

Social Policy Report

Giving Child and Youth Development Knowledge Away

Volume XXI, Number II

2007

Prejudice Reduction in Schools

Teaching Tolerance in Schools: Lessons Learned Since *Brown v. Board of Education* About the Development and Reduction of Children's Prejudice

Jennifer H. Pfeifer, Christia Spears Brown, & Jaana Juvonen
Department of Psychology
University of California, Los Angeles

Abstract

More than five decades after *Brown v. Board of Education* and four decades after the Civil Rights era, racial prejudice remains a national problem cutting across social class and culture. Although schools may seem ideal places to teach children about tolerance and harmony, there is little consensus on how to best reduce negative sentiments and behaviors toward peers of different racial or ethnic backgrounds. To understand the modest gains made by various prejudice reduction programs (each relying on different theoretical assumptions), we first review what psychologists have learned about the environmental conditions affecting prejudice, the social-cognitive constraints supporting prejudice, and the multiple manifestations of prejudice among children since this issue gained national attention via the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision in 1954. We then apply these lessons learned to analyze the effectiveness and promise of three approaches: multicultural curricula, cooperative learning techniques, and anti-bias/social-cognitive skills training. In conclusion, recommendations are made about age- and context-appropriate methods to reduce prejudice in schools and future topics to address in basic research.

Keywords: prejudice; schools; desegregation; policy; social cognition; multicultural curricula; cooperative learning; anti-bias programs

Social Policy Report

Editor

Lonnie Sherrod, Ph.D.
sherrod@fordham.edu

Associate Editor

Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, Ph.D.
brooks-gunn@columbia.edu

Director of SRCD Office for Policy and Communications

Mary Ann McCabe, Ph.D.
mmccabe@srcd.org

Managing Editor

Amy D. Glaspie



GOVERNING COUNCIL

Aletha Huston	Jeanne Brooks-Gunn
Arnold Sameroff	Greg J. Duncan
Ross D. Parke	John W. Hagen
Judith G. Smetana	Suniya Luthar
Ronald G. Barr	Ann Masten
Marc H. Bornstein	Robert B. McCall
Alysia Blandon	Ellen E. Pinderhughes
	J. Steven Reznick

POLICY AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE

Marilou Hyson	John W. Hagen
Martha Zazlow	Bonnie Leadbeater
Cheryl Boyce	Karlen Lyons-Ruth
Jeanne Brooks-Gunn	Mary Ann McCabe
Kristen Bub	Cybele Raver
Greg J. Duncan	Anthony Salandy
Dale Farran	Lonnie Sherrod
Barbara H. Fiese	

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Rachel Keen	John W. Hagen
Mary Cwik	Anne D. Pick
Sandra Graham	J. Steven Reznick
Joan Grusec	Gene Sackett
Aletha Huston	Judith G. Smetana
Brenda Jones Harden	

From the Editor

We are pleased to present this *Social Policy Report* by Pfeifer, Brown, and Juvonen that addresses a sensitive topic: racial prejudice. As the authors point out, five decades have passed since the *Brown v. Board of Education* case heard by the Supreme Court. The Civil Rights Movement led by Dr. King and others also occurred decades ago. Even with the progress in school desegregation and in workplace interaction, most of us would agree that racial prejudice is far from being eradicated. One approach to reducing prejudice is to raise children who are increasingly tolerant and do not judge individuals on the basis of superficial characteristics like the color of their skin.

Programs to teach children tolerance, many based in developmental research with a solid theoretical base, are reviewed here. Pfeifer, Brown, and Juvonen discuss school-based initiatives to reduce prejudice. Three different approaches are considered and evaluated based on research on the conditions that influence prejudice. The results of these interventions show only modest gains, however. The authors list recommendations for future prejudice reduction efforts: consider children's cognitive limitations when implementing programs before eight years of age; address both the perpetrators and the victims of prejudice; incorporate multiple ethnic perspectives; and rededicate ourselves to desegregation.

While this article focuses on racial prejudice, similar approaches could be taken to help reduce prejudices related to gender, social class, sexual orientation and disability status. The recommendations in this article, therefore, have wide relevance.

To some extent this article covers an unusual topic for *SPR*. Prejudice is not a social issue that can be directly eradicated by the enactment of legislation or design of social policy. Programs oriented to changing individual attitudes, like those reviewed here, are also needed. And much more research is needed, as these authors emphasize, to guide prevention efforts. Nonetheless, it is an issue that requires renewed and sustained attention. Developmental research has a critical role to play. This article convincingly demonstrates how useful research has been to existing and past programs and how important it is that we continue to rely on current social science evidence to guide program development and impact legal decisions relevant to desegregation. Brooke and I hope that this *SPR*—while perhaps unable to offer firm solutions—will direct renewed attention to the topic, both programmatic and in terms of influencing the research agenda of the SRCD membership.

Lonnie Sherrod, Ph.D., Editor
Fordham University

Prejudice Reduction in Schools

Teaching Tolerance in Schools: Lessons Learned Since *Brown v. Board of Education* About the Development and Reduction of Children's Prejudice

Jennifer H. Pfeifer, Christia Spears Brown,
& Jaana Juvonen

Department of Psychology
University of California, Los Angeles

As the Supreme Court is once again considering the federal mandates for desegregation in public schools, social science evidence on the effects of desegregation is timely. Because the explicit aim of *Brown v. Board of Education* was to provide equal academic opportunities for racial minority (i.e., African-American) schoolchildren, most accounts and evaluations of the successes (or failures) of desegregation have indeed focused on the academic achievement of racial minority children in desegregated schools (see Schofield, 1995, for a review). Both in the court case and broader public opinion, however, more implicit goals surfaced—including the hope that desegregation would reduce children's prejudice and discrimination (Jackson, 2001; Martin, 1988; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000; Zirkel & Cantor, 2004).

The current analysis examines the legacy of the Supreme Court ruling with regard to reducing prejudice among racial majority (i.e., White) children—specifically, school-based prejudice reduction programs adopted in the wake of desegregation. Focusing on research conducted primarily by developmental and social psychologists (but also incorporating historical and educational perspectives), we review the ways in which some of the key assumptions about racial prejudice among children have changed since the 1950's. Based on this brief review, we assert that three important lessons have been learned about (a) the conditions for intergroup contact that facilitate prejudice reduction, (b) the social-cognitive constraints that limit children's thinking about racial and ethnic differences, and (c) the various manifestations of prejudice. We then apply these lessons to our review of three approaches to school-based prejudice reduction, namely, multicultural curricula, cooperative learning, and anti-bias/social-cognitive skills training. We propose that the explicit programs to reduce racial prejudice in schools are an important – albeit largely indirect – legacy of the *Brown v. Board* decision, and therefore a careful review of their effectiveness and promise is necessary to guide both future school-based efforts and basic research (for recent related

perspectives, see also McKown, 2005; Paluck & Green, in press).

Lessons Learned about Desegregation

A: Conditions for Contact

The same year that the *Brown v. Board* decision was rendered, a landmark book was published by Gordon Allport (*The Nature of Prejudice*, 1954) that included a description of four conditions under which contact could improve intergroup relations. As part of contact theory, he proposed that to reduce prejudice groups needed to have (1) equal status, (2) common goals, (3) no competition, and (4) sanction of contact by authorities (see also Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000). Somewhat later, Zajonc (1968) suggested that mere exposure to any novel stimulus—regardless of the conditions of that exposure—could increase liking. Although the mere exposure effect was not initially demonstrated in an intergroup context, there was some support for this extrapolation—for example, exposure to pictures of unfamiliar African-Americans increased White participants' liking of those seen most frequently (Hamm, Baum, & Nikels, 1975).

Although desegregation was being widely implemented by the end of the 1960's, it remained unclear whether this mere increase in interracial contact would be sufficient to reduce prejudice or whether the specific conditions under which desegregation took place would impact its effects on prejudice. Studies examining the initial, longitudinal, and long-term impact of desegregation did not find a consistent pattern of effects—in some cases, exposure to African-American peers resulted in White students' more favorable attitudes toward them, while in other cases it did not (Cohen, 1975; Fishbein, 2002; Hallinan, 1982; Hallinan & Smith, 1985; McConahay, 1978; Schofield, 1978, 1989, 1995; St. John, 1975; Stephan, 1978; Wells, 1995; Wells & Crain, 1994; Wood & Sonleitner, 1996). It appeared that the exposure to other-race peers provided by desegregation was not sufficient on its own to reduce prejudice.

Instead, as Allport (1954) suggested, the conditions of contact matter. When explicitly considering the conditions under which desegregation was—and currently is—implemented in American schools, it is easy to understand why the policy has not been consistently effective in reducing racial prejudice. For example, academic tracking frequently results in de facto segregation within schools, further polarizing status differences (Khmelkov & Hallinan, 1999). Moreover, support for desegregation by schoolteachers and administrators, as well as within the broader community, varies widely. Not surprisingly, desegregation is more likely to lead to prejudice reduction in situations in which status differences are diminished and there is widespread support for desegregation (Schofield, 1995). For example, in classrooms where teachers place less emphasis on grades and standardized test scores,

White children are more likely to choose African-American peers as friends (Hallinan & Teixeira, 1987).

The first lesson learned since *Brown v. Board*, therefore, is that the school context—including racial composition of the students and teachers, teachers' attitudes, and school policies and practices that foster inequalities—impacts intergroup relations. As Slavin (1995) stated, “desegregation must be seen as an opportunity for improvement of intergroup relations, not as a solution in itself” (p. 629; see also Aboud & Levy, 2000). The presence or absence of the conditions for positive intergroup contact described by Allport (1954) may be critical determinants of desegregation's impact on children's prejudice.

B: Social-Cognitive Constraints

In addition to contact theory, another theoretical model frequently connected with the development of prejudice is socialization theory. During the early years of psychological research prior to and in the early years of desegregation, it was assumed that children are initially unbiased and subsequently adopt (or model) the attitudes displayed by those around them, including parents, teachers, and classmates (Allport, 1954). The importance of modeling behavior was later elaborated in related approaches such as social learning theory (Bandura, 1977). Contrary to the optimistic expectations emerging from the principles of socialization and social learning theories, the more recently formulated social-cognitive developmental theory (Aboud, 1988) contends prejudice is an inevitable, but not necessarily enduring, result of children's cognitive constraints (see also Katz, 1976; Katz & Zalk, 1978; Piaget & Weil, 1951). Such a perspective implies that, rather than being unbiased, young children are likely to be biased due to cognitive limitations (Aboud, 2003; Bigler & Liben, 1993; Clark, Hocevar, & Dembo, 1980).

One prominent example of a cognitive constraint is young children's lack of conservation skill. Children who do not conserve are typically distracted by visible physical dissimilarities between two objects (or people) and conclude that the entities are different from each other (the classic example being the child who assumes that there is always more water in a tall, thin beaker than a short, fat beaker; Piaget & Inhelder, 1941). On the other hand, children possessing conservation skill realize that things may appear different externally but maintain the same fundamental nature. This important skill relates to the reduction of prejudice inasmuch as it can help children realize that differences in skin color are not predic-

tive of internal qualities or behavior (Aboud, 1988).

