

Children's views of Britain and Britishness in 2001

Some initial findings from the Developmental Psychology Section Centenary Project

Martyn Barrett

Department of Psychology

University of Surrey

Guildford

Surrey GU2 7XH

UK

m.barrett@surrey.ac.uk

<http://www.surrey.ac.uk/Psychology/staff/MBarrett.htm>

Keynote address presented to the Annual Conference of the Developmental Psychology Section of the British Psychological Society, University of Sussex, 5th-8th September 2002.

In this talk, I am going to report some of the initial findings which are beginning to emerge from the BPS Developmental Section's Centenary Project. However, I ought to begin by first saying a few words about what the Centenary Project is, and how this project came about.

What is the Centenary Project?

As members of the British Psychological Society will know, in 2001, the Society was 100 years old. In order to celebrate the Centenary, all of the various subsystems of the BPS were invited to stage an event to mark the occasion. Most of the subsystems chose to organise a symposium, or to host a lecture by a distinguished speaker, at the Centenary Conference which was held in Glasgow last year. The Developmental Section, however, went down a different route. This Section instead chose to initiate a national research project in order to celebrate the Centenary. The aim was to set up a national study which would be scientifically interesting, and which would create future momentum in a specific field of research. In other words, the intention was to make the Section's contribution to the Centenary celebrations a more permanent research-based contribution to the field of Developmental Psychology. At an early stage in the development of this idea, the Section Committee, under the Chair of Charles Crook, decided that the Centenary Project should consist of a nationwide study into children's views of Britain and Britishness. In order to bring this idea to fruition, a small Steering Group was set up, containing members spread across the UK. The members of the Steering Group were Mark Bennett (Dundee), Rupert Brown (Kent), Charles Crook (Loughborough), Paul Ghuman (Aberystwyth), Karen Trew (Belfast), and myself (Surrey, Chair of the Group).

Right at the outset, the Steering Group made the decision that, in exploring children's views of Britain and Britishness, most crucially the project should focus upon the within-nation texture of such views. This was to be achieved by sampling from different geographical locations and different ethnic groups living across the UK. A call for contributions was sent out to the research community by email early in the summer of the year 2000, requesting ideas and methods for incorporation into the project. The members of the Steering Group then spent the summer of that year developing a large battery of measures which could be used for assessing children's knowledge, beliefs and feelings in this domain. These measures were all finally mounted on a web site at the end of the summer, so that they could be downloaded by researchers living in any location. A further email then went out to the research community, inviting Developmentalists to participate in the project, by conducting small-scale studies on their own local populations using subsets of these measures. The aim was for each local study to be conducted by undergraduate students for the purposes of their final year research projects. Each local study would form a small individual component of the full study. The Steering Group would subsequently collate all of the data into a large central database. The data would then be mounted on the web for all researchers to access and use for their own individual research purposes.

As far as the main issues to be investigated in the project were concerned, we decided to focus the study upon those issues which are prominent in the current research literature on children's understanding of, and feelings about, nations and national groups. As this literature is not very familiar to many people, I'll begin with a brief thumbnail sketch of this literature, in order to provide an initial orientation towards some of the central issues which the project aimed to investigate.

The background literature

This is a field of research in which there was one early study by Piaget & Weil in 1951. There

was then a small flurry of further studies conducted in the 1960s and early 1970s, but this line of research then came to an end round about 1973. However, during the 1990s, there has been a resurgence of interest in this area, and new studies have now been conducted in a number of different countries, including the UK, Holland, Germany, Spain, Italy, Russia and Australia. The sorts of issues which have been explored in these studies are as follows.

Firstly, several previous studies in this field have looked at children's knowledge of national geographies. These studies have revealed that before about 5 years of age, children often have little geographical knowledge of either their own country or other countries (Piaget & Weil, 1951). This knowledge begins to develop from about 5 or 6 years of age onwards. However, there is still much geographical confusion until at least early adolescence (Axia, Bremner, Deluca & Andreasen, 1998; Barrett, 1996; Barrett & Farroni, 1996; Jahoda, 1963a; Piaget & Weil, 1951). The most recent studies (Bourchier, Barrett & Lyons, 2002; Rutland, 1998) have looked at the variability which occurs in children's national geographical knowledge. It has been found that middle class children know more about other countries than working class children, and boys know more about the geography of both their own country and other countries than girls. However, children's geographical knowledge of a particular country is not systematically related either to their travel experience to that country, or to how they feel about that country (Bourchier et al., 2002).

Secondly, some of the previous studies in this field have explored the issue of when children start to categorise themselves as members of national groups, and how their subjective identification with their own national group develops. These studies have revealed that children usually begin to categorise themselves as members of their own national group from about 5 or 6 years of age (Barrett, 1996, in press; Barrett, Lyons & del Valle, in press; Barrett, Riazanova & Volovikova, 2001; Piaget & Weil, 1951; Wilson, 1998). However, not surprisingly, at this early age, children's gender, age and local city identities tend to be more important to them than their national identity (Barrett et al., 2001; Reizábal, Valencia & Barrett, in press). However, national identity does typically increase in importance through the course of middle childhood. Indeed, some studies have found that national identity may overtake both city identity and age identity in importance by the time the child is aged 11 or 12 (Barrett et al., 2001; Barrett, Wilson & Lyons, in press).

Thirdly, a few other studies have examined children's knowledge of national emblems. These studies have found that knowledge of emblems such as the national anthem, national costumes, and the national flag begins to develop from about 5 or 6 years of age onwards (Jahoda, 1963b; Weinstein, 1957). The salience of, and the significance which is attached to, particular national emblems may differ for children belonging to different ethnic groups within the same nation. For example, Moodie (1980) found that the South African flag was more salient to Afrikaans-speaking children than to English-speaking children in South Africa in the late 1970s. And different types of national emblem may also be differentially important for members of different nations. For example, Cutts Dougherty, Eisenhart & Webley (1992) found that national territorial ownership was more important to Argentinian children than to English children; however, the head of state was a more important national emblem for English children than for Argentinian children.

In fact, most of the previous studies in this field have explored how children feel about their own country and national group, and how children feel about other countries and other national groups. These studies have found that children usually develop a systematic preference for their own country and fellow nationals from about 5 or 6 years of age onwards

(Barrett, in press; Barrett, Lyons & del Valle, in press; Barrett, Wilson, Lyons, in press; Bennett, Lyons, Sani & Barrett, 1998; Lambert & Klineberg, 1967; Tajfel, Jahoda, Nemeth, Campbell & Johnson, 1970), although occasionally studies have reported ingroup favouritism emerging later (e.g. Rutland, 1999). That said, some national outgroups may still be very positively liked and evaluated, but to a lesser extent than the ingroup (Barrett & Short, 1992; Johnson, Middleton & Tajfel, 1970; Lambert & Klineberg, 1967; Middleton, Tajfel & Johnson, 1970). Once a relative order of liking of national outgroups has been established, this order tends to remain stable and consistent across the remaining childhood years (Barrett & Short, 1992; Jaspers, van de Geer, Tajfel & Johnson, 1972; Johnson et al., 1970). For example, Barrett & Short (1992) found that English 5-7 year olds liked French and Spanish people more than Italian people, and liked Italian people more than German people. This relative order of liking was maintained at 8-10 years of age. However, the overall degree of liking of all national outgroups typically increases between 5 and 11 years of age (Barrett & Short, 1992; Lambert & Klineberg, 1967). After 11 years of age, this general increase in positive regard for other national groups typically levels out (Lambert & Klineberg, 1967).

