The International Journal on School Disaffection
volume 4 number 2

# Children's attitudes towards nonconformists: Intergroup relations and social exclusion in middle childhood

Adam Rutland
Dominic Abrams
Lindsey Cameron
Centre for the Study of Group Processes
Department of Psychology
University of Kent
Canterbury
Kent CT2 7NP, UK
Tel.: +44 1227 827652
Fax.: +44 1227 827030
Email: a.rutland@kent.ac.uk

Social exclusion is a serious social problem (Abrams, Marques, and Hogg, in press). Not 'fitting in' at school may be an experience that can scar children psychologically for life (Deater-Deckard, 2001; Parker and Asher, 1987; Wenzel and Asher, 1995). This is unsurprising since being part of the 'in crowd' (i.e. accepted in-group members) is extremely important to children and adolescents (Ruble, Alvarez, Bachman and Cameron, 2003). Being rejected by one's peers can cause an increase in anti-social behaviour, deviance, aggression, lowered intellectual performance, self-defeating behaviour and a series of other maladaptive responses (Twenge and Baumeister, in press; Williams, 2001). Those who are cast as misfits may be bullied, victimised or disadvantaged in other ways (Crick, 1997; Hoover, Oliver and Hazler, 1992; Schuster, 1996).

Therefore, an important social task that children face is to work out when their own and others' behaviour contravenes social norms, and to decide how to respond when such norms are contravened (Emler and Reicher, 1995). Namely, they need to form attitudes towards nonconformity. Societal and interpersonal responses to deviance may focus primarily on the 'problem' child and his or her personal or family relationships. However, we argue within this paper that such focus may miss a significant dimension, namely that when and how a behaviour is defined as 'deviant' is also part of a wider peer group process that defines and defends group norms and boundaries. Thus below we consider how the intergroup context (i.e. perceived relations between one's own and other social groups) and socio-cognitive development (i.e. the emergence of social-cognitive abilities) affects school children's reactions to non-conformists in their peer group.

## Delinquency and the intergroup context

Much research on juvenile delinquency has underestimated how the deviant defines their behaviour in relation to the immediate intergroup context, so helping to establish what is acceptable and unacceptable within certain social groups. For example, theoretical accounts of juvenile delinquency within both psychology and sociology typically suggest that crime results from the failure of internal control

(Emler and Reicher, 1995). Psychologists have focused on the various psychological constraints that limit the internalization or development of internal controls, e.g. moral rationality, superego, genetics and nervous system (Kohlberg, 1984; Mednick and Christiansen, 1977). Sociologists have emphasised how various forms of social organisation (e.g. transient communities) prevent the proper internalization of internal controls (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960; Shaw and McKay, 1969).

Society fails to socialise individuals properly. It fails to provide people with the means to control their anti-social behaviour. This can be because society does not provide people with any standards or norms, or it implants the wrong standards that encourage criminality. Maybe the right standards exist, but certain individuals are constrained from following these standards, or perhaps even the dominant norms themselves facilitate delinquency. According to Emler and Reicher (1995), what is lacking within both psychology and sociology is a focus on how individual actions are shaped by the immediate social relations within which delinquent acts are committed. Particular attention should be paid to the role of the immediate social group because many crimes are committed within social groups.

It is commonplace for those who regard delinquency as shameful (i.e. the 'moral majority') to see it as something of which the delinquent will be ashamed. Accordingly, this has led to the elaborate myth of the 'secret sinner': individuals who will break the rules when they are alone and unobserved and will then attempt to conceal all traces of their guilt. The reality, however, may be very different. Delinquency is normally a product of small group interaction; it is largely performed in groups, it is talked about in groups, and it is communicated to group members (Emler, Reicher and Ross, 1987). For example, in March 2002, two boys (Ben, aged 17 and Robert, aged 15) were 'named and shamed' as delinquents by a British national newspaper. They had committed a large number of crimes in a working-class area of northern England. However, they were not 'secret sinners'. Their criminal acts (e.g. vandalism, shoplifting) mostly occurred in a peer group context. It is debatable whether 'naming and shaming' would lead them to develop internal control. It may instead give them a reputation/status to live up to. The prosecution lawyer in their case said, 'They should be known so there will be pressure to behave'. The defence lawyer countered, 'Their notoriety made them try to live up to their image. They will have a reputation for being tear-aways [hell-raisers] and they will enjoy living up to that reputation'.