Young children are also likely to be constrained by poor multiple classification skills. This is typically measured by having children sort a deck of cards depicting people or objects from multiple, overlapping categories in as many different ways as possible. Children possessing this ability recognize that people or objects can be members of many groups (e.g., someone may simultaneously be a woman, an African-American, and a doctor). This cognitive skill relates to the reduction of prejudice by helping children to realize people are not solely defined by race and may share characteristics that make them similar to people of other races (Aboud, 1988).

Both conservation and multiple classification skills relate to the development and expression of racial prejudice. Children who can reason beyond external dissimilarities and realize individuals possess characteristics of many different groups have particular cognitive advantages relevant to prejudice reduction. Simply, the presence of these skills

appears to increase perceptions of similarity between people from different racial or ethnic groups, and indeed, children possessing these skills tend to demonstrate less prejudice (Aboud, 1988, 2003; Bigler & Liben, 1993; Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996; Clark et al., 1980; Doyle, Beaudet, & Aboud, 1988; c.f. Aboud & Doyle, 1995; Bigler, Jones, & Lobliner, 1997; Doyle & Aboud, 1995; Kowalski & Lo, 2001).

While conservation and multiple classification skills are basic cognitive skills applied to interpersonal domains, social-cognitive skills (or lack thereof) also contribute to the propensity of early childhood prejudice. The egocentrism of early childhood declines in response to advancing perspective-taking abilities, allowing for the development of both reconciliation and empathy (Aboud, 1988; Eisenberg, 2000; Hoffman, 1991; Piaget & Weil, 1951). Reconciliation is a social-cognitive skill defined as the ability to recognize that others may possess differing, albeit equally accurate, perspectives (Aboud, 1988; also referred to as “interpretive theory of mind,” see Carpendale & Chandler, 1996). On average, children with greater reconciliation skills demonstrate lower levels of prejudice (Aboud, 2003; Aboud & Doyle, 1995; Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996; Doyle & Aboud, 1995; c.f. Nagata, 1985; Spencer, 1982). Empathy, in turn, is a social-cognitive skill with both cognitive and affective components, enabling a child to perceive and share the emotions of another individual (Eisenberg, 2000; Hoffman, 1991). Both dispositional and situationally-induced empathy have been linked

...the school context – including racial composition of the students and teachers, teachers' attitudes, and school policies and practices that foster inequalities – impacts intergroup relations.

to prosocial behavior in general and prejudice reduction in particular (Batson, 1998; Fabes, Eisenberg, & Eisenbud, 1993; Holmgren, Eisenberg, & Fabes, 1998; Vescio, Sechrist, & Paolucci, 2003; Zahn-Waxler, Radke-Yarrow, Wagner, & Chapman, 1992).

To be fair, social-cognitive developmental theory has its detractors. One criticism frequently posed is that, if underdeveloped social-cognitive skills are responsible for racial prejudice, a child should show similar levels of prejudice towards all social outgroups. In contrast, Powlishta and colleagues (Powlishta, Serbin, Doyle, & White, 1994) demonstrated that children had no consistent pattern of prejudice towards ethnic, gender, and body type (i.e., overweight) groups. Moreover, despite cognitive development, prejudice exists in some individuals in adulthood and varies across cultural and historical contexts, suggesting prejudice is clearly a multidetermined construct. In addition, some have questioned whether the relevant social-cognitive skills can be trained in advance of when they typically develop.

Nevertheless, the social-cognitive developmental theory of prejudice and the body of empirical research supporting it illustrates a second lesson that we have learned since *Brown v. Board*, namely that to understand (and hopefully, reduce) childhood prejudice, we must account for the cognitive constraints and social-cognitive skills of children. Aboud (1988) summarized the importance of this consideration in her assertion that “the prejudice seen in a child at one developmental stage is qualitatively different from the prejudice of a child at another stage because it arises out of a different understanding of the social world” (p. 27).

C. Different Manifestations of Prejudice

From the time of the *Brown vs. Board* decision to the present day, lay conceptualizations of prejudice have focused primarily on negative intergroup attitudes. More traditional definitions of prejudice illustrate its broader reach, however. For example, Allport (1954) defined prejudice as “an antipathy based on faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group or an individual of that group” (p. 9). This definition highlights the multiple ways in which prejudice manifests itself: attitudes that are felt and behaviors that are expressed in relationships or interactions between individuals or groups (e.g., friendships, or lack thereof). These different manifestations of prejudice are not always correlated with each other (see Fazio, 1990), but are relevant to this review in that prejudice reduction programs often rely on different indices of prejudice (most commonly

on cross-racial attitudes or interethnic friendships).

Another important issue related to how prejudice manifests itself is whether feeling or behaving in ways that favor one’s racial ingroup qualifies as prejudice, or if true prejudice requires outgroup derogation in some form (Brewer, 1999; Cameron, Alvarez, Ruble, & Fuligni, 2001). Most definitions of prejudice, such as Allport’s (1954), do not suggest that ingroup favoritism constitutes prejudice in and of itself. Yet, attitudinal measures of childhood prejudice frequently confound ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation due to their forced-choice features. For example, in the PRAM II (Preschool Racial Attitude Measure; Williams, Best, Boswell, Mattson, & Graves, 1975), children are asked to assign positive and negative evaluative traits

(such as kind, happy, and pretty as well as bad, stupid, and selfish) to either the own-race or other-race child depicted in a story. A single measure of bias is calculated by summing the number of positive ingroup and negative outgroup evaluations. Because a child must assign the negative traits (such as stupid) to at least one of the children, and in

many measures cannot assign positive traits (such as kind) to both the own-race and other-race child, children’s racial prejudice has been frequently overestimated (Aboud, 2003; Cameron et al., 2001; Lerner & Schroeder, 1975).

Measures addressing other manifestations of prejudice similarly rely on ingroup favoritism. For example, examinations of prejudiced behavior have usually looked at helping one’s ingroup more than an outgroup, rather than inflicting some form of harm on the outgroup (Brown & Bigler, 2002; c.f. Patchen, Davidson, Hofmann, & Brown, 1977). Prejudice that is operationalized via relationships, in turn, relies primarily on assessments of own-race and other-race friends, rather than enemies (Aboud, Mendelson, & Purdy, 2003; Graham & Cohen, 1997; Graham & Juvonen, 2002; Kistner, Metzler, Gatlin, & Risi, 1994; for new directions related to bullying, see Aboud & Joong, in press).

After accounting for all these different manifestations and definitions of prejudice, evidence suggests it is most accurate to conclude that ingroup favoritism appears in early childhood, and on average declines with the development of skills such as conservation, multiple classification, and perspective-taking. As summarized by Allport (1954), “...the familiar is preferred. What is alien is somehow inferior, less ‘good,’ but there is not necessarily hostility against it” (p. 42). Less is known about the development of outgroup derogation (Cameron et al., 2001)—which may be a more direct assessment of true prejudice. For example, outgroup derogation may require more explicit socialization than ingroup favorit-

...to understand (and hopefully, reduce) childhood prejudice, we must account for the cognitive constraints and social-cognitive skills of children.

ism. Social desirability becomes more of a concern, however, when assessing outgroup derogation than ingroup favoritism, making measurement of outgroup derogation potentially difficult in older children who are increasingly aware of the social norms against saying negative things about others. A new direction in assessing childhood prejudice is the use of more automatic measures thought to be less susceptible to these kinds of response concerns, such as the Implicit Association Test (IAT; Baron & Banaji, 2006). Although evidence about the more implicit forms of children's prejudice is still being acquired, these new techniques highlight how our understanding of the manifestations of prejudice is constantly evolving.

The varied ways in which children's prejudice presents itself illustrate a third lesson learned since the *Brown v. Board* decision. Specifically, we have learned that prejudice can manifest itself in many different forms, and that each assessment method has a limited ability to capture the full range of relevant attitudes, behaviors, and relationships concerning ingroups and outgroups. For example, although we have comparatively little evidence of outgroup derogation during childhood, there is solid evidence of widespread ingroup favoritism. Given this, Brewer (1999) makes an important point: "Ultimately, many forms of discrimination and bias may develop not because outgroups are hated, but because positive emotions such as admiration, sympathy, and trust are reserved for the ingroup and withheld from outgroups" (p. 438). Therefore, childhood ingroup favoritism is likely to pose a threat to positive interracial relations (e.g., Tatum, 1997), although it does not by itself constitute a negative bias against outgroups. The distinction among all these manifestations of prejudice may appear to be simply an academic debate, yet the lesson has important implications for prejudice-reduction interventions. Specifically, if one wants to design, implement, or evaluate a program to reduce prejudice, it is important to be mindful of what each measure tells us about the effectiveness of the program and the broad reach of prejudice.

Three Lessons for Three Approaches

To summarize thus far, we have highlighted three important advances in our knowledge since the *Brown v. Board* decision. The first is that schools, even those that are multiethnic, may or may not provide optimal contexts for reducing prejudice. Second, we need to account for the cognitive liabilities of children, especially when designing interventions to reduce prejudice. Programs ought to work better if they are geared to the child's level of social-cognitive development. Third, in assessing prejudice reduction programs, we must remember that prejudice manifests itself in a variety of ways. Specifically, it is critical to recognize that measures forcing children to derogate or show favoritism

may overestimate how prejudiced they truly are, and that relying heavily on one indicator of bias to the neglect of others limits the generalizability of program outcomes.

In the following sections, we apply these three lessons to evaluate the promise and effectiveness of the three main types of school-based programs designed to reduce children's prejudice. Each approach will be described in general, and illustrated using classic studies associated with each approach. Next, the overall effectiveness of each approach will be summarized. Although we discuss some of the general flaws in the evaluation studies, the main focus of our analyses is to apply the three lessons learned since *Brown v. Board* to each approach. The three approaches are presented in approximate chronological order, reflecting historical shifts in the prevalence of different approaches.

Multicultural Curricula

Adopting a multicultural curriculum is one of the oldest and most frequently used approaches to try to improve children's interracial attitudes, behavior, and friendships. These approaches may either (a) expose children to diverse groups in addition to traditional curricula (additive programs), (b) depict outgroup members in a counter-stereotypical manner (counter-stereotypical programs), or (c) enact major transformations of curriculum goals and structure (transformative programs; see Bigler, 1999). For example, schools may adopt curriculum units or courses covering African and African-American history or supplement traditional materials with books that include stories about or pictures of African-American children (Banks, 1995). Multicultural curricula approaches are based primarily on socialization theory. Hence, it is presumed that multicultural curricula will instill positive beliefs in place of children's incorrect or incomplete beliefs about other groups (Aboud & Levy, 2000).