Finally, some previous studies have explored the contents of children's national stereotypes. These studies have shown that at least some national stereotypes are acquired by about 5 or 6 years of age and that, during subsequent years, children's knowledge of the people who belong to different national groups expands considerably (Barrett, in press; Barrett & Short, 1992; Barrett, Wilson & Lyons, in press; Jahoda, 1962; Lambert & Klineberg, 1967). By 10 or 11 years of age children are able to produce detailed descriptions of the characteristics exhibited by members of their own and other salient national groups, including their typical physical features and appearance, clothing, language, behavioural habits, psychological traits, and sometimes their political and religious beliefs (Lambert & Klineberg, 1967).

The measures used in the Centenary Project

So, it was against this background of findings from previous studies that we designed the Centenary Project to look at children's views of Britain and Britishness. The measures which we decided to include in the study were these. Firstly, we included measures of children's knowledge of British geography. We also included measures of children's self-categorisations and subjective identifications at a variety of levels (for example, as English, British and European). Thirdly, there were measures of the emblems which children associate with national groups. Fourthly, there were measures designed to assess how children feel about national ingroups and national outgroups. And finally, there were tasks designed to elicit children's stereotypes of national ingroups and national outgroups.

In other words, the Centenary Project aimed to examine many of the variables which are prominent in the current research literature. However, a comparatively novel feature of the Centenary Project was that it aimed to measure many of these variables in the same children, so that it would be possible to examine the relationships between these variables in development. One of the characteristics of much of the existing research in this field is that each study tends to focus upon just a small handful of variables, and the relationships between variables are often not examined. In other words, there is a lack of research looking at, for example, whether children's knowledge of national geography, or knowledge of national emblems, is related to the sense of national identification, or whether the strength of national identification is related to how the child feels about the people who belong to salient national outgroups (i.e. whether the most nationalistic children are also the most prejudiced). So, one of the novel features of the Centenary Project was that it aimed to examine the relationships between different variables in development.

The result was that we ended up with a large battery of tasks. As a consequence, we have now been landed with a mountain of data. It is, in fact, impossible for me to report on all aspects of the data which have been collected in this talk. So, instead, I'm going to home in on just a few specific variables which have been measured in the study. These variables which I want to focus upon concern, firstly, the children's self-categorisations and subjective identifications; and secondly, the children's attributions of characteristics to British people, relative to their attributions of characteristics to a psychologically salient outgroup, namely German people. The reason why I have chosen to talk about these specific variables is because they enable us to address certain research questions which I think are of some interest and importance. Before I begin to discuss these research questions though, let me first give you an idea of the sample of children whose data I will be drawing upon.

The sample

I decided that I would use for the purposes of this talk the data which were collected during the BPS Centenary year of 2001. In 2001, data were collected from 1,208 children in total. These children's ages ranged between 5 and 16 years old. A breakdown of the sample in terms of their location and age is given in Table 1. As you can see, the coverage of the UK was far from ideal in 2001. No data were collected in either Scotland or Wales, and we do not yet have any data from the North of England. However, we do have a potentially useful geographical distribution already. For example, we do have enough data to be able to compare 5-10 year olds living in the South West of England (Cornwall and Devon) with those living in the South East of England (Kent). And we also have enough data to be able to compare 11-16 year olds living in London with those living in other parts of the South East of England (especially Hampshire, Surrey and Sussex).

Another breakdown of the sample is given in Table 2, which shows the ethnic composition of the 2001 sample, broken down by age. A lot of data were collected from 11-16 year olds living in London, with these London data coming from an ethnically diverse sample. I should also add that these ethnic minority children were overwhelmingly second and third generation children who were born and brought up in London. So, we have enough data to be able to compare the White English 11-16 year olds living in London with, for example, the Indian and Pakistani 11-16 year olds living in London. In fact, these sorts of comparisons enable us to address the first main research question which I want to talk about.

Variability in the development of national identity

This first research question is: to what extent is there variability in the development of national identifications, either as a function of the child's geographical location, or as a function of the child's ethnic group membership? This is an important question to ask, because many previous studies in this field have chosen to select their samples from children who happen to live in the local vicinity of the researcher. The conclusions which are drawn from these samples are then often presented as if they are representative of children of that age in general. However, it is quite possible that children's national identifications vary, depending upon the child's geographical location within the nation, and depending upon the child's ethnic group membership.

I want to start with the child's geographical location first. In one set of analyses, we looked to see whether there were any differences between the 5-10 year olds living in Cornwall and Devon versus the 5-10 year olds living in Kent on any of the identification measures. Only White English children were included in these comparisons because, so far, we have very

little data from ethnic minority children aged between 5 and 10. Basically, we found only a single significant difference, on just one of the eight identification measures which were used in both locations. This one measure came from a single question which was designed to assess the children's degree of identification with being English. This question was very simple. The child was asked "*Which one of these do you think best describes you?*". There was a set of four cards containing the response options, which were read out to the child, which said "*not at all English*", "*little bit English*", "*quite English*" and "*very English*". The cards were scored from 1 to 4. We found that the Kent children produced significantly higher scores ($M = 3.84$) than the children in Cornwall and Devon ($M = 3.36$) on this question. But this one finding aside, there were no other main or interaction effects involving location on any of the 7 other measures of national identification which were used in both locations (the importance of being British, the importance of being English, the importance of being European, the degree of identification with being British, the degree of identification with being European, the internalisation of Britishness, and the internalisation of Englishness). In other words, the 5-10 year old children responded in a very similar way in Cornwall and Devon and in Kent, overall.

However, when we compared the White English 11-16 year olds living in London with the White English 11-16 year olds living in the counties of Hampshire, Surrey, Sussex and Kent, we found a very different picture. Here, there was fairly consistent evidence that there are higher levels of national identification in children who are growing up in London. For example, one measure which showed this effect came from a question which was designed to assess the importance of being British. Here, the question was "*How important is it to you that you are British?*", and the response options were "*not important at all*", "*not very important*", "*quite important*", and "*very important*". The scores ran from 1 to 4. There was a significant main effect of location, with the London children producing higher scores ($M = 3.41$) than the children living in Hampshire, Surrey, Sussex and Kent ($M = 2.79$). In fact, there were four different questions on which there was a main effect of location, with higher levels of identification being exhibited by children living in London than outside London: the importance of being British, the relative importance of being English, the degree of identification with being British, and the degree of identification with being European. In addition, there were age by location interactions on three variables (the importance of being British, the importance of being English, and the degree of identification with being European). These interactions suggest that there are different developmental patterns in children growing up inside and outside London.

