

A Developmental Science Approach to Reducing Prejudice and Social Exclusion: Intergroup Processes, Social-Cognitive Development, and Moral Reasoning

Adam Rutland*

Goldsmiths, University of London

Melanie Killen

University of Maryland

This article presents a developmental science approach to changing attitudes and rectifying prejudice and discrimination. This is crucial because stereotypes and prejudicial attitudes are deeply entrenched by adulthood; the time for intervention is before biases are fully formed in adulthood. Adults as well as children are both the recipients and the perpetrators of prejudice as reflected by social exclusion based on group membership. Determining the factors that inhibit or reduce the negative outcomes of prejudice and exclusion is of paramount importance. Research reveals that young children are aware of in-group and out-group differences very early but what becomes full-fledged prejudice, in fact, emerges slowly during childhood and adolescence. At the same time, morality, an understanding of fairness and equality, emerges during this same time period. On the positive side, evidence reveals that in certain contexts, children understand the unfairness of prejudicial attitudes and social exclusion designed to inflict harm on others. On the negative side, prejudicial attitudes, even when not intentional, have detrimental consequences for children as targets of biased attitudes. This article describes research on social reasoning, moral judgments, group identity, group norms, and intergroup contact in childhood to shed light on the catalysts and obstacles that exist for the goal of promoting the development of positive intergroup attitudes

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Adam Rutland, Professor of Social Developmental Psychology, Department of Psychology, Goldsmiths, University of London, New Cross, London SE14 6NW, UK. Tel: +44-(0)-207-078-5442 [e-mail: a.rutland@gold.ac.uk].

We thank the following individuals for helpful feedback on the manuscript: Shelby Cooley, Laura Elenbaas, Aline Hitti, Kelly Lynn Mulvey, Sally Palmer, and Michael Rizzo. The second author was supported, in part, by a National Science Foundation/Developmental and Learning Sciences grant, #0840492.

from early childhood to adulthood. Implications for policy and intervention are provided.

Morality, Group Identity, and Intergroup Relations: A Developmental Science Approach to Changing Attitudes

Prejudice and discrimination observed in adults originates in childhood. Research on child development has investigated the origins of prejudice, how it evolves, and what factors both accelerate and diminish prejudice. Research reveals that children who experience prejudicial treatment are at risk for negative short- and long-term outcomes. Thus, it is of paramount importance to determine how best to reduce prejudice early in development, not only for facilitating the health and well-being of children, but also because by adulthood, prejudice is deeply entrenched and difficult to change. At the same time that children's prejudice begins to manifest, which reflects many different forms as described below, children's prosocial and moral orientations develop. Over the past 15 years, developmental psychologists have revealed how early forms of morality provide a means by which prejudice is thwarted, both by children themselves as well as by the messages from adults in society, who can effectively help children to understand what is fair and unjust about prejudicial behavior toward others. As mentioned, prejudice takes many forms in childhood, and we will review the different ways that it manifests (for reviews, see also, Brown & Bigler, 2002; Killen, Mulvey, & Hitti, 2013; Levy & Killen, 2008; Rutland, 2004; Rutland, Abrams, & Killen, 2010).

In this article, we highlight important social, cognitive, and moral developments that occur throughout childhood and adolescence which enable individuals to actively reason about their environment, and how the interplay between these developmental changes and the intergroup context can result in either intergroup biases or mutual respect, including moral notions of fairness and justice. We document the evidence stemming from childhood and recommend a research agenda for social psychological studies. Social psychological studies with adults using the theoretical models and frameworks that we outline could provide new avenues for investigating prejudicial attitudes and biases throughout the life span. Thus, in this article we will describe developmental research on social exclusion based upon biases and prejudice in childhood, when these judgments first become established, and conclude with implications for new research programs in adulthood. To get started, we will review children's emerging moral development, followed by a review of research on social exclusion and programs designed to reduce prejudice.

Moral Development: The Emergence of Fairness and Equality Concepts

Research on moral development over the past two decades has focused on the moral judgments that children make regarding social encounters and events

that have implications for the just, equal, and fair treatment of others. Children evaluate social events (and rules) using moral, social-conventional, and psychological domains of knowledge (Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 1983, 2006). The moral domain includes issues about fairness, equality, justice, rights, and other's welfare (physical and psychological harm). Young children evaluate moral transgressions (stealing, hitting, not sharing toys) as wrong due to the generalizability of the underlying moral principles; they refer to the unfairness associated with the rule violation. If children understand what makes inflicting harm wrong then why do they hit others? The research reveals two things relevant to this question: (1) in fact, children do not regularly hit others, and conflict stems more frequently from object disputes than the infliction of harm on others, and (2) actual situations are multifaceted and contextual factors can create obstacles for children's application of moral principles to actual situations. The factors that make actual encounters complex include psychological attributions of others (a cognitively difficult ability for children) and intergroup attitudes, a central focus of this review, to be described in more detail below.

In general, however, authority mandates are not the significant factors that make a moral transgression right or wrong for children ("Even if the teacher says it is okay to hit someone it is still not all right."). In contrast, children view conventional violations (not raising your hand to talk in class, wearing the wrong clothes to a wedding, standing on the desk in class) as wrong due to authority mandates, and consensus. These violations are contingent on group expectations: if the group wants to change the rule it is okay. The societal domain includes concerns about group functioning, group identity, and group norms or traditions (Killen, Mulvey, & Hitti 2013; Killen & Rutland, 2011). Knowledge about conventions serves as another obstacle, to some extent, for the application of moral principles. This is because the extent to which children view a situation as conventional, not moral, then they are more likely to allow the group to determine the best course of action, which diminishes the likelihood of applying moral principles of fairness or equality to the situation.

Thus, children treat rules about others that entail victims (harm to another, denial of resources, psychological harm, and rights, as examples) as independent of authority jurisdiction, which basically means that the act is wrong even if authority figures (teachers, parents) state that it is okay or legitimate to do. This is just one of a set of six criteria that have been used in the literature to show that children view moral rules as generalizable, unalterable, impersonal, and distinct from punishment (it is wrong even if no punishment is administered). In contrast, children view conventional rules about customs, group regulations, etiquette, and traditions as following a different set of criteria. Transgressions about conventions are disruptive but are not generalizable, unalterable, and independent of authority (in fact, authority determines whether conventions should be followed). The social cognitive understanding displayed by young children about the uniqueness of

moral rules for children was demonstrated using prototypic transgressions (e.g., hitting someone for no reason). Age-related changes pertained to the recognition and ability to apply multiple criteria to differentiate moral and conventional rules.

Young children apply basic fairness and equality norms regarding issues that arise in their small group interactions as they become toddlers and preschool-aged (Killen & Smetana, 2015). The most frequent source of conflicts has to do with object disputes or sharing resources. This is challenging for young children as they learn to coordinate their interactions and apply principles of equality, equity, and fairness to these contexts, often referred to as resource allocations (Mulvey, Hitti, & Killen, 2013). As children get older, however, conflicts become more psychological, covert, and complex (as an example, see Horn, 2008, regarding sexual prejudice in adolescence). One factor that reflects covert behavior pertains to conflicts associated with intergroup attitudes. Social interactions become difficult for children when in-group and out-group identity emerges, which happens by early childhood. The challenge of applying moral principles to intergroup contexts has been examined extensively as the source of the origins of prejudicial attitudes in childhood.

The developmental intergroup literature (see Killen & Rutland, 2011) shows that children justify certain attitudes and exclusion in the peer group based upon social conventions or group norms (e.g., “He can’t be in our track team because he is not fast enough if we are going to win”) because it is normative for your group to want to win the race, or they may reject peer group exclusion because of moral norms, such as equality and fairness (e.g., “We should include a boy in our girls’ game because it is fair to give him a chance to learn how to play, too”). This focus on social and moral reasoning about everyday situations is rarely seen in the social psychology literature on prejudice and interventions aimed at change the attitudes of adults seldom aims to alter how they reason about social exclusion and discrimination. The novel aspect of social domain theory (SDT) for the study of prejudice and intergroup attitudes is that it provides a way of examining an individual’s social and moral reasoning about everyday events, and to determine how social exclusion is justified and explained from a “normative” viewpoint. Social psychology research with adults would gain much from studying these different types of reasoning in the context of prejudice and discrimination.

More recently, in the past decade or 15 years, research has shown that, interestingly, children often justify social exclusion based on group membership using conventional criteria, not moral criteria (Killen & Rutland, 2011). This means that they justify excluding someone of the out-group because the group will not function well, or the tradition does not condone it. In contrast, as children have contact with members of out-groups then they begin to use moral reasons and criteria for stating what makes exclusion wrong and unfair (due to the harm experienced by another person). We expand on these lines of research in the next section.

Social Exclusion: Theory and Research

Social exclusion based upon prejudice and intergroup biases is a feature of the social world experienced by children from an early age and has important consequences on psychological development (Killen & Rutland, 2011). Once groups are formed in childhood, decisions are made about whom to include and whom to exclude. Developmental psychologists have proposed that peer exclusion may be a core facet of group dynamics that results from the basic processes underlying the evolution and maintenance of social groups (Bukowski & Sippola, 2001). While the occurrence of social exclusion is commonplace in early peer relationships, the consequences of peer rejection and exclusion have a significant impact on children's healthy social development. Experiences of exclusion based upon prejudice and intergroup biases can result in stress and anxiety; in more extreme cases, excluded children experience depression, social withdrawal, and disengagement (Horn, 2008; Newcomb, Bukowski, & Pattee, 1993; Rubin, Bukowski, & Parker, 2006).

Exclusion occurs at many levels, from dyadic to group, from interpersonal to intergroup, and reflects different types of intentions and goals. There are many forms and levels to social exclusion (Abrams, Hogg, & Marques, 2005). It can be based upon individual personality traits, namely, someone is excluded because they are overly aggressive (i.e., intrapersonal exclusion). Social exclusion may also result from poor social relationships and communication between individuals (i.e. interpersonal exclusion).

A substantial body of research in developmental psychology has been conducted on peer rejection from groups, and this type of social exclusion has been the focus of research in developmental psychology for some time (Hymel, Vaillancourt, McDougall, & Renshaw, 2002). Developmental research has principally focused on the individual social deficits that lead children to reject and be rejected (Rubin et al., 2006). Typically, this has involved an examination of the traits of individual children who have been identified as victims (e.g., fearful, socially anxious, and shy) and/or bullies (e.g., aggressive and lack sensitivity to social cues). This approach has tended to neglect the role of group membership and the intergroup context, however, in the process of social exclusion.