A classic illustration of this approach is a pair of studies that randomly assigned classrooms of White second-graders from a segregated school ($n=68$) to use either a traditional reader or a reader that was identical in content except that the pictures were multiethnic (Litcher & Johnson, 1969). Four different measures of children's interracial attitudes were used to assess prejudice, including the Clark doll test. After four months of exposure to the multiethnic reader, White children responded significantly more favorably on average towards African-Americans on all four tests than children using the traditional reader. However, follow-up studies failed to replicate these findings when the multiethnic readers were used for only one month (Litcher, Johnson, & Ryan, 1973). This style of prejudice reduction program is not a relic of the past, but continues to be used today (e.g., Cameron & Rutland, 2006; Wham, Barnhart, & Cook, 1996).

Despite the positive effects in the four-month study, reviews of multicultural curricula are often discouraging

(Banks, 1995; Bigler, 1999). The effectiveness of several representative multicultural curricula programs is summarized in Table 1. The less than optimal effects of the studies summarized in Table 1 are consistent with a recent meta-analysis that concluded that multicultural curricula were less effective than other approaches in reducing prejudice (Levy, Troise, Moyer, Aboud, & Bigler, 2003). These studies on multicultural curricula, however, tend to have basic design flaws (such as inadequate control groups and small samples sizes), and thus it is difficult to have much confidence in the results.

The three lessons learned since *Brown v. Board* help explain the inconsistent effects of multicultural curriculum programs. In general, the school context of interracial relations is generally ignored in this approach. The focus is on the materials brought to the classroom, rather than the social and organizational conditions present that are also likely to impact prejudice reduction. For example, many multicultural programs are used in schools that are very homogeneous. As shown in Table 1, six out of the seven evaluation studies involved 95-100 percent White samples. Thus to some degree, the unsuccessful effects of multicultural curricula can be understood in light of contact theory: activities included

in multicultural curricula, such as reading books or watching movies about other groups, do not meet the requirements of high quality contact between equal status individuals. In fact, Allport (1954) discussed just how resistant individuals could be to knowledge that contradicts their stereotypes. Hence, it is possible that the effects of multicultural programs are positive only when students have opportunities to “apply their knowledge” of different others to their daily interactions with different-ethnicity classmates. It will be inherently more difficult for multicultural curricula to reduce prejudice if schools lack ethnic diversity. Here again it is apparent that although desegregation is not a solution, it is an important starting point for those communities where integration is possible. If only minimal racial diversity can be attained because of population homogeneity, it is all the more important that Allport’s (1954) optimal conditions of contact be met—namely, that what little contact is possible occurs between equal status peers with common goals, and that the community and adults in authority support racial tolerance.

In addition to overlooking the presence or absence of the ideal contextual conditions for prejudice reduction, cognitive constraints during development can also help explain the less than ideal effects of multicultural curricula

Table 1
Illustration of Multicultural Curricula Approaches

Study	Attitudes	Behavior	Friendship	Grade	Design
Litcher & Johnson (1969)	Positive	N/A	N/A	2nd grade	Multiethnic reader that replaced pictures of White children with Black children used for 4 months (n=68; 100% White)
Litcher, Johnson, & Ryan (1973)	None	N/A	N/A	2nd grade	Multiethnic reader that replaced pictures of White children with Black children used for 1 month (n=128; 100% White)
Singh & Yancey (1974)	Positive	N/A	N/A	1st grade	Read biographies of famous African-Americans and other counterstereotypical fiction stories about racial outgroups, viewed movies, and participated in group discussions for 30 consecutive school days (n=41; 100% White)
Best, Smith, Graves, & Williams (1975)	None	N/A	N/A	Kinder	Counterstereotypical curricula addressing both race and color used for 8 weeks, two 45-minute sessions per week (n=60; 100% White)
Lessing & Clarke (1976)	None	N/A	N/A	6th-8th grade	Read stories about racial outgroups, wrote book reports, and gave oral presentations (n=169; 95% White, 5% Black)
Katz & Zalk (1978)	None	None	Mixed-Positive	2nd and 5th grade	Listened to a story with accompanying slides about a racial outgroup once for 15 mins (n=32; two integrated schools with varying % of White, Black, & Hispanic)
Slone, Tarrasch, & Hallis (2000)	Positive	N/A	N/A	5th grade	Read stories or watched films about complexities of social contact between Arab and Jewish Israeli children (15 mins) followed by group discussion (30 mins) for 6 sessions (n=209; 100% White)

programs. Research demonstrates that counter-stereotypical and transformative approaches are likely to be distorted or forgotten by children with underdeveloped multiple classification skills (Bigler & Liben, 1993). In one study, teachers read 12 stories to students, each depicting a different pair of one own- and one other-race child. For example, in a stereotypical story, a lazy African-American child rests at her desk while an industrious White child works. In a counter-stereotypical story, a mean White child throws rocks at a nice African-American child. White children with poor multiple classification skills remembered 30 percent fewer counter-stereotypical traits than children with good multiple classification skills, although both groups of children remembered stereotypical traits equally well (Bigler & Liben, 1993). These results suggest that cognitive constraints should be a major concern for multicultural curricula. However, multiple classification skills are not well-developed until approximately age seven, and many curriculum interventions are conducted with five- to seven-year-old children who are still trying to master this developmental task.

Finally, the manifestations of prejudice focused on by multicultural curricula evaluation studies drastically affects what we can say about their effectiveness. These studies tend to utilize attitudinal measures, to the exclusion of interracial behaviors and relationships (in part because they were designed to affect attitudes, but also because the school contexts were often homogeneous, precluding the possibility of direct interactions between groups). The heavy reliance on forced-choice attitude measures may have made it more difficult to demonstrate positive effects. Moreover, as shown in Table 1, six of the seven program evaluation studies were conducted with White samples, hence little is known about the effects of multicultural curricula on children's interracial behaviors and peer relationships in contexts that do allow for intergroup contact.

However, not all multicultural curricula fail to improve children's interracial attitudes. One new direction in multicultural curricula derives from social identity development theory, which suggests that prejudice is most likely to manifest itself if the structural conditions of intergroup contact support it (such as ingroup norms sanctioning the expression of prejudice; Nesdale, 1999, 2004). For example, Cameron and Rutland (2006) used "extended contact" through multicultural curricula (depicting ingroup members who were friends with physically-disabled children) to increase positivity towards the disabled. The goals of these types of programs are to illustrate positive intergroup affect,

model positive intergroup behavior, and develop ingroup norms countering prejudice. The evidence of their effectiveness appears promising.

Some have also suggested that successful programs may require relatively high dosages of exposure to curricula to ensure retention and encourage identification with the ingroup and outgroup characters (Slone, Tarrasch, & Hallis, 2000). Greater identification might enhance socialization of positive interracial attitudes, behaviors, and relationships. This is consistent with an often-overlooked aspect of socialization theory, that children's attitudes might be more likely to match those of their parents if the child highly identifies with the parents (Allport, 1954; see also Sinclair, Dunn, & Lowery, 2004). Regardless of the effectiveness of multicultural curricula in reducing prejudice, there may be educational value in a multicultural education. At a minimum, it provides a more realistic, well-rounded context for learning necessary in our multicultural society.

A major strength of cooperative learning programs is that they do consider the conditions that are optimal for prejudice reduction—in particular, interdependence.

Cooperative Learning Techniques

The next approach, cooperative learning techniques, was developed in laboratories and then exported to the field following the rise of multicultural curricula (Slavin, 1995). Sherif and Sherif's (1953) finding, that two fighting groups from a boys' summer camp could be brought together by common goals that required the skills and participation of both groups, exemplifies this perspective. The cooperative learning approach acknowledges the possibility of conflict and pre-existing status differences between groups. To mitigate these difficulties, cooperative learning programs were explicitly designed to meet the theoretical requirements of contact theory, making them in many ways the most successful (Banks, 1995; Slavin, 1995).

In cooperative learning programs, children are placed in small classroom groups with a diverse representation of gender, race, and ability levels. These groups are evaluated or receive rewards and recognition based on the degree to which they increase the academic performance of each group member. Each group member is responsible for a unique aspect of a project and, at times, the heterogeneous groups might also compete with one another. Programs that exclude these aspects in which groups compete and members contribute uniquely to their groups (while still placing children in heterogeneous groups) fall short of the intended design.

This approach is illustrated by a classic study that randomly assigned classrooms of White and African-American seventh- and eighth-graders (n=294) to either a traditional

classroom or a cooperative learning classroom (Slavin, 1979). The particular technique used in the cooperative learning classrooms was known as Student-Teams-Achievement Divisions (STAD). Teams composed of four or five students each worked jointly to learn material from a unit on grammar, punctuation, and English usage, and group performance was recognized and rewarded. In contrast, students in the traditional classrooms studied the unit alone and individual performance was recognized and rewarded. Pre- and post-intervention friendship nominations (an unlimited number of classmates could be nominated) were used to assess prejudice. After ten weeks of the program, students in the cooperative learning program nominated a greater number and proportion of cross-race friends compared to students in the traditional classrooms. A nine-month longitudinal follow-up with roughly one-third the original sample showed that the number and proportion of cross-race friends were still significantly greater for students assigned to the cooperative learning programs compared to traditional classrooms.

The effectiveness of several representative cooperative learning studies is summarized in Table 2. Both this

summary and recent reviews agree that cooperative learning programs appear to be more consistently positive in their effects than multicultural curricula programs or desegregation alone (Banks, 1995; Slavin, 1995). In addition, because these evaluation studies tend to be better designed than many of the studies that examine multicultural curriculum programs (e.g., more longitudinal designs, random assignment, and large samples), we can be more confident in the findings.

Similar to multicultural curricula, the three lessons learned since *Brown v. Board* are also relevant to cooperative learning techniques. A major strength of cooperative learning programs is that they do consider the conditions that are optimal for prejudice reduction—in particular, interdependence (Allport, 1954). Typically, cooperative learning methods are such that team goals cannot be met without the substantial contribution of each group member’s unique skills. As a result, this contact should be of higher quality and between individuals of more equal status than in desegregation alone or multicultural curricula. Slavin (1995) also points out that in this style of intervention, teacher support for interracial contact is unequivocal.

Table 2
Illustrations of Cooperative Learning Approaches

Study	Attitudes	Behavior	Friendship	Grade	Design
Weigel, Wiser, & Cook (1975)	Mixed-Positive	Positive	Mixed-Positive	Junior and senior high	Weigel methods, no control group (n=324; 75% White, 15% Black, 10% Hispanic)
Slavin (1979)	N/A	N/A	Positive	7th-8th grade	Student-Teams-Achievement Divisions (STAD), 10 weeks, 9 month follow-up (positive effects remained) (n=424; White and Black)
Ziegler (1981)	Positive	Positive	Positive	5th-6th grade	Jigsaw II, 8 weeks (3 class periods per week), 4-6 team members, 2.5 month follow-up (positive effects remained) (n=146; primarily White, including a variety of European ethnicities, as well as students from Asia and West Indies)
Johnson & Johnson (1981)	N/A	Positive	N/A	4th grade	Johnson methods, 45 minute sessions daily for 16 days (n=51; 80% White, 20% Black)
Oishi, Slavin, & Madden (1983, cited in Slavin, 1995)	Positive	Positive	Positive	2nd grade	Team-Assisted Individualization (TAI), number of subjects and ethnic context N/A
Sharan (1984)	Positive	Positive	None	6th-8th grade	Group Investigation and STAD (n=725; 66% White, 33% Middle Eastern)

Note: these programs are all similar in that they involve evaluating or rewarding students based on heterogeneous group work. However, they differ in that Johnson methods do not contain individualistic or competitive elements, while other programs possess these elements in some form. Also, Jigsaw II is structured such that each student gains expertise about a unique component of the project and then instructs his or her teammates about that component, while other programs do not focus on first developing each student’s expertise.

