Social groups and children's intergroup prejudice: Just how influential are social group norms?

Drew Nesdale

School of Psychology. Griffith University. Queensland (Australia)

Título: Los grupos sociales y el prejuicio intergrupal de los niños. ¿Cómo influyen las normas grupales?
Resumen: Teniendo como referencia la Teoría Evolutiva de la Identidad Social (SIDT, Nesdale, 2007), en este trabajo se presenta una serie de estudios en los que se examina la influencia de las normas grupales sobre el prejuicio intergrupal de los miembros del grupo. Los estudios 1 al 3, realizados en niños desde Educación Infantil hasta 9 años, mostraron que una norma interna de exclusión promueve la antipatía hacia el exogrupo mientras que una norma de inclusión promueve la simpatía por el exogrupo. Los estudios 4 y 5 indicaron que a medida que los niños se hacen mayores, muestran cada vez menos simpatía por aquellos miembros de su grupo que presentan rasgos y conductas inconsistentes con lo que los miembros del grupo espera. En los estudios 6 y 7 se examinaron varios factores que deberían eliminar o, al menos, moderar las actitudes negativas hacia el exogrupo en los niños pequeños. Se encontró que la norma de exclusión en el endogrupo no está moderada por la empatía de los niños sino por la presencia de una norma de inclusión en la escuela. Los resultados se discuten en relación con la SIDT y se ofrecen posibles estrategias para moderar los efectos de las normas grupales.
Palabras clave: Grupo social; niños; prejuicio intergrupo; normas grupales.

Abstract: Drawing upon social identity development theory (SIDT, Nesdale, 2007), a series of research studies examined the impact of social group norms on group members' intergroup prejudice. Studies 1-3 on pre-schoolers to 9-year olds showed that an ingroup norm of exclusion instigated outgroup dislike in ingroup members whereas an inclusion norm prompted outgroup liking. Studies 4 and 5 showed that as children increase in age during the middle childhood period, they display less and less liking for ingroup members who display traits and behaviours that are inconsistent with those expected from ingroup members. Studies 6 and 7 examined several factors that might be expected to extinguish or, at least, moderate young children's negative outgroup attitudes. However, whereas children's empathy was found not to moderate an ingroup exclusion norm, the latter was moderated by a school norm of inclusion. The findings are discussed in relation to SIDT, and possible strategies for moderating the effects of group norms.
Key words: Social group; children; intergroup prejudice; group norms.

Background

Although the presence of intergroup prejudice (i.e., feelings of dislike or hatred towards the members of particular social groups) is of considerable concern in any society, its appearance in school age children is especially worrying because of the harm it causes the recipients, as well as the possibility that such attitudes might be reinforced and hence might endure into adulthood. In view of the obvious importance of children's intergroup prejudice, it has generated a considerable amount of research (see Aboud, 1988; Brown, 1995; Nesdale, 2001, for reviews), as well as a number of theories designed to account for it. Some of these approaches have given prominence to the influence of particular cognitive processes (e.g., multiple categorization) on children's tendencies towards prejudice (e.g., *developmental intergroup theory*; Bigler & Liben, 2007), with some drawing particularly on Piagetian theory and concepts (e.g., *socio-cognitive theory*; Aboud, 1988). In contrast, other approaches have given more emphasis to social motivational processes, such as social group identification, that are presumed to be involved in intra-group and intergroup relations (e.g., *subjective group dynamics*, Abrams & Rutland, 2008; *social identity development theory*, Nesdale, 2004, 2007).

Of particular concern to the present discussion was the latter approach, social identity development theory (SIDT),

which posits that, among several critical factors, young children's intergroup prejudice is significantly influenced by their identification with particular social groups that have norms that endorse outgroup prejudice (Nesdale, 2007). After briefly elaborating upon SIDT's claims, the present paper outlines a series of studies designed to assess the extent to which SIDT's claims concerning the effect of social group norms is supported by research findings, including the possible identification of factors that might serve to extinguish or, at least, moderate the impact of group norms.

Social identity development theory

Social identity development theory (SIDT, Nesdale, 2004, 2007) was proposed in response to research that focused on the development of children's involvement in social groups and the effects of such involvement on their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviours (see Aboud, 1988; Durkin, 1995; Rubin, Bukowski, & Parker, 1998, for reviews). Although children's interest in interacting with other children is well under way prior to formal schooling, the period of middle childhood, according to Rubin and colleagues, is actually marked by children's involvement in stable social groups and children's social interaction during this period increasingly takes place in the context of their social groups. Such findings are consistent with the view that children have a fundamental need to be accepted and to belong (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), and that children's group memberships are an integral part of their self-concepts (Bennett & Sani, 2008).

On this basis, SIDT proposes that intergroup prejudice is the end point of a process that involves four sequential

Dirección para correspondencia [Correspondence address]: Drew Nesdale. School of Psychology. Griffith University, Gold Coast Campus. Parklands Drive. Southport. QLD. 4222 Australia.
E-mail: d.nesdale@griffith.edu.au

phases: undifferentiated (typically, up to two to three years), ethnic awareness (beyond two to three years), ethnic preference (after acquisition of ethnic awareness), and ethnic prejudice (typically, after six to seven years in those children who become prejudiced although, in social environments marked by long-standing inter-ethnic disputation, it may occur earlier (see Bar-Tal & Teichman, 2005; Teichman, 2001, 2006). The foregoing phases vary primarily in terms of the social motivations, attitudes and behaviours that characterise them, and the events which precipitate changes from one phase to the next. Of particular relevance to the present discussion are the *ethnic preference* and *ethnic prejudice* phases.

Briefly, according to SIDT, the *ethnic preference* phase is characterised by children's focus on, and concern for, their continuing membership of their *ingroup*, as well as the positive distinctiveness of the ingroup, in comparison with other groups. On this basis, SIDT predicts that children in the ethnic preference phase will always like their own group and prefer it to other groups, who will be liked less and seen as possessing less positive qualities, compared with the ingroup. Given the importance of peer group membership to children, SIDT further proposes that the peer group has the potential to exert a considerable influence on group members. For example, children are likely to be motivated to maintain, if not enhance, the status or standing of their group, to conform to whatever expectations that the group holds concerning the appropriate attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors to be displayed by group members (i.e., group norms), and to defend the standing of the group should it be threatened by individuals or outgroup members.

Of central importance, however, is SIDT's proposal that *some* (but not necessarily, all) children's attitudes towards the members of an outgroup may change from mere ethnic preference to *ethnic prejudice* (i.e., feel dislike or hatred towards an outgroup, rather than merely greater preference for the ingroup), under particular circumstances. These circumstances include whether the children highly identify with their ingroup, and/or outgroup prejudice is a norm held by the members of the child's social group, and/or there is a belief among the ingroup members that their group is threatened in some way by members of the outgroup.

Thus, according to SIDT, intergroup prejudice is not inevitable; it does not emerge in all children as a matter of course. Instead, whether or not particular children, or groups of children, display prejudice, is dependent upon their unique social situation.

