THE DEVELOPMENT OF ETHNIC AWARENESS, IDENTITY, AND ATTITUDES IN ETHNIC MAJORITY AND MINORITY CHILDREN.

Judith A. Griffiths
BA (Auck), GradDip Teach (Auck), BPsych (Hons)

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of Doctor of Philosophy within the School of Psychology, Faculty of Health, Griffith University

February 2007
ABSTRACT

Research into children’s ethnic awareness, identification, and attitudes has been ongoing for the past eight decades. This research had a limited focus, measuring one component of ethnic awareness or ethnic attitudes. Results indicated that ethnic majority and ethnic minority children have developed ethnic awareness by about 5-years and that it becomes increasingly sophisticated with age. In addition, the results have revealed that ethnic majority children show consistently more positive attitudes towards their ethnic in-group. In contrast, the ethnic attitudes of minority groups are less conclusive. The results of some studies matched those of the ethnic majority, others reported less positive attitudes towards the in-group, while still others reported no differences in the attitudes between the ethnic in-group and ethnic out-group.

The present program of research sought to examine a range of factors that have been proposed to contribute to the development of ethnic awareness and ethnic attitudes in ethnic majority and ethnic minority children. The examination of these factors in children from ethnic majority (Anglo-Australian) and ethnic minority (Pacific Islander) groups enabled a unique insight into the development of ethnic awareness and ethnic attitudes in children.

Study 1 explored the cognitive abilities and social knowledge of 119 children (59 Anglo-Australian; 60 Pacific Islander). Results indicated that ethnic majority and minority children were able to recognise and categorise members of the ethnic in-group and out-groups from 5-years of age. In addition they became increasingly aware of the immutability of ethnic group membership and their explanations of those characteristics that define ethnic group membership became more complex and sophisticated with age. The results also indicated that children’s social knowledge of the ethnic groups that make up their community and also their comprehension of status differences became more extensive with increasing age.
Study 2 investigated the development of children’s ethnic attitudes. Using the same 119 participants, their attitudes towards the ethnic in-group and ethnic out-groups were examined using a number of measures. The results indicated differences in the ethnic attitudes of the ethnic majority and ethnic minority groups. The ethnic majority group participants rated the in-group more positively than the out-groups, while the ethnic minority participants rated the in-group and the ethnic majority out-group equally positively. In addition, both the ethnic majority and ethnic minority participants displayed a preference for in-group neighbours, on a simulation task. The results of these two studies showed that children’s ethnic awareness and ethnic attitudes are influenced by both their cognitive development and their social knowledge garnered from the community in which they live.

One important aspect missing from this account was the contribution of the children’s membership of an ethnic group and their identity based on their group membership. Although numerous studies have investigated ethnic identity in adults and adolescents, there has been little comparable research with children. Given the absence of a reliable instrument for measuring children’s ethnic identity, Study 3 sought to address this deficiency. The responses of 279 children from the ethnic majority and minority groups to a set of test items were factor analysed, and a three-factor structure was identified. Two of the factors (ethnic pride and ethnic comparison) were shown to be common to both ethnic majority and ethnic minority groups. The third factor (involvement in ethnic activities) was unique to ethnic minority groups. Using confirmatory factor analysis, this structure was confirmed in a second study with an additional sample of ethnic majority and minority children (n = 475). Analysis of the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islanders responses revealed that on both scales, the Anglo-Australians recorded higher scores than the Pacific Islanders.
Study 4 investigated the influence of ethnic identity on ethnic attitudes using a minimal group paradigm. Two hundred and six Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander children were allocated to a same ethnicity team for a pretend drawing competition. The ethnicity of the out-group was manipulated, such that the other team comprised children of the same or a different ethnicity to the participant. Analysis of the participant’s liking responses indicated that the ethnic majority participants reported greater liking for the in-group than the out-group, regardless of the ethnicity of the out-group. In contrast, the Pacific Islanders attitudes towards the in-group and out-group were influenced by the ethnicity of the out-group. When the out-group comprised Anglo-Australian children, the Pacific Islander participants reported less liking for the in-group and more for the out-group than when the out-group was Pacific Islander.

Importantly, regression analyses also revealed that the extent of children’s ethnic identity predicted attitudes towards the in-group and out-group. Specifically, higher ethnic pride predicted liking for both the in-group and the out-groups while ethnic comparison predicted liking only for the in-group and not the out-group.

Overall, this research project has significantly extended our understanding of the development of young children’s ethnic awareness, ethnic identification, and ethnic attitudes. Of particular note is the fact that the research examined these issues in relation to members of both ethnic majority and minority groups. As anticipated, these comparisons revealed similarities as well as differences in the developmental trajectories of these processes in children from both ethnic majority and minority groups. Finally, the research program significantly enhanced our understanding of ethnic majority and minority group children’s ethnic identification and the important impact this has upon their ethnic attitudes. At the same time, it is clear that, while answering some questions, the present research also served to raise new questions to be addressed in subsequent research.
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CHAPTER 1.
INTRODUCTION

No man is an island, entire of itself

Everyman is a part of a continent

John Donne.

Everyone belongs to, or at least is born into, a particular ethnic (or racial) group. To a greater or lesser extent, ethnic groups differ in terms of their language, beliefs, attitudes, values, and characteristic behaviour patterns. Differences also exist between ethnic groups in relation to various aspects of life such as child rearing, food, religion, marriage, interpersonal relations, and education.

Ethnicity is an issue of interest to researchers because of both forced (e.g., North American and British slave trades) and unforced or voluntary migration. The migration of people from one country or region to another is not a new phenomenon, but rather dates back thousands of years. Regardless of the reason for migration, one of the consequences for immigrants is that they face the task of adapting to a new (host) culture (Nesdale, Rooney, & Smith, 1997). An important component of this is the increased contact between immigrants and members of the host country. As members of the host and immigrant groups come into contact with each other, their self-perceptions and attitudes, as well as their perceptions and attitudes towards other groups are constantly challenged and modified.

Researchers interested in ethnicity have focused on describing and explaining a range of issues, including the psychology of particular ethnic groups, the differences between ethnic communities, and the bases for intercultural attitudes and behaviours (Berry, 1997, 2005; van Oudenhoven & Eisses 1998; Verkuyten, 2001; Verkuyten &
Zaremba, 2005). Others have looked at issues such as the acculturation strategies adopted by migrants and their associated psychological health outcomes (Berry, 1990, 1997; Mak & Nesdale, 2001; Nesdale & Mak, 2000; Nesdale et al., 1997; Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind, & Vedder, 2001; van Oudenhoven & Eisses, 1998). Still others have examined the extent to which migrants continue to derive a part of their sense of self-worth from their ethnic group membership (ethnic self-esteem or ethnic identity), the conditions under which ethnic identity develops and changes (Phinney, 1992, 1993; Phinney & Chavira, 1992; Phinney & Tarver, 1988), and the impact that ethnic identity has on personal, interpersonal, and intergroup processes (Berry, Kim, Minde, & Mok, 1987; Chataway & Berry, 1989; Hurtado, Gurin, & Peng, 1994; Leong & Chou, 1994; Nesdale & Mak, 2000; Nesdale et al., 1997).

Much of the foregoing research has focused on adults’ and adolescents’ understanding of, and attitudes towards, their ethnicity, and the implications of these for different interpersonal and intergroup attitudes and behaviours. However, a considerable amount of research has also addressed related issues in children, especially on issues such as the development of ethnic awareness, ethnic self-identification, and ethnic attitudes.

Research on the latter topics commenced early in the twentieth century with a number of seminal studies carried out by Horowitz (1936; Horowitz & Horowitz, 1938) and Clark and Clark (1939a, 1939b, 1947). These studies were enormously influential, such that to a considerable extent, they established the issues that became the focus of concern to researchers for the next 50 to 60 years. In addition, they greatly influenced the procedures and measures that were employed by later researchers. Indeed, it is probably not unfair to say that the period from 1930 to 1980 was marked by an
explosion of studies that examined much the same issues using much the same methods, only differing in the particular subject population under examination.

The research to be reported in the present thesis represents, to some degree, a return to some of the foregoing issues. However, whereas the present research sought to upgrade our understanding on these issues, it also focused on new issues, using new approaches. In short, the focus of the current research program was on the development of children’s ethnic awareness, ethnic identification, and ethnic attitudes. In particular, it was concerned with these issues in relation to children from the majority/dominant (Anglo-Australian\(^1\)) ethnic group compared with those from an ethnic minority/migrant (Pacific Islander\(^2\)) group. In addition, the research also examined each group’s attitudes towards the ethnic in-group, as well their attitudes towards other ethnic out-groups, including Indigenous Australian and Vietnamese out-groups.

The Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander ethnic groups were chosen for two reasons. First, Anglo-Australians are the dominant cultural group in Australia, both in terms of size and influence. Historically, Australia has experienced several phases of migration. The outcome of the first phase resulted in British immigrants establishing themselves as the dominant group, displacing the indigenous (Aboriginal) peoples. Moreover, Britain continued to be the major source of immigrants for the next 150 years. Subsequently, there were significant increases in other European groups (e.g., Greeks and Italians) during the 1950s and 1960s. More recently, there has been significant migration by middle-eastern, Asian, and Pacific Islander ethnic groups

---

\(^1\) The ethnic majority group in the traditional member countries of the British Commonwealth, especially Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand will henceforth be referred to as ‘Anglo’\(^1\). This terminology reflects their Anglo-Saxon heritage, rather than the European heritage of the American ethnic majority group.

\(^2\) The term ‘Pacific Islander’ is used to refer to individuals from the various islands that make up Polynesia. People from these island nations use the term to refer to themselves, particularly when they are immigrants to other countries such as Australia and New Zealand.
(Nesdale et al., 1997). Second, the Pacific Island group was chosen because they are physically different to Anglo-Australians (i.e., brown-skinned) and because a significant number live in Southeast Queensland where the research was carried out.

Research investigating issues such as ethnic awareness, ethnic identification, and ethnic identity in children in Australia is not extensive. Some research has looked at the attitudes of Anglo-Australian children towards ethnic out-groups (Augoustinos & Rosewarne, 2001; Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996; Nesdale, Durkin, Maass, & Griffiths, 2004; Nesdale, Griffiths, Durkin, & Maass, 2005; Nesdale, Maass, Griffiths, & Durkin, 2003). However, with the exception of Pederson and colleagues (Pedersen & Walker, 2000; Pedersen, Walker, & Glass, 1999) there has been little research in Australia on the attitudes of the Aboriginal ethnic group toward either their in-group (Aboriginal group), or toward the Anglo-Australian or other immigrant groups. Similarly, little research has examined the in-group and out-group attitudes of children who are members of ethnic immigrant groups.

Several specific questions guided the present research project. These included: When and how do children under the age of 12-years develop ethnic awareness and ethnic attitudes? Are there differences in their awareness and attitudes depending on whether they belong to the dominant or an ethnic minority group? Further, do children develop an ethnic identity in the same way as adolescents and adults derive ethnic identity from their ethnic group membership? Finally, does this ethnic identity have any influence on the expression of ethnic attitudes towards not only the ethnic in-group, but towards ethnic out-groups who reside in the same community?

Structure of the thesis

The remainder of Chapter 1 defines and elaborates the key terms used in this research. Chapter 2 provides a review and critique of the literature of the early research
of the 1930s and 1940s and introduces the subsequent lines of research that have continued to be conducted to the present time. Research extending from the early work and focusing on specific issues (e.g., ethnic awareness) is presented and discussed more fully at the beginning of the relevant study chapters. Chapter 3 describes the first study in the present program of research. This study explored the development of children’s ethnic awareness and the influence of cognitive and social factors that have been proposed as underlying children’s awareness of different ethnic groups. Chapter 4 presents a study which was conducted to investigate children’s ethnic attitudes toward members of the ethnic in-group and ethnic out-groups which make up their local community. Chapter 5 provides an account of a series of studies which were undertaken in the development of a scale to measure ethnic identity in children under the age of 12-years. Chapter 6 details an experimental study which looked at differences between majority and minority ethnic group children in their ethnic identity and the influence of ethnic identity on the children’s expression of their ethnic attitudes. Finally, Chapter 7 provides a discussion of the findings from the research program and considers the implications that can be drawn from the research.

Definitions of Key Terms

Many of the terms used in research with ethnic groups have been used interchangeably and the choice of term often appears to have been guided by the researchers’ interests, their motivation, and/or the historical time and context in which the research was conducted. For example, the terms ‘race’, ‘ethnicity’, and ‘culture’ have often been used interchangeably despite important differences in their connotations and definitions. This interchangeable nature of terminology is also found with other terms such as ‘ethnic attitudes’ and ‘ethnic preferences’. It is therefore prudent at this time to provide a clear definition of the terms as they were used in this thesis.
Race and Ethnicity

In its most general anthropological sense, the term ‘race’ has been defined as any relatively large division of people (either Caucasoid, Negroid, or Mongoloid) that could be distinguished from others on the basis of shared genetic, biological, and physical characteristics or features (e.g., skin pigmentation, hair texture, and facial features, especially nose shape) (Carter, 1995). Researchers prior to the 1970s used the term ‘race’ predominantly. However, with increasing inter-racial marriage and the rise of minority civil rights, the boundaries between the racial groups became less clear. Accordingly, the use of the term declined in favour of the term ‘ethnicity’ to describe different groups of people that share common cultural traditions and a sense of identity. Ethnic groups can be formed on the basis of history and tradition, including customs, language, social and political mores and conventions, geographical location, religious practices, or on a sociological definition of race (e.g., African-Americans). Despite the trend toward using the terms ‘ethnic’ and ‘ethnicity’, there are still some authors who have retained the use of the terms ‘race’ and ‘racial’ (e.g., Cramer & Anderson, 2003; Kowalski & Lo, 2001; Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous, 1998; van Ausdale & Feagin, 1996).

The term ‘ethnicity’ will be used in this thesis, as it is more encompassing or inclusive than the term ‘race’ and takes into account the social and cultural aspects as well as the physical characteristics that differentiate the groups in this study (i.e., Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander).

Ethnic Awareness

This is a multi-dimensional concept that includes a number of concepts or processes such as ethnic perception and differentiation, ethnic recognition, and ethnic categorization. For the purposes of this thesis, these terms are defined as follows:
Ethnic perception and differentiation.

Ethnic perception is defined as the perception of differences between people on some shared characteristic that differentiates that group from other groups (e.g., skin colour or physiognomy, clothing, or language).

Ethnic recognition and categorisation.

Ethnic recognition is the ability to recognise and label different ethnic groups on the basis of the perceived shared characteristics. In relation to this program of research, this shared characteristic is ethnicity and its associated characteristics (e.g., language use and skin colour). Ethnic categorisation is the ability to differentiate and categorise individuals on the basis of their ethnicity.

Ethnic self-categorization.

Ethnic self-categorisation refers to children’s perceptions of themselves as belonging to or being a member of a particular ethnic group.

Ethnic Identity

‘Ethnic identity’ is used in this thesis to refer to the degree to which an individual identifies with the ethnic in-group and the thoughts, feelings and, perceptions associated with this membership. That is, it refers to the emotional investment or attachment that group members have to their in-group and to the other members of their group (Crocker, Luhtanen, Blaine & Broadnax, 1994; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Phinney, 1990, 2000; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). As with previous research, the terms ‘ethnic identification’ and ‘ethnic identity’ are considered to be synonymous in this thesis.
Ethnic Attitude and Preference

Like ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’, the concepts of ‘ethnic attitude’, ‘ethnic preference’ and ‘intergroup bias’ have often been used interchangeably in research, suggesting equivalence between them. However, some researchers appear to have drawn distinctions between ‘ethnic attitude’ and ‘ethnic preference’, although the distinctions have often not been made clear in the literature, either in terms of the choice of language, the methodology used, or in the interpretation of results (Clark & Clark, 1947; Phinney, 1990; Simon, 1974).

For the purpose of this thesis, ‘ethnic attitude’ is considered to be an affective state; that is it refer to the feelings of positivity or negativity toward an ethnic in-group or ethnic out-group, or the positivity of an evaluation of an in-group or out-group on a number of traits or attributes. Similarly, ‘ethnic preference’ is defined as the degree to which children are more favourably disposed towards the members of one ethnic group in comparison with the members of another ethnic group.

Ethnic Constancy

‘Ethnic constancy’ refers to the understanding that a person’s ethnicity or ethnic group membership remains unchanged despite superficial physical transformations (e.g., changing facial or hair colour) and the passage of time (e.g., the understanding that one’s group is the same at birth as it is later as an adult). In terms of this thesis, this latter form of ethnic constancy will be referred to as ‘ethnic stability’.

Social Knowledge

‘Social knowledge’ refers to children’s understanding of how social relationships work, including friendship and group memberships and intergroup relations. In the context of this thesis, ‘social knowledge’ is viewed narrowly as children’s accumulated understanding of the different ethnic groups that comprise their
community and the differences in the relative status of the groups, (e.g., which groups have dominant status and which have lower [inferior] status).

*Ethnic Prejudice*

‘Prejudice’ has been defined as “the holding of derogatory social attitudes or cognitive beliefs, the expression of negative affect, or the display of hostile or discriminatory behaviour towards members of a group on account of their membership of that group” (Brown, 1995, p. 8). While this thesis is not primarily concerned with ethnic prejudice, the concepts of interest in this thesis (e.g., ethnic awareness, identity, and attitudes) have been considered by researchers to be necessary contributors to the development of ethnic prejudice in children (Aboud, 1988; Nesdale, 1999, 2004, 2006). Moreover, as discussed below, many of the theoretical developments relating to the preceding constructs have occurred within theoretical models relating to ethnic prejudice.

*Chapter Summary*

In sum, the preceding brief discussion indicates that many of the concepts central to this thesis have been variously defined and used. In an attempt to minimise confusion, the present thesis will emphasise one approach to each concept. The following chapter provides a review and discussion of the early research that laid the foundations for later research and ultimately the research reported in this thesis.
CHAPTER 2.
DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN’S ETHNIC AWARENESS, SELF-IDENTIFICATION, AND ATTITUDES: THE FOUNDATION STUDIES

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to provide a review of the early research into the development of children’s ethnic awareness, self-identification, and ethnic attitudes. Research in this area stretches back more than 80 years, beginning with the early investigations into the ethnic awareness, self-identification, and attitudes and preferences of American children toward their own and other ethnic groups (e.g., Clark & Clark, 1947; Horowitz, 1936; Horowitz & Horowitz, 1938).

Horowitz (1936), Horowitz and Horowitz (1938)

The early research conducted by Horowitz (1936; Horowitz & Horowitz, 1938) focused almost entirely on European-American\(^3\) children’s attitudes toward African-Americans\(^4\). In the first of these studies, Horowitz (1936) was interested in quantifying the attitudes toward African-Americans of European-American boys from Kindergarten to Grade 8 in both mixed and segregated schools.

The children resided in New York City and in rural and urban areas of Tennessee and Georgia. Using a number of techniques, including pictures of both European-American and African-American children, and structured interviews, Horowitz asked the boys to rank order the pictures on the basis of how much they liked the person in the picture (as an index of their racial attitude).

---

\(^3\) In the interests of clarity and consistency, henceforth the term ‘European-American’ will be used when referring to Whites and White American individuals.

\(^4\) The term ‘African-American’ will be used for the remainder of this thesis when referring to Black Americans and Negro individuals.
In addition, they were further asked to indicate which person they would prefer to play with, and interact with, in a number of different social situations (e.g., invite to a birthday party, live next door to, and who they would like to have as a cousin).

In each case, the boys indicated a preference for the other European-American children (i.e., their racial in-group). Horowitz (1936) interpreted this in-group preference as an indication of prejudice toward African-Americans (i.e., the more the boys preferred their racial in-group, the more [Horowitz assumed] they disliked the racial out-group). From these results, Horowitz concluded that European-American children would prefer to play with, or interact with other European-American children in preference to African-American children. Horowitz also reported that there was no difference in the boys’ racial in-group preference on the basis of whether they lived in a rural or urban community in either the northern or the southern states. In addition, there was no difference between the preferences of the boys who attended racially segregated or racially mixed schools. These results lead Horowitz to comment that “(by this time) attitudes towards Negroes are now chiefly determined not by contact with Negroes, but with the prevalent attitudes towards Negroes” (pp. 34-35).

A further study by Horowitz and Horowitz (1938) extended this research, using a similar methodology. This study sought to investigate the influence of ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic status on European-American children’s friendship choices. There were 84 participants from Grade 1 to Grade 10 who attended a ‘white’ school from several communities in the American southern states. These communities were differentiated on the basis of the degree of segregation between the ethnic groups, that is, from exclusively European-American communities to racially mixed communities. Using pictures and interviews in the same manner as the previous study, the children’s attitudes to, and preferences for, the two groups (i.e., European-American and African-
American) were measured. The authors reported that ethnicity was an important factor in determining the friendship groups of these European-American children who again preferred to play with members of the ethnic in-group.

Clark and Clark (1939a, 1939b, 1947)

While this very early research focused on the attitudes and preferences of European-American children toward African-Americans, it was the work of Kenneth and Mamie Clark (1939a, 1939b, 1947) that turned the focus of research squarely onto the awareness, attitudes, and preferences of African-American children toward their own ethnic group and, by extension, to the majority (European-American) group. In conjunction with Horowitz (1936) and Horowitz and Horowitz (1938), this early research laid the foundation for almost 80 years of research on children’s ethnic awareness, identification, ethnic preference, and ethnic prejudice.

Clark and Clark (1939a, 1939b) initially conducted two studies examining the development of racial identification in African-American children. In the first study, 150 African-American children aged between 3- and 5-years were shown a set of line drawings of white and coloured children and (irrelevant) animals and were asked “which one is you?” Clark and Clark reported that 51% chose the coloured drawing while 44% chose the white drawing and 5% chose the irrelevant drawing. They also reported age-related increases in the number of children nominating the coloured drawing; 42% of the 3-year-olds indicated the coloured drawing as looking like them whereas, by 5-years, this had increased to 56%.

To further test if these same levels of ethnic awareness were also present in African-American children who attended racially-mixed and segregated nursery schools, Clark and Clark (1939b) presented 3-and 4-year-old African-American children with line drawings of a European-American or an African-American child, or a clown
or animal and asked the children “which one looks like you?” The authors reported that African-American children from segregated schools indicated that the coloured drawing looked like them more often, while the children attending racially mixed schools made equal choices between the white and the coloured drawing. As in the previous study, Clark and Clark reported increases in own-group nomination with age. By 4-years, the African-American children in the segregated schools ceased to identify with the irrelevant drawings (clown or animal) and identified with either the coloured or the white drawing, with a greater preference being shown towards the coloured drawing. While Clark and Clark noted that the trend was similar in the mixed race school, there remained a number of children who continued to identify with the irrelevant drawings. To investigate if the child’s skin colour influenced their responses, Clark and Clark further separated the participants on the basis of skin colour (light, medium, or dark skinned). They reported that the light-skinned children were more likely to nominate the white drawing as being like them, whereas the medium and dark-skinned children identified more with the coloured drawing. The authors concluded that the results of these studies indicated that some African-American children as young as 3-years were showing incipient signs of awareness of their ethnic group membership, and that the accuracy of their responses increased with age.

In the landmark 1947 study, Clark and Clark sought to investigate racial identification further but also to examine the developmental pattern of the relationship between ethnic awareness, identification, and preference in African-American children. The ethnic identification and preference of 253 African-American children between the ages of 3- and 7-years from both segregated schools in Arkansas (southern group) and mixed-race schools in Massachusetts (northern group) were investigated. The children differed on the dimensions of age, gender, and skin hue (light, medium, or dark). The
children were presented with dolls, which had either brown skin colour with black hair or white skin colour with yellow hair to represent the two racial groups (African-American and European-American). The dolls were dressed identically in white diapers. A total of eight questions were presented in three sets. Using a forced choice methodology, the participants responded by indicating the doll that best represented their response.

The first set of items was concerned with measuring the children’s ethnic awareness, with questions such as, “Give me the doll that looks like a white child?”, “Give me the doll that looks like a coloured child?”, or “Give me the doll that looks like a Negro child?” Clark and Clark (1947) reported that these children were aware of differences between the ethnic groups. Overall, more than 93% of the children were able to correctly differentiate between the “white” and “coloured” dolls. When asked to identify the “Negro” doll, 72% correctly gave the experimenter the brown doll. The authors concluded that children have a well-developed concept of racial difference based on physical features (white vs. brown). The lower response accuracy to the request for the Negro doll was, according to Clark and Clark, due to the social designation of the term “Negro” and the lack of differentiation between the racial groups that was evident when the terms “white” and “coloured” were used to describe the racial groups. The authors also reported that, similar to their previous results, racial awareness increased with age. This was shown by the increase in the number of correct responses from about 70% at age 3-years to 100% at age 7-years.

While the differences between the children with different skin hues were non-significant, Clark and Clark noted that the dark-skinned group of participants chose the brown doll more than either the light-skinned or medium-skinned subjects. They concluded that the dark-skinned children were more aware of racial differences and that
this awareness extended to the knowledge of the use of the term “Negro” when referring to coloured individuals.

A further question, “Give me the doll that looks like you?” was designed to measure the children’s ability to self-identify with a racial group. Sixty-six percent of the children nominated the brown doll as looking like them, while 33% nominated the white doll. The nomination of the white doll decreased with age, from 61% at three years to 13% at seven years, while there was a concomitant increase in the proportion of children nominating the brown doll (36% at age 3 to 87% at age 7-years). There was also a greater tendency for the lighter skin children to identify with the white doll (80%) rather than the medium- and dark-skinned children (26% and 19% respectively). Clark and Clark (1947) interpreted the responses of the African-American children who indicated that they looked like the ‘white’ doll or drawing as an indication that they wanted to be white (the so-called, ‘wish fulfillment’ hypothesis). They suggested that these children had developed a negative self-image, which resulted in them rejecting (or denying) their ethnicity. Still further, the Clarks posited that as a result of this in-group rejection, these children pretended (or had a secret wish) to be white in an effort to reduce the anxiety that was derived from this negative self-image and was accompanied by lowered self-esteem.

The third set of items presented by Clark and Clark (1947) to the children was aimed at measuring their racial preference, using requests such as “Give me the doll that you like to play with the best?”, “Give me the doll that is a nice colour?”, “Give me the doll that looks bad?”, and “Give me the doll that that is the nice colour?” When the children’s responses were averaged across the items, the results indicated that 60% preferred the white doll, while 30% preferred the brown doll, and the remainder indicated they were unsure or did not answer. The questions and responses are shown
in Table 2.1. This table indicates that not only did the children express a preference for the white doll, but the majority indicated that the brown doll had the least favourable attributes. Clark and Clark failed to comment in relation to those children who did not answer the question or indicated a “don’t know” response, although this was only a significant number in relation to the “looks bad” question.

Table 2.1

*Questions and Proportion of Responses to the Racial Preference Questions.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Doll choice</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Doll</td>
<td>Brown Doll</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give me the doll you like to play with</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give me the nice doll</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give me the doll that looks bad</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give me the doll that is the nice colour</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Clark and Clark (1947).

Clark and Clark (1947) again reported age-related differences in ethnic preference. They reported a marked increase in preference for the white doll from age 3- to 5-years, peaking at approximately age 4 years. Seventy-five percent of the 4-year-old children indicated that they preferred the white doll, but this percentage declined to about 50% at age 7-years. There was also a tendency for children from racially-mixed (northern) schools to report greater preference for the white doll than children from segregated schools in the southern states of America. This preference was demonstrated
by the higher number of northern children indicating the white doll as having more positive qualities than the brown doll on the preference measures.

Clark and Clark (1947) interpreted the children’s more favourable endorsement of the white doll as an outright rejection of the brown doll and, by extension, their racial group. Indeed, they reported that the preference for, and the subsequent identification with, the white doll and rejection of the brown doll was evident for all the children, although the results showed a decrease in white preference after 5-years-old. At this age, only a minority of the children misidentified with the white doll as looking like them.

These results have been interpreted by some later authors (e.g., Foster, 1994) as a number of “competing outcomes” rather than a single result, as reported by Clark and Clark (1947). On the one hand, Foster noted that Clark and Clark reported that children were aware of racial differences, as illustrated by the 93% of the children who could correctly differentiate between the dolls and the 66% of the participants who were also able to accurately identify the brown doll as looking like them. In contrast to these results, the majority of these children (60%) showed a marked preference for the white doll. The Clarks further reported age, skin hue, situational, and regional differences in the children’s responses. Foster summarised these results as indicating that there was a tendency for younger, lighter skinned, northern (State) children from racially mixed schools to be more likely to indicate a preference for the white doll in contrast to older, darker skinned children from southern racially segregated schools. Foster concluded that while there was a general tendency for white preference in these children, this did not necessarily equate to a misidentification, as suggested by Clark and Clark.

While these results may be interpreted in a number of ways, their importance in relation to research on children’s ethnic attitudes and preferences should not be
underestimated. For the first time, research showed that African-American children were aware of racial differences and that they could use racial cues to differentiate between racial groups represented by line drawings (Clark & Clark 1939a, 1939b) or dolls (Clark & Clark, 1947). These results further showed that some of these African-American children demonstrated an out-group orientation, in that they appeared to identify with and/or prefer the white stimulus figure. In the 1954 US Supreme Court Brown V. Board of Education of Topeka case, which ended public school segregation on the basis of race, Kenneth Clark argued that the rejection of a brown doll was tantamount to a rejection of race. This rejection was later interpreted as a reaction to the “corrosive effects of racism in American society” (Vaughan, 1986, p. 362). The accompanying inference from Clark and Clark’s results was that the children’s rejection of their racial in-group led to lower self-esteem and that these children were turning to the white models to enhance their self-concept or self-esteem.

In sum, these early studies were among the first to focus on, and to document, children’s ethnic awareness, self-identification, and attitudes in both European- and African-American children.

It is noteworthy that when the results of Clark and Clark’s (1939a, 1939b, 1947) studies are considered along with those conducted earlier by Horowitz (1936; Horowitz & Horowitz, 1938) an interesting picture emerged. Together, these studies showed for the first time that both ethnic majority and minority group children were operating differently, especially in their preferences for, and apparent identification with, the racial in-group and out-group. Children from both the racial majority and minority groups showed preference for the European-American (racial majority) group both in their choice of preferred friend and in the assignment of positive qualities, and a
minority of African-American children and all the European-American children identified with the white stimulus figure.

**Issues Arising from the Early Research**

The methodology used in these studies, particularly the use of dolls, has been replicated many times. However, a number of problems, including the interpretation of the data, the appropriateness of using dolls to represent people, and the use of a forced-choice methodology, were identified by later researchers.

**Interpretations and conclusions from the findings.**

The generalisability of interpretations and conclusions drawn from the early results has been questioned as being a product of their historical, political, and social climate. The issue of social change and its influence on test results has been addressed by a number of researchers. For example, Pettigrew (1978) highlighted a number of stages, each stage was aligned to particular historical period in African-American history. Pettigrew suggested that these stages might possibly account for the different research results. In the earliest phase (Coping-with-Oppression, 1929-1954), the view that segregation and discrimination were desirable for both African- and European-Americans was upheld by the dominant European-American group. During this period, Kenneth Clark used the white preference and black rejection results to argue for improved civil rights and desegregation. The Cultural Deprivation stage (1954-1968) shifted the responsibility for the findings of low self-esteem and identity confusion onto the black family and the ghetto culture. Out of this phase, (i.e., after 1968), came the rise of the black power and racial pride movements (Strong Minority). Foster noted that during this phase research findings of “inferiority (of African-Americans) became interpreted as reactionary and carrying a taint of racism” (1994, p. 231).
It is also noteworthy that the civil rights movement was not restricted to the United States. A number of other nations, including New Zealand, Australia, England, and South Africa, also experienced a rise in civil rights movements at about the same time as the United States. These movements have often been cited as being influential in accounting for a change in the research results (Foster, 1994; Kelly & Duckitt, 1995; Vaughan, 1978). For example, whereas Vaughan reported an ethnic out-group preference by Maori children in 1964, by 1971 he reported a shift toward an ethnic in-group preference. He concluded that it was possible that Maori children were re-evaluating their identity in response to the Brown Power Movement that was gaining momentum at this time in New Zealand. Moreover, the latter results appeared to parallel the hypothesis that African-Americans were also re-evaluating their group identity during the 1960s (Cross, 1986). A similar trend in the shift from an out-group to an in-group focus was also noted in South Africa during the 1970s. In later commentaries, Kelly and Duckitt (1995) and Foster (1994) attributed changes in the research to the rise of the black consciousness movement and black pride in South Africa.

Similarly, a number of studies from the 1960s to the 1980s conducted using ethnic minority groups in Britain also reported apparent historical changes in ethnic preference by West Indian and Asian minority group children (Davey & Norburn, 1980; Milner, 1973, 1983, 1984). While Milner reported that in the 1960s, 48% of the West Indian and 24% of the Asian children mis-identified with the white majority group, Davey and Norburn reported that the percentage of misidentifications had dropped to 8% for the West Indian and 15% of the Asian children by 1984.

In sum, the change in ethnic minority children’s ethnic self-identification from a focus on the dominant group to a focus on the ethnic in-group has been attributed to the
rise of the civil rights movement during the 1960s and the 1970s. One outcome of this change is that the early research results reflected the political and social climate in which they were obtained. Nevertheless, while these results might not be widely accepted in the 21st century, they provided the foundation for the decades of research which followed.

Validity of the interpretations.

The validity of the interpretations drawn from the early research has been questioned by a number of authors. For example, a number of authors (e.g., Brown & Johnson, 1971; Katz, 1973; Porter, 1971; Williams & Morland, 1976) commented on the influence of the social connotations of the colours ‘black’ and ‘white’. As noted above, the conclusion often drawn from the early research was that the preference shown for a white doll by the minority group children equated to a rejection of their ethnic in-group. In contrast, Williams and Morland hypothesised that the preference shown to the white doll might be more a reflection of the children’s preference for light rather than dark objects than preference for a doll or its representative ethnic group. Consistent with this, Porter (1971) noted a tendency for status differences between light (i.e., white) and dark (i.e., black) colours to be socially endorsed. She further commented that the high status of light over dark has historically been legitimised by cultural messages. For example, white is traditionally associated with goodness and cleanliness, while black is associated with evil and dirtiness. This distinction between light and dark is further reinforced in children’s literature, where the hero(ine) is typically dressed in white and the villain in black. Porter observed that for many children the association of the colour black with dirtiness is particularly pertinent for black children who may internalise this negative knowledge.
Drawing on this, Boswell and Williams (1975) reported that children’s preferences for the colour white predicted racial preference for European-Americans, while a fear of the dark predicted negative attitudes towards African-Americans. Williams and Morland (1976) also claimed that children’s innate preference for light over dark was generalised to skin colour, which resulted in a preference for light skin colour over dark skin colour. Under these circumstances, the children’s responses to the dolls might be considered to be a manifestation of this preference.

In sum, while the interpretation that colour preference reflected ethnic preference was accepted by early researchers to account for their results, more recent accounts have looked to cognitive and social factors in accounting for ethnic preference and attitudes.

*Appropriateness of dolls to represent people.*

In addition to the issue of the interpretation of the results and their historical and social importance, other issues have concerned the choice of methodology and the measures used in the research. One issue concerns the appropriateness of using dolls to represent different ethnic groups. This appropriateness has been questioned by a number of researchers (e.g., Aboud, 1988; Aboud & Skerry, 1984; Nesdale, 2001; Vaughan, 1986). The specific criticisms of the doll methodology lay, first, in the relevance of dolls as being representative of ‘real’ people and ethnic groups that children might expect to interact with regularly. Second, there has been a concern in the use of a white doll to represent skin hues from white to light brown and tanned, and the use of a brown doll to present skin hues from tanned or light brown through to the darkest of black skin hues.

In relation to the first criticism, Vaughan (1964b) reported that there was a tendency among the Anglo-New Zealand and Maori children to treat the dolls as dolls
and not as representations of real people, and that this effect was more marked in the Anglo-New Zealand children as they got older. He suggested that line drawings might prove to be a more valid measure of ethnocentrism in children. Indeed, in his series of studies, Vaughan used both dolls and line drawings. His results indicated that both the Maori and Anglo-New Zealand children were more accurate at racial identification when presented with a stimulus picture of real people rather than a doll which might or might not look like members of the racial group they were supposed to represent.

This differential accuracy of responses when using photographs (or line drawings) compared to dolls might be explained by the salience of racial cues used by individuals to categorise others. According to Gitter, Mostofsky, and Satow (1972) and Socre (1979), physiognomic characteristics (e.g., lip thickness, hair texture, and nose shape) may be more salient than skin colour when making ethnic categorisations. On this basis, Vaughan (1986) argued that these qualities might be attended to more than skin colour. He suggested that if dolls were used as stimuli then they should be more life-like, or some other life-like stimuli (e.g., photographs and line drawings) might be more appropriate for use in research.

Aboud and Skerry (1984) noted that dolls were seen by children as things to be manipulated, that they varied in quality, and that they were often sought out based on the degree of familiarity. More importantly, they observed that dolls have a different meaning for children as a function of their age and that this might have influenced the participants’ responses to the various measures and reduced the usefulness of dolls as a valid stimulus. Aboud and Skerry also indicated that while the results of studies using dolls and photographs were comparable for young children, they argued that photographs were more appropriate stimuli for older children. In their opinion, photographs were generally more representative of members of any ethnic group and
were able to show the variations in physical features that characterise individuals whereas dolls are unable to accommodate differences in physical appearances found in the general population.

Given such conclusions, the use of dolls as representatives of ethnic groups declined after the 1970s while photographs have increased, especially as a result of the development of photographic and computer technology (e.g., Madge, 1976; Nesdale et al., 2003, 2004; Nesdale, Durkin, Maass, & Griffiths, 2005; Nesdale, Griffiths et al., 2005; Nesdale, Maass, Durkin & Griffiths, 2005; Nesdale, Robbé, van Oudenhoven & Griffiths, 2006; Pushkin & Norburn, 1983).

In relation to the second issue concerning the appropriateness of using a single colour doll to represent multiple skin hues, Greenwald and Oppenheim (1968) replicated Clark and Clark’s (1947) preference questions but with two significant changes in the methodology. First, they introduced a mulatto-coloured doll (tawny colour, made by mixing black and white) and, second, they asked the children two versions of each question (i.e. “Is there a doll that you want to play with?”, and “Is there a doll that you don’t want to play with?”) Their results indicated that both the European-American and African-American children showed a greater preference to play with the white doll (68%) rather than either of the coloured (brown or mulatto) dolls (21%), and that they thought the white doll was a nice colour (75%), and was the good doll (69%). The mulatto doll received the most adverse evaluations with only 13% of African-American and 4% of European-American children expressing a desire to play with this doll, while 59% and 51% respectively thought it was bad, and only 8% of both African- and European-Americans thought it was a nice colour.

On the basis of these results, together with the high levels of accurate identification (84% of the European- and 89% of the African-Americans), the authors
concluded that both European- and African-American children rejected both of the coloured (brown and mulatto) dolls. Greenwald and Oppenheim’s (1968) results also differed markedly from those of Clark and Clark (1947) in response to the question, “Which doll looks like you?” They reported fewer African-American children misidentifying (13% vs. 39%), while only 11% of the light-skin coloured children misidentified with the white doll compared to 80% in Clark and Clark’s study. The authors accounted for this drop in the children’s level of misidentification in terms of the availability of a mulatto doll which offered children with varying degrees of skin hue a more appropriate response option.

A second interesting result was the proportion of participants that misidentified with the mulatto doll. Of the African-American participants, 38% misidentified with the white or mulatto doll with the greatest misidentification coming from the light-skinned children (56%), while 44% of the white participants misidentified with the mulatto doll (25%) and the brown (19%) doll. The authors commented that these rates of misidentification might have been an artifact of the availability of the mulatto doll. They argued that for the darker skinned European-American children the mulatto choice might have been a better choice than the white doll (which was a plastic pink colour).

Rice, Ruiz, and Padilla (1974) investigated the responses of 140 African-American, European-American, and Chicano children attending preschool and grade school, to photographs of representatives from the three ethnic groups. Using the same questions as Greenwald and Oppenheim (1968) and Clark and Clark (1947), they reported that the participants from the three groups could discriminate between the photos of the white and black males at all ages, and while the older children were able to discriminate between the white and Chicano males, the preschoolers were unable to
make this distinction. However, all children irrespective of their age or ethnic group were accurate in their level of self-identification.

In sum, the use of artificially coloured dolls to represent ethnic group members has declined as technology has improved and the use of more realistic mediums (e.g., photographs and computer generated images) has increased. The major issue with using dolls was their artificial colouring and their inability to accommodate variations of skin colour found in the community. While this issue was initially overcome by using a mulatto coloured doll, the increasing use of digital photography has allowed the stimuli used to become more representative of the ethnic groups in the community.

Forced choice methodology

A further criticism of the early research, and Clark and Clark’s (1947) study in particular, was the use of forced choice methodology. This forced-choice methodology dichotomised the responses, such that the choice (or selection) of one doll was often interpreted as implying a rejection of the other. In addition, a forced-choice methodology fails to measure the intensity of the children’s response. These shortcomings have been addressed by increasing the range of response options. One strategy for increasing the response options has been to use multiple item scales; for example, the Preschool Racial Attitudes Measure (PRAM, Williams, Best, & Boswell, 1975) and its later refinement, the PRAM II (Williams, Best, Boswell, Mattson, & Graves, 1975), the Katz-Zalk Projective Prejudice Test (Katz & Zalk, 1978), as well as the Multi-response Racial Attitudes Measure (MRA, Doyle, Beaudet, & Aboud, 1988).

The PRAM II (Williams et al., 1975), for example, presents participants with 24 racial and 12 filler gender items. Each item represents a positive or a negative quality or behaviour. The participants are shown a photograph or drawing of a white and a black child and they are asked to indicate which photograph/drawing was best
represented by the description. The intensity of the participant’s attitude towards the
groups was calculated by summing the pro-White and anti-Black scores. This type of
measure has an advantage over the earlier doll studies because the participant’s score is
based on an aggregate of items rather than the child’s response to a single question.
However, the same forced-choice criticism can be leveled at this measure, as the
allocation of positive traits to one group resulted in the automatic allocation of the
negative traits or attributes to the other group.

In response to this criticism, Doyle et al. (1988) devised the Multi-response
Racial Attitude Measure (MRA). Unlike the PRAM, the MRA gave participants the
opportunity to make multiple assignments of the positive and negative adjectives to the
ethnic target. Thus, children had the opportunity to rate each of the ethnic target groups
independently because the participant was allowed to nominate one group, both of the
groups, or neither of the groups, as being represented by the description.

In a comparative study using the PRAM and the MRA, Doyle and Aboud (1995)
noted that when given the opportunity to rate the groups independently using the MRA,
ethnic majority children rated both the in-group and out-group increasingly positively
with increasing age. In contrast, the children’s ratings for the ethnic out-group were
significantly less positive than for the ethnic in-group when using the PRAM. In a
further comparative study, between the PRAM II and an independent ratings measure
(where the doll/photograph is presented individually and the participants rate each of the
represented groups independently of each other), Kowalski (2003) reported that an
independent assessment measure resulted in more favourable ratings for the ethnic out-
group by both ethnic majority and minority children than when using a forced-choice
methodology. Kowalski noted that while the children differentiated between the ethnic
in-group and out-group, ethnic out-groups were nevertheless still rated positively, although less positively than the ethnic in-group.

The use of continuous rating scales has been proposed as being a more realistic measure of affect than the forced-choice methodology. Such scales allow the participant to indicate the intensity of their attitude (or affect) along a positive-negative dimension. Using this type of scale, children are asked how much they would like another person or how close they would like to sit next to them (Aboud, 1981; Aboud & Mitchell, 1977; Genesee, Tucker, & Lambert, 1978, Verna, 1982). In each of these studies, the participants located their representation closer on the continuum to the in-group member than to the member from an ethnic out-group. The intensity of the child’s opinion (or affect) was determined by measuring the distance on the scale between a representative of the target group and the participant. There are several advantages of this methodology. First, it allows the participant to rate each of the ethnic groups independently. Second, acceptance of one group is not confounded with the rejection of the other, and third, it allows researchers to measure the intensity of the children’s attitude or preference.

In sum, the use of a forced choice methodology limited the interpretation of the results. This methodology allowed only one response and forced the other response to represent the opposite attitude. This limitation has been addressed using multiple response options and continuous rating scales. These types of scales measure the intensity of the attitude rather than the presence (or absence) of an attitude. The use of independent group methodology also allows for the measurement of an attitude to one group without reference to other ethnic out-groups. These improved measures have allowed for greater understanding and explanation of children’s ethnic attitudes.
Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented a review of the early literature which inspired eight decades of later work. In particular, researchers effectively identified several issues (i.e., ethnic awareness, ethnic self-identification, and ethnic attitudes) each of which became a focus of research in its own right. At the same time, new methods were also identified and these became standard measures. However, there were a number of issues arising from the methodology, and the interpretation of the results in these early studies. Again, much of the criticism leveled at this early research has been addressed by later researchers and has lead to a strengthening of the methodology.

The following chapter reports the first study in the current research project. It was concerned with examining the development of ethnic awareness in Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander children and investigated a number of social and cognitive factors that have been proposed as underlying ethnic awareness. The chapter begins with a review of the relevant literature before proceeding to describe the present research.
CHAPTER 3.
THE DEVELOPMENT OF ETHNIC AWARENESS

Introduction

As indicated in chapter 1, ethnic awareness has been conceptualised as a multi-dimensional concept encompassing a number of different aspects. These aspects include ethnic categorization (i.e., ethnic recognition and ethnic self-identification), ethnic constancy, social knowledge of the ethnic groups that comprise the local community, and the status differences between them. In many of the studies reported to date, the research methodology and interpretation of the results have failed to draw clear distinctions between these different components. This is especially true of research that has looked at children’s ethnic awareness and their self-identification with the ethnic in-group, as well as their categorisation of individuals into ethnic out-groups. The present chapter reviews the extant literature that has been carried out on children’s ethnic awareness following the early research of Horowitz (1936; Horowitz & Horowitz, 1938) and Clark and Clark (1947). This review serves to identify a number of issues requiring further research, some of which were taken up in the present study.

As noted earlier, the early work of Horowitz (1936; Horowitz & Horowitz, 1938) and Clark and Clark (1939a, 1939b, 1947) revealed that both African- and European-American children were aware of, and were able to differentiate between, the ethnic groups in their community. Although Horowitz and later Horowitz and Horowitz did not include a direct measure of ethnic awareness, the existence of such awareness was inferred from the boys’ responses to the questions. However, Clark and Clark’s research set out to specifically measure this construct in African-American children. Their results showed that more than 90% of the African-American children could
identify the white and the coloured doll, thereby providing an indication of the children’s ethnic awareness.

Research has shown that children from both majority and minority ethnic groups exhibit a basic knowledge of racial differences from about 3-years of age and that children become increasingly accurate in their use of this knowledge with age (Clark & Clark, 1947; Epstein, Krupat & Obudho, 1976; Gregor & McPherson, 1968; Vaughan, 1963, 1964a, 1964b). Although there is consensus in the literature that children as young as 3-years may display incipient ethnic awareness, it is also acknowledged that ethnic awareness is a skill that is not decisively established until they are about 9- or 10-years old (Hunsberger, 1978; Rosenthal, 1974; Vaughan, 1964b). This claim has been supported by the increased accuracy of children’s responses to questions regarding ethnic groups with increasing age.

While the majority of the early ethnic research was conducted in North America and Europe, Graham Vaughan conducted an influential program of study in New Zealand during the 1960s. He sought to investigate the chronological development of New Zealand children’s understanding of the concept of ‘race’. Unlike Clark and Clark (1947), who were concerned with the development of racial understanding in racial minority children, Vaughan chose to concurrently track and record the development of this concept in children from the ethnic majority (Anglo-New Zealand) and the ethnic minority (Maori) group ranging in age from 4- to 12-years (Vaughan, 1963, 1964a, 1964b).

In a departure from the doll methodology employed by Clark and Clark (1947), Vaughan (1963, 1964a, 1964b) used a number of measures to investigate the concepts of racial awareness, racial identification, and racial discrimination. He proposed that the reliance on a single measure (e.g., Clark & Clark’s “Show me the doll that looks like
you?”) limited the generalisability of the results. Accordingly, he addressed this methodological limitation by using a number of measures including picture and doll identification, picture and doll discrimination, puzzle assembly, and doll classification, to investigate children’s understanding of race.

The results of the first study, using only Anglo-New Zealand children, revealed a relationship between children’s age and their correct response on the picture and doll discrimination, puzzle assembly, and doll classification tests (Vaughan, 1963). Vaughan concluded that by 4-years of age, Anglo-New Zealand children had mastered the skill of ethnic recognition, and by 6-years of age, these children began to accurately discriminate between Anglo-New Zealand and Maori pictures and dolls. By 7-years of age, the children were beginning to classify the dolls into the correct ethnic group while ignoring incongruent visual cues (i.e., the white doll being dressed in traditional Maori costume and the Maori doll being dressed in European-style clothing). However, complete mastery of the doll discrimination and classification was not achieved until 10-years when the children were no longer relying on clothing cues in their decisions. Although Vaughan used a different population and methodology to Clark and Clark (1947), his results nevertheless paralleled those reported 15 years earlier. That is, ethnic awareness is established early in childhood and it is elaborated upon with increasing age.

In follow-up studies, Vaughan (1964a, 1964b) examined the development of racial awareness and understanding in Maori children, using the same methodology. His results showed that the development of the concept of race among the Maori children did not follow the sequence he had observed in the Anglo-New Zealand sample. Table 3.1 provides a summary of the ages of task attainment. However, despite the departures
in the developmental sequence, the Maori children, like the Anglo-New Zealand children, had attained the concept of race by age 10.

Table 3.1

*Chronological Age of Attainment of Individual Tasks in the Attainment of the Concept of Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anglo-New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Identification</td>
<td>4-years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doll Identification</td>
<td>5-years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Discrimination</td>
<td>6-years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doll Discrimination</td>
<td>5-years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doll Assembly</td>
<td>7-years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doll Classification (Maori doll in traditional costume)</td>
<td>7-years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doll Classification (Maori doll in European clothing)</td>
<td>10-years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Vaughan (1963, 1964a, 1964b)

On the basis of these results, Vaughan (1964a, 1964b) proposed a three-stage sequence in the attainment of the concept of race. These stages were identification, differentiation, and attainment. According to Vaughan’s model, each stage was characterised by changes in ethnic awareness and contributed to the eventual acquisition of the concept of race. While both groups of children had acquired the concept of race by late childhood, the relationship between increasing understanding of race and chronological age did not appear to exist for Maori children in the same way as it did for the Anglo-New Zealand children. Vaughan (1964b) concluded that when this model was applied to Maori children, there were apparent differences between the two ethnic groups in the sequence of development of ethnic awareness, even though both groups of
children attained the concept of ‘race’ by age 10-years. One of the major differences between the two groups was the delay in the Maori children’s ability to correctly identify their ethnic in-group. Vaughan attributed this delay to the children’s knowledge of the differences in the groups’ status and by unwillingness on the part of the Maori children to be associated with a low status group. This incorrect group identification parallels Clark and Clark’s (1947) mis-identification results by some of the African-American children.

Research into the ethnic awareness of ethnic majority and minority children continued from 1960 through to the present time. Consistent with the results reported by the early research (Clark & Clark, 1947; Horowitz, 1936; Horowitz & Horowitz, 1938; Vaughan, 1963, 1964a, 1964b), more recent studies have continued to report differential result patterns in the development of ethnic awareness between ethnic majority and minority group children.

Overall, there has been little change in the pattern of responses by the ethnic majority children since Clark and Clark’s (1947) study. Using a doll-type study and European-American junior primary school children between the ages of 4- and 7-years, Freidman (1980) reported that more than 95% of the European-American children in his study correctly identified the white doll as looking like them. Further, he noted that when mis-identification did occur, it was primarily by the youngest (kindergarten) group leading to the speculation that there was some connection between age (and cognitive development) and identification processes. In addition, he also reported that these children could correctly identify the white and coloured dolls with more than 90% accuracy and could identify the Negro doll with 89% accuracy. These results parallel those reported by Clark and Clark (1947) despite the different ethnicity of the participants.
Other studies have also reported similarly high levels of correct ethnic self-identification by young (i.e., 4- and 5-year-old) European- and Anglo-majority group children (Crooks, 1970; Fox & Jordan, 1973; Greenwald & Oppenheim, 1968; Marsh, 1970; Morland, 1966; Morland & Hwang, 1981; Newman, Liss, & Sherman, 1983; Rice et al., 1974; Rohrer, 1977). The research also consistently reported that the accuracy of the ethnic majority children increased with age and by about 9- years of age, the children were able to self-identify with accuracy approaching 100% (Aboud, 1977, 1988; Corenblum & Wilson, 1982; Fox & Jordan, 1973; Gregor & McPherson, 1966, 1968; Milner, 1973; Newman et al., 1983). Similarly, in a more recent Australian study, Augoustinos and Rosewarne (2001) presented Anglo-Australian children with a number of photographs and asked them to identify which of the photographs looked like them. They reported that 97% of the children could correctly identify with their ethnic in-group. In addition, they reported that the accuracy of this identification increased with age, from 96% of the 6-year-olds to 98% of the 8-year-olds.

