pass on positive gossip, but negative gossip can make up as much as eighty percent of the gossip content. Bad gossip can damage the reputation of others and is an unethical behavior. Especially in primary and secondary schools, when minors become the target of gossip, it is also accompanied by bullying in schools, so we should understand the impact of gossip on minors, to avoid the occurrence of malicious incidents, so as to better serve mental health.

Keywords

Gossip, Minors, School Bullying

Copyright © 2023 by author(s) and Hans Publishers Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

1. 引言

八卦是个体参与社会活动的重要方式之一。邓巴等人的研究发现,人们平均每天会花费六个小时以上与他人交谈,其中80%到90%的内容都与自我表露及对他人的看法相关(周洲, 2021)。当下生活中,不仅成年人普遍使用着八卦,在未成年人中也广泛体现八卦的作用力,例如学前阶段的儿童就开始提供声誉信息以寻求合作伙伴(Shinohara et al., 2019),展现了作为社会化个体早期的八卦行为,青少年时期的八卦使用频率大幅提升,开始以关心八卦的方式管理自己的声誉(Shinohara et al., 2021a)。教育者们持续关注着青少年间的八卦行为:八卦对于社会而言是一个重要的联结方式,能够促进个体学习文化和建立关系,但八卦所带来的负面效应于成年人而言,他们具有独特的思维方式、丰富的生活经验和解决问题的能力,能够相对妥当地处理八卦所带来的波动。而尚未成年、心理和认知方面的不成熟的个体受到多种复杂因素的影响,可能无法独自克服八卦带来的消极一面,从而为心理健康埋下隐患,增加心理困扰和危机事件的发生。所以教育者们需要了解八卦所带来的负面影响,将理论与实践相结合,从而为帮助学生培养积极健康的心理品质做好准备。因此,本文从八卦的定义和特点开始介绍,结合八卦在未成年的各个阶段进行总结,分析得出八卦对未成年的积极和消极影响,从而更好的规避其负面效应,发挥其积极作用。

2. 八卦的定义和特点

八卦,通常被定义为共享关于缺席的第三方的评估信息(Feinberg et al., 2012; Foster, 2004),其特点主要体现在以第三者不在场且无法澄清的前提下进行的活动。八卦行为则是指八卦发送者与八卦接受者交换八卦信息的过程。Dores et al. (Dores et al., 2021)提出了四个属性用以确定八卦:1) 涉及三方,分别是八卦的发送者、八卦的接受者以及八卦目标(gossip target);2) 以八卦目标不在场为前提;3) 八卦内容效价可以区分为积极、消极或中立;4) 八卦的非正式性。由于八卦的特点之一在于八卦目标的缺席以及八卦的不可澄清性,八卦常与“流言”一词相混淆(谭光辉, 2020)。但实际上流言和八卦存在相当大的差异,具体表现在三个方面:一是八卦信息不存在确定的主题,而流言通常围绕一定的主题进行交流。二是八卦传播的内容带有道德判断,而流言则仅仅传播信息内容,不附带道德判断。三是八卦信息含有内在逻辑,以真实性为侧重点,流言却重内容不重逻辑,描述的内容可能比现实事件更加丰富、有趣(蔡静, 2008)。Rosnow and Foster (Rosnow & Foster, 2005)认为八卦和流言存在的差别还在于八卦的传播范围比流言的小,八卦只在有限的圈子中内部循环,而流言则不会受到范围限制。

根据不同的标准,对八卦的分类也不同的。部分学者将八卦分为积极八卦行为和消极八卦行为,其中积极八卦行为是指对八卦目标友好的或是被广泛认可的行为,消极八卦行为即负面八卦,是指对八卦目标的行为具有批判性并缺乏认可度(Watson, 2011; Kurland & Pelled, 2000; Jackson, 2012)。Backer (Backer et al., 2007)则根据 Arno (Arno, 1980)的定义将八卦分为策略学习八卦和声誉八卦,策略学习八卦能够使信息的接收者间接地学习他人的成功和错误之处,使他们避免经历同样的危机事件(Backer et al.,

