

# NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

**UMI**<sup>®</sup>



Differences in Racial Evaluation amongst White and Minority  
Preschool Children in a Multicultural Setting

Khamy (Khamfong) Phomphakdy

A Thesis

in

The Department

of

Education

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Master of Arts (Child Study) at  
Concordia University  
Montréal, Québec, Canada

March 2005

© Phomphakdy



Library and  
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et  
Archives Canada

Published Heritage  
Branch

Direction du  
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

*Your file* *Votre référence*

*ISBN: 0-494-04296-6*

*Our file* *Notre référence*

*ISBN: 0-494-04296-6*

#### NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

#### AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

---

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

  
**Canada**

## Abstract

### Differences in Racial Evaluation Amongst White and Minority Preschool Children in a Multicultural Setting.

Khamy (Khamfong) Phomphakdy

The main purpose of this study was to investigate White and Minority children's racial preference. A total of 51 preschoolers between the ages of 4 and 5 years ( $M = 57.73$  months,  $SD = 4.66$ ) participated in the study. Participants were divided in two groups based on their racial background: White ( $N = 25$ ) and Minority ( $N = 26$ ). Each child was assessed on 3 measures: the Multiple Response Racial Attitude (MRA, Doyle & Aboud, 1995), a picture selection/rejection task and a self-identification task. Results indicated that White children demonstrated similar level of prejudice toward Black and Asian. Also, Minority children seemed to evaluate Whites more positively than they evaluated other Minorities. However, a comparison of the MRA prejudice scores revealed no significant difference between White and Minority participants. In addition, significant correlation between the MRA scores and the picture selection of in-group was found. No gender effect was revealed.

## Acknowledgement

I would like to thank my committee members, Dr. Steven Shaw and Dr. Harriet Petrakos for their time, effort and support. I especially would like to thank Dr. Miranda D'Amico, my thesis supervisor for her patience and constant support throughout my thesis. Thank you for allowing me to work at my own pace. I would also like to thank Dr. Fiore Sicoly for his statistical support. I would also like to thank Dr. Frances Aboud for allowing me the use of some testing material. I am also grateful to Amy Parsons for assisting me with the reliability of my data. I also deeply thank my girlfriends from Concordia (Amy, Nancy, Nathalie and Kathy) for encouraging me to reach my full potential. This thesis would not have been possible (completed) without your help and support. Special thanks to Amy and Nathalie, for providing me a "writing room" in Ottawa ☺ I would also like to thank my family for their love and encouragement. Thank you to my brother Daniel for always being there when I needed him. A special thank you to Rothmony for his patience and support. Thank you for adding "spice" in my life. I would also like to thank Julie, Diane and Natasha for being the best friends a girl can have. I would also like to express my gratitude to Dr. John Vournakis for encouraging me to pursue my graduate studies. Finally, I would like to thank all the daycares, directors, educators, parents and children for their collaboration and participation in this study.

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	1
Literature Review.....	4
Racial Awareness .....	4
Racial Attitudes .....	9
Theoretical Perspectives .....	13
Methodological Issues.....	26
Summary Statement .....	27
Method.....	29
Participants .....	29
Procedures.....	29
Measures and Scoring.....	31
Interrater Reliability.....	36
Results .....	36
Descriptive Statistics.....	36
Analysis of Research Questions.....	38
Discussion .....	58
Gender Difference.....	59
White Children's Racial Preference.....	59
Minority Children's Racial Preference.....	61
Comparison Between White and Minority Children's Racial Preference.....	63
Correlation Analyses.....	65
Limitations.....	66

Implications for Parents and Educators .....	68
Suggestions for Future Research .....	68
Conclusion.....	70
Appendices	
Appendix A. Letter and consent forms for the schools .....	78
Appendix B. Letter and Consent Forms for Parents .....	81
Appendix C. Demographic Questionnaire .....	84
Appendix D. MRA Instructions .....	86
Appendix E. MRA Scoring Sheet .....	88
Appendix F. List of MRA Items .....	90
Appendix G. Coding Schemes .....	94



## List of Tables

Table 1.	
Number of Participants and Means, Standard Deviation, and Ranges of Age .....	43
Table 2.	
Means, Standard Deviation, and Ranges of White Participants ...	44
Table 3.	
Means, Standard Deviation, and Ranges of Minority Participants .....	45
Table 4.	
Frequency, percentages, Means, Standard Deviation and Ranges of Picture Selection/Rejection Task .....	46
Table 5.	
Children's Verbal Justification .....	47
Table 6.	
Children's Verbal Justification for White Children .....	48
Table 7.	
Children's Verbal Justification for Minority Children .....	49
Table 8.	
Mean Differences between Boys and Girls for Level of Prejudice .....	50
Table 9.	
Mean Differences between Prejudice toward Black and Prejudice toward Asian for White Children .....	51
Table 10.	
Mean Differences between Racial Evaluation toward Black and toward Asian for White Children .....	52
Table 11.	
Mean Differences between Prejudice toward Other Minority and Prejudice toward White for Minority Children. ....	53
Table 12.	
Mean Differences between Racial Evaluation toward Other Minority and toward White for Minority Children .....	54

Table 13.  
Mean Differences between White and Minority for Level of  
Prejudice ..... 55

Table 14.  
Mean Differences between White and Minority for Picture  
Selection/Rejection and Self-identification Task ..... 56

Table 15.  
Intercorrelation between Level of Prejudice, Selection of  
In-group Picture and Rejection of Out-group Picture ..... 57

## Introduction

As a result of the changing trends of immigration since the 1960's, Canada has become increasingly culturally diverse. A shift from European to non-European countries as the source of immigrants to Canada is leading to a more ethnically varied population and to a higher proportion of visible minorities (Statistic Canada, 1995). For example, in Quebec, prior to 1961, 88% of the immigrants were originally from Europe, whereas 42% of the immigrants arriving between 1981 and 1991 were from Asia and the Middle East and only 20% were from Europe. An important issue related to the increased cultural diversity of our society is a lack of familiarity with the different ethnic groups, their belief systems and values. Our lack of familiarity may lead to viewing differences critically and this may in turn leads to negative attitudes toward those ethnic groups that are view as different from our own group. Such attitudes refer to racial prejudice. According to Brown (1995) prejudice is often defined as a "faulty or unjustified negative judgment held about the members of a group" (p.14). Prejudice can be associated with discrimination of group members' base on different factors, such as race, gender or age. However, for the purpose of the present study, prejudice will refer specifically to racial prejudice, which is defined as "an organized predisposition to respond in an unfavorable manner

toward people from ethnic groups because of their ethnic affiliation" (Aboud, 1988, p.4).

Since the 1940's racial prejudice has been studied extensively. Researchers have attempted to investigate the causes of racial prejudice by studying children's attitude to different races and ethnic groups. Past research (Asher & Allen, 1969; Kircher & Furby, 1971) has shown that children develop racial awareness and preference at the age of 4-5 years old. As children begin to describe themselves in reference to other individuals, the process of social comparison emerges during the preschool years. It is important to know at what age children first become aware of ethnic and racial differences and how this awareness expands toward a deeper understanding of ethnicity and race. Awareness is deeply related to the child's growing self-identification. In the process of trying to learn about themselves, children increase their knowledge about others.

Children's level of prejudice appears to increase between the ages of 4 and 7 years and decline around the age of 7 or 8 years (Aboud, 1988). In a study using both cross-sectional and longitudinal data, Doyle and Aboud (1995) compared the level of prejudice of White kindergarten and grade 3 children to Blacks and Native Indians. They used a modified version of the Preschool Racial Attitude Measure II (PRAM II, William, Best, Boswell & Mattson, 1975a) and the Multiple-Response Racial Attitude (MRA,

Doyle & Aboud, 1995). The PRAM II is a forced-choice measure that required the children to assign 24 positive and negative trait adjectives (e.g., clean, dirty, good, naughty). As opposed to the PRAM II, the MRA allowed examining the in-group favoritism and the out-group prejudice independently by permitting the children to assign evaluative adjectives to more than one group. Results demonstrated that older children were less prejudiced than younger children, with an increase in favorable Black evaluation in older children. According to Aboud (1988), this decline in prejudice can be explained by the children's level of cognitive development.

Moreover, studies on racial preference demonstrated that young children appeared to prefer the color white over the color black, regardless of their own racial group (Farrell & Olson, 1983; Gopaul-McNicol, 1988; Gopaul-McNicol, 1995; Kircher & Furby, 1971; Morland, 1962; William & Al., 1975). However, most of the studies were conducted in the United States, and looked at Black and/or White children's attitudes using forced-choice measures that did not allow for separate in-group evaluation and out-group evaluation. Relatively few studies have examined Minorities' racial preferences (Aboud & Skerry, 1984). Most of the recent studies that use non forced-choice measures have examined racial preference in Whites children only (Aboud, 2003; Black-Gutman & Hickson; Doyle & Aboud, 1995). The purpose of this study is to examine Minority as well as White children's racial attitudes. In

particular, this Canadian study investigated the differences in racial attitudes of preschool children in a multicultural setting by comparing White and Minority children's racial preferences, using non forced-choice measures.

The literature reviewed includes research on race awareness and racial attitudes. Major theories are also examined in order to understand how and why children develop racial prejudice.

#### Literature Review

##### *Racial Awareness*

Awareness is a necessary precursor of any attitude, whether positive or negative. Race refers to a "group of people connected by a common origin and a set of physical characteristics that are genetically determined such as skin color, hair form, and facial and body appearance. Each race incorporates many ethnic groups" (Hall & Rhomberg, 1995, p.3). Race awareness is the recognition of race in people based on obvious physical attributes (Aboud, 1988).

Investigators usually measure racial awareness by showing pictures or dolls from different racial groups and request the children to identify correctly which feature is associated with a specific racial label. Evidence from many studies (Asher & Allen, 1969; Kircher & Furby, 1971) suggests that children of 3-4 years old are aware of differences in skin color and that this awareness increases with age.

In a classic study, Clark and Clark (1947) studied Northern (racially mixed setting) and Southern (segregated setting) black children of 3 to 7 years old in the United States. All the participants varied in skin color: light, medium, and dark. The researchers presented four dolls to the children. The dolls were identical in every aspect except skin color and hair color. Two of the dolls were brown with black hair and two were white with yellow hair. The children were asked to choose the appropriate doll to answer specific questions: (1) "Give me the white doll", (2) "Give me the colored doll", and (3) "Give me the Negro doll".

According to this classic study, results showed that participants from both Northern and Southern communities demonstrated a strong awareness of skin color (Clark & Clark, 1947). Among 3-year-old children, more than 75% chose the correct doll for the labels "white" and "colored". However, only 55% chose the brown doll when asked to pick the "Negro doll". Among 4 to 7 years old children, 94% chose the right doll when asked to pick the white doll, 93% for the "colored doll", and 72% for the "Negro doll". Considering the high percentage obtained on the other questions, the lower rates related to the "Negro doll" request may reflect the children's lack of familiarity with the word "Negro" rather than a lack of racial awareness (Clark & Clark, 1947).