Children and social groups

Consistent with SIDT's propositions, research has revealed that, certainly by school age, children seek to be members of social groups, and that they tend to like, and see themselves as similar to, ingroup compared with outgroup members (Bigler, 1995; Bigler, Jones, & Lobliner, 1997; Nesdale, Durkin, Maass, & Griffiths, 2004, 2005). Findings also reveal that children derive at least some of their self-concept and

sense of self-worth from their group memberships (Bennett & Sani, 2008; Verkuyten, 2001, 2007), and that they prefer to be members of higher rather than lower status groups (Nesdale & Flesser, 2001). There is also evidence that children reveal a strong bias towards their ingroup when they are required to make choices, indicate preferences, or allocate rewards between the ingroup and an outgroup, and that they display ingroup positivity versus outgroup negativity in their trait attributions (see Nesdale, 2001).

Further, children who are rejected by their peer group display heightened state anxiety, decreased self-esteem, enhanced risk-taking, and a tendency towards greater anti-social behaviour, from as young as 6 years of age (Nesdale & Lambert, 2007, 2008; Nesdale & Pelyhe, 2009). Moreover, although research indicates that young children spontaneously compare the standing of their group with other groups (Chafel, 1986; Yee & Brown, 1992), that they prefer to be members of higher rather than lower status groups (Nesdale & Flesser, 2001; Nesdale et al., 2004), and that children derive at least some of their self-concept and sense of self-worth from their group memberships (Bennett & Sani, 2008; Verkuyten, 2001, 2007), research has nevertheless shown that children like their ingroup more than an outgroup even when the ingroup has lower status than the outgroup (Nesdale & Flesser, 2001). In addition, their liking for their ingroup is unaffected by its ethnic make-up or the ethnic make-up of the outgroup (Nesdale et al., 2003), and their ingroup liking is unaffected by whether the ingroup is in a competition with an outgroup (Nesdale, Griffiths, Durkin, & Maass, 2007).

Overall, the preceding findings indicate that peer group membership is exceedingly important to children. Indeed, it appears that if there is the possibility of being accepted and included in a group, most children will seek to be included. The evidence also indicates that the peer group has the potential to exert a considerable influence on group members' attitudes, beliefs, and behaviours towards the ingroup and ingroup members. For example, research has shown that group members seek to include new group members who are similar to the existing members and want to support the group (Ojala & Nesdale, 2010), and are motivated to enhance and defend the status of the group from outgroup threat (Ojala & Nesdale, 2004; 2010).

While the preceding findings are entirely consistent with SIDT's predictions concerning children in the *ethnic preference* phase, there is also evidence relating to SIDT's claims concerning the factors that turn children's ingroup preference into *outgroup prejudice*. In short, consistent with SIDT, research has shown that ingroup preference hardens into outgroup prejudice (i.e., outgroup dislike or hatred) when ingroup members are highly identified with the ingroup, and when ingroup members perceive that the standing of their group is being threatened by an outgroup (Nesdale, Durkin, & Maass, & Griffiths, 2005; Nesdale, Maass, Durkin, & Griffiths, 2005). The third critical factor specified by SIDT that causes

intergroup prejudice in young children relates to the group's norms.

Social group norms and intergroup prejudice

Social group norms are the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviours considered appropriate to be displayed by the members of a particular group. According to SIDT, individuals who identify with a particular group are motivated to conform to their group's norms because they wish to continue to be accepted by, and belong to, that group and/or they wish to enhance, maintain, or defend the status of their group. Consistent with this assumption is research indicating that individuals who feel some vulnerability about their position in a desirable group typically display increased ingroup bias and outgroup negativity in order to contribute to the ingroup's status, as well as to strengthen their own acceptability to the group members (Nesdale et al., 2007, 2009), that individuals fear rejection from their group (e.g., Ojala & Nesdale, 2010), and that individuals react to rejection from their group with heightened negative affect, lowered self-esteem, and maladaptive social behaviours (Nesdale & Lambert, 2007, 2008; Nesdale & Pelyhe, 2009).

Viewed together, the preceding findings suggest that children should be motivated to conform to the expectations or norms of their group, and that this motivation should increase as the individual's identification with the group increases. Although there is evidence consistent with this proposition, much of it concerns the significant impact exerted on children's aggression and bullying by classroom norms (e.g., Boiven, Dodge, & Coie, 1995; Henry, 2001; Henry et al., 2000; Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004; Stormshak, Bierman, Bruschi, Dodge, & Coie, 1999; Wright, Giammarino, & Parad, 1986) and social group norms (Duffy & Nesdale, 2009; Nesdale, Durkin, Maass, Kiesner, & Griffiths, 2008; Nipedal, Nesdale & Killen, in press; Ojala and Nesdale, 2004). However, given the similarities between aggression, bullying, and intergroup prejudice and discrimination (e.g., all involve negative attitudes and behaviour directed towards less powerful individuals), it might be anticipated that ingroup norms of exclusion and rejection would exert a significant influence on group members' outgroup attitudes and behaviour, as predicted by SIDT. The validity of this claim will be assessed in the remainder of this paper *via* the consideration of a series of studies designed to assess the impact of social group norms on children's intergroup prejudice.

These studies are presented in three parts. After briefly outlining the group simulation employed in many of the studies, Part A describes the foundation studies that sought to assess the effect of social group norms on children's intergroup prejudice. Part B reports studies that examined the reactions of ingroup members towards members who did not conform to the group's expectations or norms. Part C then describes studies that evaluated the possible effects of variables that might extinguish, or at least moderate, the influence of ingroup norms on children's intergroup prejudice. In each case, only an abbreviated description of the study is provided, with the emphasis placed on the main findings relevant to the present discussion. Some of these studies have been published, whereas others have not.

Research Studies

Research Methods

Whereas several different methodologies were employed in the research, the most common methodology was an intergroup simulation paradigm (e.g., Nesdale, Maass et al., 2003, 2005), variants of which have also been used successfully in studies on children's peer group rejection (e.g., Nesdale & Lambert, 2007, 2008), bullying (e.g., Nesdale et al., 2008), and aggression (e.g., Nipedal et al., in press). In this paradigm, participants are tested individually and are asked to role-play participating in an intergroup drawing competition against another team. The participant is then randomly assigned membership in a group on the basis of a previously completed drawing that placed him/her in this group of equally well-credentialled drawers. The same-age and same-gender group of unknown children is then 'presented', via a set of photos. The child's own photo is then taken and fitted into the group set. To further encourage ingroup identification, the child, at the 'request' of the ingroup, chooses the team colour and name. The children are then 'introduced' to the competitor group, again *via* a set of photos, also comprised of same-age and same-gender children. To mimic the real-world situation in which the targets of intergroup prejudice typically have lower status /power than the protagonists, the outgroup members are described as being OK drawers, but not as good as the participants' group.

Although the participant's group has only a brief existence in this paradigm, participants' reactions (i.e., attitudes, beliefs, behaviour intentions) can be examined in relation to the ingroup, as well as the outgroup. Moreover, the fact that the paradigm allows for the manipulation of variables relating to the ingroup, the outgroup, and the context, enables causal inferences to be drawn, an advantage that is not afforded to correlational designs.