Individuals may be socially excluded from their own group due to group dynamics and concerns to maintain a positive and distinct group identity (i.e., intragroup exclusion). Social exclusion can also occur due to an individual's another group membership when a group excludes someone because they are from another social group (i.e., intergroup exclusion) (Killen et al., 2013; Killen & Rutland, 2011; Killen, Rutland, & Jampol, 2008). Key to these forms of social exclusion in childhood is the development of prejudice and negative attitudes, and it is important that interventions are identified that can change these attitudes.

Social psychologists (see Abrams & Christian, 2007; Abrams et al., 2005), in contrast to developmental psychology, have focused on these latter two forms of social exclusion but have often neglected the developmental origins of this type of social exclusion, focusing instead on its established presence in adulthood. Identifying different forms of exclusion in childhood is important, then, because intrapersonal and interpersonal exclusion focus on individual disposition (e.g., aggression or poor communication skills), whereas intragroup and intergroup exclusion focus on the role of the group, both in terms of group norms as well as group identity and morality (i.e., is this fair or just?). Indeed, the most distinguishing feature between these types of exclusion has to do with the focus on individual dispositions that lead to social rejection (i.e., inter- or intrapersonal exclusion) on the one hand, and the focus on the role of normative expectations, group identity, and morality in the emergence of prejudice and group-based biases (inter- or intragroup exclusion) on the other. Our approach in this article is concerned with group-based exclusion (i.e., intragroup and intergroup social exclusion).

Further, social exclusion is often characterized as a moral issue, that is, actions leading to ostracism, and ultimately genocide (Opatow, 1990; Staub, 1990). While we agree that many forms of social exclusion involve moral issues, many do not; thus, we theorize it as a multifaceted phenomenon rather than a strictly moral one. There are times when groups exclude members for reasons deemed purely legitimate, such as when universities exclude scholars at tenure who do not meet the expected criteria, or when a children's theater club excludes a child who is a bad actor and does not meet the criteria for theatrical talent.

In childhood, this distinction is understood in straightforward contexts. Moral reasoning is applied to social exclusion that results in victimization ("It's unfair") and nonmoral reasoning, such as conventional or psychological judgments, is applied to social exclusion when it is based upon agreed-upon criteria for inclusion. However, many social situations involve ambiguity and complexity, and in these situations, children's reasoning is often conflicted. This approach has implications for research with adults, and we will propose how this issue could be framed for social psychological research as well as developmental approaches.

Policy Implications

The policy implications of these different foci have been evident. Social psychologists have focused their research and policy recommendation on adults, especially the importance of intergroup contact (Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), and generally neglected developmental-focused interventions. This is the case despite the fact that research shows social exclusion based on negative intergroup attitudes develops early and can become relatively embedded in childhood. In contrast, developmental psychological research has taken two approaches to social exclusion. One line of research concentrates on child-focused

interventions and policies, from an individual deficit model and advocated policies and interventions aimed at improving children's social skills so that they experience less social exclusion. The findings from the developmental intergroup research literature provide a new lens on understanding how intergroup contact can be effective in changing attitudes, and reducing prejudice, which we discuss below. Our approach has been a developmental intergroup approach, in which we focus on group dynamics, prejudice, and bias as well as social reasoning about group norms, to understand the normative processes that lead to social exclusion early in development (Killen et al., 2013; Rutland et al., 2010).

An Integrated Developmental Intergroup Perspective on Attitude Change

In this article we draw on our perspective, integrating research within developmental and social psychology, on the development of attitudes, prejudice, and social exclusion in childhood (see for full details, Killen & Rutland, 2011; Rutland et al., 2010). We draw upon ideas central to key theories in developmental and social psychology, namely, SDT (Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 1983) and social identity theory (SIT: Tajfel & Turner, 1986), respectively.

Drawing on these theories has enabled the research program to move in new directions and inform social psychological research on how prejudice in adulthood is formed. We highlight how the development of prejudice and social exclusion is related to the emergence of important social-cognitive abilities (e.g., moral reasoning and social perspective taking) and understanding of group identity, group norms, and group dynamics. Consideration of these developmental processes is essential when implementing effective interventions to change attitudes. For example, we describe research (e.g., Cameron, Rutland, & Hossain, 2011; Feddes, Noack, & Rutland, 2009) showing what factors are significantly related to a reduction of intergroup biases, the promotion of cross-group friendships, and how this developmental approach could be applied to new research programs with young adults (e.g., the formation of ethnically diverse friendships in college residence halls). This research has shown that intergroup contact is related to changes in children's understanding of norms about cross-group friendships.

We are able to advocate with confidence the use of intergroup contact interventions at a young age because developmental research drawing on both SDT and SIT shows that children increasingly attend to group norms (i.e., conventional and moral) in middle childhood (e.g., Abrams, Rutland, & Cameron, 2003; Killen, Rutland, Abrams, Mulvey, & Hitti, 2013; Nesdale, Maass, Durkin, & Griffiths, 2005; Rutland, Cameron, Milne, & McGeorge, 2005). The developmental research informs social psychological accounts of how intergroup contact changes attitudes, and emphasizes the need for implementation of interventions to change attitudes well before adulthood.

Our perspective is founded upon three basic premises. First, as commonly understood in social psychology but less so in developmental psychology, social exclusion is a group-based phenomenon. Social psychologists know this to be true in adulthood, but it is also true in childhood since children are aware of social categories from an early age and also soon develop a keen understanding of group life. Second, children actively construal the intergroup context. They start to develop a sophisticated appreciation of groups and how they function from an early age and this is driven by important social cognitive changes that occur in childhood and adolescence. Third, children not only begin to understand group life, they also develop the ability to reason about the intergroup context by coordinating in a sophisticated manner moral and group-based judgments and evaluations. Each of these premises need to be considered when designing and implementing interventions to challenge social exclusion and prejudice in childhood and adolescence. Below we will outline each of these three tenets.

Social Exclusion as a Group-Phenomenon

In the past 15 years, research has focused on children's social exclusion and prejudice when an intergroup context exists and opposing group identities are salient; for example, when children living in ethnically heterogeneous communities are excluded from a multiethnic peer group because of their ethnic-group membership. Recent research shows that from middle childhood, group identity and group dynamics becomes a powerful and salient dimension when children evaluate the legitimacy of social exclusion and prejudice in intergroup contexts (see Abrams & Rutland, 2008; Killen & Rutland, 2011; Levy & Killen, 2008).

To understand better how group identity and group dynamics might impact children's reasoning, and particularly to expand the role of group identification with the excluded or excluder, we draw from theories in social psychology to investigate the intersection of social reasoning and group dynamics. In particular, we focus on SIT, which is an account of adult behavior but does not account for developmental change across the lifespan, including childhood and adulthood. SIT has argued that knowing you belong to a social group is related to the expression of prejudice and that relationships between social groups within any context are important in making certain social group memberships salient. Research supporting SIT has shown that bias and discrimination tend to be elevated to the extent that adults identify (i.e., both in terms of self-categorization and feeling an emotional attachment) with an exclusive in-group (Abrams & Hogg, 2001; Brewer & Brown, 1998; Brown & Gaertner, 2001).

Recent developmental studies have also found that children showing higher identification with their ethnic group tend to show stronger preferences for their ethnic group over other groups, and favor children within their group that show loyalty to the group (Abrams et al., 2003; Bennett, Lyons, Sani, & Barrett, 1998;

Pfeifer et al., 2007). Developmental research has also shown that the promotion of a common inclusive group identity (e.g., a shared nationality or school identity) rather than a singular exclusive group identity (e.g., only identification with being either an ethnic majority or minority) can reduce children's bias against those from another ethnic group (see Cameron & Rutland, 2008). Later in this article we will discuss further how the later research can inform attempts to encourage positive attitudes toward other groups.

Social-Cognitive Development

SIT has shown us the importance of group identity and the intergroup context when trying to understand and challenge social exclusion based on biases and prejudice. Nonetheless, on its own, SIT is not enough to provide a comprehensive developmental account of social exclusion and prejudice. What is missing is the question of origins: how does prejudice develop? Nor does SIT consider the roles played by developing social cognition, social knowledge, and moral reasoning as a contributor to affiliations with groups, group identity, and the formation of out-group attitudes. Developmental psychologists, working in the tradition of SIT, have considered how the influence of children's group identities is also dependent on how they actively construe their understanding of the intergroup context using their social-cognitive abilities and social knowledge (Abrams & Rutland, 2008; Nesdale, 2013; Rutland et al., 2005, 2010; Verkuyten & De Wolf, 2007). A focus on social-cognitive skills and social knowledge would be beneficial for interventions aimed at changing attitudes not just in childhood but also in adulthood.

For example, Nesdale and colleagues (Nesdale, 2007, 2013; Nesdale et al., 2005) have shown that children do not automatically show prejudice toward others from groups simply because they come from a different group. Rather, children demonstrate social acumen by using their social knowledge and social-cognitive abilities to continually monitor group norms and their social interactions with other children. Whether they show out-group prejudice or not will depend in part on the strength of their identification with their group, how much they feel their group is being threatened, and if they understand and believe that showing such prejudice is consistent with the expectation of their group (i.e., the in-group norm). This latter point concerning group norms is particularly relevant when considering interventions to challenge social exclusion since research suggests that children are more likely to show prejudice and socially exclude if they think their own group condones such actions and they are seen as typical group behavior (Nesdale et al., 2005; Rutland et al., 2005).

Research by Rutland and colleagues (Rutland et al., 2005) has also shown that the development of social-cognitive abilities influences whether individuals show intergroup biases toward others from different groups. This, too, emphasizes how attitude development is a process of active construction rather than simple

“top down” socialization or an automatic implicit cognitive or emotional process. For example, recent research suggests that group norms influence children’s developing ability to control their expressions of prejudice (FitzRoy & Rutland, 2010; Rutland et al., 2005). Developing this ability involves children acquiring social knowledge and social-cognitive abilities, in particular, the ability to understand other people’s mental states and their attitudes or beliefs about social relationships (see Abrams & Rutland, 2008; Abrams, Rutland, Pelletier, & Ferrell, 2009; Killen et al., 2008), which SDT has identified as reflecting psychological domain considerations (Killen et al., 2013). The control of explicit ethnic bias by attending to norms held at a societal level or norms of one’s group that condemn prejudice is likely to involve recursive reasoning about mental states, since the child is concerned about the way he or she is seen in the mind of others.