In comparison, ethnic minority group children have traditionally demonstrated less consistency in correctly identifying themselves as members of their ethnic in-group. Clark and Clark (1947) indicted that until age 7-years, some African-American children continued to misidentify their ethnic group membership and indicated that they looked like the white stimulus figure. This pattern of results was also reported later using children from other ethnic minority groups. For example, Rosenthal (1974) reported that at age 6-years, 67% of the Chippewa Indian children in his study were identifying with the white figure. This high level of misidentification decreased with age, so that by 10-years only 27% were still misidentifying with the white figure. Rohrer (1977) similarly reported that 52% of the African-Americans and 51% Mexican-Americans incorrectly self-identified.
While research indicated that children from both ethnic majority and minority groups display high levels of accuracy in differentiating between ethnic groups, it also indicated that ethnic majority children were more consistent in their accurate categorisation of ethnic out-group members and in identifying with their ethnic in-group. Newman et al. (1983) reported that while both ethnic majority and minority group children increased in accuracy of self-identification with age, the majority children continued to be more accurate than the Hispanic and African-American children in their study.

In contrast, other studies have reported equally high levels of accurate self-identification in ethnic majority and minority children. A study by Springer (1950) using Hawaiian Oriental and non-Oriental 3- to 6-year-olds reported high rates of correct ethnic in-group self-identification. They reported that 80% of the Orientals and 90% of the non-Oriental children correctly self-identified. In a replication of Clark and Clark (1947), Hraba and Grant (1970) reported the absence of differences between the African-American and European-American children in their self-identification levels. Using a replication of Clark and Clark’s (1947) methodology, Epstein et al. (1976) also reported that 91% of the African- and European-American children in their sample were able to correctly self-identify.

A number of studies have also reported a similar pattern of results using Canadian ethnic majority and minority group children (Fox & Jordan, 1973) and European-American and Mexican-American children (Weiland & Coughlin, 1979). Further, in a comparison of three ethnic groups, Davey and Mullin (1980) presented 512 British children who were Anglo, West Indian, or Asian, with photographs to measure the children’s ability to self-identify with the question “Which one looks like you?” The authors reported that there was no difference in the propensity of the children to
misidentify with another ethnic group. An examination of the children’s responses indicated that 82% of the Anglo, 92% of the West Indian, and 85% of the Asian children could correctly identify their ethnic in-group. This led the authors to conclude that “statistically it is not more probable that a black child will say he looks like a white child than it is probable that a white child will say he looks like a black child” (p. 244).

The social environment has also been shown to influence the accuracy of children’s self-identification. For example, Clark and Clark (1939b) reported that African-American children who attended racially segregated schools were more likely to correctly identify the coloured drawing as looking like them, while African-American children in racially mixed schools indicated less accuracy and selected both the white and coloured drawing as looking like them. In contrast, Crooks (1970) reported that African-American children in an interracial nursery school were more accurate in their self-identification with a brown doll (59% identified with the brown doll versus 41% who identified with the white doll) than African-American children who did not attend an interracial school (24% identified with the brown doll versus 76% who identified with the white doll). Crooks also remarked that the European-American children were 100% accurate in their identification with the white doll regardless of the degree of their school’s integration between ethnic groups.

In sum, the research has reported that both ethnic majority and minority children display incipient ethnic awareness from about 3-years old. There is also agreement within the literature that this awareness is not firmly established until children are in middle childhood. The series of studies by Vaughan (1963, 1964a, 1964b) showed that while the Anglo-New Zealand and Maori children did not follow the same sequence in their development of ethnic awareness, they had developed this awareness by age 9- or 10-years. Differences have been noted in the literature between the accuracy of ethnic
self-identification and preference between ethnic majority and minority children in a number of countries. In general, ethnic majority children are consistently more accurate in their ethnic self-categorisation than ethnic minority children.

Limitations of the Research Methodology

While the preceding studies have provided greater understanding of how and when children develop and utilise their ethnic awareness, there are a number of issues that need to be addressed if our understanding of children’s ethnic awareness (and its various contributing components) is to be progressed. These issues include, first, the limited response options provided in the studies, second, the effect that providing children with the appropriate ethnic labels might have on the results, and third, the limited number of ethnic groups living in the relevant communities.

As indicated in Chapter 2, the unrealistically limited (forced-) choice options might have produced results which might have been misinterpreted. The interpretation that light- and medium-skinned black American children rejected their ethnic group when they identified with the white doll might have been the outcome of these unrepresentative response options. This possibility has been highlighted by studies that have provided an intermediate response option (e.g., Greenwald and Oppenheim, 1968; Rice et al., 1974). Their results indicated that the provision of an intermediate-coloured doll resulted in fewer incorrect self-identifications by the African-American children. The difference in the results as an outcome of introducing a mid-coloured response option indicated that while young children are able to discriminate between a black-skinned person and a white-skinned person the understanding of ethnicity is more complex than mere colour differentiation.

A second issue that needs to be addressed concerns the extent to which the provision of ethnic group labels by the experimenter might have confounded the results.
When measuring ethnic categorisation, participants are usually (but not always, see Vaughan, 1963, 1964a, 1964b) provided with the ethnic labels and are asked to indicate the stimuli that match the label (e.g., “Show me the photo that looks like a Chicano?”). While a correct response might indicate that children are able to differentiate between ethnic groups, the claim that the responses are a measure of ethnic awareness should be accepted with caution. A better measure might be to allow the children the opportunity to provide their own ethnic labels to stimuli. This would indicate if the child is able to differentiate between ethnic groups, and if s/he is capable of categorising individuals without utilizing verbal cues from the experimenter. The present study sought to respond to this possible confound by allowing the participants to supply their own ethnic labels to unidentified photographs. A third issue related to the fact that recent increases in migration have given rise to communities comprising greater ethnic diversity. In contrast to the early research where communities were comprised of few racial groups, children living in the 21st century are exposed to, and interact with ever-increasing numbers of ethnic groups. With the exception of the Rice et al. (1974) study, much of the research to date has been concerned with children’s awareness of, and their ability to differentiate between, their ethnic in-group and usually one other ethnic out-group. Accordingly, the second aim of the present study was to document whether Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander children were more accurate at identifying some ethnic groups compared with others.

However, while it is useful to measure children’s ability to recognise and categorise individuals from groups in their community, it is equally important to investigate the underlying cognitive and social forces that facilitate ethnic recognition and categorisation as part of children’s ethnic awareness.
Much of the research to date has limited itself to simply measuring children’s ethnic awareness without further investigation of what factors might influence their understanding of what constitutes membership of one ethnic group to the exclusion of others. However, some researchers have documented the characteristics that children consider important in defining the bases of ethnic group membership (Aboud, 1984; Alejandro-Wright, 1985; Bernal, Knight, Garza, Ocampo, & Cota, 1993; Lerner & Buehrig, 1975; Quintana, 1994; Quintana & Vera, 1999; Quintana, Ybarra, Gonzalez-Doupe, & De Baessa, 2000).

An early study by Aboud (1984), for example, sought to investigate the centrality of ancestry as a definition of one’s ethnic group membership. She asked Anglo-Canadian children (aged 6- to 9-years) “What makes an Italian Canadian or Native Indian be an Italian Canadian or Native Indian?” Aboud reported that only 20% of participants indicated ancestry (or parents) as the basis of ethnic group membership and there was no significant effect of age on the children’s responses. These results need to be interpreted with some caution, for two reasons. First, Anglo-Canadian children were asked to describe those attributes that constituted membership of ethnic out-groups but not the ethnic in-group. This task assumed that children were able to transfer their knowledge of what determines ethnic group membership across various ethnic groups. Second, Aboud failed to describe what other categories the children used to describe ethnic group membership. As a result, this study is largely uninformative concerning our understanding of what attributes children use to assign ethnic group membership.

Research investigating children’s understanding of ethnic group membership has been conducted with children from a number of ethnic groups. Some of these groups
include African- and European-American (Lerner & Buehrig, 1975), Canadian (Aboud, 1984), and Mexican-American (Alejandro-Wright, 1985; Bernal et al., 1993). From the results of these studies, two conclusions might be drawn. First, children’s descriptions changed from a reliance on using physical descriptors (i.e., skin colour) to a reliance on inferred non-observable factors and social markers, including ethnic food preferences, ethnic activities, and language. The second conclusion was that these changes occurred with increasing age. In addition, age related changes have been shown to parallel changes in cognitive development. That is, the increasing abstractness of the children’s descriptions have, in general, occurred around the period of acquisition of concrete operations (around 7- to 11-years).

In support of this link with cognitive development, Bernal et al. (1990) reported that 8- and 10-year-old Mexican-American children used greater complexity and abstractness when describing ethnic group membership than did younger participants who primarily relied on concrete and observable characteristics.

Quintana (1998) hypothesised that children’s understanding of the basis of ethnicity become progressively sophisticated. As a result of this sophistication, their accounts of ethnic group membership move from a reliance on physical characteristics to unobservable/ internal characteristics (e.g., ancestry and language).

**Quintana’s (1994; 1998) model of the basis of ethnicity**

Quintana (1994, 1998) proposed a number of developmental stages that children progress through in their understanding of what characterises membership of an ethnic group. He suggested that the development of children’s understanding of ethnicity was a form of ethnic cognition, in particular, perspective-taking ability, which commenced in early childhood and reached a definitive level by adulthood. His model contained four developmental levels of understanding, each level becoming more sophisticated
and abstract as children developed, and acquired, an ever-increasing cognitive sophistication. He hypothesised that in the first stage, children aged approximately 3- to 6-years attended to physical features to classify individuals and they equated ethnicity with its physical manifestations. As a result, children also perceived ethnic group membership as malleable. For example, an individual’s race may be deemed to have changed if s/he got a suntan. Children in this first stage also lacked an understanding of the socially constructed use of terms like ‘African American’.

In the second stage, between the ages of about 6- to 10-years and coinciding with the acquisition of concrete operations, Quintana (1998) proposed that children’s descriptions of ethnicity progressively moved away from a focus on physical characteristics to a greater emphasis on social implications. As a consequence, their descriptions were increasingly framed as a literal interpretation of ethnicity and the cultural practices that accompany ethnic group membership (e.g., ancestry, food, and language). For example, a person would be considered Asian if they were seen to eat stereotypic Asian food with stereotypic utensils (e.g., eating rice or noodles with chopsticks) and to be heard to speak in an Asian language (e.g., Vietnamese or Mandarin).

Quintana (1998) suggested that by about 10- to 14-years, children’s understanding of ethnicity incorporated a greater social perspective as they recognised the broader implications of ethnic group membership. For example, children become aware of status differences between the ethnic groups and the relative social implications of status in terms of stereotypes and evaluations of different groups. During this stage, Quintana suggested that children begin to identify and associate with their ethnic in-group. The fourth and final stage is characterized by the expression of one’s pride in one’s ethnic group and occurs in late adolescence.
A number of studies have supported Quintana’s model (Quintana & Vera, 1999; Quintana et al., 2000). For example, Quintana et al. (2000) measured a number of aspects relating to ethnicity in Mexican-American (Latino, Study 1) and Guatemalan Ladino (Spanish-speaking children of generally European descent, Study 2) children. The results indicated age-related changes in the explanations of ethnicity in Latino and Ladino participants, such that the older participants placed greater weight on less observable characteristics than the younger participants. In addition, the authors further reported significant correlations between age and ethnic knowledge (defined by the authors as having knowledge of participation in ethnic-oriented practices) for the both groups of participants.

This model, and the research supporting it, has added another dimension to our understanding of how children ascribe membership of ethnic groups, by recording the children’s actual language and not simply relying on their response to a question or by pointing to a doll or photograph. That said, the research has a number of limitations. One limitation has been the focus on documenting single ethnic minority groups (Aboud, 1984; Quintana, 1994; Quintana & Vera, 1999; Quintana et al., 2000) with the consequence that the results lack generalisability. Thus, while the results of Quintana and colleagues have shed light on how Mexican-American children describe their ethnic group membership, they have not measured this concept in dominant group children, nor have they investigated how children define membership of other ethnic groups.

Accordingly, the present study was interested in exploring if there were differences between Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander children’s descriptions of what characteristics define ethnic group membership, and whether the type of descriptions varied in accounting for ethnic in-group and ethnic out-group membership. On the basis of previous research, it was anticipated that younger children would make
greater use of physical (observable) characteristics (e.g., skin colour and physiognomy), while older children would place greater reliance on literal (non-observable) characteristics (e.g., ancestry, ethnic practices).

**Ethnic Constancy**

As indicated in Chapter 1, ethnic constancy refers to the understanding that a person’s ethnicity remains unchanged despite superficial physical transformations and/or the passage of time. Aboud (1988) has suggested that constancy is the cognitive component underpinning ethnic identification and, like other cognitive processes, the acquisition of ethnic constancy is thought to consolidate with age and, in particular, with the acquisition of concrete operations.

Children’s understanding of ethnic constancy has been measured in relation to superficial changes in the physical appearance of dolls (Vaughan, 1963, 1964b), photographs (Aboud, 1984; Aboud & Skerry, 1983; Doyle et al., 1988), as well as using structured interview techniques (Semaj, 1980). However, there is a paucity of published research investigating children’s ethnic stability (constancy over time). On this basis, the present study drew upon the gender stability research and, in particular, the studies by Slaby and Frey (1975) and de Lisi and Gallagher (1991).

**Ethnic stability.**

There is a paucity of research investigating children’s understanding that ethnicity is stable over time. However, a number of researchers have examined children’s understanding of gender stability (e.g., Bhogle & Seethalakshmi, 1992; de Lisi & Gallagher, 1991; Leonard & Archer, 1989; Slaby & Frey, 1975) as a contributing factor in children’s gender constancy.

Kohlberg (1966) proposed cognitive-development theory to account for the development of gender constancy in young children. Kohlberg argued that the
acquisition of gender knowledge was acquired in the same manner as any other knowledge. That is, it occurred through the interaction of children’s cognitive development and the social environment in which they operate. He proposed a three-stage model of acquisition which was consistent with Piaget’s model of cognitive development. Research has repeatedly shown a link between cognitive development and gender stability and constancy (e.g., deVries, 1969; Kohlberg, 1966; Marcus & Overton, 1978; Slaby & Frey, 1975).

Support for Kohlberg’s model (1966) has been reported in studies using Indian (Bhogle & Seethalakshmi, 1992), Argentinean (de Lisi & Gallagher, 1991), American children (Leonard & Archer, 1989; Marcus & Overton, 1978; Slaby & Frey, 1973; Wehren & de Lisi, 1983), and Berlize, Kenyan, Nepalese, and American Samoan children (Munroe, Shimmin, & Munroe, 1984). In each case, the authors reported that gender identity developed prior to gender stability, which in turn preceded gender constancy. There is some debate over Kohlberg’s proposed ages of gender constancy achievement. Some research has supported Kohlberg and has also indicated that gender constancy is achieved at around 7-years of age or even older (Emmerich, Goldman, Kirsh, & Sharabany, 1977; de Lisi & Gallagher, 1991; Marcus & Overton, 1978). Other researchers have reported that children as young as 3- and 4-years old display gender constancy (Leonard & Archer, 1989; Slaby & Frey, 1975; Wehren & de Lisi, 1983).

In sum, while there has been research into children’s development of gender constancy, only a subset of these studies has examined gender stability (Bhogle & Seethalakshmi, 1992; de Lisi & Gallagher, 1991; Leonard & Archer, 1989; Slaby & Frey, 1975). These few studies indicated that gender stability is linked to cognitive ability and, in particular, the ability to conserve mass. The literature is silent on the development of ethnic stability in children. Accordingly, the present study sought to
address this oversight and to investigate this concept in both ethnic majority (Anglo-Australian) and ethnic minority (Pacific Islander) children.

*Ethnic constancy.*

As part of his study into ethnic awareness in New Zealand children, Vaughan (1963, 1964b) presented Anglo-New Zealand and Maori children with Maori dolls dressed in traditional clothing and in European clothing and asked the children to name the racial group of the dolls (e.g., “What sort of doll is that?”). He reported that when the doll was dressed in traditional Maori clothes, the children could correctly identify the race of the doll by 7-years. However, when the doll was dressed in European clothes (incongruent visual cues), the children were not consistently correct in their nomination of the race until they were 9- or 10-years of age. This result suggested that these children had not yet developed the understanding of ethnic constancy, as they were unable to ignore inconsistent visual cues when ascribing ethnic group membership.

Using an interview format, Semaj (1980) investigated the acquisition of ethnic constancy in young (4- to 11-year-old) African-American children. He asked the participants if a ‘black’ child could become ‘white’ because they really wanted to, if they were to put on a wig, or if they painted their face. In response to the first question, Semaj reported that 75% of the 4 and 5-years olds indicated that this transformation was possible; that is, 25% of these children were aware that ethnicity could not be changed by wishful thinking. In comparison, 80% of the 11-year-olds indicated that such a change was not possible.

In response to artificially changing skin colour, again there were differences in the children’s responses at different ages. For example, 25% of the 4-year-olds indicated that such a change was not possible, increasing to 60% of the 11-year-olds, leading Semaj to suggest that for the first time more than half the children were
demonstrating the acquisition of ethnic constancy. When asked if changing hair and skin colour would equate to a change in one’s ethnicity, 20% of the younger children displayed ethnic constancy (i.e., reported that change was not possible), whereas 60% for the 11-year-olds gave this response.

In addition to investigating ethnic constancy, Semaj (1980) also measured the children’s general cognitive development using a conservation task. He concluded that ethnic constancy developed after conservation and was not fully realized in African-American children until approximately 11 years of age. These results are comparable with those reported earlier by Vaughan (1963, 1964a, 1964b). That is, these studies indicated that the development of ethnic constancy is linked to increasing age, and in the research by Semaj, it is also linked with general cognitive development.

Aboud (1984) presented Anglo-Canadian children with a series of photographs showing an Italian-Canadian boy putting on traditional Native Indian clothing. In the final photograph the child had transformed his appearance (with the exception of his face), and the participants were asked to name the ethnic group of the boy in the photograph. Aboud reported that the proportion of correct responses increased from 5-to 9-years, but the participants were not consistently accurate until they were about 8-years. This age-related trend was also comparable with the results of Vaughan (1963, 1964a, 1964b) and Semaj (1980). Aboud further tested children’s understanding of ethnic constancy by asking if the boy in the first and last photo was the same person. Her results indicated that only half of the 6-year-olds reported they were the same person, while all of the 8-year-olds indicated that they were the same person. In addition, a study by Doyle et al. (1988) also indicated that children who displayed ethnic constancy also displayed conservation, leading Aboud and colleagues to
conclude that a relationship existed between cognitive development and ethnic constancy.

In sum, research on ethnic constancy to date has shown that as children increase in age, they are less likely to believe that changes in appearance result in changes in ethnic group membership. This result has received support from studies that have identified positive relationships between ethnic constancy and general cognitive development (particularly conservation and classification).

The present study also sought to investigate the existence of this relationship in a group of Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander children. First, the study examined if there was a relationship between ethnic constancy and age. It was anticipated that the older participants would indicate that ethnic group membership is constant across time and context compared to the younger participants. Second, the study investigated if cognitive development (operationalised as classification ability) and ethnic constancy were related. It was expected that participants who demonstrated concrete operations would also demonstrate ethnic constancy. Third, the study examined whether there were differences in responses between ethnic majority and ethnic minority children. It was unclear if such differences would exist between the ethnic groups due to the paucity of comparative studies between ethnic majority and ethnic minority groups.

Social Knowledge

There is a paucity of recent studies that have directly measured children’s social knowledge about ethnic groups, such as their relative status in a community, the nature of their intergroup relations and the characteristic features of the ethnic groups. Such issues were addressed in earlier research. For example, an early study by Radke and Trager (1950) investigated children’s understanding of the social implications associated with being a member of the majority and minority ethnic group, among
young European- and African-American children aged between 5- and 7-years of age. Using dolls and photographs, and a number of activities including dressing the black and white dolls, allocating houses, and indicating an occupation for the dolls, the authors measured the children’s perceptions of the dolls and, by extension, of the ethnic groups the dolls represented.

Radke and Trager (1950) reported that whereas both groups of children ‘dressed-up’ the doll from their ethnic in-group (i.e., dressed the doll in ‘good’ or ‘going out’ clothes), the African-American children showed greater differentiation between the types of clothing, with 78% dressing the doll in ‘good’ clothes and 22% in work and shabby clothes. In comparison, the European-American children dressed the white doll in ‘good’ and ‘shabby’ clothes almost equally (54% versus 46% respectively). On the basis of this result, Radke and Trager concluded that clothing had greater social significance for the African-American participants than it did for the European-American participants.

The children were also asked to indicate the quality of housing that the white and black doll lived in (e.g., a ‘nice’ semi-detached house or a ‘poor’ tenement-style house). Their results showed that both the European- and African-American children indicated that the white doll would live in the ‘nice’ house and the black doll would live in the ‘poor’ house. This result was most marked in the European-American participants with 77% of them allocating the ‘nice’ house to the white doll and the ‘poor’ house to the black doll. The majority of African-American participants also allocated the ‘nice’ house to the white doll and the ‘poor’ house to the black doll, although the percentage of children making this allocation combination was less. When asked to justify their decision, a large number of children were either inarticulate or vague in their justification of these allocations. Nevertheless, Radke and Trager (1950)
concluded that the children were showing incipient social knowledge, especially as it related to differences between the status or material welfare of the two racial groups.

When the children were asked to ascribe social roles (occupations) to the dolls, there was little difference in the roles given to the ethnic groups. Forty-nine percent of the participants allocated similar status roles to both groups, while 42% of the European-American participants allocated high status roles to the white dolls, and 43% of the African-American participants allocated high social roles to their in-group. Radke and Trager (1950) reported that 38% of the white children ascribed stereotyped and inferior roles to the African-American representative. This result was most marked in those children who had previously reported hostile attitudes towards African-Americans in an earlier attitude test, although some of the children who expressed friendly attitudes also allocated inferior social roles to the black doll. The authors concluded that children’s concepts and understanding of ethnicity included knowledge about the differences in social roles as represented by occupation, clothing, and housing. These factors became linked with race and Radke and Trager argued that the status quo of intergroup relations became justifications for discrimination.

Similar differences in social knowledge were also reported elsewhere. For example, Vaughan (1964a) suggested that Maori children were more aware of status differences between ethnic groups in New Zealand than were the Anglo-New Zealand children. He indicated that the awareness of belonging to a lower status social group influenced their responses, which were expressed as an increased desire to associate with or be part of the dominant (Anglo-New Zealand) group. Vaughan based this conclusion on the greater inaccuracy in self-identification by the Maori children.

While some might argue that the children’s responses were a product of the historical time of the research (i.e., before the rise of the black power and civil rights
movements in the United States), similar results have been reported more recently (van Ausdale & Feagin, 1996; Zinser, Rich, & Bailey, 1981). For example, Zinser et al. asked 133 European-American children between the ages of 5- and 10- years to indicate whether they considered European-Americans or African-Americans to be the poorer. Their results indicated that the older children nominated the African-American group as poorer, while the younger children responded that the African-and European-American groups were equally poor. The authors interpreted the different responses as an indication that the older children were more cognizant of the social status of different racial groups.

Using a naturalistic observation technique, van Ausdale and Feagin (1996) investigated children’s social knowledge of racial status in a preschool environment. They reported that children of preschool age actively explored the meaning of status, authority, and social rules during interactions with teachers and peers from the various ethnic groups. The authors speculated that young children realised that higher social status is automatically attributed to European-Americans by society, and that this ethnic group is therefore accorded more power, control, and prestige on the basis of skin colour. They further hypothesised that such knowledge was situational and that children would act in a race-based or race-neutral way depending on what the child considered was appropriate for the situation.

When the preceding results are compared, a consistent trend in responses and behaviours becomes apparent. That is, the majority ethnic group is accorded highest social status by both the majority and minority groups. It is noteworthy that while the children in van Ausdale and Feagin’s (1996) study were cognizant of the higher status of the majority group, their behaviour reflected this knowledge only when it was considered appropriate. This selective application of social status contrasts with the
earlier studies in which the children’s social knowledge was considered to be consistent across behaviours and attitudes.

While these studies have investigated social knowledge by observing or interviewing children, a number of researchers have investigated the influence of social knowledge using a controlled experimental methodology. In particular, researchers have examined children’s knowledge of the implications of group status on their intergroup attitudes and behaviours (Bigler, Spears Brown, & Markell, 2001; Nesdale et al., 2004; Nesdale & Flesser, 2001; Spears Brown & Bigler, 2002, Study 3; Yee & Brown, 1992). This type of research has typically utilised a minimal group or simulation methodology and has focused on children from the ethnic majority group. For example, Bigler and colleagues allocated children (aged between 7- and 12-years) into teams during summer school and artificially manipulated the status of the groups. They reported that children in the high status group showed greater in-group bias or preference compared to the children in the lower status group who showed less in-group preference than when status was not made salient. Spears Brown and Bigler speculated that the children in the low status groups had internalised the association of the high status with superior traits and roles and that this association had affected their group attitudes.

A study by Nesdale and Flesser (2001) examined the influence of group status on children’s liking for the in-group versus the out-group and on their desire to change teams. They reported that the Anglo-Australian children consistently reported greater liking for the in-group versus the out-group, but when children were arbitrarily placed in high versus low status groups they exhibited greater liking for other in-group members. In line with the earlier result reported by Yee and Brown (1992), children in low status groups indicated a greater desire to change groups than did children who had been placed into high status groups.
While these studies demonstrated the effect of different levels of group status on children’s attitudes and behaviours, they sought to measure the influence of group status using artificial groups which fail to reflect the social reality in which children operate everyday. Responding to this limitation, Nesdale et al. (2004) manipulated both the status of the in-group and the ethnicity of the out-group. Using a minimal group paradigm, Anglo-Australian children were placed into either a high or low status team which contained other Anglo-Australian children. The ethnicity of the out-group members was manipulated to be either the same (Anglo-Australian) or different (Pacific Island) ethnicity to the participant. Unlike the previous studies of Yee and Brown (1992) and Nesdale and Flesser (2001), Nesdale et al. found no effect of status on the participants’ liking for the in-group or the out-group. That is, regardless of whether the children were placed into a high or low status group, they indicated greater liking for other in-group members than for the out-group members. However, the participants indicated greater liking for the out-group when it comprised members of the same ethnicity as the in-group (i.e., Anglo-Australians) than when it comprised members that were of different ethnicity to the in-group (i.e., Pacific Islanders). However, the influence of in-group status was evident in the participants’ desire to change teams. As in previous studies, participants in the low status teams expressed a greater desire to change teams than did the children in the high status teams.

In sum, research into children’s social knowledge has indicated that young children growing up in mixed ethnic communities develop a rudimentary understanding of status differences between ethnic groups (Averhart & Bigler, 1997; Katz & Kofkin, 1997; Nesdale et al., 2004). Averhart and Bigler reported that children’s knowledge of status differences was apparent at 3-years, and other research suggests that it is certainly well established by 5-years (Radke & Trager, 1950). Children know which groups are
better off and more highly regarded and systematically make comparisons between their ethnic in-group and ethnic out-groups. This intergroup knowledge has been demonstrated using naturally occurring groups as well as artificially created groups.

While the studies reviewed in this section provide insight into how status influences intergroup attitudes, their generalisability is somewhat limited and the results should be interpreted with caution. For example, using a minimal group paradigm means that the groups created are artificial, and as such the children do not have any real social information about them. While this is often seen as an advantage of the minimal group paradigm, when one is looking at the concept of social knowledge and, in particular, the knowledge of the relative status of social groups (in this case ethnic groups), this lack of background information and the failure to take into account the children’s experiences of being members of groups of different status in the community might be considered a limitation.

Present Research

The present research set out to compare the development of ethnic awareness in ethnic majority and ethnic minority group children. Three studies were carried out. Study 1a, which was very much a preliminary study both in focus and scale, sought to clarify the language that would be appropriate for use in the later studies. Previous research (Clark & Clark, 1947) has indicated that young children are less aware of socially prescribed ethnic terms (e.g., Negro) than physiognomic (e.g., black skin versus white skin) classification of ethnicity and are therefore less accurate in their responses to questions regarding ethnic categorisation and self-identification. The aim of Study 1a was therefore to gather evidence on the most appropriate language to be used in the later studies in the Australian context. Study 1b focused on the development of ethnic awareness in ethnic majority (Anglo-Australian) and ethnic minority (Pacific Islander)
children, while Study 1c sought to measure and document the contribution of both cognitive and social knowledge processes to ethnic awareness.

The focus of this research was on comparing these processes in Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander children. The Anglo-Australian group was chosen because this group is the dominant social group in Australia. The Pacific Islander group was chosen as a comparative group to the Anglo-Australian group because, unlike other immigrant groups, they are among the latest influx of immigrants into Australia. Unlike other immigrant groups who arrived during the 1950s and have resided in Australia for several generations, the Pacific Islander children are more likely to be either immigrants or to be first-generation Australian born. In addition, this group was chosen because when the participants from the various island nations of the Pacific (including Samoa, Niue, Tonga, Tokelau and the Cook Islands) were combined they resulted in a group that was numerically equal to the Anglo-Australians. In addition, although Pacific Islanders are physically dissimilar to the dominant Anglo-Australian group (i.e., skin colour, facial features, hair attributes), the two groups nevertheless share many similarities. These include living in multi-cultural urban environments, participating in westernised education systems, sports, using the English language, and attending the same state schools.

**Study 1A: Preliminary Study**

The aim of this preliminary study was to establish the children’s comprehension of the terms ‘Anglo-Australian’ and ‘Pacific Islander’. The outcome of this preliminary study would then guide the use of the terminology to be used in the main study.
Method and Results

A convenience sample of 10 children aged 6- and 9-years of age was recruited for this study. Five were Anglo-Australian and five were Pacific Islander. These children attended a school not included in any of the subsequent studies.

Following parental consent, the children were asked to describe (or define) an Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander (“Can you tell me what makes a person a Pacific Islander” and “Can you tell me what makes a person an Anglo-Australian?”). Both the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander children were able to define a Pacific Islander as someone coming from the (Pacific) Islands, this was further clarified as someone who was from Samoa, Cook Islands, Tonga or a New Zealand Samoan etc, or as someone whose parents and grandparents were from ‘the islands’. In addition, both the 6- and 9-year-olds used physical attributes to differentiate Pacific Islanders from Anglo-Australians, including skin and hair colour.

All of the 6-year-olds and three of the 9-year-olds, regardless of their ethnic group, were unable to define what an Anglo-Australian was. The children guessed that an Anglo-Australian was someone from Australia but were unsure of the meaning of the term “Anglo”. In order to clarify this mis-understanding, the children were then asked to define the term ‘White Australian’ (“Can you tell me, what makes a person a white Australian?”). Regardless of their age or ethnic group, the children indicated that a White Australian was a person who had white (light or pinky) skin, lived in Australia, and had white parents who were also from Australia. Based on these responses, when interviewing the children in the later studies, the term ‘White Australian’ was used. However, the term Anglo-Australian is used in the remainder of this thesis to refer to this group.
Study 1B: Ethnic Categorisation and Explanation of Ethnic Group Membership

This study aimed to explore Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander children’s recognition and categorisation of ethnic groups, including their own. In particular, it sought to investigate the following specific questions.

1. Are there differences in the abilities of Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander children in recognising different ethnic groups from their local community?

2. Are Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander children more accurate at identifying some ethnic groups rather than others? Are they more accurate at recognising the ethnic in-group versus ethnic out-groups? Are there quantifiable differences in their recognition of ethnic out-groups?

3. When describing the basis of ethnic group membership, what features or attributes do the children draw upon? Are there changes in the descriptors used to describe ethnic group membership at different ages?

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited from two primary schools in Logan City, South-east Queensland, servicing a lower-middle class community. Logan City is a relatively young city (established in the late 1970s), on the southern boundary of the state capital, Brisbane. There were 119 children from Grade 1 to Grade 7; 56 were males and 63 were females. Of these, 59 were members of the Anglo-Australian\(^5\) ethnic group and 60 were

\(^5\) To be included in this group, both of the children’s parents had to identify as Anglo (or White) – Australian, as well as the child identifying themselves as a member of this group.
members of the Pacific Islander\(^6\) ethnic group. The children were aged between 5.09 years and 12.04 years \((M = 8.5\ \text{years}, \ SD = 1.79\ \text{years})\).

For the purposes of this study, the sample was divided into three age groups – the first group included children from 5.09 to 7.11 years \((M = 6.49, \ SD = .59)\), the second group consisted of children aged 8.00 to 9.09 years \((M = 8.44, \ SD = .48)\), while the participants in the third age group ranged in age from 10.68 years to 12.04 years \((M = 10.68, \ SD = .58)\). These age groups were chosen because they straddled the important stage of cognitive development focusing on the acquisition of concrete operations (Peterson, 2004). Table 3.2 provides the demographic information for this study.

Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Anglo-Australian</th>
<th>Pacific Island</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-years</td>
<td>8-years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the children in the study were proficient in reading and speaking English. English proficiency was considered important because it eliminated the need for cross-translation of items and instructions and decreased the possibility that the essence of the questions and responses would be lost in the process of translation and back translation into Polynesian languages.

\(^6\) To be included in this group, both of the children’s parents had to identify as Pacific Islander, as well as the child identifying themselves as a member of this group.
An information letter and separate consent form (see Appendix A) were distributed to every child in the participating schools. This letter outlined the nature of the study to be conducted and sought parental permission for their child’s participation. Only those children whose parents granted permission to participate and fulfilled the ethnicity requirements (i.e., were Anglo-Australian or Pacific Islander) were invited to participate. All children who were approached agreed to participate.

Materials

Photographs.

A set of photographs used in this program of research was obtained in two phases. In Phase 1, separate samples of children ranging between the ages of 5- to 12-years ($N = 250$) attending schools in other areas of greater Brisbane and the Gold Coast regions were selected to provide the sets of photographs. Following parental consent, a coloured head-and-shoulders photograph was taken of each child. All children wore their school uniform and the photographs were taken against a neutral background. In each sample, there were equal numbers of boys and girls, and equal numbers of Anglo-Australian, Pacific Island, Vietnamese, and Aboriginal children. To maintain consistency of expression, the children were asked to look straight at the camera and not to smile. The photos were taken using a digital camera and printed on 80 gsm white paper using a high resolution colour printer.

In the second phase, a second group of children ($N = 50$) from the same age range and ethnicity as the children in the photographs, and with approximately equal numbers of males and females, were shown the photographs corresponding to their age and gender. These children were asked to nominate the gender (“Is this person a boy or a girl?”), ethnic group (“Does this person look like a white Australian, a Pacific Islander, an Aboriginal, a Vietnamese, or some other group?”) and the approximate age
(using the options younger than 8-years or older than 8-years) of the child in the photograph. In addition, they were asked to rate each photograph in terms of attractiveness on a 4-point scale (not at all attractive, a little attractive, quite attractive, and very attractive). Photographs were discarded if the age range and gender of the child in the photograph could not be determined by the peer group, if the child in the photograph could not be consistently placed in one single ethnic group, or if the child in the photograph was consistently rated as either very attractive or not at all attractive. The resulting set of photographs (N = 220) was utilised as a bank from which stimulus photographs for the various studies reported in this thesis were selected.

In the present study, four photographs depicting an Anglo-Australian, a Pacific Islander, a Vietnamese, and an Aboriginal child were randomly selected from those produced in the previous phase. These photographs measured 130mm x 100mm and were laminated individually (see Appendix B). Photographs of Aboriginal and Vietnamese children were included to provide two additional out-groups to the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islanders. They were chosen because these groups are culturally and physically distinct from the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander ethnic groups and both were well represented in the schools and in the local community.

The Aboriginal group was included because it holds a special status as the original inhabitants of Australia, rather than being an immigrant group. Further, comparatively little research has addressed children’s attitudes toward indigenous children (see Augoustinos & Rosewarne, 2001; Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996), hence it comprised an important comparison group. In the present study, the participants (Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander children) were familiar with, and knowledgeable concerning Aborigines through contact at the school and in the local community.
The Vietnamese ethnic group was included because physically they are intermediate between Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islanders. That is, Vietnamese are lighter skinned than Pacific Islanders and, with the exception of their eyes, they are physically more similar in terms of their lip thickness, nose width, and hair texture to the Anglo-Australian group than the Pacific Islander group. Culturally however, the Vietnamese group is quite different from both the Anglo-Australians and Pacific Islanders.

Response Booklet.

A response booklet was prepared for each participant, (refer Appendix C). This booklet was used by the experimenter to record the participants’ free-responses to a set of questions.

Procedure

The children were tested during regular school hours in a quiet location away from the classroom. When the participant arrived at the testing location, time was spent building rapport. Once s/he was comfortable talking to the experimenter (a trained teacher), the testing commenced. It was explained to the participant that s/he would be shown a number of photographs and they would be asked to tell the experimenter what ethnic group they thought each child in the photo was a member. The experimenter checked if the child understood the term ‘ethnic’. If the participant did not comprehend this term, it was explained and elaborated upon until the participant indicated that s/he understood. Participants were also told that their responses would be written down by the experimenter.

Recognition of ethnic groups.

The participants were shown each photo individually and were asked to name the ethnic group of each child in the photograph using the instruction “Here are some
photos of children from different ethnic groups” they were shown the first photo and asked “What ethnic group does this girl (or boy) come from?” Their responses were recorded verbatim. The responses for each photograph were scored either 0 (incorrect) or 1 (correct). They were then asked “How do you know they are ………” Again their responses were recorded verbatim. This procedure was repeated with the remaining photos. The order in which the four photographs were presented was counterbalanced.

Description of ethnic group membership.

To measure the participants’ understanding of ethnic group membership, they were asked “Can you tell me what makes a person a white Australian?” and their response was recorded verbatim. The participant was then asked the same question, but this time in relation to the ethnic out-group (“What makes a person a Pacific Islander?”). Again their responses were recorded verbatim.

Results

It was expected that, as these children lived in a multi-ethnic community, any differences in their ability to identify their own and other ethnic groups would be more likely to be linked to their age and ethnicity rather than their gender. Consistent with this assumption, initial analyses indicated that there were no gender differences in the children’s responses. Consequently, the data file was summed across gender for subsequent analyses.

Recognition of Ethnic Groups

In order to examine whether children from the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander ethnic groups were better at identifying their own versus other ethnic groups, the data file was split according to the participants’ ethnic group and was summed across age for analysis. The proportions of correct responses relating to the participants’ correct identification of their own and other ethnic groups were subjected to a one-way
chi-square analysis (Siegel, 1956). The analysis revealed a non-significant result, $\chi^2(1, N = 119) = .26, p > .05$, indicating that Anglo-Australian and Pacific Island children were equally accurate in identifying their own and other ethnic groups.

The Anglo-Australian children were able to correctly nominate their ethnic in-group with accuracy approaching 90% (see Table 3.3). At the same time, they were able to correctly identify other combined ethnic groups (in this study – Pacific Island, Vietnamese, and Aboriginals) with 69.6% accuracy. The Pacific Island children were accurate using the correct ethnic label for their own group in 81.3% of the nominations and they were accurate in 84% of their identification of other ethnic groups.

A one-way chi-square analysis was also carried out to determine if the proportion of accurate responses of the participants increased with age. The participants’ responses were analysed separately on the basis of ethnic group membership (i.e., Anglo-Australian or Pacific Islander) and comparisons made between the three age groups in relation to recognising the ethnic in-group and comparative out-groups. The result for the Anglo-Australian group participants was non-significant, $\chi^2(2, N = 53) = .35, p > .05$ indicating that there were no differences in the accuracy of ethnic in-group identification with increasing age (refer Table 3.3). However, their accuracy in identifying members of the ethnic out-group was significantly different as a function of the age of the participant, $\chi^2(2, N = 119) = 6.95, p < .05$. The 10-year-olds were more accurate than the 8-year-olds and the 6-year-olds who were not significantly different from each other.

The Pacific Islander participants showed a similar pattern to Anglo-Australian children in relation to identifying their ethnic in-group, there being no difference as a function of the participants age. However, in contrast to the Anglo-Australian
participants, when asked to identify members of the ethnic out-groups, there was no significant difference in the accuracy of the nominations between the age groups.

Table 3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th>Anglo-Australian</th>
<th>Pacific Island</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Own group</td>
<td>Other groups</td>
<td>Own group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-years</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-years</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-years</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whereas the previous analyses focused on the participants’ recognition of the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander ethnic groups, it was also of considerable interest to investigate if children were better at identifying some ethnic groups more than others. In particular, it was of interest whether the participants’ could identify the Vietnamese and Aboriginal ethnic groups as they make less of a numerical contribution to the local community than the Anglo-Australians and Pacific Islander ethnic groups. Accordingly, further analyses were conducted on the children’s proportion of correct identifications of the out-groups. The results are first presented for the Anglo-Australian and followed by the results for the Pacific Island children.

The results of the chi-square analysis on the proportion of correct identification of the individual ethnic out-groups indicated that the Anglo-Australian participants equally accurate in identifying each of the different out-groups, $\chi^2 (2, N = 59) = 1.84$, $p > .05$. The proportion of correct identifications indicated that these children were
equally cognizant of the three target ethnic out-groups (i.e., Aboriginal, Pacific Islander, and Vietnamese). Similarly, the results of the analysis for the accuracy in identifying ethnic out-groups by the Pacific Islander children were also not significant, $\chi^2 (2, N = 60) = 1.56, p > .05$. Similar to the Anglo-Australian participants, the Pacific Islander children were equally cognizant of the three target ethnic out-groups (i.e., Anglo-Australian, Vietnamese, and Aboriginal).

Additional chi-square analyses were conducted on the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Island groups separately to determine if there were any age-related changes in these results. The analysis produced a non-significant result for both the Anglo-Australian participants, $\chi^2 (4, N = 59) = 3.54, p > .05$, and the Pacific Island participants, $\chi^2 (4, N = 60) = .73, p > .05$. Thus, there were no age-related differences in either the Anglo-Australian or Pacific Islander children’s abilities to accurately identify members of the three ethnic out-groups.

**Description of Ethnic Group Membership**

An open-ended question was used to investigate if children were aware of which characteristics underpin ethnic group membership. The children were encouraged to make as many responses as they were able. These responses were categorised using Quintana’s (1994) model. Using the latter half of his first level and the second level of the model (which corresponds to the ages of interest in the current study), the participant’s responses were classified as expressing either a physical or literal perspective of ethnicity. The total numbers of physical and literal descriptors used by the participants were summed to provide a total score (see Table 3.4).
Table 3.4

*Mean Number of Physical and Literal Descriptions used by Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander Participants when Describing Basis of Ethnic Group Membership.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor type</th>
<th>Anglo-Australian</th>
<th>Pacific Island</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literal</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was further anticipated that with increasing age, the number of physical responses would decrease while there would be a corresponding increase in literal responses for both Anglo-Australian and Pacific Island participants. The total number of responses in each category as a function of ethnic group membership and age are shown in Table 3.5.

In line with expectations, there were changes in the children’s’ use of physical and literal descriptors at the different ages. That is, the participants’ responses indicated a decrease in the number of responses based on physical characteristics, while there was an increase in the number of responses based on literal characteristics of ethnicity with increasing age.

Table 3.5

*Total Number of Physical and Literal Descriptions for Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander Participants as a Function of Participant’s Age.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Anglo-Australian</th>
<th>Pacific Island</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-years</td>
<td>8-years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literal</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the findings recorded in Tables 3.4 and 3.5 give an indication of the general trend in children’s descriptions of attributes that define membership of ethnic groups, they fail to take into account the responses of individual participants. The response option for this measure allowed the participants to nominate as many responses as they wanted to. Therefore focusing on the total responses given, while informative, obscures some of the meaning of the participants’ responses.

Accordingly, the responses of the individual participants were recoded as being based on physical, literal, a combination of both of these categories, or neither category. Further, the participants’ responses were calculated as a percentage of their total responses, and the participants were classified as physical, literal, both, or neither response, if more than 65% of their responses fell into one of these categories. Two classification scores were calculated for each respondent; a classification for their description of what made a person an Anglo-Australian, and a separate classification for what made a person a Pacific Islander. This multiple classification was considered advantageous as it provided the opportunity to investigate not only the children’s overall explanation of the basis of ethnic group membership but it also allowed separate analysis based on whether the participants were describing Anglo-Australian or Pacific Island groups.

In line with Aboud (1984) and Quintana (1994), this study was interested in the proportion of physical and literal descriptors used by children to describe ethnic group membership. Accordingly, the analysis was conducted using these two categories only. Using the recoded data categories of physical and literal descriptors, analyses were conducted to investigate where differences in the response categories occurred. The primary focus of these analyses was between age groups and ethnic groups. A chi-square analysis was initially conducted on the recoded data to assess the relationship of
participants’ age to their responses, regardless of their ethnic group membership. The results produced a significant chi-square, $\chi^2 (2, N = 88) = 8.25, p < .05$, indicating that there were differences in the proportion of children using physical and literal characteristics when describing ethnic group membership as a function of their age. The proportion of participants using physical characteristics declined with age, while there was a corresponding increase in the proportion of participants using literal characteristics in their explanation of ethnic group membership. Table 3.6 contains a summary of these results.

Table 3.6  
Proportion of Total Responses of Physical and Literal Characteristics in Describing the Basis of Ethnic Group Membership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Physical characteristics</th>
<th>Literal characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-years</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-years</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-years</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To further investigate if these age-related differences were influenced by the respondent’s ethnic group, further analyses were conducted on the responses of the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander participants separately. Initial chi-square analyses were conducted on the participants’ explanations of ethnic group membership for both the ethnic in-group and the ethnic out-group, regardless of age. The analyses revealed that there was a significant difference in the use of physical and literal descriptions when Anglo-Australian children were describing membership of their ethnic in-group, $\chi^2 (1, N = 41) = 10.76, p < .05$. When describing the basis of membership in their own group, the participants used significantly more literal than physical descriptions (75%
vs. 24% respectively). In contrast, when asked to describe the basis of group membership in the Pacific Island group, there was no significant difference in the proportion of literal and physical descriptions $\chi^2 (1, N = 41) = 2.95, p > .05$ used.

When the Pacific Islander children were asked to describe the basis of membership of their ethnic in-group, again there was a significant difference in the proportion of participants using literal and physical descriptions, $\chi^2 (1, N = 44) = 17.8, p < .05$. Significantly more participants used more literal (83%) than physical (18%) descriptions when describing membership of the ethnic in-group. Again, when asked to describe what makes a person an Anglo-Australian, again, there was no difference in the proportion of literal and physical descriptions used $\chi^2 (1, N = 33) = 3.76, p > .05$.

Further analyses were interested in examining whether there were differences in the proportion of participants using physical versus literal attributes in relation to ethnic in-group and ethnic out-group membership, as a function of age. The analysis of the Anglo-Australian participants revealed a non-significant result $\chi^2 (2, N = 45) = 4.79, p > .05$, indicating the absence of age-related differences in the proportion of Anglo-Australian participants. When asked to define what makes a person a Pacific Islander, there was no significant difference in the proportion of participants using either physical or literal descriptors with increasing age, $\chi^2 (2, N = 41) = 5.23, p > .05$.

The responses of the Pacific Island participants when asked to describe what makes a person a Pacific Island were also analysed using one-way chi-square analysis. The result of the analysis when describing the in-group was significant, $\chi^2 (2, N = 44) = 6.74, p < .05$. The analyses indicated that there was no difference in the proportion of participants’ using physical and literal descriptors at 6-years of age. In comparison, there were significant differences in the proportion of participants’ using physical versus literal responses at 8-years, $\chi^2 (1, N = 13) = 13.00, p < .05$ (0% and 30%
respectively) and at 10-years, \( \chi^2 (1, N = 18) = 8.00, p < .05 \) (7% and 34% respectively). Respondents at both ages used more literal descriptors than physical. When asked to define the basis of membership to the ethnic out-group, the proportion of participants using physical or literal descriptors could not be differentiated by age \( \chi^2 (3, N = 33) = 2.01, p > .05 \).

**Discussion**

This study sought to investigate children’s ability to categorise ethnic groups and their understanding of ethnic group membership. In particular, it was concerned with documenting the children’s awareness of the ethnic groups that constitute their local community. The results indicated that both ethnic majority and minority children were capable of recognising members of ethnic groups with high levels of accuracy. The results also showed that the 6-year-olds were as skilled at this task as the older children. These results provide further support for earlier research (Clark & Clark, 1947) and indicate that children as young as 5-years are aware of, and can differentiate between, the ethnic groups that are represented in their community.

Previous research (Newman et al., 1983) has reported that ethnic majority children are highly accurate in recognising the ethnic in-group. Although a different methodology was used in the present study, the results are nevertheless comparable. The accuracy of the responses of the Pacific Islander participants was also comparable with previous research.

These results also indicate that rather than operating on a gross categorisation (‘us’ versus ‘all others’), the participants accurately recognised several different ethnic groups. That is to say, children did not rely exclusively on physical characteristics that were readily observable. Rather they used their knowledge and understanding of different ethnic groups to differentiate between groups that seem physically similar.
Two possible mechanisms might be proposed to account for this result. First, the greater capacity of the older children to “see” beyond the physical markers of ethnicity (and who use unobservable characteristics to define ethnic group membership) might be a reflection of their increasing cognitive development. Second, children’s social knowledge increases as they are exposed to, and interact with, ethnic out-groups.

The current study failed to find age-related increases in the accuracy of this information, indicating that children who live in multi-ethnic communities are aware of different ethnic groups from as young as 5-years. This result also raises the point that perhaps ethnic categorisation is not solely dependent on cognitive development but that social experiences and exposure to different ethnic groups also play an important role in this process.

While children are able to easily and correctly identify and label the ethnic groups that reside in their community from the time they commence formal education, their understanding of what constitutes membership of their ethnic in-group and ethnic out-groups is expressed differently. The present results lend further support to previous research (Aboud, 1984; Alejandro-Wright, 1985; Bernal et al., 1993; Quintana, 1994; Quintana & Vera, 1999; Quintana et al., 2000), which indicated that children make use of physical and literal descriptors when accounting for ethnic group membership. The results indicated that the children in this study were aware that their ethnic group membership was based on more than physical similarity between members; thus, they used more literal than physical descriptors to account for this membership. However, when characterising membership of ethnic out-groups, they relied on both physical and literal descriptors. It is possible that children rely more on physical markers (e.g., skin colour and facial features) than literal (e.g., language and/or religion) when their knowledge concerning particular ethnic groups is not extensive. That is to say, although
children may be aware of various community ethnic groups, until they have sustained contact (through school or play situations) they are not entirely sure of the defining characteristics of these groups and must rely more on physical characteristics to determine ethnic group membership.

Of course, it might well be argued that children’s patterns of responses were a result of their limited cognitive development. Indeed, the increasing use of literal descriptors with age makes this a plausible explanation. However, a lack of cognitive sophistication fails to account for the lack of difference between ages in their use of literal descriptors when describing the basis of membership in the ethnic in-group.

While cognitive and social processes have been suggested as possible underlying mechanisms guiding this knowledge and understanding, neither were specifically tested in this study. Accordingly, the next study sought to identify the importance of the contribution of cognitive and social factors in accounting for the development of ethnic awareness in children.

**Study 1C: The Influence of Cognitive and Social Knowledge Processes**

*Introduction*

While the previous study examined children’s accuracy in identifying ethnic groups and their understanding of the basis of ethnic group membership, it did not investigate the factors that might have influenced their decision-making process. To this end, a number of factors were investigated in this study that might, either on their own or in combination, shed light on the processes that drive the development of ethnic awareness. The factors investigated in this study included both cognitive skills (classification and ethnic constancy) and social knowledge.