So, here we have evidence that there can be differences between children who are growing up in different geographical locations within the nation. Higher levels of national identification are exhibited by children who are living in the capital city. This finding actually replicates a similar finding which has recently been obtained in a study conducted in Russia, where it was found that children living in Moscow acquire a more pronounced sense of national identification than children living in other Russian cities (Riazanova, Sergienko, Grenkova-Dikevich, Gorodetschnaya & Barrett, 2001). There are several possible reasons why these differences occur. It may be that simply knowing that you live in the capital city of a nation serves to enhance the salience of that nation for you. Or it could be that living in the capital city means that the child has more immediate access to the most important emblems of the nation. Many important national emblems such as the Houses of Parliament, Big Ben, the Tower of London, and so on, are located in London, just as Red Square and the Kremlin are located in Moscow. It may be that the presence of these national emblems in their home city enhances the salience of the nation for these children. Another possible explanation is that

capital cities are more cosmopolitan, and tend to contain more foreign tourists, than other locations within the nation. Thus, capital cities may afford greater opportunities for intergroup comparisons, which could serve to enhance the salience of the child's own national ingroup at an earlier age in these cities. And no doubt there are other possible explanations of this finding as well. However, the basic point which I want to make here is that we cannot assume that patterns of development which are exhibited by children growing up in one geographical location within a country will necessarily be displayed by children who are growing up in other locations in the same country. The evidence indicates that this assumption is not warranted.

So, the data indicate that the development of national identifications can vary according to the geographical location of the child. A second question which we can address with the data from the Centenary Project is whether children who are growing up in the same geographical location, but who belong to different ethnic groups, also exhibit differences in the development of their national identifications. The ethnic composition of our sample in London means that we do have enough data to be able to compare White English 11-16 year olds living in London with Indian and Pakistani 11-16 year olds living in London. The analyses here reveal a very consistent picture: the White English children were consistently higher than the Indian and Pakistani children on virtually all of the identification measures. For example, one measure which showed this effect came from a question designed to measure the child's internalisation of Englishness. The question here was: "*How would you feel if someone said something bad about English people?*". The response options were "*very happy*", "*quite happy*", "*neutral*", "*quite sad*" and "*very sad*". The scores ran from 1 to 5. There was a significant main effect of ethnicity, with the White English children producing significantly higher scores ($M = 4.10$) than the Indian and Pakistani children ($M = 3.04$) on this question. In fact, the White English children were consistently higher than the Indian and Pakistani children on all of these measures: the importance of being British, the importance of being English, the relative importance of being English, the degree of identification with being British, the degree of identification with being English, the degree of identification with being European, British national pride, English national pride, the internalisation of Britishness, and the internalisation of Englishness

As far as the English identity is concerned, these findings are not at all surprising. It has long been argued in the sociological literature that many people in England implicitly (and sometimes explicitly) define Englishness in racial or ethnic terms (see, e.g., Miles & Dunlop 1986). So the fact that these Asian children identified to a lesser extent than the White children with being English is not at all surprising. What some people may find rather more surprising is that these Asian children also identified with the British category to a lesser extent than the White children. Britishness is often held to be a superordinate and inclusive category which subsumes all of the ethnic groups living in Britain. However, our data indicate that Asian children find the British category problematic as well.

In fact, the data from the Centenary Project indicate that the Asian children did not even consistently identify with being British to any greater extent than they identified with being English. A direct comparison between the English and British identification scores for these Asian children on four different pairs of measures is given in Table 3. As you can see, there was only one measure out of the four on which British identification was higher than English identification (the internalisation measure). And in fact, on one of the measures (the degree of identification measure), the English scores were actually higher than the British scores. So, from these data, it appears that Indian and Pakistani children do not consistently identify with

being British any more than they identify with being English.¹

There are several possible reasons for this. Some authors (e.g. Hall, 1999; Jaggi, 1999; The Runnymede Trust, 2000) have argued that the concept of Britishness is embedded within a set of implicit beliefs and stories about the imperial and colonial past in which ethnic minority groups are relegated to a subordinate and minor role (along with the Scots, Welsh and Irish). If this is the case, then it may be that members of ethnic minority groups find it more difficult than White English individuals to identify with this national story about Britain, precisely because it relegates their own group to a subordinate and minor position.

A second possibility is that the category of British is, just like the category of English, also defined for many people, at least partially, in terms of race. This observation has been made by various authors in recent years (e.g. Miles & Dunlop, 1986; Tizard & Phoenix, 1993; Jacobson, 1997a, 1997b), including the authors of The Runnymede Trust report (2000) on the future of multi-ethnic Britain which was published a couple of years ago. Samir Shah (2000), the Chair of The Runnymede Trust, has expressed this point in the following way: “The word ‘British’ – rather like ‘Chinese’ – conjures up many images. And just as I would be unlikely to imagine a black or brown face when thinking of the word ‘Chinese’, so the images brought to mind with the word ‘British’ are more likely to be of an Anglican church rather than a Sunni mosque, warm beer rather than a cold lassi, a white face rather than a black or brown one.” In other words, Shah is arguing that our mental representations of not only Englishness, but also Britishness, contain a racial element. This is *not* to say that Britishness is an inherently *racist* concept. Instead, the argument is that the concept of Britishness, in practice, seems to carry *racial connotations* for many British people. If this is the case, then it is perhaps not surprising that the members of the visible ethnic minority groups find it harder to identify with being British than White people do.

I should perhaps just mention that the data from the Bangladeshi and the Black African children show exactly the same pattern as the data from the Indian and Pakistani children (despite the smaller samples from these other two minority groups). So, the data from the Centenary Project consistently reveal that members of visible ethnic minority groups do not identify with being British to the same extent as members of the White English majority group.

Let’s return to our first research question. This, you’ll remember, was: to what extent is there variability in the development of national identifications, either as a function of the child’s geographical location, or as a function of the child’s ethnic group membership? So, our answer to this first question is that, at least from 11 years of age onwards, there is a great deal of variability in the development of national identifications, both as a function of geographical location, and as a function of ethnic group membership.

The development of ingroup bias

What I’d like to do now is move on to a second research question which we can address using the data from the Centenary Project. This second question is: how do children’s evaluations

¹ Comparable analyses were conducted on the data from the White English children. These analyses revealed that on all four pairs of measures, English identification was significantly higher than British identification for these children (indicating that 11-16 year olds are able to differentiate systematically between their Britishness and their Englishness). Note also that there were no significant differences between the responses of the Indian and the Pakistani children on any of the eight identification questions listed in Table 3.

of their own national group change during the course of their development? In particular, do young children exhibit a positive bias towards their own ingroup, and a negative bias against outgroups, and does this polarisation in attitudes subsequently decline through the course of middle childhood?

The reason why this particular research question is important is because the dominant developmental theory in this field is still cognitive-developmental theory, in the form in which this has been articulated by Aboud and Doyle and their colleagues (Aboud, 1988; Aboud & Amato 2001; Doyle & Aboud, 1995; Doyle, Beaudet & Aboud, 1988; Powlishta, Serbin, Doyle & White, 1994). These authors base their argument on evidence which has now emerged from a number of studies suggesting that children typically exhibit maximum positive bias in favour of their own ethnic and national ingroups, and maximum negative prejudice against ethnic and national outgroups, between 5 and 6 years of age. This polarisation in the child's attitudes towards ingroups and outgroups declines after the age of 6, so that by the age of about 8 or 9, there are significant decreases in both ingroup favouritism and outgroup prejudice.