Further, this body of research indicates that from approximately 7 years of age children develop an understanding of other people’s minds and emotions that arise in *social relationships*. This in part explains why older children are better able than younger children to anticipate group members’ perspectives on expressing prejudice toward other groups or peers within their own group (Abrams et al., 2003; Abrams, Rutland, Ferrell, & Pelletier, 2008; Abrams et al., 2009). Research employing the Developmental Subjective Group Dynamics (DSGD) model (Abrams & Rutland, 2008) reveals that the development of exclusion judgments between peers within groups from middle childhood is sensitive to the normative aspects of the group context (i.e., what is acceptable behavior for peers from a child’s own group and another group?). Thus, increasing children’s *accountability* makes the norms of a child’s own group more salient. The DSGD model predicts that this should encourage self-presentational concerns among children and variations in their attitudes toward other within their group who contravene the group’s norms. In support of this, research in a noncompetitive summer school context has found that increased accountability results in more peer exclusion within groups (Abrams, Rutland, Cameron, & Ferrell, 2007).

Social and Moral Reasoning

Research by Killen and colleagues (Killen, 2007; Killen & Stangor, 2001) has shown that the type of social reasoning that individuals’ use is related to their evaluations of exclusion based on group membership. For example, children and adolescents who condone friendship exclusion based on gender or race will use personal reasoning, citing friendship as a personal, not a moral decision (e.g., “You can be friends with whoever you want—it’s your choice” (Killen, Lee-Kim, McGlothlin, & Stangor, 2002)). In contrast, when peer group exclusion is condoned based on gender or race, individuals use group functioning reasoning (“If the boys’ music club excludes a girl it’s probably because she doesn’t have good CDs or know much about music”). While many children and adolescents

use moral reasoning to reject exclusion (“It’s unfair and why would you treat someone like that?”), the use of nonmoral reasoning is pervasive. With age, children use more group functioning reasoning, in particular, to justify exclusion.

In addition, children and adolescents are more likely to use moral reasoning to reject exclusion in straightforward situations than ones that are complex or ambiguous. This latter finding has been shown with children as young as 3 and 4 years of age, and reflects patterns of responses similar to those reported by Dovidio and Gaertner (1998) who found that stereotypes are activated more quickly and more often in complex and ambiguous situations. What is novel in the developmental research is that this finding is not just the presence of stereotypes in complex situations but also the use of social conventional reasoning to explain decisions to exclude others. Further, no research with adults has related the use of moral reasoning with cross-group friendships and evaluations of exclusion.

In recent years we have developed a social reasoning developmental model to the study of social exclusion and prejudice in children, which recognizes that children do not automatically show biases and exclude others simply because they are from different groups (Killen & Rutland, 2011; Rutland et al., 2010). Instead, we assert that children actively reason about the social world and construe the intergroup context considering issues of group identity, group norms, and morality. Our perspective addresses the apparent contradiction between the early onset of *both* prejudice and morality in childhood by showing that children simultaneously develop the ability to reason about the social world while considering notions of group identity, social-conventional norms, and morality (Hitti, Mulvey, Rutland, & Killen, 2013; Killen et al., 2013).

We contend that how children develop moral judgment, form group identities, and understand group dynamics contributes to their attitudes about excluding others. These decisions can then have negative outcomes for social relationships as well as social development more generally. The basic conflict between moral orientations and prejudicial attitudes that emerges in development is realized in situations involving everyday social inclusion and exclusion. Insights into the use of moral judgments or prejudice in *actual* social decision making and interaction can be gained by studying why children socially include or exclude peers. This is important because the first experiences of exclusion from social groups occur early in childhood, especially during peer interactions in the home or school context.

These data bear directly on adult research on intergroup attitudes about social exclusion. Yet, few studies with adults have examined the relationship between group identity and social reasoning about social exclusion based on group membership as well as group norms. Different forms of reasoning can be revealing about how complex issues are interpreted. Twenty-five years ago, all-male clubs were a common tradition for companies. The reasoning supporting the custom was conventional (“It’s always been done that way”). As more women became CEOs the forms of reasoning began to shift, citing moral and personal reasons (“It may be

unfair but that's the choice made by the members of the club"). Eventually moral reasoning became more frequent and the rationale for continuing the traditions of gender exclusion eroded. Examining forms of reasoning provides an understanding of the some of the factors that may perpetuate exclusionary practices.

Knowing the conditions in which children are more likely to use moral reasoning to reject intergroup exclusion and prejudice, in contrast to the use of social conventional or group-based reasoning to justify exclusion and prejudice, is important for creating effective intervention programs. It should help practitioners identify under what conditions children and adolescents are likely to be influenced by strategies that promote moral reasoning over social-conventional or group-based reasoning.

Intergroup Contact: Reducing Prejudice in Childhood

Interventions to tackle childhood exclusion and prejudice are often implemented by practitioners without any reference to developmental and social psychology research and are typically not systematically evaluated. For example, role playing or empathy training is a technique widely used by educational practitioners (Weiner & Wright, 1973). The child has to "walk in the shoes" of the other stigmatized child and feel firsthand what it is like to be discriminated against. This approach has received little empirical attention, however, and the limited research conducted suggests it does not significantly change children's empathy or attitudes that may underlie social exclusion (see Aboud & Levy, 2000).

In the remainder of this article we will outline intergroup contact interventions, and present research that demonstrates that these interventions are effective by changing how children categorize the intergroup situation, making shared group identities salient, promoting inclusive group norms, and moral reasoning. These interventions are founded on the research and theory described above, which has emerged in recent years from both developmental and social psychology, and show that theory-based research founded on evidence can change children's attitudes (e.g., Brenick & Killen, 2014; Cameron & Rutland, 2008; Turner, Voci, & Hewstone, 2007).

Intergroup Contact Theory and Development Research

Contact, according to Allport (1954), means individuals from one group (e.g., in-group) meeting and interacting with others from a different group (e.g., out-group). Under optimal conditions this form of contact serves to reduce prejudice and bias. Contact provides stereotype disconfirming information resulting in more positive attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors toward this group (Allport, 1954). A significant body of research now exists which has investigated the contact hypothesis among children by seeing whether contact between different social groups under

certain conditions reduces childhood prejudice (see Aboud, 2005; Cameron & Rutland, 2008).

Overall, this research has supported the “contact hypothesis,” as shown by a recent meta-analysis of studies examining the influence of contact on children’s intergroup attitudes which found that contact between children of different groups corresponds with less prejudice (Tropp & Prenovost, 2008). Most studies included in this analysis examined children’s ethnic or racial attitudes. There is evidence that intergroup contact has a significant effect on children’s ethnic or racial attitudes. There is less research into how contact changes children’s attitudes in relation to other categories (e.g., gender, nationality, disability, or religion) and more research is necessary to substantiate how intergroup contact is effective. Overall, cross-group contact has been incorporated successfully into a number of prejudice reduction interventions in the form of cooperative learning groups, bilingual education, and racially integrated schooling, and vicarious contact through television and fictional stories (e.g., Graves, 1999; Maras & Brown, 1996, 2000; Slavin, 1995; Wright & Tropp, 2005).

The developmental research into the effectiveness of intergroup contact has both informed social psychology accounts of how contact changes attitudes and, importantly, shown that by middle childhood individuals possess the necessary social-cognitive and reasoning skills to be influenced by intergroup contact interventions. For example, research with children has informed social psychology theory by showing that intergroup contact changes attitudes by altering how individuals perceive the norms of their group and how they construe the social categories within the contact setting (e.g., Cameron, Rutland, Brown, & Douch, 2006; Feddes et al., 2009). Developmental research has also demonstrated that intergroup contact can change attitudes in middle childhood because at this age individuals have the necessary understanding of group norms and complexity of social-moral reasoning (e.g., Cameron et al., 2011; Crystal, Killen, & Ruck, 2008).

The use of moral reasoning about exclusion and inclusion is related to “cross-group” friendships and interactions. This reasoning is achieved through encouraging children and adolescents to reject stereotypic expectations about others (due to their understanding that their friendship peers do not hold the negative qualities promoted in societal stereotypic images). For example, Crystal and colleagues assessed the level of interracial contact in the neighborhood together with the existence of cross-race friendships among 9- to 15-year-old racial majority and racial minority American children (Crystal et al., 2008). These children and adolescents were shown scenarios depicting racial-based exclusion in cross-race relationships and asked to attribute a motive to the protagonist that did the excluding, judge the wrongfulness of the exclusion decision, and estimate the frequency of the type of exclusion observed among their peers. Crystal et al. (2008) found that children with higher levels of intergroup contact gave higher ratings of wrongfulness of exclusion and lower frequency estimations of race-based exclusion than did

children reporting lower levels of contact. In addition, generally children with high contact were less likely than children with low contact to perceive the social exclusion as driven by nonracial reasons. These findings suggest that interracial contact interventions will influence not only children's ethnic attitudes but also their social reasoning about race-based exclusion.

The role of cross-race friendships in the use of stereotypes to explain interracial discomfort was also examined in a recent study (Killen, Kelly, Richardson, Crystal, & Ruck, 2010). European-American participants at 4th, 7th, and 10th grades attending high and low ethnically diverse public schools (with high and low self-reports of cross-race friendships, respectively) evaluated interracial peer encounters. Participants from high diversity schools were less likely to use stereotypes to explain racial discomfort and were more likely to view racial exclusion as morally wrong compared to participants in low diversity schools. Examples of stereotypic statements to explain interracial exclusion were: "He may not want to have lunch with him because they probably don't have the same interests because they're different looking" or "She isn't going to date him because when you're different skin color you just act differently." Children and adolescents who attended low diverse schools were more likely to use such statements, and this most reflected their lack of contact with peers of different ethnic backgrounds.

This body of research demonstrates that intergroup contact interventions within the schools can be important in promoting moral reasoning about social exclusion which is known to result in positive attitudes toward different racial groups. Positive intergroup contact, when facilitated in schools, is also likely to encourage children and adolescents to challenge negative societal attitudes about cross-race friendships and societal expectations about race-based exclusion.