In another study, Sorce (1979) attempted to determine if Black and White children utilize the same cues to discriminate

between their races. Seventy-two Black and White preschool children were tested. Sorce (1979) used a series of sketches representing a male face displaying a variety of racial characteristics (skin color, hair and eye region, and nose and mouth region) corresponding to White and Black features. The three racial categories were systematically varied and a total of eight permutations were possible. In addition, one nonracial feature, shirt color, was varied, with four sketches depicting green shirts and four sketches depicting orange shirts.

First, children were administered a discrimination test to determine whether they could differentiate perceptually between each of the three categories. The children were presented two sketches, which were identical in all features except for one racial category. The child was asked to look at both pictures and state whether they were the same or different. If the child noticed a difference, he/she was asked to state how the pictures were different.

Second, a classification task was administered to determine whether the children also thought that these racial characteristics provided significant information for distinguishing between groups of people. Children were given all eight sketches and directed to sort them into two piles so that the items in each pile were similar. They were then asked to justify their classification. When one grouping was completed, the



pictures were reshuffled and children were asked to repeat the task sorting a different way. Results showed that for both Black and White children, skin color was the easiest feature to discriminate, with hair and eye features more difficult, and nose and mouth characteristics most difficult. However, when children were asked to sort and explain the cards that were similar, they used the hair and eye racial criteria more than the skin color criterion. This seems to indicate that for preschool children, skin color discrimination alone may not be a valid measure of racial awareness (Sorice, 1979).

Once children become aware of social classifications such as race and gender, one may ask how salient is race in young children. In a study examining the salience of race in preschool children, Ramsey (1991) found that children use race more often than sex as a criteria when asked to categorize photographs that "go together". Moreover, when children were requested to choose photographs that were the same as themselves, race and gender were equally salient. However, neither race or gender seems to be an important factor of selection when children were asked to justify the picture selection of photographs different than self. They appeared to focus on more individual factors, such as clothing. Similarly, race was rarely mentioned in response to the open-ended questions which required the children to describe different race photographs.

This finding is consistent with Bennett and Al.'s findings (1991), where only 17% of the children use ethnicity as a categorization criterion. Moreover, results from Bennett and Al.'s picture selection/rejection task (1991) indicate that facial expression was mentioned more often than ethnicity. Generally young children focus on observable, external, and fairly superficial features when describing others, and they tend to describe other children from different ethnic and racial groups in terms of readily observable differences such as skin color and language (Ramsey, 1987). In Bennett and Al.' study (1991) children seem to focus more on individual factor (facial expression) rather than group factor (race). This discrepancy may be explained by the age difference between the two samples: Ramsey examined 3 to 5 years-old, while Bennett and Al. examined older children (8 to 11 year-old). Ramsey (1991) suggested that the use of race and gender criteria in the "same-as-self" selection task could possibly reflect the children's early self-identification awareness while the "different-from-self" responses reflect the every day basis criteria children use to compare themselves to their peers (e.g., hair style, clothing).

In general, White children identified themselves more accurately than Black children (Milner, 1983). However this finding may be due to the restrictive nature of the doll test. Having to choose between dolls with only one white skin or dark

brown skin, a black child with light skin might have reasonable doubt about which doll to choose.

### *Racial Attitudes*

Children not only become aware of race during the preschool years, but they also develop attitudes and preferences based on racial cues (Sorce, 1979). To evaluate racial attitudes, studies often use racial preference as a measure (Asher & Allen, 1969; Bennett, Dewberry & Yeeles, 1991; Clark & Clark, 1947; Farrell & Olson, 1983; Gopaul-McNicol, 1988; Kircher & Furby, 1971). Racial preference is defined as favoring a racial group over another racial group. This preference is usually measured by showing pictures or dolls from different racial groups and requesting the child to choose the one that they like the most.

Numerous studies (Asher & Allen, 1969; Clark & Clark, 1940; Fine & Bower, 1984; Gopaul-McNicol, 1988; Kircher & Furby, 1971; Morland, 1962) have demonstrated that young children show negative attitudes toward Blacks and preference toward Whites. The original study by Clark and Clark (1947) found that Black children preferred the white doll and rejected the black doll when asked the following questions: (1) "Give me the doll that you like to play with" - "like best", (2) "Give me the doll that is the nice doll", (3) "Give me the doll that looks bad", and (4) "Give me the doll that is a nice color". However, those results should be taken with caution, as the participants' familiarity with white and

black dolls was not assessed. These results have been consistent with several studies using a variety of material and various geographical and social settings (Asher & Allen, 1969; Clark & Clark, 1940; Fine & Bower, 1984; Gopaul-McNicol, 1988; Kircher & Furby, 1971; Morland, 1962; Radke, Sutherland, & Rosenberg, 1950). For example, using translated versions of the Color Meaning Test II (CMT II, Williams, Boswell & Best, 1975b) and the PRAM II (Williams & Al., 1975a), Best, Naylor and Williams (1975) found evidence of positive white and negative black bias in French and Italian preschool and early school-aged children. Comparable to the PRAM II, the CMT II is a forced-choice measure that requires children to choose between drawings of two animals, identical on every aspect but the color, one black and one white, in response to positive or negative descriptions. For example, "Which is the good horse?" Analysis of the CMT II scores demonstrated that 55% of the French children showed some evidence of positive bias for the white color, while 75% of the Italian children demonstrated similar preferences. Likewise, results of the PRAM II revealed that 63% of the French children and 83% of the Italian children showed some evidence of positive bias toward light-skin pictures. Using the same measures, similar findings were obtained with American children (Williams & Al., 1975a; Williams & Al., 1975b), who also tended to evaluate white more positively than black.

Gopaul-McNicol (1995) measured racial preference using the Clark doll test procedure with Black preschool children in New York and Trinidad. Most of the Black preschool children in both New York and Trinidad showed a preference for and identified with the white dolls. The majority of the children chose the black doll as "looking bad". In another study, Gopaul-McNicol (1995) investigated the racial preference of preschool children from four different islands in West India (Trinidad, Jamaica, Grenada and Barbados). The traditional doll questions by Clark and Clark (1947) along with additional questions such as "Choose a doll you would like to play with" were implemented. Results demonstrated that even in communities where Blacks constitute the majority of the population, the majority of the West Indian children selected the white doll most of the time in response to such positive questions. In contrast, the black doll was selected more in response to negative statements, as previously mentioned. Most of the children chose the white doll "to play with" (75%). The authors believe that although Blacks in the West Indies have political power, most of the economic power belongs to Whites and French Creoles, suggesting that to be rich and successful, children should aspire to be White. It was also noted that most of the participants did not have black dolls at home, suggesting that dolls may have been chosen based on familiarity rather than on racial preference.

When investigating if children at age 3 to 5 years old would also show any difference of preference for features other than skin color (white and dark brown), such as eye color (blue and brown), hair color (brown and black) and hair type (straight and curly), Kircher and Furby (1971) found that both Black and White children prefer typically white characteristics.

Farrell and Olson (1983) repeated Clark and Clark's (1947) famous study. Dark-skinned and light-skinned Black kindergarten children were tested on racial identification and racial preference. The findings of Clark and Clark were compared to Farrell and Olson's finding (1979) in order to determine the differences in racial identification and preference patterns between the two cohorts. Ninety-two percent of the dark-skinned Black children correctly identified themselves by race in the 1979 study compared to 77% in the 1947 study. Moreover, light-skinned Black children showed an even greater difference (79% as compared to 20%) in self-identification. Concerning the positive and negative preference items, a larger percentage of the Clark and Clark participants selected a white doll on the positive statements (65%) than did the Farrell-Olsen children (47%). The dark-skinned Black children in the Farrell-Olsen study assigned only 36% of negative statement to the black dolls, compared to 77% for the Clarks' dark-skinned subjects. Furthermore, the light-skinned children of the Farrell-Olsen study select positively the

white dolls 48% of the time (52% for the black dolls) and negatively 50% of the time (50% for the black dolls). As for the light-skinned participants in the Clarks' study, they favored the white dolls 76% of the time (24% for the black dolls) and selected the white dolls only 14% of the time negative preference items (86% for black dolls).

However, it must be acknowledged that these studies used different materials to assess children's racial identification and preference. The Farrell-Olsen study provided a light skinned black doll that was absent in the Clark and Clark study. This difference may have allowed the light-skinned Black children to make more accurate selections. Therefore, those comparisons between the two cohorts should be taken with caution.

#### *Theoretical Perspectives*

There are numerous theories that attempt to explain the nature of prejudice. The following section will review theories that are mainly concern with the development of racial prejudice in young children: the Social Reflection Theory, the Lay Theories, the Social Identity Theory, the Intergroup Contact Theory and the Cognitive Developmental Theory.

*Social reflection theory.* A popular notion concerning prejudice is that it is socially learned. Allport's (1954), Social Reflection Theory, suggests that children learn from parents and significant others. Children are influenced to adopt attitudes and

stereotypes that are expressed in their cultural environment. Psychologists have focused on agents of socialization as the primary factors in the development of prejudice, since the major assumption has generally been that prejudice is directly taught. The most obvious and seemingly most important factor in teaching prejudice is the family, especially the parents. Whereas many parents help their children to avoid stereotypic and prejudicial thinking, others directly or indirectly promote it. For example, Gopaul-McNicol (1988) found that 70% of the Black parents she surveyed did not buy black dolls for their children. In another of her studies Gopaul-McNicol (1995) reported that most of the parents justified buying the white dolls because "they seem prettier", or because "my child preferred the lighter one" (p.150). When Black parents buy only white dolls for their children, one may infer that white dolls are better to play with. Even without conscious or explicit value-statements, parental attitudes and behaviors become models for the child.

As most parents discover, when children enter school peers become an important part of their socialization experience. Parental influence and peer influence can become hard to separate. Most parents seek schools that will support their family's values and actively pick playmates for their children from families with like-minded attitudes. Parents coming from different racial backgrounds may have different preferences concerning their



children's activities. When children are young, parents encourage them to participate in activities that, whether intended or not, produce selective peer interaction. For example, children who are encouraged to take music lessons are likely to meet different children than those who are encouraged to play hockey. Young children develop friendships according to common activities and similar expectations (Bigelow, 1977, as cited in Pellegrini & Bjorklund, 1998).

Some of our beliefs and attitudes are also shaped by the mass media, especially television (Graves, 1999). Film, video and television have been blamed for perpetrating, even creating, stereotypes of gender and race. Children watch large amounts of television in general. Research on imitation and social learning behaviors has shown that both adults and, especially, children learn important lessons from what they see and hear in the media (Bandura, 1989b, as cited in Pellegrini & Bjorklund, 1998). Children learn how to act out certain prosocial behaviors, and when such behaviors are appropriate. In addition, Gopaul-McNicol (1995) suggests that part of the pro-White results obtained when assessing West Indian children' racial preference can be explained by the media. Although, the majority of the population in the West Indies is Black, the television programs are still mostly White, and portrayed the same pro-White bias as in Europe and North America. Television clearly has the capacity to broaden the scope

of information children are exposed to. By inclusion or exclusion of certain social groups, television provides information about those groups. When diverse groups are included, television content offers specific examples of the characteristics of each group, the problem being that those representations are not always accurate. When groups are absent from the television content, the silent implication is that the missing groups are unimportant and, thus, powerless in society (Graves, 1999). In both cases, television can contribute to the development, maintenance and modification of children's attitude toward their own and other ethnic groups. Graves (1999) commented that "Televised role portrayals and interracial interactions as sources of vicarious experience are relevant to the creation of cognitions about racial groups (stereotypes), the development of negative attitudes toward these groups (prejudice), and the performance of exclusionary behaviors (discrimination)" (p. 707). Television could be a source of information on how to interact successfully in cross-ethnic situation. However, because Black-American characters in prime time television are often segregated in all-minority situation comedies or are associated with violent acts, there is limited opportunity for meaningful modeling of positive interracial interactions (Grave, 1999).