In their own studies, Aboud and Doyle have found that, at the age of about 6, children attribute mainly positive characteristics to members of their own group, and mainly negative characteristics to members of other groups. After the age of 6, this polarisation in the attribution of characteristics to ingroups and outgroups decreases, as children gradually come to attribute more negative characteristics to the ingroup, and more positive characteristics to outgroups. The net result of this process is an overall reduction in ingroup favouritism, as well as a reduction in outgroup prejudice, through middle childhood. The attribution of negative characteristics to the ingroup, and positive characteristics to outgroups, is called "counterbias" by Aboud and Doyle.

Aboud and Doyle further argue that the development of counterbias during middle childhood is driven by more fundamental changes to the child's cognitive system at this time of life. In particular, they argue that it is the development of certain key cognitive capabilities which underlies the development of counterbias. These cognitive capabilities include: conservation; the ability to use multiple classifications; the ability to judge the deeper similarities between superficially different groups; and the ability to attend to individual differences within groups. Aboud and Doyle argue that these more general cognitive capabilities are acquired between 6 and 10 years of age. Hence, they argue, counterbias develops between these ages. So, a fundamental claim which is made by these authors is that counterbias develops through middle childhood as a consequence of domain-general cognitive-developmental changes.

Now, one of the tasks which was used in the Centenary Project assessed the children's attributions of characteristics to British people, relative to their attributions of characteristics to a salient national outgroup, namely German people. We chose Germans as the outgroup for this task because it has been well established in previous studies (e.g. Barrett & Short, 1992; Barrett, Wilson & Lyons, in press) that Germans are a highly salient national outgroup for British children. So the data from this task can be used to test the claim that there is a shift in the attribution of negative characteristics to the ingroup, and a shift in the attribution of positive characteristics to outgroups, during the course of middle childhood.

The task itself was as follows. The child was asked a number of questions of the general form: "*In your view, how many British people are X?*" The response options that the children were given were: "*none of them*", "*a few of them*", "*half of them*", "*a lot of them*", "*all of*

them". These were scored from 1 to 5. In total the children were asked this question seven times with seven different positive adjectives: *nice, kind, hardworking, clean, polite, friendly,* and *good*. And they were asked this question seven times with seven different negative adjectives: *not nice, unkind, lazy, dirty, rude, unfriendly,* and *bad*. The fourteen questions were randomly ordered for each individual child. The scores from the positive adjectives were highly correlated with each other, and exhibited good internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.84). The same applied to the negative adjectives (alpha = 0.80). So, a mean British positivity score and a mean British negativity score was calculated for each child. Exactly the same 14 questions were also asked about German people. The scores on these questions exhibited similar correlations and reliabilities (alphas were 0.87 for the positive adjectives, and 0.85 for the negative ones). So, for both British and German people, we ended up with both a mean positivity score and a mean negativity score.

Remember that the predictions are that the *negativity* scores for British people should *increase* with age through middle childhood, and that the *positivity* scores for German people should *also increase* with age through middle childhood. The results for the White English 5-10 year olds in the sample are shown in Table 4 (again, these data are taken from just the White English children because we don't have very much data yet from ethnic minority children in this crucial age range). As you can see, the British positivity scores decreased with age. And the British negativity scores increased with age. So far, then, the data (particularly the negativity data) support the predictions made by Aboud and Doyle's theory. However, now look at the German data. Here, the positivity scores actually *decreased* with age. Also, the negativity scores showed *no change* with age. In other words, the German data actually run *counter to* the cognitive-developmental prediction.

We can look at these same data another way. It is possible to derive an *overall* British evaluation score by simply subtracting the negativity scores from the positivity scores. And we can do the same with the German scores. The resulting evaluation scores then provide us with a single overall score for each national group which indicates how positively that particular group has been rated across all 14 adjectives together. This procedure reveals that the children's evaluations of both British *and* German people become less positive overall with age (British M at age 5-7 = 1.63, British M at 8-10 = 1.14, $p < 0.001$; German M at age 5-7 = 1.12, German M at 8-10 = 0.73, $p < 0.001$). So, the findings for the British ingroup are consistent with cognitive-developmental theory. However, the findings for the German outgroup run directly counter to the prediction made by this theory: prejudice towards outgroups does not necessarily decrease during middle childhood. In this case, it actually increases.

However, these data *are* consistent with other data which have recently been reported from another study which was conducted in the Basque Country in Spain (Reizábal et al., in press), which also failed to find support for the cognitive-developmental theory. In that study, it was found that there were *no changes at all* in the attitudes which were exhibited towards either national ingroups or outgroups as a function of age (the data having been collected from 6- to 15-year-old children). So, the conclusion which I want to draw from these findings is that empirical support for cognitive-developmental theory is very mixed, to say the least.

The relationship between national identification and the evaluation of the ingroup and of outgroups

A third research question which we can address using the data from the Centenary Project is this: is the strength of the child's national identification related either to the evaluation which

the child makes of the national ingroup or to the evaluations which the child makes of national outgroups? Notice that this is a question about the relationships between variables, which developmental research in this field has tended to avoid asking in the past. The reason for asking this particular question is that this is an intriguing question which is suggested by social identity theory.

The underlying argument here is based upon Tajfel's fundamental insights that individuals belong to many different social groups (for example, national, ethnic, social class, gender groups, etc.), and that when a social group membership is internalised as part of an individual's self-concept, then that individual will strive to obtain a sense of positive self-worth from their membership of that group (see Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). In order to obtain this sense of self-worth, Tajfel argued that representations of the ingroup and of relevant outgroups are constructed using dimensions of comparison which produce more favourable representations of the ingroup than of outgroups. This results in either ingroup favouritism, or outgroup denigration, or both. And the positive distinctiveness which is attributed to the ingroup over the outgroup produces positive self-esteem. However, in order for these effects to occur, the individual must have internalised a social group membership as part of his or her self-concept. That is, the individual must subjectively identify with that category. If an individual's subjective identification with a particular social group is weak or absent, then these effects will not occur.

So, this line of reasoning leads us to predict that there should be a correlation between the strength of identification and the evaluations which are made of the ingroup and relevant outgroups. This particular prediction has now been investigated extensively in relationship to adults (see, for example, Abrams, 1990; Aharpour & Brown, 2000; Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Grant, 1992, 1993; Hinkle & Brown, 1990; Kelly, 1988; Mummendey, Klink & Brown, 2001; Perreault & Bourhis, 1998), but rarely in relationship to children (although see Reizábal et al., in press, for a recent exception).