Reputation management theory (RMT; Emler and Reicher, 1995) offers an alternative to theories of delinquency common in both psychology and sociology. It is founded on the idea that while it is important to acknowledge the power and inertia of social and institutional forces, it is also important to recognise that people may also adapt, shape and seek to use for their own ends the definitions thrust upon them. Society uses delinquency to define 'insiders' and 'outsider', but individuals themselves can also use delinquency to define who they are. RMT holds that delinquency is often a symbol of identity in opposition to the social order. Delinquency often becomes a means by which adolescents manage their reputation and gain status within their social groups. This approach highlights the importance of considering the intergroup context when understanding when and how deviants define themselves as delinquent.

## Intergoup context as a framework for deviance

From a child's perspective, judgments of what constitutes deviance may be framed less by absolute norms, laws or morals and more by context-specific norms (e.g. those that are specific to particular classroom situations, or to the roles of child and adult). This might mean that the child's definition of unacceptable behaviour may depend on majority pressure or particular group memberships (e.g. gender). As a result, children may regard behaviour as 'deviant' that is quite acceptable to adults, particularly teachers. For example, children who aspire academically may be regarded by their peers as 'big-heads' or 'boffins' [eggheads], and may become isolated from the wider group. A tragic example of this recently occurred in England. An eleven-year-old boy, Thomas Thompson, killed himself because he was bullied at school for being 'too clever' [http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/em/fr/-/1/hi/england/merseyside/3041756.stm]. Other boys did not accept Thomas, because he was not interested in sport and just concentrated on his schoolwork. Unlike others members of his peer group, Thomas wanted to be a science teacher, was interested in politics and often attended anti-war rallies.

Children don't only have to decide when their own behaviour is 'deviant', they also have to judge when others' behaviour contravenes social norms, and then

decide how to react when such norms are broken. Investigation of children's responses to social conformity and deviance may provide useful insights into processes underlying social inclusion and exclusion processes among children of different ages. Our starting point is to consider how children may reject or accept one another on the basis of more than one criterion. In particular, they may focus on both social category memberships (i.e. are they a member of my in-group or a member of another out-group?), and on individual behaviour (i.e. are they behaving in a normal or deviant manner). The social categories children use to form an in-group and out-group are numerous, though research suggests the earliest social categories utilised by children are typically gender (i.e. boy or girl) and ethnicity (i.e. black or white; see Aboud and Amato, 2001; Brown, 1995; Ruble *et al.*, 2003).

A substantial body of psychological research on children's acceptance and rejection of peers has used measures of social category preference (see reviews by Aboud, 1988; Aboud and Amato, 2001; Katz, 1976; Nesdale, 2001). In much of this work children are required to make a judgment or preference among targets that represent different social categories (e.g. a boy versus a girl). Typically, by the age of three or four years children express more positive attitudes towards members of their own group than towards others (see Aboud, 1988; Nesdale, 2001). Most of this research is concerned with children's judgments about normative or typical members of groups, but there is relatively little evidence on the way children may single out particular individual members of groups for criticism or rejection. Specifically, there is little research on the way children judge normative versus deviant individuals within their in-group and other out-groups, and how evaluations of these individuals relate to their overall attitudes towards each group.