*Lay theories.* Among the important things that children learn, from parents, school, the media, and other socializing agents, are

"theories" about people; what kinds of distinctions are important, what behavioral differences count, and why people behave the way they do. These theories are referred to as lay theory because they attempt to provide an explanation of people's daily experience without a scientific base (Levy, 1999). These theories emerge from children's tendency to compare themselves to others. Children may develop them from experience, but they may also be based on what they perceive to be culturally encouraged. In the case of prejudice, it has been assumed that young children possess the lay theory that "what is similar to me is good, and what is different from me is bad". This assumption is based on the children's capacity to categorize people and to notice how similar and different others are compared to themselves. In some cases, the influence of agents of socialization could lead young children to develop a lay theory that specifies that the in-group is good ("white people are good") and that the out-group is bad ("black people are bad").

Yet, some scholars think that children can have positive bias for their own group without having hostility for the other groups (Cameron & Al, 2001). In that case children's thinking will be, "what is familiar to me is good". Therefore, Cameron and Al. (2001) propose that "the lay theories of children under the age of 7 do not necessarily incorporate out-group derogation" (p.120), but may simply reflect a preference for the things that are

familiar to them. Lay theory explains the fact that young children may feel uncomfortable with people from a different ethnic group. It also explains the mixed results obtained by Clark and Clark (1947) with Black children. Those children often show preference for white dolls, which could be attributed to familiarity.

*Social identity theory.* Social Identity Theory states that children come into the world ready to classify people into different types of groups and seem to learn race, gender and age categories quite early (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Horowitz and Horowitz (1938) suggested that preschool children not only use racial categories but also actually tend to categorize other children based on their race rather than their gender. More recent studies confirm that racial categories are salient to children in pre-school and come to predominate as social categories by the early school years although more so for children who demonstrated a higher level of racial preference (Brown, 1995).

According to Doherty-Derkowski (1995) children start showing signs of what they term "pre-prejudice" at 2-3 years of age. They show preference for people who look like themselves and avoid or ignore a child that they perceive to be different. At the age of 4-5 years, children begin to build an ethnic group identity and an individual identity. To do so, they put themselves into a category and they evaluate their social identities by comparing it with the out-groups. From this perspective, prejudices appear because the

child is trying to reach or maintain a positive social identity. Furthermore, that desire to maintain a high self-esteem will lead children to evaluate their own group positively and other groups negatively (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Thus, in a study conducted by Nesdale and Flessner (2001), children that were assigned to arbitrary groups ("excellent drawer" team vs. "good drawer" team) prefer their in-group to the comparison group. However, children in the low-status group (good drawer) like their own group less than children in the high-status group (excellent drawer).

Nonetheless, some seminal studies carried out in this domain (Clark & Clark, 1947; Horowitz & Horowitz, 1938; Kircher & Furby, 1971; Randke, Sutherland & Rosenberg, 1950) seem to be inconsistent with the Social Identity Theory. For example, in Randke and Al.'s study (1950), Black children assigned more negative attributes to pictures representing Black children than to picture representing White children, suggesting ambivalence toward their own group. Moreover, when presented with two dolls, one dark and one light complexion, and asked to "give me the doll that looks bad" and "give me the nice doll", Black children choose the dark doll over 60% of the time for the negative question and the white doll over 70% of the time for the nice question (Clark & Clark, 1947). According to Brown (1995) Black children may become aware of their race's lower-status during the process of social comparison, given that in most of the regions where studies had

been conducted, Blacks are in minority in number (i.e., North America) or in a less powerful position (i.e., South Africa) than Whites. Therefore, in order to maintain a positive self-evaluation, they psychologically distance themselves from their in-group by adhering to a more prestigious group. The assumption was also made that when Black children prefer another group over their own, they also devalue themselves.

However, replication of the doll methodology demonstrated some controversy over whether Black children still prefer the white over the black dolls. In general, although still present, the tendency of Black children to prefer white dolls seems to have decreased since the early 1970's (Milner, 1997). For instance, in a study duplicating the Clark and Clark doll study, Hraba and Grant (1970) report that the majority of the children (both Black and White) expressed a preference for the dolls of their own race. As opposed to the Clarks' findings, these findings indicate that Black children do not necessarily prefer the white dolls. The authors suggest that societal changes, black pride campaigns and interracial contact may be possible explanations for their findings.

*Intergroup contact theory.* How can children adopt more positive attitudes toward people outside their group while maintaining their identity and the values of their own group? There is an extensive body of research on intergroup contact that

addresses this question. Research has demonstrated that mere contact with members of other groups is usually not sufficient to disperse prejudicial thinking (and may enhance it) so there is no reason to believe that contact will, by itself, forestall the development of prejudice. The contact must occur under favorable conditions. If there is an aura of mutual suspicion, if the parties are highly competitive or are not supported by relevant authorities, or if contact occurs on the basis of very unequal status, then it is not likely to be helpful, whatever the amount of exposure. Contact under unfavorable conditions can stir up old tensions and reinforce stereotypes (Allport, 1954).

On the other hand, if there is friendly contact in the context of equal status, especially if such contact is supported by relevant authorities, and if the contact is embedded in cooperative activity and fostered by a mutual aid ethic, then there is likely to be a strong positive outcome. Under these conditions, the more contact the better. Such contact is then associated with improved attitudes between previously suspicious or hostile groups as well as with constructive changes in patterns of interaction between them (Pettigrew, 1998).

"The jigsaw learning method" (Aronson, Stephan, Sikes, Blancy & Snapp, as cited in Wolfe & Spencer, 1996) represents a concrete example of a situation that has provided observations that support the Intergroup Contact Theory. Students (5<sup>th</sup> graders) were

organized into multiethnic groups. Each child was given a small part of the lesson to learn and then had to relate this part of the lesson to their own group. They could also seek help from the children of another group who had the same part of the lesson as their responsibility. This method gives them the pressure to learn their piece of work, as well as to cooperate with members of other groups in order to complete their project. The study found that students actually helped each other learn and communicate therefore reducing prejudice. As well as getting to know each other better, they began to develop respect for one another, empathize together and like each other.

Studies that have examined children's acceptance and rejection of others tended to show that children preferred other children of their own race, a tendency found more among White than Black children. Among White children there is a negative correlation between self-esteem and prejudice: children with high self-esteem appear to be less prejudicial toward out-groups (Aboud, 1988). In fact research by Phinney, Ferguson, and Tate (1997) suggests that identification with one's own ethnic group leads to more positive in-group attitudes which in turn predict positive attitudes toward out-groups. There are, however, other reports of a positive relationship between in-group favoritism and out-group rejection among children (Aboud, 2003).



*Cognitive developmental theory.* Although the environment seems to be a major component in the development of prejudice, recent work shows that there is a lack of correlation between the racial attitude of the children and the racial attitude of the parents. For example, Branch and Newcombe (1986) found that 4 and 5 year old children of parents who were involved in promoting Black rights demonstrate preference for white dolls over black dolls, as opposed to their parents' beliefs. As mentioned earlier, results could reflect the dolls familiarity, rather than racial preference. Yet, it was also found through interviews that 4 and 5 year-old Black children have racial attitudes that differed from their parents. Branch and Newcombe (1986) explained the low level of race awareness and the inconsistent racial preference found in children of black activist parents by the fact that children may be sensitive to their parent's concerns about race and react only to the part of the pro-black message that implies that wider society sees their race as inferior. Cognitive Developmental Theory implies that the children's prejudicial ideas toward other racial groups are related to the acquisition of cognitive skills. Therefore, prejudice in young children is inevitable, due to their cognitive limitations. The development of racial and ethnic categories is a gradual one and depends to some extent on maturing cognitive abilities (Levy, 1999). Adult-type notions of ethnic identity come slowly. Children first learn that ethnic identity

cannot be changed and subsequently acquire the ability to label a person consistently despite superficial changes in physical appearance such as clothing. The latter may not be acquired until age 8 or so, significantly later than similar achievements for gender. Indeed, children are not especially good even at identifying their own race until they are at least 4 or 5 years old (Aboud, 1988).

Assignment of features to ethnic groups also appears gradually. Children initially tend to over-generalize about the features associated with stereotypes. For example, they may assume that if one member of a racial category does something all members of the category do also (Ramsey, 1987). Children eventually learn that people from different groups do not all share the same attributes and that people from different groups may have the same attribute (Aboud, 1988). These abilities are almost entirely absent in pre-school children, but develop gradually throughout the school years. Aboud (1988) showed that children first acquire a preference for their own group, then notions of similarity with members of their own group, and finally ethnic labels, precisely the reverse of what one might expect. Children may acquire negative attitudes toward other ethnic groups well before they have supporting beliefs or stereotypes. Children begin to learn racial categories very early, but it takes them a while to get these firmly in their grasp. The results of a longitudinal study

(Aboud, 1995) suggest that 5-year-olds seem to have prejudice but that the degree of prejudice decreases at around 8-9 years of age. Accordingly, these results reflect the influence of specific cognitive skills, such as the ability to look more at individual characteristics instead of generalizing, or the ability to acquire a different perspective.

Gutman and Hickson's (1996) work on Euro-Australian children supports the role of cognition as an important factor in age-related changes in prejudice in children. They found that "greater maturity in the ability to reconcile different racial perspectives and to perceive between-race similarity was moderately related to greater racial tolerance" (Gutman & Hickson, p.448, 1996). And as they grow older, children develop the ability to make personal judgments that are not related to cultural stereotypes but to their own personal beliefs (Augoustinos & Rosewarne, 2001). Therefore, stereotypes in young children may not be related to prejudicial attitude, but rather to a cognitive inability to differentiate between personal judgment and cultural stereotypes.

In summary, there appears to be a consensus that racial attitudes begin to take shape and are observable during preschool years and that at the same time, children develop positive and negative feelings toward various groups. However, analysis of previous research has demonstrated some limitations such as the use of dolls and forced-choice formats (Aboud, 1988).

### *Methodological Issues*

The majority of the early studies and some recent ones use dolls to represent racial group membership (Branch & Newcombe, 1986; Clark & Clark, 1947; Farrell & Olson, 1983; Horowitz & Horowitz, 1938). However, the use of dolls has been criticized for the fact that they do not adequately represent people. Children consider dolls as toys they can manipulate (Aboud, 1988). The white dolls might have been chosen because they are familiar to the participants. The use of dolls may also have restricted the investigation to only certain ethnic groups (Black and White). Moreover the Doll Technique usually presented the children with representations identical in every aspect, but skin color. However, studies that have examined more than one physical feature have found that children use more than one racial cue, not only skin color, when discriminating among racial groups (Kircher & Furby, 1971; Sorce, 1979). Since 1974, researchers have used pictures of children in order to avoid the limitation of the Doll Technique. Pictures have the benefit of providing a variation of characteristics that are associated with a diverse ethnic group, allowing having appropriate representation of ethnic groups other than Black and White. However, the use of pictures may bring the problem of extraneous factors, such as attractiveness (Aboud, 1988).