At first blush one might conclude that cooperative learning programs ignore developmental factors including the cognitive constraints and social-cognitive skills of children. However, cooperative learning techniques seem to be effective across a wide range of ages (including grades 2-12; see Table 2), and meta-analyses of contact theory have found that age does not significantly moderate the effect of contact. In fact, it is equally strong across childhood (grades 1-12), adolescence, and young adulthood; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000, 2006). Further, Ziegler (1981) found that his cooperative learning program increased an important social-cognitive skill in prejudice reduction: perspective-taking. Hence, one factor underlying the effectiveness of the cooperative-learning approach may be that it addresses this cognitive antecedent of positive intergroup relations.

In contrast to studies that evaluate multicultural curricula (which often by necessity assess interracial attitudes), studies that evaluate cooperative learning techniques primarily use interracial friendship choices, or ratings of how much children like their peers, as outcome variables—after all, this is the aspect of prejudice that is targeted by the intervention. Because of this narrow focus on one manifestation of prejudice, we are left with the same limitation described in our review of multicultural curricula—that we only partially know how these programs affect prejudice. We cannot claim that their effectiveness generalizes to White children’s more positive attitudes towards African-Americans or to positive behaviors toward other outgroup individuals (Banks, 1995). One of the few studies investigating this specifically found that friendships did not generalize to reductions in these alternate manifestations of prejudice or to increases in friendships with outgroup members who were not part of children’s cooperative learning team (Weigel, Wiser, & Cook, 1975). Proponents like Slavin (1995), however, argue that interracial friendships can be considered the most stringent test of attitude and behavior change, given the norms against cross-racial friendships and group differences accentuated by neighborhood segregation, socioeconomic status, school achievement, and activity preferences. He also reports that the cross-racial friendships formed as a result of cooperative learning interventions are

...the cross-racial friendships formed as a result of cooperative learning interventions are primarily close friendships.

...most research suggests that social-cognitive skills training and anti-bias curricula show consistently positive outcomes. In comparison to other approaches, those programs that incorporate anti-bias curricula or social-cognitive skills training (including empathy) appear to be more effective.

primarily close friendships. An additional positive factor about friendship measures, especially the varieties used to evaluate this approach, is that they usually do not force children to choose between ingroup and outgroup members as friends.

A final note about cooperative learning approaches is that these programs are some of the most difficult to implement in the classroom. Program fidelity is easy to achieve in the laboratory, but less so in the field (Slavin, 1995). Part of the difficulty in implementing cooperative learning programs may be due to the emphasis on individual achievement in the American education system, especially in the current era of academic accountability. However, critics should take note

that most cooperative learning studies also measure academic achievement and usually find that students in cooperative learning teams outperform those in traditional classes (e.g., Sharan, 1984; Slavin, 1995; Ziegler, 1981). Specifically, they report the greatest gains for those children who were furthest behind, with no losses for children who already excelled in traditional learning classes.

Anti-Bias/Social-Cognitive Skills Training

The final approach discussed here includes both social-cognitive skills training and anti-bias curricula programs, which represent the current direction taken by many schools and non-profit organizations to address issues of intergroup relations. Social-cognitive skills training arose out of the belief that young children’s prejudice

directly results from the absence of particular cognitive or social-cognitive skills and typically attempts to teach children more advanced perspective-taking skills and empathy. This approach is frequently used in conjunction with anti-bias curricula (and it is often difficult to distinguish between the two). Anti-bias curriculum programs are descendants of multicultural curriculum programs and focus explicitly on the topics of prejudice and discrimination, rather than information about minority groups. Prejudice and discrimination are defined and discussed, often in groups led by peers rather than teachers (Paluck & Green, in press).

One classic study that clearly illustrates this approach assigned fifth-graders (n=80) from an integrated school (50%

White, 30% African-American, and 20% Asian-American) to either a traditional curriculum or an intervention called “More Than Meets the Eye” (Bowers & Swanson, 1988, as cited in Aboud & Fenwick, 1999). The program introduced a fictitious class of “Hoozhoo Kids” from different racial and ethnic backgrounds by having children working individually, discussing in groups, and solving problems in pairs. Children learned to cross-categorize (an ability based on multiple classification skills) and remember the unique, internal qualities of each Hoozhoo Kid (an ability based on conservation skills). The activities also helped children identify differences between themselves and their friends, and similarities between themselves and other classmates.

To assess the program’s effectiveness, children’s racial attitudes (both before and after the program) were measured, along with their perceptions of similarities and differences between pairs of same-race individuals. On average, prejudiced attitudes decreased for those children in the intervention classroom who were initially high in prejudice, and remained stable for those children who were initially

low in prejudice. There were no changes in the perceived similarity between same-race individuals for children in the intervention class, but both high- and low-prejudice children in the intervention class used more internal (as opposed to external) descriptors of other individuals after completing the “More than Meets the Eye” program. This program exhibits qualities of both social-cognitive skills training—including perspective-taking, multiple classification, and conservation abilities—as well as anti-bias curricula, as group discussions commonly addressed racial categories, stereotypes, and discrimination (Aboud & Fenwick, 1999).

Several examples of the social-cognitive skills training and anti-bias curricula approach are described in Table 3. Similar to multicultural curricula, studies of both social-cognitive skills training and anti-bias curricula are rarely longitudinal and often have inadequate control groups. Despite these limitations in the studies examining their effectiveness, most research suggests that social-cognitive skills training and anti-bias curricula show consistently positive outcomes. In comparison to other approaches, those programs

Table 3
Illustrations of Social-Cognitive Skills Training and Anti-Bias Curricula Approaches

Study	Attitudes	Behavior	Friendship	Grade	Program Description
Weiner & Wright (1973)	Positive	N/A	N/A	3rd grade	Children randomly assigned to a variation on Jane Elliot’s Blue-Eyes/Brown-Eyes simulation (n=62; only 1 Black child)
Breckheimer & Nelson (1976)	Mixed-Positive	Mixed-Positive	Positive	Senior high school	Discussion of the causes of racial prejudice and ways to promote interracial cooperation or role-playing of these same topics (n=25; ethnic context N/A)
Katz & Zalk (1978)	Positive	Mixed-Positive	None	2nd and 5th grade	Training to differentiate individuals within a racial outgroup (n=48; two integrated schools with varying % of White, Black, & Hispanic)
Gimmestad & deChiara (1982)	Positive	N/A	N/A	4th-6th grade	Read and re-enacted dramatic plays about 4 racial outgroups, emphasizing perspective-taking and empathy (n=559; majority Hispanic)
Whetstone & Pezdek (1992)	None	Positive	Positive	3rd, 7th, and 11th grade	“A World of Difference” program: training to respond to instances of prejudice and discrimination (n=545; included segregated, stable integrated, and transitional integrated schools)
Bigler & Liben (1992)	Positive	N/A	N/A	K-5th grade	Training to improve multiple-classification skills for gender groups only, not racial groups (n=75; 100% White)
Aboud & Fenwick (1999)	Positive	Mixed-Positive	N/A	5th grade	“More Than Meets the Eye” program: training to learn internal attributes about racial outgroup members (n=126; 50% White, 30% Black, & 20% Asian)

that incorporate anti-bias curricula or social-cognitive skills training (including empathy) appear to be more effective (Levy et al., 2003).

As with the previous two approaches, we can use the three lessons learned since *Brown v. Board* to interpret the success of social-cognitive skills training and anti-bias curricula. While social-cognitive skills training and anti-bias curricula do not necessarily address whether the school context provides the optimal conditions for prejudice reduction (as shown in Table 3, two of the seven program evaluation studies were conducted in homogeneous White settings), some have taken care to note how school context has impacted the effects of social-cognitive skills training and anti-bias curricula. For example, Whetstone and Pezdek (1990) found increased acceptance of interracial social relationships as a result of the “A World of Difference” anti-bias curriculum, but only in heterogeneous schools whose ethnic composition was stable over the past five years. These approaches also recognize that successful interventions must address children’s cognitive abilities. Social-cognitive skills training, by definition, focuses on children’s cognitive limitations and attempts to advance their abilities. Although social-cognitive developmental theory suggests that children would benefit the most from cognitive skills training prior to eight years of age, this approach has been popular with a wide range of ages, just like cooperative learning techniques. Because anti-bias curricula programs are implemented primarily in older children—children who already possess the requisite cognitive skills—they may inadvertently be taking advantage of children’s cognitive abilities. This may explain, in part, why anti-bias curricula are generally more successful than multicultural curricula. Alternatively, anti-bias curricula could improve children’s perspective-taking and empathy (although they are rarely assessed), and the increases in their social-cognitive skills could subsequently be leading to reductions in prejudice.

Finally, while studies that evaluate the effectiveness of these programs commonly focus on attitudinal measures of prejudice, behaviors and friendships are also frequently assessed, and forced-choice measures are rarely used. This balanced array of measures to assess prejudice provides a more complete picture of the effectiveness of these programs. Although the manifestations of prejudice assessed by these programs are diverse, there is not much diversity in which cognitive constraints and social-cognitive skills are examined and taught. For example, most social-cognitive skills training focuses solely on perspective-taking skills and empathy. Perhaps other skills (e.g., conservation and multiple classifica-

tion) should be included more frequently in social-cognitive skills training, especially with younger children.

Summary and Conclusions

Consistent with our training, we approached the issue of prejudice reduction in this paper primarily from the perspective of developmental and social psychologists (with an eye towards including educational and historical points of view as well). We hope this paper spurs future interdisciplinary work. After all, facilitating interethnic relations involves understanding of the roles of school racial composition, community attitudes, historical background of particular social groups, etc.—topics that we could not include in this paper for the sake of brevity. Clearly, policymakers, psychologists, educators, sociologists, and anthropologists have many lessons to learn from one another (for example, we also direct readers to Banks, 2006; Baker, 1998; McKown, 2005; Paluck & Green, in press; Schofield & Hausmann, 2004; Stephan, 1999; Wells, 1995; Wells & Crain, 1994).