Recent research with adults has examined whether normative and deviant members of in-groups and out-groups are evaluated differently (e.g. Marques, Abrams, Paez and Martinez-Taboada, 1998, Marques, Abrams and Serôdio, 2001; Abrams, Marques, Bown and Henson, 2000). This research shows that individual adults who oppose group norms are judged much more harshly if they are in-group members than if they are out-group members. Moreover, the extremity of these reactions becomes stronger when people identify strongly with their in-group (see Abrams, Marques, Randsley de Moura, Hutchison and Bown, in press). However, relatively little is known about the development in childhood of judgments of specific normative and deviant members (i.e. nonconformists) of opposing social groups. Children undoubtedly experience members of their groups whose behaviour violates in-group norms (e.g. team members who prefer the other out-group team, children who won't join in a game, children who prefer opposite-gender typical activities).

In the present article, we argue that the way children form judgments of nonconformists changes as they get older. Specifically, we believe that older children are more likely to take into account not just characteristics of the person, but also the social group membership of the individual. Therefore, as children get older, their tolerance or intolerance to others may increasingly depend on how the presence of that person affects the image or reputation of the entire social group. To support our argument, we will describe our research into how children evaluate deviants or nonconformists in an intergroup context.

Social identity theory (Tajfel and Turner, 1986) defines social identity as the knowledge, values and emotional significance of one's group membership (see also Hogg and Abrams, 1988). In our research we have argued that children may engage in bullying and social exclusion towards deviants because this helps to sustain a positive social identity for other members of the group. Research in developmental psychology seems to show that in early primary/elementary school, children show an increase in in-group preference and out-group bias, but that this tends to decline as they reach early adolescence (see Aboud, 1988; Brown, 1995; Katz, 1976; Lambert and Klineberg, 1967). However, between seven and nine years of age, children show important social-cognitive transitions from judgments of others based on a few primarily physical and concrete categories (e.g. sex, hair colour) to judgments formulated using a multitude of abstract social and psychological categories (e.g. intelligence, friendliness) (Cameron, Alvarez, Ruble, and Filigni, 2001; Ruble and Dweck, 1995). This shift with age from concrete to multiple abstract descriptors is well established within the developmental literatures on person perception (e.g. Livesley and Bromley, 1973; Barenboim, 1978, 1981; Peevers and Secord, 1973), social perspective taking (Selman, 1971; 1980) and ethnic perspective taking (Quintana, 1998, 1999). In addition, children develop the ability to engage in complex social comparisons between individuals and groups based on dispositional characteristics such as shared attitudes and beliefs (see Cameron, Alvarez,

Ruble and Filigni, 2001; Ruble and Frey, 1991). By the age of nine or ten years, children no longer perceive people primarily through global evaluations (boy or girl), but also begin to acknowledge individual differences in dispositional characteristics (i.e. aggressive, selfish; Alvarez, Ruble and Bolger, 2001; Ruble and Dweck, 1995).

Consistent with this evidence, our research (Abrams, Rutland, Cameron and Marques 2003; Abrams, Rutland and Cameron, in press) suggests that as children get older they sustain their social identification with particular categories and groups through evaluations of *individual* group members, and rely less on global evaluations of the entire group. In other words, their ability to engage in multiple classifications and perceive within-group differences (Bigler, 1995; Black-Gutman and Hickson, 1996; Doyle and Aboud, 1995; Katz, Sohn, and Zalk, 1975, Martin, 1989) provides a subtler means of reinforcing their identification with social categories. Children may be aware that blatant in-group bias is not socially acceptable (Killen, Pisacane, Lee-Kin and Ardila-Rey, 2001; Theimer, Killen and Stangor, 2001; Rutland, 1999). However, they do not abandon or reduce category-based judgments altogether. Instead they may sustain important category differences by selectively approving of *individuals* (i.e. out-group deviant and in-group normative targets) who provide support for in-group categories.