Now, the Centenary Project contains data both on the strength of identification, as well as on the positivity and negativity of children's attributions to British and German people. So, the data from this project can be used to test this prediction. The findings which were obtained are shown in Tables 5-7. These analyses include the data from the entire sample, from 5 to 16 years of age, and from all ethnic groups (but similar findings are obtained if the analyses are run just on the White English children on their own, or just on the ethnic minority groups on their own). Table 5 shows the correlations between the variables which measured the strength of British identification and the children's overall British evaluation scores (as derived from the 14 adjectives). The children's age has been partialled out in all of these correlations. As can be seen, all four measures of the strength of British identification were modestly but positively correlated with the evaluation of British people. The corresponding findings on the relationship between the strength of British identification and the evaluation of German people are shown in Table 6. A very different picture can be seen here: none of the four measures correlated with the children's evaluations of German people. So, ingroup evaluations are consistently related to the strength of identification with the ingroup, but evaluations of outgroups may not be related to ingroup identification in the same way.

However, a strict interpretation of social identity theory would be that it is not these evaluations *per se* which should be related to the strength of identification, but rather the positive distinctiveness which is attributed to the ingroup over the outgroup. In other words, it should be the *difference* between the ingroup and the outgroup evaluations which should be

related to the strength of identification: the stronger the identification, the greater the motivation to evaluate the ingroup *more positively than* the outgroup. The results of a third set of analyses are therefore shown in Table 7. Here, a positive distinctiveness score was first calculated by subtracting the German evaluation score from the British evaluation score, to give a measure of the difference between the ingroup and outgroup evaluations. It turns out that this positive distinctiveness score is positively correlated with all four identification measures. These correlations are again fairly modest in size. However, it is worth noting that they are comparable to the magnitude of the correlations which have typically been obtained in studies investigating this issue with adults (Aharpour & Brown, 2000; Hinkle & Brown, 1990).

So, the data from this project fit very nicely with the prediction made by social identity theory. Once again, we can observe that this outcome is, in fact, also consistent with the findings which have emerged from the study conducted in the Basque Country (Reizábal et al., in press). Similar correlations between the strength of national identification and the positive distinctiveness attributed to the national ingroup were discovered in that study as well.

Conclusions

There are three main conclusions to be drawn from these various analyses. Firstly, it is clear that there are differences in national identification both as a function of geographical location, and as a function of ethnic group membership. In particular, children living in London exhibit higher levels of national identification than children living outside London. And White English children exhibit higher levels of identification with both Englishness and Britishness than children from ethnic minority groups. Secondly, as far as cognitive-developmental theory is concerned, the evidence from the Centenary Project is mixed. The attribution of characteristics to the national ingroup does indeed seem to become less positive through the middle childhood years. However, there is no evidence from this study that there is a lessening of prejudice towards one particular outgroup, namely Germans, through middle childhood. This is contrary to the predictions of cognitive-developmental theory. Thirdly, as far as social identity theory is concerned, the evidence from the Centenary Project seems to fit well with this theory. The project found good evidence for the predicted relationship between the strength of identification and the positive distinctiveness which is attributed to the ingroup.

Taking the second and third set of findings, I think that together they indicate that developmental theorising in this field needs to move on from the cognitive-developmental agenda which has been pursued in recent years. To take a Piagetian view that the development of identifications and intergroup attitudes is simply a consequence of underlying domain-general cognitive-developmental changes is to ignore all the many social processes, factors and influences which have now been highlighted by more than three decades of social-psychological research with adults. There is now an enormously rich social-psychological literature on all sorts of topics which are directly relevant to the issues which I've been talking about today. For example, there are extensive literatures on all of the following topics in adults.

Firstly, there is a rapidly growing literature on identity motivations (see, for example, Breakwell, 1986, 1992; Brewer, 1993; Brewer, Manzi & Shaw, 1993; Brewer & Pickett, 1999; Deaux, 1992, 2000; Hogg & Abrams, 1993; Mlicki & Ellemers, 1996; Vignoles, Chryssochoou & Breakwell, 2000, 2002). To paraphrase the title of a recent paper, it is quite

clear now that self-esteem is *not* the whole story. Other motivations include the needs for self-efficacy, distinctiveness, a sense of continuity, a sense of purpose, and cohesion.

Secondly, there is now a very large literature on identity threat (e.g. Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears & Doosje, 1999; Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Breakwell, 1986; Crocker & Quinn, 2001; Crocker, Voekl, Testa & Major, 1991; Ellemers & Bos, 1998; Ellemers, Wilke & Van Knippenberg, 1993; Grant, 1992; Jetten, Spears & Manstead, 1997; Rothgerber, 1997). A number of different types of identity threat have been distinguished in this literature, including being categorised against one's will, having the ingroup's distinctiveness undermined, having the ingroup's value undermined, and so on. And we know that different types of threat elicit different types of response in adults.

Thirdly, there is also a great deal of research into the effects of minority status on adults (e.g. Brown & Smith, 1989; Ellemers, Doosje, Van Knippenberg & Wilke, 1992; Sachdev & Bourhis, 1984; Simon, Aufderheide & Kampmeier, 2001; Simon, 1992; Simon & Brown, 1987; Simon & Hamilton, 1994). Minority status can impact upon the strength of identification with the ingroup, the perceived homogeneity of the ingroup, as well as on ingroup bias. Different effects occur under different conditions.

And fourthly, it is now well-established that, depending upon the specific comparison outgroups which are present in the prevailing context, different identity processes and different attitudes to the ingroup can be elicited in adults (Haslam, Oakes, Turner & McGarty, 1995; Haslam, Turner, Oakes, McGarty & Hayes, 1992; Hopkins & Murdoch, 1999; Hopkins, Regan & Abell, 1997; Oakes, Haslam & Turner, 1994; Spears & Manstead, 1989).

Notice that this social-psychological literature documents the various ways in which identity processes operate in adulthood. As such, a large developmental research agenda is implicitly flagged by this literature. For example, when and how do the different identity motivations become operative during the course of children's development? How do children themselves perceive possible threats to their identities, and how do they respond to these threats? How does a child's minority or majority status impact upon the development of that child's identifications and intergroup attitudes? At what age, and by what means, and in what ways, does the prevailing comparative context start to impact upon the developing child? Some of these questions have begun to be tackled by developmental psychologists in recent years (see, for example, Barrett, Lyons & del Valle, in press; Barrett, Wilson & Lyons, in press; Bennett & Sani, in press; Bigler, Brown & Markell, 2001; Bigler, Jones & Lobliner, 1997; Nesdale & Flessler, 2001; Powlishta, 1995; Sani & Bennett, 2001; Sani, Bennett, Mullally & MacPherson, in press). However, there is still a great deal of further empirical work which needs to be done. In particular, the themes of identity motivations and identity threats, as well as the issue of the effects of comparative context on identity processes in children, are all themes which have been very under-researched in relationship to children to date.

Note that I am *not* arguing that the investigation of cognitive-developmental issues is not important for understanding children's development in this domain. Instead, I *am* arguing that investigations of the development of children's cognitive capabilities must be complemented by investigations into how those cognitive capabilities interact with social identity processes. Until we pursue this line of investigation, I simply do not think that we will be able to achieve an effective understanding of why, for example, children's national identifications differ as a function of their geographical location and as a function of their ethnic group

membership, or why all children do *not* exhibit reductions in positivity towards the ingroup, and reductions in negativity towards outgroups, through the course of middle childhood.