Furthermore, we hope our review of the three different approaches taken by schools to reduce children’s prejudice demonstrates that, from a psychological vantage point, there are pertinent reasons why some programs are more effective than others. These reasons derive from the three lessons psychologists have learned about children’s prejudice since the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision in 1954: a) there are optimal conditions under which contact can reduce prejudice, b) young children possess social-cognitive constraints that increase the likelihood of being prejudiced, and c) prejudice has multiple affective, behavioral, and interpersonal components that manifest themselves in ways which can favor ingroups, derogate outgroups, or both.

Evaluations of the multicultural curricula have been conducted in predominately White schools where there are no opportunities to interact with peers of other races or ethnicities (thus, we know less about their effectiveness in diverse contexts). Nor do multicultural curricula consider children’s social-cognitive constraints. In contrast, cooperative learning techniques meet all the requirements of optimum contact to make interracial interactions maximally positive (as outlined by contact theory). However, because most cooperative learning program evaluations rely heavily on friendship choices, it is unclear whether they are effective in reducing children’s prejudicial attitudes and behaviors beyond children’s closest contacts. Anti-bias curricula and social-cognitive skills training may help children make better use of multicultural curricula, or directly reduce prejudice, by increasing empathy

Clearly, policymakers, psychologists, educators, sociologists, and anthropologists have many lessons to learn from one another.

and perspective-taking skills. Yet, like multicultural curricula, these approaches (or at least their evaluations) often overlook the role of social context and the conditions that maximize prejudice reduction.

Recommendations for Educational Practice

The information in this review has many applications for educational practice. These program-specific recommendations are contingent on children's developmental level and the social context provided by school diversity (or lack thereof). However, we also need to recognize that the initial impetus to do anything about prejudice in schools may be lacking, from the classroom to the national level. For example, the Supreme Court recently heard two cases about whether elementary schools could consider racial diversity when accepting students. Many parents and community leaders argued that the integration of schools is not an important consideration in the post-Civil Rights era, reflecting the lay belief that children are not prejudiced. This is a cultural barrier which undermines school, district, and national policies that attempt to address this "invisible problem." We hope in this paper to have demonstrated that children are indeed prejudiced for a variety of reasons, and we need to be motivated to work towards change at all possible levels. For example, it might be appropriate to incorporate prejudice reduction programs into the character education component of the No Child Left Behind policy. The more specific recommendations below integrate the findings of our entire review.

1. Multicultural curricula. It is especially important to carefully weigh the potential outcomes of using multicultural curricula with children younger than age eight. Their cognitive limitations may prevent them from learning counter-stereotypical information. Moreover, cognitive transformations of counter-stereotypical to stereotypical information may inadvertently serve to reinforce their stereotypes. Because children older than eight years of age are likely to have attained foundational cognitive abilities like multiple classification or conservation skills, multicultural curricula may be more successful in this age group. Newer multicultural curriculum programs that make use of increased affective components, modeling of positive intergroup behavior, and development of ingroup norms countering prejudice through

"extended contact" materials might be ideal ones to search out. However, our review suggests that this approach may still be less effective than the other two approaches.

2. Cooperative learning techniques. In multiethnic schools, teachers wanting to improve interracial peer relationships can consider changing their classroom organization to be compatible with cooperative learning approaches. This strategy appears to not only benefit interracial relationships but also academic outcomes, because each group member is responsible for a unique aspect of the project, and groups as a whole are evaluated or rewarded based on the performance

of each member. If the specific conditions for cooperative learning techniques cannot be met in particular classrooms (for example, if the school is lacking racial diversity), then anti-bias or social-cognitive programs are likely a better choice. On the other hand, if ethnically mixed cooperative learning groups can be constituted, they are likely to increase interracial friendships across a wide range of ages because cooperative learning techniques were founded on contact theory, which applies across childhood, adolescence, and young adulthood.

3. Anti-bias curricula/social-cognitive skills training. In homogenous schools, activities that incorporate social-cognitive skills training or anti-bias curricula are strongly advised if multicultural curricula are to be used. These may include role-playing activities that promote perspective-taking and empathy, or discussions of prejudice and discrimination. The social-cognitive skills used should be tailored as precisely as possible to the child's developmental level (for example, multiple classification and empathy both have simple as well as sophisticated forms with known developmental trajectories). More generally, programs of this type are strongly recommended because of their effectiveness across different school contexts and age groups and for different manifestations of prejudice. When in doubt, programs of this type are, therefore, likely to be an educator's safest choice. The challenge is finding concrete and personal ways to talk about prejudice and discrimination with young children. Even children as young as five, however, understand concepts related to unfairness (Laupa & Turiel, 1986) and thus can comprehend how people can be treated unfairly because of the way they look (the most basic operational definition of race).

...we also need to recognize that the initial impetus to do anything about prejudice in schools may be lacking, from the classroom to the national level.

The challenge is finding concrete and personal ways to talk about prejudice and discrimination with young children.

Muddy Waters Can Yield Clear Evidence

Bernadette M. Hickman-Maynard and Robert L. Selman
Harvard University

In the summer of 2006, a real estate developer in a small Mississippi town accidentally unearths a city pool that had been filled with dirt over thirty years prior in an effort to thwart the movement of racial integration. In his recent article, Adam Nossiter (New York Times article on 9/19/2006) visits the town and discovers that the wounds created from this part of the city's racist past remain deep and open. Over thirty years later, many White townspeople still find it difficult to talk forthrightly about the reasons behind the pool's closing, instead resorting to the use of what Nossiter (2006) called "veiled language" in an effort to communicate what they saw as the necessity of filling the pool with dirt to prevent Whites and Blacks from "mingl[ing] that close."

Discussing the reality of prejudice, racism and other social problems can be challenging for adults of all ages, races, and genders. However, there is a trend among educators to talk about prejudice and injustice with the youngest among us – our children. Decades after the Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s, educators and social scientists alike are trying to find ways to reduce prejudice in children through school interventions that directly engage the issue, with the hope that frank and honest engagement at the youngest ages can help to develop the cognitive, social, and emotional capacity for understanding necessary to combat prejudice in this world, as discussed by Pfeifer and colleagues in this SPR.

This trend comes at a time when the national educational policy climate is characterized by an emphasis in building language and math skills and their standardized assessment. As a result, interventions that are not deeply woven into these major policy initiatives will face great difficulty finding space in the classroom. In response to these concerns, some educators are using children's literature that addresses themes of prejudice and its understanding as a way of enhancing both literacy skills and social skills (Selman, 2003; Solomon, D., Watson, M., & Battistich, V., 2001).

Freedom Summer, by Deborah Wiles, published by Atheneum Book for Young Readers, is one such picture book that dramatizes a situation remarkably similar to the events reflected in the New York Times Article above. Written at a level that is accessible to the average third grade reader, it tells the story of the desegregation of public places in 1964 through the eyes of an interracial friendship pair, Joe, who is White, and John Henry who is Black. Previously forbidden to swim in the public pool, and relegated to a creek, upon the passage of the Civil Rights act of 1964, John Henry would now be able to swim in the pool with his best friend, Joe. However, on the day it was to be opened to everyone in the community, the two boys rush to the town municipal pool, only to find it being filled with tar. At the end, the boys, each sad in his own way, but each brave and resilient, go together to buy ice pops at the formerly segregated general store that remained open in spite of local assaults on desegregation.

We read *Freedom Summer* aloud to 107 predominantly low-income African-American students in grades one through five, most of whom attended neighborhood elementary schools in a Northeastern urban area. Our main goals were to assess students' comprehension of the story and their understanding of the nature of prejudice and discrimination. One of the questions we asked was, "Why was the pool filled with tar so that Joe and John Henry could not swim in it?" As expected, cognitive development, such as classification skills, as well as social-cognitive development, such as perspective taking skills, significantly affected students' understanding of the story. Younger students were largely unable to understand that racism was the underlying factor that led to the closing of the pool, attributing its closing instead to factors unrelated to racism, such as the need to build a road or a bridge. It was not until third grade that students were able (or willing) to demonstrate consistent awareness of racism's role. Older students were able to discuss various prejudicial attitudes, the intransigence of those who did not want to follow new desegregation laws, the ways in which intergroup and intragroup conflict served to perpetuate discrimination, as well as the stress those conflicts placed on Joe and John Henry's friendship (as described in a paper we are presenting at AERA this year).

However, we found that context also affected students' comprehension of the text. The illustrations and the text show Black workers filling the pool, which led even some older students with perfectly adequate social-cognitive development to interpret the story as if Blacks were trying to keep the races segregated. When informally investigating why students would make such a crucial error in interpreting the story, we hypothesized that their experience in predominantly Black schools had exposed them to a context in which Black students are the majority and use their power and influence to discriminate against White students. They extrapolated information from their own limited context and applied it to the greater mainstream society, and to history, to suggest that Blacks were the ones in power attempting to thwart integration with Whites. Thus, these preliminary findings suggest that even with the requisite cognitive tools, social context plays a very powerful role in how students make meaning of the story, the history, and their world.

Findings such as these have significant implications for fields of practice and research, and the relation among them. Teaching young children is a highly sophisticated and challenging profession, which requires deep disciplinary knowledge, especially where teaching controversial issues such as race relations are concerned. *Freedom Summer's* value as a vehicle for discussing contemporary issues of prejudice has the potential to be reduced to a literacy lesson alone, and one that might be lost on many of the children in the class if the teacher does not understand the developmental *and* contextual bases of children's competencies, and is unable to help students make connections between their knowledge of the world and their experience with the text. To aid teachers and students in the very difficult task of discussing race relations, developmental theory derived from controlled research conditions must actively make its way into the classroom so that teachers might be empowered to make sound developmental choices that appropriately challenge and scaffold student learning.

However, the run down stream from lab-space to school place is often long and gets turgid toward the practice delta and the evidence is likely to be swamped along the way. Therefore, we must also embed more of our basic research in the practices to which they are relevant, even if for a while rigor is slightly attenuated (Selman & Dray, 2006). Controlled laboratory experiments reduce the messiness of real-world complications and contextual factors, but they also reduce the insight that rich, complex, and yes, even muddy, contexts can bring to our basic understanding of how children grasp crucial social phenomena. Our collective knowledge of the way children comprehend and relate to prejudice, whether they encounter it in their literature or their world, can only be enhanced by direct study of it in the field, at the site of primary engagement.

References

- Selman, R. L.(2003). *The Promotion of Social Awareness: Powerful Lessons from the Partnership of Developmental Theory and Classroom Practice*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Selman, R.L. & Dray, A. (2006). Risk and Prevention: Practice and Research. In Damon, W. and Lerner, R. Eds. *Handbook of Child Psychology*, 6th Edition. New York City, N.Y. John Wiley and Sons. Volume 4, Renninger, A. and Sigel, I., Chapter 10, pp.378-419.
- Solomon, D., Watson, M., & Battistich, V. (2001). Teaching and Schooling Effects on Moral/Prosocial Development. In Richardson, V. Ed. *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, 4th Edition. Washington, DC. American Educational Research Association.