Cross-Group Friendships

Close and personal cross-group friendships, according to the intergroup contact research, are especially effective at reducing prejudice and negative social exclusion (Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). This type of contact involves more than occasional contact (e.g., buying something from a minority group shopkeeper), instead cross-group friendships are intimate personal relationships in which individuals would share personal information about one another and openly share their emotions and thoughts. Cross-group friendships are related to less intergroup bias among children and positive interethnic attitudes predict a decrease in children's preference for same-ethnic friendships (Rutland, Cameron, Bennett, & Ferrell, 2005; Schofield, 1995).

Overall developmental research suggests that cross-group friendships are a particularly effective means to challenge negative group-based social exclusion in children (Tropp & Prenovost, 2008). However, a strong conclusion that policy and practice should focus on promoting cross-group friendship would be premature

since typically studies on the association between cross-group friendships and children's intergroup attitudes have relied on cross-sectional or correlational designs. This involves researchers measuring children's reported level of contact at one moment in time and examining whether, for example, children with high contact show the least intergroup bias. Such designs do not allow for a convincing test of directional hypotheses (Brown & Hewstone, 2005). These designs make it difficult to determine whether having cross-group friendships result in more positive attitudes toward other groups or, if in fact children's positive attitudes to these groups mean they pursue more intergroup contact and cross-group friends. It is clear that longitudinal studies are needed to provide more confidence in the causal relationship between cross-group friendships and more positive attitudes. Longitudinal designs will also be able to show with more certainty that children's positive attitudes are related to more cross-group friendships.

An important demonstration of intergroup contact using a longitudinal design was conducted by Feddes and colleagues who examined longitudinal cross-group friendship (or direct contact) effects on out-group attitudes (Feddes et al., 2009). This study included German (i.e., majority status) and Turkish (i.e., minority status) children age 7–11 years in ethnically nonmixed elementary schools at the beginning and end of the German school year. Over a 7-month period, Feddes et al. (2009) asked children to complete a questionnaire at two time points. This questionnaire measured the ethnicity of the children's best friends and their ethnic intergroup attitudes. It was found that among majority status German children, but not minority status Turkish children, more cross-group friendships predicted over time positive out-group evaluations over time. The original element of this study was that it showed the longitudinal causal direction between greater direct contact (i.e., more cross-group friendships) and more positive out-group attitudes among ethnic majority children. This association was in part mediated by perceived social norms about cross-ethnic friendship relations. This meant that the experience of direct contact partly made children's attitudes more positive by making them think that cross-ethnic friendships are more acceptable and to be encouraged by both groups.

This finding shows that direct contact is effective because it can change how children construe the intergroup context. It makes children think that cross-group friendships are relatively normal and tolerable within their group and their immediate environment. This research shows that any attempt to understand and eliminate social exclusion in children's lives by challenging their negative attitudes needs to consider group identity and norms. The findings are in line with other studies which have shown that in-group and out-group norms about having cross-ethnic friendships are influenced by intergroup contact and in turn result in more positive attitudes toward other groups (Pettigrew, 1998).

Research has also shown that self-disclosure (i.e., sharing intimate details with another person) in children's interethnic friendships, in which the distinctions

between different self- and different groups are blurred, leads to more positive intergroup attitudes through increasing empathy and intergroup trust (Turner et al., 2007). This might be why cross-group friendships are especially important for changing intergroup attitudes. It is the case that mere contact between groups, just attending ethnically mixed schools or youth clubs, may not provide the opportunity for those children involved to form close friendships and develop empathy and intergroup trust, or engage in self-disclosure (Pettigrew, 1998). Contact is effective when it changes how children construe the categories (self, my group, other groups) within the intergroup context so similarities are emphasized and differences minimized.

The adult sanctioning of mutual respect and multiculturalism in the study by Feddes et al. (2009) was evident in the frequent opportunities for positive interethnic contact over a prolonged time which were supported by the authorities while equal status was emphasized (e.g., through a recognition of the language by offering Turkish language courses). These conditions closely reflect Allport's (1954) optimal contact conditions, which should both allow the formation of cross-ethnic friendships and positive change in intergroup attitudes. Authority support for cross-group contact is very important because it solidifies group norms of social inclusion within the intergroup context and encourages children to change how they construe their social environment.

How Can We Promote Cross-Group Friendships?

The longitudinal research described above suggests that cross-group friendships are important in the process of reducing prejudice and challenging negative attitudes that feed social exclusion in childhood. This then begs a question. What factors contribute to the formation of friendship in childhood? Developmental research has shown that children choose friendships based on a number of dimensions, including perceptions of similarity, shared interests, and psychological compatibility (Rubin et al., 2006). Thus, providing a basis for children from different racial and ethnic backgrounds to share interests in childhood, identify areas of similarity, and develop psychological compatibility could create a foundation for spontaneously having cross-race friends, prior to the onset of group identity and prejudicial attitudes (Killen et al., 2013). Thus, the implications for policy are clear. Intervention programs need to focus on the conditions for fostering, developing, and encouraging intergroup friendships in childhood.

Research has examined why children seem to prefer same over cross-ethnic friendships and what attitudes predict children's preference for same over ethnic cross-ethnic friendships (Jugert, Noack, & Rutland, 2011). Jugert and colleagues measured children's friendships in ethnically heterogeneous secondary schools over the course of the first school-year for German and Turkish children. They found that children who held positive ethnic intergroup attitudes, desired contact

with the ethnic out-group and thought their group held a positive norm about cross-ethnic friendships at the beginning of their first school year showed a lower preference for same-ethnic friendship at the end of the school year. Importantly, trends in both German and Turkish children's ethnic friendship preferences were linked to their intergroup attitudes and understanding of group norms about friendship; while intergroup contact conditions were only predictive of German children's ethnic friendship preferences.

These findings show that interventions aimed at promoting positive ethnic attitudes and inclusive group norms, that encourage openness to interacting with the ethnic out-group, are likely to result in cross-ethnic friendships and so decrease examples of social exclusion. Jugert and colleagues (Jugert et al., 2011) also found German children who perceived that Allport's optimal conditions for intergroup contact were improving over time showed less preference for same-ethnic friendships. These results indicate that it is problematic to merely assume that perceived contact conditions are stable both over time and interindividually and have a uniform effect on all children's friendship choices (Molina, Wittig, & Giang, 2004). This, again, raises the point that intergroup contact may be less effective in promoting social inclusion and positive intergroup attitudes among minority status children.

Intergroup Contact and Minority Status Children

Research has shown that intergroup contact is construed differently by majority and minority ethnic groups, and cross-group friendships typically only reduce the prejudice of majority group children. This reflects a larger, complex issue about the conditions under which intergroup contact is effective (see Dixon, Levine, Reicher, & Durrheim, 2012; Killen, Mulvey, Hitti, & Rutland, 2012). For example, Feddes et al. (2009) found that more cross-group friendships were not related over time to more positive out-group evaluations among the minority status Turkish children. This finding is in line with in recent meta-analyses which have included more than 500 studies investigating contact effects among children, adolescents, and adults (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Tropp & Prenovost, 2008). These analyses have found the link between intergroup contact and reduced prejudice was significantly weaker for members of minority status group compared to members of majority status groups. Studies using correlational designs have also only shown positive associations between majority and not minority status children's cross-ethnic friendships and intergroup attitudes (Aboud, Mendelson, & Purdy, 2003; Turner et al., 2007).

Similarly, Aboud et al. (2003) showed a positive cross-sectional correlation between cross-ethnic friendship and intergroup attitudes among majority, but not minority, status children. This study was conducted among ethnic majority (e.g., White Canadian) and minority status (e.g., Black Caribbean) children from grades

1–6 in a multiracial English-language elementary school in Montreal. Aboud and colleagues also showed that for ethnic majority status children, positive racial attitudes were significantly correlated to higher numbers of cross-race exclusion friendships and, in particular, high-quality cross-race friendships were linked with less racial bias. In contrast, no association between cross-race friendships and more positive racial attitudes was shown among Black Caribbean children.

It is possible that among ethnic minority status children Allport's optimal contact conditions are being interpreted differently compared to majority status children. If so, then this would explain the failure to find a relationship between attitudes and intergroup contact among minority status children (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005; Tropp & Prenovost, 2008). It would suggest that minority status group members may be less persuaded as to the extent to which optimal conditions are met compared to majority group members. Namely, minority status children are not perceiving that the groups hold equal status, share a common identity, or are engaging in cooperation rather than competition during contact. Children from ethnic minority groups may also think that the intergroup contact they experience is not fully supported and defended by authority figures and policies in significant institutions (e.g., school, community organizations). As an example, in a recent study, the perception of fair treatment by authority figures in schools was related to students' evaluations of interracial exclusion (Crystal, Killen, & Ruck, 2010). Children from ethnic majority groups, in contrast, may be more likely to hold a different view and believe that when intergroup contact occurs then optimal conditions exist. This suggests that interventions to address negative social exclusion based upon biases and prejudices need to ensure that both majority and minority status children have a favorable view of the conditions under which intergroup contact occurs.

A key condition for effective intergroup contact, according to Allport (1954), is the perception of equal status between the different social groups involved in the contact. It is possible that the lack of contact effects for ethnic minority status children might also reflect the nonexistence of this condition. This is because the ethnic minority status group is well aware of their group's lower status in many cultures (Jones et al., 1984) and therefore are continuously aware of being a possible victim of prejudice (Crocker, Major, & Steele, 1998). Research shows from a young age children are aware of social status differences and this affects their intergroup attitudes (Nesdale & Flesser, 2001). Studies by Verkuyten and colleagues (2001) have also found children are conscious of high levels of social exclusion among children from ethnic minority groups. These studies suggest even children from minority status groups attend to status differences in every intergroup contact, which may help explain weak contact effects among this population.