In fact, it is not only the Centenary Project, but also several other recent studies, which have finally begun to reveal just how variable children's development in this domain actually is. For example, Barrett, Lyons & del Valle (in press) found quite different patterns in national identity development amongst children who are growing up in Britain vs. Spain vs. Italy, in Catalonia vs. Andalusia, and in England vs. Scotland. Similarly, Barrett, del Valle, Lyons, Vila, Monreal & Perera (1999) and Reizábal et al. (in press) found that children who are growing up in Catalonia and in the Basque Country display different patterns of national identity development, and different patterns of attitudes to national ingroups and outgroups, depending upon their specific sociolinguistic situation (with these patterns of differences themselves differing between Catalonia and the Basque Country). Finally, Barrett et al. (2001), in a multi-national study conducted in Russia, Ukraine, Georgia and Azerbaijan, found pervasive differences in: (1) the national identity development of children belonging to the same ethnic group but growing up in different geographical locations within the same nation; (2) differences in the national identity development of children growing up in the same geographical location but belonging to different ethnic groups; and (3) differences in the national identity development of children belonging to the same ethnic group and living in the same location but attending schools using different languages of education. In other words, it has become quite clear in recent years that there is enormous diversity and variability in children's development in this domain. And it really is time for developmental theorists and researchers to turn their attention to the issue of how and why such diversity and variability occurs, rather than just pursuing an oversimplistic cognitive-developmental agenda.

The future of the Centenary Project

So where does the Centenary Project go from here? Well, the project is continuing. The Steering Group has decided that this venture has been sufficiently productive and interesting during its first year of life to make it worth while leaving all of the materials on the web for anyone to access and use according to their own inclinations in the future. And indeed, the project is ongoing. During the current year, further data are being collected in Portsmouth, on the Isle of Wight, and on the island of Guernsey. I have also recently received an offer to collect data for the project from Welsh children who are being educated in Welsh-language schools and from Welsh children who are being educated in English-language schools. And maybe we can persuade some of our colleagues in Scotland to collect some data as well. In case anyone else would like to get involved in the project, the web address from which all the necessary information about the Centenary Project can be accessed and downloaded is:

<http://devpsy.lboro.ac.uk/bps/project/>

If anybody would like to participate, please do bear in mind that the members of the Steering Group are always extremely happy to talk to colleagues, and to the students of colleagues, especially if any advice or guidance is needed in using any of the materials or measures from the project. The email addresses of the members of the Steering Group are all available on the project website.

I would just like to end by saying a very big thank you to all of the individuals who participated in the project in 2001. A list of the students (and their supervisors) who collected the data which I have been talking about today is given in Table 8. Without the hard work of

these students and their supervisors, this presentation would simply not have been possible. So I'd just like to end by expressing my heartfelt thanks to all of these individuals who inputted in such an important way to this project during the BPS Centenary year.

References

- About, F. (1988). *Children and Prejudice*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- About, F. & Amato, M. (2001). Developmental and socialization influences on intergroup bias. In R. Brown & S.L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Intergroup Processes* (pp. 65-85). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Abrams, D. (1990). How do group members regulate their behaviour? An integration of social identity and self-awareness theories. In D. Abrams & M.A. Hogg (Eds.), *Social Identity Theory: Constructive and Critical Advances* (pp. 89-112). New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Aharpour, S. & Brown, R. (2000). Group identification and ingroup bias: a metaanalysis of tests in the Hinkle-Brown model. Unpublished paper, University of Kent, Canterbury, UK.
- Axia, G., Bremner, J.G., Deluca, P. & Andreasen, G. (1998). Children drawing Europe: the effects of nationality, age and teaching. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 16, 423-437.
- Barrett, M. (1996). English children's acquisition of a European identity. In G. Breakwell & E. Lyons (Eds.), *Changing European Identities: Social Psychological Analyses of Social Change* (pp. 349-369). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Barrett, M. (in press). *Children's Knowledge, Beliefs and Feelings about Nations and National Groups*. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Barrett, M., del Valle, A., Lyons, E., Vila, I., Monreal, P. & Perera, S. (1999). Bilingual children and the sense of national identity: the case of children living in Catalonia. Paper presented at VIIIth International Congress for the Study of Child Language, San Sebastian, Spain.
- Barrett, M. & Farroni, T. (1996). English and Italian children's knowledge of European geography. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 14, 257-273.
- Barrett, M., Lyons, E. & del Valle, A. (in press). The development of national identity and social identity processes: do social identity theory and self-categorization theory provide useful heuristic frameworks for developmental research? In M. Bennett & F. Sani (Eds.), *The Development of the Social Self*. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Barrett, M., Riazanova, T. & Volovikova, M. (eds.) (2001). *Development of National, Ethnolinguistic and Religious Identities in Children and Adolescents*. Moscow: Institute of Psychology, Russian Academy of Sciences (IPRAS).
- Barrett, M. & Short, J. (1992). Images of European people in a group of 5-10 year old English school children. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 10, 339-363.
- Barrett, M., Wilson, H. & Lyons, E. (in press). The development of national ingroup bias: English children's attributions of characteristics to English, American and German people. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*.

- Bennett, M., Lyons, E., Sani, F. & Barrett, M. (1998). Children's subjective identification with the group and ingroup favoritism. *Developmental Psychology*, 34, 902-909.
- Bennett, M. & Sani, F. (Eds.) (in press). *The Development of the Social Self*. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Bigler, R.S., Brown, C.S. & Markell, M. (2001). When groups are not created equal: effects of group status on the formation of intergroup attitudes in children. *Child Development*, 72, 1151-1162.
- Bigler, R.S., Jones, L.C. & Lobliner, D.B. (1997). Social categorization and the formation of intergroup attitudes in children. *Child Development*, 68, 530-543.
- Bourchier, A., Barrett, M. & Lyons, E. (2002). The predictors of children's geographical knowledge of other countries. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 22, 79-94.
- Branscombe, N.R., Ellemers, N., Spears, R. & Doosje, B. (1999). The context and content of social identity threat. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social Identity* (pp. 35-58). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Branscombe, N.R. & Wann, D.L. (1994). Collective self-esteem consequences of outgroup derogation when a valued social identity is on trial. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 24, 641-657.
- Breakwell, G.M. (1986). *Coping With Threatened Identities*. London: Methuen.
- Breakwell, G.M. (1992). Processes of self-evaluation: efficacy and estrangement. In G.M. Breakwell (Ed.), *Social Psychology of Identity and the Self Concept* (pp. 35-55). London: Academic Press.
- Brewer, M.B. (1993). The role of distinctiveness in social identity and group behaviour. In M.A. Hogg & D. Abrams (Eds.), *Group Motivation: Social Psychological Perspectives* (pp. 1-16). New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Brewer, M.B., Manzi, J.M. & Shaw, J.S. (1993). In-group identification as a function of depersonalization, distinctiveness and status. *Psychological Science*, 4, 88-92.
- Brewer, M.B. & Pickett, C.L. (1999). Distinctiveness motives as a source of the social self. In T.R. Tyler, R.M. Kramer & O.P. John (Eds.), *The Psychology of the Social Self* (pp. 71-87). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Brown, R. & Smith, A. (1989). Perception of and by minority groups: the case of women in academia. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 19, 61-75.
- Crocker, J. & Quinn, D.M. (2001). Psychological consequences of devalued identities. In R. Brown & S.L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Intergroup Processes* (pp. 238-257). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Crocker, J., Voekl, K., Testa, M. & Major, B. (1991). Social stigma: the affective