There is clear evidence in the literature that cognitive development involves the acquisition of a range of skills that increase in complexity and sophistication with
increasing age (Flavell, 1963). In relation to the current study, the acquisition of concrete operations is of primary importance as it involves the application of logical operations and principles (in particular, conservation and classification) to interpret experiences based on objective rather than intuitive processes. (Aboud, 1984; Flavell, 1963; Marcus & Overton, 1978; Ocampo, Knight, & Bernal, 1997).

Cognitive Classification and Ethnic Awareness

Classification has been defined as the ability to organise objects into categories or classes (Berger, 1998). Classification is acknowledged as a skill that is refined when children move into the concrete-operational stage of Piaget’s (1952) model of cognitive development. During the preoperational phase, young children are able to classify objects on the basis of one dimension or salient feature (e.g., colour). However, it is not until the attainment of concrete-operations that they are able to see beyond the most salient feature and are able to regroup the objects using other similar features. According to Piaget’s (1952) model, it is not until approximately age 7-years that children begin to understand that objects can be grouped on the basis of multiple dimensions. These multiple dimensions include shape, size, and colour.

Previous studies have investigated the link between children’s cognitive development and ethnic constancy and their ethnic awareness and attitudes (Aboud, 1984; Bernstein, Zimmerman, Werner-Wilson, & Vosberg, 2000; Bigler, Jones, & Loblinder, 1997; Bigler & Liben, 1993; Semaj, 1980) while Marcus and Overton (1978) investigated the link between cognitive development and gender constancy. As we have seen, Aboud (1984) and Semaj (1980) have championed the cognitive approach in accounting for changes in ethnic awareness. Both of these authors reported significant correlations between conservation and ethnic constancy. Both Aboud and Semaj concluded that the ability to conserve mass was related to the understanding of ethnic
constancy, such that, the acquisition of conservation facilitated the development of ethnic constancy.

Bigler and Liben (1992, 1993) have examined the role that classification plays in ethnic stereotyping and attitudes. Bigler and Liben (1993) examined the influence of classification and ethnic stereotyping on children’s memory for counter-stereotypic information. Their results showed that ethnic stereotyping and multiple classification skills were related to improved memory for counter-stereotypic information. In addition, Bigler (1995) reported a link between multiple classification skills and ethnic attitudes; such that children with more advanced classification skills demonstrated more positive attitudes toward other classroom members than children with less developed classification skills. In contrast, other researchers have considered the contribution of social forces in children’s development of ethnic awareness as being important (Katz & Kofkin, 1997; Ocampo et al., 1997).

Because the present study was interested in children’s ethnic awareness, including their ability to recognise and identify different ethnic groups, a classification task was chosen as a measure of cognitive ability. Thus, the present task measured the participants’ ability to classify stimuli on an increasing number of dimensions. The task was a modification and extension of one reported by Inhelder and Piaget (1964) and was initially devised to investigate children’s ability to form multiple collections of objects based on a similarity of attributes.

In addition to a measure of classification, the development of ethnic constancy was also examined. As noted earlier, ethnic constancy has been conceptualised as the understanding that a person’s ethnicity is immutable despite the passage of time or superficial changes to the person’s appearance. Previous research has also indicated that differences exist between dominant and ethnic minority children in terms of the
acquisition of ethnic constancy (Aboud, 1984; Semaj, 1980; Vaughan, 1963, 1964b). Given children’s increased social exposure to ethnic groups and the social changes that have occurred in the 20 years since the last study by Aboud, it was considered possible that such changes might have had an influence on children’s understanding of the immutability of ethnic group membership.

**Social Knowledge and Ethnic Awareness**

Another potentially important aspect in the development of children’s ethnic awareness is their growing attentiveness to social stereotypes (e.g., Augoustinos & Rosewarne, 2001; Taft, 1959). In addition, children become increasingly aware of the status differences that exist between the ethnic groups in their community (Ruble et al., 2004). The influence of this social knowledge in the development of ethnic awareness has been shown repeatedly in the literature (Averhart & Bigler, 1997; Katz & Kofkin, 1997; Radke & Trager, 1950; van Ausdale & Feagin, 1996; Vaughan, 1964a). This research has indicated that children are aware of group status differences within their community, and in the case of ethnic minority children, some may choose not to identify with their ethnic in-group because of the low community status accorded to this group.

Building on previous research, the current study sought to investigate if there were differences in the children’s level of social knowledge including knowledge of the differences in the status of the community’s ethnic groups.

This study sought to investigate the contribution of cognitive and social knowledge processes in ethnic awareness of ethnic majority (Anglo-Australian) and ethnic minority (Pacific Islander) children. In particular, it sought to investigate the following questions:
1. Are there differences between the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander participants in relation to their levels of ethnic constancy?

2. Is there a relationship between cognitive ability (classification) and ethnic constancy?

3. Are there differences between the level of social knowledge of the Pacific Islander participants and the Anglo-Australian participants?

4. Are there age related increases in social knowledge in both the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander participants?

5. Are there differences in the responses of the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander participants when asked to indicate social status of the various ethnic groups living in their community?

**Method**

*Participants*

The participants in this study were those who participated in Study 1b.

*Materials*

*Response Booklet.*

A response booklet was prepared. This booklet was used by the experimenter to record the participant’s score for the classification task, responses to the items assessing ethnic constancy and social knowledge (refer Appendix C).

*Classification task*

The stimuli consisted of 24 computed-generated picture-cards presented as two sets, each consisting of 12 pictures. Each picture measured 150mm x 105mm and was printed on 80gsm white paper and laminated. The first set of picture-cards depicted a car (six cards) and a boat (six cards). These cards were further differentiated by degree
of colour: they were presented in either a colour (three cars and three boats) or a grayscale format (three cars and three boats). The second set of picture-cards was modified from Bernstein et al. (2000) and Bigler et al. (1997). These were presented as grayscale photographs of a girl or a boy (of the same approximate age as the participants) reading the same book, or talking on the same telephone. These activities were chosen as they were well-known activities to the participants. The photos were presented in monochrome to make the child and the activity salient. There were three photos of a girl reading a book, and three of her talking on the telephone. There were also three photographs of the boy reading and three talking on the telephone. Refer Appendix B.

This activity was scored from 0 to 2. A score of 0 indicted that the child was unable to sort the cards on any dimension, 1 indicated that the child could sort on one dimension but not the other (e.g., the participant sorted the picture-cards by shape, which resulted in a group of cars and a group of boats, or the cards were sorted by colour - a group of coloured cars and a group of coloured boats). A score of 2 indicted that the child was able to sort on both dimensions.

*Ethnic stability*

Three questions were modified from the gender constancy and stability scale (Slaby & Frey, 1975). This measure was introduced by the experimenter with the phrase “Do you remember, you said before that you belonged to the …ethnic group? (The name of the participant’s ethnic group was inserted by the experimenter). Once the participant had responded, the experimenter proceeded to ask three questions;

1. “what ethnic group did you belong to when you were born?
2. “what ethnic group will you belong to next year?’ (The following qualifier was added for the younger children …when you are in grade X)?
3. “what ethnic group will you belong to when you grow up to be an adult?” (The following qualifier was for the younger age groups was added … like mum or dad?)

The children’s responses to each item were recorded and scored 0 (if their ethnic group answer was incorrect (i.e. did not match either their parents or their own ethnic group nomination from the ethnic categorisation items) or 1 (if their response matched the ethnic group nominated previously). The individual items were summed to provide a total score with a range from 0 to 3.

**Ethnic constancy**

This measure was modified from Semaj (1980) to accommodate the ethnic groups in the current sample. Each question initially elicited a YES/NO response from the participants, and was followed by a question which examined the participants’ reason for their initial response. The questions were,

1. is it possible for you to become (a white Australian/ Pacific Islander) if you were to put on a wig to change the colour of your hair? This was followed by the question “Why?” or “Why not?”
2. what if you changed the colour of your face with makeup or face paint? Why or Why not?
3. what if you put on a wig and changed the colour of your face with makeup or face paint? Why or why not?

In each case, the child’s response was recorded verbatim for later scoring. In the first instance, the participant’s responses were coded ‘YES’ which indicated that ethnic constancy had not yet been attained. This response was followed by the “why” question, or ‘NO’ which indicated that the participants understood that ethnic group membership could not be easily changed (i.e., ethnic constancy had been attained). This
response was followed by the “why not” question. The participants were also asked an additional question investigating their justification for their response.

The responses were coded according to four criteria. The first was when the participant was unable to give a reason for their response. If the participant indicated that change was not possible, their responses were coded as being based on affective reasoning (e.g., “because I/they don’t want to”), perceptual reasoning (e.g., “still looks Australian/Pacific Island, some hair and skin visible”), or internal reasoning (e.g., “underneath all the changes, still Australian/Pacific Island”). The combination of the response (YES/NO) and the justification for their response (affective, perceptual, or internal) produced the following score for each of the items; 0 = Yes (incorrect response), 1 = no, with an affective justification, 2 = no, with a perceptual justification, and 3 = no, with an internal justification.

**Social Knowledge**

Social knowledge was assessed using three sets of questions. First, participants were asked to name as many ethnic groups residing in their community as they could. Second, they indicated the group they considered to be the most important/powerful ethnic group, (“Of these groups, which is the best group, the group that is the most important, the group that has the best houses and cars and the group that has the most money”). The group they considered the second most important ethnic group (“Of these groups, which is the next most important ethnic group, the group that is still important, and still have nice houses and cars, and money, but is not as good as the … ethnic group?”). Finally, they were asked about the least important group (“What about the worst group? You know the group that is the least important, the group that lives in the worst houses and has the worst cars?”). The participant’s responses were recorded verbatim. Third, participants responded to the same questions from the perspective of a
child from the ethnic out-group (i.e., an Anglo-Australian would respond for a Pacific Islander). The participants’ responses were recorded by the experimenter.

Procedure

Time was initially spent establishing rapport between the participant and the experimenter. Once established, the experimenter proceeded to work through the questions in the response booklet.

Classification task.

The order that the sets of cards were sorted by the participant was counterbalanced. The participant was handed the first set of cards (either shapes [cars or boats] or activities [book or telephone]) and given the following instruction, “here are some pictures, could you put the pictures which go together in the same pile?” Once this was completed, they were asked “is there another way that the pictures can be sorted that is different to what you have just done?” If the participant indicated that there was another way the cards could be sorted, they were asked to provide a demonstration with the instruction, “Can you show me?” If the participant responded that there was no alternative way of sorting the cards or were unable to correctly re-sort them, the cards were collected. The participants were handed the second set of picture-cards and the instructions were repeated.

Ethnic stability.

The participants were asked to indicate the ethnic group membership of their parents and their own ethnic group membership. The children’s’ responses were recorded and were followed by the questions in the response booklet.
Ethnic constancy.

The participants responded to the questions in the response booklet pertaining to ethnic constancy over context.

Social knowledge.

The participants were given the following instructions “there are many different ethnic groups of people living in your community, people that live near you or go to this school. Can you name as many of these ethnic groups that you can think of?” They were then asked to indicate which group they considered to be the most important/powerful ethnic group, the second most important groups and the least important groups. The participant’s responses were recorded verbatim.

Following this, the participants were shown a photograph of a member of the ethnic out-group who was matched in age and gender to the participant. They were asked to repeat the procedure, this time, taking the perspective of a child from the ethnic out-group. That is, an Anglo-Australian would indicate which groups they thought a Pacific Islander would consider the most, the second most, and the least important group while a Pacific Islander would respond how they thought an Anglo-Australian would. Again, the participants’ responses were recorded by the experimenter. At the conclusion of the interview, the children were thanked for their time and were returned to their classroom.

Results

Classification Task

Since the scores from the two cognitive classification tasks (shapes and gender) were significantly correlated \((r = .64)\), the scores were combined to produce a composite score that ranged between 0 (could not classify either of the sets of picture-
cards on any dimension) to 4 (could classify both sets of picture-cards on two dimensions).

Sorting frequency was then subjected to an independent samples (Kruskal-Wallis) chi-square analysis (Siegel, 1956). The analysis indicated a significant difference in classification ability as a function of age $H(2, N = 119) = 8.569, p < .05$. The results indicated that as the participants increased in age, there was an increase in their ability to accurately classify on an increasing number of dimensions. The percentage of children who were able to classify on all four dimensions increased from 6-years (27.5%) to 8-years (41.5%) to 10-years (60.5%), whereas the number of children sorting on only two dimensions decreased from 6-years (50.0%) to 8-years (29.3%) to 10-years (15.8%). Mann-Whitney chi-square analyses were conducted to investigate differences based on the participant’s ethnicity and gender. The results revealed that there were no differences in the participants’ ability to classify on increasing number of dimensions as a result of their gender ($U = 1638.5, N_1 = 56, N_2 = 63, p > .05$) or ethnic group membership ($U = 1593.5, N_1 = 59, N_2 = 60, p > .05$).

**Ethnic Stability**

The total score (sum of the three item scores) were analysed using a 3 (age: 6 – vs. 8-vs 10-years) x 2 (gender: male vs. female) x 2 (ethnic in-group: Anglo-Australian vs. Pacific Islander) ANOVA. Exploratory data analysis was conducted to ensure that the data met the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance for ANOVA. An alpha level of .05 was used as the significance level for all the analyses and Duncan’s Multiple Range Test ($\alpha = .05$) was used to assess the significance of differences between cell means. Partial $\eta^2$ is reported as an estimate of effect size.

The analysis revealed two main effects which were qualified by a significant three-way interaction. A significant main effect for *ethnic group* $F(1,107) = 31.96, p <$
.0005, partial $\eta^2 = .23$, indicated that the Anglo-Australian participants ($M = 2.83, SD = .59$) demonstrated a greater understanding of the permanence of ethnicity over time (ethnic stability) than did the Pacific Islander participants ($M = 2.02, SD = .87$). A significant main effect of participant age was also revealed, $F(2,107) = 3.05$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$. The 10-year-olds expressed a greater understanding of the permanence of ethnic group membership ($M = 2.68, SD = .66$) than the 8-year-olds ($M = 2.22, SD = .88$). There was no significant difference between the 6- and 8-year-olds on this measure ($Ms = 2.38, 2.22$, $SDs = .95, .88$ respectively). These main effects were qualified by a significant three-way age x gender x ethnic group interaction $F(2,107) = 3.26, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$ (refer Figure 3.1).
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Figure 3.1 Age x gender x ethnic group interaction on ethnic stability.
An examination of the cell means using Duncan’s Multiple Range Test indicated that, at each of the ages (i.e., 6-, 8-, & 10-years), the Anglo-Australian girls demonstrated the highest level of ethnic stability understanding (i.e., they endorsed the view that once you were born Anglo-Australian you would continue to be Anglo-Australian throughout your life). In comparison, the Pacific Islander girls showed a gradual increase in the understanding of the temporal ethnic stability. By 10-years of age, their understanding of this stability was significantly greater ($M = 2.50, SD = .76$) than at 6- ($M = 1.67; SD = .82$) and 8-years ($M = 1.70; SD = .82$), which did not differ significantly. However, their understanding was still significantly less than the Anglo-Australian girls at any age. From another perspective, there were significant differences at each of the ages for the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander girls, such that at each age the Anglo-Australian girls were displaying a higher understanding of the stability of ethnic group membership than the Pacific Islander girls.

A different pattern of results was revealed in relation to the boys’ responses. There was no significant difference for the Anglo-Australian boys in their level of ethnic constancy between 6-and 8-years ($Ms = 2.55, 2.75$ and $SDs = .76, .78$, respectively). However, by 10-years, their level of understanding was significantly greater than the 6- and 8-year-olds and was comparable to the 10-year-old girls understanding ($M = 2.38, SD = .91$).

The pattern of understanding for the Pacific Island boys was quite different. The responses of the 8-year-olds ($M = 2.50, SD = .75$) showed significantly less understanding of ethnic stability than the 6-year-olds ($M = 1.70, SD = .76$). The 10-year-olds ($M = 2.11, SD = .93$) also showed greater ethnic stability understanding than the 8-year-olds. However their understanding was significantly less than that of the 6-year-olds ($Ms = 2.11, 2.50; SDs = .93, .75$ respectively).
From another perspective, at 6-years of age, there was no significant difference between the responses of the Anglo-Australian ($M = 2.50, SD = .75$) and the Pacific Islander boys ($M = 2.55, SD = 1.00$). However, at both 8- and 10-years, the 8-year-old Anglo-Australians were showing greater understanding of ethnic stability than the Pacific Islanders.

Still further, the result indicated that there were differences between the levels of ethnic stability for the 6- and 8-year-old Anglo-Australians, such that girls demonstrated greater understanding of the stability of ethnic group membership than similar aged boys. However, this difference was not present at 10-years. The responses of the Pacific Islander participants showed that the boys and girls had an equal understanding of ethnic stability at 6-years, by 8-years, the boys were demonstrating a greater understanding. However, by age 10-years, the Pacific Islander girls were demonstrating a higher understanding of ethnic stability that matched the 10-year-old Anglo-Australian girls.

**Ethnic Constancy**

The participants’ individual item scores were summed to provide a total score for the analysis. This summed score had a range from 0 to 9, where a higher score was indicative of a greater understanding of the unchanging nature of ethnic group membership in different contexts.

Using the summed score of the items, the data were subjected to a 3 (age: 6- vs. 8- vs. 10-years) x 2 (gender: male vs. female) x 2 (ethnic group: Anglo-Australian vs. Pacific Island) ANOVA. Exploratory data analysis was conducted to ensure that the data met the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance for ANOVA. An alpha level of .05 was used as the significance level for all the analyses and Duncan’s
Multiple Range Test (\(\alpha = .05\)) was used to assess the significance of differences between cell means. Partial \(\eta^2\) is reported as an estimate of effect size.

The analysis revealed two main effects, which were further qualified by two interactions. There was a significant main effect of \textit{age}, \(F(2,107) = 14.69, p < .0005, \eta^2 = .22\). Comparisons of the cell means using Duncan’s Multiple Range Test showed that there was no significant difference in the level of ethnic constancy between the 6- (\(M = 3.45, SD = 2.50\)) and 8-year-olds (\(M = 4.32, SD = 2.51\)) but, both groups displayed significantly less understanding of the permanence of ethnic group membership than the 10-year-olds (\(M = 6.34, SD = 2.43\)). This main effect was qualified by an \textit{age x gender} interaction \(F(2,107) = 8.662, p < .0005\), partial \(\eta^2 = .139\) (refer Figure 3.2).

![Figure 3.2 Age x gender interaction on ethnic constancy over context](image)

Comparisons of the cell means using Duncan’s Multiple Range Test indicated that the 6-year-old girls (\(M = 2.00, SD = 2.02\)) were significantly more likely indicate that ethnicity could be changed by making superficial physical changes to appearance than the 8-year-olds (\(M = 4.78, SD = 2.50\)). The 10-year-old girls (\(M = 6.53, SD = 3.5\))
2.20) were significantly more aware of the immutability of ethnic group membership than either the 6- or 8-year olds.

In contrast, the responses of the boys indicated that the responses of the 6-year-olds ($M = 5.05, SD = 2.01$) were significantly higher than those of the 8-year-olds ($Ms = 3.72, SD = 2.37$). There were also significant differences on the understanding of ethnic constancy between the 10-year-olds ($M = 6.16, SD = 2.67$) and the younger boys, indicating a greater understanding of the immutability of ethnic group membership despite superficial appearance changes. From another perspective, the 6-year-old boys displayed greater ethnic constancy than similar aged girls. There were no significant differences in the level of ethnic constancy knowledge between the 8 and 10-year-old boys and girls.

The analysis also revealed a significant main effect for participant ethnic group, $F(1, 107) = 6.45, p < .01, \eta^2 = .06$. The Anglo-Australian participants displayed greater understanding of the immutability of ethnic group membership than the Pacific Islander participants ($Ms = 5.31, 4.05$ and $SDs = 2.67, 2.68$ respectively). This main effect was qualified by an age x ethnic group interaction which approached significance $F(2,107) = 2.753, p = .06$, partial $\eta^2 = .049$ (refer Figure 3.3).
Comparisons of the cell means using Duncan’s Multiple Range Test indicated that the 10-year-old Anglo-Australian participants ($M = 7.43$, $SD = 1.50$) displayed significantly greater understanding of the immutability of ethnicity despite superficial changes to appearance than did the 10-year-old Pacific Islander participants ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 2.71$). In contrast, there was no significant difference in the level of ethnic constancy displayed by either the Anglo-Australian or Pacific Islander 6-year-olds ($Ms = 3.75, 3.15$ and $SDs = 2.53, 2.54$ respectively) or the 8-year-olds ($Ms = 4.56, 4.13$ and $SDs = 2.33, 2.63$ respectively). From another perspective, there were increases in ethnic constancy from 6- to 10-years for the Anglo-Australian participants, whereas there were no differences as a function of age for the Pacific Islander participants.

From another perspective, while there was no significant difference between the 6- and 8-year-old Anglo-Australians ethnic constancy ($Ms = 3.75, 4.56$ and $SDs = 2.53, 2.33$ respectively), the Anglo-Australian 10-year-olds ($M = 7.43$, $SD = 1.50$) demonstrated significantly greater ethnic constancy than the younger participants. In contrast, the responses for the Pacific Islander participants revealed a different pattern of responses to those of the Anglo-Australian participants. There was a significant
increase in ethnic constancy from 6- to 8-years ($M_s = 3.15, 4.13$ and $SD_s = 2.53, 2.63$ respectively). In contrast, there was no significant increase in the level of ethnic constancy from 8- to 10-years ($M = 5.00, SD = 2.71$).

While these results were interesting, the participants’ explanations of their responses were of considerably greater significance. The participants’ responses were categorised according to whether their reason was based on affective (no desire to change), perceptual (there is skin or hair showing), or internal reasons (underneath all the changes the individual remains unchanged). Each of the superficial changes were analysed separately.

As indicated in Table 3.7, chi-square analysis revealed significant differences in the reason given for lack of change when putting on a wig, $\chi^2 (2, N = 76) = 23.3$, $p < .05$. Significantly more participants indicated that ethnic group could not be changed by giving a perceptual reason rather than either an internal or an affective reason. The reasons given for the participants’ responses that ethnic group will not change if someone painted their face a different colour were also significantly different from chance, $\chi^2 (2, N = 81) = 32.9$, $p < .05$. Again, there were more perceptual reasons given than internal or affective. The responses to the item put on a wig and paint your face were also significantly different from chance, $\chi^2 (2, N = 61) = 17.1$, $p < .05$. For the first time, the participants were more likely to indicate that one could not change because underneath the changed hair and face colour one’s ethnic group was constant, rather than because original skin and hair may be showing or because one does not want to change.
Table 3.7

Proportion of Responses Giving Affective, Perceptual, or Internal Reasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Perceptual</th>
<th>Internal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Put on a wig</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint your face</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint face &amp; put on wig</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>52.48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations between Measures of Cognitive Development

It has been suggested previously (Aboud, 1984; Semaj, 1980) that ethnic constancy is a cognitive achievement based on cognitive processes, particularly, concrete operations. As such it would be reasonable to expect that the three cognitive concepts would be highly correlated if indeed they were dependent on the same underlying process. To investigate if there was any relationship between these cognitive functions, the three measures were correlated and the results are shown in Table 3.8.

Table 3.8

Correlations between Measures of Cognitive Functioning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Ethnic Constancy</th>
<th>Ethnic Stability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Constancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

The table indicates that two ethnic constancy measures were significantly correlated. However, the results indicated that while classification was significantly correlated with ethnic constancy, it was not correlated with ethnic stability.
Social Knowledge

Participants’ social knowledge was measured by a number of items. In the first instance, the children were asked to name as many ethnic groups that they could think of that lived in their local community. The total number of ethnic groups recalled by the participants was designed to test whether the ethnic minority group would display greater ethnic awareness than the ethnic majority group and therefore would be able to name more community ethnic groups than the latter group of participants. The children’s nominations were summed to provide a total score. These totals were then differentiated according to age and ethnic group membership. Refer Table 3.9. As the children were encouraged to make as many nominations as possible their multiple responses rendered the data unsuitable for further statistical analysis. However, this table indicates that there was little difference in the total nominations of community groups by both Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander respondents. Table 3.9 also shows little difference in the total number of community groups named at each of the three ages.

Table 3.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Participant ethnicity</th>
<th>Anglo-Australian</th>
<th>Pacific Island</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Mean)</td>
<td>(Mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-years</td>
<td></td>
<td>54 (2.70)</td>
<td>61 (3.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-years</td>
<td></td>
<td>84 (4.67)</td>
<td>102 (4.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-years</td>
<td></td>
<td>120 (5.71)</td>
<td>115 (6.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total group nominations</td>
<td></td>
<td>258 (4.36)</td>
<td>278 (4.75)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To further investigate the participant’s social knowledge, three open-ended questions were asked. These questions investigated the children’s understanding of the relative importance (status ranking) of social groups in the community. The participants were asked to indicate which of the groups from their list they considered the most important or highest status group, the second most important, and the least important or lowest status group. The most commonly occurring response combination for the highest, second highest, and the lowest status group were included in the analysis. The responses of the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander participants were analysed separately. Table 3.10 records the response of the Anglo-Australians.

Table 3.10  
*Proportion of Nominations of Group Status by Anglo-Australian Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group Nomination</th>
<th>Highest Status</th>
<th>Second-highest</th>
<th>Lowest Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Australian</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total proportion of responses</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way chi-square analyses on the responses of the Anglo-Australian participants on their rating of social status comparing their responses for nomination of the highest status group $\chi^2 (2, N = 53) = 63.55, p < .05$, the second highest status group $\chi^2 (3, N = 53) = 12.60, p < .05$, and the lowest status group $\chi^2 (2, N = 53) = 23.25, p < .05$ showed that all the distributions were significantly different from chance. These
participants nominated their ethnic in-group as the highest social status, the Pacific Island group was nominated as the second highest social status group, and the Aboriginal group was nominated as the lowest status community group.

The responses to the same questions investigating perceived social status made by the Pacific Islander participants were also subjected to a chi-square analysis (see Table 3.11). When asked to nominate which group they considered having the highest social status, the participants did not discriminate between their own and the Anglo-Australian group, $\chi^2 (2, N = 54) = .32, p > .05$. Significantly more Pacific Islanders than expected by chance nominated their group as the second-highest status group, $\chi^2 (2, N = 39) = 26.46, p < .05$. The participants also indicated that the Aboriginal group was the lowest status group $\chi^2 (2, N = 58) = 25.80, p < .05$.

Table 3.11
Proportion of Nominations of Group Status by Pacific Islander Participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group Nomination</th>
<th>Highest Status</th>
<th>Second-highest</th>
<th>Lowest Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Australian</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total proportion of responses</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: dashes (--) indicate no nominations in this category.

To investigate whether the participants were responding using an ethnocentric bias, they were asked the same questions but were required to respond on behalf of
another child from the ethnic out-group. The responses of the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander participants were again analysed separately using chi-square analyses.

When asked to nominate which of the community groups the Pacific Island child would consider the highest status, the Anglo-Australians indicated (see Table 3.12) that they would consider their ethnic in-group (i.e. Pacific Island) most important, $\chi^2 (2, N = 54) = 12.52$ $p < .05$. Their responses to which group a Pacific Island child would consider as the second-highest status group was also significant, $\chi^2 (2, N = 54) = 14.00$, $p < .05$. The Anglo-Australian participants indicated that a Pacific Islander child would nominate the Anglo-Australian group as the second highest status group. The chi-square result for the nomination for the lowest status group was also significant, $\chi^2 (5, N = 54) = 6.08$, $p < .05$, the Anglo-Australian participants indicated that in their opinion a Pacific Island child would think that the Aboriginal group had the lowest status.

Table 3.12
*Proportion of Nominations of Group Status by Anglo-Australian Participants on Behalf of Members of the Ethnic Out-Group (Pacific Islanders).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group nomination</th>
<th>Highest status Nomination</th>
<th>Second-highest Nomination</th>
<th>Lowest status Nomination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Australian</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Proportion</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: dashes (--) indicate no nominations in this category.

Similarly, the Pacific Island participants were asked to indicate which groups an Anglo-Australian child would consider the highest status, the second highest status and
the lowest status group. Again, significant results on all three items were revealed (see Table 3.13). A large proportion of Pacific Islander participants indicated that, in their opinion, an Anglo-Australian child would nominate their ethnic in-group (i.e. Anglo-Australian) as having the highest status, $\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 37.23$, $p < .05$. When asked which group an Anglo-Australian child would think was the second-highest status group, the majority thought that an Anglo-Australian child would nominate the Pacific Islander group, $\chi^2 (2, N = 39) = 35.37$, $p < .05$. When asked which would be the least important group, the participants indicated that an Anglo-Australian would nominate the Aboriginal group, $\chi^2 (1, N = 30) = 2.19$, $p < .05$.

Table 3.13
Proportion of Nominations of Group Status by Pacific Islander Participants on behalf of Members of the Ethnic Out-Group (Anglo-Australian).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group nomination</th>
<th>Highest status nomination</th>
<th>Second-highest nomination</th>
<th>Lowest status nomination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Australian</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total proportions</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: dashes (--) indicate no nominations in this category.

Discussion

The aim of this study was to examine differences in the cognitive and social knowledge processes in Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander children at different ages, using a number of measures, including their ability to recognise ethnic groups and their understanding of the immutability of ethnic group membership over context and
time. This study also sought to explore difference in social and status knowledge by these children as a function of their ethnic group membership and age.

Classification

In accordance with previous literature (Aboud, 1984; Flavell, 1963; Semaj, 1980; Ocampo et al., 1997) and as expected, there were age-related changes in children’s classification ability. The results showed that as children increased in age, their ability to classify objects on an increasing number of dimensions increased. As this thesis only focused on cognitive development as it relates to ethnic constancy, the results of the classification task will be discussed in conjunction with these other measures.

Ethnic Stability and Constancy

The present study measured children’s understanding of the immutability of ethnic group membership over two contexts; stability of membership over time and across different contexts. These results will be discussed individually.

Ethnic stability.

The present study adapted the methodology used in gender stability research to explore ethnic stability in Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander children. The present results are consistent with studies that have reported age-related differences in children’s understanding of gender stability (de Lisi & Gallagher, 1991; Slaby & Frey, 1975). That is, the level of understanding reported by the 10-year-olds was significantly greater than the understanding of either the 6- and 8-year-olds. The results further failed to reveal a difference in this understanding between these two age groups. The analysis also indicated that the participants’ ethnic group membership influenced their understanding and expression of ethnic stability. The Anglo-Australian participants indicating greater understanding of ethnic stability compared to the Pacific Islander
participants. This result has highlighted difference between the ethnic groups in their understanding of the concept of ethnic stability. The reason for this difference is not immediately clear and without additional research, and conclusions drawn are open to speculation.

Bhogle & Seethalakshmi, (1992) reported gender differences in children’s level of gender stability knowledge, such that girls demonstrated a higher level of understanding than boys. A similar finding was also revealed in the present study, although these differences were observed within the interaction between age, gender, and the participants’ ethnic group. The results indicated that Anglo-Australian girls (regardless of age) displayed a higher level of ethnic stability understanding, than the younger Anglo-Australian boys, but the 10-year-old boys matched their level of understanding. On the other hand, the Pacific Islander girls showed increases in their understanding of ethnic stability with age, while the Pacific Islander boys showed the greatest variability in their responses.

The underlying reason for the variability in ethnic stability of the Pacific Islander boys at the three ages is not immediately obvious. These results suggest that in contrast to the both the Anglo-Australian and the Pacific Islander girls, Pacific Islander boys become less accurate in their understanding as they get older. This explanation seems unlikely as it runs counter to the other results on this measure. A more plausible reason is that the 6-year-olds are simply guessing and their responses are not representative of the level of understanding. Further the discrepancy between the responses of the Pacific Islander girls and boys also calls into question the reliability of their results. However, without further investigation this interpretation is speculative.

The present results indicate that there are a number of forces operating that influence children’s development of ethnic stability, and that these forces are not the
same as those that influence the development of gender stability. One influence might be the degree of ethnic mix within the local community, such that exposure to generations of ethnic group members might consolidate the understanding of ethnic stability. Further research in this area is imperative to further identify these influences and to examine their contribution to the understanding of ethnic stability.

Although the results have reported higher levels of ethnic stability understanding by the Anglo-Australian participants compared to the Pacific Islander participants, it should be noted that none of the participants scored less than 50% accuracy in their responses. This would indicate that both ethnic majority and ethnic minority children understand that ethnicity is stable over time, although at different levels of understanding.

*Ethnic constancy.*

These results also shed light on the development of ethnic majority and minority children’s understanding that ethnicity is immutable despite superficial physical changes. When the responses of the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander participants are considered together, they show that children as young as 6-years demonstrate awareness that ethnicity is constant despite changes in physical appearance. In contrast, Semaj (1980) reported that the majority of the young African-American children in his study did not consistently demonstrate ethnic constancy (i.e., responding that change was possible) until they were about 11-years-old, which is significantly older than the present sample. Similarly, Aboud (1984) reported that ethnic constancy was not fully established in Anglo-Canadian children until 8-years although she noted that was present in some of the 5-year-olds. Using a doll classification measure, Vaughan (1963) also reported that both the Maori and Anglo-New Zealand children were unable to ignore incongruent visual cues when nominating the ethnicity of the Maori doll. For
example, it was not until the children were about 9- or 10-years old that they were able to consistently indicate the correct ethnicity of the Maori doll when it was dressed in European clothes, although more than 50% of the Anglo-New Zealand 7-year-olds were correct in their responses. The present results suggest that children living in multi-ethnic communities acquire this knowledge much earlier than previously suggested. In the present study, 70% of the 6-year-olds reported that ethnicity could not change despite changes in appearance.

The present study further extends our knowledge of the development of ethnic constancy because, unlike some previous research, which was conducted on a single ethnic group (Aboud used dominant Anglo-Canadians, Semaj used African-Americans), the present study provided a direct comparison of an ethnic majority and an ethnic minority group on this dimension.

The results of this study indicated that there were differences in level of ethnic constancy between the ethnic majority and minority group. The reason for the differences between the groups is not immediately clear. The differences cannot be accounted for by cognitive developmental processes as the results of the classification task failed to identify differences between the ethnic groups. In addition, the possible contribution of factors other than cognitive-based abilities was highlighted by the low correlations between the cognitive measure and ethnic stability and constancy. These low correlations hint that processes other than cognitive development contribute to children’s understanding of the permanence of ethnic group membership over both time and context. It is possible that these differences might be accounted for by social factors, in particular, knowledge of status differences between community groups.

At each age, the Anglo-Australian participants showed greater ethnic constancy than the Pacific Islanders, although the responses of both groups never dropped below
65% accuracy indicating that both groups were demonstrating ethnic constancy. The most interesting intergroup difference was found with the 10-year-olds. At this age, there was still a relatively small number of Pacific Islander participants who indicted that ethnicity was able to be changed. The motivation for their responses (indicating that ethnicity could change) of this group is open to speculation and further research is needed before any firm conclusions can be drawn.

The participant’s justification for their responses to this measure was also examined. Consistent with the previous study, the participants’ justifications became progressively more abstract with increasing age, in the same manner that their descriptions of ethnicity also became more abstract and based on more internal attributes with age. For example, when presented with one change option (paint your face or put on a wig), a greater number of participants reported that there would still be some physical characteristics present that would characterise the individual as being a member of their own ethnic group (e.g., if a Pacific Islander child put on a blonde wig, their brown face would still characterise them as Pacific Islander). When the physical changes were of a greater magnitude (e.g., paint face and put on a wig) than simply changing one feature and the salient physical markers of ethnicity were no longer visible, the participants’ responses became focused on internal or literal aspects. In other words, when one’s physical appearance has changed significantly to allow one to look physically similar to another ethnic group, ethnicity then became accounted for by internal factors such as ancestry, language, and traditional activities. This outcome further extends the results reported in the previous study, by showing that ethnic majority and minority children are increasingly able to rely on non-visual cues to ascribe ethnic group membership and shift from a reliance on visual markers of ethnicity to non-visual and internal markers.
In line with the gender constancy research which reported a relationship between constancy and stability (de Lisi & Gallagher, 1991; deVries, 1969; Kohlberg, 1966; Slaby & Frey, 1975), the current study found that ethnic constancy and stability were also related concepts. However, the magnitude of relationship was low indicating that while they might be related, they are measuring different capabilities and cognitive processes.

The absence of a significant correlation between ethnic stability and classification is also worthy of comment. The gender research has traditionally made use of conservation of mass as a measure of cognitive ability and hence the absence of a correlation in this study might be a reflection of the choice of cognitive measure. It is possible that while ethnic constancy is based on the ability to classify on ever-changing dimensions, the ability to mentally-transform abstract structures (such as age) is more relevant to the ability to classify objects on the basis of physical features. Future research could well examine the relationship between ethnic constancy and other indicators of the acquisition of cognitive operations.

**Social Knowledge**

In this study, social knowledge was measured by asking the participants to name as many ethnic groups in their community as they could as well as the status of various groups. In contrast to previous research (Radke & Trager, 1950), there were no significant differences between the number of community ethnic groups nominated by the Anglo-Australian and the Pacific Islander participants. While Radke and Trager suggested that ethnicity was more salient for minority groups, the present result suggests that ethnicity is equally salient to ethnic majority and minority children. In addition, it suggests that factors other than one’s ethnicity influence knowledge of community ethnic groups. The participants in this study lived in a multi-cultural
community, and the exposure to, and contact with, a large number of ethnic groups might account for this result. Future research might consider repeating this study in communities which are less ethnically diverse to investigate if ethnic diversity influences children’s ethnic knowledge.

Associated with the knowledge of ethnic groups is the awareness of status differences between the various ethnic groups. The results of this study are in line with those previously reported which indicated that ethnic majority participants would accord the ethnic majority group with having the highest status (van Ausdale & Feagin, 1996; Radke & Trager, 1950). The responses of this group of children further supports SIT’s (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) assertion that individuals seek to be members of positively distinct groups in order to enhance or maintain positive social identity. The endorsement of the existing social status quo by the ethnic majority group serves this purpose.

The responses of the Pacific Islander participants are interesting as they run counter to previous research (Radke & Trager, 1950; Rosenberg & Simmons, 1971; Vaughan, 1963, 1964a). These early studies would suggest that the Anglo-Australian group would be accorded the highest status by ethnic minority participants based in part on the pre-existing social status quo. The present results indicated that the Pacific Islander participants did not statistically separate the Pacific Islander and Anglo-Australian group when asked to indicate the highest status group. This failure to differentiate the groups could be interpreted in several ways. This result could indicate that ethnic minority children are aware of, and endorse, the socially acknowledged status of different ethnic groups only if their group is not disadvantaged. That is, they might be more willing to accord high status to the ethnic majority out-group only when they can also accord similarly high status to their ethnic group. Alternatively, it might
also be possible that these children reported the social status as they would like it to be (i.e., their in-group being the highest status), while still acknowledging the actual social status of the groups in the community. This result casts some doubt on the earlier results (e.g., Radke & Trager, 1950) as it perhaps indicates that children from the ethnic minority group might be struggling with the knowledge of the inferiority of their group. These children might nominate the ethnic in-group as holding equal status to the ethnic majority group as a means of protecting their social identity.

The high proportion of nominations of the ethnic in-group as having a ‘second highest status’ suggests some support for Vaughan’s (1963, 1964a) view that children of ethnic minority groups are aware of their group’s (inferior) social status to the dominant group. The equal rating of the ethnic in-group and the Anglo-Australian out-group might also be a reflection of SIT’s hypothesis of positive distinctiveness. The responses of the Pacific Islanders might also fit with SIT’s suggestion that positive social identity is based upon favourably intergroup comparison. It is possible that the Pacific Islanders might consider their ethnic group equal to the dominant ethnic group, because of the low socioeconomic status of the community and of the absence of material and financial differences between the groups. It is also a possibility that the Pacific Islanders used a different comparison criterion to the Anglo-Australians. That is, the Pacific Islander chose to compare the ethnic in-group and the dominant out-group on criteria which was more favourable to the ethnic in-group. Future research should consider exploring this further.

In addition, this study also asked the children to repeat the exercise from the perspective of a child from the ethnic out-group. When asked to rank the same groups from the perspective of an Anglo-Australian child, the Pacific Islander participants nominated the groups in the same order as the Anglo-Australian children, that is, they
nominated the Anglo-Australian group highest, the Pacific Islander group second highest, and the Aboriginal group lowest status. This result could suggest that the Pacific Islander children have well-established knowledge of the existing social status of the three ethnic groups and were able to set aside their own preferences in favour of those belonging to a member of the ethnic majority group. On the other hand, the Anglo-Australian participants indicated that a Pacific Islander child would nominate the Pacific Islander group as the highest status group, followed by the Anglo-Australian, and the Aboriginal groups. It is possible that the Anglo-Australian children were applying their own ethnocentric ideology to the Pacific Islander group.

The low status ranking of the Aboriginal group serves to further support the assumption that children are aware of social status differences within the community and take them on as their own and freely articulate this knowledge. The low ranking of the Aboriginal group also fits with SIT, such that both groups rated this out-group less favourably than the in-group in order to protect their groups’ positive distinctiveness.

Overall, the results of this study provide support for the suggestion that children have acquired social knowledge by the time they commence formal education, and that they are aware of the various ethnic groups in their community regardless of whether they are from the ethnic majority or ethnic minority group. These results illustrate that ethnic minority children have greater variability in social knowledge than do members of the ethnic majority group. By way of illustration, the Pacific Islander participants indicated that an Anglo-Australian would never consider their ethnic in-group to be the lowest status group. In addition, the majority of the Pacific Islander participants thought that the Anglo-Australians would not consider the Aboriginal group as having anything but the lowest social status. In comparison, the Anglo-Australian participants evidenced greater variation in their responses on behalf of a Pacific Islander.
Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented three studies investigating the development of ethnic awareness in ethnic majority and minority children. The contribution of cognitive processes and social knowledge were investigated separately to explore differences between the ethnic majority and minority groups on a number of measures. These measures included (a) ethnic recognition and descriptions of the underlying characteristics of ethnic group membership, (b) cognitive development and ethnic constancy and stability, and (c) social and status knowledge.

The results can be summarised accordingly. First, ethnic majority and minority children are equally correct in their ability to recognise and categorise members of the ethnic in-group and out-groups from 5-years of age. Second, children’s understanding of the defining characteristics of ethnic group membership became more abstract with increasing age, as shown by a shift from relying on physical markers to internal markers to account for ethnic group membership. The results revealed that children’s definitions of the characteristics defining ethnic group membership was not influenced by their own ethnic group membership. Third, the results revealed differences between the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander participants’ understanding of the immutability of ethnic group membership over context and time. The results revealed that Anglo-Australian participants reported higher levels of ethnic constancy and stability that the Pacific Islander participants. Fourth, children’s social knowledge of the ethnic groups that make up their community increased with age. In addition, the results revealed differences between the ethnic majority and minority groups in their understanding of status differences. This result was evident in their report of the social status held by their ethnic in-group in relation to the other ethnic groups that comprise the local community.
In conclusion, the results revealed that children’s ethnic awareness is present by the time they commence formal education and that is consolidates with increasing age. The results also indicated that cognitive development makes some contribution, other factors, in particular, social knowledge, contributes to the development of ethnic awareness.

The study presented in the next chapter sought to extend our understanding of children’s ethnicity and its effects by examining the development of ethnic attitudes in ethnic majority and minority children.
CHAPTER 4.
THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN’S ETHNIC ATTITUDES

Introduction

The previous chapter indicated that children as young as 5-years have a working knowledge of the different ethnic groups that make up their community. In addition, they are cognizant of the status hierarchy of these groups. This study also showed that children’s understanding of what constituted ethnic group membership became increasingly sophisticated and cognitively complex with age. Their explanations of the characteristics defining ethnic group membership increasingly became based on internal dimensions (e.g., ancestry and culture) rather than relying on physical characteristics and other visual cues. The study described in the present chapter was interested in exploring how this knowledge and awareness is reflected in children’s ethnic attitudes.

Research on Children’s Ethnic Attitudes

At around the same time as the research by Horowitz (1936), Horowitz and Horowitz (1938) and Clark and Clark (1939a, 1939b, 1947), other studies were looking at the ethnic preference (measured by nominations of friends) of European-American and Mexican-American high school students (Loomis, 1943). On the basis of the students’ responses, Loomis concluded that adolescents prefer their own ethnic group as friends and consider in-group members as having more favourable attributes than out-group members. In contrast, Helgerson’s (1943) study of friendship choices by young European-American and African-American children (age 2 ½ years to 6 ½ years) indicated that students in mixed-race schools reported a greater preference for European-American rather than African-American friends. For example, 55% of the African-Americans indicated a preference for European-American friends, while only 44% chose African-American students as preferred friends. At the same time, 63% of
European-American students chose other European-American students as their preferred friends. A later study by Springer (1950) asked Hawaiian children (Oriental and non-Oriental) to select from a number of photos which child they would like as a sibling and as a playmate. These results indicated that the children expressed greater preference for their ethnic in-group when choosing both a sibling and a playmate. Like the light-skinned African-American children in the study by Clark and Clark (1947), who identified with, and expressed preference for the European-American group, Springer reported that part-Orientals indicated a preference for non-Orientals (i.e., European-Americans) as siblings and playmates.

Using a naturalistic observation methodology, McCandless and Hoyt (1961) observed the play patterns of Oriental and White Hawaiian children aged 3 ½ years to 5 ½ years. In a pattern that replicated the results of Springer (1950), McCandless and Hoyt reported that the two groups played with members of their own ethnic group. The authors indicated that while the children did not actively avoid out-group members, they chose instead to play with other in-group members. The authors interpreted this decision as an illustration that children display in-group preference but not necessarily out-group rejection. Similarly, Abel and Sahinkaya (1962) used photos of children who differed in ethnicity and asked 4- and 5-year-old European-American children to nominate who they would choose as a friend. They reported that like the previous studies, these European-American children preferred to play with members of their own race in preference to African-American playmates.

Other researchers have adopted the methodology of Clark and Clark (1939a, 1947) and Horowitz and Horowitz (1938) to examine children’s ethnic attitudes and preferences. A range of stimuli representing different ethnic groups, including dolls (Asher & Allen, 1969; Fox & Jordan, 1973; Gin, 2003; Hraba & Grant, 1970), line
drawings (Brown & Johnson, 1971; Doyle & Aboud, 1995; Newman et al., 1983), and photographs (Boulton & Smith, 1992; Corenblum & Annis, 1993; Epstein et al., 1976; Nesdale et al., 2003, 2004; Weiland & Coughlin, 1979) have been used. In all of these studies, children from different ethnic majority groups have been asked to indicate which doll or photograph they would prefer to have as a friend, and/or which has the more positive qualities, and/or which they liked more. In addition, structured interviews (Loomis, 1943), naturalistic observations (McCandless & Hoyt, 1961) and attribution tasks (Bennett, Lyons, Sani, & Barrett, 1998; Doyle & Aboud, 1995; Rutland, Cameron, Bennett, & Ferrell, 2005; Williams et al., 1975; Williams, Best, Boswell, Mattson et al., 1975) have also been employed.

The main findings from this research in relation to ethnic majority children are that these children consistently display a more positive attitude toward their in-group, by apportioning in-group members more positive traits and attributes (Aboud & Mitchell, 1977; Asher & Allen, 1969; Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996; Boulton & Smith, 1992; Cramer & Anderson, 2003; Kelly & Duckitt, 1995; Kowalski & Lo, 2001; Laor, Wolmer, & Cohen, 2004; Madge, 1976; Morland & Hwang, 1981; Tajfel, Jahoda, Nemeth, Rim, & Johnson, 1972; Teichman, Bar-Tal, & Teichman 2006; Verkuyten, 2003; Verkuyten & Thijs, 2002; Weiland & Coughlin, 1979; Zinser et al., 1981). When asked to nominate a representative of the in-group or an out-group that they would prefer to interact with or have as a friend or to name their actual friends, these children indicated a clear preference for in-group members (Aboud, Mendelson & Purdy, 2003; Goldstein, Koopman, & Goldstein, 1979; Madge, 1976; Morland, 1966; Morland & Hwang, 1981; Ward & Braun, 1972).

As noted earlier, there are methodological limitations inherent in presenting children with a doll or similar object and asking them to pick which one they prefer or
which one they like better. In response, a number of studies have employed different methodologies, including multiple response scales (Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996) and asking children to produce drawings to represent the ethnic groups of interest to the researcher (e.g., Teichman, 2001). For example, Black-Gutman and Hickson (1996) investigated the ethnic attitudes of 122 Anglo-Australian children aged between 5- and 12-years toward their ethnic in-group and toward two ethnic out-groups, Asian-Australians and Indigenous (Aboriginal) Australians. Each group was represented by photographs. The authors reported that the participants used more positive traits to describe the in-group members versus out-group members. Unlike previous research, which had indicated greater positivity to the in-group, Black-Gutman and Hickson noted that there was no significant difference between the evaluations of the in-group and the Asian-Australian group, but the participants were less positive toward the Aboriginal group. They further reported age differences in the children’s attitudes. Their results showed that younger aged children (5- to 6-years) demonstrated the greatest negativity toward the Aboriginal out-group, with the children’s ratings of this group becoming more positive with increasing age to 8-years when it became more negative again.

Using a large Israeli sample ($N = 888$) of Jewish children between the ages of 4- and 15-years, Teichman (2001) reported that the Jewish Israeli children expressed more positive attitudes towards their ethnic in-group while expressing more negative attitudes towards the ethnic out-group (Arab). This result supports Bar-Tal’s (1996) conclusion that Jewish Israeli children view Arabs as possessing more negative attributes and characteristics than Jews. Like Black-Gutman and Hickson (1996), Teichman also reported age differences in the results. The pre-school children expressed positive in-group and negative out-group sentiments but there was a reduction in the in-group positivity and out-group negativity with increasing age. Similarly, Brown and Johnson
(1971) asked 259 Anglo-British children (3- to 11-years) to allocate positive and negative traits to either shaded or non-shaded silhouettes. Their results indicated that the youngest age group attributed more negative attributes to the shaded silhouette than did the older children. Further, they noted an increased tendency with age to attribute positive statements to the non-shaded silhouette and negative statements to the shaded silhouette. They commented that those children who attended integrated schools (i.e., had greater contact with minority groups) were less likely to display negative attitudes.

In sum, research relating to ethnic attitudes of majority group children indicates that these children have more positive attitudes toward their in-group versus out-groups (e.g., Asher & Allen, 1969; Bar-Tal, 1996; Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996; Kelly & Duckitt, 1995; Kowalski & Lo, 2001; Laor et al., 2004; Teichman, 2001) and indicate greater in-group preference (Aboud et al., 2003; Goldstein et al., 1979; Madge, 1976; Morland, 1966; Morland & Hwang, 1981; Ward & Braun, 1972). In addition, the research shows that children’s in-group attitudes often change with age (e.g., Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996; Teichman, 2001).

In contrast, the research findings in relation to ethnic minority groups have not been as clear or consistent. For example, some studies have reported more positive attitudes toward the ethnic in-group than comparative out-groups (Epstein et al., 1976; Fox & Jordan, 1973; Gregor & McPherson, 1968; Margie, Killen, Sinno, & McGlothlin, 2005). However, other research has reported negative in-group attitudes by ethnic minority children (Asher & Allen, 1969; Boulton & Smith, 1992; Cramer & Anderson, 2003; Davey & Mullin, 1980; Gin, 2003; Rosenthal, 1974).

While some research has examined children’s ethnic attitudes and preferences using a single ethnic group as participants, either the majority or the minority ethnic group, other research has directly compared these groups simultaneously. For example,
Radke, Sutherland, and Rosenberg (1950) asked 523 (7- to 13-year-old) African- and European-American children to rate a number of pictures representing the two ethnic groups in relation to the possession of either positive or negative traits. They reported that the European-American participants allocated more positive traits to their ethnic in-group, and more negative traits to the out-group target. In contrast, they reported that the African-American participants allocated more negative traits to their in-group, indicating that the out-group (i.e., the European-American group) was more likely to possess positive traits.

Stevenson and Stewart (1958) asked 225 European- and African-American children to attribute positive and negative attributes to representatives of the two ethnic groups. Their results indicated that the African-American children made more negative self-attributions and were more likely to say that an African-American representative was bad compared to a European-American representative. In contrast, the European-American children assigned more positive attributes to the in-group than the out-group. Bruce, Curtis, and Johnson (1998) presented 5- and 6-year-old Maori children with light and dark-shaded silhouette cards to represent the majority (Anglo-New Zealand) and minority (Maori) ethnic groups in New Zealand research. Consistent with previous findings, the authors reported that the Maori participants allocated the positive traits to the light shaded card and, allocated negative traits to the dark shaded silhouette.