It is important to consider which group benefits from intergroup contact opportunities. In the case of ethnicity, for example, ethnic minority students are also the numeric minority which means that they have multiple opportunities for

contact, both in and outside of the school context. Even though contact alone is not enough to reduce bias (conditions have to be met such as cross-group friendship), when there is very little contact (such as for majority students in predominantly majority schools), cross-group friendship is almost nonexistent. When ethnic minority students are the numeric majority, such as in sections of New York City, for example, intergroup contact has been shown to reduce bias among ethnic minority students (Ruck et al., 2011). It should, therefore, be noted that policies aimed at addressing intergroup social exclusion, which should challenge the discrimination of majority status and powerful groups, must be enacted alongside other policies that challenge social inequality directly. Intergroup contact may not promote positive attitudes among minority status groups in some contexts but policies aimed at reducing social inequality may be effective.

Reducing Implicit Biases

Developmental psychology research shows that children have implicit biases from an early age (Baron & Banaji, 2006; Cvencek, Greenwald, & Meltzoff, 2011; Rutland et al., 2005). This prompts the question, while intergroup contact seems to reduce majority status children's explicit prejudice, can it also decrease these children's implicit biases? Recent research suggests that implicit biases can be reduced by intervening, especially by exposure children to out-groups in the form of intergroup contact. For example, Turner et al. (2007) studied the attitudes of White majority status 8- to 11-year-old children, living in ethnically nondiverse areas, toward the South-East Asian British ethnic minority status group (e.g., individuals of Indian, Pakistani, or Bangladeshi ethnic origin) in the United Kingdom. Turner and colleagues found White British children who reported more cross-ethnic friendships with South-East Asian British children also showed more positive implicit out-group attitudes measured using a version of the Implicit Association Task (IAT; Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998).

Implicit biases appear early in childhood but are nonetheless not always immune to contextual influences, since it is possible that frequent quality contact with an out-group during the early part of life (i.e., before 8 years of age) might hinder the formation of implicit biases (Cunningham, Preacher, & Banaji, 2001). Intergroup contacts arguably act to prevent the development of negative associations involving the out-group that will be highlighted by the IAT. Overall, research on implicit biases suggests that intergroup contact interventions and policies can challenge implicit biases that emerge in childhood, but the research with adult suggests that such biases are often difficult to reduce once established (Greenwald et al., 2002). The implication here is that interventions to reduce implicit biases, and the associated discrimination and social exclusion that might result need to be introduced early in childhood if they are going to be most effective.

Other studies have shown that intergroup contact experienced by children can reduce implicit biases. This research has used indirect measures of attribution biases among children that are different from the implicit reaction-time measures described above (e.g., the IAT). For example, McGlothlin and colleagues, drawing on previous methodologies (Lawrence, 1991; Sagar & Schofield, 1980), used the ambiguous situations task to determine whether children used race to attribute intentions when judging typical everyday peer encounters (Margie, Killen, Sinno, & McGlothlin, 2005; McGlothlin & Killen, 2005, 2006). As an indirect assessment of intergroup attitudes the child is not told explicitly about race but only asked to describe what might be occurring in interracial social situations. Biases would be present if different interpretations of the same act performed by either a White character or a Black character were given by the children. These indirect and subtle biases have the potential to affect children's representations of situations and taint interracial relationships (Aboud et al., 2003). For example, if an African American child is described by a European American child as less helpful and more aggressive than a European American child when showing exactly same behavior then it is less likely that the African American child will be befriended.

Research conducted by McGlothlin and Killen (2006), using the ambiguous situations methodology, showed racial bias was revealed by European American children in nonmixed schools. In contrast, they found European American children at the same age, and in the same school district, but enrolled in ethnically mixed schools did not attribute more positive intentions to the in-group than the out-group. Among this group, there was evidence that race was not used to attribute negative intentions. Overall, developmental research suggests that intergroup contact can reduce both implicit and explicit forms of social exclusion in the form of biases and prejudices shown by children.

Extended Intergroup Contact in Childhood

The evidence we have covered so far suggests that direct intergroup contact, especially cross-group friendships, can reduce both explicit and implicit biases in favor of one group over another. Nonetheless, research also shows that cross-ethnic friendships compared to same-ethnic friendships, are pretty uncommon, less stable and decline with age (Kao & Joyner, 2004; Schneider, Dixon, & Udvari, 2007). It is encouraging, with such segregation, to find evidence that merely being aware of cross-ethnic friendships between members of one's own group and another group can also reduce prejudice (Liebkind & McAlister, 1999; Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, & Ropp, 1997). This is known as the "extended contact" effect. This involves intergroup attitudes becoming more positive by just hearing that a member of their group has a friendship with a child from a different social group. This type of indirect or extended contact means the child is experiencing

intergroup contact via knowing their group is spreading its boundaries to connect with the out-group.

Research suggests that extended contact can help address prejudice in both adolescents (Liebkind & McAlister, 1999) and young children (Cameron & Rutland, 2008). For example, in a series of studies Cameron and colleagues developed and tested extended contact interventions for children as young as 5 years (see Cameron & Rutland, 2008). Children were shown to intergroup friendships through reading illustrated stories that portrayed friendships between in-group and out-group members (e.g., White English children and non-White refugee children). It was shown that the extended contact intervention was effective in improving attitudes toward out-groups among 5–11 years old children and across a variety of stigmatized out-groups, including the disabled, non-White refugees and South-East Asian British.

A study by Cameron et al. (2006) manipulated what level of social categorization was salient using different models of story reading based upon extended intergroup contact. This study investigated majority status White English children's attitudes toward Black refugees. The design of this study was to vary whether the social categories of those in the stories were mentioned (or not) and whether individual characteristics were emphasized (i.e., decategorization approach). The decategorization approach (Brewer & Miller, 1984) contends that in order for positive attitude change to occur during cross-group contact, the out-group member should not be seen as being a member of the out-group but instead should be treated as an individual. Thus, group boundaries will become immaterial and people will be treated as individuals rather than as group members. In other stories the superordinate (i.e., school) category membership of the story characters was stressed (i.e., common in-group identity approach). Gaertner and Dovidio (2000) developed this approach when they recommended that contact is most effective with the creation of a common in-group that includes the in-group (e.g., White English) and former out-group members (e.g., Black refugees) in one superordinate category (e.g., school). The result should be that more positive attitudes toward in-group members should then be extended to new in-group members, namely, the previous out-group members.

Finally, the protagonists' subgroup identities as White English and refugees were salient in other stories while also underlining their common school identity (i.e., dual identity approach). This method is an amalgamation of the intergroup and the common in-group approach. The intergroup approach involved children being encouraged to focus on whether the children in the stories was disabled or not, in addition to their individual traits (Brown & Hewstone, 2005). The key here was to ensure the children thought those in the stories were typical and reflective of others from their social category (i.e., disabled), so making it hard for the children in the story to be subtyped (i.e., "she is friendly but is not like all other disabled children"). The dual identity approach contends that it

is possible for individuals to hold both the original in-group identity and the common in-group identity simultaneously. Thus, the goal of the dual identity approach is to invoke a superordinate identity while encouraging the maintenance of its constituent subgroup identities. The dual identity approach promotes generalization through the maintenance of subgroup salience.

Children who experienced the extended contact stories showed significantly more positive attitudes toward refugees compared to the children in the control group who read no stories. In addition, the study found that the dual identity extended contact was significantly better at promoting positive attitudes than the other forms of extended contact. These findings show the value of encouraging a common in-group identity when trying to reduce children's prejudice, and are also fitting with the notion that children are more likely to generalize a positive out-group attitude from the contact situation to the whole out-group when subgroup categories remain salient. Cameron and colleagues also showed that extended contact works by changing children's cognitive representations of social relations; in this way the self begins to treat in-group members, to some extent, like the self. When an in-group member, and thus part of the self, has an out-group close friendship, that person and the out-group itself are seen positively as part of the self.

More recent research (Cameron et al., 2011) among children suggests that extended contact stories, and especially those involving friendships improve intergroup attitudes making children think that others like them think intergroup friendships are legitimate and normal (i.e., it changes the norm the children think their group has about having cross-group friendships). This is understandable since we described research earlier in this article which showed that in middle childhood children are sensitive to group norms for intergroup relations, what they should and should not do to "fit" in with the group. Research indicates that children's perceived group norms about the appropriateness of intergroup friendships may be a major barrier to formation of friendships between children from different groups. For example, Aboud and Sankar (2007) found that when children thought about who to be friends with they were worried about what their in-group peers would think about an out-group friend, and whether they would get along with them. The study by Cameron and colleagues, however, suggests that having positive extended contact changes the group norms for cross-group friendships, thereby making general attitudes more positive. The implication here is that extended contact interventions, based upon story reading in schools, may be an effective means to challenge in-group norms against having cross-group friendships, and so, advance more positive intergroup attitudes.

These findings are also important since they suggest that extended contact interventions are likely to promote actual direct contact and the formation of friendships. This is critical since recent studies conducted on children have shown that direct intergroup contact is relatively more effective in promoting positive

attitudes and reducing exclusion than indirect contact (Cameron et al., 2011; Feddes et al., 2009). Crucially, these findings indicate that extended contact should not be seen as a replacement or alternative to direct contact, rather these types of interventions aimed at reducing negative social exclusion should be seen as forerunners to real direct contact; which are important since they create the right social and psychological climate to promote direct contact (e.g., reduced anxiety, norms that condone cross-group friendships).

Mass Media and School-Based Interventions

The extended contact studies described above concentrated on relatively small-scale interventions based on story reading. This leaves open a question: will extended contact approach prove successful when challenging negative social exclusion on a larger scale and especially in a more hostile intergroup context in which groups are often in conflict and hold very negative stereotypes?

Mass Media Interventions

A focus on broad-based media interventions used throughout the world might help answer this question. Television serves as a source of information about the social world to children. This is evident in the report from Bar-Tal and Teichman (2005) that 87% of preschool aged, Israeli-Jewish children report learning about Arabs through television programming. Television may serve as a source of stereotypic information and result in social exclusion, nonetheless high quality programming can also work to combat such stereotypic information and promote social inclusion through the extended contact. Research suggests that educational television not only promotes cognitive skill development but also promotes moral development and prosocial behaviors including prejudice reduction (see Fisch, 2004). Sesame Workshop in the Middle-East produces a major broadcast media working with children in Israel, Gaza, and the West Bank to promote tolerance and reduce negative stereotypes. Overall, research conducted in the Middle-East has demonstrated that young children have negative stereotypes about the out-group, and that messages throughout the media strengthen negative attributes about the out-group (Bar-Tal & Teichman, 2005; Brenick et al., 2010; Teichman & Zafirir, 2003). Sesame Workshop has the clear goal to collaborate with local broadcasters in conflict regions of the world to promote tolerance and mutual respect in young children (Cole, Labin, & del Rocio Galarza, 2008). Shara'a Simsim/Rechov Sumsum is a program co-produced with Israeli and Palestinian children's media providers alongside Sesame Workshop, which included bilingual episodes and cross-over segments in which characters from Shara'a Simsim (the Palestinian street) visited characters on the Israeli street (Rechov Sumsum) and vice versa.