Another problem related to most research on prejudice is the use of forced-choice measures. Many researchers have include only two racial groups, asking children to choose which one they would like to play with or which one is the good one (Clark & Clark, 1947; Farrell & Olson, 1983; Gopaul-McNicol, 1988; Horowitz & Horowitz, 1938). This method does not allow the child to like or dislike more than one group. The forced-choice also confounds acceptance of one group with the rejection of the other group. If the child prefers the white doll, it does not necessarily mean that he/she does not like the black doll. It also does not provide the intensity of the attitude. When a child prefers the white doll to the black doll it is not clear whether the preference shown is slight or strong.

#### *Summary Statement*

In regard of previous studies' limitations, the present study will examine racial preference amongst children utilizing the MRA and a picture selection/rejection task, two measures that allow separating in-group and out-group evaluation. Moreover, the MRA allows the evaluation of racial attitudes toward two out-groups. In their study, Doyle and Aboud (1995), along with others that had used the MRA (Aboud, 2003; Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996) only examined White children's prejudice. Considering that North America is an ethnically heterogeneous society, research should also examine racial preference of groups other than Whites.

Although, major societal changes have occurred since 1970, Blacks as well as other racial groups are still considered as Minorities with lower social, political and economic status than Whites.

This study will be an extension of Doyle and Aboud' study (1995), as it will examine the differences between racial preference amongst White and Minority children. More specifically, it will examine whether Minority children demonstrate the same level of in-group and out-group preference exhibited by White children as shown by previous research. Previous researchers have demonstrated the emergence of racial prejudice in preschool children; therefore this study will investigate the attitudes of children between 4 and 5-years old.

Four main research questions will guide this study. The first research question that will be addressed is whether or not White children will demonstrate the same level of prejudice toward Blacks and Asians. A second research question asked is if Minority children demonstrate the same level of prejudice toward both out-group (White and other Minority). The third research question investigated is the difference between White and Minority children's racial attitudes. Finally, the fourth research question asked is if there is a relationship between the level of prejudice and the selection of in-group pictures and the rejection of out-group pictures.

## Method

### *Participants*

The participants of this study were 56 preschool children (27 boys, 29 girls) from seven Anglophone daycare centers in the Montreal Metropolitan area. Participants were classified based on their ethnic background as "White" or "Minority" children. The "White" group included white children with European and Eastern background. The "Minority" group was composed of children with diverse ethnic and racial ancestry (Kurt, 2003): 13 Asian, 7 Black and 5 Arab. Four participants could not be included in either group as they were racially mixed (parents were from different backgrounds) and their responses were discarded for the analysis. Another participant was of unknown background (the parent gave an incomplete background questionnaire) and was also not included in the analyses.

### *Procedures*

Prior to implementation, the researcher contacted the directors of different daycare centers in the greater Montreal Metropolitan area to ask permission for the facilities' participation (Appendix A). Once permission was obtained, the class teacher was approached and informed of the study.

Following the teacher's consent to participate in the study, the researcher then contacted the parents through a letter that was sent home with the children (Appendix B). Parents were also

sent a permission form concerning acceptance or refusal of their child's participation to the study (Appendix B). Along with the permission form, parents were also sent a short demographic questionnaire (Appendix C) that addressed information on the participant's ethnic background. The parents were asked to return the consent form along with the questionnaire in an envelope (provided by the researcher) to the classroom teacher. Once those forms were returned to the researcher, the data collection process begun.

Based on the information obtained from the parent's questionnaire, the researcher determined each participant's group (White or Minority). Each participant was brought from his or her classroom to a separate private classroom setting in order to test them individually. In the first phase, they were given the MRA test following standardized procedure (F. E. Aboud, personal communication, September 10, 2003) (Appendix D). Children's responses were recorded on "pre-prepared" sheets (Appendix E). To ensure confidentiality, the researcher randomly assigned a participant number to each participant. This number was connected to each participant's identity on a master list and was used for data analysis purpose.

On the same day, following the MRA test, a picture selection/rejection task was given to the participant. The choice of the selected drawings was noted and participant's verbal



justifications were tape recorded and identified with the participant number. In order to separate the MRA test from the picture selection/rejection task as well as to allow the researcher to display the appropriate pictures, non-race related puzzles of low difficulty level were given to the children between the two tasks. Following the picture selection/rejection task, children were given a self-identification task. Testing time for all tasks took approximately 20 minutes for each participant. Once the child had completed all tasks, the researcher thanked the child for his/her participation and then accompanied him/her back to their respective classrooms.

#### *Measures and Scoring*

*Multi-response racial attitude measure (MRA: Doyle & Aboud, 1995).* Children's racial attitude was determined using the MRA following a standardized procedure used in previous studies (Doyle & Aboud, 1995, Aboud, 2003). The MRA consists of twenty evaluative adjectives, 10 positives and 10 negatives derived from the PRAM II and 4 neutral filler items (Appendix F). Each item is represented by a drawing of a concrete behavioral example on three 14 x 14 cm cards. Those cards were to be sorted among three boxes labeled as belonging to children from different racial background. To prevent response bias due to facial expression, color drawings of silhouettes without facial attributes was used to label the boxes. The original boxes were labeled as belonging to a White child, a

Black child and a Native Indian child (Doyle & Aboud, 1995). However, for the purpose of this study, when the participant was from an ethnic background other than the three mentioned above, the native Indian label was replaced by a label that would correspond to the participant's own ethnic group (e.g., Asian or Arab), in order to allow an in-group evaluation. The participant's in-group was determined based on the information obtained from the parent's questionnaire. Therefore, children were assigned an ethnic label (in-group) based on their parent's ethnic background. Colored drawing of heads representing White, Black, Native Indian, Asian, Latin American and Arab children were provided in both genders in order to control for gender bias. The choice of these racial categories was made in order to relate to ethnic composition of the greater Montreal Metropolitan demographic (Statistic Canada, 2003). However, the present study only utilized drawings related to White, Black, Asian and Arab children. The researcher changed the label of the boxes in accordance with the participant ethnicity and gender. For example, if the child is an Asian girl, one box was presented as belonging to a White girl and the other boxes were presented as belonging to a Black girl and to an Asian girl. For each item, the participant was given the three identical cards related to the adjective and was asked to place them in the box or boxes of "people who are that way" (see Appendix D for MRA instructions). For example, one item is "Some

children are naughty. They often do things like drawing on the wall. Is it the Black child, the White child or the Asian child, or more than one child who is naughty?" The cards show an apartment wall with crayon marks on it (Aboud, 2003).

*Scoring of the MRA.* The responses of the MRA were input into SPSS. Six scores, ranging from 0 to 10, were obtained by summing the number of in-group positive attributes assigned to each box (own, out-group 1 and out-group 2). An in-group evaluation was calculated by subtracting the number of negative evaluations from the number of positive evaluations attributed to the child's own group (positive/own - negative/own). An out-group evaluation was also derived for each of the two out-groups by similar calculations (positive - negative), with a possible range of -10 (very unfavorable) to + 10 (very favorable). Two prejudice measures were also calculated (prejudice 1 = in-group evaluation - out-group 1; prejudice 2 = in-group evaluation - out-group 2) to evaluate how much more favorable children were to the in-group in comparison to each of the out-groups (Aboud, 2003). Internal consistency for each of the six scores was satisfactory. Cronbach's alpha ranged from .84 to .88. Furthermore, both prejudice measures were combined to create an overall prejudice score (combined prejudice= prejudice 1 + prejudice 2) in order to allow a comparison between both racial groups.

*Pictures selection/rejection task.* A modified version of Bennett, Dewberry and Yeeles (1991) picture selection/rejection task was used to assess the participant racial preference. Drawings were presented instead of photographs as a way to control for external factors such as attractiveness or type of clothing (Aboud, 1988). In addition, drawings offer the advantage of systematic permutations by allowing figures to be varied on different characteristics chosen by the researcher. For example, drawing pictures of two, otherwise identical, girls could be varied only on the basis of color. In order to meet the requirements of this study, a new set of pictures were developed. The pictures were based on the original drawings used by Doyle and Aboud (1995) to label the MRA boxes. A total of 24 colored drawings representing diverse ethnic groups were made for this task. These pictures represent an equal number of (a) boys and girls, (b) White, Black, Native Indian, Asian, Latin American and Arab children (4 of each group) and (c) children expressing either a smiling or neutral expression. However, as mentioned earlier, drawings that represented Native Indian and Latin American were not utilized due to the absence of participant from those backgrounds. Only 12 pictures were presented to each participant. The researcher selected and randomly arranged the 12 pictures that correspond to the 3 ethnic groups that were used for the MRA testing for each participant.

The researcher then asked the participant: "Can you tell me if there are any children who you think are nice?" After each selection, the child was asked to justify their choice: "Why do you like this one?" S/He was then asked whether there were any children that s/he thought were "not nice", and also had to justify each judgment. This measure was given to establish if the children will display ethnocentrism by favoring their in-group and rejecting out-group children. Children's selections were noted and their verbal justifications were tape recorded. Coding categories were generated in light of the preliminary analysis of participant's justification for selecting or rejecting pictures (Appendix G).

*Self-identification task.* Using the same drawings as for the picture selection/rejection task, the researcher asked the child "Which one do you think looks most like you?" and "Why do you think this one (pointing the child's choice) looks most like you?" This self-identification task question was added to evaluate the participant's awareness of their own race and if they would address race in their justification. Since the literature has demonstrated that self-identification may influence the development of racial prejudice, in order to reduce response bias to the racial preference measures, the self-identification task was only given upon completion of the previous tasks. Responses

were analyzed using the same coding scheme as for the picture rejection/selection task.

#### *Interrater Reliability*

The primary researcher and a second researcher unfamiliar with the purpose of the study conducted interrater reliability on 15/51 (29%) children's verbal justification for the picture selection/rejection task and for the self-identification. The reliability was verified by calculating the number of answers that were in agreement on the sum of answers in agreement and disagreement multiplied by 100 in order to obtain a percentage. The mean reliability for the children's verbal justification reached an average of 86% agreement.

### Results

#### *Descriptive Statistics*

*Participants.* A total of 51 preschoolers (24 boys, 27 girls) with a mean age of 58 months (4 years 10 months) participated in this study. For further analysis, participants were also divided into two groups: White (26) and Minority (25). The means, standard deviations, and maintenance are presented in Table 1.

*Multi-response racial attitude.* Descriptive statistics for the MRA for both racial groups were computed. Table 2 illustrates the means, standard deviation, and range for racial attitudes for White children and Table 3 present the means, standard deviations and range for Minority children.

*Picture selection/rejection task.* Descriptive statistics for the selection/rejection task were computed (Table 4). Overall 84.3 % of the children selected at least one in-group picture during the picture selection task and 94.1 % rejected at least one out-group picture during the picture rejection task. More specifically, 96.2 % of White children choose at least one in-group picture for selection task and rejected at least one out-group at 96.2 %. Minority children chose at least one in-group picture at 65.2 % for the selection task and rejected at least one out-group picture at 87.8 %.