2007)。相比之下,声誉八卦的主要特征是八卦传播者对八卦目标的声誉进行操控,以达到自己的潜在目的(Wyckoff et al., 2019),而这对于竞争双方可能产生不可忽视的影响。

从八卦的属性来看,八卦的优点也是八卦的缺点。一方面,社会渗透理论认为,八卦是一种亲密的社会活动,因为它能保护群体成员免受非合作者的伤害还使得个体避免自私化的趋势,使个体满足社会规范,在群体的监督下达成合作行为(Fehr & Sutter, 2019)。即使是那些无视社会规范、行为自私、为自己的利益而伤害他人的人,似乎也只是将八卦作为调整自己的形象的工具和手段,而不是利用八卦贬损他人(Hartung et al., 2019)。社会交换理论也认为八卦的过程是信息交换的过程,帮助个体掌握最前沿的信息并进行决策,从而推动社会的发展。另一方面,八卦又被认为是不道德的,声誉理论认为在八卦目标不在场的情况下,对他人的行为进行指责或评价,可能影响到他人的名誉及正常的生活,导致个体产生自卑的心理。组织自尊和资源保护理论同样认为八卦目标若得知自身负面八卦的传播,则会感到窘迫、羞愧等情绪,进而导致心理压力逐渐增大,产生严重的心理问题(孙祎, 2019)。并且八卦在规范个体的同时,个体可能担心在群体中成为八卦目标,或是担心自己与他人不同从而受到排斥等负面影响,将个体的想法和感受隐藏,失去自由表达的权利。组织者运用舆论的方式达到维护团体的行为也时常发生。在某些文化背景下还将八卦当做是一种严重的罪过(Al Lily et al., 2018)。

3. 八卦行为的测量方式

八卦的测量方法大多采用观察法、问卷法和情景法。

观察法是针对于个体或群体在日常生活中的表现进行观察的一种研究方法,能够很好的观察到实验条件下所没有的真实情况,不仅以直接观察的方式表现,有时还会进行录音、录像等方式进行敏感词的检测,但这种研究方法难以对八卦目标的身份进行检测和确定,并且会涉及到研究对象的隐私纠纷(Hartung & Renner, 2013)。

问卷法是个体根据自身真实感受进行问卷的填写和评估。常用的问卷有 the tendency to gossip Questionnaire (TGQ) (Nevo et al., 1993)、由二十四个项目组合而成的 Gossip Functions Questionnaire (GFQ) (Hartung & Renner, 2013; Foster, 2004), 由二十二个项目组合而成的 the Motives to Gossip Questionnaire (MGQ) (Beersma & Van Kleef, 2012; Hartung et al., 2019)问卷从信息、友谊、影响力和娱乐四个角度进行打分,以及由 Chandra and Robinson (Chandra & Robinson, 2010)编写的觉知负面职场八卦问卷用以调查职场中的个体对于八卦的看法。问卷法以第一人称进行填写,对于个体主观想法能够得到更真实的数据。

而情境法常常以假设情景进行展示,之后询问八卦事件中的接受者或是旁观者的感受或预期行为,这种研究与现实贴近(Caivano & Talwar, 2021; Caivano et al., 2020),但是个体可能存在认知和行为失调的情况,导致研究结果出现偏差。例如学者要求儿童和青少年对八卦行为作出评价时,他们会认为这是不道德的,但是他们同样承认自己也会参与八卦行为(Wargo et al., 2017)。

4. 八卦行为在未成年阶段中的发展

根据个体心理和生理的发展特点以及我国法律的有关规定,将不满十八周岁的自然人归为未成年人。而八卦行为则伴随着未成年人各阶段的发展。

个体八卦行为的萌芽最早出现在学前阶段,虽然个体对于八卦还没有准确的理解,但在行为上开始有了选择性和战略性(Warneken & Tomasello, 2009; Warneken, 2018)。相关研究表明,婴儿在九个月大或者更早的时候,就表现出了对除日常照顾者的第三方的信息的兴趣(Carpenter & Nagell, 1998),这可能是个体早期对于八卦兴趣倾向的外露。而两、三岁的幼儿了解社会规范后,逐渐开始报告同龄人中违反规范的行为(den Bak & Ross, 1996; Ingram & Bering, 2010)。Lieberman and Shaw (Lieberman & Shaw, 2018)对四