This broadcast involved characters from the Palestinian and Israeli communities experiencing positive interaction and forming friendships. This is a form of extended contact since children from each side of the conflict in the Middle-East are learning of someone from their group having a positive friendship (i.e., holding hands, laughing, and playing games together) with someone from the other group. These broadcasts also highlighted the religious and ethnic traditions of each respective society, illustrating such core themes as acceptance, friendship, and the appreciation of similarities and differences.

Brenick et al. (2007) were asked to evaluate the effectiveness of viewing the show in intergroup attitudes in very young children (ages 3–6). Overall the findings of research into the programs showed that children from four cultural groups (Jewish in Israel, Arab in Israel, Arabs in Ramallah, and Arabs in Jordan) had a very positive response to viewing of selected Sesame Stories programs regularly over a period of several weeks. The results also revealed that children understood the moral themes embedded in the stories. Such that when they were presented with moral reasoning problems (e.g., exclusion from a group based on gender or cultural membership) after exposure to Sesame Stories, a majority of children responded with positive or inclusive moral explanations (see Brenick et al., 2007). In addition, the interviews provided basic developmental information regarding how young children in the Middle-East judge social conflict scenarios, particularly those that involve exclusion of children based on gender, cultural membership, and stereotypes.

These findings indicate that media intervention in the form of television shows focused on young children can have positive outcomes and can challenge negative social exclusion. Indeed, research indicates that Sesame Street programming is an effective media intervention, in general, due to the fact that it allows children to identify with the characters by age, gender, and ethnicity. It also offers familiar, child-relevant content, such as dealing with situations they would face in their everyday lives (Fisch & Truglio, 2001), as well as in this particular situation, because it is informed by research from developmental psychology and intergroup relations. In Rechov Sumsum/Shara'a Simsim, exchanges and interactions between peers and "equals" (e.g., Muppets and children) serve to provide key information about moral exchanges.

Research also suggests that similar effects from broadcast media interventions are seen with Macedonian, Albanian, Roma, and Turkish children who all showed increases in positive attitudes toward members of their own and the other group(s) after viewing *Nashe Maalo* (Our Neighborhood). This is a children's television program that represented children from each of the four ethnicities in an effort to promote mutual respect and understanding (Brenick et al., 2007, 2010). Other positive effects of viewing *Nashe Maalo* included higher ratings of self-perception, higher percentages of correctly identifying the other ethnic languages, and higher percentages of willingness to invite children from another ethnic group into their

home (Common Ground Production – Search for Common Ground in Macedonia & Sesame Workshop, 2000). These findings are all the more impressive given the high level of conflict between these groups. Overall the studies described above suggest that extended contact via mass media interventions is effective when challenging negative social exclusion in hostile intergroup context in which groups are often in conflict and harbor very negative attitudes.

Multicultural Education

Multicultural education is a type of approach commonly used in schools to challenge prejudice and social exclusion. The use of multicultural education is more widely spread than small-scale intergroup contact interventions and it works under the assumption that prejudice and social exclusion is a result of ignorance about the out-group (Hill & Augustinos, 2001). Multicultural approaches deal with the complex problem of both celebrating diversity by respecting cultural identities and, at the same time, recognizing that such identities are often viewed in negative terms by the majority group (Verkuyten, 2008). Like many educational strategies, multicultural interventions are not often based upon research evidence drawn from psychology or any other social science.

There exists, however, some examples of research that have examined in schools the use of socialization influences (e.g., story books, videos, games, and activities) to promote multicultural awareness. For example, one intervention involving fourth grade children in Hawaii held over a 10-week period used a variety of methods (e.g., “Multicultural Bingo,” “Hands Activity”) to encourage children to think about their ethnic and cultural differences and similarities (Salzman & D’Andrea, 2001). This study found the teachers but not the children reported more cooperative social interaction between the different ethnic groups. In contrast, other research suggests that multicultural interventions can often be unsuccessful and even have negative effects on children’s intergroup attitudes. As an illustration, Bigler (1999) reviewed a number of studies showing that highlighting certain stereotypical activities (e.g., songs or cultural practices) sometimes reinforce negative ethnic stereotypes.

Multicultural education, however, can help create a school climate that promotes positive attention to cultural diversity, deals with negative interactions between children from different groups and promotes tolerance to others from diverse cultures (see Verkuyten, 2008). Research in the United States has shown that teaching 6- to 11-year-old European American children directly about historical racial discrimination in their country can improve their racial attitudes (Hughes, Bigler, & Levy, 2007). This study showed that European American children who learnt about historical racism held more positive and less negative attitudes toward African Americans, and they also showed an increase in the degree to which they valued racial fairness.

A common form of bullying in schools is ethnic victimization in the form of racist name calling (Smith & Shu, 2000). Verkuyten and Thijs (2002) examined how this type of social exclusion among Dutch, Turkish Dutch, Moroccan Dutch, and Surinamese Dutch preadolescents is related to school multicultural education. Verkuyten and colleagues surveyed 10–12 year olds from 178 classrooms in 82 elementary schools across the Netherlands, and performed multilevel analysis showing that personal experience and sensitivity to ethnic name calling, teasing, and social exclusion in the playground were determined independently by classroom settings and structure. Specifically, children experienced less ethnic-based exclusion if they believed they could tell the teachers about unfair behavior toward them and the teacher would take action. This study also showed that Dutch children reported more awareness of ethnic exclusion if they said their classes spent more time discussing multicultural issues (e.g., the need to be fair to others from different countries and recognize different cultures within the class and society). Research in the Netherlands has also shown that 10- to 13-year-old Dutch and Turkish Dutch children reporting higher levels of multicultural education in the classroom showed less ethnic intergroup bias (Kinket & Verkuyten, 1999; Verkuyten & Thijs, 2001).

Overall, research indicates that multicultural contexts within the classroom can help limit ethnic exclusion and the development of negative ethnic intergroup attitudes. Actual multicultural practices in the classroom (e.g., teachers who dealt with examples of ethnic exclusion and discussed the need for fairness toward all cultures) help to establish a positive inclusive group norm within the classroom which discourages social exclusion (Verkuyten, 2008). Meanwhile, more formal aspects of multicultural education (e.g., teaching children about cultural traditions held by different ethnic groups) most likely acted to limit negative attitudes by improving children's knowledge and understanding.

Summary

Overall, we have described a robust and extensive body of research which has revealed the developmental roots of intergroup attitudes and social exclusion, and we have identified the policy implications for this line of research. Our developmental science approach draws from both SDT and SITs to examine the origins of prejudice and social exclusion in childhood. We have shown how an integrated model, that focuses on important social, cognitive, and moral developments that enable children to actively construe and reason about their environment, and how the interchange between these developmental changes and the intergroup context, can result in helping us understand the emergence of intergroup biases or social inclusion founded on moral notions of fairness and justice.

The developmental research into attitude change we have described draws upon some theories relatively unknown within social psychology (i.e., SDT),

and uses different methods, measures, and participant samples from most social psychological studies on prejudice and intergroup bias. Nonetheless, it can inform social psychological research and interventions aimed at challenging prejudice and social exclusion. As mentioned at the outset, we recommend that social psychological research with adults include social reasoning as an assessment in studies on intergroup attitudes. Social-conventional and psychological reasoning, rather than moral reasoning, is frequently used by adults to condone exclusion and perpetuate the status quo. Understanding the context and conditions which motivate individuals to focus on fairness and equality (moral reasons) rather than traditions, customs, and societal or group expectations (conventional reasons) or personal prerogatives and personal choice (psychological reasons) would be illuminating among adults too. Conventional and psychological reasoning is often condoned by society, thus making it less vulnerable to social desirability than explicit assessments of prejudicial attitudes. This advantage reasoning measures have in common with some implicit tasks, but they still allow for an emphasis on deliberative thought and cognition.

Further, analyses of how individuals evaluate familiar everyday instances of social exclusion removes the limitations of a reliance, typical in much social psychological research, on abstract situations that bear little to everyday reality. Moreover, while many age-related changes exist in the use of different forms of reasoning from childhood to adolescence, there are also findings showing the use of different forms of reasoning is not always age-related, making it relevant for social psychological assessments. For example, the propensity to use moral reasoning is relatively stable when judging most forms of social exclusion across childhood, adolescence, and adulthood (Killen & Rutland, 2011). Studying active reasoning in adults would benefit the development of social psychology theory and help identify thoughts in need of change if we are to challenge prejudice and discrimination.

Our developmental science approach has shown how children and adolescents actively construal the intergroup context using their developing social-cognitive skills and social-moral reasoning, rather than basing their attitudes or behavior on only aversive emotions or automatic unconscious responses. This is promising from the eye of a practitioner and policy maker since it suggests the potential for attitude change through interventions that alter how individuals construct the intergroup context. Indeed, we have reviewed many intervention strategies that are known to be effective in childhood when prejudice has the potential to develop but is not fully formed or entrenched (Aboud, 2003; Cameron, Alvarez, Ruble, & Fuligni, 2001; Nesdale, 2004, 2008).

Effective interventions strategies in childhood are those that challenge prejudice and social exclusion based on stereotypic expectations and prejudice, and by fostering moral reasoning regarding the unfairness of prejudice and discrimination. Contact helps individuals construe the context differently so they begin to

form shared group identities, inclusive group norms, and a stronger sense of moral reasoning surrounding prejudice and social exclusion. Any educational policy or strategy aimed at changing negative attitudes must foster an overall social climate and set of norms within the school and classroom that promotes fairness, inclusion, and challenges prejudice. Policies and interventions that are informed by robust and systematic research within developmental and social psychology have the potential to alleviate the many negative psychological and social consequences often associated with prejudice and social exclusion, and to create a more fair and just society.