Most importantly, the findings revealed in these simulation group studies are remarkably similar to findings obtained in studies where children have been randomly assigned to groups in a naturalistic setting, and the effects of the group assignments have been observed over a period of days or weeks (e.g., Bigler, 1995; Bigler et al., 1997; Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, & Sherif, 1961). Finally, since the paradigm is actually a simulation, the research is also ethically responsible because it does not occasion deception, invasions of privacy, or hurtful manipulations.

Part A: Examining the effect of group norms on children's intergroup prejudice.

Study 1

This study (Nesdale & Kokkoris, 2005), used the simulation group paradigm outlined above to assess the impact of social group norms (inclusion versus exclusion) on 5 and 8-year old Anglo-Australian children's attitudes towards members of same (i.e., Anglo-Australian) versus different ethnicity (i.e., Pacific Islanders) outgroups (manipulated *via* the photos of the outgroup members). To manipulate ingroup norms, children in the *inclusion* group norm condition were told that, *from talking to your other team members, I can tell that the kids in your team really like the kids in the other teams and they are real friendly to them. If you want to stay in your team, you will have to like the kids in the other team and be friendly to them.* In contrast, in the *exclusion* norm condition, the children were told that, *from talking to your other team members, I can tell that the kids in your team really don't like the kids in the other teams and they are not friendly to them. If you want to stay in your team, then you cant like the kids in the other teams and you cant be friendly to them.*

Participants' attitudes towards the ingroup and outgroup were based on the sum of their responses to three questions concerning their liking, trust, and willingness to play with the (ingroup or outgroup) target, each measured on separate 5-point bi-polar scales (e.g., 1 (*I don't like them at all*) to 5 (*I like them a lot*)). Thus, the summed response scales one for each of the ingroup and outgroup, explicitly allowed for the measurement of like and dislike responses towards both groups.

Consistent with SIDT, the results revealed a *target group x group norm* interaction. As expected, the participants liked their ingroup more than the outgroup. Most importantly, the participants liked the outgroup when the ingroup had an inclusion norm (but not as much as the ingroup), but disliked the outgroup when the ingroup had an exclusion norm. It is also noteworthy that the ingroup norms did not impact on the participant's liking for the ingroup, and that the group norm effect was not interactively influenced by the outgroup's ethnicity.

Study 2

This study (Nesdale, Maass, Durkin, & Griffiths, 2005) used the simulation paradigm to examine the impact of social group norms (inclusion versus exclusion) on 7- and 9-year old Anglo-Australian children's attitudes towards members of same (i.e., Anglo-Australian) versus different ethnicity (i.e., Pacific Islanders) outgroups when the ingroup was, versus was not, under threat from the outgroup. Group norms were manipulated as in Study 1. To manipulate outgroup threat, children in the *threat* condition were told that, *the members of the other team really don't like your team, they think that the judges cheated when they said that your team were really good drawers, they really think they can beat you and they are out to get you, and they*

want your team to come last in the competition. Participants in the *no threat* condition were given no further information about the out-group. A single question, with an associated 5-point bi-polar scale, was used to measure how much the participants liked the members of their own team, with a separate question measuring liking for the other team.

Consistent with SIDT, the results revealed a *group norm* main effect indicating greater outgroup dislike when the ingroup had an exclusion rather than an inclusion norm. In addition, there was a *participant age x group norm x outgroup threat* interaction threat which indicated that there was a different *group norm x outgroup threat* effect at each age level. However, at both ages, outgroup attitudes were more negative when the ingroup had an exclusion versus an inclusion norm, and both age groups were most negative towards the outgroup when the ingroup had an exclusion norm *and* the outgroup was a threat to the ingroup.

Study 3

This study (Durkin, Nesdale, Dempsey, & McLean, 2010) was modelled on Study 2 and comprised a further attempt to assess the effect of group norms, as well as outgroup threat, on young children's outgroup prejudice. However, compared with Study 2, the 62 participants in Study 3 were pre-schoolers (rather than school age), they were white and Scottish (rather than Anglo-Australian), and the group norms (*inclusion* versus *exclusion*) were conveyed with more subtlety via one of two media presentations (rather than the researcher conveying the views of the ingroup members to the new member).

Participants saw one of the two media presentations, each of which was entitled, 'People from Scotland', and began with an image of the *saltire*, the Scottish flag. An instrumental version of a traditional tune ('Bonnie Scotland'), played on bagpipes, was audible in the background. Through successive slides, a range of people (adults and children) were shown engaged in a variety of leisure and social activities, including distinctively Scottish pursuits such as playing the bagpipes or visiting well-known Scottish locations, as well as non-culture specific but familiar activities such as playing musical instruments, enjoying a game of hopscotch, conversing with friends. In the *exclusion* version, the people were all white, whereas in the *inclusion* version, the people were from a variety of ethnic backgrounds, including Asian (Indian/Pakistani), Afro-Caribbean, and white.

After watching the presentation, participants were given a picture of a group of children. This was a group which had appeared, in the same photograph, in the presentation just viewed. Thus, the children in the *exclusion* condition received the picture of an all-white group, and the children in the *inclusion* condition received the picture of the multiethnic group. The experimenter explained that this was to be a bowling group, and that the participant would be joining them as a group member. To facilitate their ingroup identification, participants were asked to suggest a team name.

The participants were then told that there were other bowling teams. They were introduced to four other teams, one group at a time. These were represented in four separate group photographs (two all white, two multicultural). To manipulate outgroup threat, one of the all-white groups was presented with a *threat-absent* description, and one was presented with a *threat-present* description. The same arrangement was made for the multiethnic groups. The descriptions were: *Threat-absent*: *This group said they are glad to be playing with your team and hope you all do well. Threat-present*: *This group says they don't like your team and they think you are all rubbish at bowling. They hope your team loses.*

Ingroup and outgroup liking was measured on a bi-polar scale using smiley faces, that ranged from 1 (*I like that group lots*) to 5 (*I really don't like that group at all*). The participants liking for the ingroup was measured using the liking scale. The participants were then shown each of the out-groups, one-by-one, with order of presentation randomized. With each presentation of the relevant photograph, the experimenter reminded the participant what the group's message had been (threat-absent or threat-present).

The findings revealed a *group norm x outgroup threat x outgroup ethnicity* interaction effect. This indicated that when outgroup threat was absent, participants exposed to the *inclusion group norm* condition liked the multi-ethnic out-group more than the white out-group. However, participants exposed to the *exclusion group norm* liked the white out-group more than the multi-ethnic out-group. In contrast, when the outgroup comprised a threat to the ingroup it was disliked, regardless of the group norm or the ethnicity of the outgroup.

In sum, the results of this study were markedly similar to those obtained in Study 2, despite the fact that there were differences in the paradigm and participants. As in the previous study, in the absence of outgroup threat, group norms exerted a significant influence on outgroup liking. In addition, outgroup threat was also a significant influence on dislike for the outgroup although, in this study, outgroup threat overwhelmed the impact of both group norms and outgroup ethnicity.