岁的幼儿展开相关研究时发现这时的幼儿开始将所了解的信息传达给朋友。并且会认为对不在场的第三方做出积极评价的人更加善良、诚实(Shinohara & Kobayash, 2022)。

童年时期的儿童语言系统发展初步成熟,八卦使用频率上升,此时八卦与个体声誉的关系更加密切。例如七岁的儿童会认为一手信息会比从其他人那里获取的八卦更有价值(Haux, Engelmann, Herrmann & Tomasello, 2017),并且能够根据人际关系来推断八卦的真实性。而六到十岁的儿童会将八卦视为间接攻击的行为,从而更愿意选择与传播他人积极八卦的个体建立友谊(Ingram, 2014; Shinohara et al., 2021b)。值得注意的是,学龄前儿童仅在有评价性观察者在场的情况下才会根据对观察者的看法调整他们的利他或亲社会行为(Botto & Rochat, 2018; Engelmann et al., 2012),而六到八岁的孩子则开始通过推断旁观者的心理状态来调整分配方式用以声誉管理(Shinohara et al., 2019)。通过对比我们可知儿童不仅能够从八卦中获取信息,还能够利用八卦改善自身名誉。

青春期的个体则将八卦变成了常见的社交活动(McGuigan & Cubillo, 2013)。Schoon (Schoon, 2012)发现,青少年的八卦量和成年人一样多,或许是因为此阶段的发展任务是发展亲密关系,建立群体归属感,而这正是八卦的属性之一。在青少年群体建立时,受欢迎的青少年更有可能成为八卦的发起者,但常以中立或者消极的方式讨论他人。而相对于受欢迎的青少年,不受欢迎的青少年不仅表现在较少的与同龄人讨论八卦,还体现着与他们成立团体处于劣势,更有可能因为较低的社会地位而受到惩罚,并且自尊水平低的青少年会更容易成为间接攻击的受害者(Carbone-Lopez et al., 2010)。

5. 八卦对未成年人的心理影响

从八卦在未成年阶段的发展中,我们可知童年中期和青少年时期个体特别容易受到周围人的影响,并且八卦更多是以消极的形式出现(Wargo et al., 2017)。评价性作为八卦的本质之一,对个体的声誉和心理都存在着潜在的影响,尤其在以下方面发生显著作用:

首先是对合作行为所产生的影响。相关研究证明,当个体受到八卦影响时,作为负面八卦的目标会通过自我导向的指责来修复社会关系(Martinescu, 2017)。个体合作意愿也从内部的自由选择转化成外部的环境压力,并且会降低个体将来与八卦小组成员合作的意愿(Nelissen & Mulder, 2013)。八卦对合作群体而言亦是如此,在短期能够增加约束力达到合作的目的。但从长期的角度而言,无论八卦的真实与否,都会减少个体合作倾向(Dores et al., 2019)。

其次,社会心理学家表示人类天生属于社会性动物,会关心自身和他人的声誉。并且多项研究证明在撒谎能带来物质或名誉上的回报的条件下,人们就有可能产生撒谎行为(Feldman et al., 2002; Leary, 1995; Sedikides & Alicke, 2012)。这表明,当个体在与其他人产生利益冲突时,八卦或许是一种低成本的校园霸凌的工具。而其结果可能会导致八卦目标受到歧视、社会边缘化(Bali et al., 2023)以及自卑心理,进而增加产生心理健康问题的风险(Archer & Coyne, 2005)。