- consequences of attributional ambiguity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 218-228.
- Cutts Dougherty, K., Eisenhart, M. & Webley, P. (1992). The role of social representations and national identities in the development of territorial knowledge: a study of political socialization in Argentina and England. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29, 809-835.
- Deaux, K. (1992). Personalizing identity and socializing self. In G.M. Breakwell (Ed.), *Social Psychology of Identity and the Self Concept*. London: Academic Press.
- Deaux, K. (2000). Models, meanings and motivations. In D. Capozza & R.J. Brown (Eds.), *Social Identity Processes: Trends in Theory and Research*. London: Sage.
- Doyle, A.B. & Aboud, F.E. (1995). A longitudinal study of white children's racial prejudice as a social-cognitive development. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 41, 209-228.
- Doyle, A.B., Beaudet, J. & Aboud, F.E. (1988). Developmental patterns in the flexibility of children's ethnic attitudes. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 19, 3-18.
- Ellemers, N. & Bos, A. (1998). Individual and group level responses to threat experienced by Dutch shopkeepers in East Amsterdam. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 1987-2005.
- Ellemers, N., Doosje, B.J., Van Knippenberg, A. & Wilke, H. (1992). Status protection in high status minorities. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 123-140.
- Ellemers, N., Wilke, H. & Van Knippenberg, A. (1993). Effects of the legitimacy of low group or individual status on individual and collective identity enhancement strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 766-778.
- Grant, P.R. (1992). Ethnocentrism between groups of unequal power in response to perceived threat to valued resources and to social identity. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 24, 348-370.
- Grant, P.R. (1993). Reactions to intergroup similarity: examination of the similarity-differentiation and similarity-attraction hypothesis. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 25, 28-44.
- Hall, S. (1999). Un-settling "the heritage": re-imagining the post-nation. Keynote address presented to the conference on *Whose Heritage?: The Impact of Cultural Diversity on Britain's Living Heritage*, The Arts Council of England, Manchester, November 1999.
- Haslam, S.A., Oakes, P.J., Turner J.C. & McGarty, C. (1995). Social categorization and group homogeneity: changes in the perceived applicability of stereotype content as a function of comparative context and trait favourableness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 34, 139-160.

Haslam, S.A., Turner, J.C., Oakes, P.J., McGarty, C. & Hayes, B.K. (1992). Context-dependent variation in social stereotyping 1: the effects of intergroup relations as mediated by social change and frame of reference. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 251-278.

Hinkle, S. & Brown, R. (1990). Intergroup comparisons and social identity: some links and lacunae. In D. Abrams & M.A. Hogg (eds.), *Social Identity Theory: Constructive and Critical Advances*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Hogg, M.A. & Abrams, D. (1993). Towards a single-process uncertainty-reduction model of social motivation in groups. In M.A. Hogg & D. Abrams (Eds.), *Group Motivation: Social Psychological Perspectives* (pp. 173-190). New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Hogg, M.A. & Abrams, D. (1993). Towards a single-process uncertainty-reduction model of social motivation in groups. In M.A. Hogg & D. Abrams (Eds.), *Group Motivation: Social Psychological Perspectives* (pp. 173-190). New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Hopkins, N. & Murdoch, N. (1999). The role of the 'other' in national identity: exploring the context-dependence of the national ingroup stereotype. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 9, 321-338.

Hopkins, N., Regan, M. & Abell, J. (1997). On the context-dependence of national stereotypes: some Scottish data. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 553-563.

Jacobson, J. (1997a). Perceptions of Britishness. *Nations and Nationalism*, 3, 181-199.

Jacobson, J. (1997b). Religion and ethnicity: dual and alternative sources of identity among young British Pakistanis. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 20, 238-256.

Jaggi, M. (1999). From writing back to rewriting Britain. Keynote address presented to the conference on *Whose Heritage?: The Impact of Cultural Diversity on Britain's Living Heritage*, The Arts Council of England, Manchester, November 1999.

Jahoda, G. (1962). Development of Scottish children's ideas and attitudes about other countries. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 58, 91-108.

Jahoda, G. (1963a). The development of children's ideas about country and nationality, Part I: The conceptual framework. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 33, 47-60.

Jahoda, G. (1963b). The development of children's ideas about country and nationality, Part II: National symbols and themes. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 33, 143-153.

Jaspers, J.M.F., van de Geer, J.P., Tajfel, H. & Johnson, N. (1972). On the development of national attitudes in children. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 2, 347-369.

Jetten, J., Spears, R. & Manstead, A.S.R. (1997). Distinctiveness threat and prototypicality: combined effects on intergroup discrimination and collective self-esteem. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 27, 635-657.

Johnson, N., Middleton, M. & Tajfel, H. (1970). The relationship between children's preferences for and knowledge about other nations. *British Journal of Social and Clinical*

Psychology, 9, 232-240.

Kelly, C. (1988). Intergroup differentiation in a political context. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 27, 321-327.

Lambert, W.E. & Klineberg, O. (1967). *Children's Views of Foreign Peoples: A Cross-National Study*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Middleton, M., Tajfel, H. & Johnson, N. (1970). Cognitive and affective aspects of children's national attitudes. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 9, 122-134.

Miles, R. & Dunlop, A. (1986). The racialisation of politics in Britain: Why Scotland is different. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 20, 23-32.

Mlicki, P.P. & Ellemers, N. (1996). Being different or being better? National stereotypes and identifications of Polish and Dutch students. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 97-114.

Moodie, M.A. (1980). The development of national identity in white South African schoolchildren. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 111, 169-180.

Mullen, B., Brown, R. & Smith, C. (1992). Ingroup bias as a function of salience, relevance, and status: an integration. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 103-122.

Mummendey, A., Klink, A. & Brown, R. (2001). Nationalism and patriotism: national identification and out-group rejection. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 40, 159-172.

Nesdale, D. & Flesser, D. (2001). Social identity and the development of children's group attitudes. *Child Development*, 72, 506-517.

Oakes P.J., Haslam, S.A. & Turner, J.C. (1994). *Stereotyping and Social Reality*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Perreault, S. & Bourhis, R.Y. (1998). Social identification, interdependence and discrimination. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 1, 49-66.

Piaget, J. & Weil, A.M. (1951). The development in children of the idea of the homeland and of relations to other countries. *International Social Science Journal*, 3, 561-578.

Powlishta, K.K. (1995). Intergroup processes in childhood: social categorization and sex role development. *Developmental Psychology*, 31, 781-788.

Powlishta, K.K., Serbin, L.A., Doyle, A.B. & White, D.R. (1994). Gender, ethnic and body type biases: the generality of prejudice in childhood. *Developmental Psychology*, 30, 526-536.