In sum, consistent with SIDT, Studies 1-3 provide evidence that a group norm, in this case, of exclusion, can cause individual children from as young as 4 to 9-years of age to display prejudice towards an ethnic minority outgroup, as well as a same ethnicity outgroup. In addition, whereas ingroup norms were shown to have a significant influence on intergroup prejudice, such norms typically did not impact on the children's liking for their ingroup. Apparently, what is important is the need to show ingroup solidarity and conformity. This issue was pursued further in the next study.

Part B: Assessing the reactions of ingroup members towards group members who do not conform to the group's norms.

Given that the preceding studies have revealed young children's preparedness to be influenced in their outgroup attitudes by the norms of their ingroup, it raises the question of how ingroup members would react to particular members who behaved in ways that were contrary to the norms of the ingroup. In short, would such counter-normative behaviour by a group member be excused on the grounds that s/he is a group member, or would the group members be unhappy with the ingroup member's behaviour and hence view that individual more negatively, perhaps with a view to getting the member to leave the group?

Some research relevant to this issue has been carried out on adults. That research has identified a phenomenon, termed the "black sheep" effect, whereby adults derogate an unlikable or atypical ingroup member more than a similarly unlikable or atypical outgroup member (e.g., Marques, Robalo, & Rocha, 1992; Marques, Yzerbyt, & Leyens, 1988). Some research has also addressed this issue in relation to children.

Study 4

The aim of this study (Nesdale, 1999) was to examine whether the responses of young children to an ingroup member who displayed attitudes and behaviours inconsistent with those expected from ingroup members would be similar to those evidenced by adults. However, compared with the previous studies that have been outlined, this study used a new paradigm because of the nature of the particular issues pursued. This paradigm involves children reading (or, being read) a short story involving two characters, one being of the same, and the other different, ethnicity (or, gender) to the subject. The story is thematic (e.g., 'a day at the zoo') and each character reveals a particular set of traits and behaviours as the story unfolds. Thus, the salience of ethnicity (or, gender), as well as the focus on ingroup versus outgroup attitudes, are de-emphasised and the task is made more familiar and realistic because of the array of information presented, as well as the other issues that are addressed (e.g., what did the characters wear, what did they do, etc.), in addition to how much did the children like the story characters.

Study 4 examined the extent to which the ethnic stereotype consistency of an ingroup versus outgroup member influenced 8, 10, and 12 year old Anglo-Australian children's memories of the story, as well as their judgments of, and liking for, the two story characters. The children listened to a story about an ingroup Anglo-Australian boy and an outgroup Vietnamese boy, each of whom displayed equal numbers of the relevant ethnic stereotype-consistent and stereotype-inconsistent qualities and attributes (each ethnic stereotype had previously been determined in a separate study using a different sample of children). Each story char-

acter also displayed an additional positive and negative behaviour.

The results indicated that the children's attention was not shared equally between the ingroup and outgroup characters. Of particular significance to the children as they increased in age was the seeming ingroup (i.e., stereotype) inconsistency of the ingroup story character. Thus, the findings revealed that, as they increased in age, the children remembered more of the ingroup versus outgroup story character's stereotype-inconsistent qualities, whereas they remembered a similar number of each character's stereotype-consistent qualities. In addition, as they increased in age, the children increasingly disliked the ingroup story character, whereas they increasingly liked the outgroup story character. Finally, the ingroup and outgroup story characters' negative behaviours were attributed to internal and external causes, respectively, whereas their positive behaviours were attributed to external and internal causes, respectively.

In short, as they increased in age, the children's responses were apparently increasingly motivated by their concerns regarding the ingroup character's worthiness to be a member of their ingroup.

Study 5

This study (Nesdale & Brown, 2004) was designed to extend our understanding of children's reactions to ingroup members who do not conform to ingroup expectations. Whereas Study 4 focused on the violation of expectations relating to ingroup versus outgroup ethnic stereotypes, Study 5 explored the violation of group expectations concerning the sorts of qualities to be displayed by ingroup members. In short, it was assumed that ingroup members would be expected to have positive qualities, and hence to be similar to the other ingroup members, whereas outgroup members would be expected to have less positive, even negative, qualities, and hence to be similar to the other outgroup members.

The study involved samples of 6, 9, and 12 year old children and, overall, proceeded in much the same way as did Study 4, with the participants responding to a story involving an Australian character and a Chinese character. However, there were two major changes. First, rather than responding to stereotypic and counter-stereotypic qualities, the participants responded to a set of positive and negative traits associated with each character, the traits having been selected on the basis of the results of an earlier study. The criteria for selecting the final two sets of positive and negative traits were that each trait selected must be matched in positivity or negativity with another trait, and that all traits were rated as moderate rather than extreme on the bipolar scale. Second, the study also manipulated the relationship between the two story characters (good versus bad friends). After hearing the story, participants were assessed on their memory for each characters' traits, as well as perceived similarity to, and liking for the two story characters.

Consistent with Study 4, the results revealed that, as they increased in age, the children remembered more of the ingroup character's negative versus positive traits, saw themselves as increasingly dissimilar to him, and they liked him less. In contrast, they remembered more of the outgroup character's positive versus negative traits, and saw themselves as increasingly similar to him, and liked him more. The story characters' relationship did not systematically impact on the children's responses.

In sum, whereas Studies 1-3 revealed the extent to which young children are prepared to conform to the norms of their ingroup, Studies 4 and 5 showed that ingroup members expect group-conforming and -enhancing behaviours from group members. Not to do so is to risk dislike and derogation by the members, as well as the possibility of the ultimate sanction, social exclusion. Importantly, these findings confirmed that even children in middle childhood display the same "black sheep" effect as has been revealed by adults (e.g. Marques, Robalo, & Rocha, 1992; Marques, Yzerbyt & Leyens, 1988). Subsequent research which has focused on children's group norms relating to nations has also confirmed these findings (Abrams, Rutland, Cameron, & Marques, 2003; Abrams, Rutland, & Cameron, 2004; Abrams, Rutland, Cameron, & Ferrell, 2007).

Part C: Assessing the effectiveness of different variables in moderating the influence of ingroup norms on children's intergroup prejudice.

Given that Studies 1-5 have made clear the considerable impact exerted by social group norms on group members' intergroup prejudice, as well as their attitudes towards group members who do not conform to group norms, the question to be asked is whether, and how, the impact of such group norms can be extinguished or, at least, moderated. Although several approaches to modifying children's negative intergroup attitudes and behaviours have been assessed, including facilitating positive inter-ethnic contact (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998), enhancing the utilization of particular cognitive processes (e.g., multiple classification) that counteract category- or group-based responding (Aboud, 1988; Bigler & Liben, 1993, 2007), and encouraging the re-categorization of group membership so as to include both ingroup and outgroup members (Gaertner et al., 2008), few attempts have actually been made to moderate negative intergroup attitudes when they are underpinned by a norm endorsed by a child's social group.

There appear to be several factors that might possibly exert such an effect. One possibility is that the effect of a norm that endorses or supports intergroup prejudice might be counteracted by an individual difference variable that is contrary to the thrust of the group norm. A second possibility is that the effect of such a norm might be counteracted by a community norm that endorses a contrary attitude. The research studies described in this section sought to assess each of these possibilities.