最后,青春期与低年龄的个体的八卦内容出现了较大的差别,从谈论所发生的事件本身转变为对同龄人及外表的吸引力的讨论上,这样的谈论在无形中建立起了亲密关系和社会群体(Wargo et al., 2017),而八卦目标在得到更少的朋友帮助外,还进一步增加了被排斥的风险,这样的变化降低了个体的自尊水平,可能会导致八卦目标产生更强的自杀意念(Kaltiala-Heino et al., 1999)。不仅如此,在对 2342 名高中生同伴伤害和自杀倾向的自我报告中发现,不论同伴伤害事件发生频率的高低,都正向预测着个体的自杀倾向(Klomek et al., 2008)。因此,八卦在对未成年人的心理影响不仅体现在对心理健康的威胁上,还会成为个体的生命安全的潜在危险因素。

同时八卦也有着不可忽视的积极作用。例如 Martinescu 等人(Martinescu et al., 2019)认为当个体参与八卦时,会将自己与他人做无形的对比,从而放大自身的优点,更加自信地评估自己并给予自己更高的

评价。与此研究结果相似的是受欢迎的个体会发现自己处于社会规范的发展和社会化的中心地位(Brown, 2011),从而使个体感到自信,并利用八卦作为表达他们观点的手段,进而促进他们在未来更多地参与各种社交活动,也将更有可能成为积极的社会互动者。八卦还能减少学生对学业表现的负面情绪,因为他们可以更好地理解自己在与他人比较时的位置,从而使学生对自己的学习表现有一个更清晰的定位(Romano et al., 2017),减少盲目自信和过度自卑情况的发生。

通过谈论八卦,未成年人能够更清晰地认识到在社会群体中提升地位的必要条件之一是符合社会标准,并认识到不符合标准可能会受到排斥(Brown, 2011)。八卦还能够使未成年人了解关于吸引力、时尚和外表等因素的受欢迎程度,从而规范自身的行为举止(Adler & Adler, 1992; Rose et al., 2011)。除此之外,避免自私自利的行为和替代学习也属于谈论八卦的益处,因为社会群体不欢迎自私自利的人和行为,而替代性学习能够使个体了解不同的经历所产生的不同结果,从而更好的确定自己的计划和目标。

不仅如此,八卦还能增加个体的亲密感。据社会渗透理论(Altman & Taylor, 1973),个体会与他们感觉较亲近的人分享他们的个人想法和感受。而对青少年的调查中发现,当朋友闲聊时,接受者的反应往往会进一步鼓励八卦行为。因为在信息交换的过程中,会增加对彼此的信任及好感,从而为儿童和青少年的友谊关系提供一个坚实的支持系统(Gottman & Graziano, 1983)。当朋友们对八卦内容具有相同的看法时,还能够维持并促进社会关系(Eder & Enke, 1991)。

综上所述,八卦是一个复杂的社会现象,既是团结合作的催化剂,也是夹杂着言语欺凌的利刃。而作为未成年人的引导者和模范者,教育者们应该更清楚地认识到八卦的利与弊,在生活和学习中发挥八卦的积极作用,为未成年的身心健康创造一个良好的成长环境。尽量避免八卦所带来的负面影响,使学生了解八卦的潜在危害,引导其向善向好,共同建设一个和谐的校园和社会环境。

6. 小结

随处可见的八卦行为对于八卦的传播者和接收者而言影响力是微弱的,当要求个体对自己的八卦倾向进行评价时,他们会认为自己的八卦程度不如普通的同性同龄人(Hartung et al., 2013)。可对于八卦目标而言,以损害自身声誉为前提,影响社会地位的负面八卦可能会使个体的自尊水平下降以及生活和心理上带来困扰。尤其是网络发达的时代背景下,信息可在短时间内快速传播,八卦目标没有足够的反应和处理的时间,八卦接收者可能仅仅在意传播的内容而不顾真实性或澄清的部分。而对于未成年人而言,这个年龄阶段是适应群体生活的初始阶段,若出现过度的八卦事件需要学校、教师及家长进行适当的帮助和干涉。部分未成年人不够了解语言的危害性,从而以娱乐的幌子间接地伤害他人,但网络欺凌和校园霸凌的发生,也多以语言的方式出现的。因此,在日常生活和教育当中,作为未成年人的看护者,我们应该引导孩子正确使用语言,学会尊重他人,减少负面八卦的恶意传播,从而避免网络欺凌和校园霸凌时间的发生,才能更好的促进当下青少年身心健康齐发展,减少心理疾病和危机事件的发生。