References

- 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. (2005). The development of prejudice in childhood and adolescence. In J. F. Dovidio, P. Glick, & L. A. Rudman (Eds.), *On the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport* (pp. 310–326). Oxford: Blackwell.
- 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. 269–293). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- About, F. E., Mendelson, M. J., & Purdy, K. T. (2003). Cross-race peer relations and friendship quality. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 27*, 165–173.
- About, F. E., & Sankar, J. (2007). Friendship and identity in a language-integrated school. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 31*, 445–453.
- Abrams, D., & Christian, J. N. (2007). A relational analysis of social exclusion. . In D. Abrams, J. N. Christian, & D. Gordon (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary handbook of social exclusion research* (pp. 211–232). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2001). Collective self. In M. A. Hogg & S. Tindale (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology, Vol. 3: Group processes* (Vol. 3, pp. 425–461). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Abrams, D., Hogg, M., & Marques, J. (Eds.). (2005). *The social psychology of inclusion and exclusion*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Abrams, D., & Rutland, A. (2008). The development of subjective group dynamics. In S. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Abrams, D., Rutland, A., & Cameron, L. (2003). The development of subjective group dynamics: Children's judgments of normative and deviant in-group and out-group individuals. *Child Development, 74*, 1840–1856.
- Abrams, D., Rutland, A., Cameron, L., & Ferrell, J. M. (2007). Older but wiler: In-group accountability and the development of subjective group dynamics. *Developmental Psychology, 43*, 134–148.
- Abrams, D., Rutland, A., Ferrell, J. M., & Pelletier, J. (2008). Children's judgments of disloyal and immoral peer behavior: Subjective group dynamics in minimal intergroup contexts. *Child Development, 79*, 444–461.
- Abrams, D., Rutland, A., Pelletier, J., & Ferrell, J. (2009). Children's group nous: Understanding and applying peer exclusion within and between groups. *Child Development, 80*, 224–243.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.
- Bar-Tal, D., & Teichman, Y. (2005). *Stereotypes and prejudice in conflict: Representations of Arabs in Israeli Jewish society*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Baron, A. S., & Banaji, M. R. (2006). The development of implicit attitudes. *Psychological Science, 17*, 53–58.

- Bennett, M., Lyons, E., Sani, F., & Barrett, M. (1998). Children's subjective identification with the group and in-group favoritism. *Developmental Psychology, 34*, 902–909.
- Bigler, R. S. (1999). The use of multicultural curricula and materials to counter racism in children. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*, 687–705.
- Brenick, A., & Killen, M. (2014). Moral judgments about Jewish-Arab intergroup exclusion: The role of cultural identity and contact. *Developmental Psychology, 50*, 86–99.
- Brenick, A., Killen, M., Lee-Kim, J., Fox, N., Leavitt, L., Raviv, A., Masalha, S., Murra, F., & Smadi, Y. (2010). Social understandings of Young Israeli-Jewish, Israeli-Palestinian, Palestinian, and Jordanian children: Moral judgments and stereotypes. *Early Education and Development, 21*, 886–911. doi:10.1080/10409280903236598
- Brenick, A., Lee-Kim, J., Killen, M., Fox, N. A., Leavitt, L. A., & Raviv, A. (2007). Social judgments in Israeli and Arabic children: Findings from media-based intervention projects. In D. Lemish & M. Gotz (Eds.), *Children, media and war* (pp. 287–308). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Brewer, M. B., & Miller, N. E. (1984). Beyond the contact hypothesis: Theoretical perspectives on desegregation. In N. Miller & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 281–302). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Brewer, M. B., & Brown, R. (1998). Intergroup relations. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 554–594). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 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.
- Brown, R. J., & Gaertner, S. L. (Eds.). (2001). *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Brown, R. J., & Hewstone, M. (2005). An integrative theory of intergroup contact. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 37*, 255–343.
- Bukowski, W., & Sippola, L. (2001). Groups, individuals, and victimization: A view of the peer system. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 355–377). New York: Guilford Press.
- Cameron, J. A., Alvarez, J. M., Ruble, D. N., & Fuligni, A. J. (2001). Children's lay theories about in-groups and out-groups: Reconceptualizing research on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 5*, 118–128.
- Cameron, L., & Rutland, A. (2008). An integrative approach to changing children's intergroup attitudes. In S. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood* (pp. 191–203). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Cameron, L., Rutland, A., Brown, R. J., & Douch, R. (2006). Changing children's intergroup attitudes toward refugees: Testing different models of extended contact. *Child Development, 77*, 1208–1219.
- Cameron, L., Rutland, A., & Hossain, R. (2011). When and why does extended contact work? The role of high quality direct contact and group norms in the development of positive ethnic intergroup attitudes amongst children. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 14*, 193–206.
- Cole, C. F., Labin, D. B., & del Rocio Galarza, M. (2008). Begin with the children: What research on Sesame Street's international coproductions reveals about using media to promote a new more peaceful world. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 32*, 359–364.
- Common Ground Production – Search for Common Ground in Macedonia & Sesame Workshop. (2000). *Lessons from Nashe Maalo: A research report on what ethnic Albanian, Madedonian, Roma and Turkish youth learned from watching Nashe Maalo*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Crocker, J., Major, B., & Steele, C. M. (1998). Social stigma. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., pp. 504–533). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Crystal, D. S., Killen, M., & Ruck, M. (2008). It is who you know that counts: Intergroup contact and judgments about race-based exclusion. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 26*, 51–70.
- Crystal, D. S., Killen, M., & Ruck, M. R. (2010). Fair treatment by authorities is related to children's and adolescents' evaluations of interracial exclusion. *Applied Developmental Science, 14*, 125–136.
- Cunningham, W. A., Preacher, K. J., & Banaji, M. R. (2001). Implicit attitude measures: Consistency, stability, and convergent validity. *Psychological Science, 12*, 163–170.

- Cvencek, D., Greenwald, A. G., & Meltzoff, A. N. (2011). Measuring implicit attitudes of 4-year-olds: The Preschool Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 109*, 187–200.
- Dixon, J., Levine, M., Reicher, S., & Durrheim, K. (2012). Beyond prejudice: Are negative evaluations the problem and is getting us to like one another more the solution? *Brain and Behavioral Sciences, 35*, 411–425.
- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1998). On the nature of contemporary prejudice: The causes, consequences, and challenges of aversive racism. In J. Eberhardt & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), *Confronting racism: The problem and the response* (pp. 3–32). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Feddes, A. R., Noack, P., & Rutland, A. (2009). Direct and extended friendship effects on minority and majority children's interethnic attitudes: A longitudinal study. *Child Development, 80*, 337–390.
- Fisch, S. M. (2004). *Children's learning from educational television: Sesame Street and beyond*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Fisch, S. M., & Truglio, R. T. (2001). Why children learn from Sesame Street. In S. M. Fisch & R. T. Truglio (Eds.), *"G" is for growing: Thirty years of research on children and Sesame Street* (pp. 233–244). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- FitzRoy, S., & Rutland, A. (2010). Learning to control ethnic intergroup bias in childhood. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 40*, 679–693.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common in-group identity model*. Hove, England: Psychology Press.
- Graves, S. B. (1999). Television and prejudice reduction: When does television as a vicarious experience make a difference? *Journal of Social Issues, 55*, 707–725.
- Greenwald, A. G., Banaji, M. R., Rudman, L. A., Farnham, S. D., Nosek, B. A., & Mellott, D. S. (2002). A unified theory of implicit attitudes, stereotypes, self-esteem, and self-concept. *Psychological Review, 109*, 3–25.
- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1464–1480.
- Hill, M. E., & Augustinos, M. (2001). Stereotype change and prejudice reduction: Short- and long-term evaluation of a cross-cultural awareness programme. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 11*, 243–262.
- Hitti, A., Mulvey, K. L., Rutland, A., Abrams, D., & Killen, M. (2013). When is it okay to exclude a member of the ingroup?: Children's and adolescents' social reasoning. *Social Development*. doi: 10.1111/sode.12047.
- Horn, S. S. (2008). The multifaceted nature of sexual prejudice: How adolescents reason about sexual orientation and sexual prejudice. In S. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood* (pp. 173–190). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hughes, J., Bigler, R., & Levy, S. (2007). Consequences of learning about historical racism among European American and African American children. *Child Development, 78*, 1689–1705.
- Hymel, S., Vaillancourt, T., McDougall, P., & Renshaw, P. D. (2002). Peer acceptance and rejection in childhood. In P. K. Smith & C. H. Hart (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of childhood social development* (pp. 265–284). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Jones, E. E., Farina, A., Hastorf, A. H., Markus, H., Miller, D. T., & Scott, R. A. (1984). *Social stigma: The psychology of marked relationships*. New York: Freeman.
- Jugert, P., Noack, P., & Rutland, A. (2011). Friendship preferences among German and Turkish preadolescents. *Child Development, 82*, 812–829. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01528.x
- Kao, G., & Joyner, K. (2004). Do race and ethnicity matter among friends? Activities among interracial, interethnic, and intraethnic adolescent friends. *Sociological Quarterly, 45*, 557–573.
- Killen, M. (2007). Children's social and moral reasoning about exclusion. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 16*, 32–36.
- Killen, M., Lee-Kim, J., McGlothlin, H., & Stangor, C. (2002). How children and adolescents evaluate gender and racial exclusion. *Monographs for the Society for Research in Child Development*. Serial No. 271, Vol. 67, No. 4. Oxford, England: Blackwell Publishers.