*Self-identification task.* With regard to the self-identification task, 74.5% of the participants correctly chose an in-group picture for the self-identification question. However, White children demonstrated a higher level of self racial awareness (85%) than Minority children (64%).

*Children's verbal justifications.* In order to determine how children justified their choices for selection/rejection and self-identification tasks, frequency counts were run on the participants' verbal justification and were coded prior to analysis. Table 5 provides the frequencies for all the reasons given to justify their choices. Facial expression (60.8%) appears to be the most frequent reason for the selection/rejection task while physical attribute (80.4%) was the most frequent reason for the self identification task. As in Bennett's study (1991), race

has only low frequencies in all 3 tasks: 0% for the rejection task, 2% for the selection task and 5.9% for the self-identification task.

White children (Table 6) only mentioned race for the self-identification task (11.5%), while Minority children (Table 7) only mentioned race for the selection task (4%). Gender also had low frequencies in children's justifications with an average of 3.9% for all three tasks.

#### *Analysis of Research Questions*

*Preliminary analysis.* First, since the participants were derived from different daycare centers, a one way analysis of variance was computed to verify if there was a significant difference between daycares. In regard to the level prejudice (combined prejudice score), results demonstrate no significant differences between daycare centers  $F(1, 6) = 1.51, p > 0.05$ . To establish whether age was a factor in the level of prejudice, a second ANOVA was calculated. Findings indicate that there was no significant difference between age groups (e.g., 49 months, 50 months, etc.) and the level of prejudice  $F(1, 16) = 0.915, p > 0.05$ . Finally, in order to determine whether boys and girls differ in their level of prejudice, an ANOVA was conducted with gender as the independent variable and the level of prejudice as the dependant variable. Girls ( $M = 8.56$ ) demonstrated a higher level of prejudice than Boys ( $M = 6.38$ ). However, results of this



analysis were not significant  $F(1, 50) = 0.319, p > 0.05$  (Table 8). There is no significant difference between boys and girls level of prejudice.

*Question 1: Is there a difference between White children's level of prejudice toward Black and Asian?*

In order to determine if there was a difference between White children's level of prejudice toward Black and toward Asian, a paired t-test between prejudice 1 (toward Black) and prejudice 2 (toward Asian) for White participants was conducted. Results demonstrated that there is no significant difference between prejudice toward Black and prejudice toward Asian  $t(25) = 1.96, p > .05$  (Table 9). Even though the participants demonstrate more prejudice toward Black ( $M = 6.69$ ) than toward Asian ( $M = 3.96$ ), this difference was not statistically significant. Further analyses were done to establish if White children demonstrated the same level of evaluation for in-group than for both out-groups. Results show that White children assigned more positive adjectives, to their own group than to Black,  $t(25) = 4.852, p < .01$  or Asian,  $t(25) = 3.870, p < .01$ . Moreover, t-tests on in-group evaluation and both out-groups evaluation indicate that White children evaluated their in-group more positively than they evaluated Black,  $t(25) = 4.513, p < .01$  or Asian,  $t(25) = 3.426, p < .01$  (Table 10).

*Question 2: Is there a difference between Minority children's level of prejudice toward other Minority and toward White?*

A paired sample t-test looking at Minority children's level of prejudice for other Minority and White (i.e., prejudice 1 and prejudice 2) was computed. The results illustrated in Table 11 showed a statistically significant difference in the level of prejudice toward other Minority and toward White for Minority participants  $t(24) = 5.109, p < .01$ . Overall, Minority children demonstrated more prejudice toward other Minority ( $M = 6.44$ ) than toward White ( $M = 2.16$ ). In order to investigate these findings further, analyses were computed on positive and negative attribution given to each groups. Findings revealed a significant difference in children's attribution of positive adjectives for their in-group and for the out-group 1 (other Minority),  $t(24) = 3.479, p < .05$ . Minority children also seem to attribute more positive adjectives to out-group 2 (White) than to their own group. However, this difference was not significant,  $t(24) = -1.537, p > .05$ . Similar results were obtained with paired t-test between in-group evaluation and out-groups evaluation. Participants significantly evaluate their in-group more positively than out-group 1,  $t(24) = 3.442, p < .05$ , but no significant difference were found between in-group evaluation and out-group evaluation 2,  $t(24) = -1.370, p > .05$  (Table 12).

*Question 3: Do White and Minority children differ in racial prejudice?*

In order to establish if White and Minority children differ in their level of prejudice, an analysis of variance was done. The independent variable was the racial groups and the dependant variable was the level of prejudice toward all groups (MRA combined prejudice score). White children ( $M = 10.65$ ) were found to be more prejudiced than minority children ( $M = 4.28$ ). However, that difference was not statistically significant,  $F(1, 50) = 2.877, p > .05$  (Table 13). Further analysis was conducted comparing White and Minority children results on the picture selection/rejection task and the self-identification task (Table 14). Findings reveal a significant difference,  $F(49) = 7.944, p < .05$ , between the picture selection of in-group. White children ( $M = 1.65$ ) appeared to select more in-group drawing than Minority children ( $M = 1.08$ ) when asked to identify "nice children".

In order to assess if there was a significant relationship between White and Minority level of self-identification, a one-way ANOVA was conducted. Results show that White children identified themselves more accurately than Minority children, however that difference was not significant,  $F(49) = 2.902, p > .05$ .

*Question 4: Is there a relation between the level of prejudice, the selection of in-group picture and the rejection of out-group picture?*

In order to determine if there is a relation between the selection of in-group picture and the rejection of out-group picture, and the level of racial prejudice as measured by the MRA, correlation tests were conducted. Findings reveal that selection of in-group was positively correlated with level of prejudice,  $r(50) = 0.286, p < .05$ . Selection of in-group was also positively correlated to the rejection of out-groups,  $r(50) = 0.450, p < .01$ . However, no significant relation was found between the children's level of prejudice and the rejection of out-group picture (Table 15).

Table 1.

*Number of Participants and Means, Standard Deviation, and Ranges of Age (n=51)*

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Range</i>
Sample	51	57.73	4.66	49-65
Boys	24	56.96	4.98	49-65
Girls	27	58.41	4.34	49-65
White	26	56.58	4.72	49-65
Minority	25	58.92	4.38	49-65

*Note.* The children's age is in months.

Table 2.

*Means, Standard Deviation, and Ranges of White Participants*

(*n*=26)

Racial Evaluation	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Range</i>
Positive in-group	8.12	2.14	4-10
Positive out-group 1	4.85	3.07	1-10
Positive out-group 2	5.96	2.86	0-10
Negative in-group	3.42	3.20	0-10
Negative out-group 1	6.96	2.76	2-10
Negative out-group 2	5.35	3.29	0-10

*Note.* Out-group 1= Black, Out-group 2= Asian

Table 3.

*Means, Standard Deviation, and Ranges of Minority Participants*

(n=25)

Racial Evaluation	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Range</i>
Positive in-group	7.00	3.18	0-10
Positive out-group 1	3.44	3.39	0-10
Positive out-group 2	8.12	2.64	1-10
Negative in-group	4.48	3.45	0-10
Negative out-group 1	7.36	3.24	0-10
Negative out-group 2	3.44	3.36	0-10

*Note.* Out-group 1= Other Minority, Out-group 2= White

Table 4.

*Frequency, percentages, Means, Standard Deviation and Ranges  
of Picture Selection/Rejection Task (n=51)*

Group	Nb. of picture	Freq.	%	M	SD	Range
White						
Selection of in-group	0	1	3.8	1.65	.629	0-3
	1	8	30			
	2	16	61.5			
	3	1	3.8			
Rejection of out-group	0	1	3.8	2.23	1.243	0-4
	1	8	30.8			
	2	7	26.9			
	3	4	15.4			
	4	6	23.1			
Minority						
Selection of in-group	0	7	28	1.08	.812	0-2
	1	9	36			
	2	9	36			
Rejection of out-group	0	2	8	2.72	1.815	0-8
	1	5	20			
	2	6	24			
	3	2	8			
	4	8	32			
	5	1	4			
	8	1	4			

*Note.* The maximum number of picture for selection of in-group is 4. The maximum number of picture for rejection of out-group is 8.



Table 5.

*Children's Verbal Justification (n=51)*

Justification	Frequency cited (%)
Picture Selection Task	
Race	2
Facial expression	60.8
Physical attribute	25.5
Gender	5.5
No reason	7.8
Other	25.5
Picture Rejection Task	
Race	0
Facial expression	60.8
Physical attribute	23.5
Gender	3.9
No reason	2
Other	29.4
Self-identification Task	
Race	5.9
Facial expression	13.7
Physical attribute	80.4
Gender	2
No reason	3.9
Other	5.9

Table 6.

*Children's Verbal Justification for White Children (n=26)*

Justification	Frequency cited (%)
Picture Selection Task	
Race	0
Facial expression	57.7
Physical attribute	26.9
Gender	3.8
No reason	0
Other	30.8
Picture Rejection Task	
Race	0
Facial expression	57.7
Physical attribute	23.1
Gender	3.8
No reason	0
Other	34.6
Self-identification Task	
Race	11.5
Facial expression	11.5
Physical attribute	76.9
Gender	3.8
No reason	0
Other	7.7

Table 7.

*Children's Verbal Justification for Minority Children (n=25)*

Justification	Frequency cited (%)
Picture Selection Task	
Race	4
Facial expression	64
Physical attribute	24
Gender	8
No reason	16
Other	16
Picture Rejection Task	
Race	0
Facial expression	64
Physical attribute	24
Gender	4
No reason	4
Other	24
Self-identification Task	
Race	0
Facial expression	16
Physical attribute	84
Gender	0
No reason	8
Other	4

Table 8.

*Mean Differences between Boys and Girls for Level of Prejudice*  
(*n*=51)

---

Group	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Boys	24	6.38	13.665	.319	.575
Girls	27	8.56			

---

Note. \**p* < .05, two-tailed. \*\**p* < .01, two-tailed.

Table 9.

*Mean Differences between Prejudice toward Black and Prejudice toward Asian for White Children (n=26)*

---

Prejudice	<i>M</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Toward Black	6.69	1.96	25	.06
Toward Asian	3.96			

---

Note. \* $p < .05$ , two-tailed. \*\* $p < .01$ , two-tailed.

Table 10.

*Mean Differences between Racial Evaluation toward Black and toward Asian for White Children (n=26)*

Racial Evaluation	<i>M</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Positive own Positive Black	8.12 4.85	4.852	25	.000**
Positive own Positive Asian	8.12 5.96	3.870	25	.001**
Negative own Negative Black	3.42 6.96	-4.057	25	.000**
Negative own Negative Asian	3.42 5.35	-2.509	25	.019
In-group evaluation Out-group evaluation 1	4.58 -2.12	4.513	25	.000**
In-group evaluation Out-group evaluation 2	4.58 .62	3.426	25	.002**

Note. \**p* < .05, two-tailed. \*\**p* < .01, two-tailed.

Table 11.

*Mean Differences between Prejudice toward Other Minority and  
Prejudice toward White for Minority Children (n=25)*

Prejudice	<i>M</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Toward other Minority	6.44	5.109	24	.00**
Toward White	-2.16			

Note. \* $p < .05$ , two-tailed. \*\* $p < .01$ , two-tailed.

Table 12.