参考文献

- 蔡静(2008). *流言: 阴影中的社会传播*. 中国广播电视出版社.
- 孙祎(2019). 中学生校园负面八卦行为的起因及影响研究. *科幻画报*, (9), 188.
- 谭光辉(2020). 论“八卦”的特征和社交、情感功能. *思想战线*, 46(1), 158-164.
- 周洲(2021). 喜欢聊八卦是什么心理? *大众心理学*, (6), 39-40.
- Adler, P. A., & Adler, K. P. (1992). Socialization to Gender Roles: Popularity among Elementary School Boys and Girls. *Sociology of Education*, 65, 169-187. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2112807>
- Al Lily, A. E., Elayyan, S. R., Alhazmi, A. A., & Alzahrani, S. (2018). Understanding the Public Temper through an Evaluation of Rumours: An Ethnographical Method Using Educational Technology. *Palgrave Communications*, 4, Article No. 141. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-018-0197-2>

- Altman, I., & Taylor, D. A. (1973). *Social Penetration: The Development of Interpersonal Relationships*. Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Archer, J., & Coyne, S. M. (2005). An Integrated Review of Indirect, Relational, and Social Aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9, 212-230. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr090_32
- Arno, A. (1980). Fijian Gossip as Adjudication: A Communication Model of Informal Social Control. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 36, 343-360. <https://doi.org/10.1086/jar.36.3.3629529>
- Bali, D., Pastore, M., Indrio, F., Giardino, I., Vural, M., Pettoello-Mantovani, C., & Pettoello-Mantovani, M. (2023). Bullying and Cyberbullying Increasing in Preadolescent Children. *The Journal of Pediatrics*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2023.113565>
- Beersma, B., & Van Kleef, G. A. (2012). Why people Gossip: An Empirical Analysis of Social Motives, Antecedents, and Consequences. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42, 2640-2670. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00956.x>
- Botto, V. S., & Rochat, P. (2018). Sensitivity to the Evaluation of Others Emerges by 24 Months. *Developmental Psychology*, 54, 1723-1734. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000548>
- Brown, B. B. (2011). Popularity in Peer Group Perspective: The Role of Status in Adolescent Peer Systems. In A. H. N. Cillessen, D. Schwartz, & L. Mayeux (Eds.), *Popularity in the Peer System* (pp. 165-192). The Guilford Press.
- Caivano, O., & Talwar, V. (2021). What Would You Do? Children's Hypothetical Responses to Hearing Negative and Positive Gossip Involving Friends and Classmates. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 38, 2268-2288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075211011714>
- Caivano, O., Leduc, K., & Talwar, V. (2020). When Is Gossiping Wrong? The Influence of Valence and Relationships on Children's Moral Evaluations of Gossip. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 38, 219-238. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjdp.12319>
- Carbone-Lopez, K., Esbensen, F. A., & Brick, B. T. (2010). Correlates and Consequences of Peer Victimization: Gender Differences in Direct and Indirect Forms of Bullying. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 8, 332-350. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204010362954>
- Carpenter, M., & Nagell, K. (1998). Social Cognition, Joint Attention, and Communicative Competence from 9 to 15 Months of Age. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 63, i+iii+v-vi+1-174. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1166214>
- Chandra, G., & Robinson, S. L. (2010). They're Talking about Me Again: The Impact of Being the Target of Gossip on Emotional Distress and Withdrawal. In *Academy of Management Conference* (pp. 153-174).
- De Backer, C. J., Nelissen, M., & Fisher, M. L. (2007). Let's Talk about Sex: A Study on the Recall of Gossip about Potential Mates and Sexual Rivals. *Sex Roles*, 56, 781-791. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9237-x>
- den Bak, I. M., & Ross, H. S. (1996). I'm Telling! The Content, Context, and Consequences of Children's Tattling on Their Siblings. *Social Development*, 5, 292-309. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.1996.tb00087.x>
- Dores Cruz, T. D., Beersma, B., Dijkstra, M. T. M., & Bechtoldt, M. N. (2019). The Bright and Dark Side of Gossip for Cooperation in Groups. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, Article No. 1374. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01374>
- Dores Cruz, T. D., Nieper, A. S., Testori, M., Martinescu, E., & Beersma, B. (2021). An Integrative Definition and Framework to Study Gossip. *Group & Organization Management*, 46, 252-285. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601121992887>
- Eder, D., & Enke, J. L. (1991). The Structure of Gossip: Opportunities and Constraints on Collective Expression among Adolescents. *American Sociological Review*, 56, 494-508. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2096270>
- Engelmann, J. M., Herrmann, E., & Tomasello, M. (2012). Five-Year Olds, but Not Chimpanzees, Attempt to Manage Their Reputations. *PLOS ONE*, 7, e48433. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0048433>
- Fehr, D., & Sutter, M. (2019). Gossip and the Efficiency of Interactions. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 113, 448-460. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geb.2018.10.003>
- Feinberg, M., Willer, R., Stellar, J., & Keltner, D. (2012). The Virtues Of Gossip: Reputational Information Sharing as Prosocial Behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102, 1015-1030. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026650>
- Feldman, R. S., Forrest, J. A., & Happ, B. R. (2002). Self-Presentation and Verbal Deception: Do Self-Presenters Lie More? *Basic & Applied Social Psychology*, 24, 163-170. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15324834BASP2402_8
- Foster, E. K. (2004). Research on Gossip: Taxonomy, Methods, and Future Directions. *Review of General Psychology*, 8, 78-99. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.8.2.78>
- Gottman, J. M., & Graziano, W. G. (1983). How Children Become Friends. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 48, 1-86. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1165860>
- Hartung, F. M., & Renner, B. (2013). Social Curiosity and Gossip: Related but Different Drives of Social Functioning. *PLOS ONE*, 8, e69996. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0069996>