One of our studies (Abrams, Rutland, Cameron and Marques 2003) examined how six to seven year olds and ten to 11 year olds evaluated normative and deviant children from an in-group or out-group summer play scheme. Abrams and colleagues also measured children's global preference for their summer play scheme over another scheme (i.e. their intergroup bias). The normative children were depicted as expressing normative (own-group favouring) attitudes. The deviant children evaluated both groups positively, therefore, displaying some disloyalty to their own group. Abrams *et al.*, (2003) were particularly interested in whether the children showed the so-called 'black sheep effect' (Marques, Yzerbyt and Leyens, 1988). This happens when people who favour their in-group over the out-group normative members reverse their preferences when judging deviants: out-group deviants are disliked less than otherwise similar in-group deviants. The study by Abrams and colleagues found evidence that both age groups showed a global preference for their in-group playscheme over the out-group scheme. However, the 'black sheep effect' emerged later than global bias, in favor of the in-group over the out-group. The older children differentiated more strongly between the two types of children (deviant and normative) in terms of how acceptable each would be to other members of each group. In addition, only the older children evaluated the normative in-group and deviant out-group member more positively than the deviant in-group member and normative out-group member. That is, rather than globally favouring all in-group over all out-group members, older children favoured the individual children from either group whose attitudes showed relatively greater support for the in-group.

The research by Abrams *et al.* (2003) suggests that, whereas young children are likely to evaluate peers on the basis of group membership rather than norm-related behaviour, older children focus on both the group membership of the individual and whether their individual behaviour fits the relevant group norms. Judgments of individuals may then reflect how well they support the perceiver's group, and hence social identity. There is a need to be aware that this pattern of findings may be restricted to intergroup settings that involve relatively novel groups. It is conceivable that in the case of more pervasive groups with strong socially prescribed norms (e.g. gender- or age-related behavioural norms), younger children might be more adept at recognising deviance and its implications. Notwithstanding this caveat, the findings of Abrams *et al.*, (2003) suggest that older children are more likely to focus on deviant behaviour in an intergroup context and thus are arguably more prone to socially exclude, and perhaps seek to influence, nonconformists. In the case of relatively novel groups, including informal peer groups that may form and dissipate within school, it seems likely that younger children would find it less easy to understand the normative aspects of group membership, such as those of group loyalty.

In another of our studies (Abrams, Rutland and Cameron, in press), we also tested our expectation that as children get older, social identity is sustained first by intergroup biases alone (i.e. favouring all in-group members over all out-group members) and later also by intragroup biases (i.e. favouring specific individuals within groups). Abrams and colleagues tested 476 English children aged between five and 11 years. They were asked to evaluate the English and German soccer teams leading up to the World Cup Soccer Finals in Japan/South Korea 2002, and judge in-group or out-group members whose attitudes towards the teams was normative versus anti-normative. As expected, all

children expressed intergroup bias. A developmental increase in sensitivity to group member deviance was anticipated since research suggests that from around eight years of age children attend more to individuated information (Bigler, 1995; Doyle and Aboud, 1995; Livesley and Bromley, 1973) and more fully appreciate the perspective of the individual in relation to the social group (Bennett and Yeeles, 1990; Banerjee, 2002; Banerjee and Yuill, 1999a, 1999b; Banerjee and Lintern, 2000).

Abrams and colleagues also asked children to rate how acceptable the normative and deviant targets would be from the perspective of other members of each group (a measure we labelled differential inclusion). As expected, older children were significantly more able to predict that the deviant's group would reject deviants. Moreover, results showed that the differences in evaluations of in-group deviants and out-group deviants also strengthened with age. Younger children preferred in-group members to out-group members (i.e. in-group favouritism); and while rating the in-group deviant less favourably, they still rated them equally or more favourably than out-group members. In contrast, older children showed the 'black sheep effect', evaluating in-group deviants significantly less positively than out-group deviants.