Studies 6a and 6b

Several writers have suggested that enhancing children's emotional empathy is one technique that could be used to increase children's liking for outgroup members, especially members of ethnic minority groups (e.g., Aboud & Levy, 2000; Feshbach & Feshbach, 1998). In a similar vein, it is plausible that emotional empathy, defined as the ability to experience the same feelings as those of another person in response to a particular situation (Nesdale, Griffiths, Durkin, & Maass, 2005), might play an important role in moderating the effect of group norms on children's attitudes towards outgroup members.

Consistent with this suggestion, research has shown that children display empathy from an early age, even as early as the preschool years (Eisenberg, Fabes, Miller, Shell, Shea, & May-Plumlee, 1990; Radke-Yarrow, Zahn-Waxler & Chapman, 1983), and that increasing empathy is associated with increased pro-social or helping behavior (Eisenberg et al., 1990; Krevans & Gibbs, 1996; Litvack-Miller, McDougall, & Romney, 1997; Roberts & Strayer, 1996; Strayer & Roberts, 2004; Warden & Mackinnon, 2003). On this basis, it is plausible that the more empathic children from the dominant ethnic group would display more positive attitudes towards members of ethnic minority groups, than would less empathic children. Although there are several possible explanations for this prediction, perhaps the most plausible is that empathy might lead to a decrease in outgroup prejudice because empathic children who are members of the dominant ethnic group might well feel compassion or sympathy for members of ethnic minority groups who are less well-off than they are themselves.

Study 6a (Nesdale et al., 2005, Study 1) addressed this question, using the standard minimal group paradigm. After assessing their emotional empathy using a modified version of Bryant's (1982) Index of Empathy for Children and Adolescents, 5 to 12 year old Anglo-Australian children were assigned to a same ethnicity team for an intergroup drawing competition against another team that was subsequently revealed to be of the same (Anglo-Australian) or different (Pacific Islander) ethnicity. The children subsequently rated how much they liked the members of the (same or different ethnicity) outgroup.

As anticipated, the findings revealed an *empathy x outgroup ethnicity interaction* which indicated that whereas the children's greater liking for the same ethnicity outgroup was unaffected by their level of empathy, their liking for the different ethnicity outgroup increased as their level of empathy increased.

Given that Study 6a revealed a positive effect for emotional empathy, at least in terms of the children's attitudes towards members of an ethnic minority group, Study 6b (Nesdale et al., 2005, Study 2) explored the extent to which children's empathy-inspired positive feelings towards ethnically different outgroups might blunt, inhibit, or moderate a dominant group child's tendency to conform to his/her ingroup's norm of exclusion and rejection directed towards outgroup members, especially those belonging to an ethnic minority group.

Accordingly, Study 6b included a sample of 5 – 12 year old Anglo-Australian children who were tested using the same basic paradigm as the preceding study, with two main changes. First, in this study, the outgroup was always comprised of different ethnicity (i.e., Pacific Islander) children. Second, after completing the same emotional empathy scale, the children were assigned to a group that either had a norm of inclusion or exclusion. Again, the children subsequently rated how much they liked the members of the different ethnicity outgroup.

The results of Study 6b revealed a significant *empathy x group norm* interaction effect on ethnic minority group liking. Confirming the findings of Study 6a, this finding indicated that, when the ingroup had an inclusion norm, the participants expressed greater liking for the ethnic minority group, as their empathy increased. In contrast, however, when the ingroup had an exclusion norm, the children liked the ethnically different group less, and their liking for that group was unaffected by their level of empathy. That is, the effect of the child's empathy was simply negated by the contrary social group norm.

In sum, the findings of Studies 6a and 6b indicated that an individual difference variable can influence the outgroup attitudes of group members - the results of both studies indicated that children's liking for ethnically different groups increased as their own empathy increased. At the same time, however, and reinforcing the influence exerted by the ingroup on group members, the results of the second study indicated that a group norm of exclusion can negate the effect of a contrary individual difference variable on intergroup attitudes, such as emotional empathy.

Study 7

As speculated above, another possibility is that a social group norm might be able to be moderated, if not extinguished, by a contrary community norm. For example, a social group norm that endorses the exclusion and rejection of outgroup members might be able to be moderated by a school norm that is firmly and unequivocally contrary to the social group norm. Indeed, for many years, it has been commonplace for school authorities to specify various expectations or norms concerning the appropriate attitudes, beliefs and behaviours to be displayed by children towards each other (e.g., inclusiveness, friendliness), as well as those not to be displayed (e.g., prejudice, discrimination, bullying).

Accordingly, the aim of Study 7 (Nesdale & Dalton, 2010) was to contrast a social group norm with a school norm in order to assess whether the former would, at the least, be moderated by the latter. In addition, however, we recognised that the school norm might not be as influential as necessary given that, on the one hand, children receive lots of enjoinders from teachers to do more of this and less of that and, on the other hand, that social group norms are

apparently powerful sources of influence. Accordingly, we sought to increase the salience of the school norm by manipulating the extent to which the children believed that they were under the surveillance of relevant authorities (Rutland, Cameron, Milne, & McGeorge, 2005).

In sum, Study 7 examined the impact of social group norms of inclusion versus exclusion on the group members' intergroup attitudes when there was a school norm that endorsed inclusion, and the group members' responses were, versus were not, under the surveillance of their class teachers. The participants were 7- and 9-year-old Anglo-Australian children who participated in the same simulation group paradigm, with the exception of four main changes.

First, after greeting each child, and outlining the pretend intergroup drawing competition, the researcher made the *school norm* salient to all the participants. Thus, the researcher indicated that, *your principal and teacher have said to me that this school likes all the children to like kids in other groups and to be friendly towards them.* The participants were then assigned to their group.

Second, rather than manipulating the *social group norms* via information conveyed by the researcher, a new form of communication was implemented so that the researcher was not in the position of having to verbally present the norms of both the school and the social group, in sequence. Accordingly, in this study, each participant was told that his/her group had recorded a "secret message" for only the participant to hear. To emphasize this point, before and after the message, the researcher told the participant that, *this is for your ears only, I am not allowed to know what the message is, so you must keep your team's secret message to yourself.* The participant was then asked to put on head phones in order to listen to the secret message.

In each social group norm condition, the participant first heard several same age and gender voices welcome him/her to the team (e.g., *Hullo, we're really happy you are going to be in our team)*. The participant then heard one "team member" speak on behalf of the team. Thus, in the *inclusion group norm* condition, the participant heard a "team member" explain that *the kids in our team really like the kids in the other teams and we are real friendly to them. If you want to stay in our team, you will have to like the kids in the other teams and be friendly to them.* In contrast, in the *exclusion* norm condition, the children were told that, *the kids in our team really don't like the kids in the other teams and we are not friendly to them. If you want to stay in our team, then you cant like the kids in the other teams and you cant be friendly to them.*

Third, the ethnicity of the outgroup was held constant, with the outgroup always being comprised of Anglo-Australian children. Fourth, after introducing the participants to the same ethnicity outgroup (*via* a set of photos), and producing each participant's response booklet, the researcher carried out the surveillance manipulation. The participants in the *surveillance* condition were told that, *their teacher wanted to see their answers to the questions and that their completed booklets are to be placed in this box (*points to box labelled with the teacher's name sitting on the table in front of the child*).* The children

in the *no surveillance* condition were given no such information. The participants' then provided their ingroup and outgroup attitudes *via* their responses on the *liking, trust,* and *play with* measures.