In contrast to these results, Bartel, Bartel, and Grill’s (1973) study indicated a shift towards more positive ethnic in-group attitudes by African-American children. They further reported a replication of the attitude response by the European-American children in kindergarten through Grade 4. Using a number of positive and negative subscales, they reported that both the European- and African-American children attributed more positive attributes to their respective in-group representatives.
However, the authors reported that both groups indicated that the black representative possessed more negative attributes.

Davey and Mullin (1980) examined the ethnic attitudes of three groups of British primary school children. The authors showed 512 Anglo, West Indian, and Asian students photographs of members from the three ethnic groups and asked the children to indicate which group they would prefer to be like. Their results indicated that more than 85% of the white children indicated that they wanted to be like the ‘white’ photograph, while the other two groups also indicated a preference for the ‘white’ photo. Less than 50% of the ethnic minority children wanted to be like the representative for their ethnic in-group.

Morland and Hwang (1981) also reported differences in the preferences of different ethnicity participants. In their study, Chinese children in Hong Kong and Taiwan, and European-American children showed a preference for in-group friends. But, in the same study, the African-American children indicated a preference for friends from the European-American ethnic out-group. Kowalski and Lo (2001) similarly reported that Taiwanese children exhibited a similar in-group bias when selecting friends from a number of ethnic groups. They noted that this in-group preference was greatest in the younger children and reduced with increasing age.

Nesdale et al. (2003, 2004) conducted a series of studies investigating the ethnic attitudes of Anglo-Australian children towards members of the in-group and a Pacific Islander out-group. Their results indicated that these children demonstrated more positive in-group attitudes than towards members of the Pacific Islander out-group.

In sum, the research to date has indicated that, first, ethnic majority children from a range of countries display a marked preference for, and more positive attitude toward, members of the ethnic in-group (e.g., Abel & Sahinkaya, 1962; Aboud, 1980;

Second, whereas research has shown that ethnic majority group children prefer the ethnic in-group above other ethnic groups, recent results also indicate that they do not report dislike or hatred for ethnic minority out-groups. Rather, such groups are simply liked less than the ethnic in-group. Studies by Kowalski (2003) and Nesdale and colleagues (2003, 2004; Nesdale & Flesser, 2001) have shown that although the participants displayed more positive attitudes towards the in-group and differentiated between the ethnic in-group and out-groups, out-groups were still rated favourably.

Third, the situation regarding the ethnic preferences of ethnic minority children is less clear. Unlike research with dominant groups, the research with minority groups fails to show a consistent preference by these children. While early research reported out-group preference in some children, the results from later research with different minority groups have been mixed.

A number of theories have been proposed to account for the development of children’s intergroup (including ethnic) attitudes. These theories are presented in the following section.

*Theories Accounting for Ethnic Attitudes in Children*

What is known of the development of children’s ethnic attitudes has accrued largely via theory and research which has focused primarily on the development of prejudice. Early models of ethnic prejudice in both adults and children have emphasised, on the one hand, the emotional maladjustment of adults and children (Adorno et al., 1950) and, on the other hand, the influence of significant others (Allport, 1954; Rosenfield & Stephan, 1981). In addition, explicitly developmental approaches have also been proposed to account for the development of ethnic attitudes in children.
One such approach emphasises cognitive processes and is illustrated by the models of Goodman (1964), Katz (1976), and Aboud (1988). Another approach emphasises social motivational processes and is illustrated by the theories of Nesdale (1999, 2004, 2006) and Vaughan (1987). Since all of these theories focused on prejudice, most tended to emphasise the development of out-group rather than in-group attitudes by members of the ethnic majority group. However, they also shed some light on intragroup attitudes (Aboud, 1988; Katz, 1976; Nesdale, 2001).

**Emotional Maladjustment.**

According to the emotional maladjustment approach (Adorno et al., 1950), the development of prejudice was associated with a particular personality type - the Authoritarian Personality. This approach described children’s prejudice as an expression of their emotional maladjustment arising from an overly harsh and restrictive upbringing. This restrictive and overly controlled upbringing resulted in feelings of frustration, anger, and hostility toward their parents. The resulting feelings of hostility and frustration towards their parents were displaced toward groups or individuals, who were typically weaker and lacking authority and power, such as ethnic minority groups or other socially devalued groups, because of the children’s anxiety about the consequences of directing their aggression toward their parents. The outcome from this type of upbringing was children who were insecure, overemphasised power, and developed faulty thought processes, which became apparent in the expression of out-group prejudice.

Support for the link between authoritarianism and prejudice was reported in a number of studies, much of it focusing on adults rather than children. For example, Adorno et al. (1950) reported significant correlations between measures of ethnocentrism and authoritarianism as support for the link between personality and
prejudice. Shortly after, Campbell and McCandless (1951) also reported similar correlations between authoritarianism and hostility toward ethnic minority groups among European-American college students. Similarly, Pettigrew (1958) reported significant correlations between the authoritarianism and anti-Black attitudes in South Africa and in the southern American states. Support for the link between authoritarianism and negative attitudes has also been reported in research on stigmatized groups, including the mentally ill (Cohen & Struening, 1962; Hanson & Blohm, 1974), and AIDS sufferers (Witt, 1989). These studies reported less positive attitudes towards these stigmatized groups by high authoritarian individuals compared to low authoritarian individuals.

However, other research has failed to support the link between authoritarian personality and prejudice. For example, a Canadian study by Forbes (1985), reported no correlation between authoritarianism and anti-French attitudes in the English-speaking sample, and no correlation between authoritarianism and anti-English attitudes in the French-speaking sample.

While this theory was able to adequately account for the differences in the degree of prejudice that might occur between individuals, it ignored a number of other factors that might also contribute to the expression of negative out-group attitudes. These include possible age-related changes in the nature of prejudice, the effect of social processes, and existing relationships between the dominant and minority ethnic groups. It was also unable to adequately explain why prejudice is displayed toward some groups but not others and why the targets of prejudice can suddenly change (Brown, 1995). Finally, the theory also failed to take into account the influence of parents and significant others and the prevailing social norms (Nesdale, 2004).
Ultimately, despite some early support for the theory (e.g., Adorno et al., 1950; Campbell & McCandless, 1951) the emotional maladjustment hypothesis lost its influence predominantly as a result of contradictory findings as well as methodological issues, particularly concerns over the validity of the scale used to measure authoritarianism (Brown, 1995; Heaven, 2001). Concerns were also raised in relation to the confounding of authoritarianism with other social markers, such as education level (Katz, 2003) and the possibility that other social and cultural forces also contributed to the expression of prejudice in some individuals (Brown, 1995; Heaven, 2001).

**Social Learning Approaches.**

Placing greater emphasis on social factors, the social learning approach (Allport, 1954; Rosenfield & Stephan, 1981) assumed that children’s ethnic attitudes (and therefore prejudice) were merely a reflection of the attitudes of the community in which they lived. According to this approach, children observed and imitated the attitudes and behaviours of significant others, their parents in particular. Nesdale (2004) suggested that this learning might be presumed to occur because children are rewarded by their parents for their imitative behaviour and that children identify with, and seek to please, their parents.

While research has indicated that children as young as 3- and 4- years develop an awareness of the characteristics of intergroup relations, support for this approach has been mixed. On the one hand, there is a body of research that has reported positive correlations between the ethnic attitudes of children and their parents (Bird, Monachesi, & Burdick, 1952; Goodman, 1964; Harris, Gough, & Martin, 1950; Horowitz & Horowitz, 1938; Mosher & Scodel, 1960; Porter, 1971; Radke, Trager & Davis, 1949; Radke-Yarrow, Trager & Miller, 1952; Sinclair, Dunn, & Lowery, 2005). Indeed,
distinct similarities in the verbal expressions of children and their parents toward ethnic minority groups have been reported (Radke-Yarrow et al., 1952; Sinclair et al., 2005).

On the other hand, other research has reported that these correlations are at best low or non-existent between the ethnic attitudes of children and their parents (Aboud & Doyle, 1993; Bird et al., 1952; Frenkel-Brunswick & Havel, 1953). In addition, where positive correlations have been reported, the children have often attributed the source of these negative attitudes to their parents (Horowitz & Horowitz, 1938; Porter, 1971; Radke et al., 1949).

Apart from the influence of parents and, later, peers, on children’s ethnic attitudes, a number of studies have looked at the influence of the media, particularly television, on children’s ethnic attitudes. Similar to the earlier studies, this research has also produced mixed results. Both Reid (1979) and later Graves (1999) reported a link between greater television watching and increased reinforcement of (ethnic) stereotypes. In contrast, Bogatz and Ball (1971) argued that educational programs such as Sesame Street present a more diverse view of the world and hence might reduce the negative influence of television on ethnic attitudes.

On the basis of the mixed research results, it has been argued that it would be premature to assume that children should be regarded “simply as sponges that soak up dominant ethnic attitudes” (Nesdale, 2004 p. 222). Further, while children may hold the same attitudes toward ethnic minority groups as their parents, Durkin (1995) pointed out that children’s intellectual capacities develop rapidly throughout middle childhood. As a result, they are active participants seeking to understand and control their social and cognitive environments. On the basis of the preceding brief discussion and the lack of strong empirical support for this approach, social learning does not appear to provide an adequate explanation for the development of children’s intergroup attitudes.
While these early theories are no longer considered to make a large contribution to accounting for the development of children’s ethnic attitudes, they have, nevertheless, contributed to later models which provide more comprehensive explanations for the development of ethnic attitudes and prejudice in children.

_Cognitive Approaches._

*Goodman’s (1964) development of ethnic attitudes.*

One of the earliest theories to account for the development of ethnic attitudes in children was proposed by Goodman (1946, 1964). Goodman conceptualised the development of ethnic attitudes as a continuum comprising three essential and overlapping stages.

Goodman (1964) described the first stage of her model as being characterised by the establishment and refinement of an understanding of oneself and others in terms of their membership of a racial (or ethnic) group. In a later review of Goodman’s model, Katz (1976) suggested that this (ethnic) awareness is evident at about 3- or 4-years of age. Goodman’s second stage occurs between 4- and 7- years of age, and is characterised by the development of an ethnic orientation, including the “acquisition of socio-cultural patterns, values, and folklore pertaining to race” (Goodman, 1946, p. 625). The outcome of the third stage, which occurs after 7-years, is the establishment of “race attitudes”, which Goodman described as “enduring predispositions to react in a characteristic way, usually favorably or unfavorably, towards persons, objects, situation, or ideals concerned with race” (p. 625).

While acknowledging Goodman’s (1964) three-stage model of ethnic awareness, ethnic orientation, and ethnic attitudes, Katz (1976) claimed that this model was overly simplistic and that development occurred over a longer developmental period.
(approximately 10 years) than the somewhat shorter (7 years) model originally proposed by Goodman.

Katz’s (1976) model of racial attitude acquisition.

In a refinement of Goodman’s (1964) model, Katz (1976) proposed eight overlapping stages in the development of children’s ethnic attitudes. The eight stages in Katz’s model included (a) the early observation of ethnic cues, (b) formation of rudimentary ethnic concepts, (c) conceptual differentiation between ethnic groups, (d) recognition of the irrevocability of ethnic cues, (e) consolidation of ethnic group concepts, (f) perceptual elaboration of ethnic attitudes, (g) cognitive elaboration of ethnic attitudes, and (h) ethnic attitude crystallization. Briefly, during the first stage, young children’s (i.e., under 3-years of age) observation of their environment includes the observation of members of ethnic out-groups. Katz suggested that the effects of these observations are tempered by the children’s developmental level. For example, during the first year of life the presence of ethnic cues are not salient as children are not capable of processing them. This maturity occurs later.

The second stage is, according to Katz, generally completed in all children by the time they are 4-years old. During this stage, children increasingly verbalise their observation of racial differences. These verbalisations were often supported by the provision of a group label or name by an adult or sibling, and were often accompanied by some evaluative comment about the (target) out-group. Katz suggested that the children’s behavioural response to these comments in conjunction with a generalisation of other fears (Williams & Morland, 1976) or through learned connotations to colours (Stabler, Johnson, Berke & Baker, 1969; Williams, 1964, as cited in Katz, 1976) might be expressed as a desire not to interact with members of the out-group.
During the *third* stage of development, with the acquisition of ethnic labels, children encounter positive and negative examples of ethnic out-groups and they begin to verbally differentiate between the racial groups and receive feedback for their responses. During the *fourth* stage, children develop the understanding that membership of ethnic groups is unchanging over time (ethnic constancy). Katz suggested that until children accurately identify and label ethnic out-groups, and understand the immutability of this membership, an accurate concept of a group would not exist. During the *fifth* stage, Katz suggested that the concept of ethnic group was consolidated and that the perceptual and cognitive components of attitudes become interrelated.

The remaining stages focused on the elaboration and crystallisation of ethnic attitudes. During the *sixth* stage following the children’s categorization of groups into ‘us’ and ‘them’ on the basis of racial cues, differences between groups become accentuated, while intra-group (especially in relation to ethnic out-groups) differences become diminished. This process leads to ethnic in-group bias and preference. The *seventh stage* is characterised by cognitive elaboration. It is during this stage that children’s concept attitudes and preferences become ethnic attitudes. The *eighth* and final stage is characterised by what Katz referred to as attitude crystallisation. That is to say, during late childhood, children’s attitudes become increasingly stable and accepted by the child. Katz suggested that these attitudes will not change while the status quo in the community groups remains unchallenged.

A number of studies have reported results that are consistent with several of Katz’s stages. For example, studies by Katz and colleagues (Katz, 1973; Katz, Johnson & Parker, 1970; Katz, Sohn, & Zalk, 1975) have reported that perceptual elaboration commences and develops during middle childhood. A number of other studies has
supported Katz’s claim that affective processes favour in-group members (e.g., Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971).

Although Katz’s model loaded heavily onto a cognitive framework, she also acknowledged the contribution of social processes, at least in the early stages of ethnic attitude development. This contribution came via verbal labels and evaluative responses made by parents, other adults, and peers, toward ethnic out-groups. However, this model failed to take into account other social processes such as social knowledge and group comparison on the basis of status. Group comparison as well as social knowledge and motivation have been shown to be present and influential in children’s attitude ratings of their own and other groups (Nesdale, 1999; Nesdale & Flesser, 2001; Nesdale et al., 2004; Radke & Trager, 1950).


Social cognitive theory (ST, Aboud, 1988) was proposed to account for the development of prejudice in dominant children. The theory also encompassed the development of their ethnic awareness, identification and categorisation because of their central role in the development of prejudice.

ST proposed two overlapping sequences which operated in combination to produce differing ethnic attitudes in children and, together, lead to the development of prejudice in (dominant group) children. Essential components in this development were changes in children’s cognitive and affective processes toward their own and other ethnic groups. Figure 4.1 provides a summary of ST’s processes.
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*Figure 4.1* Summary of the main sequence of ST (Adapted from Aboud, 1988)
As indicated in this figure, the first of these sequences (Sequence A) is dominated by the nature of children’s experiences with other ethnic groups. When children are young (i.e., between 3- and 5-years), the affective phase prevails and children are dominated by their emotions and preferences, the latter being directed towards members of the ethnic in-group. In particular, children are influenced by fear (of strangers) and happiness. Consistent with this, research shows that young children are wary of strangers by 12 months of age, especially of individuals who are physically different. This wariness decreases by age 3, but may still extend to strangers who look different and act unpredictably (Aboud, 1988).

During the perceptual phase (age 6- to 7-years), children’s perceptions of others develops relative to themselves. In this stage, they begin to notice similarities and differences between themselves and others. Aboud argued that children in this stage dislike dissimilar others and their attitudes toward the ethnic in-group and ethnic out-groups are determined by these perceptions of dissimilarity. It is during this stage that children engage in ethnic categorisation and self-identification; that is, they identify themselves as members of a particular ethnic group by noting their similarities and dissimilarities to others.

During the cognitive phase (age 8- to 12-years), following the acquisition of concrete operations, children begin to understand categories and the individual qualities of people. It is during this stage that they develop ethnic constancy and the ability to decentre, which leads them to understand different perspectives and alternative views. On the basis of this sequence, by 8- to 10-years, the level of out-group prejudice in children is considered to reduce from previous higher levels.

According to ST, the second sequence (Sequence B) is dominated by the object of the child’s attention. Initially, children are considered to be egocentric and to assume
that others see things according to their perspective and also that other people would experience the same emotions as they do in any given situation. In the second stage, children are considered to become pre-occupied with differences between groups and, in particular, the differences between children’s own group and other groups. Aboud likened this stage to Piaget’s (1952) sociocentric stage.

According to ST, in-group bias and out-group prejudice increase with increasing age, and peak between the ages of 5- and 7-years, when differences between groups are most obvious to children. ST proposes that all children display ethnic prejudice between these ages. However, with increasing age and in particular, with the acquisition of concrete operational thinking, ST proposes that there is a systematic decline in in-group biases. This decline is facilitated by children’s cognitive abilities which allow them to attend to individuals not as representatives of their ethnic group, but rather on the basis of their individual qualities. Consequently, ST predicts that attitudes towards ethnic out-groups become increasingly positive while the positive attitudes previously displayed toward in-group members become more moderate.

Thus, according to this model, children’s ethnic attitudes begin to develop from about the time they become aware of, and fear, the presence of strangers. These attitudes become manifested as prejudice towards ‘different’ people and their respective ethnic groups. On the basis of these differential social and psychological processes, Aboud claimed that the attitudes shown at each age were qualitatively different, and at least for the youngest group, were based on their limited mental processes which restrict their complete understanding of ethnicity.

Although this model is labeled ‘social cognitive theory’, the focus lay on accounting for the research findings on the basis of cognitive development, while the contribution of social processes received scant treatment. According to ST, prior to 7-
years, affective processes negate the influence of social processes. It is not until children acquire concrete operations (at about 7- or 8-years), that they become more responsive to social influences, including group norms or the judgments of individuals who are important to them. Aboud speculated that if a child lived in a prejudiced family or community, s/he might maintain his/her prejudiced attitudes despite having developed flexible cognitive capabilities that would normally decrease prejudice. If, on the other hand, a child lived in a less prejudiced family and community, then his/her cognitive development and the social forces (group norms) would combine to decrease prejudice. Although these suggestions take social forces into account, they nevertheless suggest that children simply and unquestioningly adopt the ethnic attitudes that surround them in their daily lives (as in the social learning approaches).

The strength of ST is that it provides a systematic and comprehensive explanation for age-related differences in the ethnic attitudes of ethnic majority group children. It achieves this by linking the development of ethnic awareness, categorisation and identification with cognitive development. A number of studies have reported increasingly more positive attitudes towards ethnic minority groups as children increased in age beyond 6-to 7-years (Aboud, 1988; Corenblum & Annis, 1993; Doyle & Aboud, 1995). Consistent with ST, several studies have also reported that changes in children’s cognitive functioning heralded changes in their ethnic attitudes (Aboud, 1980, 1984; Aboud & Christian, 1979; Aboud & Mitchell, 1977; Aboud & Skerry, 1984; Clark, Hocevar, & Dembo, 1980; Corenblum & Annis, 1993; Doyle & Aboud, 1995; Doyle et al., 1988; Ocampo et al., 1997).

For example, Corenblum and Annis (1993) measured cognitive development and ethnic attitudes in 294 Anglo-Canadian and indigenous Canadian children (aged 5- to 7-years). Their results indicated that, as they expected, there were increases in cognitive
functioning with age. The results showed that for both ethnic groups, cognitive functioning predicted in-group attitudes, such that the children with higher-level cognitive functioning displayed greater preference for the ethnic in-group.

Positive correlations have also been reported between cognitive development and attitude flexibility (Doyle et al., 1988) and ethnic constancy (Aboud, 1984). Two studies have also reported that the acquisition of concrete operational thinking and ethnic attitude flexibility occur simultaneously with a decrease in in-group bias and prior to a decrease in out-group prejudice (Doyle & Aboud, 1995; Doyle et al., 1988).

However, a number of findings remain a challenge for the theory. For example, Doyle and Aboud (1995) reported a link between concrete operational thinking and a decrease in out-group prejudice. It was also notable that 50% of the children in this study who had mastered conservation nevertheless continued to display ethnic prejudice.

Moreover, although a number of studies have reported support for ST's claims that ethnic majority group children display increasing in-group positivity and out-group negativity until the ages of 6- or 7-years, followed by a decline in in-group positivity and a corresponding increase in out-group positivity (Aboud & Mitchell, 1977; George & Hoppe, 1979; Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005; Teichman, 2001; Teichman et al., 2006; Williams et al., 1975), a number of studies has failed to support this claim. For example, some studies have reported that the level of prejudice remained unchanged between 7- and 12-years (Asher & Allen, 1969; Banks & Rompf, 1973; Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996; Milner, 1973; Weiland & Coughlin, 1979), while others have reported increases in ethnic prejudice during this latter period of childhood (Bartel et al., 1973; Hraba & Grant, 1970; Vaughan & Thompson, 1961).
Moreover, ST’s assumption that children’s ethnic prejudice is based on their initial fear of the unknown and their attachment to the familiar fails to recognise the importance of social and motivational factors that operate around the child. While some prejudice might be accounted for by the physical differences between the ethnic in-group and out-groups, it fails to adequately account for prejudices between groups that are physically similar, for example, prejudice directed towards physically similar national or religious groups (Barrett, Wilson, & Lyons, 2003; Chyatte, Schaefer & Spiaggea, 1951; Jaspers, van der Geer, Tajfel, & Johnson, 1972; Rutland, 1999; Tajfel et al., 1972).

Two studies illustrate this point. Jaspers et al. (1972) measured national attitudes and preferences of 120 Dutch children to their own and a number of other countries. Their results indicated that the Dutch children reported more positive attitudes for Dutch people than for people from countries who were physically similar (e.g., France and Germany). In addition, countries that were perceived to be more similar to The Netherlands were described more favourably than countries that were perceived to be less like The Netherlands. A second study by Barrett et al. (2003) reported that when English children aged between 5- and 11- years were asked to describe their own and either an American or German national out-group, they exhibited greater in-group favouritism at each of the ages. The authors noted that with increasing age there were more negative in-group attributions and more positive out-group attributions made. However, despite this trend, the in-group was still described in more positive terms than the out-group.

Further, it will be recalled that the earlier research paradigm of Clark and Clark (1947) was criticised for the assumption that ethnic preference equated to ethnic prejudice (see chapter 2). This criticism might also be directed at the research that
Aboud has used as the basis of ST. Much of the research cited to support ST has come from studies that measured children’s in-group preferences rather than their out-group prejudice (e.g., Brand, Ruiz, & Padilla, 1974; Katz, 1976; Proshansky, 1966; Stephan & Rosenfield, 1979). These studies presented children with dolls and asked them to indicate a preference for one over the other using a forced-choice methodology (e.g., Brand et al.; Katz). Like the early research, a preference for one group was interpreted as a rejection of the other. However, more recent studies using a bi-polar rating scale have revealed that although the in-group may be preferred by children, there is typically no out-group derogation or prejudice revealed (Aboud & Mitchell, 1977; Kowalski, 2003; Nesdale et al., 2003, 2004; Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005; Nesdale, Griffiths et al., 2005; Nesdale, Maass et al., 2005). In addition, this type of forced-choice measure is limited as a measure of prejudice as it fails to measure the intensity of the children’s affect for either the in-group or the out-group.

ST’s account of children’s ethnic attitudes is ultimately limited by its dependence on cognitive development and its relative indifference to social context and motivational considerations (Nesdale, 2006). In short, it seems unlikely that children’s ethnic prejudice is founded solely on the affective–perceptual processes that are manifest as a fear of the unknown. Rather, it has been suggested that the use of socially relevant labels and evaluative statements by parents and peers also supports and contributes to the development of early ethnic prejudice (Katz, 1976; Nesdale, 2006; Vaughan, 1987). ST does not consider this factor particularly important.

In sum, while the cognitive theories presented in this section have made some contribution to our understanding of the development of ethnic attitudes in children, neither provides an explanation that can account for all of the research findings. Of particular concern is their indifference to existing social factors. In contrast to the
former approach, two theories have taken a more social motivational perspective in accounting for the development of intergroup attitudes and behaviour in children (Nesdale, 2004, 2006; Vaughan, 1987).

**Social Motivational Approaches.**

Both social motivational approaches draw heavily on social identity theory (SIT, Tajfel & Turner, 1979), which focused on accounting for ethnic prejudice in adults. Given the influence of SIT in both Nesdale’s (1999; 2004; 2006) and Vaughan’s (1987) approaches, SIT will first be briefly described before turning to the more explicitly developmental approaches.

*Tajfel and Turner’s (1979) Social Identity Theory.*

According to social identity theory (SIT, Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and its more recent elaboration, self-categorization theory (SCT, Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987) intergroup attitudes and behaviour are not solely dependent on cognitive processes (cf. Aboud, 1988), nor on competition and conflict between groups for scarce resources, as suggested by Sherif (1966) and colleagues (Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, & Sherif, 1961; Sherif & Sherif, 1953; Sherif, White, & Harvey, 1955). Rather, SIT and SCT gave particular emphasis to the desire of individual group members to identify with social groups. This identification provides individuals with a frame of reference that allows them to create and define their place in society. This definition is derived from comparisons with other social groups, where individuals categorise themselves as similar to, or different from, and better or worse than, members of an out-group. These comparisons result in individuals’ ‘social identity’, which has been described as “those aspects of an individual’s self-image that derive from the social categories to which he perceives himself as belonging” (Tajfel & Turner, 1979, p. 40). According to SIT, people are motivated to identify with groups that are considered
to be positively distinct and hold a higher social status than comparative groups. As a result, in-group members are perceived to be similar and to possess more positive attributes and they are treated more favourably by other in-group members (Platow et al., 1997; Reynolds, Turner, & Haslam, 2000; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Vaughan, Tajfel, & Williams, 1981). In contrast, out-group members are perceived to be different, to hold less positive attributes and may experience prejudice and discrimination (Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Grant, 1993; Jetten, Spears, & Manstead, 1996; Kelly, 1988).

Although SIT provides an account of ethnic attitudes and intergroup behaviour in adults and adolescents, it is actually mute on the development of ethnic attitudes and intergroup behaviour in children. Despite this, several authors have suggested that SIT can be adapted to provide an explanation for children’s intra- and intergroup attitudes and behaviour (Davey, 1983; Milner, 1996; Nesdale, 1999; Vaughan, 1987).


Vaughan (1987) proposed that children (like adults) develop a social understanding and identity based on existing-social categories, many of them socially imposed. Examples of these groups include ethnic and religious groups. Vaughan noted that children are born into any number of social groups (e.g., gender, ethnicity, religious) and are usually content to operate within them. Once the child becomes aware of salient and large-scale social categories (e.g., ethnicity), his/her sense of identity (as a member of a particular ethnic group) develops through comparisons with other available groups. As a result of this comparison process, Vaughan predicted that all children should demonstrate a preference for their (ethnic) in-group.

As has been discussed previously, this prediction has been consistently supported in the literature in relation to in-group preference by ethnic majority children.
since the 1930s (Clark & Clark, 1947; Horowitz & Horowitz, 1938; Nesdale et al., 2003, 2004; Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005; Nesdale, Griffiths et al., 2005; Nesdale, Maass et al., 2005; Vaughan, Tajfel, & Williams, 1981), but not necessarily for members of ethnic minority groups (Asher & Allen, 1969; Gregor & McPherson, 1966; Vaughan, 1964a; 1964b).

The adaptation of SIT to account for the development of children’s ethnic attitudes has a number of strengths over the cognitive models of Katz (1976) and Aboud (1988). First, this adaptation can account for ethnic in-group bias that has been consistently demonstrated by ethnic majority group children. Second, it can account for the out-group preference demonstrated by some ethnic minority group children (Asher & Allen, 1969; Clark & Clark, 1947; Morland, 1966; Vaughan, 1964a). According to Vaughan, when ethnic minority group children’s social identity is degraded by negative evaluations relative to the ethnic majority group, ethnic minority children may aspire towards the dominant group values and hence show out-group preference. It will be recalled that this interpretation contrasts with ST (Aboud, 1988) which views the development of ethnic attitudes and behaviour being underpinned by a common sequence of cognitive development.

In addition, Vaughan’s (1987) application of SIT (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) is also able to account for the shift towards in-group preference by minority group children as a result of social change. For example, the rise of the civil rights movements during the 1970s saw a change in the way that ethnic minority groups viewed themselves relative to the dominant ethnic group. During this time of racial activitism, ethnic minority groups utilised social strategies consistent with those outlined by SIT, including changing the comparison dimensions, or highlighting those dimensions that the minority
group considered more desirable (“Black is Beautiful”) to raise the consciousness and the intra-group attitude of the ethnic group.

A number of studies has been reported that support Vaughan’s (and SIT’s) assumption that the factors of inclusion and belonging which are important to adults are also important to children and motivate them to seek out friends and social groups from an early age and may reflect a need to belong and be accepted (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Milner, 1996; Nesdale, 2004; Rubin, Bukowski & Parker, 1998; Vaughan, 1987). In addition, studies have also indicated that young children tend to report greater liking for, and similarity to other in-group members than to out-group members (e.g., Bigler, 1995; Bigler et al., 1997; Nesdale et al., 2004; Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005; Nesdale & Flesser, 2001; Nesdale, Griffiths et al., 2005; Nesdale, Maass et al., 2005). A study by Nesdale and Pelyhe (2006) also showed that acceptance by a particular social group influenced, to some degree, children’s sense of self-worth.

However, one limitation of Vaughan’s adaptation of SIT (1987) is its failure to adequately address age-related changes in children’s development of ethnic attitudes, as well as their ethnic awareness and ethnic identification. Although Vaughan claimed that the development of ethnic identity paralleled cognitive development, he made no effort to elaborate on this relationship or to test it experimentally. One shortcoming of simply applying the principles of an adult theory to children has been the failure to consider that ethnic attitudes and prejudice might change and develop with age, either as a result of more sophisticated cognitive processes (Aboud, 1988) and/or through increasing social awareness and knowledge. Social identity development theory (SIDT, Nesdale, 1999, 2004, 2006) has been proposed to provide an explanation of the development of intergroup attitudes and behaviour in children that takes these processes into account.

Social identity development theory (SIDT; Nesdale, 1999, 2004, 2006) sought to address the limitations of both ST (Aboud, 1988) and Vaughan’s social identity model (Vaughan, 1987). Although SIDT draws upon the core assumptions of SIT and SCT (Turner et al., 1987), it takes into account changes in children’s intergroup attitudes and behaviours as they relate to increasing age and the influence that cognitive, linguistic, and social knowledge changes have on this process.

As with ST (Aboud, 1988), SIDT (Nesdale, 1999, 2004) focused on children’s ethnic understanding and attitudes in terms of their contribution to the development of prejudice. Like other theories of prejudice, SIDT was concerned only with the dominant group, on the assumption that prejudice is usually directed toward out-group members by this group (Verkuyten & Masson, 1995). In short, SIDT proposes that children progress through four sequential stages of development (undifferentiated, ethnic awareness, ethnic preference, and ethnic prejudice). Each stage is differentiated in terms of the characteristic intergroup attitudes, the behaviour demonstrated and the events which herald a change from one stage to the next. A brief review of each of the stages follows.

Undifferentiated.

During the undifferentiated stage, young children (i.e., prior to about 2 - or 3-years-old) respond randomly to environmental objects (including unfamiliar people) on the basis of what catches their attention. During this stage, SIDT argues that racial cues are typically not salient to children, although one of the many achievements of this stage is the ability to discriminate between colours (as well as some other attributes) of inanimate objects.

Ethnic Awareness.
By about 3-years of age, children’s awareness of different ethnic groups has begun to emerge, particularly in those children who live in multi-ethnic communities. Several studies have demonstrated that children can accurately identify and distinguish between skin colour hues at this age (e.g., Clark & Clark, 1939b; Goodman, 1946; Stevenson & Stevenson, 1960). SIDT proposes that a child’s ethnic awareness begins to develop as a consequence of the child’s recognition of a ‘different’ attribute in a person (‘that person is black’) and the labeling of that person as an out-group member by a significant other (e.g., parent or older sibling). This use of a label in association with the perception of differences facilitates social categorisation based on physical characteristics (e.g., skin colour) (see Katz, 1976 for a similar suggestion). This categorisation is further enhanced by both verbal and non-verbal evaluations (positive and negative) of an out-group member by adults and peers. As noted previously by Vaughan (1987), children enter a social environment in which the social categories are specified and the nature of intergroup relations is established. Thus, the social categories which children are likely to emphasise are not simply those that are strange and unfamiliar (c.f. Aboud, 1988), but rather they will be those that have social significance in the community (Katz, 1976; Vaughan, 1987).

A critical part of ethnic awareness is ethnic self-identification; that is, the understanding that children themselves are a member of a particular ethnic group, to the exclusion of others. According to SIDT, there is evidence that self-identification occurs soon after the acquisition of ethnic awareness. Accurate self-identification has been reported in dominant group children as young as 3- years (Marsh, 1970) and, by 6- or 7-years, nearly all dominant group children are able to correctly indicate their ethnic group membership (Aboud, 1977, 1980; Corenblum & Wilson, 1982; Fox & Jordan,
The acquisition of ethnic awareness and ethnic self-identification is important as it heralds SIDT’s third stage of ethnic preference, which overlaps with children’s ongoing development of ethnic awareness and elaboration.

*Ethnic Preference.*

SIDT argues that there are three central features that characterize this phase. First, social categorization processes lead children to identify or associate themselves with other children who are considered similar on one or more dimensions (including gender, ethnic group, and age) and to see children from out-groups as different. A number of studies has revealed that not only can ethnic majority children as young as 3-years easily distinguish the faces of ethnic in-group versus out-group members, but that by the time they commence school they are able to quantify their perceptions of similarity and differences between ethnic in-group and out-group members (Katz, 1973; Katz & Seavey, 1973; Katz, Sohn, & Zalk, 1975; Nesdale et al., 2003). A critical part of the categorisation process builds on children’s awareness of ethnic differences and their increasing ability to identify with one ethnic group (ethnic in-group) to the exclusion of ethnic out-groups. This self-identification as a member of the ethnic majority group (along with gender identification) is considered critical in the child’s incipient social identity (Nesdale, 1999, 2004, 2006). The most noticeable outcome of self-identification is that children turn their focus toward the in-group rather than the out-group and they are primed to look for, and see, similarities rather than differences.

The second central feature of this phase lies in the children’s orientation to, and preference for, the ethnic in-group relative to ethnic out-groups. Unlike ST and SIT, which both assume that ethnic self-identification is sufficient to instigate both in-group
favoritism and out-group prejudice, SIDT contends that the act of self-identification simply triggers a focus on, and a preference for, the in-group. In-group preference is based on the perceived similarity between in-group members which is revealed as in-group preference, rather than a focus on the out-group and perceived dissimilarity between the child and the out-group members, which is revealed as dislike and prejudice.

Support for this view comes primarily from research on ethnic preferences. For example, when presented with in-group and out-group stimulus figures, ethnic majority children consistently indicate a preference for the ethnic in-group stimulus figure (Meltzer, 1941; Nesdale et al., 2003, 2004, Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005; Nesdale & Flessor, 2001; Nesdale, Griffiths et al., 2005; Nesdale, Maass et al., 2005; Springer, 1950; Tajfel, Nemeth, Jahoda, Campbell, & Johnson, 1970; Verna, 1982). When asked to assign positive and negative traits, ethnic majority children invariably assign more positive traits to the ethnic in-group than an out-group (Aboud & Mitchell, 1977; Genesee et al., 1978; Kowalski, 2003; Nesdale, 1999; Nesdale & Brown, 2004). Support for in-group preference (rather than ethnic prejudice) has also been demonstrated in children’s friendship choices, indicating that while young children preferred to play with other members of the ethnic in-group (Aboud et al., 2003; Boulton & Smith, 1992; Cramer & Anderson, 2003; Kowalski & Lo, 2001, Teplin, 1976) they did not actively avoid ethnic out-group classmates (McCandless & Hoyt, 1961).

In a similar vein, Kowalski (2003) reported that while children as young as 3-years differentiated between the ethnic in-group and out-group, they did not hold negative out-group attitudes. Rather, the attitudes they held toward the out-groups were simply less positive. Similarly, using a minimal group paradigm and ethnic majority
children, Nesdale et al. (2003) reported that while participants indicated greater liking for the in-group, they did not report dislike or hatred for the out-group, only that they liked them less.

Interestingly, support for the concept of in-group preference (versus out-group prejudice) has also been revealed in research conducted with adults (Brewer, 1979). Brewer’s research has indicated that in-group preference does not necessarily equate to hatred for the out-group. She reported low correlations between positive attitudes towards the in-group and the expression of hostility towards the out-group.

The third feature of this phase is that whereas the in-group is perceived as being distinct and qualitatively better than other groups (positive distinctiveness) children who are members of an (ethnic) out-group are considered more similar to each other, as well as different to members of the in-group (Katz et al., 1975; Katz & Zalk, 1978). This has been referred to as the out-group homogeneity effect (Linville, 1998). Dominant group children in this phase typically strive for the positive distinctiveness of their group through ongoing comparison with (ethnic) out-groups. They are exposed to, and gather, information which supports the positive distinctiveness of their ethnic in-group. At the same time, they may also begin to learn information about ethnic out-groups, which is typically more negative and serves to heighten the differences between the groups, contributing to the perceived relative superiority of the in-group and increasing the social self-esteem of in-group members. Like Vaughan’s (1987) adaptation of SIT, SIDT acknowledges that children are content to operate within existing social categories where the nature of group relations is established.

SIDT posits that as children are exposed to the various ethnic groups that comprise their local community, their understanding of the prevailing social structure of these groups is enhanced (Radke et al., 1949). Part of this understanding is their
awareness of the relative social standing of the different ethnic groups (Radke & Trager, 1950) and the nature of relations between the groups (Vaughan, 1986). In addition, they also become aware of the social language used to describe the different groups and their respective members (Nesdale, 2001).

**Ethnic Prejudice.**

According to SIDT, the ethnic prejudice phase is marked by a change in focus from in-group preference to out-group prejudice. Unlike ST, which suggests that all children display ethnic prejudice up until 7-years of age, whereupon it systematically decreases with increasing age, SIDT contends that it is during this period that prejudice may develop and crystallize in some children, but not in others. The progression from in-group preference to out-group prejudice requires a shift in the child’s focus in their affective, cognitive, and behavioural domains. This shift implies that the child’s attention moves away from a focus on the in-group and becomes focused on both the in-group and the out-group and, in some cases, results in a preoccupation with the out-group. Rather than simply indicating greater liking for an in-group member, ethnic prejudice is manifested as a dislike or hatred of the ethnic out-group. This phase (for those children who develop ethnic prejudice), is also characterised by a shift away from ethnic out-group friends toward exclusion and derogation of out-group members and, in more extreme cases, it may be expressed as verbal and physical attacks against members of the ethnic out-group. In addition, rather than simply knowing and being able to recite negative facts (stereotypes) about an out-group that had been learnt in the previous stage, as reported by Augoustinos and Rosewarne (2001), prejudiced children hold these stereotypes as their own.

According to SIDT, whether ethnic prejudice emerges in children is dependent upon the presence of one or more of the following factors. First, the emergence of
Ethnic prejudice depends upon the degree to which the child identifies with the ethnic in-group. That is, SIDT argues that the more that the child identifies with the in-group, the more likely it is that s/he will like the members of the in-group and at the same time dislike the members of ethnic out-groups. Nesdale, Durkin et al. (2005) have reported evidence consistent with this claim.

Second, the development of ethnic prejudice is also influenced by the in-group’s norms as they relate to prejudice. That is, when the child’s group holds ethnic prejudice as a norm, there is a greater likelihood that the child will conform to the group norm and display ethnic prejudice. Further, Nesdale (2006) noted an interaction between group norms and in-group identification, such that the more that the child identifies with the in-group, the greater the likelihood that they will conform to the in-group’s (prejudicial) norm.

In short, SIDT argues that children display negative and prejudicial attitudes when they mirror the attitudes or norms of the group that the child values and with whom the child identifies. That is, children will adopt those attitudes that fit with their view of themselves as belonging to a social group and sharing a particular set of attitudes, beliefs, and behaviours that are governed by positive (or inclusive) or negative (and exclusionary) group norms. The links between group norms and ethnic attitudes have been demonstrated in a study by Nesdale, Maass et al. (2005). In that study, Anglo-Australian children were allocated to a group with a norm of either exclusion or inclusion. The results indicated that when the group had a norm of exclusion, the participants reported dislike for the ethnic minority out-group, whereas when the in-group had a norm of inclusion, the participants reported liking for the ethnic minority out-group.
Third, SIDT argues that ethnic prejudice will increase to the extent that the members perceive that their group is threatened by members of the out-group (Brown, 1995; Stephan, Ybarra, Martinez, Schwarzwald, & Tur-Kaspa, 1998; Teichman et al., 2006). Recent research has indicated that as out-group threat is perceived to increase, so ethnic prejudice towards that group will be increased (Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005; Nesdale, Maass et al., 2005). For example, Nesdale and colleagues reported that the participants evidenced dislike for the ethnic minority out-group when the in-group felt threatened by the out-group.

In summary, SIDT proposes that the progression from preference to prejudice is dependent on a number of intra-group factors or elements, including social identity processes and group norms as well as intergroup factors, including the perception of out-group threat.

A number of SIDT’s propositions are directly contrary to ST (Aboud, 1988). First, unlike ST which sees the development of ethnic prejudice as occurring as a matter of course in all children, SIDT contends that the development of ethnic prejudice in a child is influenced by the social/community situation in which the child functions. On this basis, SIDT argues that there are conditions under which children may never display ethnic prejudice. These include contexts in which children identify strongly with a group that does not endorse prejudice towards ethnic minority groups and settings in which inter-ethnic relations are harmonious or a super-ordinate goal exists that overrides the distinctiveness of ethnic groups (Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastosio, Bachman, & Rust, 1993). In contrast, ethnic prejudice has been shown to exist in children as young as 3-years of age under conditions of continued intergroup conflict. A recent study by Teichman et al. (2006) indicated that the presence of inter-ethnic
conflict between Israelis and Palestinians accelerated the development of ethnic prejudice in young Israeli children.

Second, because SIDT emphasises the importance of social motivational processes rather than perceptual-cognitive processes, the development of ethnic prejudice is not linked to specific ages. Rather, prejudice depends upon children’s social knowledge and their particular social circumstance. Countering the argument by Aboud (1988) that ethnic prejudice decreases after the acquisition of concrete operations, Nesdale suggests that this decline in ethnic prejudice may be a result not of decreasing prejudice but rather in their increasing ability to know, and respond to, what is considered socially appropriate behaviour. Given that children’s social knowledge increases as they increase in age, SIDT anticipates that children’s tendencies towards displaying negative attitudes and behaviours towards out-groups are likely to moderate or decrease. That is, as children increase in age, it is likely that they develop an increasing tendency to regulate the expression of particular attitudes and behaviour in accordance with their beliefs about what is generally acceptable (e.g., by teachers and parents) in a particular situation (Rutland, Cameron, Milne & McGeorge, 2003).

Support for this proposed increased self-monitoring with age has been reported in research by Nesdale and colleagues (Nesdale et al., 2003, 2004, Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005; Nesdale, Griffiths et al., 2005; Nesdale, Maass et al., 2005). These studies indicated that there were quantitatively different responses of participants at different ages. In each study, the older participants reported more positive attitudes toward out-groups than the younger participants. The authors suggested that the responses of the older children probably reflected their increasing tendency to self-regulate the expression of particular attitudes and behaviours in accordance with internalised normative beliefs about what is acceptable behaviour in a particular situation. Although
the findings do not provide direct support for it, consistent with this view is evidence that children begin to understand and engage in self-monitoring behaviour from about eight years of age (Aloise-Young, 1993; Banerjee, 2002; Banerjee & Yuill, 1999; Bennett & Yeeles, 1990). In addition, there is evidence that they become increasingly aware that intergroup prejudice and discrimination are generally considered to be unacceptable and inappropriate (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Killen, Piscane, Lee-Kim, & Ardila-Rey, 2001; Rutland, 1999; Rutland et al., 2003; Spears Brown & Bigler, 2004; Thiemer, Killen, & Stangor, 2001).

While much of SIDT’s support has been drawn from studies using an experimental simulation methodology (Nesdale et al., 2003, 2004; Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005; Nesdale & Flesser, 2001; Nesdale, Griffiths et al., 2005; Nesdale, Maass et al., 2005) there is also a growing body of research supporting SIDT’s propositions using paradigms that are socially realistic. For example, Bigler and colleagues (Bigler, 1995; Bigler et al., 1997) randomly assigned 6- to 11- year-old children at a summer camp into groups differentiated by the color of their shirts. This assignment prompted in-group favouritism by the children. Other intergroup studies have also revealed that when social comparisons and competitiveness between groups are emphasised, children’s in-group favouritism increases accordingly (Vaughan et al., 1981; Yee & Brown, 1992).

In evaluating SIDT, it is clear that the model provides a more comprehensive explanation of the development of children’s ethnic prejudice than either ST or SIT. The strength of SIDT lies in its ability to account for the development of children’s ethnic attitudes drawing upon social processes, as well as their social knowledge. Importantly, it argues that the development of ethnic prejudice is not directly linked to age or, at least, not limited to the more sophisticated cognitive processes attained via
concrete operations that are associated with increasing age. However, SIDT argues that social cognitive processes might serve to reduce the likelihood of the expression of ethnic prejudice as children increase in age. These social cognitive processes include the ability to decentre (i.e., the ability to take the perspective of another, (in this case an ethnic out-group individual), to engage in higher level moral reasoning (Feffer & Gourevitch, 1960; Kohlberg, 1976; Selman & Byrne, 1974), and to experience emotional empathy towards the members of minority out-groups which increases with increasing age.

Nesdale (1999, 2004, 2006) suggested that there are good grounds for supposing that the ability of ethnic majority group children to decentre and to be able to ‘see’ the perspective of the ethnic minority group member will result in these children being less likely to develop ethnic prejudice toward the ethnic out-group than children who had not yet developed this skill. Similarly, children who develop moral reasoning that goes beyond the external consequences of behaviour and are able to reason based on what is considered right by universal principles of rightness would also be less likely to develop prejudice. Finally, SIDT proposes that children’s ability to feel empathy for less well-off ethnic minority children are less likely to develop ethnic prejudice towards the latter children. Although research has not addressed the effects of decentration and moral reasoning on children’s ethnic prejudice, a recent study by Nesdale, Griffiths et al., (2005) reported that children’s degree of emotional empathy was related to their degree of liking for an ethnic out-group. Consistent with SIDT, children with higher levels of empathy expressed greater liking for members of ethnic minority out-groups.

In sum, research support for SIDT has primarily been based on studies examining the variables which are presumed to be influential in the preference and prejudice phases. In addition, support has mainly come from studies using simulated
groups rather than real groups. However, whereas SIDT provides an account of the development of ethnic attitudes in majority children, it has yet to be applied to ethnic minority children, in order to investigate the processes that underlie the development of ethnic attitudes in all children.

**Study 2: Children’s Ethnic Attitudes in Australia**

Based on the preceding analysis, a number of issues were identified that need to be addressed. First, no research to date has examined and compared the ethnic attitudes of ethnic majority (Anglo-Australian) and minority (Pacific Islander) groups in Australia. Given the differences between these groups that have been identified previously, this study was interested in investigating their attitudes towards the in-group versus the out-group. Specifically, the study examined whether Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander children hold more favourable attitudes toward their own ethnic in-group than towards ethnic out-groups. It was anticipated that the ethnic in-group would be rated more favourably than ethnic out-groups by the ethnic majority group. However, it was unclear how the ethnic minority children would respond given that the results of the research with other ethnic minority groups are mixed, especially in relation to increasing age. It was further expected that based on the results of Kowalski (2003) and Nesdale et al. (2003), the participants would express less positive attitudes toward ethnic out-groups, rather than expressing negative attitudes.

Second, the majority of the existing research has compared children’s attitudes towards their ethnic in-group and one other ethnic out-group (eg. European- vs. African-Americans, Anglo-New Zealanders vs. Maoris, and Anglo-Australians vs. Pacific Islanders). Conclusions concerning children’s ethnic preferences based on attitudes to one ethnic out-group are limited in terms of generalisability. Since communities in Australia comprise many ethnic groups, including the dominant group, the indigenous
group, as well as immigrant groups, the present study sought to extend the
generalisability of the present results by examining the participants' attitudes toward
two other ethnic out-groups. For Anglo-Australian participants, this included
indigenous (Aborigine) Australians, as well as Pacific Islanders. In contrast, for the
Pacific Islander participants, the out-groups included Anglo-Australians and indigenous
Australians.

Extrapolating from Black-Gutman & Hickson’s (1996) results, it was expected
that the Anglo-Australian participants would indicate greater preference for the Pacific
Islander group than the Aboriginal group. However, if children categorise groups into
‘us’ and ‘them’, as suggested by SIT, it might be expected that there would be no
significant difference in the ratings of the ethnic out-groups. Given the inconsistencies
in the extant findings relating to ethnic minority children, it was unclear how the Pacific
Islander participants would respond on this measure.

Third, researchers have typically presented children with one representative of a
particular ethnic group (usually a doll or picture) and one representative of a second
ethnic group, and then asked them to choose a friend or the person (or group) that they
liked more. As noted earlier, one issue here is whether one stimulus figure provides a
sufficient representation of a particular group. Accordingly, consistent with Nesdale
and colleagues (Nesdale et al., 2003, 2004; Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005; Nesdale &
Flesser, 2001; Nesdale, Griffiths et al., 2005; Nesdale, Maass et al., 2005), each group
in the study was represented by two figures. A second issue is whether the use of a
single item such as “Which group do you like?” or “Which group do you want to play
with?” is able to provide a comprehensive insight into children’s ethnic attitudes.
Accordingly, the present research responded to this limitation by using a number of
independent measures to explore children’s ethnic attitudes.
The first measure used was a modification of the Multi-response Racial Attitude measure (MRA, Doyle et al., 1988). This independent assessment measure allowed participants to rate three ethnic groups (Anglo-Australian, Pacific Islander, and Aboriginal) independently of each other on a common series of traits, with each trait being rated on a bi-polar scale. This allowed for the intensity of the children’s attribution on each trait to be measured. It was anticipated that the Anglo-Australians would rate the in-group more positively than out-groups, while the ratings of the Pacific Islanders were less clear.

The second measure used a more traditional methodology and asked participants to nominate which group of children they would prefer to play with. On the basis of previous results (Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996; Nesdale et al., 2003, 2004; Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005; Nesdale, Griffiths et al., 2005; Nesdale, Maass et al., 2005), it was expected that the Anglo-Australian children would express a clear preference for members of the ethnic in-group. Again, the expected responses of the Pacific Islander participants were less clear. Based on their responses to the social knowledge measures (Study 1b, Chapter 3), where these children did not discriminate between the ethnic in-group and the dominant group, there was some uncertainty relating to how the children would respond.

The third measure utilised a modification of the street simulation developed by Valk (2000). Specifically, children in the present study were asked to allocate a house to families from the ethnic in-group and several ethnic out-groups in a hypothetical street. Arguably, this exercise is more realistic than trait ratings and conceivably reflects more closely the attitudes of the community in which the child lives. While in reality people have no choice in their neighbours, they invariably express an opinion about, or attitude toward, them. Extrapolating from Valk and Karu’s (2001) results with
young adults, it was expected that the children would locate the house of the ethnic in-
group family significantly closer to their own house than they would locate the house of
the ethnic out-groups. Also of interest, however, was whether the children would
differentiate between the ethnic out-groups, perhaps choosing to locate one group closer
than the other.

The final issue addressed concerned the possibility that the ethnic attitudes and
preferences of these children might change as a function of their age. As noted earlier,
previous research has indicated that there are sometimes age-related changes in
children’s ethnic attitudes. The research has indicated, at least for ethnic majority
children, that in-group bias sometimes declines with age and/or there is an increase in
out-group positivity (Aboud et al., 2003; Aboud & Mitchell, 1977; Kalin, 1979; Nesdale
et al., 2003, 2004; Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005; Nesdale, Griffiths et al., 2005; Nesdale,
Maass et al., 2005). However, this finding has not always been obtained (Asher &
Allen, 1969; Davey, 1983; Hraba & Grant, 1970; Milner, 1973; Rice et al., 1974;
Vaughan & Thompson, 1961). Moreover, inconsistent results have also been reported
with ethnic minority children (Asher & Allen, 1969; Epstein et al., 1976; Margie et al.,
2005). Accordingly, the present study provided a further opportunity to test the age
effect, and hence the study included samples of 6-, 8- and 10-year-old children.