*Mean Differences between Racial Evaluation toward Other  
Minority and toward White for Minority Children (n=25)*

Racial Evaluation	<i>M</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Positive own Positive other Minority	7.00 3.44	3.479	24	.002**
Positive own Positive White	7.00 8.12	-1.537	24	.137
Negative own Negative other Minority	4.48 7.36	-2.632	24	.015*
Negative own Negative White	4.48 3.44	1.127	24	.271
In-group evaluation Out-group evaluation 1	2.52 -3.92	3.442	24	.002**
In-group evaluation Out-group evaluation 2	2.52 4.68	-1.370	25	.183

Note. \* $p < .05$ , two-tailed. \*\* $p < .01$ , two-tailed.



Table 13.

*Mean Differences between White and Minority for Level of Prejudice (n=51)*

Racial					
Group	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
White	26	10.28	13.665	2.877	.096
Minority	25	4.28			

Note. \* $p < .05$ , two-tailed. \*\* $p < .01$ , two-tailed.

Table 14.

*Mean Differences between White and Minority for Picture Selection/Rejection and Self-identification Task (n=51)*

Task	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Select in-group				
White	1.65	.774	7.994	.007*
Minority	1.08			
Reject out-group				
White	2.23	1.55	1.270	.265
Minority	2.72			
Self-Identification				
White	.85	.440	2.902	.95
Minority	.64			

Note. \* $p < .05$ , two-tailed. \*\* $p < .01$ , two-tailed.

Table 15.

*Intercorrelation between Level of Prejudice, Selection of In-group Picture and Rejection of Out-group Picture (n=51)*

	MRA Prejudice	Selection of In-group	Rejection of Out-group
MRA Prejudice	-	.286*	.186
Selection of In-group		-	.450**
Rejection of Out-group			-

Note. \* $p < .05$ , one-tailed. \*\* $p < .01$ , one-tailed.

## Discussion

Numerous studies have been conducted in order to understand children's prejudicial attitudes. Research on racial awareness has suggested that children demonstrate both racial awareness and preference as young as 4 to 5 years of age (Aboud, 1988; Asher & Allen; 1969; Kircher & Furby; 1971, Clark & Clark, 1947).

Furthermore, other studies have investigated young children's racial preferences (Farrell & Olson, 1983; Gopaul-McNicol, 1995; Hraba & Grant, 1970; Press, Burts & Barling, 1979). Research findings have indicated that young children, regardless of their race, appear to prefer pictures or dolls representing White children over representations of Black children (Asher & Allen, 1969; Clark & Clark, 1940; Fine & Bower, 1984; Gopaul-McNicol, 1988; Kircher & Furby, 1971; Morland, 1962).

The majority of these researchers came to that conclusion using forced-choice measure (i.e., the Clark Doll Test, the PRAM II) which allowed differentiating in-group favoritism and out-group derogation. More recent studies (Doyle & Aboud, 1995; Aboud, 2003; Gutman & Hickson, 1996) have addressed this methodological issue by utilizing the MRA, a measure that permits separating in-group and out-group evaluations. However, those studies only examined White children's prejudice. Therefore, the main purpose of this study was to investigate White and Minority children's

preferences using measures such as the MRA and a picture selection/rejection task.

More specifically, the present study examines the differences between White and Minority children's racial attitude toward their own group and two racial out-groups. The following section includes a discussion of the results in relation to each research questions, limitations of this study, implications for parents and educators and suggestions for further research.

#### *Gender Difference*

The results of the study demonstrate no difference between boys' and girls' racial preferences. This finding appears to be consistent with the literature (Moore, Hawk & Denne, 1994; Doyle & Aboud, 1995; Ramsey, 1991; Press, Burt & Barling, 1979; Clark, Hocevar & Dembo, 1980).

#### *White Children's Racial Preference*

The first research question addressed whether White children would demonstrate the same level of prejudice toward Black Minority and Asian Minority. Relatively few studies have investigated White Children's prejudice toward other racial group than Black. In a study examining White children's racial attitude, Doyle and Aboud (1995), found that children seem to have less negative attitudes toward Native Indian than Black. Another study utilizing similar measures revealed that Euro-Australian children evaluate Aboriginals more negatively than Asian Australian (Black-

Gutman & Hickson, 1996). The differences in bias toward both minority groups were suggested to be related to "environmental learning factors" (Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996, p.455) that reflects negative stereotypes of Aboriginal people in the Australian society.

However the results of the present study revealed that there was no significant difference between the means, suggesting that White children demonstrate the same level of prejudice toward the Black and Asian groups. Although this finding contradicts Doyle and Aboud (1995) and Black-Gutman and Hickson (1996) findings, it is consistent with the results of a previous study by Ramsey (1991). When comparing White preschooler's response to photographs of Asian and Black children, Ramsey found no difference in the children's racial preference for both groups. One explanation for the lack of differentiation found in the present study is that children perceived both Black and Asian as equal in social status or that they considered both groups as out-groups as opposed to in-groups. However, analysis of the means suggest that children have shown more prejudice toward Black than Asian. Therefore, another possible explanation could be that the sample was too small. A larger sample for White children than was employed for the current study might have provided more statistical power.

An alternative explanation could also be that prejudice is determined by cognitive factors (Aboud, 1988) and not influenced

by cultural or social factors. According to the Cognitive Developmental Theory, prejudice occurs as a result of the children's cognitive level of development. Young children lack the ability to attend to individual differences within groups and tend to generalize group differences (Aboud, 1988). Therefore, children could not express different levels of prejudice toward the two out-groups as a function of their social representation.

Furthermore, White participants' in-group and out-group evaluations were also analyzed. The finding that White children attributed more positive adjectives to their own group than to the other groups concurs with previous research's findings (Aboud, 1988). In addition, they attribute less negative adjectives to their in-group than to both out-groups, therefore providing a significantly higher score of in-group evaluation than out-group evaluation for both Black and Asian. These results seem to support Tajfel and Turner's (1979) Social Identity Theory, that children demonstrate in-group favoritism and negative attitude toward out-groups in order to maintain a positive social identity.

#### *Minority Children's Racial Preference*

The analysis conducted on the Minority children's responses examined whether there was a difference between their level of prejudice toward another Minority and toward White. Findings indicated that Minority children were significantly more prejudiced toward the other Minority group than toward the White

group. Although there is a lack of empirical evidence on Minority racial attitude toward other minority, these findings seem to support Allport's (1954) Social Reflection Theory suggesting that prejudice develops through socialization. According to this theory, children would be more favorable to the White group, who represent the majority, than to the other minority.

Moreover, results from the analysis of the MRA scores revealed that Minority children attributed more positive adjectives to their in-group than to the other minority. In addition, their out-group evaluation of the other minority was shown to be significantly lower than their in-group evaluation.

It also was found that there were no significant differences between the Minority children's in-group evaluation and their out-group evaluation of the White group, suggesting that Minority children evaluate themselves similarly to White children.

However, it is interesting to note that Minority children appear to give more positive adjectives to the White group than to their own group. They also seem to attribute more negative adjectives to their own group than to the White group. Perhaps if the sample had been larger, the findings would have been significant, but it does appear that Minority children seem to demonstrate a preference toward the White group over their own group.



*Comparison Between White and Minority Children's Racial Preference*

*Multi-response racial attitude.* Findings revealed no significant difference between White and Minority children's level of prejudice. Although numerous research studies have examined Black and White children's pattern of racial preferences, relatively few have assessed whether White and Minority children demonstrate the same level of prejudice. The finding that no difference between both groups was found seems to be inconsistent with previous research results (Taylor, 1966; Williams & Al., 1975a) that have shown a lower level of prejudice amongst Black children than White children. However, the Minority group of this study is composed of a higher percentage of other minorities (Asian and Arab) than Black and therefore, findings might not be comparable to the findings of previous studies. In addition, although there was no significant difference, results indicated that Minority children demonstrate lower prejudice scores than White children.

*Picture selection/rejection task.* Results showed that Minority children selected in-group pictures less often than White children. Likewise Minority children rejected out-group pictures less often than White Children. These findings provide support to earlier work (Aboud & Mitchell, 1997; Asher & Allen, 1969; Clark & Clark, 1947; Williams & Al, 1975b; Gopaul-McNicol, 1986) that Black children as well as other Minorities appears to prefer white

Social Reflection Theory, environmental factors can account for those differences. In contrast, the Social Identity Theory would suggest that Minority children that demonstrate racial preference toward another group over their own, probably also demonstrate a negative self-concept.

*Verbal justification for picture selection/rejection and self-identification task.* In accordance with Bennett's study (1991), ethnicity was mentioned only relatively few times across the 3 tasks. The most frequent justification for the picture selection/rejection task was facial expression. The majority of children (96.1%) chose at least one picture with a smiling facial expression for "children who you think are nice" and pictures with the neutral expression for "children who you think are not nice" (98%). In contrast, 31.4 % chose pictures with the neutral expression in response to "children who are nice" and only 29,4% selected pictures with the smiling expression for "children who you think are not nice". This finding suggests that facial expression might be used as a cue to make personality inferences (e.g., "he looks mad", "he's smiling, he must be nice", etc.).

For the self-identification task, Minority children demonstrated lower results than White children. This may be explained by the fact that the material that was utilized might have confused Arab children. The Arab children that misidentified their in-group chose a drawing of a White child when asked to

identify the picture that looked most like them. The drawings of Arab and White children were extremely similar and could only be differentiated by a darker skin color and darker hair; however, preschool children might not have been able to differentiate between the two groups without help. For instance, verbal identification of the drawings by the researcher may have increased the children's ability to correctly identify with the pictures of their in-group. In addition, the most frequent justification children made for self-identification was "physical attribute" ("Black hair like me" most). Therefore it could also be possible that children based their self-identification on individual variable (e.g., physical attribute, facial expression) rather than on group variable (race, gender).

#### *Correlation Analyses*

In terms of the measurements use in this study, a multiple analysis of variance reveals some significant findings. In contrast to the picture rejection of out-group, the picture selection of in-group was found to be significantly correlated with the MRA composite (combined prejudice score), which represent the children's overall level of prejudice. In addition, the picture rejection of out-group was shown to be strongly correlated with the picture selection of in-group. Although those findings seem to contradict themselves, they are supported by Aboud's research findings (2003). Her findings revealed that the PRAM

research findings (2003). Her findings revealed that the PRAM which confounds in-group and out-group evaluation was significantly correlated to the MRA in-group favoritism but not to out-group prejudice. In regard to this finding, one may speculate that the MRA seems to measure more accurately in-group evaluation than out-group evaluation. However, further study should be done before any conclusion can be drawn. Although the measures were not the same, the positive correlation obtained between in-group selection and out-group rejection picture appeared to be consistent with Doyle and Aboud's (1995) findings which revealed a significant and positive correlation between positive-White and negative-Black attribution.

#### *Limitations*

The primary limitation is the small sample size of the study ( $N = 51$ ). The small number of children that participated in the study may not have provided sufficient statistical power, to allow the detection of certain differences. This could explain the non-significance of some tests.

The second limitation relates to the fact that all the participants in this study were attending daycare centers. Consequently, the findings may not be representative of children who do not attend daycare. Moreover, the seven daycare centers that participate in this study were located in the greater metropolitan area of Montreal, a relatively multicultural setting.