Analysis of the participants' summed responses on these measures revealed a main effect for *group norms,* which was qualified by a significant *group norm x target group x participant age* interaction effect. Consistent with SIDT, and with earlier findings, these findings revealed that the participants' outgroup attitudes were again significantly more negative when the ingroup had a norm of exclusion versus inclusion.

However, whereas it might be concluded on this basis that the contrary school norm exerted scant effect on the participants' intergroup attitudes, such was not the case. Rather, there were two pieces of evidence that indicate that the participants did respond to the school norm, although certainly not to the extent of extinguishing the impact of the social group norm.

The first piece of evidence concerns the fact that, in contrast to Study 1 above, the participants' intergroup attitudes were differentially influenced by the age of the participants. Thus, consistent with other studies (e.g., Study 1), and with SIDT, the younger participants expressed dislike towards the outgroup when the ingroup had a norm of exclusion whereas they revealed liking for the outgroup when the ingroup had an inclusion norm (although less liking than they had for the ingroup). In contrast, (and contrary to Study 1 above) the older participants displayed liking for the outgroup when the ingroup had an exclusion norm, as well as when the ingroup had an inclusion norm (although, in both cases, less liking than that expressed towards the ingroup).

Thus, compared with the younger children, the effect of the ingroup exclusion norm on the older participants' outgroup attitudes was significantly moderated, apparently by the school group norm emphasising positive attitudes towards outgroup children. The fact that the school norm had a larger effect on the older versus younger children is consistent with other research indicating that older children have an increasing awareness of the importance of listening and responding positively to the injunctions of adults in authority, especially concerning attitudes and behaviours that are considered to be unacceptable and inappropriate (e.g., Brown & Bigler, 2004; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Rutland, 1999; Rutland et al., 2005). In addition, the finding coincides with research indicating that, as the middle childhood period unfolds, children have an increasing tendency towards engaging in self-presentational behavior that puts them in the best possible light, especially when they are being observed by adults (e.g., Aloise-Young, 1993; Banerjee, 2002; Banerjee & Yuill, 1999; Bennett & Yeeles, 1990; Rutland et al., 2005).

The second piece of evidence concerns the participants' attitudes towards the ingroup. It will be recalled that, in other research on this issue in which ingroup norms have been manipulated, but in the absence of a contrary community norm or any type of surveillance, the participants' attitudes towards the ingroup were unaffected by the ingroup's norms

(e.g., Study 1; Study 2). In contrast, in the present study, both the younger and older participants revealed significantly less positive attitudes towards the *ingroup* when it had a norm of exclusion versus inclusion. Indeed, the older participants actually revealed less liking for the ingroup than the outgroup when the ingroup had an exclusion norm, although the difference was not significant. Again, these findings indicate that the children heard the message concerning the school's expectations and that they responded positively to it.

In sum, the children's intergroup attitudes revealed, once again, the positive influence of their ingroup's norms on their intergroup attitudes. In addition, however, there was also evidence that their intergroup, as well as ingroup, attitudes were moderated by the explicit statement of the school norm.

That said, a question to be asked is why the effect of the exclusion group norm was not moderated even more substantially by the school norm? Perhaps the most plausible explanation of the relatively modest school norm effect is that, given the particular situation (i.e., questions being asked concerning a child's outgroup attitudes in the context of an explicit school norm endorsing outgroup inclusion and a social group norm endorsing inclusion or exclusion), it is likely that the children would have tried to respond positively to *both* sources of influence so as not to run afoul of either source. According to this approach, children might be expected to give greater, equal, or less weight to the norms of the group versus the school, depending upon the particular situation and those present. Thus, compared with the present situation, it might be expected that young children would be less responsive to school norms versus group norms when mixing with the members of their ingroup in the playground.

A second question concerns the fact that there was not a significant effect due to the surveillance manipulation. One possibility is that the surveillance variable was simply not manipulated effectively, hence the school norm was not made more salient. Against this, it would have been difficult for the children not to be cognizant of the manipulation, especially since it was carefully explained and there was a box bearing the teacher's name sitting in front of them throughout their participation. If this was the case, it suggests that the influence of the surveillance manipulation may have been eroded because of the child's need to respond simultaneously to the social group norm.

Discussion

In their review of research on children's peer relationships, Rubin et al (1998) concluded that little research attention had been devoted to group phenomena despite the importance of social groups to children. A growing number of researchers have since sought to redress this oversight. As part of this effort, the present paper has outlined a series of studies on the extent to which children's groups impact on their members' attitudes towards their ingroup and other outgroups *via* their group's social norms. Importantly, the program of re-

search has been guided by a new theory, social identity development theory (Nesdale, 2004, 2007), and a simulation research paradigm has been utilized in order to test the theory's predictions.

Social group norms and their effects

As we have seen, the research studies revealed a particularly consistent and coherent set of findings concerning the impact of social group norms. Thus, confirming social identity development theory (SIDT, Nesdale, 2004, 2007*)*, Studies 1-3 indicated that young children are responsive to social group norms to the extent that they like outgroups when the ingroup has a norm of inclusion and they dislike outgroups when the ingroup has a norm of exclusion. Importantly, this effect was displayed even by pre-school children, by both boys and girls, and in studies using different paradigms. In addition, Studies 4 - 5 indicated that as children increase in age during the middle childhood period, they display less and less liking for ingroup members who display traits and behaviours that are inconsistent with those expected from a group member. Clearly, this set of studies unambiguously emphasise the importance of peer group membership to young children and the considerable effect that such membership can have upon them.

Studies 6 - 7 extended this focus by examining several factors that might be expected to extinguish or, at least, moderate, young children's negative outgroup attitudes. However, the findings from these studies indicated that this is a particularly challenging task. Thus, whereas Study 6a revealed that children's emotional empathy predicted greater liking for members of ethnic minority groups, Study 6b indicated that empathy failed to influence children's minority group liking when their empathy was contrary to the ingroup's norms. Clearly, these findings suggest that even young children are aware that group membership carries with it an expectation that group norms are to be adhered to, and they adhere to them, presumably because of their concerns about the possibility of peer group rejection, should they fail to do so.

That said, Study 7 revealed more promising findings concerning the impact of contrary school norms in moderating the impact of group norms. That study indicated that a school norm endorsing inclusion moderated a group norm endorsing exclusion, both in terms of the ingroup members' attitudes towards outgroups, as well as their attitudes towards the ingroup. This study suggests at least one promising avenue to pursue in challenging the influence of social groups and their group norms.