Recommendations for Future Research

This review also suggests future directions for those doing basic empirical research. If carried out, these recommendations will complement those for educational practice by exploring developmental and contextual factors more broadly than in the past.

1. Prejudice in later childhood and adolescence. While there is little variance in children's prejudice prior to age eight (Aboud, 1988), probably attributable to cognitive constraints, there is much greater variance in children's prejudice after age eight. Researchers should begin to address what factors contribute to prejudice in later childhood and adolescence. One area of potential research concerns whether ethnic identity development is related to the expression of prejudice (Pfeifer, Ruble, Bachman, Alvarez, Cameron, & Fuligni, in press). Tajfel and Turner (1979, 1986), in their social identity theory, propose that individuals who strongly identify with their group are more motivated to evaluate their group positively compared to other groups. As children and adolescents are in the process of developing an ethnic identity, it is important to examine how this process affects prejudice. New lessons in this domain are simply waiting to be learned. A related area of potential research assumes that most individuals hold some degree of prejudice. What is critical is whether that prejudice is expressed or not, and the internal and external motivations we possess to control prejudiced responding (Devine, Plant, Amodio, Harmon-Jones, & Vance, 2002). This topic is relevant to later childhood and adolescence as inhibitory control and other self-regulatory capabilities exhibit a protracted course of development through the first two decades of life (e.g., Wright, Waterman, Prescott, & Murdoch-Eaton, 2003).

2. Address both the holder and target of prejudice. As more and more children belong to racial, ethnic, linguistic, or national minority groups, we need to consider ways to reduce intergroup prejudices, as well as explore how children cope with being the target of prejudice. Ideally, interventions should begin to address prejudices directed at multiple groups from the perspective of both the holder and target (in addition to further recognizing that individuals can also be both holders and targets of prejudice). Although prejudice reduction interventions are not typically designed from the target's

perspective, research has consistently shown that elementary and middle school children are aware of, and report having experienced, many types of prejudice and discrimination. For example, a majority of African-American and Mexican-American 10- to 12-year-olds report having experienced some form of racial/ethnic discrimination, with verbal insults and racial slurs being most commonly reported (Quintana, 1998; Simons, Murry, McLoyd, Lin, Cutrona, & Conger, 2002). Many children also reported being suspected of wrongdoing or being excluded from activities because of their race (Simons et al., 2002). Thus, it is evident that children know they are experiencing prejudice and discrimination, and this may lead to poor peer relationships (Schofield, 1980), reductions

in academic achievement (Gougis, 1986; Steele & Aronson, 1995), and more negative mental health (Krieger, 1999). New interventions should be designed to not only reduce these instances of prejudice and discrimination, but also help children cope with them when they do occur.

3. Beyond "Black versus White" to multiethnic schools. It has become evident that the school context has dramatically changed in the past fifty years. In heterogeneous schools, ethnic differences are no longer primarily "Black versus White" but often involve more than two groups. Moreover, the particular ethnic or racial groups (e.g., Latino, Asian, Black, and White) and their relative sizes vary from school to school. To date, there is significantly less information available on prejudice (or prejudice reduction) in multi-

ethnic schools. However, some preliminary findings regarding student perceptions of their school environment and their social relationships are encouraging. For example, Juvonen, Nishina, and Graham (2006) found that African-American and Latino students felt safer in school, less harassed by peers, and less lonely in contexts that were ethnically more diverse, compared to less diverse classrooms and schools. In general, while it seems as if context is particularly important for determining the prejudice-related outcomes, we are not in a position to evaluate its specific effects until further research is conducted. A related area of potential research is supplied by the common ingroup identity model (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). With the multiplicity of ethnic and religious groups in some heterogeneous schools, the creation of superordinate identities (which could range from the school to the national level) may serve to diminish subgroup prejudices. This has

New interventions should be designed to not only reduce these instances of prejudice and discrimination, but also help children cope with them when they do occur.

The problem of resegregation has advanced to the point that schools are now as segregated as in the early 1970's.

rarely been studied in children, although there is some evidence that increasingly central national (American) identities can diminish intergroup bias in ethnic minority and immigrant children (Pfeifer et al., in press).

4. Resegregation. At the same time as some schools have become more multiethnic, many schools are once again homogeneous: not only have schools desegregated, but they have since been resegregated. The problem of resegregation has advanced to the point that schools are now as segregated as in the early 1970's (Harvard University Graduate School of Education, Civil Rights Project, 1999). For example, African-American children are more likely to attend majority African-American schools now compared to any time since the 1960's, and Latino students are even more likely to attend predominately ethnic minority schools today than are their African-American peers (Orfield & Lee, 2006; Orfield, 2001; Pettigrew, 2004). The reality of these homogeneous contexts trumps the possibility of using cooperative learning or other strategies to create conditions for interracial contact that are maximally effective at prejudice reduction. In these cases, multicultural curricula would likely play a critical role by supplying the necessary content, but because it only provides vicarious intergroup exposure, it may be insufficient to reduce prejudice on its own—especially in younger children. The addition of social-cognitive programs to a multicultural base could create beneficial synergies (i.e., multicultural curricula might provide concrete examples to which children can apply social-cognitive gains). Future research should examine the additive effects of multicultural curricula and social-cognitive skills training to test this hypothesis.

Social Implications

Assuming prejudice reduction is a valued goal in our society, there is hardly a better place than schools to potentially make a difference in children's attitudes and behaviors toward "different" others. The current review suggests that the contexts under which any prejudice reduction is attempted are important inasmuch as diversity allows more than vicarious exposure. Racially homogenous schools can never provide the conditions under which children learn to constructively work with other-race peers. Hence, it would be paradoxical and unfortunate if the lessons learned since 1954 are ignored when making decisions about the federal mandates for desegregation in public schools. To create the best possible contexts under which to implement school-based programs to achieve prejudice reduction in children—and ultimately in society—it may be necessary to "rededicate" ourselves to desegregation (Pettigrew, 2004).

References

- About, F. E. (1988). *Children and prejudice*. New York: Blackwell.
- About, F. E. (2003). The formation of in-group favoritism and out-group prejudice in young children: Are they distinct attitudes? *Developmental Psychology*, 39, 48-60.
- About, F. E., & Doyle, A.-B. (1995). The development of in-group pride in Black Canadians. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26(3), 243-254.
- About, F. E., & Fenwick, V. (1999). Exploring and evaluating school-based interventions to reduce prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(4), 767-786.
- About, F. E., & Joong, A. (in press). Intergroup name-calling and conditions for creating assertive bystanders. In S. Levy and M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup relations: An integrative developmental and social psychological perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- About, F. E., & Levy, S. R. (2000). Interventions to reduce prejudice and discrimination in children and adolescents. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing Prejudice and Discrimination* (pp. 269-294). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- About, F. E., Mendelson, M. J., & Purdy, K. T. (2003). Cross-race peer relations and friendship quality. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 27(2), 165-173.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Baker, L. (1998). Unraveling the Boasian Discourse: The racial politics of "culture" in school desegregation, 1944-1954. *Transforming Anthropology*, 7, 15-32.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Oxford, England: Prentice-Hall.
- Banks, J. A. (1995). Multicultural education: Its effects on students' racial and gender role attitudes. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 617-627). New York: Macmillan.
- Banks, J. A. (2006). Improving race relations in schools: From theory and research to practice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62, 607-614.
- Baron, A. S., & Banaji, M. R. (2006). The development of implicit attitudes: Evidence of race evaluations from ages 6, 10, and adulthood. *Psychological Science*, 17, 53-58.
- Batson, C. D. (1998). Altruism and prosocial behavior. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, et al. (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology*, Vol. 2 (4th ed., pp. 282-316). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Best, D. L., Smith, S. C., Graves, D. J., & Williams, J. E. (1975). The modification of racial bias in preschool children. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 20(2), 193-205.
- Bigler, R. S. (1999). The use of multicultural curricula and materials to counter racism in children. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 687-705.

Tolerance Promotion, Talent Development, and the Burden of Dreams Deferred

Clark McKown, University of Illinois, Chicago*

In this article, Pfeifer, Brown, and Juvonen discuss three school-based strategies for promoting interracial tolerance and esteem. Those strategies, rooted in theories of prejudice, include multicultural curricula, cooperative learning, and social-cognitive bias reduction. Pfeifer and colleagues join a growing chorus of researchers who conclude that context affects racial attitudes (McGlothlin & Killen, 2006; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) and that schools could play a key role in producing a pluralistic society characterized by a mutual respect conspicuously and often devastatingly absent in many parts of the world (Banks, 2006; McKown, 2005; Paluck & Green, in press).

Pfeifer and colleagues rightly point out limitations of existing work and suggest promising future directions. Even without further evidence, however, their article leads to four firm conclusions. First, setting characteristics, such as the structure of intergroup contact, affect children's racial attitudes. Second, some settings, particularly schools, can be designed to promote tolerance. Third, varied strategies promote tolerance, from teaching children to see human diversity to teaching children how to work cooperatively in diverse groups. Fourth, school-based tolerance promotion strategies work. Pfeifer and colleagues lead us to conclude that although we should continue to study and expand the range of tolerance promotion strategies, we know enough about what works that we may justifiably act now.

Why then are there no prominent state or national campaigns to integrate into schools with all deliberate speed effective tolerance promotion strategies? One likely reason is that tolerance promotion is usually described as a non-academic "add-on." Educators are already overburdened with the monumental task of imparting academic knowledge and skills. Under pressure to increase achievement test scores, even educators who value racial tolerance may forego tolerance promotion in favor of more purely academic initiatives.

The choice between tolerance and talent development is a false one, however. In fact, time spent promoting tolerance may very well be time spent nurturing talent. We know, for example, that stereotypes can impair achievement among members of academically stereotyped ethnic groups (Aronson & Steele, 2005; Steele & Aronson, 1995) as early as elementary school (McKown & Weinstein, 2002, 2003). If tolerance is increased in schools, then, it stands to reason that fewer children will be subjected to damaging stereotypes about their academic ability. Increased tolerance is thus not only a desired outcome, but also a means to academic success.

A second reason tolerance promotion is not widely practiced is that, as Pfeifer and colleagues point out, many believe racism is largely a thing of the past (Waller, 2001; Wilson, 1987), obviating the need for intervention. This belief runs counter to evidence that a substantial minority of adults endorse overt racial prejudices (Bobo, 2001) and that many more adults harbor subtler, implicit prejudices (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2004). Moreover, research from around the globe suggests that children continue to display inter-ethnic biases (Enesco, Navarro, Paradela, & Guerrero, 2005; Nesdale, in press). To motivate key constituents to act, increased public awareness that racial prejudice persists is critical.

Finally, even those who acknowledge that prejudice still merits attention may believe that other problems represent more pressing threats. A broader perspective calls this belief into question. In a diverse and increasingly interdependent global economy, growing smaller through technology and transportation, our economic competitiveness depends on our capacity to work with people across ethnic, cultural, and national borders. Furthermore, in an era characterized by intense and bloody ethnic conflict around the world, the ability to negotiate intergroup conflict has never been more important. In the very near future, the nation with the highest average intergroup intelligence will be at a huge economic and strategic advantage.