- Hartung, F. M., Krohn, C., & Pirschtat, M. (2019). Better than Its Reputation? Gossip and the Reasons Why We and Individuals with “Dark” Personalities Talk about Others. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, Article No. 1162. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01162>
- Haux, L., Engelmann, J. M., Herrmann, E., & Tomasello, M. (2017). Do young Children Preferentially Trust Gossip or First-hand Observation in Choosing a Collaborative Partner? *Social Development, 26*, 466-474. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sode.12225>
- Ingram, G. P. D. (2014). From Hitting to Tattling to Gossip: An Evolutionary Rationale for the Development of Indirect Aggression. *Evolutionary Psychology, 12*, 343-363. <https://doi.org/10.1177/147470491401200205>
- Ingram, G. P., & Bering, J. M. (2010). Children’s Tattling: The Reporting of Everyday Norm Violations in Preschool Settings. *Child Development, 81*, 945-957. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01444.x>
- Jackson, C. (2012). Using Gossip Constructively as a Part of Holistic Process. *Holistic Nursing Practice, 26*, 183-187. <https://doi.org/10.1097/HNP.0b013e31825d67ea>
- Kaltiala-Heino, R., Rimpelä, M., Marttunen, M., Rimpelä, A., & Rantanen, P. (1999). Bullying, Depression, and Suicidal Ideation in Finnish Adolescents: School Survey. *BMJ, 319*, 348-351. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.319.7206.348>
- Klomek, A. B., Marrocco, F., Kleinman, M., Schonfeld, I. S., & Gould, M. S. (2008). Peer Victimization, Depression, and Suicidality in Adolescents. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 38*, 166-180. <https://doi.org/10.1521/suli.2008.38.2.166>
- Kurland, N. B., & Pelled, L. H. (2000). Passing the Word: Toward a Model of Gossip and Power in the Workplace. *Academy of Management Review, 25*, 428-438. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259023>
- Leary, M. R. (1995). *Self-Presentation: Impression Management and Interpersonal Behavior*. *Social Psychology Series*. Brown & Benchmark Publishers.
- Lieberman, Z., & Shaw, A. (2018). Secret to Friendship: Children Make Inferences about Friendship Based on Secret Sharing. *Developmental Psychology, 54*, 2139-2151. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000603>
- Martinescu, E. (2017). *Why We Gossip: A Functional Perspective on the Self-Relevance of Gossip for Senders, Receivers and Targets*.
- Martinescu, E., Janssen, O., & Nijstad, B. A. (2019). Self-Evaluative and Other-Directed Emotional and Behavioral Responses to Gossip about the Self. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*, Article No. 2603. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02603>
- Mcguigan, N., & Cubillo, M. (2013). Information Transmission in Young Children: When Social Information Is More Important than Nonsocial Information. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 174*, 605-619. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221325.2012.749833>
- Nelissen, R. M. A., & Mulder, L. B. (2013). What Makes a Sanction “Stick”? The Effects of Financial and Social Sanctions on Norm Compliance. *Social Influence, 8*, 70-80. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15534510.2012.729493>
- Nevo, O., Nevo, B., & Derech-Zehavi, A. (1993). The Development of the Tendency to Gossip Questionnaire: Construct and Concurrent Validation for a Sample of Israeli College Students. *Educational & Psychological Measurement, 53*, 973-981. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164493053004010>