Social identity development theory (Nesdale, 2004, 2007)

The present research was guided by predictions drawn from *social identity development theory (*Nesdale, 2004, 2007), an approach that recognises the singular focus that children place on their

group and that emphasises the critical significance of social identity processes in the development of children's intra- and intergroup attitudes and behaviour. Thus, SIDT represents a long overdue shift away from the prevailing emphasis in much social developmental research on the predominance of cognitive processes (e.g., Aboud, 1988; Bigler & Liben, 2007).

As the present paper has revealed, there is accumulating support for SIDT's propositions thus far. The theory provides a good account of the findings that have been revealed in the early research on ethnic choice and trait attributions (see Aboud, 1988; Nesdale, 2001), as well as the field research carried out by researchers such as Sherif et al. (1961) and Bigler et al (1997). In

addition, the theory has been strengthened by recent research, including that presented above concerning the impact of ingroup norms on children's intergroup prejudice. Indeed, the results of the latter studies have provided consistent support for the main tenets of SIDT.

At the same time, it is recognised that more research will need to be carried out before a complete understanding of children's intra- and intergroup behaviour is achieved, and before SIDT can be accepted as a comprehensive account of this behaviour. Given the importance of the issue, this research is sorely needed.

References

Aboud, F. E. (1988). *Prejudice and Children.* Cambridge MA: Basil Blackwell.

Aboud, F.E., & Levy, S.R. (2000). Interventions to reduce prejudice and discrimination in children and adolescents. In S. Oskamp (Ed.). *Reducing prejudice and discrimination. "The Claremont Symposium on Applied Social Psychology"* (pp. 269-293). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Abrams, D., & Rutland, A. (2008). The development of subjective group dynamics. In S. Levy, & M. Killen (Eds.). *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood* (pp.32-46). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Abrams, D., Rutland, A., & Cameron, L. (2003). The development of subjective group dynamics: Children's judgments of normative and deviant ingroup and outgroup individuals. *Child Development, 74,* 1840-1856.

Abrams, D., Rutland, A., Cameron L., & Ferrell, J.M. (2007). Older but wilier: In-group accountability and the development of subjective group dynamics. *Developmental Psychology, 43,* 134-148.

Abrams, D., Rutland, A., Cameron L., & Marques, J.M. (2003). The development of subjective group dynamics: When ingroup bias gets specific. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 21,* 155-176.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Cambridge, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Aloise-Young, P.A. (1993). The development of self-presentation: Self-Promotion in 6- to 10-year-old children. *Social Cognition, 11,* 201-222.

Banerjee, R. (2002). Audience effects on self-presentation in childhood. *Social Development, 11,* 487-507.

Banerjee, R.; & Yuill, N. (1999). Children's explanations for self-presentational behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 29(1),* 105-111.

Bar-Tal, D., & Teichman, Y. (2005). *Stereotypes and prejudice in conflict: Representation s of Arabs in Israeli Jewish society.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachment as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117,* 497-529.

Bennett, M. & Sani, F. (2008). Children's subjective identification with social groups: A group reference effect approach. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 26,* 381-387.

Bennett, M. & Yeeles, C. (1990). Children's understanding of self-presentational strategies of ingratiation and self-promotion. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 20,* 455-461.

Bigler, R. S. (1995). The role of classification skill in moderating environmental influences on children's gender stereotyping: A study of the functional use of gender in the classroom. *Child Development, 66,* 1072-1087.

Bigler, R. S., Jones, L. C., & Lobliner, D. B. (1997). Categorization and the formation of intergroup attitudes in children. *Child Development, 68,* 530-543.

Bigler, R.S., & Liben, L. S. (1993). A cognitive-developmental approach to racial stereotyping and reconstructive memory in Euro-American children. *Child Development, 64,* 1507-1518.

Bigler, R.S., & Liben, L. S. (2007). Developmental intergroup theory: Explaining and reducing children's social stereotyping and prejudice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 16,* 162-166.

Boiven, M., Dodge, K.A., & Coie, J.D. (1995). Individual-group behavioral similarity and peer status in experimental play groups of boys: The social misfit revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69,* 269-279.

Brown, C. S., & Bigler, R. S. (2004). Children's perceptions of gender discrimination. *Developmental Psychology, 40,* 714 – 726.

Brown, R. (1995). *Prejudice.* Oxford, UK: Blackwells.

Bryant, B.K. (1982). An index of empathy for children and adolescents. *Child Development, 53,* 413-425.

Chafel, J.A. (1986). A naturalistic investigation of the use of social comparisons by young children. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 19(3),* 51-61.

Durkin, K. (1995). *Developmental social psychology.* Oxford, UK: Blackwells.

Durkin, K., Nesdale, D., Dempsey, G., & McLean, A.(2010). *Young children's responses to media representations of intergroup threat and ethnicity.* University of Strathclude, UK.

Duffy, A., & Nesdale, D. (2009). Peer groups, social identity, and children's bullying behaviour. *Social Development. 18,* 121-139.

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R.A., Miller, P.A., Shell, R., Shea, C., & May-Plumlee, T. (1990). Preschoolers' vicarious emotional responding and their situational and dispositional prosocial behavior. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 36(4),* 507-529.

Feshbach, N.D., & Feshbach, S. (1998). Aggression in schools: Towards reducing ethnic conflict and enhancing ethnic understanding. In P.K. Trickett, & C.J. Schellenbach (Eds.). *Violence against children in the family and the community.* Washington DC: American Psychological Association (pp. 269-286).

Gaertner, S.L., Dovidio, J.F., Guerra, R., Rebelo, M., Monteiro, M.B., Riek, B.M., & Houlette, M.A. (2008). The common in-group identity model. In S.R. Levy and M. Killen, *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood and through adulthood* (pp.204-219). Oxford, UK: Oxford University press.

Greenwald, A.D., & Banaji, M.R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review, 102,* 4-27.

Henry, D. (2001). Classroom context and the development of aggression: The role of normative processes. In F. Columbus (Ed.), *Advances in psychology research,* Vol. 6 (pp.193-227). Hauppage, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Henry, D., Guerra, N., Huesmann, R., Tolan, P., VanAcker, R., & Eron, L. (2000). Normative influences on aggression in urban elementary school classrooms. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 28(1),* 59-81.

Killen, M., & Stangor, C. (2001). Children's social reasoning about inclusion and exclusion in gender and race peer group contexts. *Child Development, 72,* 174-186.

Krevans, J., & Gibbs, J.C. (1996). Parents' use of inductive discipline: relations to children's empathy and prosocial behavior. *Child Development, 67(6),* 3263-3277.

Litvack-Miller, W., McDougall, D., & Romney, D.M. (1997). The structure of empathy during middle childhood and its relationship to prosocial

behavior. *Genetic, Social, & General Psychology Monographs, 123(3),* 303-324.

Marques, J. M., Robalo, E. M., & Rocha, S. A. (1992). Ingroup bias and the 'black sheep' effect: Assessing the impact of social identification and perceived variability on group judgements. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 22,* 331-352.

Marques, J.M., Yzerbyt, V.Y., & Leyens, J-P. (1988). The 'Black Sheep Effect': Extremity of judgements towards ingroup members as a function of group identification. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 18,* 1-16.

Nesdale, A.R. (1999). Developmental changes in children's ethnic preferences and social cognitions. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 20,* 501-519.