Tolerance promotion has a clear moral dimension in any society that aspires to equal opportunity for its citizens. Unfortunately, pure appeals to conscience may not enjoin even those of good will to use what we have learned, so clearly described in this paper, to promote tolerance if that is the only end served. Intense pressure to foster academic growth,

economic vitality, and strategic advantage can spur action so long as educators, policymakers, and the public understand that tolerance promotion may very well be an untapped resource for nurturing the talents essential for our individual and collective prosperity.

References

- Aronson, J., & Steele, C.M. (2005). Stereotypes and the fragility of academic competence, motivation, and self-concept. In A. Elliot & C.S. Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of Competence and Motivation* (pp. 436-456). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Banks, J.A. (2006). Improving race relations in schools: From theory and research to practice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62(2), 607-614.
- Bobo, L. (2001). Racial attitudes and relations at the close of the twentieth century. In N.J. Smelser, W.J. Wilson, & F. Mitchell (Eds.), *America Becoming: Racial Trends and Their Consequences* (pp. 264-301). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Dovidio, J.F., & Gaertner, S.L. (2004). Aversive Racism. In M.P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 36 (pp. 1-52). San Diego, CA: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Enesco, I, Navarro, A., Paradela, I., & Guerrero, S. (2005). Stereotypes and beliefs about different ethnic groups in Spain: A study with Spanish and Latin American children living in Madrid. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 26(6), 638-659.
- McGlothlin, H., & Killen, M. (2006). Intergroup attitudes of European American children attending ethnically homogeneous schools. *Child Development*, 77(5), 1375-1386.
- McKown, C. (2005). Applying ecological theory to advance the science and practice of school-based prejudice reduction interventions. *Educational Psychologists*, 41(3), 177-189.
- McKown, C., & Weinstein, R.S. (2002). Modeling the role of child ethnicity and gender in children's differential response to teacher expectations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32, 159-184.
- McKown, C., & Weinstein, R.S. (2003). The development and consequences of stereotype-consciousness in middle childhood. *Child Development*, 74(2), 498-515.
- Nesdale, D. (in press). Social identity development and children's ethnic attitudes in Australia. In S. Quintana, & C. McKown (Eds.) (in press). *Handbook of race, racism, and the developing child*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Paluck, E.L., & Green, D.P. (in press). Prejudice reduction: What works? A review and assessment of research and practice. *Annual Review of Psychology*.
- Pettigrew, T., & Tropp, L.R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(5), 751-783.
- Pfeifer, J.H., Brown, C.S., & Juvonen, J. (2007). Teaching tolerance in schools: Lessons learned since Brown v. Board of Education about the development and reduction of children's prejudice. *Social Policy Report: Giving Child and Youth Development Knowledge Away*, 21(2).
- Steele, C.M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(5), 797-811.
- Waller, J. (2001). *Face to face: The changing state of racism across America*. New York: Perseus.
- Wilson, W.J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

* Work on this paper was supported by a William T. Grant Scholar's Award to Clark McKown. Thanks to Roger Weissberg for his thoughtful comments on an earlier draft.

- Bigler, R. S., Jones, L. C., & Lobliner, D. B. (1997). Social categorization and the formation of intergroup attitudes in children. *Child Development*, 68, 530-543.
- Bigler, R. S., & Liben, L. S. (1992). Cognitive mechanisms in children's gender stereotyping: Theoretical and educational implications of a cognitive-based intervention. *Child Development*, 63, 1351-1363.
- Bigler, R. S., & Liben, L. S. (1993). A cognitive-developmental approach to racial stereotyping: Theoretical and educational implications of a cognitive-based intervention. *Child Development*, 64, 1507-1518.
- Black-Gutman, D., & Hickson, F. (1996). The relation between racial attitudes and social-cognitive development in children: An Australian study. *Developmental Psychology*, 32, 448-456.
- Bowers, V., & Swanson, D. (1988). *More than meets the eye*. Vancouver, British Columbia: Pacific Educational Press.
- In Aboud, F. E., & Fenwick, V. (1999). Exploring and evaluating school-based interventions to reduce prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(4), 767-786.
- Breckheimer, S. E., & Nelson, R. O. (1976). Group methods for reducing racial prejudice and discrimination. *Psychological Reports*, 39(3), 1259-1268.
- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(3), 429-444.
- Brown, C. S., & Bigler, R. S. (2002). Effects of minority status in the classroom on children's intergroup attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 83, 77-110.
- Cameron, J. A., Alvarez, J. M., Ruble, D. N., & Fuligni, A. J. (2001). Children's lay theories about ingroups and outgroups: Reconceptualizing research on prejudice. *Personality & Social Psychology Review*, 5(2), 118-128.
- Cameron, L., & Rutland, A. (2006). Extended contact through story reading in school: Reducing children's prejudice toward the disabled. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62, 469-488.
- Carpendale, J. I. M., & Chandler, M. J. (1996). On the distinction between false belief understanding and subscribing to an interpretive theory of mind. *Child Development*, 67, 1686-1706.
- Clark, K. B., & Clark, M. P. (1947). Racial identification and preference in Negro children. In T. M. Newcomb & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in social psychology*. (pp. 169-178). New York: Henry Holt and Co.
- Clark, A., Hocevar, D., & Dembo, M. H. (1980). The role of cognitive development in children's explanations and preferences for skin color. *Developmental Psychology*, 16(4), 332-339.
- Cohen, E. G. (1975). The effects of desegregation on race relations. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 39, 271-299.
- Devine, P. G., Plant, A. E., Amodio, D. M., Harmon-Jones, E., & Vance, S. L. (2002). The regulation of implicit race bias: The role of motivations to respond without prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 835-848.
- Doyle, A.-B., Beaudet, J., & Aboud, F. E. (1988). Developmental patterns in the flexibility of children's ethnic attitudes. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 19, 3-18.
- Doyle, A.-B., & Aboud, F. E. (1995). A longitudinal study of White children's racial prejudice as a social cognitive development. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 41, 209-228.
- Eisenberg, N. (2000). Emotion, regulation, and moral development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, 665-697.
- Fabes, R. A., Eisenberg, N., & Eisenbud, L. (1993). Behavioral and physiological correlates of children's reaction to others in distress. *Developmental Psychology*, 29(4), 655-663.
- Fazio, R. H. (1990). Multiple processes by which attitudes guide behavior: The MODE model as an integrative framework. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*: Vol. 23 (pp. 75-109). New York: Academic Press.
- Fishbein, H. D. (2002). *Peer prejudice and discrimination: The origins of prejudice* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Gimmetstad, B. J., & deChiara, E. (1982). Dramatic plays: A vehicle for prejudice reduction in the elementary school. *Journal of Educational Research*, 76, 45-49.
- Gougis, R. A. (1986). The effects of prejudice and stress on the academic performance of black Americans. In U. Neisser (Ed.), *The school achievement of minority children: New perspectives* (pp. 145-158). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Graham, J. A., & Cohen, R. (1997). Race and sex as factors in children's sociometric ratings and friendship choices. *Social Development*, 6, 355-372.
- Graham, S., & Juvonen, J. (2002). Ethnicity, peer harassment, and adjustment in middle school: An exploratory study. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 22(2), 173-199.
- Hallinan, M. T. (1982). Classroom racial composition and children's friendships. *Social Forces*, 61, 56-72.
- Hallinan, M. T., & Smith, S. S. (1985). The effects of classroom racial composition on students' interracial friendliness. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 48, 3-16.
- Hallinan, M. T., & Teixeira, R. A. (1989). Opportunities and constraints: Black-White differences in the formation of interracial friendships. *Child Development*, 58, 1358-1371.
- Hamm, N. H., Baum, M. R., & Nikels, K. W. (1975). Effects of race and exposure on judgments of interpersonal favorability. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 11(1), 14-24.
- Harvard University Graduate School of Education, Civil

- Rights Project (1999, June). Resegregation in American Schools. Retrieved June 9, 2003 from http://www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu/research/deseg/reseg_schools99.php
- Hoffman, M. L. (1991). Empathy, social cognition, and moral action. In W. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development* (pp. 275-301). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Holmgren, R. A., Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1998). The relations of children's situational empathy-related emotions to dispositional prosocial behavior. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 22(1), 169-193.
- Jackson, J. P. (2001). *Social scientists for social justice: Making the case against segregation*. New York: New York University Press.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1981). Effects of cooperative and individualistic learning experiences on interethnic interaction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73, 444-449.
- Juvonen, J., Nishina, A., & Graham, S. (2006). Ethnic diversity and perceptions of safety in urban middle schools. *Psychological Science*, 17, 393-400.
- Katz, P. A., & Zalk, S. R. (1978). Modification of children's racial attitudes. *Developmental Psychology*, 14, 447-461.
- Katz, P. A. (1976). The acquisition of racial attitudes in children. In P. A. Katz (Ed.), *Towards the elimination of racism* (pp. 125-154). New York: Pergamon.
- Khmelkov, V. T., & Hallinan, M. T. (1999). Organizational effects on race relations in schools. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(4), 627-645.
- Kistner, J., Metzler, A., Gatlin, D., & Risi, S. (1993). Classroom racial proportions and children's peer relations: Race and gender effects. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85(3), 446-452.
- Kowalski, K., & Lo, Y.-F. (2001). The influence of perceptual features, ethnic labels, and sociocultural information on the development of ethnic/racial bias in young children. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32(4), 444-455.
- Krieger, N. (1999). Embodying inequality: A review of concepts, measures, and methods for studying health consequences of discrimination. *International Journal of Health Services*, 29, 295-352.
- Laupa, M., & Turiel, E. (1986). Children's conceptions of adult and peer authority. *Child Development*, 57, 405-412.
- Lerner, R. M., & Schroeder, C. (1975). Racial attitudes in young White children: A methodological analysis. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 127, 3-12.
- Lessing, E. E., & Clarke, C. C. (1976). An attempt to reduce ethnic prejudice and assess its correlates in a junior high school sample. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 1, 3-16.
- Levy, S. R., Troise, D. M., Moyer, A., Aboud, F.E., & Bigler, R. E. (June, 2003). A meta-analytic review of the effectiveness of anti-bias interventions and subsequent social-cognitive developmental approach to improving racial attitudes among children. Symposium paper presented in S. Gaertner (Chair). "Integrating theory, practice, and research: A focus on school-based intervention programs." *Anti-bias Education: Practice, Research, and Theory*, Evanston, IL.
- Litcher, J. H., & Johnson, D. W. (1969). Changes in attitudes toward Negroes of White elementary school students after use of multiethnic readers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 60, 148-152.
- Litcher, J. H., Johnson, D. W., & Ryan, F. L. (1973). Use of pictures of multiethnic interaction to change attitudes of White elementary school students toward Blacks. *Psychological Reports*, 33, 367-372.
- Martin, W. E. (1998). *Brown v. Board of Education: A brief history with documents*. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's Press.
- McConahay, J. B. (1978). The effects of school desegregation upon student racial attitudes and behavior: A critical review of the literature and a prolegomenon to future research. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 42, 77-107.
- McKown, C. (2005). Applying ecological theory to advance the science and practice of school-based prejudice reduction interventions. *Educational Psychologist*, 40, 177-189.
- Nagata, D. K. (1985). The relationships between ethnic attitudes and egocentrism measures. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 146(2), 151-160.
- Nesdale, D. (1999). Developmental changes in children's ethnic preferences and social cognitions. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 20, 501-519.
- Nesdale, D. (2004). Social identity processes and children's ethnic prejudice. In M. Bennett and F. Sani (Eds.), *The development of the social self*. New York: Psychology Press (pp. 219-245).
- Oishi, S., Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. (1983). Effects of student teams and individualized instruction on cross-race and cross-sex friendships. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada. In Slavin, R. E. (1995). *Cooperative learning and intergroup relations*. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 628-634).
- Orfield, G. (2001). *Schools more separate: Consequences of a decade of resegregation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Civil Rights Project.
- Orfield, G., & Lee, C. (2006). *Racial transformation and the changing nature of segregation*. Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.