The aim of this study was to examine ethnic majority and minority children’s
attitudes towards their own ethnic group, as well as towards a subset of ethnic groups
that comprise their local community. On the basis of previous research it was expected
that the Anglo-Australian children would display a more positive attitude toward the
ethnic in-group than towards ethnic out-groups. In particular, it was anticipated that
1. the Anglo-Australian in-group would be rated more positively than the two
ethnic out-groups;
2. members of the Anglo-Australian in-group would be preferred as friends/playmates and neighbours than members of the two ethnic out-groups.

In contrast, in view of the diverse results reported in the literature, it was unclear how the Pacific Islander children would express their ethnic attitudes. However, based on the results of study 1c, it was expected that

1. Pacific Islander participants would express at least equally positive attitudes towards the in-group and the Anglo-Australian out-group; and

2. Pacific Islander participants would not differentiate between the in-group and the Anglo-Australian out-group when nominating friends or neighbours.

Finally, it was also anticipated that, regardless of the children’s ethnic group membership, their attitudes towards the out-groups would be expressed in less positive rather than negative terms.

Method

Participants

The participants from the previous study (Study 1b) also took part in this study. Briefly, there were 119 participants from Grades 1 to 7 recruited from two primary schools in Logan City, South-east Queensland. Of these, 59 were Anglo-Australian and 60 were Pacific Islander. There were 56 males and 63 females divided into three age groups. There were 40 participants from Grades 1 and 2 (age M = 6.5, SD = .6 months), 41 from grades 3 and 4 (age M = 8.4, SD = .5), and 38 from Grades 5 and 6 (age M = 10.7, SD = .6). Only those children who had been granted parental permission were included in the sample.
Materials

Photographs.

Photographs were randomly selected from the pool generated in the previous study (see Study 1b, Chapter 3 for a more detailed description of this process). Different photographs were used in the administration of the ethnic attitudes and ethnic preference measures. This was done to avoid confounding the results.

Ethnic attitudes.

For the ethnic attitude task, six photographs, each measuring 75mm x 98mm and depicting two of each Anglo-Australian, Pacific Islander, and Aboriginal children were used. The photographs were matched in age and gender to the participant. The six photographs were displayed on a single landscaped A4 page. Each group was separated by a 5mm vertical red line.

Choice of friends.

For this task, the target groups were represented by different photographs of two Anglo-Australian, Pacific Islander, Vietnamese, or Aboriginal children. The photographs measured 130mm x 100mm and were presented vertically on an A4-sized landscaped paper with two groups to a page. The groups were separated by a 2mm red line. The four groups were presented simultaneously by enclosing them in plastic display sheets inserted into a binder. The location of each group was counterbalanced to guard against order effects. In addition, a single photograph of either an Anglo-Australian or Pacific Islander child matching the gender and general age group of the participant was used in the second part of this measure. These individual photographs measured 130mm x 100mm, and depicted a head-and-shoulders image of an Anglo-Australian or Pacific Islander child matched in age and gender to the participant.
Response Booklet.

A response booklet was produced containing a number of sections, each relating to the different measures of interest. Refer Appendix C.

Ethnic attitudes.

Seven adjective pairs were adapted from the MRA (Doyle et al., 1988). The adjectives used included: *bad-good; unfriendly-friendly; unhelpful–helpful; stupid–smart; dirty-clean*. Each pair was presented on a 5-point bi-polar response scale. Participants indicated the extent to which each adjective best described the children from the three separate ethnic groups. The bi-polar scales were anchored by 1 (very negative rating- e.g., very unfriendly) and 5 (very positive rating- e.g., very friendly), with 3 indicating a neutral point. A total score was calculated for each participant in relation to each of the ethnic groups. This score ranged from 7 (very negative) to 35 (very positive). This scale has been used previously and has a Cronbach reliability of .87 (Nesdale, Maass, Kiesner, Durkin, & Griffiths, 2006).

Choice of friends.

Participants responded to two items, choosing a friend/playmate for themselves and for a member of the ethnic out-group. Their responses to these items were recorded verbatim by the experimenter.

Proximity of ethnic neighbours.

A diagram comprising nine ‘houses’ (represented as boxes, each with a gabled roof) was used. The middle house was shaded blue whereas the other eight had no shading. This middle house was marked ‘your house’. The participants were asked to indicate which house they would allocate to an Anglo-Australian, a Pacific Islander, an Aboriginal and a Vietnamese family, by placing the appropriate letter on the house. The child could locate the ‘new’ families to either the left or right of their ‘house’. The
responses were scored from 1 (immediately next door) to 4 (furthest house from child’s house), regardless of direction.

Procedure

Participants were tested individually in a quiet location near to their classroom during scheduled school hours. Once rapport had been established between the participant and the experimenter, the testing session commenced. The participants were informed that their parents had given the experimenter permission to ask the child some questions and to discuss a number of topics. They were also informed that the questions would be answered in several ways, including a questionnaire where the participant drew a circle around the response that they considered to be the best answer for them, or the experimenter would write down their answers on the questionnaire. The participant was then given the opportunity to practice responding to sample items until they felt confident in responding. The participants were also informed that

“unlike schoolwork, there is no right or wrong answers to any of the questions. I (the experimenter) am interested only in what you think is the best answer for you”.

The participant’s understanding of this was checked and the testing session commenced. The procedure for each of the measures is presented separately for ease of comprehension.

Ethnic attitudes.

In counter-balanced order, participants were shown the photographs of the three ethnic groups (Anglo-Australian, Pacific Islander, and Aboriginal) and were asked to rate the groups on the items in the scale. The following instruction was given:

“I would like to show you some photographs of some kids, and I would like you to tell me what you think of them. Remember that
there are no right or wrong answers; I (the experimenter) am only interested in your thoughts and opinions about these kids. Like before, these questions are answered by drawing a circle around what you think is the best answer for you”.

The participants were directed to the response booklet and the items and the response options were read aloud and they responded accordingly.

Choice of friend/playmate.

In counter-balanced order, participants were shown the photographs of the four ethnic groups (Anglo-Australian, Pacific Islander, Vietnamese, and Aboriginal) and were asked to imagine that they had just started at a new school. The participants were told

“Here are photos of some groups of kids, if you could choose, which group would you like to play with (or for the older children ….the group you would like to join in with)?”

The participant’s response was recorded by the experimenter. The subjects were then shown a photograph of another child of the same age and gender but from the (Anglo-Australian or Pacific Islander) ethnic out-group and they were told

“I would like you to pretend that this child (in the photo) might be coming to your school, which group of friends do you think that this new kid would like to join (or play) with?”

Their response was again recorded by the experimenter.

Proximity of ethnic neighbours.

Participants were directed to a diagram in their response booklet with a row of nine ‘houses’. The following introduction to this measure was given
“Let’s pretend that one Australian (A), one Pacific Islander (P), one Aboriginal (B), and one Vietnamese (V) family is going to move into your street. You do not know anything about their families except which ethnic group they come from. Because it is your street you are allowed to choose who lives in which house. Where in relation to your house would you like these families to live? Can you write the letter of each group in the house that you want them to live in? But remember, you can only put each family into one house”.

Once the participant had responded to all the measures in this study, any questions they may have had were answered. They were then thanked for their participation and returned to their classroom.

Results

Prior to any data analysis, the data were examined and tested for violations to the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance. Any violations to these assumptions and the identification of outliers will be presented with the individual data sets. An alpha level of .05 was used as the significance level for all the analyses and Duncan’s Multiple Range Test (α = .05) was used to assess the significance of differences between cell means. Partial η² is reported as an estimate of effect size.

Ethnic Attitudes

Participants’ summed scores on the attitude rating scales were subjected to a 3 (age; 6- vs. 8- vs. 10-years) x 2 (gender: male vs. female) x 2 (ethnic group: Anglo-Australian vs. Pacific Islander) x 3 (target ethnic group; Anglo-Australian vs. Pacific
Islander vs. Aboriginal) repeated analysis of variance, with the last factor a within subjects factor.

The results revealed one significant main effect and two interactions. There was a significant main effect for target group, $F(2, 214) = 33.31, p < .0005$, partial $\eta^2 = .24$. The participants rated the Aboriginal group significantly less positively ($M = 23.91, SD = 6.09$) than the Anglo-Australian group ($M = 27.95, SD = 4.45$) and the Pacific Islander group ($M = 27.24, SD = 4.93$), who did not differ significantly.

This main effect was qualified by two significant interactions. First, the analysis revealed a target ethnic group x participant ethnic group interaction $F(2,214) = 7.254, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$. This is shown in Figure 4.2.
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**Figure 4.2** Target ethnic group x participant ethnic group interaction effect on mean ethnic attitudes

Comparison of the cell means using Duncan’s Multiple Range Test revealed that the Anglo-Australian participants rated their ethnic in-group more positively ($M = 28.88, SD = 4.63$) than the Pacific Islander group ($M = 26.22, SD = 4.71$) who were rated significantly more positively than the Aboriginal group ($M = 23.78, SD = 6.51$).
In comparison, the Pacific Islander participants rated the ethnic in-group and the Anglo-Australian out-group equally positively ($M$s = 28.25, 27.03, $SD$s = 4.98, 4.14, respectively), and significantly more positively than the Aboriginal out-group ($M$ = 24.03, $SD$ = 5.66). From another perspective, both the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander participants rated the Aboriginal group significantly less positively than the other two groups.

In order to further investigate if ethnic out-groups were disliked or simply liked less, the attitude of the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islanders participants towards out-groups, one-sample t-tests were conducted against the scale mid-point. As anticipated, the attitudes of the Anglo-Australians towards the Pacific Islanders and the Aboriginals were significantly different to the scale mid-point (Pacific Islander $t(58) = 19.95$, $p < .0005$ and Aboriginals $t(58) = 11.52$, $p < .0005$). For both ethnic out-groups, the attitude ratings were located in the positive half of the scale, indicating less positive rather than a negative attitude.

When the attitude ratings of the Pacific Islander participants towards the Anglo-Australian and Aboriginal out-groups were examined against the scale mid-point, the analysis also indicated a similar pattern of results to those of the Anglo-Australians. That is, the attitude ratings were located in the positive half of the scale for the Anglo-Australian $t(59) = 24.40$, $p < .0005$, and for the Aboriginals $t(59) = 13.72$, $p < .0005$, indicating a less positive attitude towards these groups rather than a negative attitude.

The analysis also revealed a significant target ethnic group x age group interaction $F(4, 214) = 3.99$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .07$. Refer Figure 4.3.
Figure 4.3  Target ethnic group x participant age interaction effect on ethnic attitude measure.

Comparison of the cell means using Duncan’s Multiple Range Test indicated that regardless of the participant’s ethnicity, the 6-year-olds rated the Aboriginal group less positively ($M= 24.87, SD = 6.40$) than either the Anglo-Australian ($M = 29.00, SD = 4.40$) or Pacific Islander groups ($M = 27.73, SD = 4.43$), whose ratings did not differ. Similarly, the 8-year-olds rated the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander groups ($Ms = 28.32, 27.10$ and $SDs = 4.64, 6.37$, respectively) equally and more positively than the Aboriginal group ($M = 22.10, SD = 6.79$). In contrast, at 10-years-of-age, the participants rated each of the groups equally positively (Anglo-Australian: $M = 26.45, SD = 4.04$; Pacific Islander: $M = 26.89, SD = 3.55$; Aboriginal group: $M = 24.84, SD = 4.04$). The results also revealed that while there were no age differences in the ratings of the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander ethnic groups by the participants, the 8-year-olds rated the Aboriginal ethnic group significantly less positively than the 6- and 10-year-olds.

From another perspective, the participants’ attitude towards the Anglo-Australian did not change as a function of the participants’ age. That is, there was no
significant difference in the in ratings of positivity between the 6- \( (M = 29.00, SD = 4.40) \), 8- \( (M = 28.32, SD = 4.64) \) and 10-year-olds \( (M = 26.45, SD = 4.04) \). In addition, there was also no significant difference in the participants’ attitudes towards the Pacific Islanders at either 6- \( (M = 27.73, SD = 4.43) \), 8- \( (Ms = 27.10, SD = 6.37) \) or 10-years \( (M = 26.89, SD = 3.55) \). In contrast there were age-related differences in the children’s attitudes towards the Aboriginal group. The 8-year-olds indicated a significantly less positive attitude towards this groups than the 6-year-olds \( (Ms = 24.87, 22.10, SDs = 6.40, 6.79 \text{ respectively}) \). The attitudes of the 10-year-olds \( (M= 24.84, SD = 4.04) \) were significantly more positive than the 8-year-olds, and were not significantly different to the attitudes of the 6-year-olds.

**Choice of Friend**

The participants were asked to choose a group of friends from a number of different ethnic groups (including their own). In addition, they were shown a photograph of a child from the ethnic out-group and asked to nominate which group they thought this child would choose to play with. The analysis for the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander participants are reported separately.

**Anglo-Australian participants.**

Analysis of the Anglo-Australian participants responses revealed a significant result for choice of own playmate \( \chi^2 (3, N = 59) = 63.24, p < .05 \). Table 4.1 shows that the majority of these children indicated that they would prefer to play with other members of the ethnic in-group (i.e., Anglo-Australians). Of the remaining groups, these participants expressed a greater desire to play with the Pacific Islander group than either the Aboriginal or Vietnamese groups.
Table 4.1

Proportion of Nominations for Choice of Playmates for Self and Ethnic Out-Group Member by Anglo-Australian Participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target groups</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anglo-Australian (self)</td>
<td>Pacific Islander (other child)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Australian</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional analyses were conducted to test if there were differences in the choices of playmates for the participants as a function of their age or gender. The chi-square analysis for gender indicated that there was a significant difference in the responses for boys and girls when asked to pick which group they would choose to play with, $\chi^2(3, N = 59) = 7.83, p < .05$. A majority of girls (83%) picked their ethnic in-group (i.e., Anglo-Australian) as preferred playmates. In contrast, 45% of the boys indicated that they would be more willing to play with members of the other groups although the majority (55%) indicated that the Anglo-Australian ethnic group was preferred. The analysis conducted on the choice of playmates as a function of age was not significant. At each age, the children indicated a preference for their own ethnic group (i.e., Anglo-Australian) rather than the other ethnic groups.

When asked to nominate which group a Pacific Islander child of the same age and gender would choose to play with, the result of the chi-square analysis was significant, $\chi^2(3, N = 59) = 41.68, p < .05$. As shown in Table 4.2, the majority indicated that a Pacific Islander child would choose to play with their ethnic in-group (i.e., Pacific Islander). The participants further thought that a Pacific Islander child
would choose to play with a group of Aboriginal children in preference to a group of Anglo-Australians, and Vietnamese children. The analysis of choices as a function of gender was non-significant. Both boys and girls indicated that a Pacific Islander child would choose to play with other Pacific Islander children.

There was also a significant difference in the participants’ responses as a function of age, $\chi^2 (6, \ N = 59) = 14.22, p < .05$. The 6-year-olds indicated that a Pacific Islander child would choose to play with each of the groups equally (Anglo-Australian 25%, Pacific Islander 30%, Aborigine 25%, and Vietnamese 20%), whereas the 8- and 10-year-olds indicated that a Pacific Islander would show a clear preference (78%) for members of their own ethnic group compared to the other groups (Anglo-Australian 5.56%; Aborigine 16.68%; Vietnamese 0%, respectively).

*Pacific Islander participants.*

The responses of the Pacific Islander participants to the first question (Which group would you choose to play with?) revealed a significant result, $\chi^2 (3, \ N = 60) = 86.00, p < .05$. Like the Anglo-Australians, the majority of these children chose members of their ethnic in-group (i.e. Pacific Islander) as their preferred play group, Anglo-Australians were nominated less frequently, but more often than the Vietnamese or Aboriginal children as preferred playmates. Table 4.2 outlines these results.
Table 4.2
Proportion of Nominations for Choice of Playmates for Self and Other Ethnic Group Member by Pacific Islander Participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Ethnic groups</th>
<th>Pacific Islander (self)</th>
<th>Anglo-Australian (other child)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Australian</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Pacific Islanders’ responses were further analysed on the basis of participant gender. The results of this analysis were non-significant. Both boys and girls showed a clear preference for members of their ethnic in-group as preferred friends (81% and 80%, respectively), rather than members of the ethnic out-groups. Similarly, there were no significant differences in the choice of playmate as a function of age. All participants, regardless of age, indicated that they would prefer other Pacific Islander children as friends.

The Pacific Islander children were then asked to indicate which group they thought an Anglo-Australian child would choose to play with. The chi-square statistic was significant, $\chi^2 (3, N = 60) = 115.73, p < .05$. As shown in Table 4.3, the majority of participants indicated that in their opinion, an Anglo-Australian child would choose to play with other Anglo-Australian children (81.6%), while choosing the other groups significantly less frequently.

The result of the chi-square analysis as a function of gender was not significant. Both boys and girls indicated that, in their opinion, an Anglo-Australian child would choose other Anglo-Australian as friends. The age-based analysis was also non-
significant. The participants at each age indicated that an Anglo-Australian child would prefer to play with other Anglo-Australian children if they had the choice.

**Proximity of ethnic groups**

Participants’ distance scores for each ethnic family were analysed using a 3 (age: 6- vs. 8- vs. 10-years) x 2 (gender: male vs. female) x 2 (participant ethnic group: Anglo-Australian vs. Pacific Islander) x 4 (target ethnic group: Anglo-Australian vs. Pacific Islander vs. Vietnamese vs. Aboriginal) ANOVA, with the last factor being a within subjects factor. The analysis yielded two main effects which were further qualified by two interactions.

A main effect for *age* was revealed by this analysis, $F(2, 107) = 5.90, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .10$. A comparison of the cell means indicated that the 10-year-olds placed other families closer to their home ($M = 1.90, SD = .08$) than the 6-year-olds ($M = 2.30, SD = .08$) and the 8-year-olds ($M = 2.20, SD = .08$) who did not differ.

A significant main effect for *target group* was also revealed, $F(3, 321) = 19.720, p < .0005$, partial $\eta^2 = .16$. Comparison of the cell means using Duncan’s Multiple Range Test, indicated that the participants located the Anglo-Australian family ($M = 1.79, SD = 1.08$), the Pacific Islander family ($M = 1.83, SD = 1.08$), and the Vietnamese families ($M = 2.21, SD = 1.01$) significantly closer than the Aboriginal ($M = 2.68, SD = 1.04$) family.

The preceding effect was qualified by a significant *ethnic target x participant ethnic group* interaction $F(3, 321) = 9.434, p < .0005$, partial $\eta^2 = .08$. Refer to Table 4.3.
Table 4.3

*Target Ethnic Group x Participant Ethnic Group Interaction on Proximity of Ethnic Families.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Participant Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Anglo-Australian</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Australian</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.59&lt;sub&gt;a,b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.98&lt;sub&gt;b,c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.76&lt;sub&gt;a,b,c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.35&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.02&lt;sub&gt;b,c,d,e&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.40&lt;sub&gt;d,e,f&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.80&lt;sub&gt;f,g&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.54&lt;sub&gt;f,g&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Cells not sharing the same means (subscripts) are significantly different. (α = .05)

This table indicates that the Anglo-Australian participants located the Anglo-Australian, Pacific Islander and the Vietnamese families equally close to their house, and significantly closer than the Aboriginal family. This table also shows that there was a clear preference by the Pacific Islander participants to have another Pacific Islander family closest to their house. The next preferred ethnic group as neighbours was the Anglo-Australian family, while the Vietnamese and Aboriginal families were the least, and equally preferred, neighbours.

However, the preceding effect was qualified by a significant target ethnic group x age group x participant ethnic group interaction, F(6, 321) = 2.312, p < .05, partial η² = .04. This interaction is shown in Figure 4.4.
Anglo-Australian participants.

Pacific Islander participants.

*Figure 4.4* Target ethnic group x age x participant ethnic group interaction effect on preferred proximity of ethnic families.
A comparison of the cell means of the three ages using Duncan’s Multiple Range Test indicated that the Anglo-Australian 6-year-olds equally preferred either an Anglo-Australian or a Vietnamese family as their closest neighbours ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 1.34$ and $M = 1.95$, $SD = 1.20$, respectively). They indicated significantly less preference for either a Pacific Islander ($M = 2.50$, $SD = 1.34$) or an Aboriginal ($M = 2.60$, $SD = 1.00$) family, which they failed to discriminate between. At the same age, the Pacific Islander 6-year-olds indicated equal preference for either another Pacific Islander family or an Anglo-Australian family ($Ms = 1.60$, $1.85$, $SDs = .88$, $1.23$ respectively). They showed significantly less preference for a Vietnamese family ($M = 2.60$, $SD = .99$) although this group was preferred significantly more than an Aboriginal family ($M = 3.20$, $SD = .89$).

The 8-year-olds were, on the whole, more definite in their choice of neighbours. The Anglo-Australian participants indicated that their preferred neighbours were another Anglo-Australian family ($M = 1.28$, $SD = .83$), significantly more so than either a Pacific Islander ($M = 2.56$, $SD = 1.25$) or a Vietnamese family ($M = 2.22$, $SD = .94$) whose proximity scores did not differ significantly. Their least preferred group as neighbours were an Aboriginal family ($M = 2.83$, $SD = 1.04$). Like the Anglo-Australians, the Pacific Islander 8-year-olds preferred to live closest to their own ethnic group ($M = 1.30$, $SD = .82$) and closer than an Anglo-Australian family ($M = 2.13$, $SD = 1.06$). These groups were preferred as neighbours significantly more than either a Vietnamese ($M = 2.52$, $SD = .99$) or an Aboriginal family ($M = 2.65$, $SD = 1.06$), whose proximity scores did not differ statistically from each other.

The Anglo-Australian 10-year-olds indicated an equal preference to live closer to a family from another Anglo-Australian ($M = 1.48$, $SD = .93$), a Pacific Islander ($M = 1.76$, $SD = .77$) or a Vietnamese ($M = 1.90$, $SD = .77$) family. In contrast, they indicated
significantly less preference to live near an Aboriginal family ($M = 2.24, SD = .94$). The Pacific Islander 10-year-olds also indicated greater preference to live next to another Pacific Islander family ($M = 1.35, SD = .61$), than to either an Anglo-Australian ($M = 1.94, SD = .83$) or a Vietnamese ($M = 2.00, SD = 1.00$) family, whose preferred proximity did not differ. Like the Anglo-Australians, the Pacific Islander participants nominated an Aboriginal family ($M = 2.65, SD = 1.06$) as the one they would least prefer to live near.

**Discussion**

The aim of the present study was to compare the ethnic attitudes of ethnic majority and minority group children toward their ethnic in-group and out-groups, at several different ages and using a number of different measures. Each of these measures examined children’s in-group and out-group attitudes from a different perspective, including evaluating the in-group and out-group on a number of attributes, the preference for a friend from the ethnic in-group versus out-groups, and an indication of the preferred proximity of these groups to the participant’s family.

*Ethnic Attitudes*

It was anticipated that the ethnic majority (Anglo-Australian) participants would rate their in-group more positively than ethnic out-groups. In accordance with this prediction and previous research, the present results indicated that ethnic majority children held more positive attitudes towards their ethnic in-group than they held towards ethnic out-groups (Doyle & Aboud, 1995; Horowitz, 1936; Kowalski, 2003; Nesdale et al., 2003). These results showed that the Anglo-Australian participants demonstrated a significantly more positive attitude towards the ethnic in-group than towards the Pacific Islander out-group, who was rated significantly more favourably than the Aboriginal out-group. However, the findings for the ethnic minority (Pacific
Islander) participants diverged from those of the ethnic majority participants. The Pacific Islander participants did not differentiate between the ethnic in-group and the Anglo-Australian ethnic out-group, such that they indicated equally positive attitudes towards these two groups, while displaying a less positive attitude toward the Aboriginal out-group. The equal positive attitude towards the ethnic in-group and the Anglo-Australian out-group reflects the result of the previous study, where these two ethnic groups were accorded equal high status by this same group of children.

The present results have highlighted differences in ethnic attitudes of ethnic majority and minority group children. That is, both the ethnic majority and ethnic minority children differentiated between the respective ethnic out-groups in their ethnic attitudes, but in different ways. Although the Aboriginal group was rated significantly less positively by the Anglo-Australian participants than the other Pacific Islander out-group, the Anglo-Australians rated both out-groups less positively than the ethnic in-group. In contrast, whereas the ethnic minority group participants rated their own group and the ethnic majority group equally positively and the Aboriginal out-group significantly less positively. This result reflects the participants’ responses on the previous social status knowledge measure reported in the previous chapter in so far as their responses are consistent with their perception of equal status between the ethnic in-group and the ethnic majority out-group.

The less positive rating of the Aboriginal representatives by both Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander participants may also be a reflection of their perception of this group as having the lowest social status. As reported in the previous chapter, all the participants indicated an awareness of the low status of the Aboriginal group, relative to the other ethnic groups in their community.
In accounting for these results, it might be argued that the different responses are a by-product of how these children differentially perceive the status of ethnic groups in their community. Thus, the more positive attitude ratings given to the ethnic in-group by the ethnic majority children might reflect their perception of the different social status achieved by the ethnic majority and minority groups in the community. That is to say, the attitudes of these majority children might simply be a reflection of the ethnic status quo and that they are reporting community reality. In contrast, the responses of the ethnic minority participants might be a reflection of how they would like the ethnic status quo to be. That is, they are reporting how they would like things to be, rather than how they actually are.

It is worth noting that while the ethnic majority and minority groups indicated different patterns of attitudes toward the ethnic majority and minority groups, they were nevertheless in agreement in revealing the least positive attitudes towards one of the ethnic out-groups, the Aboriginal group. Again, it may be that these children are simply responding on the basis of established community status and ethnic status quo. Children do not live in a vacuum, but rather they live and operate in societies where the social structure and status of ethnic groups are established. In Australia, the indigenous group is generally acknowledged by children of this age as holding the lowest social status in the eyes of the community. However, it is clear that the underlying motivations for the children’s responses require further investigation.

There were significant differences in the ratings of the ethnic groups as a function of the participants’ age. This difference in the ratings was most noticeable for the Aboriginal group. In contrast to previous studies (e.g., Nesdale et al., 2003) that reported no age effects, the present study revealed changes in attitude as a function of the participant’s age toward the Aboriginal ethnic out-group but not towards the Anglo-
Australian or Pacific Islander groups. This difference in results compared to Nesdale et al. might be a function of the inclusion of a third ethnic group.

The present results showing an absence of age related attitudes towards the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander parallel those of Nesdale et al. (2003). The inclusion of the Aboriginal group has added another layer of attitude that has not previously been extensively considered. The participants’ attitudes toward the Aboriginal group became less positive from 6- to 8-years and then became more positive at 10-years of age. This decline and subsequent increase contrasts with Black-Gutman & Hickson (1996) who reported increased out-group positivity from 6- to 8-years followed by a decline at 10-years. The basis of the differences between the ages is not immediately clear. One possibility is that the more extreme attitudes of the 8-year-olds compared with the 6- and 10-year-olds may be accounted for by the particular 8-year-old age cohort that participated in this study. Specifically, this particular group might have had negative personal experiences with indigenous children in their community.

Another possible explanation is that the change in attitudes with increasing age might lie in the 10-year-olds being more image conscious than the younger children. That is, the results might reflect their increasing ability to self-regulate the expression of less positive out-group responses in accordance with their beliefs of what constitutes socially accepted behaviour (Rutland et al., 2003). However, whereas this interpretation accounts for the increase from 8- to 10-years, it does not account for the decrease from 6- to 8-years, nor can it account for the parity between the responses of the 6- and 10-year-olds. Clearly, the issue of changes in children’s ethnic attitudes as a function of their age also needs further investigation.
Unlike some previous research (Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996; Teichman, 2001) which reported the expression of negative attitudes towards out-groups, the participants in this study did not express negative attitudes, only less positive ones. This present result provides additional support for recent research (Kowalski, 2001; Kowalski & Lo, 2003; Nesdale et al., 2003; 2004; Nesdale & Fless, 2001) which also reported the absence of negative out-group attitudes with participants reporting less positive attitudes rather than negative ones.

**Choice of friend/playmate**

When asked which ethnic group the children preferred as friends/playmates both the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Island participants indicated a clear and overwhelming preference for their ethnic in-group. This preference for the ethnic in-group was also reflected in their responses that members of an ethnic out-group would also choose from within their in-group when choosing friends.

The preference for an Anglo-Australian in-group friend is consistent with research findings reported consistently in this area (e.g., Corenblum & Annis, 1993; Epstein et al., 1976; Gin, 2003; Horowitz, 1936; Hraba & Grant, 1970). In this study, as well as previous studies, ethnic majority children indicated a clear preference for friends from the ethnic majority in-group (e.g., Aboud et al., 2003; Goldstein et al., 1979; Madge, 1976).

The preference for an in-group friend by the Pacific Islander participants is consistent with some previous research (e.g., Fox & Jordan, 1973; Hraba & Grant, 1970; Loomis, 1943; McCandless & Hoyt, 1961; Springer, 1950; Vaughan, 1978). In each of these studies, children from the ethnic minority group indicated their preference for friends from the ethnic in-group. These results contrast with other research that has
indicated a preference for the out-group when choosing friends (e.g., Asher & Allen, 1969; Clark & Clark, 1947).

This result is noteworthy because it indicates that there might not be an overlap between social knowledge and attitudes and making a decision that will impact on the individual. That is, asking children about ethnic group status and to indicate their attitudes towards ethnic groups are conceptual processes and have no implications for the individual. However, asking children to nominate a friend has ‘real-world’ implications and is a decision process that children make on a regular basis. As such, this measure might be a better measure of children’s ethnic attitudes, than more conceptual measures.

When the participants were asked to nominate friends on behalf of a member of the comparative ethnic out-group, the results highlight notable differences between their choices. The Anglo-Australian participants indicated that while a Pacific Islander would, in the first instance, choose a friend from their ethnic in-group, their second choice was for an Aboriginal friend in preference to an Anglo-Australian and a Vietnamese friend. While the children were not asked their justification for their responses, it might be tentatively suggested that the children thought that a decision of who would be chosen as friends might be made on the basis of skin colour (i.e., that brown skinned children would rather mix with other brown or black skinned children in preference to lighter skinned children). However, without seeking justification, this interpretation cannot be endorsed.

In contrast, it appeared clear that the Pacific Islanders thought an Anglo-Australian would choose other Anglo-Australians as friends, followed by Pacific Islanders, Vietnamese, and Aboriginals. While the Anglo-Australian participants might have responded to this question along ethnic lines (i.e., based on skin colour), it
appeared that the Pacific Islanders were promoting their ethnic in-group over the Vietnamese and Aboriginal groups. This response reflects the previous social knowledge results (see Chapter 3) were the Pacific Islander group was considered equal to the ethnic majority group.

Future research will need to look more at the underlying motivations and processes in how children choose their friends. Until this research is conducted any conclusions drawn here are speculative.

_Proximity of ethnic groups_

Participants were also asked to indicate which houses in a street they would allocate to ethnic in-group and out-group families. As such, this measure is an elaboration of the previous ‘pick a friend’ measure and sought to investigate if the children’s preferences would change as the task become increasingly hypothetical; that is, with fewer personal implications for the participants.

When the results of the interaction (i.e., age x participant ethnic group x target ethnic group) are considered as a whole, no consistent pattern in their proximity rating for the Anglo-Australian, Pacific Islander, and Vietnamese can be seen. The only consistent pattern of choice was the children’s indication that their least preferred neighbour would be the Aboriginal family. With the exception of the 8-year-old Anglo-Australian and the 6-year-old Pacific Islanders, who rated the Aboriginal least preferred equally with another ethnic out-group, the remaining age groups located the Aboriginal group significantly further away than the remaining ethnic groups.

The results indicated that the ethnic majority participants expressed an equal preference for their in-group, the Pacific Islander, or the Vietnamese family as close neighbours, while they indicated least preference for Aboriginal neighbours. The youngest group of minority children again failed to differentiate their preferences for
neighbours between the ethnic in-group and the ethnic majority out-group, assigning both groups equally close proximity. This result replicated both the ethnic attitude and status rating results. In a further replication of the differential attitude results, the present results also indicated that the participants differentiated between the ethnic out-groups when assigning houses. While both the ethnic majority and the ethnic minority participants indicated least favourable locations for the Aboriginal group, their preferences for the Vietnamese group were not as consistent. The Anglo-Australian children indicated that they would prefer a Vietnamese family as neighbours than Pacific Islander or Aboriginal families. This result provides partial support for the Anglo-Australian children’s preference for the Asian group over the Aboriginal group reported by Black-Gutman and Hickson (1996). This pattern of results indicates that the ethnic preferences of the dominant group are dependent on the target out-group. While these children prefer the Pacific Islander group over the Aboriginal group, when given an intermediate group (Vietnamese), their preference for the Pacific Island group decreases.

The result is interesting because rather than taking the ethnic majority children’s responses at face value (i.e., the Vietnamese group is preferred over other ethnic out-groups and not just Aborigines), it might indicate that children’s responses are not necessarily aimed at identifying the preferred group but rather isolating the least preferred group. It is possible that these children seek to distance the ethnic in-group from the Aboriginal group, and the lack of differentiation between the in-group and the remaining ethnic out-groups is because their focus is on separation from one group while the other ethnic groups receive less thought.

On the other hand, the Pacific Islander participants located the Vietnamese family further away than the Anglo-Australian group but closer than the Aboriginal
group. This result might indicate that the minority group is seeking to isolate other ethnic minority groups from their in-group and the ethnic majority group. It is possible that their responses are reflecting the established status quo of the ethnic group. As with the choice of friend, the Pacific Islander participants indicated a preference for the in-group over ethnic out-groups regardless of age.

The preceding results are noteworthy for several reasons. First, they indicated a certain consistency in the responses on the different measures, by the ethnic majority and minority children. The present findings suggest that children’s ethnic attitudes are consolidated at an early age and that they are sufficiently comfortable to express them overtly.

Second, the results indicated that ethnic majority children display clear and consistently positive in-group attitudes, further supporting previous results (Asher & Allen, 1969; Cramer & Anderson, 2003; Teichman et al., 2006). This was demonstrated by the more positive in-group attitude rating and was reinforced by their preference for ethnic in-group neighbours. In contrast, the pattern of results for the ethnic minority children was inconsistent across the measures and differed from those of the ethnic majority children. The responses of the ethnic minority participants to the trait attribution measures indicated equally positive attitudes toward the ethnic in-group and the ethnic majority group. However, when asked to indicate preferences for friends or neighbours, their responses mirrored those of the dominant ethnic group (i.e., they displayed in-group preference).

The results of the present study appear incompatible with the developmental framework proposed by ST (Aboud, 1988). According to ST, young ethnic majority children should display increasing levels of out-group negativity and in-group positivity. Aboud further posits that this pattern of attitudes should peak at around 7-
years, when, with the acquisition of concrete operations the in-group positivity declines and there is a concomitant increase in out-group positivity.

Chapter Summary

The present results indicated that regardless of age, the ethnic majority participants rated the ethnic in-group more positively, were more likely to pick another Anglo-Australian child as a friend, and indicated a preference for another Anglo-Australian family as neighbours. It could be argued that the present results support a small part of ST’s claim in relation to the ethnic attitudes measure. For example, while there was no change in the ratings of the Anglo-Australian or Pacific Islander ethnic groups at each of the ages, there was an increase in the positivity ratings of the Aboriginal group by the 10-year-olds. If the proximity ratings of the ethnic groups are examined, there is no change in the proximity of the ethnic in-group (as would be expected according to socio-cognitive theory), while there is also little change in the ratings of the Vietnamese and Pacific Islander out-groups the proximity of the Aboriginal group does not show the declines that would be expected. It would appear that ST is useful for some ethnic out-groups but not others on some measures, but it is not useful in accounting for the ethnic in-group attitudes of the ethnic majority group. In addition to this lack of generalisability of the results, ST is also limited by its exclusive focus on accounting for the development of ethnic attitudes and ultimately ethnic prejudice in ethnic majority children. Until this theory can account for the development of ethnic attitudes in ethnic minority children, its usefulness to the research community is limited.

The current results also provide limited support for SIDT (Nesdale, 1999, 2004, 2006) in that the ethnic majority participants indicated more positive attitudes towards, preferred as friends, and revealed a preference for neighbours from, the ethnic in-group
rather than ethnic out-groups. This in-group preference would locate children in SIDT’s ‘ethnic preference’ phase. According to SIDT, this phase is characterised by an in-group preference but not out-group prejudice. The absence of out-group prejudice is demonstrated by the less positive, rather than negative, out-group attitudes, and the willingness of some of these children to have friends from ethnic out-groups. This result also replicates previous research on children’s friendship choices (e.g., Aboud et al., 2003; Boulton & Smith, 1992; Cramer & Anderson, 2003; Kowalski & Lo, 2001; Teplin, 1976).

Providing further support for SIDT (Nesdale, 1999, 2004, 2006) was the lack of difference between the age groups in their expression of ethnic attitudes and preferences. This consistency across ages indicates that factors other than age and cognitive development contribute to the expression of children’s ethnic attitudes. The present results indicate that in line with SIDT, in the absence of intergroup threat, children will indicate a preference for the in-group versus out-groups, but will rate both groups positively.

However, like ST, SIDT fails to provide an adequate account for the development of ethnic attitudes in ethnic minority children. The present results indicate that SIDT cannot be uniformly applied to both the ethnic majority and minority groups without some modification of the theory.

In sum, the present findings highlight a number of points. First, attitudes towards the ethnic in-group and out-groups by ethnic majority and minority children are expressed in different ways. While the ethnic majority group appears to express consistent in-group attitude bias, there does not appear to be a similar in-group bias in the attitudes of ethnic minority children (i.e., Pacific Islanders), at least those measured in the present study. Clearly, more research is needed to address this issue. However,
both the ethnic majority and the ethnic minority children appeared to display less positive attitudes towards the Aboriginal out-group, as well as a lack of consistency in their attitudes and preferences for the Vietnamese ethnic group. These findings are important as they suggest that children’s ethnic attitudes are not applied uniformly across ethnic out-groups, but rather are influenced by the particular target out-group. They further raise the possibility that social factors including social knowledge contribute to children’s ethnic attitudes.

If these results are considered along with those of Nesdale and colleagues (Nesdale et al., 2003; 2004; Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005; Nesdale, Griffiths et al., 2005; Nesdale, Maass et al., 2005), they provide further support for SIDT’s proposition that in the absence of threat from an out-group, children from the ethnic majority group will display positive attitudes towards both the ethnic in-group and out-group. This finding is contrary to ST, which has suggested that children will display negative attitudes toward ethnic out-groups.

The present results have also highlighted as a limitation of SIDT its silence on the development of the ethnic attitudes of ethnic minority group children. The present results have shown that the ethnic minority children don’t display the same in-group positivity as ethnic majority children, and thus, SIDT would need some modification if it is to account for the development of ethnic attitudes in all children.
CHAPTER 5.
THE DEVELOPMENT OF ETHNIC IDENTITY IN YOUNG CHILDREN

Introduction

Studies 1a, 1b and 1c indicated that young Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander children were aware of the ethnic groups that constitute their community and the social dynamics that influence interactions between these ethnic groups. In addition, these studies demonstrated that, in general, Anglo-Australian children displayed more positive attitudes across a number of measures towards members of their ethnic in-group than towards members of ethnic out-groups. In contrast, Pacific Islander children displayed equally positive attitudes towards the in-group and the Anglo-Australian out-group while displaying less positive attitudes toward the Aboriginal out-group. The aforementioned studies shed light on how children’s ethnic awareness and attitudes are expressed in everyday situations. These studies support and extend previous research which has also reported a relationship between general cognitive development and children’s ethnic cognitions (Aboud, 1984; Ocampo et al., 1997; Semaj, 1980) and the contribution of social knowledge to ethnic knowledge and stereotypes (Radke & Trager, 1950).

However, there is one factor that has been largely left unexplored in relation to children’s ethnic awareness and their ethnic attitudes, this is their ethnic identity. To date, investigation into children’s ethnic identity has been limited because of the absence of a reliable and valid measure of this construct. The current study sought to respond to this deficit by creating and validating such a scale for use in subsequent research.
Approaches to Ethnic Identity

Ethnic identity has been defined in multiple ways in the literature, with the focus of the definition often reflecting the interests of the researcher. For example, Phinney (1996) suggested that ethnic identity is a fundamental aspect of self-concept that is associated with the individual’s self-definition (self-label) and the sense of belonging and commitment to an ethnic group, including their thoughts, feelings, perceptions and behaviours associated with the group. Also contributing to ethnic identity is knowledge about the group, its history and traditions, and an understanding of the implications of ethnic group membership (Phinney, 2000). Similarly, Smith (1989) defined ethnic identity development as a process of coming to terms with one’s ethnic membership as a salient reference group. She argued that ethnic identity is the sum of group members’ feelings about those values, symbols, and common histories that identify them as a distinct group. In addition, Smith suggested that ethnic identity is a learned aspect of an individual’s overall personality development and therefore influenced by in-group and out-group evaluations.

Other researchers have treated ethnic identity as an important consideration for minority ethnic groups. For example, Nesdale et al. (1997) have defined ethnic identity as the extent to which an immigrant retains the attitudes, values, beliefs, and behaviours of their traditional ethnic group as their own. Valk & Karu (2001) define ethnic identity as an attitude held by group members toward their group of origin and its common cultural practices, and their feelings of attachment to the group. Sellers et al. (1998) defined racial/ethnic identity as the significance and qualitative meaning that individuals attribute to their membership of the African-American group within their self-concepts.

While the definitions used may differ, there is nevertheless agreement in the literature on the presence of a core set of components that contributes to an individual’s
ethnic identity. These components comprise self-definition, which has been described as the ethnic label that an individual uses for him/herself, a sense of belonging to the group, and the individual’s attitudes toward the ethnic group.

Research with adults and adolescents has shown that individuals with high ethnic identity self-identify as group members, evaluate their group more positively, prefer their group, and are happy with their group membership. In addition, they are interested in, and knowledgeable about, their ethnic group and are committed to that group and participate in the groups’ ethnic practices and traditions. At the other end of the continuum, individuals with low or diffuse ethnic identity indicate displeasure and discontent with their ethnic group. They are more likely (compared to high identity individuals) to negatively evaluate their group and indicate their desire to leave the group. They have little involvement in ethnic activities and show little interest in their ethnic group and little commitment or sense of belonging to their group (Phinney, 1992). The degree of involvement in the social life and cultural practices of the ethnic group is also used as a marker of ethnic identity. The most commonly assessed ethnic practices are use of language, choice of friends, participation in traditional ethnic religious practices and social organisations and politics (Nesdale et al., 1997). These markers of ethnic identity have been identified in adults and adolescents, but not as yet in children.

It is important to note that not all of these components have been emphasised by researchers (Phinney, 1990). Some have chosen to focus on one component in preference to others. For example, some researchers have emphasised the feelings of belonging and commitment to the group and the sense of shared values and attitudes toward that group (e.g., Parham & Helms, 1985; Tajfel, 1981; Ting-Toomey, 1981). Other researchers have emphasised the importance of cultural aspects of group
membership (e.g., language, history, and traditions) in determining identification with an ethnic group (Rogler, Cooney, & Ortiz, 1980) and ethnic self-esteem (Parayno, 2001; Phinney, Chavira, & Williamson, 1992).

**Measurement of Ethnic Identity in Adults and Adolescents**

A number of scales has been developed to measure ethnic identity and social or collective self-esteem in ethnic minority adults and adolescents (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Nesdale et al., 1997; Phinney, 1992; Sellers et al., 1998). The overlap between group based or social self-esteem and ethnic identity is evident in the measurement scales utilised. For example, the Universal Ethnic Identity Scale (Nesdale et al., 1997) has both ethnic involvement and ethnic identity subscales. Similarly, the Collective Self-esteem Scale (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) which is ostensibly a measure of collective or social self-esteem in adults, includes both identity and self-esteem subscales. Likewise, the Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity (Sellers et al., 1998) also contains measures of ethnic group-based self-esteem and identification.

The most popular measure of ethnic identity in adolescents (Multi-group Ethnic Identity Measure; MEIM; Phinney, 1992) includes subscales measuring affirmation and belonging, ethnic identity achievement, and ethnic behaviours. The inclusion of ethnic self-esteem as a subset of ethnic identity serves to emphasise the ongoing tendency for researchers to treat ethnic identity and ethnic self-esteem as complementary, if not equivalent, processes.

**Universal Ethnic Identity Scale (Nesdale et al., 1997).**

This scale was developed to measure ethnic identity in adult members of immigrant groups. The scale comprises three subscales which measure pride in ethnic background and membership (i.e., ethnic or social self-esteem), liking for traditional and social activities of the individual’s ethnic group, and sense of belonging to the
(new) country. Nesdale et al., (1997) reported that the subscales had acceptable levels of internal consistency, with Cronbach alphas ranging from .75 for sense of belonging to this (new) country to .77 for the three scales. The Universal Ethnic Identity Scale has been used with a number of different ethnic groups, including Chinese, (Nesdale & Mak, 2000, 2003); Vietnamese (Nesdale, et al., 1997; Rooney, 1996), Eastern European, Sri Lankan, and New Zealanders (Nesdale & Mak, 2000).

Studies by Nesdale et al., (1997) and Nesdale and Mak (2000, 2003) used the Universal Ethnic Identity Scale (Nesdale et al., 1997) to investigate the relative contribution of migrants’ ethnic identity processes to their psychological health, personal self-esteem and acculturation strategies in Australia. Nesdale et al. reported a low relationship between ethnic identity and migrant’s sense of positive personal self-esteem, which is considered an important coping resource (Pearlin & Schooler, 1978). In addition, Nesdale and Mak (2003) reported the main predictors of ethnic identity (i.e., immigrants’ identification with their culture of origin) were cultural distance between the traditional and host groups, the extent of friendship with Australians, the degree to which the immigrants were involved with their ethnic communities, and their ability to speak English. The immigrants’ level of ethnic identification was also found to be the primary determinant of ethnic self-esteem. Finally, immigrant psychological health was reported to be mainly dependent upon personal self-esteem rather than ethnic self-esteem and/or ethnic identification. The Universal Ethnic Identity Scale has been predominately used as a measure of variables (e.g., ethnic identity) that are predictive of other immigrant psychological processes. To date, there has been no published research which has set out to provide a comparison of ethnic identity in adult migrants in Australia.
The Collective Self-esteem Scale (CSE; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) is currently the only published adult scale designed specifically to measure social (collective) self-esteem across various social groups, including ethnic groups (Crocker et al., 1994; Ruttenberg, Zea, & Seligman, 1996). The CSE comprises four sub-scales assessing membership esteem (how good or worthy the individual feels as a member of social groups), private collective self-esteem (personal judgment of how good the in-group is), public collective self-esteem (individuals’ judgments of how others evaluate their group), and identity (importance of an individual’s group to their self-concept). Luhtanen and Crocker reported moderate correlations between the CSES and measures of personal global self-esteem. For example, the correlation with Rosenberg’s (1965) scale was .38, while they reported a correlation of .33 with Coopersmith’s (1967) self-esteem scale. These correlations lead Luhtanen and Crocker to conclude that although personal and collective self-esteem are related they are conceptually and empirically distinct.

A study by Crocker et al., (1994) assessed collective self-esteem and psychological well-being among 238 college students from European-American, African-American and Asian ethnic groups. Their results indicated that there were differences between the ethnic groups on the various CSE subscales as well as differences in the contribution of collective self-esteem to psychological well-being for these groups. The results led the authors to propose that collective self-esteem predicted psychological well-being in the African-American and Asian students but not the European-American students. In an examination of the influence of the individual subscales, the authors concluded that group identification and private collective self-esteem subscales predicted psychological well-being for the African-American students,
and the membership and private and public subscales predicted psychological well-being in the Asian students. The authors concluded that, in the most general terms, CSE can predict psychological well-being for minority ethnic groups. However, this predictive function of CSE was not apparent for the ethnic majority group of students. Crocker et al. suggested that one reason for the lack of CSE in the ethnic majority students might have been that group memberships are neither particularly central nor salient for the ethnic majority group members.

This differential result between ethnic minority and majority groups was also reported by Weisskirch (2005). Using the MEIM (Phinney, 1992), he reported that the Asian and Latino students exhibited higher ethnic identity than the African- and European-American students. Weisskirch also reported that the European-American students reported the lowest ethnic identity of all the groups.

Ethnic Identity in Adolescents

The development of ethnic identity in adolescence has been placed within the broader concept of general identity formation that is often acknowledged as one of the central psychological tasks of adolescence (Erikson, 1968; Marcia, 1966; Spencer, Icard, Harachi, Catalano, & Oxford, 2000). In particular, Erickson (1968) claimed that ethnic identity was a process located at the core of individuals’ exploration of their communal culture providing them with a sense of belonging and historical continuity.

While ethnicity was rarely included in early models of ego identity development, several models were subsequently proposed to account for ethnic identity development in African-American college students (Cross, 1978), young Asian American adults (Kim, 1994) and Chicano adolescents (Arce, 1981; Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1983). The development of ethnic identity in adolescence was hypothesised to occur through a number of stages which paralleled those in Erikson’s ego formation process.
Progression from one stage to the next was triggered by some “crisis” that caused adolescents to reassess their knowledge about their ethnic in-group and to clarify the confusion of the crisis by becoming more psychologically involved with their ethnic group. These models acknowledged that each stage was more sophisticated than the previous stage, with the end result were individuals who had a clear understanding and acceptance of their ethnicity (ethnic identity).

*Multi-group Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992).*

Prior to the publication of the Multi-group Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992), the scales used to measure ethnic identity in adolescents focused on the unique aspects of specific ethnic groups, including African-Americans (Cross, 1991; Parham & Helms, 1981), Mexican-Americans (Felix-Ortiz, 1994), and Chinese-Americans (Ting-Toomey, 1981). In a review of the literature, Phinney (1992) pointed out the lack of generalisability of these scales based on their focus on one group and their attempt to identify and measure key aspects of identity for that group to the exclusion of all other groups. In contrast, the MEIM was developed to provide a single measure of ethnic identity development that could be used without modification for all ethnic groups, including the majority ethnic group. The creation of a single scale for multiple groups has a distinct and obvious advantage over the earlier group-specific models. For the first time, the MEIM allowed researchers to make direct comparisons between ethnic majority and minority groups’ expression and endorsement of their identity based on their ethnic group membership.

The MEIM is a two-factor, 20-item scale. The first factor, ‘ethnic identity achievement’ was measured using items focusing on three related aspects. Ethnic affirmation and belonging items measured pride in the ethnic in-group, feeling good about one’s ethnic background, being happy with one’s ethnic group membership, and
feelings of belongingness and attachment to the group. The ethnic identity achievement scale investigated the process undertaken to find out about one’s ethnic group and to understand what membership of this group means to the individual member. Ethnic behaviours, Phinney’s third scale, investigated the degree to which the individual members participated in activities associated with their traditional ethnic group.

The MEIM has been used with almost all ethnic groups in the USA, including dominant European-, Asian-, African-, Mexican- Native-, Jewish-, and Italian-Americans, and Pacific Islander adolescents and young adults (Phinney, 1991, 1992, Ponterotto, Gretchen, Utsey, Stracuzzi, & Saya, 2003; Roberts et al., 1999; Spencer et al., 2000; Worrell, 2000).

Research by Phinney (1992) and Phinney and Chavira, (1992) suggested that, like ego identity, ethnic identity development consolidated with age. This consolidation was marked by an increasing awareness of the traditional ethnic group, as adolescents strove to develop a clear understanding of their ethnic heritage. Further research has also identified a positive relationship between ethnic identity and ethnic self-esteem for minority adolescents, a relationship that is not generally found in majority group adolescents. Phinney concluded that ethnic group membership plays an important role in the self-concept of minority youth but not necessarily in the self-concept of the majority group youth. Critical issues in psychological functioning of minority adolescents include the degree of involvement in traditional cultural activities and responding to, and dealing with, the often disparaging views of the dominant group to their ethnic group. During adolescence, concerns about ethnicity shift from learning about ethnic labels to understanding the significance of group membership which is then carried through into adulthood (Spencer et al., 2000).
The results of a number of studies by Phinney and colleagues (Phinney, 1992; Phinney & Alipuria, 1990; Phinney & Tarver, 1988) and others (Spencer et al., 2000), using both majority and minority groups indicate that the MEIM is a reliable measure of the development of ethnic identity in adolescents and young adults. Ponterotto et al. (2003) reported that in a survey of 12 published studies, using American high school and college samples, the alphas were consistently similar. Collectively, the reported alphas for the Ethnic Identity subscale ranged from a low of .81 to a high of .92. Support for the validity of the MEIM has also been reported in other studies (Phinney, 1992; Ponterotto et al., 2003; Roberts et al., 1999; Spencer et al., 2000; Worrell, 2000).