Nesdale, D. (2001). Development of prejudice in children. In M. Augoustinos and K. Reynolds (Eds.). *Understanding Prejudice, Racism, and Social Conflict.* London: Sage.

Nesdale, D. (2004). Social identity processes and children's ethnic prejudice. In M. Bennett & F. Sani (Eds.). *The development of the social self.* (pp. 219-246). East Sussex: Psychology Press.

**Nesdale, D. (2007). The development of ethnic prejudice in early childhood: Theories and research. In O. Saracho & B. Spodek (Eds.), *Contemporary perspectives on social learning in early childhood education* (pp.213-240). Charlotte, N.C.: Information Age Publishing.

Nesdale, D. & Brown, K. (2004). Children's attitudes towards an atypical member of an ethnic ingroup. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 28,* 328-335.

**Nesdale, D., & Dalton, D. (in press). Effect of social group norms and school norms on children's intergroup prejudice. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology.*

Nesdale, D., Durkin, K., Maass, A., & Griffiths, J. (2004). Group status, outgroup ethnicity, and children's ethnic attitudes. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 25,* 237-251.

Nesdale, D., Durkin, K., & Maass, A., & Griffiths, J. (2005b). Threat, group identification, and children's ethnic prejudice. *Social Development, 14,* 189-205.

Nesdale, D., & Flesser, D. (2001). Social identity and the development of children's group attitudes. *Child Development,* 72(9), 506-517.

Nesdale, D., Griffiths, J. Durkin, K., & Maass, A. (2005). Empathy, group norms and children's ethnic attitudes. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 26,* 623-637.

Nesdale, D., Griffiths, J., Durkin, K., & Maass, A. (2007). Effects of group membership, intergroup competition, and outgroup ethnicity on children's ratings of ingroup and outgroup similarity and positivity. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 25,* 359-373.

Nesdale & Kokkoris, (2005). *Group norms, outgroup ethnicity and children's intergroup prejudice.* Griffith University, Queensland.

Nesdale, D., & Lambert, A. (2007). Effects of experimentally-manipulated peer rejection, on children's negative affect, self-esteem, and maladaptive social behavior. *International Journal of Behavioural Development,31,* 115-122.

Nesdale, D., & Lambert, A. (2008). Effects of experimentally-induced peer group rejection on children's risk-taking behaviour. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 5,* 19-38

Nesdale, D., Maass, A., Durkin, K., & Griffiths, J. (2005). Group norms, threat, and children's racial prejudice. *Child Development, 76(3),* 652-663.

Nesdale, D., Maass, A., Griffiths, J. & Durkin, K (2003). Effects of ingroup and outgroup ethnicity on children's attitudes towards members of the ingroup and outgroup. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology.21,* 177-192.

Nesdale, D., Maass, A., Kiesner, J., Durkin, K., & Griffiths, J. (2008). Effects of group norms on children's intentions to bully. *Social Development,* 17, 889-907.

Nesdale, D., Maass, A., Kiesner, J., Durkin,K., Griffiths, J., & Ekberg, A. (2007). `Effects of peer group rejection, group membership, and group norms, on children's outgroup prejudice. *International Journal of Behavioral Development. Special issue: Social Identity and Intergroup Attitudes in Children and Adolescents, 31,*526-535.

Nesdale, D., Maass, A., Kiesner, J., Durkin, K., Griffiths, J., & James, B. (2009). Effects of peer group rejection and a new group's norms on

children's intergroup attitudes. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology.27,* 783-797.

Nesdale, D., & Pelyhe, H. (2009). Effects of peer rejection on children: Social anxiety, self-esteem, and attitudes towards the in-group and out-group. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology.6,* 294-317.

Nipedal, C. Nesdale, D. & Killen, M. (in press), Social group norms, school norms, and children's aggressive intentions. *Aggressive Behavior.*

Ojala. K., & Nesdale. D. (2004). Bullying as a group process: The effects of group norms and distinctiveness threat on attitudes towards bullying. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology. 22,* 19-35.

Ojala. K., & Nesdale. D. (2010). *Group belongingness and intra- and intergroup attitudes in children.* Griffith University, Queensland.

Pettigrew, T.F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49,* 65-85.

Radke-Yarrow, M., Zahn-Waxler, C., & Chapman, M. (1983). Prosocial dispositions and behavior. In P. Mussen (Ed.). *Manual of child psychology: Vol 4. Socialization, personality, and social development* (pp. 469-545). New York: Wiley.

Roberts, W., & Strayer, J. (1996). Empathy, emotional expressiveness, and prosocial behavior. *Child Development, 67,* 449-470.

Rubin, K., Bukowski, W., & Parker, J.G. (1998). Peer interactions, relationships and groups. In W. Daemon (Series Ed.). and N.Eisenberg (Vol.Ed.). *Handboook of child psychology: Vol 3, Social emotional and personality development* (5th ed., pp. 619-700): NY: Wiley.

Rutland, A. (1999). The development of national prejudice in in-group favoritism and self-stereotypes in British children. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 38,* 55-70.

Rutland, A., Cameron, L., Milne, A., & McGeorge, P. (2005). Social norms and self-presentation: Children's implicit and explicit intergroup attitudes. *Child Development, 76,* 451-466.

Salmivalli, C., & Voeten, M. (2004). Connections between attitudes, group norms, and behavior in bullying situations. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 28,* 246-258.

Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). *Intergroup cooperation and conflict: The robber's cave experiment.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma.

Stormshak, E. A., Bierman, K. L., Bruschi, C., Dodge, K. A., & Coie, J. D. (1999). The relation between behavior problems and peer preference in different classroom contexts. *Child Development, 70,* 169-182.

Strayer, J. & Roberts, W. (2004). Children's anger, emotional expressiveness, and empathy: Relations with parents' empathy, emotional expressiveness, and parenting practices. *Social Development, 13(2,* 229-254.

Teichman, Y. (2001). The development of Israeli children's images of Jews and Arabs and their expression in human figure drawings. *Developmental Psychology, 37,* 749-761.

Teichman, Y. (2006). *Intergroup inclusion and exclusion in a context of an intractable conflict: Developmental perspective.* Paper presented at European Association of Experimental Social Psychology, Medium Sized Meeting: Social developmental perspectives on intergroup inclusion and exclusion, University of Kent, July, 2006.

Verkuyten, M. (2001). National identification and intergroup evaluation in Dutch children. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology. 19,* 559-571.

Verkuyten, M. (2007). Ethnic in-group favoritism among minority and majority groups: Testing the self-esteem hypothesis among pre-adolescents. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 37,* 486-500.

Wright, J.C., Giammarino, M., & Parad, H.W. (1986). Social status in small groups: Individual-group similarity and the social "misfit". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50,* 523-536.

Warden, D., & Mackinnon, S. (2003). Prosocial children, bullies and victims: An investigation of their sociometric status, empathy and social problem-solving strategies. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 21(3),* 367-385.

Yee, M.D., & Brown, R. (1992). Self-evaluations and intergroup attitudes in children aged three to nine. *Child Development, 63,* 619-629.