Abrams, Rutland and Cameron (in press) expected that age differences in evaluative biases towards individual children would be dependent on children's comprehension of the intergroup implications of deviance. Consistent with this idea, results showed that, independently of the relationship between age and intergroup bias, both those factors were associated with a stronger awareness of differential inclusion. The effect of age on the black sheep effect was fully mediated by differential inclusion. This suggests that age-related effects on evaluations of deviant group members reflect children's developing social-cognitive capacity to make sense of normative and deviant behaviour in an intergroup context. Older children are more attuned to the way deviants will be perceived by the deviant's peer group, and their own reactions to deviants depends on this awareness coupled with whether the deviant is an in-group or an out-group member (Marques, Abrams, Paez, and Hogg, 2001).

We also argue that evaluations of groups and specific group members serve to maintain an individual's social identity. In line with our expectations and the subjective group dynamics model (e.g. Marques, *et al.*, 1998; Abrams *et al*, in press), Abrams, Rutland, and Cameron (in press) found that children who identified strongly with their in-group showed more intergroup bias and a stronger black sheep effect (see also Abrams, *et al.*, 2000, 2002). Interestingly, identification had no effect on differential inclusion. Thus, identification affected only the measures that related theoretically to positive social identity. Although it is always difficult to separate cognitive and motivational processes, this pattern of findings suggests that the measure of differential inclusion may tap a relatively cognitive process that is independent of identity-relevant goals whereas the measure of differential evaluation taps relatively more motivational, identity-serving processes. However, Abrams, Rutland and Cameron (in press) contended that the psychological linkage between evaluations of groups, group members, and social identity changes with age. Consistent with this prediction, they found that the 'black sheep effect' was strongest amongst the oldest children. These findings suggest that older children with the strongest group identification are most likely to show the 'black sheep effect', as a means to sustain their social identity. This implies that amongst older children those with strong group attachments are more likely to socially exclude nonconformists within their group. Thus those wishing to prevent social exclusion may wish to focus attention on older children with strong in-group identification.

There are interesting implications of this research for the way children understand, and respond to, a range of potentially deviant behaviours. In a school context a child may be viewed as deviant as a result of bullying, physical differences, over-working, selection of friends from a group they don't belong to, and expression of attitudes that implies movement towards or away from the perceiver's own group. However, children's understanding of, and reactions to, deviance in an intergroup context appears to change substantially between the ages of five and 11. This suggests that strategies for intervention (e.g. to prevent victimisation) may need to be different for children of different ages. Young children may pick on one another for just being different physically, or just being members of a different group (i.e. 'I don't like you because you look different to me' or 'I don't like you because you are not in my group'). This implies that focusing on shared groups, which all children can belong to, might be a way to reduce group-based preferences.

The common in-group identity model (Gaertner and Dovidio, 2000) posits that in order to effectively reduce antipathy between individuals in different groups the salience of group distinctions should be reduced and replaced by encouraging categorisation at a superordinate level, which includes the in-group and out-group in the same all-encompassing in-group. Gaertner and Dovidio (2000) argue that encouraging recategorization of former out-group members as members of a larger in-group affords former out-group members certain benefits previously reserved for in-group members. Among older children who are especially concerned with *in-group* differences the situation may be more complex. First, they may not show obvious in-group bias and, therefore, people may be less aware of bias in favor of the in-group at this age and identify less need for intervention. Second, interventions with older children should target directly older children's hostility to deviant in-group members, but must recognise that these members may be rejected for intergroup reasons. Therefore, we need to find ways to highlight the fact that deviants do fit the in-group or to identify other cross-cutting group memberships on which they are more normative (thereby so reducing the threat to the in-group) or highlight different in-group norms (i.e. tolerance rather than loyalty).