However, the results of the research are mixed concerning the ages that adolescents and young adults acquire ethnic identity. Phinney and Tarver (1988) remarked on the lack of consensus in the literature over when ethnic identity begins to develop. They reported that some research has suggested that the college years are the most critical, while other researchers have suggested that ethnic identity begins to develop during high school. In one study, Phinney and Alipuria (1990) reported that the majority of college students in their sample exhibited high levels of achievement and led the authors to conclude that the process of ethnic identity development began long before college.

**Ethnic Identity in Children**

Research on ethnic identity in children has traditionally been focused in two areas. On the one hand, developmental psychologists have focused on how children learn the labels and attributes of their own ethnic group (Aboud, 1988; Bernal et al., 1993; Vaughan, 1963, 1964a, 1964b). On the other hand, cross-cultural psychologists have focused their attention on those characteristics that define ethnic identity and how
these characteristics are affected by contact with members of other ethnic groups (Phinney, 1992).

Like much of the adult research, the definition of ‘ethnic identity’ as it applies to children is unclear and has often been used interchangeably to describe self-esteem, ethnic awareness, and self-identification. The ambiguity in the definition has carried over into the methodology employed in the research. As indicated in Chapter 2, much of the early research on children concentrated on measuring children’s ethnic self-identification (“Which photo looks like you?”) and preference (“Which photo is the nice photo?”) (e.g., Clark & Clark, 1947; Vaughan, 1963, 1964a, 1964b). The early studies did not directly investigate ethnic identity but were primarily concerned with group preference and the ability to identify and classify objects, including representations of various ethnic groups. The negative evaluation of representatives of their own ethnic groups by some of the minority group children was interpreted as evidence of rejection of the ethnic in-group among African-American (Clark & Clark, 1947) and New Zealand Maori children (Vaughan, 1964a, 1964b) and was equated with low self-esteem.

On the basis of an absence of an ethnic identity scale specifically for children, several studies have been conducted to measure the utility of the MEIM for use with this population. One such study was reported by Reese, Vera, and Paikoff (1998). In this study, a modified version of the MEIM (Phinney, 1992) was administered to 118 fourth- and fifth-grade children. Using confirmatory factor analysis, Reese et al’s results did not support the use of the MEIM as a reliable measure for young children. They reported a different factor structure to that identified by Phinney (1992) and that almost half of these items failed to satisfactorily load onto the factor structure. They also reported lower alphas for the Ethnic Identity subscale across two administrations.
(0.72 and 0.59), while there was no assessment of the Other-Group Orientation subscale reported.

In a review of this study, Ponterotto et al. (2003) cautioned that the less robust factor structure and lower alpha coefficients might have been related to the young age of the respondents. It is possible that the questions, which Phinney (1992) indicated load onto Erikson’s Stage of Identity Formation, were not suitable for a population that had yet to reach this developmental stage. It seems reasonable, therefore, to expect that as preadolescents have not yet embarked upon identity formation stage on a personal level, they would not yet have embarked on this exploration at an ethnic level. This does not mean, however, that ethnic identity is not experienced by children. Rather, it could be that, to date, there is no suitable measure available to satisfactorily document this phenomenon. The results of Reese et al. clearly indicate the need for an ethnic identity scale that has been designed to be developmentally congruent for use with children in middle and late childhood.

The remainder of the current chapter describes the development and administration of a scale to measure ethnic identity in children. The stages set out by Hattie (1981) served as a guide for the construction and validation stages of the proposed ethnic identity scale. According to Hattie, the outcome of scale construction should be a scale that is a parsimonious and sound tool for the measurement of children’s ethnic identity. The aim of this exercise was to develop a number of items that were relatively independent of one another, and a scale with factor names that are easily recognisable by other researchers as being consistent with the underlying theoretical framework and the output of the exploratory analysis. Hattie also recommended that the scale be administered to a further sample culminating in a
confirmatory factor analysis to provide a test of the quality of the measurement while simultaneously testing the theory fit.

The development of the present scale involved a number of stages, with each stage being reported separately. This method of presentation was considered advantageous as it facilitates the description of the distinct stages in the development of the Ethnic Identity Scale for Children (EISC). The first stage dealt with the collection and organisation of a bank of items which were later reduced into coherent factor structures using exploratory factor analysis. The second stage was concerned with the development of factor names that were both descriptive of the factor and recognisable by other researchers. The third stage consisted of a validation study involving a different sample of both ethnic majority and minority children. In this study, the children’s responses were subjected to confirmatory factor analysis to assess the appropriateness of the scale as a valid and reliable instrument for measuring the construct of ethnic identity in ethnic majority and ethnic minority children.

**Study 3: The Development of an Ethnic Identity Scale for Children**

**Stage 1: Children’s social group membership and their attitudes towards them.**

The aim of this stage was

1. to collect names of the different social groups to which children considered themselves to hold membership; and

2. to produce lists of adjectives, both positive and negative that reflected the children’s attitudes toward the groups and the members of them.
Method

Participants

Participants were obtained from one primary school in South-East Queensland. This school was located on the Gold Coast. There were 60 students from Grade 1 to Grade 7. Of these, 20 children were from Grades 1 and 2, 20 were from Grades 3 and 4, and 20 from Grades 5 to 7. There were approximately equal numbers of boys and girls in each group. The children were pre-dominantly Anglo–Australian ($N = 50$) and a smaller number ($N = 10$) of the children were from ethnic minority groups including New Zealand and Pacific Island countries. Consent to participate was initially sought from all parents of the children enrolled at the school. Forty percent of the children were given parental permission to participate and, of these, 60 children were randomly selected to participate. The children were invited to take part and none declined. The children received no payment or other reward for their participation.

Materials

The materials consisted of large sheets of white paper which were used to record the participant’s responses and comments. In the top half of each sheet, a number of groups of ‘stick people’ had been drawn. These groups were surrounded by a circle, thereby making each group independent of the others. There was no other writing or drawing on the page.

Procedure

The children were interviewed using a small-group interview technique, which has been suggested is particularly useful in the early stages of research, as the structure and organisation of small groups allows for the possibility that the discussions will “spark off new ideas, criticism, or developments” (Dockrell, Lewis & Lindsay, 2000, p.52). An additional strength of the group interview is that it provides social support
when discussing personal issues and a more natural style of communication for the children, as opposed to a one-on-one interview with an unfamiliar adult.

The groups chosen for this study differed in size, depending on the grade of the participants. The children in the first two grade groups (i.e., Grades 1 & 2 and Grades 3 & 4) were tested in groups of two. This was done to allow the children the opportunity to feel comfortable in a discussion concerning personal feelings. The smaller groups also gave the experimenter greater control over the structure (but not the content) of the discussion to counter the lack of attention that is commonly displayed by children in lower primary school (Berger, 1998). The older children (i.e., Grades 5 to 7) were tested in groups of four. This group size was selected because the older children were considered able to provide their own structure to a discussion with less experimenter input and control. The larger group was also considered appropriate to allow these children greater anonymity when discussing their feelings and attitudes. The maximum group size of four was considered advantageous, as the responses were written on large sheets of paper by the experimenter as the discussion was occurring. The groups were single gender (i.e., either males or females) and, where possible, were from the same ethnic background.

The experimenter sat with each group in a quiet location. The children were shown a large sheet of paper on which a series of drawings of “stick-people” surrounded by circles had been drawn. The experimenter explained to the children that all people (represented by the stick people) are members of different types of groups (represented by the circles). The children were asked to name as many groups as they could to which they considered themselves holding membership. The names of these groups (e.g., family, friends, and class groups) were written on an adjacent sheet of paper. Each group name was recorded on the first nomination, and was displayed to the rest of the
group. When the children’s free responses appeared to be declining, the experimenter prompted the children by saying “Can you think of some more groups that you are members of?” At no time did the experimenter suggest any social groups to the children.

Once the children had exhausted their list of social group memberships, the experimenter directed their attention back to the large sheet of paper containing the list of social groups they had generated. The experimenter randomly selected one of the groups from the list and proceeded to ask the children a series of questions designed to elicit their feelings, both positive and negative about their membership of the chosen social group. These questions were presented in the following set order. “What do you like about being part of ________?” Once their positive attitudes were exhausted, the negative attitudes were explored. The children were then asked, “What do you dislike about being part of ________?” For example, if the group selected was ‘family’, the questions were “What do you like/dislike about being part of your family?” After each question, the experimenter used the follow-up question “Why?” in an attempt to elicit a greater range of attitudinal responses. The children’s responses were recorded on the large sheet of paper and were used to generate further discussion - listing their responses enabled the participants and the experimenter to refer back to the list and to eliminate repeated responses.

The children were then asked to imagine that they had to move from one of the groups listed on the board to another group. Again, a group was selected from those nominated by the children. They were then asked the following questions “How would you feel if you had to change into this group? For example, the female groups were asked “How would you feel if you had to become a boy?” As before, the follow-up question “Why?” was used to allow the children to fully explore their feelings and
attitudes. They were then asked to imagine the opposite situation where another person was being moved into their group and to consider how that person would feel, and how they as existing group members would feel about this new member. On each occasion, the experimenter selected different groups from the lists to ensure that as many group attitudes as possible were sampled. The discussions about social groups were balanced by discussing either the group to which the children nominated membership and the opposite group or groups. For example, if the members of the group were female, the discussion first focused on attitudes towards being a girl. The experimenter then turned the discussion to how the group felt about boys and how they would feel if they were to become a boy. This distinction between the groups was maintained for all the social categories discussed.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the children were thanked for their participation, returned to their class, and the experimenter filed their responses. The procedure was then repeated with the next group.

Results and Discussion

Nomination of Social Groups

The discussions resulted in two sets of responses. The first set consisted of names of groups in which the children considered that they held membership. This list of groups is shown in Table 5.1 and indicates that children consider themselves to be members of a number of different social groups.

The greatest numbers of group nominations are those groups in which membership is ascribed (i.e., membership is beyond the control of the individual). These groups were the three most commonly nominated (each being mentioned by 22 of the possible 60 groups or 36.8%). However, while ascribed membership may be one possible explanation for the higher nomination of these groups, it fails to explain why
other groups with ascribed membership (e.g., age and religion) were nominated less frequently (6 nominations each or 10%).

Table 5.1
Summary of Social Groups that Children Considered Themselves Members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group name</th>
<th>Frequency of nomination</th>
<th>Percentage of total nominations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National (cultural group)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports teams/clubs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama/singing/music</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/playgroups</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class work (buzz) groups</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids clubs (scouts/guides, interest groups)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age groups</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States of Australia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community (local area)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps the most plausible reason for the focus on ascribed groups is that these groups are salient, meaning that they are immediately apparent when we see someone (e.g., gender or ethnic group membership). In addition, membership of these groups is somehow distinctive from others (especially for ethnic groups that vary on the dimension of colour). Salience is based on a number of factors, including the
importance of a category to the individual, the novelty of the category in the given situation (i.e., a minority group in relation to a dominant group), and whether the category is figural (i.e., the category or group stands out). In support of a salience explanation, it is noteworthy that two of the groups (gender and ethnic group) most frequently nominated by the children differentiate the group members on the basis of physical appearance (e.g. skin colour, gender-related physical attributes). The physical difference may serve to make some groups figural and/or the numerical infrequency of some of these groups (in particular ethnic groups) may serve to make them novel within the community.

The high proportion of gender nominations can be accounted for by research that has shown that children develop awareness of both genders from an early age (Fagot & Leinbach, 1993). For example, by age 2-years, children are aware of their own gender and can gender-type others. By 3-years, they have a rudimentary knowledge that gender group membership is constant and stable (Leonard & Archer, 1989; Slaby & Frey, 1975; Wehren & de Lisi, 1983). Consequently, by the time children commence formal education, they are well aware of the importance and implications of gender group membership.

Previous research has also reported that children’s awareness of ethnic groups is well established by the commencement of formal education (Clark & Clark, 1947; Goodman, 1964; Porter, 1971). Children’s ethnic awareness also becomes increasingly sophisticated with age. By 5- to 7-years, they are aware of many of the different ethnic groups in their community, the requirements for membership, and the factors that differentiate ethnic groups. Associated with this knowledge, children’s language has developed to a point where they are increasingly able to verbalise their attitudes towards the different ethnic groups.
The ‘family’ group was nominated as frequently as were gender and ethnic groups. This frequent nomination might suggest that the family has special social significance for the child. Although the family might reduce in importance to children as the peer group becomes increasingly important in later childhood, it remains a salient group and easily recalled.

Group salience could also go some way towards accounting for the 30% of nominations given to the child’s school. Aside from the fact that children spend much of their time attending school, children in Australian schools wear uniforms, and this serves to differentiate members of different schools, frequently making school a salient category. This explanation can equally be extended to account for the 28% of nominations given to sports teams and clubs, which are also differentiated by uniforms.

**Attitudes Towards Social Groups**

The second list comprised adjectives (both positive and negative) that were used by the children to describe their attitudes and feelings toward the nominated groups.

On the whole, the children’s attitudes toward their own group and other groups were positive. At the same time, while the children’s responses reflected greater positivity and liking for their own group, they did not denigrate the out-group. This pattern of results has also been shown using the minimal group paradigm with children (Kowalski, 2003; Nesdale et al., 2003, 2004, Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005; Nesdale, Griffiths et al., 2005; Nesdale, Maass et al., 2005) and adults (Brewer, 1979). Gender however, is one exception. Fagot and Leimbach (1993) noted that by age 4-years, children express value judgments and gender stereotypes about boys and girls. In addition, they also engage in gender-appropriate games and behaviour. According to Huston (1983), by the time children start school, they have well-formed ideas and prejudices about gender differences and subscribe to the superiority of their gender over
the alternative. The negativity towards the opposite gender was reflected in the comments made by some of the children. These include, for example, “Girls are smarter than boys – everyone knows that” (Grade 3 girl), “Girls scream at nothing, they are stupid” (Grade 2 boy) and “Your hygiene goes (when you are a boy) because my brother always stinks, he doesn’t have a bath” (Grade 5 girl). This negative attitude was surprising given the earlier results.

The negativity toward the out-group evident in the children’s gender comments was not present when asked about ethnic out-groups. Whereas the children’s comments toward their in-group were positive (e.g., “It’s cool to be Australian” and “I like coming from New Zealand”), their comments about ethnic out-groups tended to highlight differences between the dominant and ethnic minority groups in a non-evaluative manner. For example, comments included, “They are a brownie colour” (Grade 2, girl), “They have different eyes (they go up and down)”, (Grade 1 boy), “They eat different foods, they live differently”, “They have a different culture to us” (Grade 5), “Australians have got white skin” (Grade 1). The adjectives produced in this stage were set aside and used in the generation of the statements in Stage 4 of this study.

In sum, this stage served two purposes. The first was the generation of a list of groups to which children considered themselves members, and gave some indication of their relative importance by the frequency that these groups were brought to mind by children when asked. The children’s responses indicted that four groups (family, gender, ethnicity, and sporting team) were nominated more frequently than others.

The second purpose was to obtain a list of adjectives, both positive and negative, that the children use to describe their feelings and attitudes towards these groups and their members, for the purpose of constructing scale items in future stages. Overall, this stage provided a good starting point for future data collection.
Stage 2: Importance of Social Groups

This stage was intended to build upon the previous stage and provide additional information to further develop an understanding of the meaning of social groups to children, and their attitudes and impressions toward these social groups. It sought to meet these aims by

1. investigating the relative importance of a number of social groups to children;
2. increasing the adjective pool to be used as the basis for generating the statements to be used in a scale measuring ethnic identity in children; and
3. further exploring and documenting children’s feelings and attitudes toward various social groups.

Method

Participants

Participants were obtained from two primary schools in South-East Queensland. These schools were located at the northern end of the Gold Coast. There were 69 participants from Grades 1 to 6. Of these, 23 were from Grades 1 and 2 (range = 6.01 – 7.09 years, \(M = 6.09, SD = .22\)), 23 from Grades 3 and 4 (range = 7.10 – 8.10 years, \(M = 7.92, SD = .33\)), and 23 from Grades 5 and 6 (range = 8.11 – 11.02 years, \(M = 9.77, SD = .68\)). There were approximately equal numbers of boys and girls in each grade.

The majority of the participants were from the dominant Anglo-Australian group \((N = 54)\) and, in addition, there were 15 participants from other ethnic groups. The demographics of the participants are shown in Table 5.2. Parental consent was obtained prior to the commencement of this study. Only those children whose parents had given consent took part. Participation was voluntary and the children received no payment or reward for taking part. The participants were interviewed during scheduled class time.
Table 5.2  

*Participants Demographic Information.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Class Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participants</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Materials*

A single page document was produced which listed the five most frequently nominated groups generated in the previous stage. These groups were family, gender, school, ethnic group, and sports teams. The group “friends” was included in this list as this sixth group was based on the well-documented importance of friends and friendship groups for children (Berger, 1998). Several orders of the groups were produced so as to counterbalance and hence avoid response bias.

*Procedure*

The younger children (Grades 1 and 2) were tested individually, whereas older children (Grades 3 to 6) were tested in small groups of two or three. The children were tested in a quiet location adjacent to the classroom. This was done to ensure the privacy and confidentiality of the children’s responses. The experimenter spent time building rapport with the children. Once the children appeared relaxed and were talking easily with both the experimenter and, in the older grades, with the other children in their group, permission was sought to record their discussion. The children were assured of the confidentiality and anonymity of their responses, and no child refused this request. Each child was given the single page with the list of groups and the following instructions:
“I have been to different schools and I have talked to children about the different groups that they are members of. Here is a list that they came up with for me. The groups are family, gender (whether you are a boy or girl), the sports teams that kids belong to, the school you go to, and the different ethnic or cultural groups that people come from, and your friends. Can you please tell me which of these groups is the most important to you…… is it your family, gender (whether you are a boy or girl), the sports teams that people can belong to, what school you go to, and the different national or cultural groups that people come from, or your friends?

I would like you to place the number 1 next to the group that is the most important for you, number 2 beside the next most important, 3 beside the third most important group, 4 beside the next most important group, 5 beside the next, and the number 6 beside the group that is the least important to you”.

Using the same open-ended questions and scenarios from Stage 1, the experimenter then asked the children what they liked and disliked about being a member of a number of different social groups. Their feelings regarding changing from their in-group to the opposite group were also discussed. The children were then asked to imagine the opposite situation and discussion was initiated using the same questions from Stage 1. Each group on the list received an equal amount of discussion.

At the end of the discussion, the children were thanked for their participation, returned to their class, and the experimenter filed their responses. This procedure was then repeated with the next child or group of children. The children’s responses to the
questions regarding feelings towards group membership were transcribed at the conclusion of the testing and they were combined with the responses from the previous study. This combined list would be used as one source for the construction of scales to measure ethnic identity in children.

Results and Discussion

The children were asked to rank, in order of personal importance to them, the six groups that had been most commonly named in the previous stage. Since the small number of ethnic minority children resulted in insufficient numbers to make any analyses of their results interpretable, only the responses of the Anglo-Australian children were analysed \((N = 54)\). The ranking scores given to each group were reversed so that a high score was indicative of greater importance. The children’s group rankings were analysed using Friedman’s two-way analysis of variance by ranks. In the initial analysis, the children’s rankings were analysed without regard to their age or gender. The result of this analysis indicated that the groups were ranked differently from each other, \(\chi^2 (5, N = 54) = 127.55, p < .0005\). In order to explore if there were differences in the mean rankings of these groups as a function of the participants’ age, the data were further analysed using Friedman’s analysis. The results of this analysis indicated that there were differential rankings of the groups as a function of the participant’s age, \(\chi^2 (N = 3 \text{ and } k = 6) = 11.48, p < .05\). The mean importance rankings of the groups are shown in Table 5.3.
Further Friedman’s two-way analysis of variance by ranks was conducted to explore possible differences in the importance rankings by male and female participants. The results indicated differential rankings of the various groups’ importance as a function of the participant’s gender, $\chi^2 (N = 2$ and $k = 6) = 6.44, p = .05$. Table 5.4 provides a summary of the mean rankings of group importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Friends</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-years</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-years</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-years</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like the children in Stage 1, this group of children shared many similar sentiments about the various groups (in-groups and out-groups) with which they interacted. Again, the comments concerning feelings about their in-group were, on the whole, more positive than the descriptions about the various out-groups. The unique responses from this stage (i.e. those that had not been mentioned by the children in Stage 1) were added to the children’s responses from the first stage. This was to increase the base from which to draw the adjectives to be used in the construction of the ethnic identity scale.
In summary, Stage 2 added considerably to the quantity of the adjectives to be used in the construction of the scales measuring ethnic identity in children. This stage afforded the opportunity to validate the results from the previous stage and to further investigate the importance of the social groups to which the children between the ages of 6- and 12-years belong.

However, one limitation of the preceding stages was that they were conducted in communities where Anglo-Australians are numerically dominant. Indeed, there were comparatively few non-Anglo-Australians in the sample and their data were not analysed. Stage 3 sought to address this numerical imbalance and narrow the focus of the research to concentrate on the importance of children’s ethnic groups and, in particular, whether there were differences in the level of importance placed on ethnic group membership by dominant (Anglo-Australian) versus minority ethnic children.

**Stage 3: The Importance of Ethnic Group Membership to Young Children**

Up until this point, the focus of the research had been very general. That is to say, there were no limitations to the range of social groups the children were given the opportunity to rate or discuss. The aim of this stage of the research was to focus on a specific social category (ethnicity) and to further investigate the importance that children from both the ethnic majority and minority groups place on their membership in their respective ethnic groups.
Method

Participants

Participants were recruited from one primary school in Logan City, in South-East Queensland. This region was chosen because it is home to a large number of ethnic groups, including both the Anglo-Australians and Pacific Islanders. All students received permission to participate and every student enrolled in the school and present on the day that testing took place participated. This resulted in a total sample of 454. There were 259 boys and 195 girls. The children ranged in age from 5 years 7 months to 13 years 2 months ($M = 8.6$ years, $SD = .77$). The total sample was divided into three age groups with 147 participants in age group one, ($range = 5.7$ years to $7.8$ years, $M = 6.3$ years, $SD = .7$ years), 150 participants in age group two, ($range = 7.9$ years to $10.1$ years, $M = 8.5$ years, $SD = .81$ years), and 147 participants in age group three ($range = 10.2$ years to $13.2$ years, $M = 11.04$ years, $SD = .82$ years). Respondents were asked to provide the following demographic data: grade level, date of birth, gender, and ethnic/cultural group.

Due to low representation of some ethnic groups (Indian, Arabic, and South American) in the sample these ethnic groups were removed from the study, leaving a final sample size of 437. The participants were organized into broad ethnic groups. These groups were determined in consultation with the Community Liaison Officers who worked in the school. The demographics of the final sample are shown in Table 5.5.
Table 5.5

Participants Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Anglo-Australian</th>
<th>Non-Anglo-Australian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>176 (40.3%)</td>
<td>261 (59.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>European (Anglo)</th>
<th>Pacific Island</th>
<th>Indigenous Australian</th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>European (non-Anglo)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Australian</td>
<td>36 (8.2%)</td>
<td>216 (28.8%)</td>
<td>42 (9.6%)</td>
<td>37 (8.5%)</td>
<td>20 (4.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>W.Samoan</td>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>Torres Strait Islander</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Bosnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>NZ Maori</td>
<td>Aboriginal Australian</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Former Yugoslavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Materials

A single sheet was produced which listed five of the groups from Stage 2. These groups were ethnic group, family, friends, gender, and school. Five versions of the list were provided with the order of group presentation counter-balanced.

Procedure

Testing took place during scheduled class time. The classes from Grades 3 – 7 were tested as a class group, whereas the Grade 1 and Grade 2 children were tested individually. Each student was randomly given one of the sheets containing the list of five groups. All students had the following instructions printed at the top of the sheet. These instructions were

“We are all members of different groups. Some of these groups are our family, the school we go to, our friends, and our cultural or ethnic group. While we are all members of many groups, we all feel differently about them and some are more important to us than others.”
Below is a list of 5 groups that we are all members of. Put the number 1 beside the group that is the most important group to you, number 2 beside the next important, number 3 beside the next important, number 4 beside the next important, and number 5 beside the group that is the least important to you. There are no right or wrong answers on this task, so your answers will probably be different to the person sitting next to you.

Students in Grades 3 to 7 were given the instructions orally by the class teacher. The teachers of the Grade 1 and 2 classes read the same instructions to their class using modified language to suit the developmental level of their students. Once the children had ranked the groups in order of personal importance, the sheets were collected and placed in envelopes, which were sealed to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. The children and teachers were thanked for their participation.

Results

Mean rankings of importance were calculated for each of the participants’ ethnic groups on the five social groups. The means and standard deviations are shown in Table 5.6. This table is included for illustrative purposes and was not subjected to statistical analysis.
Table 5.6

Mean Rankings (and Standard Deviations) of Importance of the Different Social Groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ethnic group</th>
<th>Social Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Australian</td>
<td>1.11 (.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-European</td>
<td>1.22 (.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>1.24 (.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>1.29 (.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>1.05 (.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.22 (.48)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results that were of most direct interest to the present study were the participants’ rankings of the importance of their ethnic group. To investigate if there were differences in the importance placed on ethnic group by children from different ethnic groups, the mean rankings for these groups were analysed using Kruskal-Wallis test for K independent samples. The results indicated differences between the six ethnic groups in the importance placed on ethnic group membership, $\chi^2 (5, N = 437 = 78.79, p < .0005$.

The Anglo-Australian children ranked their ethnic group as being less important ($M = 3.65, SD = 1.13$) than did the children from non-Anglo European ($M = 2.90, SD = 1.12$), Anglo-European ($M = 2.75, SD = 1.03$), Aboriginal ($M = 2.71, SD = 1.04$), Pacific Island ($M = 2.62, SD = 1.17$), and Asian ($M = 2.32, SD = 1.03$) ethnic groups. These ethnic minority groups did not differ in their rating of importance. In other words, ethnic group was considered more important to children from the ethnic minority
groups (including immigrant groups) than to children from the dominant ethnic group. There were no significant effects of age nor were any interactions identified.

Discussion.

Based on these results, it is clear that children think about the importance of their ethnic group membership in different ways. In particular, the results indicated a clear difference in the extent to which ethnic group is considered important to children from the ethnic majority versus minority ethnic groups.

One pre-requisite to responding to a task such as this is that the children need to have developed an appreciation of what an ethnic group is, as well as the ability to self-identify (and self-label) with an ethnic group. It is possible that Anglo-Australian children do not consider “Australian” as an ethnic group in the same way that children from ethnic minorities consider themselves as belonging to a different group from the ethnic majority group. If Australia is not considered to be an ethnic group by its members, this may account for the lower importance they accord to ethnic group membership, compared with the other groups. In contrast, children from ethnic minority groups may simply be more aware of their ethnic group membership (Radke & Trager, 1950; Study 1).

This heightened awareness of the ethnic minority children may be a reflection of the increasing multiculturalism of Australia, where there is greater acceptance of, and support for, ethnic minority groups. This can be illustrated by reference to one of the schools where the school actively encourages the participation of the various ethnic groups in the children’s education. The school these children attend regularly conducts multi-cultural days and celebrations of the different ethnic groups that constitute the school’s population. These days and programs tend not to celebrate the uniqueness of the Anglo- populations (e.g., Anglo-Australian, Anglo-New Zealander, American, and
British) at the school. Policies like this may go some way towards accounting for the higher importance rating made by the children from ethnic minority groups.

The differences in the importance of ethnic group to boys and girls is also worthy of comment. The dominance of males in positions of power and higher status within all ethnic groups (including the ethnic majority group), may account for the gender differences in importance ratings. Most ethnic group cultures are defined by male–dominated activities and attributes. For example, the Australian culture is defined by ‘mateship’, male–dominated sports (football), and the glorification of Australia’s military past. The Pacific Island culture is defined and demonstrated by male activities, such as the ‘haka’ which is a ceremonial war dance traditionally performed before battle by the male warriors. From this perspective, it is possible that boys consider their ethnic group to be of greater importance than do the girls. It may be that the girls place greater importance on those social groups (e.g., friends) that are defined by and celebrate feminine attributes (e.g., nurturing, caring, relationship oriented).

The different response patterns based on ethnic group membership and gender clearly require further investigation to begin to identify the nature of the underlying differences in their responses. However, while such results are important and will contribute to furthering our understanding of the importance of ethnic group membership, their pursuit was beyond the scope of the current research program.

**Stage 4: Development of the Ethnic Identity Scale for Children**

The previous stages in this study identified that there were differences in the importance placed on ethnic group membership by children from the dominant and ethnic minority groups. This difference in the importance of ethnic group membership by the ethnic majority and ethnic minority groups suggest that there might be differences in the levels of ethnic identity in these children.
The aim of this stage was to develop a pencil-and-paper measure of ethnic identity that could be administered to young children between the ages of 5 - and 12-years from both the dominant (Anglo-Australian) and ethnic minority groups. The requirements for developing this scale were that:

1. The language used in the questionnaires needed to be appropriate for use with children who differed in their reading level,

2. The response procedure needed to be simple enough for the youngest group of children to cope with; and

3. The measures needed to be short and easy to administer.

Method

Participants

Participants were obtained from two primary schools in Logan City in South-East Queensland. There were 279 participants from Grades 1 to 7, of whom 139 were boys and 140 were girls. The children were aged between 5.6 years and 12.10 years ($M = 8.8$ years, $SD = 2.1$ years). The demographics of the participants are shown in Table 5.7.

An information letter outlining the aim and methodology of this study with a consent form was distributed to every parent in the schools. The Community Liaison Officers attached to both of the schools provided a translating service if the parents requested help. Only those children who had been given parental consent were invited to take part in the study. All the children approached agreed to participate.
Table 5.7

Participants Demographic Information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.06 – 7.07</td>
<td>7.09 – 10.07</td>
<td>10.08 – 12.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>139 (49.6%)</td>
<td>86 (30.8%)</td>
<td>97 (34.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>140 (50.4%)</td>
<td>96 (34.4%)</td>
<td>96 (34.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnic Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>142 (50.7%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Australian</td>
<td>136 (49.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>20 (7.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>78 (27.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Australian</td>
<td>15 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>23 (8.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>3 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anglo-NZ</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Romania</th>
<th>NZ -Maori</th>
<th>Cook Island</th>
<th>Western Samoa</th>
<th>Cambodia</th>
<th>Philippines</th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>Lebanon</th>
<th>North Africa</th>
<th>South America</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NZ -Maori</td>
<td>Cook Island</td>
<td>Western Samoa</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Materials

The Ethnic Identity Scale for Children contained two subscales. The first measured ethnic identity in both ethnic majority (Anglo-Australian) and ethnic minority children, whereas the second subscale measured involvement in ethnic activities by minority group children. The primary sources of items were the lists of adjectives and statements made by the children in the previous stages of the current research. In addition, the items in the adolescent (Phinney, 1992) and adult scales (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Nesdale et al., 1997) were examined. By using the children’s previous responses in conjunction with existing scales, it was possible to construct items that were comparable with existing scales while still appropriate to the language and comprehension levels of young children aged 5- and 12-years.

On the basis of the adult and adolescent scales, ethnic identity was conceptualised as comprising three elements. The first focused on public identity (others’ perception of the ethnic group), thus corresponding to Luhtanen and Crocker’s
The second scale was a measure of private identification, which was concerned with the children’s own evaluation of their ethnic group. This second measure corresponded with Luhtanen and Crocker’s private collective self-esteem, Nesdale et al’s (1997) ethnic pride subscale, and Phinney’s (1992) affirmation and belonging subscales. A third subscale measured the concept of involvement in ethnic-based activities (ethnic involvement). This scale corresponded with Nesdale et al’s (1997) liking for traditional and social activities subscale.

Initially, a 32-item scale was proposed, with three additional questions that were designed to serve as filter items. Prior to the administration of the questionnaires, meetings were held with the Community Liaison Officers from the participating schools. This group of people acts as a conduit between the school and the different ethnic groups within the community. There were five Community Liaison Officers representing the Arabic/Muslim, Cambodian, Former Yugoslavia, and Pacific Islander communities. The officers were presented with completed copies of the proposed questionnaires and were asked for feedback and comments. As a result of this consultative process, the language of some of the items in the various scales was modified as some of the community liaison officers questioned the complexity of the language for individuals who spoke English as a second language. In addition, one additional item was included, (Can you read or write in your traditional language?). This item was considered important by the Community Liaison Officers as they felt that language use involved more than the ability to speak a language. They indicated that immigrant children from some of the ethnic groups might have different levels of language competency. Based on the feedback from this meeting, the existing adult and adolescent scales, and the children’s responses in the previous stages of this research, a new scale containing 36 items was produced. See Table 5.8.
Table 5.8

*Original Items Proposed for the Ethnic Identity Scale for Children*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed subscale</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>Other kids would like to come from my country if they could</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other kids tease me because I come from my country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other kids think people from my country are really good people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other kids think my country is better than their country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other kids think that people from my country have better things than people from their country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other kids think that people from my country are richer than people from their country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>I like being from my country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think my country is the best country in the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would feel sad if I wasn’t from my country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I wish I was Australian/ Pacific Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I often tell kids that I am from my country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think my country is a good country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like telling other kids about my country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel silly (embarrassed) by some things people from my country do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am proud of my country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am proud of my country when my country win a sporting game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think my country is better than other countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think that people from my country are better at doing things than people from other countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Involvement</td>
<td>I like to hang out (play with) with other kids from my country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like wearing the traditional dress of my country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My mum and dad like it when I wear the traditional dress of my country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would feel funny if my Australian friends saw me in the traditional dress of my country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For lunch I eat food from my country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like to eat Australian food more than food from my country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to eat the food of my country more often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like speaking the language of my country more than English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel funny speaking the language of my country in front of my Australian friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My family does things with other families from my country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like doing these things with my family and others from my country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mum and dad like it when I do things with other people from my country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At home we celebrate the special days of my country or Australia’s special days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think that special celebrations of my country are better than Australia’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filler items</td>
<td>Does your country have a traditional costume that people wear on special days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you speak another language at home or only English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can you read and write in your traditional language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do people from your country eat different food to Australians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Community Liaison Officers again examined these 36 items and the outcome was a series of items that was considered by these representatives to be sufficiently culturally sensitive for use with different ethnic and/or cultural groups.

Alternative forms of both questionnaires were developed – Form A was designed for administration to Anglo-Australian children, while Form B was designed for administration to ethnic minority children. While the forms contained identical questions, the critical wording in each statement was changed to reflect the ethnic backgrounds of the individual children.

Whereas Form A contained 18 items, an additional set of items was included in Form B. These items were designed to facilitate the development of a measure of the participants’ involvement in ethnic activities (ethnic involvement). The scale comprised 14 items and four filter questions; these were included to determine the relevance of the subsequent questions to the different ethnic groups. These filter questions were considered necessary because the scale was designed to be used with a variety of ethnic groups and some of the concepts explored were not relevant to all the groups (e.g., Anglo-Australians, Anglo-New Zealanders, and the Anglo-British did not have a traditional language other than English, nor a traditional ethnic costume or national dress).

The ethnic involvement subscale was included only for those children from ethnic minority groups. Anglo-Australian children were not tested on this subscale because when a pilot study was conducted using 10 Anglo-Australian children from the target age range (i.e., 5 - to 12-years), who were not part of the main study, indicated that they did not consider these questions relevant to Australians and that they would be unable to respond to them.
The children’s responses to the items on each of the scales were measured using 5-point uni-polar scales, consisting of drawings of animals, which were well known to children (e.g., frogs, butterflies, seals, and puppies). The scales measured the strength of the children’s agreement with each of the statements. The drawings increased in size from small to large, and the response scales were anchored at the lower (smallest picture) end by 1 (not at all) and at the upper end (largest picture) by 5 (a lot). The scale items were presented with the response options printed directly underneath each statement. The children were asked to respond to the items in each scale by drawing a circle around the response option they considered to be the most representative of their feeling. This method has previously been demonstrated as an effective means of getting children’s responses to these types of questions (e.g., Nesdale et al., 2003, 2004; Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005; Nesdale & Flessor, 2001; Nesdale, Griffiths et al., 2005).

Given that the Principals and individual teachers considered that the students were sufficiently proficient in English to be able to complete the questionnaires, the instructions and questionnaires were written in English. In addition, a pilot study utilising a read and speak procedure, with 10 children from the target age range (5 – 12 years) who did not take part in the main study, indicated that the language level of the questionnaires was understandable by children in the target age range, and, in particular, by the youngest age group of children.

**Procedure**

Each child was tested individually away from the classroom. The experimenter spent time establishing rapport with the children. Once the children were relaxed and comfortable talking with the experimenter, they were asked to name their parents’ ethnic group and the ethnic group with which they considered themselves as being members. This task was administered to enable the experimenter to determine which of
the alternative questionnaires (Form A or B) would be administered, and to make sure that the child’s ethnic group was salient. The children’s parents/guardians had previously been asked to indicate on the consent form the ethnic group of both parents. This was done as a guide for the experimenter if the children (in particular the 5-year-olds) were unable to identify the ethnic group to which they belonged. If the child indicated they were unsure of their parent’s ethnic group, the experimenter prompted them with a number of optional groups. The children were asked, “Does your mum (or dad) come from ______?” A list of alternative ethnic groups was provided and the majority of these children were able to correctly identify their parent’s ethnic group. All the children were asked what group they considered themselves to be members. Again, if the children were unable to respond, they were prompted with the question, “Are you the same as mum (or dad)?” If the child indicated that they were not the same as mum or dad, they were asked, “Are you something else?” Of the total sample, only four children (1.5%) were unsure of their parent’s ethnic group and required prompting. If the children indicated that they identified with an ethnic group different to that of their parents, this group was recorded as the child’s ethnic group. Only two children (.75%) reported being a member of an ethnic group that was different to that of their parents.

The instructions for the tasks were given verbally and, in the few cases that the children did not understand the instructions fully, they were explained in greater detail. The children were told that there were no right or wrong answers to any of the questions and that the experimenter was only interested in what they thought about the statements. They were instructed to respond to the questions by drawing a circle around the answer that was the best one for them. The children completed a number of practice questions to ensure they understood how the questions were administered and they were
comfortable with this procedure. The questions were administered verbally as well as visually; this was done to accommodate the limited reading level of the younger age children (5- and 6-year olds).

Depending upon the ethnic group membership of the children, either one (ethnic identity) or two questionnaires were administered to each child (ethnic identity and ethnic involvement). Once the children had completed the questionnaires, they were thanked for their participation and returned to the classroom.

Results

Initial analysis indicated that there were no significant differences between the means of ethnic majority and minority groups on the items. As a result, the ethnic identity questionnaires for ethnic majority and ethnic minority children were combined for the purpose of the analysis. This combined analysis was considered appropriate as the scales for both groups were assumed to measure the same concepts and contained duplicate questions.

Exploratory Factor Analysis - Ethnic Identity

To determine the underlying factor structure of the scale, factor analysis was performed on the data set. The responses of 279 children (138 Anglo-Australian and 141 ethnic minority groups) were used in the exploratory factor analysis (EFA). According to Comery and Lee (1992), EFA requires a large sample size to be effective. However, while there are guidelines for factor analysis in the literature, there is great variability in what is considered to be an ideal sample size. For example, Spector (1992) reported acceptable sample sizes ranged upwards from 100 and Nunnally (1978) suggested 10 subjects per item was an acceptable and appropriate number, while Flynn and Pearcy (2001) concluded that there is no absolute rule of thumb for determining what an appropriate sample size is for EFA, although a larger sample will produce a
more robust results than a small sample size. On this basis, it was concluded that the present sample was of an acceptable size to produce robust results.

The data were examined for violations to normality and the presence of univariate and multivariate outliers. This investigation failed to identify the presence of univariate outliers. Using a critical value of chi-square (.001) with 9 degrees of freedom (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1995) there were no multivariate outliers identified. The initial exploration of the distribution of the data set indicated one variable (“I like being an Australian/ from my country”) violated the assumptions of normality. According to Hair et al. departures from normality are of concern in factor analysis “only to the extent that they diminish the observed correlations” (p. 374). However, since such assumptions are not problematic when factor analysis is being utilised as a descriptive tool, the item was retained in the analysis.

An inspection of the correlation matrix revealed a number of variables that failed to correlate with the other variables in the data set at a level greater than .30. These variables were: “Other kids tease me because I come from Australia/my country”, “I feel embarrassed (or) silly by some things that Australians/people from my country do”, and “I am proud of my country when we win a sporting game”. The remaining correlations were significant. According to Tabachnick and Fidel (1996), the usefulness of exploratory factor analysis is questionable if variables fail to correlate at a minimum correlation of .30. They recommend that items that fail to correlate at this level should be removed in an attempt to improve the resulting factor structure. On this basis, these variables were removed from the data set and the correlation matrices were reproduced. The new correlation matrix revealed that all the variables produced significant bivariate correlations greater than .30, suggesting that the reduced data set was appropriate for factor analysis.
A series of factor analyses was carried out. In addition to the minimum level of correlation between variables, a number of other criteria were applied to determine whether items should be removed from the data set for additional analyses. Initially, factor loadings of .35 were considered significant, and therefore, items that did not load onto a factor structure equal to or greater than this level were removed. If only one or two items loaded onto a factor structure, these items were also removed, since Tabachnick and Fidel (1996) indicate that interpretation of such factors is hazardous. Complex items (i.e., those that loaded above .35 on more than one factor) were also considered for removal. However, if the item produced a factor loading of greater than .50 on one of the factors which, according to Hair et al. (1995) is practically significant, consideration was given to retaining the item. An inspection of the rotated component matrix indicated the presence of one complex item. The item ("Other kids think Australians/people from my country are good") loaded onto each of the factors. Since none of the individual factor loadings of this item was greater than .50, the item was removed from the data set. An additional factor was identified which contained only two items ("I often tell other kids about my country and I like telling other kids about my country"). Since a factor structure with such a small number of items results in an unstable factor structure, these items were removed and the analysis was repeated on the reduced data set.

When the final factor solution was obtained, Bartlett’s test of sphericity, which assesses the presence of correlations among the variables, was significant, $\chi^2 (28) = 488.99; p < .0005$, indicating that the data set was suitable for factor analysis. Measures of sampling adequacy also supported this type of analysis. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .77, and all the individual measures were greater than .66.
The resulting analysis revealed two factors with eigenvalues greater than one. These two factors accounted for 55.73% of the total variance. A varimax rotation was performed on the data to aid in the interpretation of the factor structure. The first factor accounted for 31.94% of the total variance and was labeled Ethnic Comparison. The five items loading on to this factor were concerned with the comparison of the children’s own ethnic group with other ethnic groups. The factor included items such as “I think people from Australia/my country are better at doing things than people from other countries”. The items were concerned not only with the child’s comparisons with other groups, but also their perception of other groups’ favourable comparison of their ethnic group (e.g., “Other kids think my country/Australia is better than theirs”).

The second factor contained three items and accounted for 23.79% of the total variance and was labeled Ethnic Pride. This factor was concerned with the pride that the child derived from being a member of an ethnic group. It included items such as “I am proud of my country/Australia”. Table 5.9 shows the factor structure identified by this analysis.
Table 5.9

*Item Factor Solution with Varimax Rotation –Ethnic Identity for Anglo-Australian and Ethnic Minority Children.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-scale and Item</th>
<th>Factor 1 Comparison</th>
<th>Factor 2 Pride</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic Comparison</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids think people from my country have nicer things than people from their country</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids think my country is better than where they come from</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids think people from my country are richer than people in their country</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids would like to come from my country if they could</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think people from my country are better at doing things than people from other countries</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Ethnic Pride**                                                                 |                     |                |
| I am proud of my country                                                          | x                   | .82            |
| I like being from my country                                                      | x                   | .75            |
| I think my country is the best country in the world                                | x                   | .71            |

**Eigenvalue**

|                     | 2.78 | 1.68 |

Note: Only factor loadings of .50 and above are shown for ease of comprehension.

*Reliability of the Ethnic Identity Scale*

Initial assessment of the ethnic identity scale focused on the internal consistency of the ethnic comparison and ethnic pride subscales. Cronbach’s alphas were calculated for the two subscales. The Cronbach alpha for the ethnic comparison subscale was .80, which indicates that the scale is stable. Similarly, the second factor (Ethnic Pride) was also shown to be a stable factor with a Cronbach alpha of .85. As recommended by Hair et al. (1995) and Nunnally (1978) a value of .70 or above is considered an acceptable level of internal consistency. Hair et al. suggested that the item-to-total correlation should also be used as a measure of reliability. They suggested that the correlation between the items and the total scale should exceed .50 for the scale to be
considered reliable. The item-to-total-correlations for the Ethnic Comparison factor exceeded Hair et al.’s. minimum of .50 and were all significant at .01. The item-to-total-correlations for the Ethnic Pride factor also exceeded .50 and were significant at .01. Refer to Table 5.10

Table 5.10

*Item to Total Correlations for the Ethnic Pride and Ethnic Comparison Scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item to Total Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other kids think people from my country have nicer things than people from their country</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids think my country is better than where they come from</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids think people from my country are richer than people in their country</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids would like to come from my country if they could</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think people from my country are better at doing things than people from other countries,</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud of my country</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like being from my country</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think my country is the best country in the world</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Factor Analysis - Ethnic Involvement in Ethnic Minority Group Children*

An additional factor analysis was conducted using the items that were developed to measure ethnic involvement by minority group children. The exclusion criteria outlined in the previous factor analysis were employed with the data set. There were no violations to assumption of normality or were the presence of univariate and multivariate outliers detected.

An inspection of the correlation matrix identified bivariate correlations greater than .30. Under these circumstances, the use of factor analysis with this data set was
appropriate (Tabachnick & Fidel, 1996). This was further confirmed by a significant Bartlett’s test of sphericity, $\chi^2 (13) = 112.05; p < .0005$. Measures of sampling also indicated support for the appropriateness of this analysis. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .74 and all the individual measures of sampling adequacy were greater than .72.

The analysis identified one factor with an eigenvalue greater than one. This factor accounted for 42.6% of the variance. The factor loadings for the six items in this factor are shown in Table 5.11.

### Table 5.11

**Item Factor Solution with Varimax Rotation – Ethnic Involvement by Ethnic Minority Children**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor Ethnic Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like wearing the traditional dress of my country</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mum and Dad like it when I do things with other people from my ethnic group</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like doing things with other people from my ethnic group</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family does things with other people from my ethnic group</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mum and Dad like it when I wear the traditional dress of my ethnic group</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For lunch at school I eat the traditional food of my ethnic group.</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>2.558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only factor loadings greater than .50 are shown for ease of comprehension.

**Reliability of the Ethnic Involvement Scale**

Assessment of the reliability of this scale focused on the internal consistency of the scale. The Cronbach alpha for the items in this scale was .78. A Cronbach alpha of this magnitude is considered to be a reliable indication of the stability of this scale as a measure of ethnic involvement in ethnic minority children. In a further check on the
reliability of this scale, item-to-total correlations were computed. The item-to-total correlations were significant for each variable at significance level of .01 Refer Table 5.12.

Table 5.12

*Item to Total Correlations for the Ethnic Involvement Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item to Total Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like wearing the traditional dress of my country</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mum and Dad like it when I wear the traditional dress of my ethnic group</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family does things with other people from my ethnic group</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like doing things with other people from my ethnic group</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mum and Dad like it when I do things with other people from my ethnic group</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For lunch at school I eat the traditional food of my ethnic group</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

This study was driven by two aims; first, it sought to develop a measure of the constructs that contribute to children’s sense of ethnic identity and the understanding of the value of their particular ethnic group, not only from their perspective, but also from the perspective of ethnic out-groups. In addition, the study sought to develop a measure of involvement in ethnic activities that could be used for ethnic minority groups. The outcome of this study was the production of three scales that were shown to be both statistically reliable measures of these constructs.

A comparison of the reliability of the ethnic identity scales for children and the adolescent (MEIM, Phinney, 1992) and adult scales (Universal Ethnic Identity Scale, Nesdale et al., 1997) indicates that the scales developed in this study are an equally
reliable measure. In a more direct comparison using a modified version of the MEIM, Spencer et al. (2000) reported Cronbach alphas for a modified MEIM in the range of .64 to .82 for children of the same age range as the present sample.

There are, however, some notable differences in the makeup of the present children’s ethnic identity scale versus the adolescent and adult scales. The first of the children’s scales (Ethnic Comparison) in the current structure indicates that, rather than exhibiting separate public and private self-esteem scales (as might have been expected based on Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992), the children combined the underlying components and focused on comparing their ethnic group with other ethnic groups. The items in this subscale were a combination of what the children thought about their ethnic group and its members and what they thought other children thought of their ethnic group.

In contrast, the ethnic pride scale is similar to Luhtanen and Crocker’s (1992) private subscale and Phinney’s (1992) affirmation and belonging subscale. The items on this subscale are concerned with the pride in their ethnic group and their positive attitude toward their membership of their ethnic group. As this scale was developed and tested with children, it might be expected that children would evidence less reliability in their responses than adults. On the contrary, the reported high reliability of this subscale serves to further reinforce the potential utility of this scale with children.

In sum, the outcome of the present stage was the identification of two scales that were reliable measures of ethnic identification in both ethnic majority and minority children. The factor structures indicate that the concepts that underlie ethnic identification are similar for children from the dominant (Anglo-Australian) and ethnic minority groups. A third sub-scale measuring ethnic involvement by ethnic minority children was developed and was also shown to be a reliable measure. The correlation
matrices indicated that each of subscales makes a significant contribution to children’s ethnic identity. In addition, the inclusion of the ethnic involvement scale further contributes to this concept for children from ethnic minority groups.

The four stages to date have dealt with the requirements corresponding to Hattie’s (1981) first stage in the development of behavioural measures. The next stage (Stage 5) addressed the validity of the factor structure and the transparency of the factor names.

Stage 5: Measurement of the Face Validity of the Ethnic Identity Scale for Children

To ensure that the factor names were transparent and representative of the items in each factor, Hattie (1981) suggested giving a number of experts the items and factor names with the request that they indicate which items in their opinion should load onto the different factors. These nominations can then be tested using Fleiss’ (1971) generalization of Kappa’s statistic (Cohen, 1960) to determine the level of rater agreement on the appropriateness of the factor names. A high Kappa’s statistic indicates high agreement between the raters indicating that the factor names are representative of the item names and hence contributes to the face validity of the scales.

Method

Participants

To test the face validity of the ethnic identity factors for ethnic majority and ethnic minority children, six individuals were identified all of who had experience in either scale construction and/or conducting research with children. Of these, four had PhDs and the remaining two were graduate students conducting social psychological research with children of the same ages as those in the present study.
Materials

The items identified by the previous analysis were produced as two lists, one with items written for the ethnic majority children (this corresponded to Form A) and the other containing items written for the ethnic minority children (this corresponded to Form B). See Appendix C. These lists contained the factor structure names and the individual items from these alternative forms. Included on the list for the ethnic minority children were the items and factor structure for the ethnic involvement scale. The items in the duplicate scales for the Anglo-Australian and ethnic minority groups were presented separately to allow for the exact wording to be used in each item. The separation of the two scales also allowed for each to act as a check for the other.

Procedure

The experts were provided with the alternative lists. They were provided with a brief explanation of the factor names and were asked to nominate which factor they thought the individual items should load onto.

Results and Discussion

The results relating to the ethnic majority (i.e., Anglo-Australian) and ethnic minority groups were analysed separately as the ethnic minority Form B contained the additional ethnic involvement subscale.