Reizábal, L., Valencia, J. & Barrett, M. (in press). National identifications and attitudes to national ingroups and outgroups amongst children living in the Basque Country. *Infant and Child Development*.

Riazanova, T., Sergienko, E., Grenkova-Dikevitch, L., Gorodetschnaya, N. & Barrett, M. (2001). Cognitive aspects of ethno-national identity development in Russian children and adolescents. In M. Barrett, T. Riazanova, & M. Volovikova (eds.), *Development of National, Ethnolinguistic and Religious Identities in Children and Adolescents* (pp. 164-196). Moscow: Institute of Psychology, Russian Academy of Sciences (IPRAS).

Rothgerber, H. (1997). External intergroup threat as an antecedent to perceptions of in-group and out-group homogeneity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 1206-1212.

The Runnymede Trust (2000). *The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain: The Parekh Report*. London: Profile Books.

Rutland, A. (1998). English children's geo-political knowledge of Europe. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 16, 439-445.

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.

Sachdev, I. & Bourhis, R.Y. (1984). Minimal majorities and minorities. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 14, 35-52.

Sani, F. & Bennett, M. (2001). Contextual variability in young children's gender ingroup stereotype. *Social Development*, 10, 221-229.

Sani, F., Bennett, M., Mullally, S. & McPherson, J. (in press). On the assumption of fixity in children's stereotypes: a reappraisal. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*.

Shah, S. (2000). Get your facts right, please. *The Guardian*, Friday October 20, 2000.

Simon, B. (1992). The perception of ingroup and outgroup homogeneity: reintroducing the intergroup context. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 3, 1-30.

Simon, B., Aufderheide, B. & Kampmeier, C. (2001). The social psychology of minority-majority relations. In R. Brown & S.L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Intergroup Processes* (pp. 303-323). Oxford: Blackwell.

Simon, B. & Brown, R.J. (1987). Perceived intragroup homogeneity in minority-majority contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 703-711.

Simon, B. & Hamilton, D.L. (1994). Self-stereotyping and social context: the effects of relative in-group size and in-group status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 699-711.

Spears, R. & Manstead, A.S.R. (1989). The social context of stereotyping and differentiation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 19, 101-121.

Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation between Social Groups: Studies in the Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. London: Academic Press.

Tajfel, H., Jahoda, G., Nemeth, C., Campbell, J. & Johnson, N. (1970). The development of

children's preference for their own country: a cross-national study. *International Journal of Psychology*, 5, 245-253.

Tajfel, H. & Turner, J.C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In S. Worchel & W.G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 7-24). 2nd edition. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Tizard, B. & Phoenix, A. (1993). *Black, White or Mixed Race? Race and Racism in the Lives of Young People of Mixed Parentage*. London: Routledge.

Vignoles, V.L., Chryssochoou, X., & Breakwell, G.M. (2000). The distinctiveness principle: identity and the bounds of cultural relativity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4, 337-354.

Vignoles, V.L., Chryssochoou, X., & Breakwell, G.M. (2002). Evaluating models of identity motivation: self-esteem is not the whole story. *Self and Identity*, 1, 201-218.

Weinstein, E.A. (1957). Development of the concept of flag and the sense of national identity. *Child Development*, 28, 167-174.

Wilson, H. (1998). *The Development of National Identity in 5 to 11 Year Old English Schoolchildren*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Surrey.

Table 1: The sample in 2001 by location and age

	Age 5-7	Age 8-10	Age 11-13	Age 14-16	Total
Cornwall	20	20			40
Devon	20	20			40
Hampshire			24	27	51
Kent	56	63	15		134
Leicestershire	16	16			32
London			304	179	483
Surrey		3	96	64	163
West Sussex			20	85	105
Northern Ireland	20	20		120	160
Total	132	142	459	475	1208

Table 2: The ethnic composition of the 2001 sample

	Age 5-7	Age 8-10	Age 11-13	Age 14-16	Total
White English	102	109	195	153	559
White Scottish		1	3	3	7
White Welsh			2	2	4
White Northern Irish	20	20		76	116
White Irish			4	48	52
White European			19	20	39
White Other			4	7	11
Black Caribbean			5	5	10
Black African			22	24	46
Black Other		1	5	2	8
Chinese			9	6	15
Indian	6	7	38	42	93
Pakistani		2	56	26	84
Bangladeshi	2		17	16	35
African Asian			13	3	16
Asian Other			14	8	22
Other			23	10	33
Mixed ethnicity	1	1	19	16	37
Ethnicity information not available	1	1	11	8	21
Total	132	142	459	475	1208

Table 3: Comparison of the English vs. British identification scores for the Indian and Pakistani children

Importance of being British	2.25	
Importance of being English (scale from 1-4)	2.11	ns
Degree of identification with being British	2.50	
Degree of identification with being English (scale from 1-4)	2.75	$p < 0.005$
British national pride	3.46	
English national pride (scale from 1-5)	3.42	ns
Internalisation of Britishness	3.11	
Internalisation of Englishness (scale from 1-5)	3.04	$p < 0.05$

Table 4: Age-related changes in positivity and negativity towards British and German people (White English children only)

British mean positivity scores:

Age 5-7	Age 8-10	
3.86	3.57	p < 0.001

British mean negativity scores:

Age 5-7	Age 8-10	
2.23	2.44	p < 0.005

German mean positivity scores:

Age 5-7	Age 8-10	
3.56	3.20	p < 0.001

German mean negativity scores:

Age 5-7	Age 8-10	
2.44	2.47	ns

Table 5: Correlations between the strength of British identification and the British evaluation scores

	Correlation with British evaluation score (age partialled out)	
Importance of being British	0.21	p < 0.001
Degree of identification with being British	0.19	p < 0.001
Internalisation of Britishness	0.25	p < 0.001
British national pride	0.31	p < 0.001

Table 6: Correlations between the strength of British identification and the German evaluation scores

	Correlation with German evaluation score (age partialled out)	
Importance of being British	- 0.11	ns
Degree of identification with being British	- 0.07	ns
Internalisation of Britishness	- 0.02	ns
British national pride	- 0.06	ns

Table 7: Correlations between the strength of British identification and British positive distinctiveness

	Correlation with British positive distinctiveness (age partialled out)	
Importance of being British	0.23	$p < 0.001$
Degree of identification with being British	0.17	$p < 0.001$
Internalisation of Britishness	0.19	$p < 0.001$
British national pride	0.25	$p < 0.001$

Table 8: Participants in the Centenary Project in 2001

Students	Supervisors
Janet Jackson	Charles Crook
Kate Arnold	Rupert Brown
Jenni Samson	Rupert Brown
Anni Ahmavaara	Adam Rutland
Marie Barkaway	Paul Webley
Suzanne Miley	Claire Byrne
Una O'Dowd	Karen Trew
Alexandra Dixon	Martyn Barrett
Emma Alexander	Martyn Barrett
Abigail Lear	Eithne Buchanan-Barrow
Ayasha Shadat	Eithne Buchanan-Barrow