To conclude, children fail to 'fit in' for a number of reasons; for example, they look different to others, they interact with out-group members, they express beliefs perceived as abnormal or engage in acts unacceptable to their group. In some cases, this may result in social exclusion, and a cycle of anti-social behaviour and under performance can be established from which the child cannot escape. Our research (Abrams, Rutland, Cameron and Marques, 2003; Abrams, Rutland and Cameron, in press) suggests that when children perceive nonconformists, their reactions may depend on their group membership and that of the nonconformist, in addition to the personal idiosyncratic characteristics of the deviant. If the social context encourages comparison and rivalry between the in-group and outgroups, children's perceptions of nonconformists are likely to be associated with their desire to sustain a positive social identity, by reinforcing the norms and values of the in-group through approval of individuals (i.e. out-group deviants and in-group normative members) who support the in-group norms. This process becomes noticeably stronger as children progress through middle childhood and they express high levels of identification with their in-group. We believe an appreciation of social and cognitive influences on children's attitudes towards nonconformists should help inform attempts to prevent social exclusion during middle childhood.

## References


Aboud, F. E. (1988). *Children and prejudice.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Aboud, F. E., and Amato, M. (2001). Developmental and socialisation influences on intergroup bias. In R. Brown and S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes* (pp. 65-85). Oxford: Blackwell.

Abrams, D., Marques, J. M. and Hogg, M. A. (in press) (Eds). *The social psychology of inclusion and exclusion.* Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

Abrams, D., Marques, J.M., Bown, N. and Dougill, M. (2002). Anti-norm and pro-norm deviance in the bank and on the campus: Two experiments on subjective group dynamics. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 5, 163-182.

Abrams, D., Marques, J.M., Bown, N.J., and Henson, M. (2000). Pro-norm and anti-norm deviance within in-groups and out-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 906-912.

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

Abrams, D., Rutland, A., Cameron, L. (in press). The development of subjective group dynamics: Children's judgments of normative and deviant in-group and out-group individuals. *Child Development.*

Abrams, D. Marques, J. M., Randsley de Moura, G., Hutchison, P. and Bown, N. J. (in press). The maintenance of entitativity: A Subjective Group Dynamics model. In V. Y Yzerbyt, C. M . Judd and O. Corneille (Eds.), *The Psychology of Group Perception: Contributions to the Study of Homogeneity, Entitativity, and Essentialism.* Philadelphia PA: Psychology Press.

Alvarez, J.M, Ruble, D.N. and Bolger, N. (2001). Trait understanding or evaluative reasoning? An analysis of children's behavioural predictions. *Child Development*, 72(5), 1409-1425.

Banerjee, R. (2002). Children's understanding of self-presentational behaviour: Links with mental-state reasoning and the attribution of embarrassment, *Merrill Palmer Quarterly*, 48, 378-404

Banerjee, R. and Lintern, V. (2000). Boys will be boys: The effect of social evaluation concerns on gender typing. *Social Development*, 9, 397-408.

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

Banerjee, R. and Yuill, N. (1999b). Children's understanding of self-presentational display rules: Associations with mental-state understanding. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 17, 111-124.

Barenboim, C. (1978) The development of recursive and non-recursive thinking about persons. *Developmental Psychology*, 52(1), 129-144.

Barenboim, C. (1981). The development of person perception in childhood adolescence: From behavioural comparisons to psychological constructs to psychological comparisons. *Child Development*, 52(1), 129-144.

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

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

Black-Gutman, D., and Hickson, F. (1996). The relationship between racial attitudes and social-cognitive development in children: An Australian Study. *Developmental Psychology*, 32, 448-456.

Brown, R.J. (1995). *Prejudice: its social psychology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Cameron, J. A., Alvarez, J. M., Ruble, D., and Fuligni, A. J. (2001). Children's lay theories about in-groups and out-groups: Reconceptualizing research on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5, 118-128.

Cloward, R. A. and Ohlin, L. E. (1960). *Delinquency and Opportunity*. New York: Free Press.

Crick, N. R. (1997). Engagement in gender normative versus nonnormative forms of aggression. Links to social psychological adjustment, *Developmental Psychology*, 33, 610-612.

Deater-Deckard, K. (2001). Recent research examining the role of peer relationships in the development of psychopathology. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 42, 565-579.

Doyle, A., and Aboud, F. (1995). A longitudinal study of white children's racial prejudice as a social-cognitive development. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 41, 2, 209-228.