Fleiss’ (1971) generalization of Kappa’s statistic (Cohen, 1960) was used to calculate the degree of expert-rater agreement for the items in the factors, taking into account chance agreement. The analysis revealed that Kappa’s statistic for the Anglo-Australian list reached a level of agreement of .915 (91.5%), while Kappa’s statistic for the ethnic minority version was calculated to be .763 (76.3%). These levels of agreement between expert raters are considered excellent.
Nevertheless, in an attempt to increase the level of agreement, the explanations of the factor names were modified and extended to provide greater clarification and explanation of the underlying concepts of each of the factor structures for the experts. The additional explanation increased the Kappa’s statistic for the Anglo-Australian version to .957 indicating 95.7% agreement among the raters. This Kappa statistic was statistically significant at the .05 level ($z = 14.44$), showing that there was significant agreement between the experts. When Kappa’s statistic was recalculated on the ethnic minority scale, the degree of expert-rater agreement was increased to .954. Agreement of 95.4% was statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level ($z = 32.04$). The high degree of agreement among the independent expert-raters indicated that the scales had face validity, that is, the scales appeared to measure what they were developed for.

However, while it is important that scales are valid, it is also important that they are reliable and that the factor structures can be replicated using a different sample. This issue of the scale’s reliability was addressed in Stage 6 of the research.

**Stage 6: Administration of the Ethnic Identity Scale for Ethnic Majority and Ethnic Minority Children – Sample Two**

Stage 4 of the current study resulted in an instrument that appeared to be potentially useful in measuring the concept of ethnic identity in young children. The exploratory factor analyses identified a number of subscales for both ethnic dominant and ethnic minority groups. The aim of the current stage was to provide further evidence of the construct validity of the ethnic identification scale for both ethnic majority and minority children, via the use of structural equation modeling (SEM) (Arbuckle, 2003). Further assessment of the internal consistency of the subscales for each questionnaire was also conducted.
Method

Participants

The participants were obtained from primary schools in the Logan and North Gold Coast Education regions of South-East Queensland. These regions are adjoining and have similar socio-economic status. There were 475 children who took part in this study. Of these, 242 were identified by their parents (via the consent form), and later confirmed by the children, as being members of the Anglo-Australian group. There were 119 boys and 123 girls in the Anglo-Australian group. The children in this group were aged between 5.0 years and 13.5 years ($M = 8.06$ years, $SD = 1.94$ years) and there were approximately equal numbers of boys and girls.

The remaining 233 children and their parents identified with ethnic groups other than the dominant Anglo-Australian group. These participants ranged in age from 5.6 years to 14.0 years ($M = 8.12$, $SD = 1.98$). There were approximately equal numbers of boys and girls in the sample. The ethnic groups were categorised into seven broad categories based on general geographic location. Table 5.13 presents the demographics for this sample. On the basis of the results from Stage 4, the children were separated into dominant (Anglo-Australian) and ethnic minority groups for questionnaire administration and analysis.

Parental consent was sought prior to the commencement of the study, and only those children who received consent participated in the study.
Table 5.13

*Ethnic Group Membership of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Anglo Australian</th>
<th>Non-Anglo-Australian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>242 (50.9%)</td>
<td>233 (49.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European (Anglo)</td>
<td>14 (2.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>136 (28.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Australian</td>
<td>25 (5.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>32 (6.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European (non-Anglo)</td>
<td>18 (4.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>7 (1.04%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-NZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Samoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ Maori</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torres Strait Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Australian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Yugoslavia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Materials**

The two subscales, Ethnic Comparison and Ethnic Pride, were combined into a single document for this administration. The items used the generic term “my ethnic group” in each item and the experimenter inserted the name of the participant’s ethnic group during the administration. The participants from ethnic minority groups also completed six additional items that measured the extent of their involvement in the traditional activities of their ethnic group. Two versions of the questionnaire were produced, Form A contained the ethnic comparison and ethnic pride subscales and was administered to the Anglo-Australian and the European-Anglo participants. Form B included the additional ethnic involvement subscale and was administered to the ethnic minority groups.
Responses to each item were measured using a 5-point uni-polar response scales. A picture of a familiar animal represented each response option and the response options were printed directly underneath each picture. The pictures were graded in size from small (1) to large (5) and the response options were anchored at the lower end by 1 (not at all) and at the upper end by 5 (a lot). The children were required to indicate their level of agreement with each statement by drawing a circle around the option they consider most representative of their position. The order of items from each of the three sub-scales and the filler items were randomly placed within the final questionnaire.

Procedure

Each child was tested individually away from the classroom. Once rapport with the child was established, they were asked by the experimenter to name their parents’ ethnic group and the group with which they considered themselves to be members. This task was administered to ensure that the child’s ethnic group was salient and that each child was administered the appropriate version (either Form A or Form B) of the questionnaire.

The participants were informed that the experimenter was going to ask them some questions and that they would be asked to respond to each question by drawing a circle around the answer that was the best one for them. They were told that there were no right or wrong answers to any of the questions and that the experimenter was only interested in what they thought about the statements. The children completed a number of practice questions to ensure they understood the task and that they were comfortable with how they were expected to respond to the statements. If the child appeared not to understand the instructions or the method of response, the instructions were repeated and the child completed additional practice questions. Each question and set of response options were read aloud to the participants; this was done to accommodate the
limited reading level of the younger age children (i.e., the 5- and 6-year olds). Once the children had completed the questionnaire, they were thanked for their participation and returned to the classroom.

Results

In order to test the appropriateness of the scales as a measure of ethnic identity in children, the data were analysed using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) (AMOS 5.0; Arbuckle, 2003). The aim of structural equation modeling is to test whether the factor structure that was identified in the earlier exploratory factor analysis (stage 4) was an adequate fit for the new sample and, at the same time, assesses the quality of the scale as a measurement tool. A maximum likelihood method of estimation was used in this analysis. This method has been shown to perform reasonably well with data sets that are less than optimal (i.e., if the data sample is small or if kurtosis is detected in the sample) (Hoyle & Panter, 1995).

It is acknowledged in the literature that no one single index can give a complete indication of the ‘goodness of fit’ of a proposed model, therefore it is widely accepted that a range of indices for each of the index types be reported (Byrne, 2001; Hair et al, 1995; Hoyle & Panter, 1995). This use of multiple measures allows the researcher to gain consensus across types of measures as to the acceptability of the proposed model.

Accordingly, in order to interpret the fit of the model, a number of absolute and incremental fit indices were selected and reported. Absolute fit measures assess only the overall model fit with no adjustment for the degree of “overfitting” that might occur. Absolute fit indices assess how well the proposed model reproduces the sample data. These indices typically judge “badness of fit” (Hoyle & Panter, 1995). The optimal fit index has a value of zero and, as this value increases from zero, there is greater discrepancy (and therefore worse fit) between the implied covariance matrix and the
observed matrix. The chi-square (CMIN – minimum discrepancy) is reported in addition to the associated degrees of freedom. Hair et al. (1995) have noted that the chi-square statistic can often be sensitive to sample size, becoming significant as the sample increases in size. Consequently, a relative chi-square value (CMIN/DF) is also reported. This value takes into account the size of the sample and is seen as an alternative index to chi-square. The model is considered an acceptable fit when the CMIN/DF value is 3.00 or less.

Incremental fit indices are reported as an indication of the superiority of the proposed model to an alternative model, usually the independence model (one where there is no specified covariance among the variables). Incremental fit indices typically gauge a “goodness of fit”, with larger values indicating that the proposed model is superior to the alternative model. The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) has been suggested as the index of choice when reporting incremental fit indices (Bentler, 1990). The Incremental Fit Index (IFI) is also reported as an indication of the goodness of fit. Values for both of these indices range from 0 to 1.00. Values greater than .90 are considered indicative of a well-fitting model (Hoyle & Panter, 1995).

The final statistic reported is the Root Mean Square of Approximation (RMSEA) (Steiger & Lind, 1980 as cited in Byrne, 2001). This index is concerned with how well the proposed model would fit with the population covariance matrix if it were available. When determining the degree of fit, values less than .05 indicate good fit, while values up to .08 are considered to be reasonable (Browne & Cudek, 1993).

Before the CFA was conducted, the data were examined to check whether the assumptions of univariate and multivariate normality were met. The distributions for three of the eight items showed negative skew and minor kurtosis. As violations to the univariate assumptions were not excessive, the analysis proceeded without the use of
Bootstrapping. The data were also checked for the presence of multivariate outliers through the computation of Mahalanobis Distance. Using a conservative level of probability ($p < .001$) (Tabachnick & Fidel, 1996) an investigation of the data set revealed there were no multivariate outliers.

**Ethnic Identity in Majority and Minority Group Children**

The first analysis was conducted using the two-factor model identified in the earlier exploratory factor analysis. The factor structure identified in the previous exploratory factor analysis was analysed to test the ‘fit’ of the original model with the current data. The fit statistics for this two-factor model identified in the earlier exploratory factor analysis were $\chi^2 (19) = 48.94, p = .000; \text{CMIN/DF} = 2.57; \text{IFI} = .93; \text{CFI} = .93; \text{RMSEA} = .06$. The results of this analysis indicated that the two-factor model was a robust model.

To further investigate whether this two-factor model was the most appropriate model that could be used, an alternative model was tested. This alternative model comprised a single factor, with the two factors and their associated items combined. The goodness-of-fit indices obtained for the alternative model were $\chi^2 (2) = 99.42, p < .001; \text{CMIN/DF} = 4.97; \text{IFI} = .81; \text{CFI} = .81; \text{RMSEA} = .09$. Each of the indices failed to reach the accepted minimum level to be considered a “good” fit and therefore a robust model. Based on these indices, the two-factor model was considered to be a superior model to the alternative model.

**Ethnic Involvement by Minority Group Children**

As with the ethnic identification data, the data file for this group was initially explored to check whether the assumptions of univariate and multivariate normality were met. The data were characterised by a number of variables violating the assumptions of univariate normality. None of the violations was considered excessive
and the analysis proceeded with non-normally distributed data. Using a conservative level of probability (p < .001), an examination of Mahalanobis Distance indicated that there were no multivariate outliers in this data. Using the same reporting procedure as the ethnic identity scales, confirmatory factor analysis using AMOS (Arbuckle, 2003) was conducted on this data set to determine if the factor structure identified in the previous section was an adequate fit to the current data. The fit statistics for this factor indicated that the factor structure was a good fit to the current data, \( \chi^2 (9) = 8.93, p = .44; \) CMIN/DF = .99; IFI = 1.00; CFI = 1.00; RMSEA = .00.

Discussion

The research presented in this chapter outlined a systematic program designed to produce a reliable and replicable scale capable of measuring ethnic identity in children, from both the dominant and ethnic minority groups. The need for a measure unique to children was highlighted by the ineffectiveness of modifying the MEIM for use with children (Spencer et al., 2000) and the preceding focus by researchers on adolescent and adult populations.

The aim of this final stage was to conduct a cross-validation study using data gathered from a group different to the previous groups in order to test the ‘fit’ and reliability of the proposed measure of ethnic identity in children. Confirmatory factor analysis (Arbuckle, 2003) indicated that the responses collected in the present stage replicated the structure of those collected in Stage 4. This replication of the factor structure indicated that the Ethnic Identity Scale for Children was a reliable measure. Future research could investigate the validity of this scale by further administering it to a number of different ethnic minority groups.

The present study was important because it was the first to develop a scale specifically for children aged 5- to 12-years, rather than relying on modifying the
MEIM, CSE, the Universal Ethnic Identity Measure, all of which were developed for use with adolescents or adults.

Stage 7: Validation of the Ethnic Identity Scale for Children

While it is considered necessary to ensure that any new scale is statistically reliable, it is also important to ensure that the scale is valid. Thus, the next stage saw the predictive validity of the scale tested to explore if it was capable of identifying differences between the ethnic majority and minority groups in their level of ethnic identity. Given that previous results had revealed differences in ethnic preference by ethnic majority and minority children, and that there were differences between these same groups in the importance placed on ethnic group membership, the current study sought to explore if there were differences in the level of ethnic identity that these children derived from their ethnic group. As this study was one of the first formal measures of ethnic pride and ethnic comparison, it was unclear if there would be differences between the ethnic majority and ethnic minority groups and how these differences would be expressed.

Method

Participants

The responses of a subset of the 475 participants from the previous stage were selected for use in this test of validity. There were 359 participants; 239 Anglo-Australians and 120 Pacific Islanders. The children were aged between 5-years and 13-years and 5 months. The total sample was divided into three age groups. These age groups were chosen because they straddled the important stage of cognitive development focusing on the acquisition of concrete operations (Peterson, 2004). The acquisition of concrete operations is associated with the development of decentration and with increasing age further refinements and sophistication of cognitive processes.
As many of the items required children to take another’s perspective into consideration, the three age groups were considered appropriate to highlight age related changes. The first group contained 122 children who ranged in age from 5 years to 7 years and 7 months ($M = 6.06, SD = .87$). The second group contained 120 children and ranged in age from 7 years and 8 months to 9 years and 6 months ($M = 8.12, SD = .73$), while the third group of 117 children, ranged in age from 9 years, 7 months to 13 years, 5 months ($M = 10.34, SD = 1.1$). The sample also contained approximately equal numbers of boys and girls.

**Materials and Procedure**

Those items in the ethnic identity scales that related to the scales “Ethnic Pride” and “Ethnic Comparison” were taken from the previous stage. The participants’ responses on both scales were summed to produce total scores. That is, each participant generated an ethnic pride score and an ethnic comparison score. Subsequent statistical analyses were conducted on these total scores.

**Results**

The participants’ scores on each of the scales were summed to produce a total score. That is, each participant generated a total ‘ethnic pride’ scale and a total ‘ethnic comparison’ score. These total scores were independently subjected to 3 (mean age: 6–vs. 8- vs. 10-years) x 2 (gender: male vs. female) x 2 (participant ethnicity: Anglo-Australian vs. Pacific Islander) analysis of variance. The data were initially subjected to exploratory analysis to ascertain if there were violations to the assumptions of ANOVA. This analysis revealed no violations. The significance of the effects were determined using an alpha of .05, and partial eta square ($\eta^2$) is reported as a measure of the effect size. Duncan’s multiple range test was used to assess the significance of difference between pairs of cell means ($\alpha = .05$).
Ethnic Pride

The results of the analysis of variance revealed a main effect of participant ethnicity $F(1, 351) = 13.56, p < .0005, \eta^2 = .04$. The Anglo-Australian participants reported greater ethnic pride ($M = 13.68, SD = .14$) than the Pacific Islander participants ($M = 12.79, SD = .20$). The analysis failed to reveal a significant main effect for either age or gender, or any interaction effects.

Ethnic Comparison

The analysis of variance for the total ethnic comparison scale also revealed a significant main effect for participant ethnicity $F(1, 351) = 27.61, p < .0005, \eta^2 = .07$. Again, the Anglo-Australian participants again reported greater ethnic comparison ($M = 17.32, SD = .43$) than the Pacific Islander participants ($M = 13.36, SD = .62$). That is, the Anglo-Australian thought that their ethnic group rated more favourably than other ethnic groups. In contrast, the Pacific Islanders thought that their ethnic group would rate less favourably than other groups. There were no other main effects or interactions identified by the analysis.

Discussion

The current analyses have shown that in addition to the statistical validity shown in the confirmatory factor analysis, there is evidence consistent with these scales being a valid measure of ethnic identity in ethnic majority and ethnic minority children. That is, this scale has the ability to differentiate between the ethnic majority (Anglo-Australian) and an ethnic minority (Pacific Islander) group in predictable ways. Thus, in line with the expectations, the Anglo-Australian group demonstrated greater ethnic pride in their ethnic in-group and perceived their ethnic in-group as being more favourable than ethnic out-groups.
The difference of ethnic identity for the two groups is worthy of further consideration given the results of previous stages in this study. For example, in Stage 1, the Pacific Islander participants indicated that their ethnic group was more important to them than it was to the Anglo-Australian participants. However, the present results suggest that although ethnic group was considered more important to the ethnic minority group, it contributed less to their self-concept than it did for the Anglo-Australians who indicated that ethnic group membership was less importance. This result contrasts with research conducted with adults and adolescents (e.g., James, Kim, & Armijo, 2000; Parayno, 2001; Phinney, 1992; Phinney & Tarver, 1988; Roberts et al., 1999). These studies indicated that ethnic identity was higher in ethnic minority participants than in ethnic majority participants.

There is the possibility that the ethnic majority participants linked the perceived status of the ethnic in-group to ethnic pride and that their level of ethnic pride was directly affected by the status of their ethnic in-group. It might be that feeling good about the ethnic in-group (ethnic pride) is an expression of their groups’ status. While this interpretation might be adequate for the ethnic majority group, it fails to account for the lower ethnic pride expressed by the ethnic minority group children. As indicated previously, when given the opportunity to rank the ethnic groups, the Pacific Islanders rated their group as having equal status to the Anglo-Australian group. Under these conditions, the Pacific Islanders should have been expected to report at least equal ethnic pride. It is possible that there are other factors other than ethnic group status that have an effect on ethnic pride. If this explanation is to be considered seriously, then further research is needed to identify what these other factors might be.

When the participants’ responses to the ethnic comparison scale are examined, again, there are differences between the ethnic majority and minority responses. The
results further support the higher status position of the ethnic majority group, indicating that not only do these children think their ethnic group compares more favourably than ethnic out-groups, but they also think others share this opinion. This result contrasts the previous social knowledge study, in which the Anglo-Australian participant thought that a Pacific Islander would think that their ethnic in-group would have higher status than the Anglo-Australian group. In contrast, although the ethnic minority participants might perceive their group as having equal status to the Anglo-Australian ethnic group, their responses revealed that they thought their ethnic group compared less favourably to other ethnic groups. Although the comparison ethnic group was not named, it could be assumed that the Pacific Islanders were comparing their ethnic in-group with the ethnic majority out-group. Future research might consider using two ethnic groups that are identified or named by the experimenter as comparisons. It might be the case that a comparison with either another immigrant group or even the indigenous Aboriginal group may produce different results. These differential results might be expected using a social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) framework. It is possible that the lower results of the Pacific Islander minority might be an artifact of the items used. Four of the items on this scale asked the participant to respond to the items from the perspective of some other child. Again, the participants might have used Anglo-Australians as their reference group. As indicated in chapter 3, 92% of the Pacific Islanders thought that Anglo-Australian would rate all other ethnic groups as having lower status and therefore comparing less favourably to the Anglo-Australian ethnic in-group. This explanation needs to be tested in future research.

The present analysis failed to reveal gender effects. Previous research on ethnic identity in adults and adolescents (Ponterotto et al., 2003; Roberts et al., 1999; Spencer et al., 2000; Worrell, 2000) also indicated mixed results in relation to analyses on
gender effects. For example, a number of studies (e.g., Nesdale et al., 1997; Phinney, 1991, 1992; Spencer et al., 2000; Ting-Toomey, 1981; Ullah, 1985) reported that adolescent females were more likely to report greater ethnic identity than adolescent males. In contrast, a study by Fathi (1972) reported that Jewish boys indicated greater identification with Jewish norms than similar aged Jewish girls. Still other studies (e.g., Phinney et al., 1992; Phinney & Traver, 1988) reported no gender differences in ethnic identity. This lack of consistency between the present results and previous research might be an artifact of the ethnicity of the children in this sample. This present study was conducted using young children, and it might be that their ethnic experiences are not differentiated between boys and girls at this age, and they are yet to experience of understand gender-specific ethnic experiences. For example, Pacific Islander boys are tattooed with traditional symbols as a rite of passage from boyhood to adulthood. This traditional activity is conducted only by males (Hall, 2000). A second possible explanation might lie in the nature of the items used, such that they failed to discriminate between the genders. However, this possibility is considered to be less of a problem to the validity of the scale as there is previous research also indicating no gender differences (Phinney et al., 1992; Phinney & Traver, 1988). In addition, ethnic roles may not be prescribed in young children to the level of these roles in adolescents and adults. Future research might consider further investigating these issues in more detail.

The present result also did not identify age-related changes in either ethnic pride or ethnic comparison. These results contrast with work by Phinney (1992) and Phinney and Chavira (1992). The results of these studies lead Phinney and Chavira to suggest that ethnic identity consolidated through adolescence and that it was firmly established by young adulthood. The present results indicated that in contrast to the view that ethnic
identity is a task that is confined to adolescence and accompanies identity formation, young children experience ethnic identification and with the use of an appropriate measure are able to express their ethnic identity. The absence of age effects also indicated that 6-year-olds derive some part of their identity as a function of their ethnic group membership in a similar way as older children. While this study did not indicate differences between the ages, it would be valuable to conduct longitudinal research, which might identify changes within the individual’s level of ethnic identity with increasing age.

Chapter Summary

In sum, a review of the literature highlighted the absence of a measure of ethnic identity for children. In contrast, a number of instruments available for use with adults and adolescents were identified (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Nesdale et al., 1997; Phinney, 1992). A study by Reese et al. (1998), attempted to modify the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM, Phinney, 1992) for use with children. Their results indicated that such a modification was unsatisfactory. To address this deficiency, the present study set out to create and validate an instrument that could be used to measure ethnic identity in ethnic majority and minority children.

Using the stages proposed by Hattie (1981), a number of items were generated, administered, and subjected to factor analysis to produce a clear yet parsimonious scale. Two scales (ethnic pride and ethnic comparison) were common to both the ethnic majority and minority groups. A further scale (involvement in ethnic activities) was unique to ethnic minority groups. Further analyses replicated the factor structure as being adequate using a different population. In addition to the factor analyses, the scales were shown to be both valid and reliable measures.
The next chapter reports an experimental study that examined ethnic identification in ethnic majority and minority children. Extending from the present results, the next study sought to investigate if the differences in ethnic pride and comparison between the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander ethnic groups could be replicated using other groups of children from the same ethnic majority and ethnic minority groups. Importantly, it also looked at the contribution that ethnic identification makes to the expression of ethnic attitudes by children from the ethnic majority and minority ethnic groups.
CHAPTER 6.
ETHNIC IDENTITY AND CHILDREN’S ETHNIC ATTITUDES

Introduction

Researchers have shown considerable interest in issues relating to the development and maintenance of ethnic identity in immigrant adolescents and adults. Some researchers have explored the contribution of acculturation processes to the development of ethnic identity (Liebkind, 1996; Mattar, 2004; Tsang, Irving, Alaggia, Chau & Benjamin, 2003; Ward, 2006). Others have examined the relationship between ethnic identity and self-esteem (Carlson, Uppal, & Prosser, 2000; Castro, 2000; Hogg, Abrams, & Patel, 1987; Romero & Roberts, 2003). Researchers have also examined the link between ethnic identity and psychological health, including depression and anxiety (Liebkind, 1993) and adjustment (e.g., Caldwell, Zimmerman, Bernat, Sellers, & Notaro, 2002; Kurien, 2005; Phinney & Alipuria, 1990; Phinney, DuPont, Espinosa, Revill, & Sanders, 1994; Yasui, Dorham, & Dishion, 2004). Several studies have also been conducted investigating the influence of ethnic identity on academic achievement (Berhanu, 2005; Berriz, 2005; Sheets, 1999; Spencer, Noll, Stoltzfus, & Harpalani, 2001).

Spencer et al. (2001), for example, reported that African-American students who had an African identity (operationalised as endorsing Afrocentric values) exhibited higher ethnic self-esteem and achievement goals than African-American students who adopted a Eurocentric value system. Recent studies have also looked at the relationship between traditional language use and ethnic identity (Bailey, 2000; Weisskirch, 2005). For example, Weisskirch reported that the more Latino adolescents used their traditional language as a language-brokering tool (i.e., translation of written and face-to-face information for non-English speaking parents), the more positive they felt about their
traditional ethnic group and the higher their ethnic identity. Bailey also reported on the language (including code-switching) used by Dominican adolescents to negotiate their ethnic identity. His results indicated that these adolescents used their language to establish their ethnic identity and to distinguish themselves from similar-looking African-American adolescents.

With increases in immigration and the subsequent ethnic blending of families through marriage and adoption, researchers have also begun to focus on ethnic identity forged as a result of family processes (Cheng & Kuo, 2000; Dosanjh & Ghuman, 1997; Hughes, 2003; Javo, Alapack, Heyerdahl, & Ronning, 2003; Umana-Taylor, Bhanot, & Shin, 2006). The research has also examined ethnic identity in bi-racial children (Kerwin, Ponterotto, Jackson, & Harris, 1993; Larson, 1995; Qian, 2004; Ward, 2006) and inter-racially adopted children and adults (Clark, 2000; Westhues & Cohen, 1998). The influence of family processes is important in appreciating the development of ethnic identity in children. While adolescents and adults might be considered free to actively explore their ethnicity, young children do not share this same freedom. In many cases what children learn about their ethnic group and how they experience their ethnicity is often guided and facilitated by their parents (Lee, 1999).

Some research to date has indicated that ethnic minority groups might have a stronger sense of ethnic identity than do ethnic majority group members. For example, in the United States a number of studies have reported higher ethnic identity among ethnic minority adolescents than among ethnic majority adolescents (James et al., 2000; Parayno, 2001; Phinney, 1992; Phinney & Tarver, 1988; Roberts et al., 1999). In a study of ethnic identity in European-American, African-American, Asian American and Latino- Hispanic students, Parayno reported that the European-American students expressed lower levels of ethnic identity than the ethnic minority students.
Research in New Zealand also reported differences in ethnic identity among Maori and Anglo-New Zealand adolescents (Liu, Wilson, McClure, & Higgins, 1999; Thomas & Nikora, 1996), with Maori adolescents reporting greater ethnic identity than Anglo-New Zealand adolescents. A study by Ward (2006) examined the differences in ethnic identity in Anglo-New Zealand, Maori and dual-heritage adolescents in New Zealand. Ward reported that the Maori participants exhibited stronger national and ethnic identity than either the Anglo-New Zealand or the dual-heritage participants. Ward further revealed that dual-heritage New Zealand adolescents identified with both the Maori and the Anglo-New Zealand ethnic groups equally strongly. These results show a similar trend to those reported earlier by Kerwin et al. (1993). In this study, the authors’ examined identity development in biracial schoolchildren. Their results indicted that these children identified equally strongly with both ethnic groups and showed sensitivity to values, views, and cultures of both groups. The results of research using participants who have dual heritage (bi-racial) have identified a group within society who are able to successfully negotiate between the two ethnic groups of their parents.

Contrasting with this research are the studies of Bornam (1999) and French, Seidman, Allen, and Aber (2006). Bornam reported that the White South African (Afrikaans- and English-speaking) participants reported higher ethnic identity than the Black South African participants. Also of interest were the significant differences between the levels of ethnic identity of the White South African participants. The Afrikaans speakers reported higher levels of ethnic identity than the English speakers.

More recently, French et al. (2006) reported that the European-American students in their sample demonstrated higher ethnic identity (operationalised as group self-esteem) than either the African-American or Latino participants. This result is
interesting as French and colleagues measured participants in grade 5 and 6 (early adolescence) and again three years later (middle adolescence) and the reported consistent results over this period. These results also showed changes in the ethnic minority group’s level of ethnic identity but not in the majority group, that is, the collective self-esteem of the African-American and Latino students increased between the measurement events, although they remained lower than the ethnic majority group.

*Ethnic Identity in Children*

While there has been extensive research concerned with ethnic identity using both adults and adolescents, the research investigating ethnic identity in children is almost non-existent. As noted in the previous chapter, much of the research into children’s ethnic identity has focused on other constructs (e.g., ethnic self-categorisation and preference, Clark & Clark, 1947; Vaughan, 1963, 1964a, 1964b) and inferences have been drawn from these results. Some of these studies tended to equate ethnic self-categorisation with personal self-esteem or at least, to view ethnic self-categorisation as a marker or indicator of social self-esteem.

Few studies have been conducted to measure ethnic identification as distinct from ethnic self-categorisation in children. Recall that in the latter case, children have simply been asked to identify their ethnic group by pointing to a doll that looks like them (Clark & Clark, 1947) whereas ethnic identity refers to the extent to which children identify with (e.g., take pride in their membership of) their ethnic group. As noted in the previous chapter, one constraint to studies on children’s ethnic identity has been the lack of a valid measure of this concept for children.

However, one notable exception was a study by Share-pour (1999). This study examined the relationship between ethnic identity and ethnic in-group attitudes (operationalised as in-group preference) of Iranian children resident in Australia. Using
a measure of group attachment, Share-pour measured the children’s attachment to, and pride in, their ethnic group. In addition, he investigated the perceived importance of the ethnic in-group to these children. His results revealed that the more important children thought their ethnicity was the more positive were the attitudes they expressed towards the in-group. This pattern was repeated in relation to children’s ethnic pride; that is, the more ethnic pride expressed by these children, the more positive were the in-group attitudes they espoused. One limitation of this study was that the children’s attitudes towards an out-group were not measured.

Related to the preceding research, the research outlined in Chapter 6, which detailed the development of the Ethnic Identity Scale for Children, revealed that, regardless of age or gender, ethnic majority children exhibited stronger ethnic pride and ethnic comparison than ethnic minority children. This finding is consistent with Bornam (1999) and French et al. (2006), but not with Liu et al. (1999) and Ward (2006), although these latter studies were carried out on adolescents and adults.

**Study 4: Ethnic Identity and Children’s Ethnic Attitudes**

The present study sought to extend this research, and the research by Share-pour (1999), by investigating the attitudes of both Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander children towards their respective ethnic in-group and out-group, thus providing a comparison between ethnic groups not investigated by Share-pour. Importantly, the study also sought to assess the extent to which the type of children’s ethnic identification predicted their ethnic attitudes.

While no study to date has examined the link between ethnic identity and intergroup attitudes, in ethnic majority and minority group children, it is plausible that there should be such a linkage. In particular,
1. consistent with Share-pour (1999), it was expected that the higher a child’s ethnic identity, the more they would favour the in-group.

2. consistent with the previous study, it was anticipated that ethnic majority children would have greater ethnic identity than minority group children.

3. consistent with SIDT, it was anticipated that the higher the children’s ethnic identity, the more likely it was that they would like the out-group less.

**Method**

**Participants**

The sample consisted of 206 children; 121 Anglo-Australian and 85 Pacific Islanders. The children were aged between 5 years, 6 months to 12 years, 11 months. They were split into two age groups. The first group contained 102 children who were aged from 5-years, 6-months to 8-years and 3 months ($M = 6.70$, $SD = .93$). The remaining 104 children were aged between 8-years, 4 months and 12-years, 11 months ($M = 9.75$, $SD = 1.33$). There were approximately equal numbers of males and females and Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islanders in each group. Participants attended primary schools in South-east Queensland. The schools participating in this study serviced lower–middle class communities. Only those children who had been granted parental permission were included in the study.

**Materials**

*Photographs of in-group and out-group members.*

The photographs of the in-group and out-group members were randomly selected from the pool of photographs generated at the commencement of this program of research. A more detailed description of the procedure undertaken in the production of this photographic pool has been described in chapter 3.
Sixty photographs were randomly selected from this pool of photographs. The set of photographs used in this study consisted of five photos in each age x gender x ethnic group combination. These photos were matched in terms of clothing, background, facial expression, and attractiveness, but differed in age, gender, and ethnicity.

**Response Booklet.**

A response booklet was created which contained the ethnic identity scale, the main dependent measures, and a number of filler items.

**Ethnic identity.**

The participant’s ethnic identity was measured using the Ethnic Identity Scale for Children. The development and validation of this scale has been described in the previous chapter. This scale comprises three scales; two are applicable for all ethnic groups (ethnic comparison and ethnic pride) and were used in the present study. A full description of the scale items and the scale reliability has been presented in the previous chapter.

**Intergroup attitudes.**

The children’s intergroup attitudes were measured using items that asked for the participants’ degree of liking for both the ethnic in-group (*how much do you like the other children in your team?*) and liking for the ethnic out-group (*How much do you like the children in the other team?*). The participants responded to these questions using a 5-point bi-polar scale ranging from 1 (*I don’t like them at all*) to 5 (*I like them a lot*). The scale comprised 5 pictures of familiar animals (e.g. kittens and puppies) with the largest pictures at the two end points and the smallest picture in the middle (indicating a neutral midpoint). The response items were printed immediately below each of the pictures. In addition, the response booklet contained a number of filler items.
Willingness to change teams.

A single items measure was used to determine the participants desire to change from their present team into the other team. This item was presented as a 5-point unipolar scale ranging from 1 (I don’t want to change teams at all) to 5 (I want to change teams a lot).

Procedure

This study was carried out in two phases. In the first phase, all children in Grades 1-6 from the participating schools were asked by their teachers to draw a picture of themselves on a 145mm x 210mm piece of paper. After completing the drawing, the children were told that during the next week some visitors would look at their drawings, if their parents had given permission. A simple drawing was selected to act as the basis of the children’s allocation into one of the hypothetical competition groups as it was one activity in which all children could reasonably be expected to have some experience and one in which it is routine for the products to be offered up for evaluation by others. From preschool onwards, children find skill mastery highly motivating (Jennings, 1991). Research into the development of social comparisons has found that even quite young children spontaneously evaluate themselves against their peers, initially on the basis of simple assertions of ability, superior, size, or possessions (Chafel, 1986; Ruble, 1983). In addition, the use of drawings to form groups has been successfully used in a number of published studies (Nesdale et al., 2003, 2004, Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005; Nesdale & Flesser, 2001; Nesdale, Griffiths et al., 2005; Nesdale, Maass et al., 2005).

In the second phase, those children who had been given parental permission to participate were tested individually in a quiet location near their classroom. Prior to the testing session commencing and following initial conversation designed to make the
participant feel comfortable with the experimenter, a Polaroid head-and-shoulders photo was taken of the child.

The participants were directed to the response booklet and given guidance and practice on responding to questions using the response scales. They were informed that “unlike school-work there were no right or wrong answers to these questions, and that the experimenter was interested only in what they thought was they best answer for them”. Each question and response option was read aloud by the experimenter to account for the limited reading ability of the youngest children.

Participants were then asked to pretend that they were going to participate in a drawing competition and that all the children’s drawings had been judged by an artist and the children had been put into groups for the competition. The participant was told that the artist had judged their drawing and they had been put into a group of drawers “who draw just like you”.

The children were directed to a large board and were “introduced” to the other members of their team. They were asked to pin their photograph onto the board in between the other two members of their team (in-group), which had been matched to the participant in terms of their age, gender, and ethnic group membership. To make this team membership more realistic, the children were asked to choose the name of a colour for their team. This was written beside their team. The use of a team name was designed to enhance the participant’s identification with their team.

A sheet of paper covering the remaining half of the board was removed and the photographs of the other team (out-group) members were revealed. The members of the out-group were also age and gender matched to the participant. In order to manipulate out-group ethnicity, the members of the out-group were either the same ethnicity or different ethnicity to the participant. A colour name was randomly chosen by the
experimenter and was written beside the out-group. Participants were directed back to the response booklet and completed the questions.

At the completion of the testing session, the participants were debriefed. The debriefing consisted of explaining the pretend nature of the competition. It was also explained to the participants that the study was interested in their opinions about different groups of children. Any questions the participants had were answered as contributed to the debriefing session. At the completion of this debriefing, the children were thanked for their participation in the pretend game. They were also given their Polaroid photograph to keep and they returned to their normal classroom activities.

Results

Preliminary Analysis

Exploratory data analysis was conducted on the children’s scores to ensure that there were no violations to the assumptions of ANOVA. The analysis revealed that in all cases, the assumptions were met and the levels of skew and kurtosis were within acceptable limits (Hair et al., 1995). The data were then tested for gender differences using independent samples t-tests. Consistent with previous research using similar aged samples (Bigler, 1995; Bigler et al., 1997; Nesdale et al., 2003, 2004, Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005; Nesdale & Flesser, 2001; Nesdale, Griffiths et al., 2005; Nesdale, Maass et al., 2005; Vaughan et al., 1981), and adults (Dovidio, Gaertner, & Validzic, 1998), no significant gender effects were revealed. Accordingly, the data were summed across gender for the subsequent analyses.

The significance of the effects was determined using an alpha of .05, and partial eta square (η²) is reported as a measure of the effect size. Duncan’s multiple range test was used to assess the significance of difference between pairs of cell means (α = .05).
Ethnic Identity

In order to examine if children from ethnic majority and ethnic minority groups exhibited different levels of ethnic identity, the participants’ scores on the ethnic pride and ethnic comparison scales were subjected to separate 2 (age: 6- vs. 9- years) x 2 (participant ethnicity: Anglo-Australian vs. Pacific Islander) ANOVAs. The results of the analysis on ethnic pride are presented first and the results of the analysis for ethnic comparison follow.

Ethnic Pride.

The analysis revealed only a main effect for participant ethnic group, \( F(1,204) = 12.81, p < .0005, \eta^2 = .06 \). The Anglo-Australian participants exhibited greater pride in their ethnic in-group \( (M = 13.92, SD = 2.0) \) than the Pacific Islander participants \( (M = 12.88, SD = 2.0) \). There were no other main effects or interactions revealed in this analysis.

Ethnic Comparison.

The analysis for this variable revealed two significant effects. There was a main effect for age \( F(1,205) = 6.40, p < .05, \eta^2 = .03 \), which indicated that the younger children \( (M = 16.18, SD = 4.63) \) felt that both they and other groups thought that their ethnic in-group compared more favourably than ethnic out-groups, than did the older participants \( (M = 14.53, SD = 4.75) \).

The analysis also revealed a significant main effect for participant ethnicity group \( F(1,205) = 19.11, p < .0005, \eta^2 = .09 \). The means indicated that Anglo-Australian participants considered their ethnic in-group rated more favourably on the comparison criteria than did the Pacific Islander participants \( (Ms = 26.45, 13.17, SDs = 4.58, 4.86 \) respectively). The analysis did not reveal any significant interactions.
Ethnic In-group and Out-group Attitudes

The participants’ in-group and out-group attitudes were analysed using a 2 (age: 6 vs. 9) x 2 (participant ethnicity: Anglo-Australian vs. Pacific Islander) x 2 (out-group ethnicity: same vs. different) x 2 target (in-group vs. out-group) repeat measures ANOVA, with the last factor within subjects.

The significance of the effects was determined using an alpha of .05, and partial eta square ($\eta^2$) is reported as a measure of the effect size. Duncan’s Multiple Range Test was used to assess the significance of difference between pairs of cell means ($\alpha = .05$).

The analysis revealed two main effects, which were qualified by a number of significant interactions. A significant main effect for target was revealed $F(1,198) = 250.82, p < .0005, \eta^2 = .56$. The participants indicated a more positive attitude toward their in-group ($M = 4.40, SD = .86$) than towards the out-group ($M = 2.99, SD = 1.34$). This result was qualified by a significant target x age group interaction $F(1,198) = 11.78, p < .05, \eta^2 = .06$. See Figure 6.1.
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*Figure 6.1* Age x target group interaction on in-group and out-group attitudes
As indicated in this figure, the 6-year-old participants’ indicated greater liking for the in-group \((M = 4.57, SD = .77)\) than for the out-group \((M = 2.86, SD = 1.45)\). The 9-year-olds also reported greater liking for the in-group than for the out-group \((Ms = 4.23, 3.11, SDs = .90, 1.21\) respectively). From another perspective, a comparison of the cell means indicated that there was a significant decrease in the reported liking for the in-group from 6- to 9-years \((Ms = 4.57, 4.23, SDs = .77, .90\) respectively), at the same time, there was no significant difference in their liking of the out-group \((Ms = 2.86, 3.11, SDs = 1.45, 1.21)\).

The analysis also identified a significant target x participant ethnicity x out-group ethnicity interaction \(F(1,198) = 7.69, p < .05, \eta^2 = .04\). As revealed in Figure 6.2, a comparison of the cell means using Duncan’s Multiple Range Test indicated that there were differences in the reported liking for the in-group and out-group by the participants.

**Liking for the in-group.**

A comparison of the cell means indicated that the Anglo-Australian participants liked the in-group more than the out-group regardless of the ethnicity of the out-group members were the same or different to the participants. The results of the Pacific Islander participants were significantly different from the Anglo-Australians. A comparison of the cell means indicated that like the Anglo-Australians, the Pacific Islanders reported greater liking for the in-group than the out-group. Whereas the ethnicity of the out-group did not influence the reported liking for in-group by the Anglo-Australians, the Pacific Islanders reported significantly less liking for their in-group when the out-group was made up of Anglo-Australian children.

From another perspective, when the out-group was of the same ethnicity as the participants, the Pacific Islanders reported greater liking for the in-group than did the
Anglo-Australians ($M_s = 4.70, 4.22, SD_s = .74, .85$). However, when the out-group was made of children from a different ethnicity as the participants, there was no significant difference in the level of reported liking for the in-group for the Pacific Islander and Anglo-Australian participants ($M_s = 4.41, 4.34, SD_s = .92, .96$).

_Liking for the out-group._

A comparison of the cell means revealed that there was no significant difference in the reported liking for the same ($M = 3.00, SD = 1.30$) versus different ($M = 2.95, SD = 1.36$) ethnicity out-group by the Anglo-Australian participants. In contrast, there was a significant difference in the reported liking for the out-group by the Pacific Islander participants when the out-group comprised members of the different ethnicity ($M = 3.29, SD = 1.36$) than when it was made up of other Pacific Islanders ($M = 2.73, SD = 1.28$).
Figure 6.2  Target x participant ethnicity x out-group ethnicity interaction on mean liking.
Willingness to Change Teams

In order to investigate if the children would like to change from the team that they had been allocated into the other (alternative) team, a 2 (age: 6- vs. 8-years) x 2 (participant ethnic group: Anglo-Australian vs. Pacific Islander) x 2 (out-group ethnicity: same vs. different) ANOVA was conducted on their responses to this item. The results of the analysis revealed two significant main effects, which were qualified by a significant interaction. A significant main effect of participant ethnicity was revealed, $F(1,198) = 4.19, p = .05, \eta^2 = .02$. In addition, a significant main effect of out-group ethnicity was revealed, $F(1,198) = 6.91, p < .05, \eta^2 = .03$. These main effects were qualified by a significant participant ethnicity x out-group ethnicity interaction $F(1,199) = 14.59, p < .0005, \eta^2 = .07$. This result is presented in Figure 6.3.
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**Figure 6.3** Participant ethnicity x out-group ethnicity interaction on willingness to change teams.

Figure 6.3 indicates that the Pacific Islander participants expressed a greater desire to change teams when the out-group members were from the different (Anglo-Australian) ethnic group ($M = 1.98, SD = 1.56$) than when the out-group was made up of children from the same ethnic group as the participant (Pacific Islander) ($M = 1.11$, $SD = 1.56$).
In contrast, the Anglo-Australian participants showed significantly less desire to change into the out-group when it comprised children from a different (Pacific Islander) ethnicity ($M = 1.19$, $SD = .65$) than when the out-group contained other Anglo-Australian children (same ethnicity) ($M = 1.36$, $SD = .91$).

Regression analysis

Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were carried out on the participants’ scores to examine the extent to which children’s level of ethnic identity (operationalised as ethnic pride and ethnic comparison), age, and ethnic group membership were significant predictors of their liking for ethnic in-group and out-group members. On the basis of the factor analyses reported in the previous chapter, separate analyses were conducted to assess the predictive significance of the Ethnic Pride and Ethnic Comparison subscales on liking for the ethnic in-group and the ethnic out-group. Consequently, the multiple regressions will be reported separately.

Liking for the Ethnic In-Group

Ethnic Pride.

To investigate the predictive value of age, ethnic group membership (participant ethnicity), and ethnic pride on liking for the ethnic in-group, the variables were entered into the multiple regression in the following order. At step 1, age was entered, this was followed at step 2 by the participant’s ethnic group membership and, at step 3, ethnic pride was entered. The interaction terms of ethnic pride x age were entered at step 4, and finally, the interaction term participant ethnic group x ethnic pride was entered at step 5.

The regression analysis (refer Table 6.1) revealed that at step 1, the equation was significant, $F(1,204) = 9.20$, $p = .001$. Age accounted for 4.3% of the variance of children’s liking for their ethnic in-group. As children increased in age, their liking for
the ethnic in-group decreased. The inclusion of participant ethnicity at step 2 was also significant, $F(2, 204) = 7.17, p < .05$. This inclusion accounted for an additional 2.3% of the variance. ($F_{\text{change}}(1, 202) = 4.95, p < .05$). The Pacific Islanders reported greater liking for the in-group than the Anglo-Australian participants. At step 3, ethnic pride was entered. The contribution of ethnic pride at step 3 was also significant $F(3, 204) = 8.75, p < .0005$, accounting for an additional 3.4% of the variance of children’s liking for the in-group ($F_{\text{change}}(1, 201) = 6.75, p < .05$). The positive coefficients indicated that the greater the level of ethnic pride reported by the participants, the more they liked their in-group. There was no significant addition to the variance accounted for by the terms added at Steps 4 and 5.

Table 6.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.208*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.204*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Ethnicity</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.195*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.190*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Ethnicity</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.196*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Pride</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.180*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2 = .043$ for Step 1, $\Delta R^2 = .023$ for step 2, and $\Delta R^2 = .030$ for step 3. * $p < .05$

Ethnic Comparison.

The second hierarchical multiple regression investigated the predictive significance of the variables of age, participant ethnicity, and ethnic comparison on liking for the in-group. Refer Table 6.2 for a summary of this regression. At step 1, age
was entered into the regression and the equation was significant, \( F(1,205) = 8.77, p < .05 \), accounting for 4.1% of the variance. The contribution made by age was in the same direction as in the previous multiple regression equation; that is, the older children reported less liking for their in-group than the younger children. At step 2, the inclusion of participant ethnicity also rendered the equation significant \( F(2,205) = 7.16, p < .05 \), this variable accounted for an additional 2.5% of the variance (\( F_{\text{change}}(1, 203) = 5.47, p < .05 \)). As before, the Pacific Islanders reported greater in-group liking than the Anglo-Australians. At step 3, ethnic comparison was included and also resulted in the equation yielding a significant result, \( F(3,205) = 8.75, p < .0005 \). This variable accounted for an additional 4.9% of the variance. (\( F_{\text{change}}(1, 202) = 11.21, p < .05 \)). The positive coefficient indicated that the more favourably the children thought their ethnic group compared to other ethnic groups, the more they liked the in-group. There was no significant addition to the variance by the terms added at Steps 4 and 5.

Table 6.2

*Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression for Age, Participant, and Ethnic Comparison Variables Predicting Liking for the Ethnic In-group.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.203*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.198*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Ethnicity</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.157*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.148*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Ethnicity</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.227*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Comparison</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.237*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( R^2 = .041 \) for Step 1, \( \Delta R^2 = .025 \) for step 2, and \( \Delta R^2 = .049 \) for step 3, *\( p < .05 \).
Liking for the Ethnic Out-group

Ethnic Pride.

The children’s liking for the ethnic out-group was also subjected to hierarchical multiple regression to examine the influence of children’s ethnic pride on their liking for ethnic out-groups. The same variables were entered into the regression analysis in the same steps as the previous regressions. As shown in Table 6.3 at step 1, age was entered and the regression equation was significant, $F(1,204) = 5.54, p < .05$, with the equation accounting for 2.7% of the variance in children’s liking for the out-group. The coefficient indicated that as children get older they report greater liking for out-groups. Participant ethnicity was entered at step 2, and the equation failed to reach significance ($p > .05$), indicating that participant ethnicity did not predict their liking for out-groups. At step 3, ethnic pride was entered into the regression, this variable significantly contributed to out-group liking, $F(3,204) = 3.36, p < .05$, accounting for an additional 2.1% of the variance. ($F_{\text{change}}(1, 201) = 4.46, p < .05$). The positive coefficient indicated that the more pride the children had in their ethnic in-group, the more they reported liking for out-groups. The inclusion of the interaction terms failed to add to the variance accounted for by the regression equation.
Table 6.3

*Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression for Age, Participant, and Ethnic Pride Variables Predicting Liking for the Ethnic Out-group.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.163*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Ethnicity</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.163*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Ethnicity</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.173*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Ethnicity</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.150*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: R² = .027 for Step 1, ΔR² = .027 for step 2, and ΔR² = .048 for step 3. *p < .05

*Ethnic Comparison.*

The second hierarchical multiple regression investigating the predictive significance of ethnic comparison and the variables of age and participant ethnic group membership were entered in the analysis in the same order as the previous regressions. The regression analysis revealed that, when age was included at step 1, the equation was significant, $F(1,205) = 5.66, p < .05$, accounting for 1.8% of the variance. An examination of the coefficients ($B = .010, SE B = .004, β = .165$) indicated that as children increased in age they reported greater liking for out-groups than the younger children in the sample. The remaining equations did not reach significance, indicating that the remaining variables (participant ethnicity and ethnic comparison) were not predictive of children’s out-group attitudes.
Discussion

The aim of this study was to investigate ethnic identity (conceptualised as ethnic pride and ethnic comparison) in ethnic majority and ethnic minority children. A further aim was to attempt to replicate the differences between the ethnic majority and ethnic minority group identified in the previous study. In addition, the study explored the possible contribution made by ethnic identity to the expression of children’s ethnic attitudes.

Ethnic Identity

Ethnic Pride.

The data analysis indicated that, as expected, there were differences between the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander participants in terms of their ethnic identity. Consistent with the previous study and the results of Bornam (1999) and French et al., (2006), but not with other researchers (e.g., James et al., 2000; Liu et al., 1999; Thomas & Nikora, 1996; Ward, 2006), the Anglo-Australian participants reported higher levels of ethnic pride than the Pacific Islanders. It is interesting to note that there were no age effects, indicating that ethnic pride was apparently established early and in this study tended not to change with age. The results relating to ethnic pride revealed in that study replicate those previously reported in chapter 5. In the previous and present study, the Anglo-Australians reported greater ethnic pride in than Pacific Islanders.

Ethnic Comparison.

In addition, the Anglo-Australian participants also rated their ethnic group as being more favourable (ethnic comparison) than the Pacific Islander participants. This result might simply reflect the social status quo. It was reported in Chapter 4, that the Anglo-Australians rated their ethnic group as having the highest status and thought that others would also endorse this position. While the Anglo-Australian responses were
consistent between studies, the responses of the Pacific Islanders were mixed. Compared with the earlier study, the Pacific Islanders reported lower ethnic pride and thought that their ethnic group did not compare as favourably as the Anglo-Australian, or indeed other ethnic groups. This result is interesting as it is not consistent with previous results. For example, in study 1, the children nominated their ethnic in-group as having equally high status to the ethnic majority group. This attitude of equal status does not appear to translate into perceived positive evaluations for this group.

In relation to the responses on the ethnic comparison scale, the present result provided a partial replication of the previous study. That is, there was a difference in the comparison scales for the ethnic groups. As with the previous study, the Anglo-Australian participants’ scores were higher than the Pacific Islander participants. Although not revealed in the previous study, a main effect of age was revealed in relation to changes in ethnic comparison in this study. The reason for this result is not immediately obvious. This significant age result might be an artifact of the structure of the study sample. In the previous study, the sample was divided into three age groups whereas the current study used only two age groups. It is possible that any age effects that might have been present in the previous study were diluted by the greater number of age groups used. In contrast, the use of two age groups might have made differences between the ages to be more readily observed, by concentrating the participants’ responses into a smaller number of age categories. However, this is speculation and further research needs to look at the effect of age more closely.

In-Group and Out-Group Attitudes

This study sought to explore ethnic majority and minority children’s in-group and out-group attitudes using a simulation methodology. This study is the first that has used this methodology with an ethnic minority group, although this minimal group
paradigm has been used many times with Anglo-Australian children (Nesdale et al., 2003, 2004, Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005; Nesdale, Griffiths et al., 2005; Nesdale, Maass et al., 2005). Consistent with the earlier research by Nesdale and colleagues, and the previous studies, the participants indicated more positive attitudes toward the ethnic in-group than the out-group. Supporting Nesdale, Griffiths et al. (2005) the current analysis revealed that at both 6- and 9-years, the in-group was liked more than the out-group, and occurred irrespective of the participants’ ethnic group.

This result supports SIDT’s (Nesdale, 1999, 2004, 2006) hypothesis that the ethnic majority group would report consistently greater liking for the ethnic in-group than for the ethnic out-group. Although not originally proposed to account for ethnic attitudes in ethnic minority groups, the results of the Pacific Islander participants’ are in line with SIDT’s hypothesis concerning greater in-group liking. This result provides partial support for the generalisability of SIDT to ethnic minority groups.

In addition, these results provide partial support for ST’s suggestion of age differences in ethnic attitudes. Consistent with ST, attitudes toward the in-group become less positive with increasing age. Contrary to ST, there was no concomitant increase in positivity towards the out-group, indeed the present results revealed no change in attitudes towards the out-group.