- Paluck, E.L., & Green, D.P. (in press). Prejudice reduction: What works? A review and assessment of research and practice. *Annual Review of Psychology*.
- Patchen, M., Davidson, J. D., Hofmann, G., & Brown, W. R. (1977). Determinants of students' interracial behavior and opinion change. *Sociology of Education*, 50, 55-75.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 65-85.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (2004). Justice deferred: A half century after *Brown v. Board of Education*. *American Psychologist*, 59, 521-529.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice: Recent meta-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 93-114). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 751-783.
- Pfeifer, J. H., Ruble, D. N., Bachman, M. A., Alvarez, J. M., Cameron, J. A., & Fuligni, A. J. (in press). Social identities and intergroup bias in immigrant and non-immigrant children. *Developmental Psychology*.
- Piaget, J. & Inhelder, B. (1941). *The development of the idea of quantity in the child*. Oxford, England: Delachaux & Niestle.
- Piaget, J., & Weil, A. M. (1951). The development in children of the idea of the homeland and of relations to other countries. *International Social Science Journal*, 3, 561-578.
- Powlisha, K. K., Serbin, L. A., Doyle, A.-B., & White, D. R. (1994). Gender, ethnic, and body type biases: The generality of prejudice in childhood. *Developmental Psychology*, 30(4), 526-536.
- Quintana, S. M. (1998). Development of children's understanding of ethnicity and race. *Applied & Preventive Psychology: Current Scientific Perspective*, 7, 27-45.
- Schofield, J. W. (1978). School desegregation and intergroup relations. In D. Bar-Tal & L. Saxe (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Education*. New York: Halsted Press.
- Schofield, J. W. (1980). Complementary and conflicting identities: Images and interaction in an interracial school. In S. Asher & J. Gottman (Eds.), *The development of children's friendship*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schofield, J. W. (1989). *Black and White in school: Trust, tension or tolerance?* New York: Teachers College Press.
- Schofield, J. W. (1995). Review of research on school desegregation's impact on elementary and secondary school students. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 597-616). New York: Macmillan.
- Schofield, J. W., & Hausmann, L. R. M. (2004). School desegregation and social science research. *American Psychologist*, 59, 538-546.
- Sharan, S. (1984). *Cooperative learning in the classroom: Research in desegregated schools*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sherif, M. & Sherif, C. W. (1953). *Groups in harmony and tension: An integration of studies of intergroup relations*. Oxford, England: Harper & Brothers.
- Simons, R. L., Murry, V., McLoyd, V., Lin, K., Cutrona, C., & Conger, R. D. (2002). Discrimination, crime, ethnic identity, and parenting as correlates of depressive symptoms among African American children: A multi-level analysis. *Development and Psychopathology*, 14, 371-393.
- Sinclair, S., Dunn, E., & Lowery, B. S. (2004). The relationship between parental racial attitudes and children's implicit prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 41, 283-289.
- Singh, J. M., & Yancey, A. V. (1974). Racial attitudes in white first-grade children. *Journal of Educational Research*, 67(8), 370-372.
- Slavin, R. E. (1979). Effects of biracial learning teams on cross-racial friendships. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71, 381-387.
- Slavin, R. E. (1995). Cooperative learning and intergroup relations. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 628-634). New York: Macmillan.
- Slone, M., Tarrasch, R., & Hallis, D. (2000). Ethnic stereotypic attitudes among Israeli children: Two intervention programs. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 46(2), 370-389.
- Spencer, M. B. (1982). Preschool children's social cognition and cultural cognition: A cognitive developmental interpretation of race dissonance findings. *Journal of Psychology*, 112, 275-286.
- St. John, N. (1975). *School desegregation: Outcomes for children*. Oxford, England: John Wiley & Sons.
- Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African-Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 797-811.
- Stephan, W. G. (1978). School desegregation: An evaluation of predictions made in 'Brown vs. Board of Education'. *Psychological Bulletin*, 85, 346-366.
- Stephan, W. G. (1999). *Reducing prejudice and stereotyping in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979/2001). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In M. A. Hogg & D. Abrams (Eds.), *Intergroup relations: Essential readings* (pp. 94-109). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *The psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Tatum, B. D. (1997). "Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Vescio, T. K., Sechrist, B., & Paolucci, M. P. (2003). Perspective-taking and prejudice reduction: The mediational role of empathy arousal and situational attributions. *European*

- Journal of Social Psychology, 33(4), 455-472.
- Weigel, R. H., Wiser, P. L., & Cook, S. W. (1975). The impact of cooperative learning experiences on cross-ethnic relations and attitudes. *Journal of Social Issues*, 31(1), 219-244.
- Weiner, M. J., & Wright, F. E. (1973). Effects of undergoing arbitrary discrimination upon subsequent attitudes toward a minority group. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 3, 94-102.
- Wells, A. S. (1995). Reexamining research on school desegregation: Long- versus short-term effects. *Teachers College Record*, 96, 691-706.
- Wells, A. S., & Crain, R. L. (1994). Perpetuation theory and the long-term effects of school desegregation. *Review of Educational Research*, 64, 531-555.
- Wham, M.A., Barnhart, J., & Cook, G. (1996). Enhancing multicultural awareness through storybook reading experience. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 30, 1-9.
- Whetstone, L. M., & Pezdek, K. (1990). Preliminary evaluation of "A World of Difference" curriculum materials. Unpublished manuscript, The Claremont Graduate School, CA.
- Williams, J. E., Best, D. L., Boswell, D. A., Mattson, L. A., & Graves, D. J. (1975). Preschool Racial Attitude Measure II. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 35, 3-18.
- Wood, P. B., & Sonleitner, N. (1996). The effect of childhood interracial contact on adult anti-Black prejudice. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20, 1-17.
- Wright, I., Waterman, M., Prescott, H., & Murdoch-Eaton, D. (2003). A new Stroop-like measure of inhibitory function development: Typical developmental trends. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 44, 561-575.
- Zahn-Waxler, C., Radke-Yarrow, M., Wagner, E., & Chapman, M. (1992). Development of concern for others. *Developmental Psychology* 28(1), 126-136.
- Zajonc, R. B. (1968). Attitudinal effects of mere exposure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 9(2), 1-27.
- Ziegler, S. (1981). The effectiveness of cooperative learning teams for increasing cross-ethnic friendship: Additional evidence. *Human Organization*, 40, 264-268.
- Zirkel, S., & Cantor, N. (2004). Fifty years after Brown v. Board of Education: The promise and challenge of multicultural education. *Journal of Social Issues*, 60(1), 1-15.

About the Authors

Jennifer Pfeifer is a doctoral candidate in Developmental Psychology at the University of California, Los Angeles. She studies the neural bases of self perception, empathy and perspective-taking during middle childhood and adolescence. One of her particular interests is in studying the social cognitive foundations of prejudice development and reduction. She has been funded by a National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship and a Ruth L. Kirschstein National Research Service Award.

Christia Spears Brown is an Assistant Professor in Developmental Psychology at the University of California, Los Angeles. Her research focuses on how children in middle childhood understand and experience membership in academically stigmatized social groups. She is currently investigating the role of school context on the development of gender and racial/ethnic identities and the cognitive and situational prerequisites to perceiving discrimination.

Jaana Juvonen is a Professor and Chair of Developmental Psychology at the University of California, Los Angeles. She studies peer relationships and school adjustment of youth. She has co-authored *Focus on the wonder years: Challenges facing the American middle school* (2004), co-edited *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (2001) and *Social motivation: Understanding children's school adjustment* (1996). She is a former recipient of a National Academy of Education Spencer Fellowship and Senior Fellowship of the Academy of Finland.

Social Policy Report is a quarterly publication of the Society for Research in Child Development. The *Report* provides a forum for scholarly reviews and discussions of developmental research and its implications for the policies affecting children. Copyright of the articles published in the *Report* is maintained by SRCD. Statements appearing in the *Report* are the views of the author(s) and do not imply endorsement by the Editors or by SRCD.

Electronic access to the *Social Policy Report* is available at the *Report's* website:
<http://www.srkd.org/spr.html>

Purpose

Social Policy Report (ISSN 1075-7031) is published four times a year by the Society for Research in Child Development. Its purpose is twofold: (1) to provide policymakers with objective reviews of research findings on topics of current national interest, and (2) to inform the SRCD membership about current policy issues relating to children and about the state of relevant research.

Content

The *Report* provides a forum for scholarly reviews and discussions of developmental research and its implications for policies affecting children. The Society recognizes that few policy issues are noncontroversial, that authors may well have a "point of view," but the *Report* is not intended to be a vehicle for authors to advocate particular positions on issues. Presentations should be balanced, accurate, and inclusive. The publication nonetheless includes the disclaimer that the views expressed do not necessarily reflect those of the Society or the editors.

Procedures for Submission and Manuscript Preparation

Articles originate from a variety of sources. Some are solicited, but authors interested in submitting a manuscript are urged to propose timely topics to the editors. Manuscripts vary in length ranging from 20 to 30 pages of double-spaced text (approximately 8,000 to 14,000 words) plus references. Authors are asked to submit manuscripts electronically, if possible, but hard copy may be submitted with disk. Manuscripts should adhere to APA style and include text, references, and a brief biographical statement limited to the author's current position and special activities related to the topic. (See page 2, this issue, for the editors' email addresses.)

Three or four reviews are obtained from academic or policy specialists with relevant expertise and different perspectives. Authors then make revisions based on these reviews and the editors' queries, working closely with the editors to arrive at the final form for publication.

The Committee on Child Development, Public Policy, and Public Information (now the Committee for Policy and Communications), which founded the *Report*, serves as an advisory body to all activities related to its publication.