Emler, N.P., and Reicher, S.D. (1995) *Adolescence and delinquency*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Emler, N., Reicher, S and Ross, A. (1987). The social context of delinquent conduct. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 28, 99-109.

Gaertner, S. L. and Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common in-group identity model*. Hove, East Sussex: Psychology Press.

Hogg, M. and Abrams, D. (1988). *Social identification: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes*. London: Routledge.

Hoover, J.H., Oliver, R., and Hazler, R.J. (1992) Bullying: Perceptions of adolescent victims in the Midwestern USA. *School Psychology International*, 13, 5-16.

Katz, P. A. (1976). The acquisition of racial attitudes in children. In P. A. Katz (Ed.), *Towards the elimination of racism*. (pp. 125-154). New York: Pergamon.

Katz, P. A., Sohn, M., and Zalk, S. R. (1975). Perceptual concomitants of racial attitudes in urban grade-school children. *Developmental Psychology*, 11, 135-144.

Killen, Pisacane, Lee-Kin and Ardila-Rey (2001). Fairness or stereotypes? Young children's priorities when evaluating group exclusion and inclusion. *Developmental Psychology*, 37, 587-596.

Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The psychology of moral development: the nature and validity of moral stages*. San Francisco, Harper and Row.

Mednick, S. and Christiansen, K. (1977) *Biosocial bases of criminal behaviour*. New York, Gardner.

Lambert, W. E., and Klineberg, O. (1967). *Children's views of foreign peoples: A cross-national study*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Livesley, W.J. and Bromley, D.B. (1973). *Person Perception in Childhood and Adolescence*. Oxford; John Wiley and Sons.

Marques, J. M., Abrams, D., and Seródio, R. G. (2001). Being better by being right: Subjective group dynamics and derogation of in-group deviants when generic norms are undermined. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 436-447

Marques, J. M., Yzerbyt, V. Y., and Leyens, J.-Ph. (1988). The black sheep effect: Judgmental extremity towards in-group members as a function of in-group identification. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 18, 1-16.

Marques, J. M., Abrams, D., Paez, D., and Hogg, M. A. (2001). Social categorisation, social identification, and rejection of deviant group members. In M. A. Hogg and R. S. Tindale (Eds.) *Blackwell handbook of social psychology (Vol. 3): Group processes* (pp. 400-424). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Marques, J. M., Abrams, D., Paez, D., and Taboada, C. M. (1998). The role of categorisation and in-group norms in judgements of groups and their members. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 976-988.

Martin, C. L. (1989). Children's use of gender-related information in making social judgements. *Developmental Psychology*, 25, 80-88.

Nesdale, D. (2001). Development of prejudice in children. In M. Augoustinos and K. J. Reynolds (Eds.), *Understanding prejudice, racism and social conflict*. London: Sage.

Parker, J. G. and Asher, S. R. (1987). Peer relations and later personal adjustment: Are low-accepted children at risk? *Psychological Bulletin*, 102, 357-389.

Peevers, B.H. and Secord, P.F. (1973). Developmental changes in attribution of descriptive concepts to persons. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 27(1), 120-128.

Quintana, S. M. (1998) Children's developmental understanding of ethnicity and race. *Applied and Preventative psychology*, 7(1), 27-45.

Quintana, S. M. (1999). Role of perspective-taking abilities and ethnic socialization in development of adolescent ethnic identity. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 19(2), 161-184.

Ruble, D. N., and Dweck, C. S. (1995). Self-conceptions, person conceptions, and their development. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Review of Personality and Social Psychology: Social Development* (Vol. 15, pp. 109-139). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ruble, D. N., and Frey, K. S. (1991). Changing patterns of comparative behaviour as skills are acquired: A functional model of self-evaluation. In J. Suls and T. A. Wills (Eds.), *Social comparison: Contemporary Theory and Research* (pp. 79-113). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Ruble, D. N., Alvarez, J., Bachman, M. and Cameron, J. (2003). The development of a sense of 'We': The emergence and implications of children's collective identity. In M. Bennett and F.