- Killen, M., Kelly, M., Richardson, C., Crystal, D., & Ruck, M. (2010). European-American children's and adolescents' evaluations of interracial exclusion. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 13, 283–300.
- Killen, M., Mulvey, K. L., & Hitti, A. (2013). Social exclusion in childhood: A developmental intergroup perspective. *Child Development*, 84, 772–790.
- Killen, M., Mulvey, K. L., Hitti, A., & Rutland, A. (2012). What works to address prejudice? Look to developmental science research for the answer [commentary on lead article by Dixon et al.]. *Brain and Behavioral Sciences*, 35, 440.
- Killen, M., & Rutland, A. (2011). *Children and social exclusion: Morality, prejudice and group identity*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Killen, M., Rutland, A., Abrams, D., Mulvey, K. L., & Hitti, A. (2013). Development of intra- and intergroup judgments in the context of moral and social-conventional norms. *Child Development*, 84, 1063–1080.
- Killen, M., Rutland, A., & Jampol, N. (2008). Social exclusion in middle childhood and early adolescence. In K. H. Rubin, W. Bukowski & B. Laursen (Eds.), *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships and groups* (pp. 249–266). New York: Guilford.
- Killen, M., & Smetana, J. G. (2015). Origins and development of morality. In M. Lamb (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology* (7th ed.) (Vol. III, pp. 701–749). New York: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Killen, M., & Stangor, C. (2001). Children's reasoning about social inclusion and exclusion in gender and race peer group contexts. *Child Development*, 72, 174–186.
- Kinket, B., & Verkuyten, M. (1999). Intergroup evaluations and social context: A multilevel approach. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 219–237.
- Lawrence, V. W. (1991). Effect of socially ambiguous information on White and Black children's behavioral and trait perceptions. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 37, 619–630.
- Levy, S., & Killen, M. (2008). *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Liebkind, K., & McAlister, A. (1999). Extended contact through peer modeling to promote tolerance in Finland. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 765–780.
- Maras, P., & Brown, R. (1996). Effects of contact on children's attitudes toward disability: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 26, 2113–2134.
- Maras, P., & Brown, R. (2000). Effects of different forms of school contact on children's attitudes toward disabled and non-disabled peers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70, 337–351.
- Margie, N. G., Killen, M., Sinno, S., & McGlothlin, H. (2005). Minority children's intergroup attitudes about peer relationships. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 23, 251–269.
- McGlothlin, H., & Killen, M. (2005). Children's perceptions of intergroup and intragroup similarity and the role of social experience. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 26, 680–698.
- McGlothlin, H., & Killen, M. (2006). Intergroup attitudes of European American children attending ethnically homogeneous schools. *Child Development*, 77, 1375–1386.
- Molina, L. K., Wittig, M. A., & Giang, M. T. (2004). Mutual acculturation and social categorization: A comparison of two perspectives on intergroup bias. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 7, 239–265.
- Mulvey, K. L., Hitti, A., & Killen, M. (2013). Morality, intentionality, and exclusion: How children navigate the social world. In M. Banaji & S. Gelman (Eds.), *Navigating the social world: A developmental perspective* (pp. 377–384). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nesdale, D. (2004). Social identity processes and children's ethnic prejudice. In M. Bennett & F. Sani (Eds.), *The development of the social self* (pp. 219–245). Hove & New York: Sage.
- Nesdale, D. (2007). The development of ethnic prejudice in early childhood: Theories and research. In O. Saracho & B. Spodek (Eds.), *Contemporary perspectives on socialization and social development in early childhood education*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Nesdale, D. (2008). Social identity development and children's ethnic attitudes in Australia. In S. Quintana & C. McKown (Eds.), *Handbook of race, racism, and the developing child* (pp. 313–338). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Nesdale, D. (2013). Social acumen: Its role in constructing group identity and attitudes. In M. Banaji & S. A. Gelman (Eds.), *Navigating the social world: What infants, children, and other species can teach us* (pp. 323–326). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nesdale, D., & Flessler, D. (2001). Social identity and the development of children's group attitudes. *Child Development, 72*, 506–517.
- Nesdale, D., Maass, A., Durkin, K., & Griffiths, J. (2005). Group norms, threat, and children's racial prejudice. *Child Development, 76*, 652–663.
- Newcomb, A. F., Bukowski, W. M., & Pattee, L. (1993). Children's peer relations: A meta-analytic review of popular, rejected, neglected, controversial. *Psychological Bulletin, 111*, 99–128.
- Opatow, S. (1990). Moral exclusion and injustice: An introduction. *Journal of Social Issues, 46*, 1–20.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65–85.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 90*, 751–783.
- Pfeifer, J. H., Ruble, D. N., Bachman, M. A., Alvarez, J. M., Cameron, J. A., & Fuligni, A. J. (2007). Social identities and intergroup bias in immigrant and nonimmigrant children. *Developmental Psychology, 43*, 496–507.
- Rubin, K. H., Bukowski, W., & Parker, J. G. (2006). Peer interactions, relationships and groups. In W. Damon, R. M. Lerner, & N. Eisenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of Child Psychology: Vol 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (6th ed., pp. 571–645). New York: Wiley.
- Ruck, M. D., Park, H., Killen, M., & Crystal, D. (2011). Intergroup contact and evaluations of race-based exclusion in urban minority children and adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 40*, 633–643.
- Rutland, A. (2004). The development and self-regulation of intergroup attitudes in children. In M. Bennett & F. Sani (Eds.), *The development of the social self* (pp. 247–265). New York: Psychology Press.
- Rutland, A., Cameron, L., Bennett, L., & Ferrell, J. M. (2005). Interracial contact and racial constancy: A multi-site study of racial intergroup bias in 3–5 year old Anglo-British children. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 26*, 699–713.
- Rutland, A., Cameron, L., Milne, A., & McGeorge, P. (2005). Social norms and self-presentation: Children's implicit and explicit intergroup attitudes. *Child Development, 76*, 451–466.
- Rutland, A., Killen, M., & Abrams, D. (2010). A new social-cognitive developmental perspective on prejudice: The interplay between morality and group identity. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*, 279–291.
- Sagar, H. A., & Schofield, J. W. (1980). Racial and behavioral cues in Black and White children's perceptions of ambiguously aggressive acts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*, 590–598.
- Salzman, M., & D'Andrea, M. (2001). Assessing the impact of a prejudice prevention project. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 79*, 341–347.
- Schneider, B. H., Dixon, K., & Udvari, S. (2007). Closeness and competition in the inter-ethnic and co-ethnic friendships of early adolescents in Toronto and Montreal. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 27*, 115–138.
- Schofield, J. W. (1995). Review of research on school desegregation's impact on elementary and secondary school students. In J. A. Banks & C. A. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 597–616). New York: Macmillan.
- 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.
- Smetana, J. G. (2006). Social-cognitive domain theory: Consistencies and variations in children's moral and social judgments. In M. Killen & J. G. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (pp. 119–154). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Smith, P. K., & Shu, S. (2000). What good schools can do about bullying: Findings from a survey of English schools after a decade of research and action. *Childhood, 7*, 193–212.
- Staub, E. (1990). Genocide and mass killing: Cultural-societal and psychological origins. In H. T. Himmelweit & G. Gaskell (Eds.), *Societal psychology* (pp. 230–251). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of inter-group behavior. In S. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago: Nelson Hall.
- Teichman, Y., & Zafrir, H. (2003). Images held by Jewish and Arab children in Israel of people representing their own and the other group. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34*, 658–676.
- Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005). Relationships between intergroup contact and prejudice among minority and majority status groups. *Psychological Science, 16*, 951–957.
- Tropp, L. R., & Prenovost, M. A. (2008). The role of intergroup contact in predicting children's inter-ethnic attitudes: Evidence from meta-analytic and field studies. In S. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood* (pp. 236–248). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Turiel, E. (1983). *The development of social knowledge: Morality and convention*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Turiel, E. (2006). Thought, emotions, and social interactional processes in moral development. In M. Killen & J. G. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (pp. 7–35). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Turner, R. N., Voci, A., & Hewstone, M. (2007). Reducing explicit and implicit out-group prejudice via direct and extended contact: The mediating role of self-disclosure and intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 93*, 369–388.
- Verkuyten, M. (2008). Multiculturalism and group evaluations among minority and majority groups. In S. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood* (pp. 157–172). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Verkuyten, M., & De Wolf, A. (2007). The development of in-group favoritism: Between social reality and group identity. *Developmental Psychology, 43*, 901–911.
- Verkuyten, M., & Nekuee, S. (2001). Self-esteem, discrimination, and coping among refugees: The moderating role of self-categorization. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31*, 1058–1075.
- Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2001). Ethnic and gender bias among Dutch and Turkish children in late childhood: The role of social context. *Infant & Child Development, 10*, 203–217.
- Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2002). Racist victimization among children in the Netherlands: The effect of ethnic group and school. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 25*, 310–331.
- Weiner, M. J., & Wright, F. E. (1973). Effects of undergoing arbitrary discrimination upon subsequent attitudes towards a minority group. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 3*, 94–102.
- Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 73–90.
- Wright, S. C., & Tropp, L. R. (2005). Language and intergroup contact: Investigating the impact of bilingual instruction on children's intergroup attitudes. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 8*, 309–328.

ADAM RUTLAND is Professor of Social Developmental Psychology in the Department of Psychology at Goldsmiths, University of London, UK. He is also a Special Elected Member of the Graduate Faculty, Graduate School, University of Maryland, College Park. He has contributed widely to various books and journals (including *Child Development*, *Developmental Psychology* and *Perspectives on Psychological Science*) and is the co-author (with Melanie Killen) of *Children and Social Exclusion: Morality, Prejudice, and Group Identity* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2011). He is also co-editor of the forthcoming Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of Group Processes in Children and Adolescents (with Drew Nesdale and Christia Spears Brown) and the Sage Library in Developmental Psychology five-volume Reader on Childhood Social Development (with Peter K. Smith). He is a member

of the Society for Research in Child Development (SRCD) Committee on Equity and Justice in Childhood. His research interests are social-cognitive development, prejudice, intergroup relationships, social reasoning and morality; peer exclusion, rejection, group dynamics and victimization; cross-group friendships, intergroup attitudes, psychological well-being; interventions to reduce prejudice, intergroup contact; children's acculturation; and ethnic and national identification.

MELANIE KILLEN is Professor of Human Development and Quantitative Methodology and Professor of Psychology (Affiliate) at the University of Maryland. She received her Ph.D. from the University of California, Berkeley. She is the author of *Children and Social Exclusion: Morality, Prejudice and Group Identity* (2011) with Adam Rutland, co-editor of *Social Development in Childhood and Adolescence: A Contemporary Reader* (2011) with Robert Coplan, guest editor of the *Journal of Social Issues* (2014) with Dominic Abrams, and serves as the Editor of the *Handbook of Moral Development* (2006, 2014) with Judith Smetana. She is a Fellow of APA, APS, and SPSSI, and has received funding from the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development for her research on social exclusion, moral reasoning, prejudice, social cognition, and intergroup attitudes.

Copyright of Social Issues & Policy Review is the property of Wiley-Blackwell and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.