These results could be explained in a number of ways. It might be that with increasing sophistication, older children are increasingly able to differentiate between individuals and respond to them on an individual basis rather than as representatives of the ethnic group. This argument is able to account for the change in the in-group attitudes, as increasing cognitive sophistication should also result in a decrease in in-group positivity. However, the absence of change in out-group attitudes calls the
validity of ST’s explanation into question. Clearly, more research is needed to tease out the effects of age on children’s ethnic attitudes.

Although the children reported more positive attitudes towards the in-group than the out-group, regardless of the ethnicity of the out-group members, a number of interesting results were revealed when the children’s attitudes were examined as a function of participant ethnicity. For example, consistent with previous research (Nesdale et al., 2003), the Anglo-Australian participants reported greater liking for the in-group than the out-group, regardless of the ethnic makeup of the out-group. In contrast, the attitudes of the Pacific Islanders showed a more interesting pattern. In short, their attitudes toward both the in-group and out-group were influenced by the ethnicity of the out-group. These children reported less positive attitudes toward the in-group and more positive attitudes toward the out-group when the out-group was Anglo-Australian rather than Pacific Islander.

**Willingness to Change Teams**

The inclusion of the item asking children if they would like to change teams provided an additional layer of explanation. This item served as a check on the consistency between attitudes and future behaviour. The results reported in earlier studies were further reinforced by the Pacific Islander children’s greater willingness to change teams when the out-group was Anglo-Australian than when it was Pacific Islander. The participants’ responses indicated that not only did the Pacific Islander participants like Anglo-Australian out-groups more than Pacific Islander out-groups, they also indicated that they would like to join the preferred ethnic out-group. In contrast, the Anglo-Australian participants indicated a greater willingness to change teams when the out-group members were of the same ethnicity.
This result is consistent with that reported by Nesdale et al. (2003). In their study, the authors reported that the Anglo-Australian participants indicated a greater willingness to change when the other team was of the same versus a different ethnicity. This indication of a desire to move or change ethnic groups may not be particularly meaningful as it might be considered a sideways move where there is no real change in the status quo of these ethnic groups. On the other hand, the unwillingness of the Anglo-Australians to change into a team of Pacific Islanders might be because the Anglo-Australian participants saw this as losing their acknowledged higher social status. In a similar pattern of results, Nesdale and Flesser (2001) reported that children expressed greater unwillingness to move to a lower status group. Although the basis of the status in Nesdale and Flesser was different to that in the present study (they used drawing ability) the results nevertheless are the same.

It might be that if there is no intergroup threat to the ethnic status quo, (i.e., they will remain part of the dominant ethnic group regardless of their team membership) children might apply other criteria when deciding on their preferred team. Children might use physical characteristics or perhaps evaluate the other team in how friendly they appear or if they resemble actual friends. However, these explanations cannot be arbitrarily accepted and without future research exploring children’s decision-making process, they must remain speculative.

The Pacific Islanders’ responses were again different from the responses of the Anglo-Australians’. These children reported greater willingness to change teams and join with the ethnic majority team. If taken at face value, this result contradicts the earlier results relating to children’s ethnic awareness. As indicated in chapter 3, the Pacific Islanders nominated their ethnic in-group as having equal social status as the Anglo-Australian group. In addition, they rated both groups equally positively on the
trait allocation measure. SIT (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and Vaughan’s (1986) adaptation of SIT provides one possible explanation for this result. According to SIT and Vaughan, members of low status social groups will strive to join with higher social status groups in order to enhance or improve their social identity.

Previous research (Nesdale & Flesser, 2001) has also reported children will show greater willingness to move from a low status group to a higher status group, but not from a high status to a lower status group. Unlike Nesdale and Flesser, group status was not manipulated, thus indicating that status and comparison are constantly being applied to social situations and in the absence of artificial manipulation, group (including ethnic) status might become a default comparison for ethnic minority but not ethnic majority groups.

Importantly, whereas the previous study established face validity of the ethnic identity scale, the present study also established its predictive significance. Specifically, consistent with expectations, ethnic identity predicted in-group attitudes for both ethnic majority and ethnic minority children. The results indicated that the greater the children’s ethnic identity the more they liked their in-group.

Further, the results indicated that pride in one’s ethnic group predicted out-group liking as well as in-group liking. Interestingly, the more pride felt by the participant, the more the out-group was liked. It is noteworthy that this finding is inconsistent with SIT and SIDT. One possible explanation might be that compared with adults, children, who feel positively about their ethnic in-group (i.e., the more pride they feel), the more magnanimous in their attitudes towards ethnic out-groups.

The regression equation also provided support for ST’s claim of a differential relationship between age and in-group and out-group liking. Consistent with ST, the older participants showed a decrease in in-group liking with a concomitant increase in
in-group liking. However, ST’s claim that age, and therefore, cognitive development accounts for changes in intergroup attitudes provides an incomplete explanation for these results. The contribution of participant ethnicity and ethnic identity in accounting for in-group and out-group attitudes highlights the inadequacy of ST’s reliance on age to account for changes in ethnic attitudes.

In contrast, the present results provide support for SIDT’s claim that children will demonstrate an orientation toward, and preference for, the ethnic in-group in comparison with an out-group. This pattern of responses of the ethnic minority children, which mirrored the Anglo-Australian responses, provides further support for the generalisability of SIDT in accounting for the development of ethnic attitudes in ethnic minority as well as ethnic majority children.

Chapter Summary

In sum, this chapter sought to examine ethnic attitudes and ethnic identification in Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander children and the influence of ethnic identification on the expression of these attitudes.

In relation to the first aim, the present results provide further support for the hypothesis that ethnic majority children will report greater liking for the in-group than the out-group. In addition, liking for the out-group is mediated by the ethnicity of the group members, with out-groups comprising the same ethnicity as the participant being liked more than out-groups from a different ethnicity.

The present study also examined intergroup attitudes of an ethnic minority group. While the results for in-group liking mirrored those of the dominant group, ethnic minority children reported an opposite trend in out-group liking. In contrast to the ethnic majority participants, the ethnic minority participants reported greater liking for the different ethnicity out-group than the same ethnicity out-group.
In addition, this study provided further support for the utility of the Ethnic Identity Scale for Children. The current study replicated the previous results and indicated that ethnic identity varies between ethnic majority and ethnic minority children. Results indicated that children from 6-years-old have a sense of belonging to a particular ethnic group. Although this identity might be relatively rudimentary compared to adolescents and adults, this study has shown that it is present to a measurable degree in these children and that it exerts some influence on the expression of ethnic attitudes towards the in-group and out-group.
CHAPTER 7.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This thesis sought to examine the development of children’s ethnic awareness, ethnic identification, and ethnic attitudes. It also sought to explore the contribution that ethnic identity makes in the expression of ethnic attitudes in both ethnic majority and ethnic minority group children. Specifically, three broad questions guided this research program. First, how do young children living in a multicultural community develop an awareness and understanding of who they are as a member of the dominant ethnic group or as a member of an ethnic minority group? Second, when and to what extent, do children identify with their ethnic group, and does this change with age? Third, does ethnic identity influence children’s attitudes towards their own ethnic group, as well as other ethnic groups?

These questions were investigated using a variety of measures and methodologies. These included photographs and drawings to investigate children’s preference for friends and neighbours, rating scales using the minimal group paradigm to assess ethnic attitudes, and structured interviews to explore children’s social knowledge. This project also developed and validated a measure of ethnic identity for children (EISC) that had previously been absent from the literature.

In response to the piecemeal approach previously adopted in investigating the development of children’s ethnic awareness, ethnic identification and ethnic attitudes, this thesis set out to conduct a systematic program of research. The aim of this program was to explore each of the concepts in order to contribute to the development of a more inclusive account of the development and expression of children’s ethnic awareness, identification, and attitudes.
**Theoretical Issues**

Much of the extant research has been theory-driven. Accordingly, at the beginning of each of the research chapters, a discussion was presented of the theories that have been proposed to account for the research results as they relate to the different concepts. While each of these theories has contributed to our understanding of ethnic awareness and attitudes in children, some have distinct shortcomings while others are unable to provide a complete account of the extant research findings. These theories have sought to account for children’s ethnic awareness, ethnic identification, and ethnic attitudes on the basis of personality (e.g., Adorno et al., 1950), cognitive development (e.g., Aboud, 1988) and social motivational factors (e.g., Nesdale, 1999; 2004; 2006; Vaughan, 1987). When examined as a whole, the results of the various studies on which these theories are based indicate that neither pure cognitive development nor pure social development can adequately account for the development of ethnic awareness and attitudes in young children.

Although not without limitations, it appears that social identity development theory (Nesdale, 1999, 2004, 2006) currently provides the most comprehensive account of the development of ethnic intra- and intergroup attitudes in children. Reminiscent of earlier theories, SIDT was originally proposed to account for the development of ethnic prejudice in dominant group children. Nesdale has recently modified his theory in order to broaden the applicability of SIDT with the aim of accounting more for intra- and intergroup attitudes and behaviour, rather than just ethnic prejudice (Nesdale, Maass, Kiesner, Durkin, Griffiths, 2006). Within the expanded scope of SIDT, ethnic prejudice is considered a specific intergroup attitude. That is, ethnic prejudice is acknowledged as one type of attitude expressed by children, although it is at the most extreme end of the attitude continuum.
SIDT emphasises the critical role of social identity processes in the development of children’s intra-and intergroup attitudes. This emphasis on social identity processes emphasises a departure from a reliance on cognitive development that had previously gained prominence in the literature. That said, SIDT does not entirely dismiss the contribution of cognitive development. However, unlike ST (Aboud, 1988), SIDT does not specifically link changes in attitudes to specific ages and thus specific cognitive stages. According to SIDT, children’s ethnic attitudes are a product of their social situations. SIDT proposes that children’s attitudes develop and mature because of the dynamics of the group in which they reside as well as the surrounding intergroup environment. Thus, the relevant group dynamics include the existing social relationships between ethnic groups in the community and the attitudes and norms of the other members of the child’s group.

SIDT has a limited focus in accounting only for intra- and intergroup attitudes in majority group children, rather than accounting for both majority and minority group children. Research (Nesdale et al., 2003, 2004; Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005; Nesdale, Griffiths et al., 2005; Nesdale, Maass et al., 2005) has shown that with increasing age there are changes in children’s ethnic attitudes and SIDT would account for these changes using a social identity argument. In addition, Nesdale and colleagues have ignored the role that ethnic awareness plays in the development and expression of ethnic attitudes in children. Until more research is conducted into the contribution of these processes SIDT can only provide a partial account regarding the development of children’s ethnic attitudes. SIDT’s account of the development of children’s’ ethnic awareness and attitudes could be considerably enhanced if future research is conducted with children from ethnic minority groups. Research utilising the ethnic majority group provides one part of the explanation of the development and expression of ethnic
attitudes. Further research using ethnic minority groups can only add to the SIDT’s utility in accounting for the intra- and inter-ethnic group attitudes of children.

Measures and Methodology

The review of the literature also indicated that there has been a reliance on using a small number of measures to investigate ethnic awareness, ethnic identification, and ethnic attitudes in children. The use of the established methodology, albeit with different populations, has served to provide consistent replications of the results, thus adding to the reliability of such measure. However, this reliance also serves to limit our understanding of these concepts. While this current project has utilised established methodology, some of which has been in use for eight decades, it also attempted to broaden the scope of the results and, by extension, our understanding of the concepts by using either different measures or by combining new and established measures in order to provide new ways of looking at old things.

The literature has also highlighted the absence of a reliable and valid measure of children’s ethnic identification. Two studies measuring children’s ethnic identification have been reported (Reese et al., 1998; Share-pour, 1999). Reese et al. modified the MEIM (Phinney, 1992) for use with young children and the results of this study indicated that the modification of an adolescent scale for young children did not produce particularly meaningful results. Share-pour also investigated the relationship between attachment to the ethnic group and in-group attitudes. One limitation of Share-pour’s study was the assumption that attachment to one’s group equated to ethnic identity. Additionally, his sample comprised children who had no long-term investment in their community, as they were children of sojourner parents. The different types of scales used in these studies highlighted the need for a reliable and valid measure of
ethnic identity in children. An additional requirement of this study was that any scale needed to be useful for both ethnic majority and ethnic minority groups.

**Overview of the Thesis**

Beginning in Chapter 2, the early research of Horowitz (1936; Horowitz & Horowitz, 1938) and Clark and Clark (1939a, 1939b; 1947) was reviewed. These studies were the first to begin investigating children’s ethnic awareness and the ethnic attitudes in both ethnic majority and ethnic minority group children. The results of these early studies revealed that European-American children correctly identified with, had more positive attitudes towards, and preferred to have contact with other, European-American children. In contrast, the responses of the ethnic minority children indicated a propensity to identify with, and display more positive attitudes towards, the European-American out-group.

These studies were important because they provided the foundation and methodology for more than eight decades of research. However, a number of methodological issues were identified. These issues include the interpretation of the results, the use of a forced-choice methodology, and the appropriateness of using dolls represent different ethnic groups. Later researchers have addressed these issues. One outcome has been the use of improved stimuli and tighter methodology has resulted in research output that is more reliable, valid, and relevant to the multi-ethnic communities that are common in the latter 20th and early 21st centuries.

**The Development of Ethnic Awareness**

Chapter 3, focused on the issue of ethnic awareness. Early research has shown that children from both majority and minority ethnic groups exhibit a basic knowledge of racial differences from about 3-years of age and that their knowledge becomes increasingly accurate with age (Clark & Clark, 1947, Epstein et al., 1976; Gregor &
McPherson, 1968; Vaughan, 1963, 1964a, 1964b). However, it was also acknowledged that ethnic awareness is not decisively established until children are about 9- or 10-years old (Hunsberger, 1978; Rosenthal, 1974; Vaughan, 1964b).

The research also identified a difference in the ethnic awareness of ethnic majority and ethnic minority children. Since the 1930s, the ethnic awareness of ethnic majority group children has shown a consistent pattern, which has been expressed as in-group positivity and accurate in-group self-categorisation. In contrast, the responses of the ethnic minority children have been less consistent. Some studies have reported that ethnic minority children were less accurate in their ethnic self-categorisation, by identifying with the ethnic majority group and indicating a greater positivity for the majority group, over a number of measures (Crooks, 1970; Epstein et al., 1976; Rohrer, 1977; Rosenthal, 1974). Other studies have reported in-group orientation responses that mirror those of the ethnic majority group (Davey & Mullin, 1980; Vaughan, 1978).

The studies in this chapter sought to examine children’s ethnic awareness in relation to both cognitive and social factors. These factors include the ability to recognise members of ethnic groups, the ability to describe the characteristics that define ethnic group membership, and the ability to understand ethnic constancy, and social knowledge.

**Recognition of Ethnic Groups.**

Consistent with previous results (e.g., Clark & Clark, 1947; Newman et al., 1983), the results of this study indicated that both the ethnic majority (i.e., Anglo-Australian) and the ethnic minority (i.e., Pacific Islander) children could correctly recognise a number of ethnic groups that comprise their local community. However, one interesting trend was that the Pacific Islanders were better at recognising different ethnic
groups than were the Anglo-Australians, indicating perhaps that ethnicity is more salient to the former children.

This study is unique because this is the first time that this open-response format, has been used. Traditionally, children have been presented with a stimulus figure and asked to identify “the one that looks like you?” or “show me the white doll?” which might be seen as leading the participant’s responses. The use of an open-response format allows for children’s unguided responses and provides a more accurate instrument for measuring social knowledge. Also setting this study apart from previous research was the lack of ethnic group names provided by the experimenter, which the participants could have used as a clue when responding. As such, the present study relied on the participants’ existing knowledge when responding, and hence resulted in a more valid outcome.

In conclusion, the results of this study indicated that young children are able to accurately recognise and name ethnic groups that reside in their community. These results also suggested that children understand that ethnic group membership is determined by the presence or absence of some characteristics and use this knowledge when discriminating between physically similar ethnic groups.

*Basis of Ethnic Group Membership.*

Study 1b sought to investigate what characteristics children draw upon when describing or determining ethnic group membership. A number of studies have been conducted examining children’s understanding of ethnic group membership (Aboud, 1984; Alejandro-Wright, 1985; Bernal et al., 1993; Quintana, 1994; Quintana & Vera, 1999; Quintana et al., 2000). The results indicate that when describing the basis of ethnic group membership, children’s descriptions changed from a reliance on using physical descriptors (i.e., skin colour) to a reliance on inferred non-observable factors
and social markers, including ethnic food preferences, ethnic activities, and language as children get older.

The present study sought to further investigate how Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander children attribute ethnic group membership. Consistent with previous results, the responses of the children in this study showed age-related changes in their use of physical and internal descriptors to assign or describe ethnic group membership. The results also indicated that the children used different types of descriptors for describing the in-group and ethnic out-groups. When describing the ethnic in-group, children used more literal descriptors indicating perhaps that they were aware that ethnic in-group membership was based on more than physical similarity between the group members. In contrast, when characterising membership of ethnic out-groups, they relied on both physical and literal descriptors indicating that when children’s knowledge of ethnic groups is superficial, they possibly supplement their descriptions with those features that are most salient.

These results add to our body of knowledge because this study asked children to describe ethnic group membership of their ethnic in-group and ethnic out-group, unlike previous research, which focused only on their descriptions of ethnic out-group membership and failed to provide a comparison between ethnic groups. The study also indicated that children rely on different cues when ascribing membership of the ethnic in-group and ethnic out-groups. While it is important to be cognizant of ethnic awareness and social knowledge, it is also important to investigate the cognitive and social processes that might underlie this knowledge. Study 1c investigated the role of cognitive processes, in particular ethnic constancy and stability and the social process of social knowledge.
Ethnic Constancy and Stability.

The link between children’s cognitive development and their ethnic awareness and attitudes has previously been documented (Aboud, 1984; Bernstein et al., 2000; Bigler et al., 1997; Bigler & Liben, 1993; Semaj, 1980). This previous research has identified age-related differences in children’s understanding of ethnic constancy over context, although no research has looked at children’s understanding of ethnic stability. The present results were, in general consistent with the previous research. That is, they indicated that children were aware of the immutability of ethnic group membership despite superficial changes in appearance. But there were some notable differences between the present and previous results. Thus, the present results indicated that Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander children had acquired this skill earlier than reported by Semaj (1980) and Aboud (1984). It is interesting to note that while the majority of Pacific Islander participants were aware that ethnic group membership could not change over context, there was still a minority of these children (across all ages) who indicated that change was possible in this situation, thus not demonstrating ethnic constancy.

Adding to our knowledge of ethnic constancy were further items which looked at children’s understanding of ethnic stability. This part of study 1c was unique as it was the first to measure this understanding in children, although there is a body a research that has looked at gender stability in young children (e.g., de Lisi & Gallagher, 1991; Slaby & Frey, 1975). The present results were consistent with the ethnic constancy and the gender stability literature. This study indicated that there were age-related differences in the children’s level of understanding, such that the older children revealed greater understanding of ethnic stability than the younger children. The results also highlighted differences between the ethnic groups, with the Anglo-Australians revealing greater understanding than the Pacific Islanders.
Social Knowledge.

A number of items sought to investigate the children’s level of social knowledge as a contributing factor to their ethnic awareness and their growing attentiveness to social stereotypes. Previous research has highlighted the importance of social knowledge to the development of ethnic awareness (Averhart & Bigler, 1997; Katz & Kofkin, 1997; Radke & Trager, 1950; van Ausdale & Feagin, 1996; Vaughan, 1964a). The results of the present study indicated that children from both the ethnic majority and ethnic minority groups were cognizant of the ethnic groups within their community and that they were aware of the status differences between these groups.

Consistent with previous research (Radke & Trager, 1950), the children from the Pacific Islander minority group demonstrated greater awareness of the different ethnic groups in their community than the Anglo-Australian children. This was shown by their greater ability to freely recall the names of more ethnic groups than the Anglo-Australian children. This result might suggest that ethnicity is more salient for ethnic minority groups than the ethnic majority group (see Oakes, 1987).

The second measure of social knowledge investigated awareness of status differences between the various community ethnic groups. The results of this study were in line with those previously reported which indicated that the ethnic majority group would be accorded the highest status by both ethnic majority and ethnic minority (van Ausdale & Feagin, 1996; Radke & Trager, 1950). Thus, the Anglo-Australian children responded to the questions on group status in the same way that ethnic majority children have responded for the previous 40 years. However, the responses of the Pacific Islander participants are interesting as they run counter to previous research (Radke & Trager, 1950; Rosenberg & Simmons, 1971; Vaughan, 1963, 1964a). The present results indicated that the Pacific Islander participants did not separate the Pacific
Islander and Anglo-Australian group when asked to indicate the group with the highest status. These results also clearly showed that of all the available ethnic groups, the Aboriginal group was consistently accorded the lowest social status by both the Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander participants.

In sum, this set of studies provided us with an additional layer of knowledge concerning the development of children’s ethnic awareness. It is unique in that for the first time a study has been conducted with an ethnic majority and an ethnic minority group simultaneously, thus enabling a direct comparison between these groups to be made.

Study 1 was important because it explored the cognitive and social processes that underlie ethnic awareness. The next study (Study 2) continued this examination into children’s ethnic awareness by looking at the development of their ethnic attitudes. It was interested in examining how ethnic awareness and cognitive and social knowledge processes are reflected in ethnic majority and ethnic minority children’s ethnic attitudes.

**Study 2: The Development of Ethnic Attitudes**

In the present exploration of children’s ethnic attitudes, the participants were first asked to rate the ethnic in-group and two ethnic out-groups on a number of traits. The results indicated that consistent with previous research (Doyle & Aboud, 1995; Horowitz, 1936; Kowalski, 2003; Nesdale et al., 2003), the ethnic majority children (i.e., Anglo-Australian) held more positive attitudes towards their ethnic in-group than they held towards ethnic out-groups. The responses of the ethnic minority (Pacific Islander) participants were also consistent with the previous study (Study 1c). In both studies, the Pacific Islanders failed to differentiate between the ethnic in-group and the Anglo-Australian out-group, (e.g., in the present study, the Pacific Islanders showed
equally positive attitudes towards both groups, while in study 1c, these same children indicated that the in-group and the Anglo-Australian out-group held equal social status). Also in line with study 1c, both Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islander participants indicated least positive attitudes towards the Aboriginal group.

This study also measured children’s preferences for the in-group and ethnic out-groups using two measures. The children were first asked to choose a friend. In contrast to the previous studies (study 1c), there was no difference in the pattern of responses for the Anglo-Australian or the Pacific Islander participants. Thus, both groups indicated a clear and overwhelming preference for friends from their ethnic in-group. This preference for the ethnic in-group was reflected in their responses that members of an ethnic out-group would also choose from within their in-group when choosing friends.

The second measure asked participants to allocate houses to ethnic families in a hypothetical street exercise. In contrast to the previous results, the Anglo-Australian participants expressed an equal preference for their in-group, a Pacific Islander, or a Vietnamese family as close neighbours. However, reflecting previous results, they indicated least preference for Aboriginal neighbours. The Pacific Islander children again failed to differentiate their preferences for neighbours between the ethnic in-group and the ethnic majority group, assigning both equally close proximity, and significantly closer than the Vietnamese or Aboriginal families.

This study has contributed to our understanding of the development of ethnic awareness in children, by further exploring how children’s ethnic attitudes are expressed. This study also highlighted the differences between the ethnic majority group and an ethnic minority group in the expression of ethnic attitudes.

When taken in conjunction with the previous results (Abel & Sahinkaya, 1962; Aboud, 1980; Brown, 1995; Doyle & Aboud, 1995; Genesee et al., 1978; Helgerson,
1943; Horowitz, 1936; Horowitz & Horowitz, 1938; Madge, 1976; Nesdale, 2001; 
Nesdale et al., 2003; Vaughan, 1964a, 1978; Zinser, et al., 1981), the present results 
indicated that the ethnic majority children gave much the same responses as they have 
for the last eight decades. That is, they showed a clear and consistent preference for, and 
more positive attitudes towards, their ethnic in-group. Moreover, they seemed to 
distance themselves from the ethnic out-groups, without regard to the identity of the 
ethnic out-group. However, this conclusion is open to speculation until further research 
is conducted to investigate the children’s justifications for their response.

In contrast, the ethnic minority children did not differentiate between the ethnic 
in-group and the Anglo-Australian ethnic out-group, rating both groups equally 
positively. The research to date has reported mixed results in relation to the attitudes of 
ethnic minority children. Some studies have reported equal preference being expressed 
by ethnic minority children, whereas other studies have reported in-group preference 
(e.g., Fox & Jordan, 1973; Margie et al., 2005), and still others have reported an out-
group preference (e.g., Cramer & Anderson, 2003; Gin, 2003). The current result adds 
further to the inconsistencies reported in the literature and further research will need to 
be undertaken.

A review of the extant literature revealed that many researchers have used a 
single measure in their studies, thus limiting the generalisability of the results. This 
study departed from this reliance on a single measure because it used several related 
measures to explore a single construct. The advantage of using multiple measures is 
that they allow the researcher to get a broader picture of how children’s attitudes are 
being expressed across a number of dimensions, thus giving us a broader base on which 
to draw conclusions.
The research, thus far, concentrated on exploring children’s ethnic awareness and their ethnic attitudes towards their ethnic in-group and ethnic out-groups. Two questions became apparent as the research progressed. First; how important was being a member of an ethnic group? Second, do children draw some part of their identity from being a member of their ethnic group?

Study 3: Ethnic Identity in Children

Ethnic identity has been examined in both adults (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Nesdale & Mak, 2000, 2003; Nesdale et al., 1997) and adolescents (Phinney, 1991, 1992, Ponterotto et al., 2003; Roberts et al., 1999; Spencer et al., 2000; Worrell, 2000), while little research has been conducted on this topic with children (but see Reese et al., 1998; Share-pour, 1999). A review of the literature highlighted the absence of a reliable and valid measure of ethnic identity and served as the motivation for Study 3.

Study 3 was conducted in several stages following the framework suggested by Hattie (1981). Each stage contributed to the creation of the Ethnic Identity Scale for Children (EISC), which was shown to comprise two factors that were common to both the ethnic majority and ethnic minority groups. The first, “ethnic pride”, included items that measured the feelings of positivity and pride felt towards their ethnic group. The second scale, “ethnic comparison” contained items concerned with how the children viewed their ethnic group in relation to ethnic out-groups, but also how they thought others saw their ethnic group. A third scale “involvement in ethnic activities’ was identified for ethnic minority groups but not for the ethnic majority group. These scales were shown to be both reliable and valid measures of ethnic identity across two administrations. As a further test of the validity of this scale, the responses on the ethnic pride and ethnic comparison scales were analysed to explore if the scales were able to identify differences between the ethnic majority and ethnic minority groups. The results
indicated that in contrast to adolescents and adult research, the Anglo-Australian children reported higher scores on both the ethnic pride and ethnic comparison scales. However, further validation studies will be needed to increase the validity and reliability of this scale.

Study 4: Ethnic Identity and Ethnic Attitudes

The final study sought to explore the predictive value of ethnic identity on the expression of children’s ethnic attitudes. Importantly, the study employed a simulation paradigm so as to enhance the realism of group membership in the situation. Although this methodology has been used several times with an Anglo-Australian ethnic group (Nesdale et al., 2003, 2004, Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005; Nesdale, Griffiths et al., 2005; Nesdale, Maass et al., 2005), the present study was the first to use this paradigm with participants from an ethnic minority group. The inclusion of an ethnic minority group allowed for the direct comparison between the ethnic majority and minority groups on the same dimensions, rather than having to make comparison across the results of several studies.

Consistent with previous research (Nesdale et al., 2003, 2004; Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005; Nesdale, Griffiths et al., 2005; Nesdale, Maass et al., 2005), the Anglo-Australian participants reported greater liking for members of the in-group than the out-group (regardless of whether the out-group comprised other Anglo-Australian or Pacific Islander children). Similarly, the Pacific Islanders also indicated a more positive attitude toward the in-group than the out-group.

Interestingly, one noticeable difference concerned the change in attitude by the Pacific Islander participants toward the out-group when it comprised Anglo-Australian versus Pacific Islander members. In short, the Pacific Islander participants indicated a more positive attitude toward the out-group when it was made up of Anglo-Australian
children than when it was made up of other Pacific Islander children. This response was not apparent in the Anglo-Australian responses. This attitude was further reinforced by their greater willingness to change teams when the out-group was Anglo-Australian than when it was Pacific Islander. In contrast, the Anglo-Australian participants indicated a greater willingness to change teams only when the out-group members were of the same ethnicity.

In sum, the results of the Anglo-Australian participants are consistent with the research using other ethnic majority groups that has been reported since the early studies of Horowitz (1936; Horowitz & Horowitz, 1938). That is, ethnic majority children indicate a more positive attitude and display clear preference for members of their ethnic in-group than toward ethnic out-groups. In general, this preference was not influenced by the ethnicity of the out-group. This result was demonstrated in the present program using both free-response interviews, and simulated studies.

In contrast, the Pacific Islander responses showed much greater variability than the Anglo-Australian participant responses. In response to items which were more open and allowed greater freedom to respond, these children indicated an equally positive attitude and preference for both the in-group and the ethnic majority out-group. However, in the studies with more restricted response options, the Pacific Islander participants were more likely to indicate an in-group preference. This variability in their responses might be an artifact of the methodology used, or it might reflect their confusion and insecurity of being young immigrants in Australia, and their striving to find their place and that of their ethnic group in a new country.

The results also indicated that the Anglo-Australian participants felt greater pride in their ethnic group and thought that it compared more favorably to other ethnic groups. In contrast, the Pacific Islanders felt less pride in their ethnic group and thought
it compared less favourably to other ethnic groups. This result is interesting because in the earlier studies, the Pacific Islanders had indicated equality between their ethnic in-group and the majority ethnic out-group, and they had also indicated that ethnic group membership was more important to them than did the Anglo-Australian participants.

Importantly, the predictive significance of ethnic identity in relation to children’s ethnic attitudes was also tested in this study. Consistent with expectations, ethnic pride predicted in-group and out-group attitudes for both ethnic majority and ethnic minority children. The results indicated that the higher their ethnic pride the more the children liked their in-group. Interestingly, the analysis also revealed that the higher the ethnic pride, the more the ethnic majority and minority group children reported liking for the out-group. It is interesting to note that the ethnic comparison subscale also predicted liking for the ethnic in-group, such that the more favourable the child thought their group comparison to be, the more they indicated liking for that group. However, the regression indicated that ethnic comparison did not predict liking for the ethnic out-group.

*Issues to be Addressed in Future Research*

While the present results shed light on the development of ethnic awareness in young children living in Australia, there are a number of issues that need to be addressed if a more complete picture of children’s ethnic awareness is to be obtained.

One advantage of this research was that examining the attitudes of the participants towards more than one out-group enabled assessment of attitudes at a community level. The use of more minority groups could extend the usefulness of this research by increasing its relevance to the local community. However, as was the experience in the present research, some ethnic minority groups are numerically insufficient to provide a minimum sample size, thus limiting the range of ethnic groups
that could be recruited. One possible solution would be to build links with ethnic minority organizations (e.g., community support groups, religious organizations, social clubs etc) to facilitate the recruitment of larger numbers of ethnic minority groups. As communities become increasingly multi-cultural, this wider focus can only allow for a better picture of the emergence of ethnic awareness in young children.

At no time in Australia’s history have international migration issues loomed as large in debates about the nation’s economic, social, and political future as they have in the last decade. There is currently ongoing public debate in relation to the arrival, detention, and treatment of asylum seekers, many of who are from ‘Islamic or Muslim’ countries (e.g., Afghanistan, Lebanon, and Iraq). The linking of threats of terrorism and terrorist activity with members of Muslim communities both in Australia and in other parts of the world has fuelled further public debate and possibly influenced attitudes towards these groups in Australia.

A number of studies have examined the ethnic attitudes of adult Anglo-Australians towards refugees and asylum seekers. Each of these studies reported negative attitudes towards these groups (e.g., Pedersen, Atwell, & Heveli, 2005; Schweitzer, Perkoulidis, Krome, Ludlow & Ryan, 2005; Shanahan, 2002). Shanahan reported that 48% of participants in a national opinion poll supported turning away all asylum seekers arriving on the shores of Australia. In addition, Schweitzer et al. (2005) and Pedersen et al. (2005) reported that more than 60% of participants expressed negative attitudes towards asylum seekers.

While it is now increasingly accepted that children simply do not ape the attitudes of their parents (Nesdale, 2004), it is undeniable that they are nevertheless influenced by the attitudes and norms of the society in which they live. Therefore, extending this line of research into looking at the ethnic awareness and attitudes of
children towards groups of refugees and asylum seekers could further extend our knowledge. It would not be unreasonable to expect that children’s awareness and attitudes towards groups that have a high profile and subsequently attract high social commentary in the press and media may be significantly different to the ethnic awareness and attitudes towards groups that migrate legally in accordance with Australian immigration policy and are not subject to public scrutiny and opinion. However, until this research is conducted, this expectation remains open to speculation.

Future research could also consider comparing the responses of ethnic minority groups across situations, where in one, the group holds numerical majority status, and in the other, it holds numerical minority status. It is possible that the pattern of their responses as the majority group might be similar to those of the ethnic majority group in the present study. However, this expectation is open to conjecture until the appropriate research is conducted.

It might also be interesting to investigate if there are differences in children’s ethnic awareness, ethnic identity, and ethnic attitudes based on the number and diversity of the ethnic groups in their local community. Would there be differences in the responses of children who come from communities where there is relatively little ethnic mix (i.e., predominantly Anglo-Australian communities) compared to those children who live in communities with a high degree of ethnic mixing and multiculturalism? It would also be useful to explore children’s ethnic awareness, identification, and attitudes based on the degree of contact between the dominant and minority groups in their local community. Although many communities are multicultural, the degree of contact between the ethnic majority and ethnic minority groups can be enhanced or restricted based on choices made regarding what schools the children attend and the ethnic makeup of their friends. These questions need to be addressed in future research.
Another area that needs further consideration is the effect of age. While the results presented in this thesis indicate that in some situations age is influential in children’s ethnic awareness and understanding, this focus needs broadening. While the present research focused on children who attended primary schools, the results indicated that the majority of them were already demonstrating ethnic awareness. As such, it could add to our understanding of this development by investigating this development in younger (i.e., preschool) children. By interviewing younger children, it might be possible to identify at what age ethnic awareness begins to develop. In addition, there was some variability in the responses of children in the upper age group. This variability suggests that ethnic awareness is still developing in some children. By extending this line of research into adolescence it might be possible to identify at what age ethnic awareness is fully established. In sum, the extension of this line of research to younger and older children will further consolidate our knowledge about the development of ethnic awareness.

In addition to exploring the development of children’s ethnic awareness, this program of research also developed a scale to measure ethnic identification in children. This scale has been shown to have both content and predictive validity. These scales have also been shown to be reliable over several administrations. While the results of the validation studies were promising, additional validation studies are needed. These future validation studies might consider using a greater number of ethnic minority groups than those used in the current study. The scale measuring children’s involvement in ethnic activities was not used in the current project as there was only one ethnic minority group and as noted previously, this scale is not applicable for use with the ethnic majority group. Further administration with additional ethnic minority groups is required to provide additional information about the validity and reliability of this scale.
Conclusion

In conclusion, this thesis has facilitated some insight into the development of ethnic majority and minority children’s ethnic awareness, ethnic identification, and ethnic attitudes in Australia. Future research is needed to extend and elaborate this line of research. As the research spotlight is extended to an increasing number of ethnic groups, a better understanding of future ethnic relations in Australia and beyond can be gained. One outcome of this knowledge would be the ability to monitor, predict, and ultimately improve ethnic relations among children and later adults in what is an increasingly multicultural society in the 21st century.
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APPENDIX A
PARENT INFORMATION LETTER AND CONSENT FORM PARENT
INFORMATION SHEET

Project: The development of children’s intergroup attitudes.

Chief Investigator: Professor Drew Nesdale
School of Applied Psychology
Griffith University
Phone: (07) 555 28878
Email: d.nesdale@mailbox.gu.edu.au

A study to explore the development of children’s intergroup attitudes is being conducted by Mrs Judith Griffiths in meeting the requirement of a PhD, under the supervision of Professor Drew Nesdale from the School of Applied Psychology, Griffith University, Gold Coast.

The task that is simple, engaging and will take about 20 minutes of your child’s time. The children will be asked to respond to a series of statements about their thoughts and attitudes towards social groups of which they are members. It is stressed to the children that there are no right or wrong responses to any of the statements, and that the children’s responses will be treated with respect and dignity. The Chief Investigator, Professor Drew Nesdale and Mrs Griffiths have backgrounds in teaching and have had extensive experience in interacting with young children.

The only personal information required about your child is their date of birth and gender. Confidentiality and anonymity is guaranteed for all children. You would be welcome to withdraw your child from the study at any time, and your child will be free to withdraw at any time. As this study will involve several stages, children who are given parental consent will participate in one of the stages at various times.

If you have any complaints concerning the manner in which the research project is conducted it may be communicated to Mrs Griffiths, Professor Nesdale, or, if an independent person is preferred, either

The University's Research Ethics Officer, Office for Research, Bray Centre, Griffith University, Kessels Road, Nathan, Qld 4111, telephone (07) 3875 6618; OR

The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Administration), Bray Centre, Griffith University, Kessels Road, Nathan, Qld 4111, telephone (07) 3875 7343.

Your consideration for your child’s participation in this project is greatly appreciated. As no scale currently exists to measure how children feel about their group membership, this project is important and will ultimately contribute to an understanding of how children feel about the various groups they are members of.

Yours faithfully
Judith Griffiths
PARENT CONSENT FORM.

Project: The development of children’s group attitudes

I understand that permission is sought for my child to participate in a project to investigate the development of children’s group attitudes that is being conducted by Mrs Judith Griffiths, under the supervision of Professor Drew Nesdale from the School of Applied Psychology at Griffith University.

I understand that my child is not required to participate in this study if I do not wish him/her to do so and that s/he can withdraw from the study at any time without having to explain his/her reasons for withdrawing. No penalty or loss of benefit or treatment will occur following withdrawal.

I understand that my child’s responses will remain anonymous and will be treated confidentially with those of other children in the project.

I have read the information sheet and the consent form. I agree to the participation of my

child______________________________, Date of Birth _____/_____/______,

class_____ in the project to develop a scale to measure collective self-esteem in children and give my consent freely. I understand that the project will be carried out as described in the information statement, a copy of which I have retained. I realise that my child’s participation is my decision and will not affect his/her schooling in any way. I also realise that s/he can withdraw from the project at any time and that s/he does not have to give any reasons for withdrawing. I have had all questions answered to my satisfaction.

If you are willing to allow your child to take part in this project, please sign the bottom of this form and return it to your child’s teacher by ___/_____/______.

Signatures:

.................................................................  ......................
Parent/Caregiver(s)                  Date

.................................................................  ......................
Investigator(s)                     Date

Thank you
Judith Griffiths
APPENDIX B
SAMPLES OF PHOTOGRAPHS USED

Image removed, please consult print copy of the thesis held in Griffith University Library
SAMPLES OF COMPUTER GENERATED SORTING CARDS
Image removed, please consult print copy of the thesis held in Griffith University Library
APPENDIX C
RESPONSE BOOKLET

Subject No: _____________  Class___________  Age: ________

CLASSIFICATION TASK:

Materials:  
2 sets of 12 cards
1 set different coloured boats and cars (6 of each)
1 set of cards of boys and girls in gender-neutral activities (talking on the phone/reading a book).

Give the Subjects the pictures of cars and boats.

Here are some pictures, could you put the pictures which go together in the same pile.

Sort dimension:    colour    shape

Why did you put them together like this?

Is there another way that the pictures can be sorted?  YES
NO (if no move to the next sorting activity)

Sort dimension:    colour    shape

Why did you put them together like this?

Give the participant the photos of the boy and girl.

Here are some pictures, could you put the pictures which go together in the same pile.

Sort dimension:    gender    activity

Why did you put them together like this?

Is there another way that the pictures can be sorted?  YES
NO

Sort dimension:    gender    activity

Why did you put them together like this?
ETHNIC RECOGNITION

Materials:

*4 photos - 1 x Anglo and 1 x Pacific Islander, 1 X Chinese and 1 x Aboriginal*

*Here are some photos of kids from different country or cultural groups*

Showing the child one photo at a time, ask:

*What country or cultural group does this kid come from?* Record the child’s response.

Follow-up question:

*How do you know they are ethnic group?* Record the child’s response.

Regardless of whether the child is right or wrong in their response, go through all 4 photos. If the child is wrong or any of the photos or responds “don’t know”, at the end say…..

*If I were to show you these photos again and tell you that 1 of the kids is Australian, 1 is Chinese, 1 is Pacific Islander, and 1 is Aboriginal, can you tell me which group does this kid belong to……… (this is the prompted response), go through the photos again in the same order.*

Insert photo presentation order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ETHNIC CATEGORISATION.

What cultural/ethnic group do you belong to? ____________________________

What cultural/ethnic group does your mum belong to? _____________________

What cultural/ethnic group does your dad belong to? ______________________

Counterbalance order of these last three questions

Now I would like to ask you some questions about the group that you come from:

ETHNIC CONSTANCY.

You said that you belonged to the ....................... country or cultural group (refer back to previous question)

What group did you belong to when you were born? ______________________

What group will you belong to next year? _________________________________

What group will you belong to when you grow up? _________________________

Is it possible for you to become (other group)___________________________ if you really wanted to?

            YES             NO

Why (or why not)?

What if you were to put on a wig to change the colour of your hair?

            YES             NO

Why (or why not)?

What if you changed the colour of your face with makeup or painted it?

            YES             NO

Why (or why not)?
What if you put on a wig and changed the colour of your face with makeup or paint?  

YES  

NO  

Why (or why not)?

SOCIAL KNOWLEDGE

There are many different groups of people living in your community, people that live near to you or go to this school, can you name as many of these groups as you can think of?  

Record responses

Of all of these groups,

Which group is the best group?

You know the group that is the most important - The group that has the best houses and cars and the group has the most money (to buy nice things for their kids)

Group Name:  

If don’t know use 3 or 4 groups off the list the child came up with

Could the Aust group be the best, or could the Pacific Island group be the best etc.. until the child chooses one group as the best.

Group Name:  

What about the second best group?

Group Name:  

Which is the worst group? You know the group that is the least important, the group that lives in the worst house and the worst car,

Group Name:  
DECENTRATION MEASURE

Here is a photo of another child, (pick the photo of the opposite ethnic group) which group do you think they think is the best group

You know the group that is the most important - The group that has the best houses and cars and the group has the most money to buy nice things for their kids.

Group Name: _______________________________________________

What about the second best group?

Group Name: _______________________________________________

What about the worst group? You know the group that is the least important, the group that lives in the worst house and the worst car;

Group Name: _______________________________________________

ETHNIC UNDERSTANDING

What makes a person Australian/PI (own group first)?

What makes a person ________? (other group)

GROUP PREFERENCE

Materials: 2 Anglo photos, 2 Pacific Island, 2 Aborigine, 2 Vietnamese

Here are some groups of kids, if you could choose, which group would you like to play with.

Aust Pacific Island Aboriginal Vietnamese

Indicate group the child nominates
Let’s pretend that this is a photo of a new kid who might be coming to your school, which group do you think they would like to play with. *Pick a photo of a child from the opposite ethnic group*

Aust Pacific Island Aboriginal Vietnamese

*I would like you to have a look at the children in these groups and tell me some things about them. There are no right or wrong answers, I am just interested in what you think.*

*OK.*
1. I like being (or coming) from my country.

Not at all  A tiny bit  A little bit  Quite a lot  A lot

2. I am proud of my country

Not at all proud  A tiny bit proud  A little bit proud  Quite a lot proud  Very proud

3. I think that my country is the best country in the world.

Not at all  A tiny bit  A little bit  Quite a lot  A lot

4. I often tell other kids that I am from my country

Never  Not very often  Sometimes  Quite often  All the time

5. I like telling other kids about my country.

Not at all  A tiny bit  A little bit  Quite a lot  A lot

6. I think that people from my country are better at doing things than people from other countries

Not at all better  A tiny bit better  A little bit better  Quite a lot better  A lot better

7. Other kids would like to be from my country if they could

Not at all  A tiny bit  A little bit  Quite a lot  A lot

8. Other kids think that people from my country are really good

Not at all  A tiny bit  A little bit  Quite a lot  A lot
9. Other kids think that my country is better than their country

Not at all A tiny bit A little bit Quite a lot A lot

10. Other kids think that people from my country have better (nicer) things than people from their country.

Not at all A tiny bit A little bit Quite a lot A lot

11. Other kids think that people from my country are richer than people from their country.

Not at all A tiny bit A little bit Quite a lot A lot

12. My family does things with others from my country

Never Not very often Sometimes Quite often All the time

13. I like doing these things

Not at all A tiny bit A little bit Quite a lot A lot

14. I am happy that I come from my country

Not at all A tiny bit A little bit Quite a lot A lot
1. Do you think that these Australian kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really bad</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>A bit bad</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Really good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&amp; a bit good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Do you think that these Pacific Island kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really bad</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>A bit bad</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Really good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&amp; a bit good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Do you think that these Aboriginal kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really bad</th>
<th>Quite bad</th>
<th>A bit bad</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Really good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&amp; a bit good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Do you think that these Australian kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really dumb</th>
<th>Quite dumb</th>
<th>A bit dumb &amp; a bit smart</th>
<th>Quite smart</th>
<th>Really smart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Do you think that these Pacific Island kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really dumb</th>
<th>Quite dumb</th>
<th>A bit dumb &amp; a bit smart</th>
<th>Quite smart</th>
<th>Really smart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. Do you think that these Aboriginal kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really dumb</th>
<th>Quite dumb</th>
<th>A bit dumb &amp; a bit smart</th>
<th>Quite smart</th>
<th>Really smart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. Do you think that these Australian kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really sad</th>
<th>Quite sad</th>
<th>A bit sad</th>
<th>Quite happy</th>
<th>Really happy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&amp; a bit happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Do you think that these Pacific Island kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really sad</th>
<th>Quite sad</th>
<th>A bit sad</th>
<th>Quite happy</th>
<th>Really happy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&amp; a bit happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Do you think that these Aboriginal kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really sad</th>
<th>Quite sad</th>
<th>A bit sad</th>
<th>Quite happy</th>
<th>Really happy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&amp; a bit happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Do you think that these Australian kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really unfriendly</th>
<th>Quite unfriendly</th>
<th>A bit unfriendly &amp; a bit friendly</th>
<th>Quite friendly</th>
<th>Really friendly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Do you think that these Pacific Island kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really unfriendly</th>
<th>Quite unfriendly</th>
<th>A bit unfriendly &amp; a bit friendly</th>
<th>Quite friendly</th>
<th>Really friendly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Do you think that these Aboriginal kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really unfriendly</th>
<th>Quite unfriendly</th>
<th>A bit unfriendly &amp; a bit friendly</th>
<th>Quite friendly</th>
<th>Really friendly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. Do you think that these Australian kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really boring</th>
<th>Quite boring</th>
<th>A bit boring &amp; a bit fun</th>
<th>Quite fun</th>
<th>Really fun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Do you think that these Pacific Island kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really boring</th>
<th>Quite boring</th>
<th>A bit boring &amp; a bit fun</th>
<th>Quite fun</th>
<th>Really fun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
14. Do you think that these Aboriginal kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really boring</th>
<th>Quite boring</th>
<th>A bit boring</th>
<th>Quite fun</th>
<th>Really fun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&amp; a bit fun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Do you think that these Australian kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really unhelpful</th>
<th>Quite unhelpful</th>
<th>A bit unhelpful</th>
<th>Quite helpful</th>
<th>Really helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&amp; a bit helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Do you think that these Pacific Island kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really unhelpful</th>
<th>Quite unhelpful</th>
<th>A bit unhelpful</th>
<th>Quite helpful</th>
<th>Really helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&amp; a bit helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Do you think that these Aboriginal kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really unhelpful</th>
<th>Quite unhelpful</th>
<th>A bit unhelpful</th>
<th>Quite helpful</th>
<th>Really helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&amp; a bit helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Do you think that these Australian kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really dirty</th>
<th>Quite dirty</th>
<th>A bit dirty</th>
<th>Quite clean</th>
<th>Really clean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&amp; a bit clean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Do you think that these Pacific Island kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really dirty</th>
<th>Quite dirty</th>
<th>A bit dirty</th>
<th>Quite clean</th>
<th>Really clean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&amp; a bit clean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Do you think that these Aboriginal kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really dirty</th>
<th>Quite dirty</th>
<th>A bit dirty</th>
<th>Quite clean</th>
<th>Really clean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&amp; a bit clean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. Let’s pretend that one Australian (A), one PI (P), one Aboriginal (B), and one Vietnamese (V) family is going to move into your street. You do not know anything about their families except which group they come from. Because it is your street you are allowed to choose who lives in which house. Where in relation to your house would you like these families to live? Can you write the letter of each group in the house that you want them to live in. **You can only put each family into 1 house.**
APPENDIX D
EXPERT RATING SCALES

SECTION A: ANGLO-AUSTRALIAN ETHNIC GROUP

Thank you for agreeing to complete this task. There are two separate versions of this task, the first, relates to the Anglo-Australian ethnic group and the second relates to groups other than Anglo-Australians.

The following pages contain statements with which some people agree and others disagree. Regardless of your opinions, I would like you to assign one of the following categories (circle the number) that you think bests represents each statement:

Category descriptions.

1) Having positive feelings (pride) about Australia (and being Australian)
OR
2) Outward expression of the positive feelings about Australia and being Australian
OR
3) Perceptions of others positive feelings toward Australia and Anglo-Australians.

Please think carefully about each of your decisions, if there are several categories that you could assign a statement, please circle the one that you consider is the most appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think Australia is the best country in the world</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like telling other kids about Australia</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud of being an Australian</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often tell other kids that I am from Australia</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like being an Australian</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids think that Australians have nicer/better things than people from their country</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that Australians are better at doing things than people from other countries</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids think that Australia is better than where they come from</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud of Australia when we win a sporting game</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids think that Australians are richer than people from their country</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids think that Australians are “good” or “cool”</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next section refers to ethnic groups other than the dominant Anglo-Australian group, please continue.
SECTION B: ETHNIC/CULTURAL GROUPS OTHER THAN ANGLO-AUSTRALIAN

The following pages contain statements with which some people agree and others disagree. Regardless of your opinions, I would like you to assign one of the following categories (circle the number) that you think best represents each statement:

The statements on this page are generic statements designed to accommodate a number of different ethnic/cultural groups. The name of the child’s ethnic/cultural group is substituted for the words “my country” or “my group”;

e.g. I am proud of “my country” or “my group” → I am proud of being Samoan.

**Category descriptions.**

1) Having positive feelings (pride) about being a member of an ethnic/cultural group and the country that is associated with the child’s group, and the outward expression of positive feelings (pride)
OR
2) Child’s comparison between the their own ethnic/cultural group (and its members) and the dominant country group (in this case Australians)
OR
3) Perceptions of others positive feelings toward the ethnic/cultural group.
OR
4) Level (or degree) of liking or positive reinforcement (approval) in participating in traditional customs and way of life of the ethnic/cultural group
OR
5) Level (or degree) of liking or positive reinforcement (approval) in associating/socialising with other members of the child’s ethnic/cultural group

Please think carefully about each of your decisions, if there are several categories that you could assign a statement, please circle the one that you consider is the most appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For lunch I eat the traditional food of my country</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud of my country/cultural group</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids think that people from my country/group have better/nicer things than people from their country.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like being from my country/cultural group</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to hang out with kids from my country/cultural group</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that people from my country are better at doing things than people from other countries</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids think that my country/group is better than theirs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often tell other kids that I am from my country/cultural group</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My parents like it when I do things with other members of my ethnic/cultural group 1 2 3 4 5

Other kids think that people from my country/group are richer than people from their country 1 2 3 4 5

I like wearing the traditional dress of my country 1 2 3 4 5

I feel proud of my country/cultural group when we win a sporting game 1 2 3 4 5

Other kids would like to come from my country/cultural group 1 2 3 4 5

Other kids think that people from my country/cultural group are really good 1 2 3 4 5

My parents like it when I wear the traditional dress of my country/cultural group 1 2 3 4 5

I like telling other kids about my country/cultural group 1 2 3 4 5

My family does things with other people from my country/cultural group 1 2 3 4 5

I think my country/cultural group is better than Australia 1 2 3 4 5

I like doing things with other people from my country/cultural group. 1 2 3 4 5

Thank you for your help

Judith Griffiths