Sani (Eds.), *The Development of Social Self.* East Sussex, England: Psychology Press.

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

Schuster, B. (1996) Rejection, exclusion, and harassment at work and in schools: An integration of results from research on mobbing, bullying and peer rejection. *European Psychologists*, 1, 293-317.

Selman, R. L. (1971). Taking another's perspective: Role-taking development in early childhood. *Child Development*, 42(6), 1721-1734.

Selman, R. L. (1980). *The Growth of Interpersonal Understanding: Development and Clinical Analyses.* San Diego: Academic Press.

Shaw, C. R. and McKay, H. D. (1969). *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas.* 2nd edn. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tajfel, H., and Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In S. Worchel and W. G. Austin (eds.). *The psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Theimer, C.E., Killen, M. and Stangor, C. (2001). Young children's evaluations of exclusion in gender-stereotypic peer contexts. *Developmental Psychology*, 37, 18-27

Twenge, J.M., and Baumeister, R.F. (in press) Social exclusion increases aggression and self-defeating behaviour while reducing intelligent thought and prosocial behaviour. In D. Abrams, J.M. Marques, and M.A. Hogg (Eds). *The social psychology of inclusion and exclusion.* Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

Wentzel, K. R. and Asher, A. R. (1995). The academic lives of neglected, rejected, popular and controversial children. *Child Development*, 57, 910-923.

Williams, K.D. (2001) *Ostracism: The power of silence.* New York: Guildford Press.

# The International Journal on School Disaffection

volume 4 number 2

The only journal of its kind anywhere, this is a twice yearly publication that represents the perspectives of academics and practitioners working in the field of dropout prevention. It contains topical papers on issues and theories surrounding disaffection and the wide range of effective strategies, both individualised and structural, that are being used around the world to keep children from leaving school.

The purpose of the journal is to explore and share thinking and solutions and to raise awareness of the issues surrounding school disaffection. The research based papers are internationally refereed.

The journal is jointly published by the National Dropout Prevention Center of Clemson University, the National Dropout Prevention Network and Trentham Books of Stoke on Trent, England and has the support of a distinguished editorial board of academics and practitioners from around the world.

*The International Journal on School Disaffection* and the International Consortium on School Disaffection (ICSD) are closely associated with the National Dropout Prevention Center/Network at Clemson University, South Carolina.

The editor welcomes unsolicited submissions.
Contact her at reva@ourhouse114.plus.com

**The International Consortium on School Disaffection**
The consortium, launched in 2002, is a world-wide multi-disciplinary group of academics, psychologists, researchers and practitioners working in the area of disaffection, run under the auspices of the National Dropout Prevention Centre.

Its rationale is to bring professionals together to discuss common concerns and challenges and to explore strategies, occasionally through exchanges.

The ICSD welcomes new members from around the world who are working in the area of dropout prevention. Email: ndpc@clemson.edu
Website: www.dropoutprevention.org for information on the ICSD and National Dropout Prevention Network membership.
More information about Trentham Books can be found at www.trentham-books.co.uk.

**Subscription Details for Non-NDPC Members**
First published 2003, ISSN 1478-8497
Two issues per year: Spring and Autumn
Subscriptions can commence at any time.

Print and Online: £168.00, €252.00 or
Print Only – Institutions £48.00 (UK)
£58.00,€87.00 (Overseas)
Private addresses £34.00 (UK)
£44.00, €66.00 (Overseas)
Back Issues: £17.50, €27.00 each

Correspondence should be sent to:
**Trentham Books Limited, Westview House,**
**734 London Road, Oakhill, Stoke on Trent,**
**Staffordshire, England ST4 5NP**
**Tel: +44 (0) 1782 745567/844699**
**Fax: +44 (0) 1782 745553**
**Email: tb@trentham-books.co.uk**
**www.trentham-books.co.uk**