Therefore, results might have been different for children from more homogenous settings.

The third limitation concerned the administration of the three measures. Measures were always presented in the same order; as a result, there was no consideration for a counterbalance effect. In addition, the three measures were given within the same testing period with only a five minutes break between the presentation of the MRA and the selection/rejection task, which did not allow sufficient time to prevent the fact that some of the picture selection/rejection responses might be influenced by the MRA attributions.

The fourth limitation was that children were not given the option to not assign the MRA adjective to any of the groups. This lack of option may have forced the children to assign more negative objectives than they would have if the option was given to them. Perhaps a fourth box label "trash can" would have allowed children to throw negatives items they though would not applied to any group (Kowalski, 2002 as cited in Aboud, 2003).

A final limitation is the racial composition of the Minority group. Three different groups (Black, Asian and Arab) were analyzed as one racial group. However, those groups might have different patterns of racial attitude. Findings might have been different if the composition of the Minority groups was changed (e.g., more Black children or more Arab children).

### *Implications for Parents and Educators*

Results from this study have practical implications for both parents and educators. Findings have demonstrated that children of 4 to 5 years old seem to favor their own group over other racial groups. This indicates a tendency to positively evaluate their in-group. Educators could therefore use cooperative tasks to allow children to identify with their team and extend in-group favoritism to teammates regardless of their racial appearance (Fishbein, 2002). In addition, both educators and parents should consider teaching children about cultural diversity. An anti-bias curriculum could also be implemented as early as preschool level. Evidence to support explanations provided by the Social Reflection Theory was found in this study. This theory proposes that societal environmental factors are related to children's racial preference. Consequently, parents and educators should be aware of their roles as socializing agents and provide children with positive role models. For example, teachers should include curriculum materials that depict different races in a positive light as well as activities such as celebrating holidays from different cultures or reading books from authors from different background.

### *Suggestions for Future Research*

The purpose of the present study was to examine the differences of White and Minority preschool children's racial attitude. Even though results have shown that children of both

group seems to attribute more positive adjectives to their in-group than to out-groups, it does not clearly establish whether or not there is a difference between White and Minority Children's level of prejudice. Therefore, it is important to further investigate these findings further. This study has examined racial attitudes of 4-5 years old children. Further research could extend this study by assessing children of 7-8 years old racial preference. This type of study would allow cross-sectional analysis that could shed light on the development of Minority and White children's racial preference, since there is still no consensus on the subject. Also, the sample was relatively small, thus further research should increase the sample size in order to increase statistical power as well as the level of generalizability of the findings. Future studies may also investigate the different minority groups by assessing them individually (e.g., Black, Asian and Arab) as opposed to combining them into one group. Moreover, as an extension of this study, researchers may consider investigating children's racial attitudes in a racially homogenous community. It would be interesting to assess the salience of race in such a community. Finally, future research may also consider investigating the influence of children's racial attitudes on children's behavioral discrimination.

Furthermore, the relationship between self-esteem and racial preference should be explored in future research as research evidence has suggested that a strong ethnic identity will lead to positive in-group evaluation which predicts a positive out-group attribution (Phinney, Ferguson & Tale, 1997).

#### Conclusion

In summary, the results obtained in this study provide further insight into the development of young children's racial preferences, particularly of Minority children. More specifically, this study found that both White and Minority children tend to evaluate their in-group more positively than their out-group. However, Minority and White children differ in their prejudice level towards out-groups. It was found that White children's prejudice level was similar for both Black and Asian, while Minority children appeared to demonstrate more prejudice toward the other Minority group than toward Whites. In addition, children's level of prejudice, as measured by the MRA and the selection of in-group pictures was found to be significantly related. A positive relationship between their selection of in-group pictures and the rejection of out-group pictures was also found.

Overall, the results of this study not only contribute to a better understanding of racial prejudice in young children, but also provide helpful indications for adults, especially parents



and educators. What the research suggests to date is that straightforward and focused discussions about racial issues are necessary in order to foster changes in negative attitudes about others (Aboud, 1988). Given the state of the world and the fact that a peaceful co-existence is still not the norm, teaching children to work, live and love together can only begin by encouraging young children to develop accepting attitudes and an ability to appreciate others and other's multiple perspectives. Considering that prejudice develops in children at such an early age, it is imperative that early childhood curriculums consider incorporating anti-bias philosophies. By incorporating such philosophies, parents and educators can play a pivotal role in the development of children's understanding and appreciation for cultures different than their own.

## References

- Aboud, F. E. (1988). *Children and prejudice*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Aboud, F. E. (2003). The formation of in-group favoritism and out-group prejudice in young children: Are they distinct attitudes? *Developmental Psychology, 39*(1), 48-60.
- Aboud, F. E., & Skerry, S. A. (1984). The development of ethnic attitudes: A critical review. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 15*(1), 3-34.
- Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Asher, S.R. & Allen, V.L. (1969). Racial preference and social comparison processes. *Journal of Social Issues, 25*, 157-165.
- Augoustinos, M., & Rosewarne, D. L. (2001). Stereotype knowledge and prejudice in Children. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 19*(1), 143-156.
- Bennet, M., Deuberry, C., & Yeeles, C. (1991). A reassessment of the role of ethnicity in children's social perception. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, 32*(6), 969-982.
- Best, D.L., Naylor, C.E., & Williams, J.E. (1975). Extension of color bias research to young French and Italian children. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 6*, 390-405.

- Branch, C.W., and Newcombe, N. (1986). Racial attitude development among young Black children as a function of parental attitudes: A longitudinal and cross-sectional study. *Child Development, 57*, 712-721.
- Brown, R. (1995). *Prejudice: Its social psychology*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Cameron, J. A., Alvarez, J. M., Ruble, D. N., & Fuligni, A. J. (2001). Children's lay theories about ingroups and outgroups: Reconceptualizing research on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 5*(2), 118-128.
- Clark, A., Hocevar, D., & Dembo, M.H. (1980). The role of cognitive development in children's explanations and preferences for skin color. *Developmental Psychology, 16*, 332-339.
- Clark, K.B. & Clark, M.K. (1947). Racial identification and preferences in Negro children. In T.M. Newcomb & E.L. Hartley (Ed.), *Reading in social psychology* (pp.169-178). New York: Holt.
- Clark, K.B., & Clark, M.K. (1940). Skin color as a factor in racial identification of Negro preschool children. *Journal of Social Psychology, 11*, 159-169.
- Doherty-Derkowski, G. (1995). *Quality matters: Excellence in early childhood programs*. Ontario: Addison-Wesley.

- Doyle, A. B., & Aboud, F. E. (1995). A longitudinal study of white children's racial prejudice as a social-cognitive development. *Merrill-Palmer-Quarterly*, 41(2), 209-28.
- Farrell, W.S., & Olson, J.L. (1983). Kenneth and Mamie Clark revisited: Racial identification and racial preference in dark-skinned and light-skinned Black children. *Urban Education*, 18(3), 284-297.
- Fine, M., & Bowers, C. (1984). Racial self-identification: The effects of social history and gender. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 14(2), 136-146.
- Fishbein, H.D. (2002). Peer prejudice and discrimination: The origins of prejudice (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gopaul-McNicol, S. (1995). A cross-cultural examination of racial identity and racial preference of preschool children in the West Indies. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26(2), 141-152.
- Gopaul-McNicol, S. (1988). Racial identification and racial preference of Black preschool children in New York and Trinidad. *The Journal of Black Psychology*, 14(2), 65-68.
- Graves, S. B. (1999). Television and prejudice reduction: When does television as a vicarious experience make a difference? *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(4), 707-727.

- Gutman, D. B., & Hickson, F. (1996). The relationship between racial attitudes and social cognitive development in children: An Australian study. *Developmental Psychology*, 32(3), 448-56.
- Hall N.S., & Rhomberg, V. (1995). *The affective curriculum: Teaching the anti-bias approach to young children*. Scarborough, Ontario: International Thomson.
- Horowitz, E. L., & Horowitz, R. E. (1938). Development of social attitudes in children. *Sociometry*, 1, 301-338.
- Hraba, J., Grant, G. (1970). Black is beautiful a reexamination of racial preference and identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 16(3), 398-402.
- Kircher, M., & Furby, L. (1971). Racial preference in young children. *Child Development*, 42, 2076-2078.
- Kurt, K. (2003). The emergence and racial attitudes in preschool-aged children. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 143(6), 677-691.
- Levy, S. R. (1999). Reducing prejudice: Lessons from social-cognitive factors underlying perceiver differences in prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(4), 745-766.
- Milner, D. (1983). *Children and race*. Sage Publications: London.
- Milner, D. (1997). Racism and childhood identity. *Psychology*, 10(3), 123-125.

- Moore, J.W., Hauck, W.E., & Denne, T.C. (1983). Racial prejudice, interracial contact and personality variables. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 52, 169-173.
- Morland, J.K. (1985). The development of racial bias in young children. *Theory into Practice*, 26, 472-479.
- Pellegrini, A.D. & Bjorkland, D.F. (1998). *Applied child study: A developmental approach* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbawn Associates.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 65-85.
- Phinney, J. S., Ferguson D. L., & Tate, J. D. (1997). Intergroup attitudes among ethnic minority adolescents: A causal model. *Child Development*, 68(5), 955-969.
- Press, L., Burts, I., & Barling (1979). Racial preferences among South African White and Black preschool children. *Journal of Social psychology*, 107, 125-126.
- Radke, M., Sutherland, J., & Rosenberg, P. (1950). Racial attitudes of children. *Sociometry*, 13, 154-171.
- Ramsey, P. G. (1987). *Teaching and learning in a diverse world: multicultural education for young children*. New York: Columbia University
- Ramsey, P.G. (1991). The salience of race in young children growing up in an all-white community. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83(1), 28-34.

- Sorce, J.F. (1979). The role of physiognomy in the development of racial awareness. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 134, 34-41.
- Statistic Canada (1995). *Immigrants in Quebec. Canadian Social Trends*. Catalogue 11-008E
- Statistic Canada (n.d.) *2001 Census*. Retrieved March 27, 2003, from <http://www.statcan.ca/english/Pgdb/demo53b.htm>.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrate theory of intergroup conflict. In W.G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Taylor, R.G., Jr. (1966). Racial stereotypes in young children. *The Journal of Psychology*, 64, 137-142.
- Williams, J.E., Best, D.L., Boswell, D.A., Mattson, L.A., & Graves, D.J. (1975a). Preschool Racial Attitude Measure II. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 35, 3-18.
- Williams, J.E., Boswell, D. A., & Best, D. L. (1975b). Evaluative responses of preschool children to the colors white and black. *Child Development*, 46, 501-508.
- Wolfe, C. T. & Spencer, S. J. (1996). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their overt and subtle influence in the classroom. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(2), 176-185.

Appendix A.

Letter and consent forms for the schools



\_\_\_\_\_ I give permission for this study to be conducted in this facility.

\_\_\_\_\_ I do not give permission for this study to be conducted in this facility.

Name and name of  
Facility \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Witness Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Appendix B.

Letter and Consent Forms for Parents

## CONSENT FORM FOR THE PARTICIPATION IN A RESEARCH PROJECT

This is to state that I agree to allow my child to participate in the research project conducted by Khamy Phomphakdy and under the supervision of Dr. Miranda D'Amico from the Education Department at Concordia University.