- Romano, A., Balliet, D., & Wu, J. (2017). Unbounded Indirect Reciprocity: Is Reputation-Based Cooperation Bounded by Group Membership? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 71*, 59-67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.02.008>
- Rose, A. J., Click, G. C., Smith, R. L., Cillessen, A. H. N., Schwartz, D., & Mayeux, L. (2011). Popularity and Gender: The Two Cultures of Boys and Girls. In A. H. N. Cillessen, D. Schwartz, & L. Mayeux (Eds.), *Popularity in the Peer System* (pp. 103-122). The Guilford Press.
- Rosnow, R. L., & Foster, E. K. (2005). Rumor and Gossip Research. *Psychological Science Agenda, 19*, 1-2. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e403822005-004>
- Schoon, A. (2012). Dragging Young People down the Drain: The Mobile Phone, Gossip Mobile Website Outoilet and the Creation of a Mobile Ghetto. *Critical Arts, 26*, 690-706. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02560046.2012.744723>
- Sedikides, C., & Alicke, M. D. (2012). Self-Enhancement and Self-Protection Motives. In R. Ryan (Ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Motivation* (pp. 303-322). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195399820.013.0017>
- Shinohara, A., & Kobayashi, T. (2022). Children’s Understanding of Friendship Formation Caused by Gossip. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 217*, Article ID: 105370. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2021.105370>
- Shinohara, A., Kanakogi, Y., & Myowa, M. (2019). Strategic Reputation Management: Children Adjust Their Reward Distribution in Accordance with an Observer’s Mental State. *Cognitive Development, 50*, 195-204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2019.04.003>
- Shinohara, A., Kanakogi, Y., Okumura, Y., & Kobayashi, T. (2021a). Children Manage Their Reputation by Caring about Gossip. *Social Development, 31*, 455-465. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sode.12548>
- Shinohara, A., Kanakogi, Y., Okumura, Y., & Kobayashi, T. (2021b). How Do Children Evaluate the Gossiper of Negative

- Gossip? *Japanese Psychological Research*, 63, 111-117. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpr.12279>
- Wargo Aikins, J., Collibee, C., & Cunningham, J. (2017). Gossiping to the Top: Observed Differences in Popular Adolescents' Gossip. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 37, 642-661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431615617291>
- Warneken, F. (2018). How Children Solve the Two Challenges of Cooperation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 69, 205-229. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-122216-011813>
- Warneken, F., & Tomasello, M. (2009). The Roots of Human Altruism. *British Journal of Psychology*, 100, 455-471. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000712608X379061>
- Watson, D. C. (2011). Gossip and the Self. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 41, 1818-1833. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00772.x>
- Wyckoff, J. P., Asao, K., & Buss, D. M. (2019). Gossip as an Intrasexual Competition Strategy: Predicting Information Sharing from Potential Mate versus Competitor Mating Strategies. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 40, 96-104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2018.08.006>