### A. Purpose

I have been informed that the purpose of this research project is to examine cultural awareness among preschool children.

### B. PROCEDURE

I understand that my child will participate in a study conducted at his/her educational facility. I am aware that my child will be required to complete a standardized attitude test as well as a picture selection / rejection task. I understand that my child's answers to the selection/ rejection task be tape recorded. The study will only require a minimal amount of time of my child's time, approximately 20 minutes. I also am aware that I am required to fill out a short demographic questionnaire in order to provide information on my child's background. I will be asked to return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to my child's daycare educator. I understand that the above procedure will not harm or risk my child nor myself. Finally, I understand that all the information provided to the researcher will not be divulged without my permission.

### C. PARTICIPATION CONDITIONS

- I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue my participation at any time, without consequence. I understand that my child is free to discontinue participation at any time, without consequence.
- I understand that my child's participation in this project is CONFIDENTIAL (the researcher will know his/her identity but will not reveal it to anyone).
- I understand that the results of this study may be published. If this occurs, only group results will be published and no child will be individually identified.

I HAVE CAREFULLY STUDIED THE INFORMATION ABOVE AND I ACCEPT AND UNDERSTAND THIS CONTRACT. I CONSENT FREELY AND ACCEPT TO PARTICIPATE VOLUNTARILY IN THIS STUDY.

CHILD'S NAME \_\_\_\_\_

NAME (capital letters) \_\_\_\_\_

SIGNATURE \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

RESEARCHER'S SIGNATURE \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

Appendix C.  
Demographic Questionnaire

Study on Children's Cultural Awareness  
Khamy Phomphakdy, M.A. Child Study  
Concordia University

Demographic Questionnaire

Name : \_\_\_\_\_

Date : \_\_\_\_\_

1. What is your child's name and date of birth?
2. In what country was your child born?
3. In what country was your child's mother born?
4. In what country was your child's father born?
5. What are the language(s) spoken at home?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!

Appendix D.  
MRA Instructions

## Preschool MRA Instructions

**I'm going ask you what you think about different people. You have probably not met any of these people but I want to know what your thoughts are. I have asked many children these questions; some answer one way and some answer another way. Every answer is fine as long as it is your true feeling. I did not write your name here; that means it is private. The questions I will ask you are not difficult but if you feel uncomfortable about answering one of them or don't understand, let me know.**

Use same-sex silhouettes and boxes. Put silhouette of same-race child on the left box; put the silhouettes of the other-group children on the other two boxes. Order the 24 sets of pictures as on the scoring sheet.

**Each of these boxes belongs to a child. This one belongs to a Black child, this one to a White child, this one to a Asian child. Mention the child's own group first.**

Practice with child pictures: **I will show you pictures and I want you to put them in the boxes where they go. If they don't go with anyone, give them back to me. Give the pictures of 3 Black children, and say, With whom do these cousins go, the Black child, the White child, the Asian child, or more than one child? Put them where they go.** If the child uses more than 2 boxes, ask for the reason and accept if it is legitimate, or point out misunderstanding if it is not.

Practice with the 3 T-shirts: **These are pictures of t-shirts. Who wears t-shirts? Is it the Black child, the White child, the Asian child, or more than one child? Put the t-shirts in the boxes where they belong.** Child should sort into at least 2 boxes. If not, ask about something like brown eyes, which belong to more than one child. Ask, where would you put pictures of brown eyes? Do not suggest that a response is unacceptable; simply try another example to show dispersion of cards.

**Now I am going to tell you how some children are, and I want you to tell me if it is the White child, the Black child, the Asian child, or more than one child who is like that.**

Proceed with 24 questions, giving the sets of 3 picture cards while reading each question. Circle or slash appropriate initial to indicate whether cards were put in the White, Black, Asian box.

Be as unobtrusive as possible when recording answers.

Appendix E.  
MRA Scoring Sheet



MRA S number \_\_\_\_\_

Grade \_\_\_\_\_ Sex \_\_\_\_\_ Age \_\_\_\_\_

1. Clean      own    other1 other2
  2. Unfriendly own    other1 other2
  3. Mean      own    other1 other2
  4. Wonderful own    other1 other2
  5. Likes to run own    other1 other2
  6. Dirty      own    other1 other2
  7. Healthy    own    other1 other2
  8. Good      own    other1 other2
  9. Cruel      own    other1 other2
  10. Stupid    own    other1 other2
  11. Nice      own    other1 other2
  12. Likes to sing own other1 other2
  13. Happy     own    other1 other2
  14. Selfish    own    other1 other2
  15. Sick      own    other1 other2
  16. Friendly   own    other1 other2
  17. Likes TV   own    other1 other2
  18. Naughty   own    other1 other2
  19. Kind      own    other1 other2
  20. Won't let others play own other1 other2
  21. Likes music own    other1 other2
  22. Bad      own    other1 other2
  23. Helpful    own    other1 other2
  24. Smart      own    other1 other2
- Total Pos      Own    Other1 other2
- Total Neg

Appendix F.

List of MRA Items

## MRA Items

1. CLEAN: Some children are clean. They never forget to wash their hands before eating. Who is clean? Is it the black child, the white child, the Asian child, more than one of them who is clean? Put the pictures with who is clean.

Pos W \_\_\_\_\_ B \_\_\_\_\_ O \_\_\_\_\_

2. UNFRIENDLY: Some children are unfriendly. They are always pushing other children around and getting into fights. Who is unfriendly? Is it the white child, the Asian child, the black child, more than one child who is unfriendly? Put the pictures with who is unfriendly.

Neg W \_\_\_\_\_ B \_\_\_\_\_ O \_\_\_\_\_

3. MEAN: Who is mean and always poking other children? Is it the Asian child, the black child, the white child, more than one child who is mean? Put the pictures with who is mean.

Neg W \_\_\_\_\_ B \_\_\_\_\_ O \_\_\_\_\_

4. WONDERFUL: Some children are simply wonderful. They can do just anything with glue and paper. Who is wonderful? Is it the white child, the Asian child, the black child, or more than one who is wonderful?

Pos W \_\_\_\_\_ B \_\_\_\_\_ O \_\_\_\_\_

5. LIKES TO RUN: Some children like to run. Who likes to run? Is it the black child, the white child, the Asian child, or more than one of them who likes to run?

Fill W \_\_\_\_\_ B \_\_\_\_\_ O \_\_\_\_\_

6. DIRTY: Some children always have dirty hands and put finger marks everywhere. Who is dirty? (If child seems to lose track of task and starts putting all in one box or all in all 3 boxes repeatedly, try repeating entire set of choices for an item or two. If child puts all three in one box all the time, on the filler items ask for each individual box, if that child e.g. likes to run, and make sure the answer is consistent with how the child sorts. If child needs it, ask for an action with each item e.g. "put". If child appears to follow task, use the abbreviated version given here)

Neg W \_\_\_\_\_ B \_\_\_\_\_ O \_\_\_\_\_

7. HEALTHY: Some children are healthy. They eat good food that gives them lots of energy. Who is healthy?

Pos W \_\_\_\_\_ B \_\_\_\_\_ O \_\_\_\_\_

8. GOOD: Some children are really good and do the right thing like keeping their room tidy. Who is good?

Pos W \_\_\_\_\_ B \_\_\_\_\_ O \_\_\_\_\_

9. CRUEL: Some children are cruel. They sometimes throw rocks at little cats. Who is cruel?

Neg W \_\_\_\_\_ B \_\_\_\_\_ O \_\_\_\_\_

10. STUPID: Some children do stupid things like pulling all the toilet paper in a bathroom. Who is stupid?

Neg W \_\_\_\_\_ B \_\_\_\_\_ O \_\_\_\_\_

11. NICE: Some children are really nice. When they receive a present like this one they remember to say thank you. Who is nice?

Pos W \_\_\_\_\_ B \_\_\_\_\_ O \_\_\_\_\_

12. LIKE TO SING: Most children like to sing. Who do you think likes to sing?

Fill W \_\_\_\_\_ B \_\_\_\_\_ O \_\_\_\_\_

13. HAPPY: Some children are very happy. They smile and laugh a lot. Who is happy?

Pos W \_\_\_\_\_ B \_\_\_\_\_ O \_\_\_\_\_

14. SELFISH: Some children are selfish. They like to keep all the toys to themselves and they don't share with their friends.

Neg W \_\_\_\_\_ B \_\_\_\_\_ O \_\_\_\_\_

15. SICK: Some children are always sick. They often miss school and cannot play with their friends because they have to stay in bed. Who is sick?

Neg W \_\_\_\_\_ B \_\_\_\_\_ O \_\_\_\_\_

16. FRIENDLY: Some children have a lot of friends because they are fun to be with. Who is friendly?

Pos W \_\_\_\_\_ B \_\_\_\_\_ O \_\_\_\_\_

17. LIKES T.V.: Many children like watching T.V. Who likes watching T.V.?

Fill W\_\_\_\_\_ B\_\_\_\_\_ O\_\_\_\_\_

18. NAUGHTY: Some children are naughty. They often do things like drawing on the wall with crayons. Who is naughty?

Neg W\_\_\_\_\_ B\_\_\_\_\_ O\_\_\_\_\_

19. KIND: Some children are kind. They bring flowers to their teacher. Who is kind?

Pos W\_\_\_\_\_ B\_\_\_\_\_ O\_\_\_\_\_

20. WON'T LET OTHERS PLAY: Some children won't let others play; they tell them "go away, we won't let you play with us. Who won't let others play?

Neg W\_\_\_\_\_ B\_\_\_\_\_ O\_\_\_\_\_

21. LIKES MUSIC: A lot of children like to listen to music. Who likes music?

Fill W\_\_\_\_\_ B\_\_\_\_\_ O\_\_\_\_\_

22. BAD: Some children are bad. They take money from their mother's purse and they don't tell her. Who is bad?

Neg W\_\_\_\_\_ B\_\_\_\_\_ O\_\_\_\_\_

23. HELPFUL: Some children are helpful. They like to carry things for other people. Who is helpful?

Pos W\_\_\_\_\_ B\_\_\_\_\_ O\_\_\_\_\_

24. SMART: Who is smart and always does good work in class?

Pos W\_\_\_\_\_ B\_\_\_\_\_ O\_\_\_\_\_

Total Pos W\_\_\_\_\_ B\_\_\_\_\_ O\_\_\_\_\_

Total Neg W\_\_\_\_\_ B\_\_\_\_\_ O\_\_\_\_\_

Appendix G.  
Coding Schemes

## **Coding Schemes for Children's Verbal Justifications.**

**Race:** Reference to race, ethnicity or skin color.

Examples: he's white; skin is brown

**Facial expression:** Reference to the smile or inference of emotion base on the facial expression. Examples: does not have a smile; happy; angry face.

**Physical attribute:** Reference to specific body feature such as hair and eyes, reference to clothing. Examples: long hair; nice beautiful eyes; blue shirt.

**Gender:** Reference to the sex of the child represented in the drawing. Examples: she's a girl; it's a boy.

**No answer:** Children did not respond to why they choose their selections. Examples: Silence; I don't know.

**Other:** Irrelevant responses, statement referring to actions the child represented in the drawing would engage in. Examples: she gives flowers to her teacher; he helps people make stuff.