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Abstract

This thesis reports three studies which examined the development of cultural practices, social identifications and inter-group attitudes in 7- to 11-year-old British children living in London. In studies 1 and 2, 32 ethnic minority and 12 English ethnic majority children participated in qualitative one-to-one semi-structured interviews. Results revealed that the minority and majority group children had multiple identifications which were context-dependent; had adopted multi-cultural practices which were often domain and context specific; and that there was variability in the relationship between the children's social identifications and cultural practices. In study 3, 244 English, Indian and Pakistani children participated in a quantitative study designed to examine the development of inter-group attitudes and prejudice, and to explore whether children's inter-group attitudes are related to their levels of ethnic, national and religious identification, their patterns of inter-group friendships, their levels of appropriation of cultural practices drawn from ethnic cultures other than their own, and their cognitive classification ability. Results showed that there was variability in the children's social identifications and inter-group attitudes as a function of their ethnicity; that there were no age-related differences in the children's inter-group attitudes, inter-group friendships, identifications and cognitive classification skills; that there was no evidence of negative prejudice towards ethnic outgroups; and that inter-group attitudes, identifications, cultural practices, and classification skills were largely independent of each other. There were differences in the children's cultural practices as a function of ethnicity, gender and age, and they appeared to have adopted a multi-cultural integration acculturation strategy with their cultural practices varying according to cultural domain and context. It is argued that the existing dominant theories of ethnic attitude development in children, acculturation and contact cannot explain the patterns of development found in the present data, and that there is a need for new theories in this field.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Why Study Children’s Ethnic Group Attitudes, Identifications and Cultural Practices?

Recently, in the UK, attitudes towards ethnic minority communities (especially Muslim communities) have become increasingly tense, but ethnic tensions are also a global problem (Eade, Barrett, Flood & Race, 2008; Modood, 2007; Parekh, 2000). Multiculturalism has been an important focus for researchers over the past few decades, but since the events of September 11th in America in 2001, the Madrid bombings in Spain in 2004, and the 7/7 bombings in London in 2005, this phenomenon is now of heightened interest. With some ethnic relations in the UK appearing to have worsened since these events (ETHNOS, 2006), debates regarding the value of multiculturalism for encouraging a tolerant and harmonious society, and the re-examination of the British way of life are widespread. As a result, the UK Government has opened a debate about community cohesion and the nature of Britishness (Commission on Integration and Cohesion, 2007), and commissioned a fundamental review of the extent to which the National Curriculum in Citizenship Education addresses issues of Britishness, the obligations which British citizenship entails, issues concerning ethnic diversity, and intolerance towards members of other ethnic groups (Department for Education and Skills, 2007), and the recommendations of the latter review are currently being implemented. In addition, a citizenship test is now a prerequisite for immigrants wishing to obtain British citizenship, and citizenship ceremonies have been introduced which all adults who want to adopt British citizenship are now required to attend (Home Office UK Border Agency, 2009).

These government initiatives have taken place against the background of a staggering growth in cultural diversity in the UK over the past 15 years which has led some authors to describe the UK, and especially London, as now being ethnically super-diverse (Vertovec, 2006). British children who are growing up in this culturally diverse context acquire an understanding of who they are and to which ethnic groups they and others belong, and acquire attitudes and feelings towards the people who
belong to their own and other ethnic groups. They also acquire understandings of Britishness and beliefs about the criteria which make someone British, and stereotypes of the people who belong to different national and ethnic groups (Aboud, 1988; Barrett, 2007). Nation and ethnicity are important issues in British children’s lives, playing a crucial role in the cultural practices which they adopt, their own subjective identifications, their inter-group attitudes, their inter-group friendships, the levels of prejudice and discrimination which they experience, and their own social status within British society. Therefore, understanding how children’s ethnic and national group understandings, attitudes and practices develop is a crucial facet of understanding their overall social development.

This thesis reports a series of three studies which investigated the developmental processes through which British children’s ethnic and national group understandings, attitudes and practices develop between the ages of 7 and 11 years. Both majority English and ethnic minority children were included in these studies, with one of the overall goals of the research being to identify the social and psychological drivers of the children’s inter-group attitudes.

1.2 Structure of the Thesis

Chapter 2 begins the thesis with a review of literature relevant to the present research. The review starts with an overview of the history of research into the development of prejudice and ethnic attitudes in children by outlining some key concepts, the main methodologies which have been used, and some of the main findings as well as the gaps, and criticisms which may be made of this work. The chapter then reviews the two currently dominant theories of ethnic group attitude development in children, namely Cognitive Developmental Theory (CDT, Aboud, 1988) and Social Identity Development Theory (SIDT, Nesdale, 1999a, 2004). CDT’s Piagetian perspective posits that age-related changes in children’s cognitive abilities are what drive age-related changes in their attitude development. SIDT, on the other hand, posits social-motivational and social identity processes as the key drivers of this development. Relevant findings from existing research are outlined, and it is argued that these provide mixed support for these two theoretical
perspectives. Therefore, the review turns to other bodies of research which suggest that children’s ethnic, national and religious identifications and patterns of inter-group contact might explain the variability which has been found to characterise the development of children’s ethnic attitudes. In addition, existing theory and research on acculturation processes is reviewed, and it is suggested that children’s cultural practices may also be an additional driver of their inter-group attitudes. The review ends with a statement of the principal research questions which the present body of research was designed to address.

Chapter 3 reports study 1 which explored 7- to 11-year-old British minority children’s social identifications and cultural practices. The children attended a multi-ethnic school in London. The study employed a qualitative semi-structured one-to-one interview in order to explore what identifications were important to these children, how they viewed these different identities, if these identifications remained stable or varied in salience across contexts, as well as what cultural practices they adopted in different contexts and settings, and if there were any links between their identifications and their practices. The grounded analysis revealed that these children had multiple social identities, with religious, ethnic and British identifications being the most important. However, these identifications were context-dependent and non-conflicting. These identities, and the children’s cultural practices, were multiple, diverse and domain- and context-specific. There was also variability in the relationship between the children’s identifications and practices. The minority children appeared to favour multicultural integration or alternation acculturation strategies, and the multicultural context of London and the school children attended appeared to have influenced the children’s cultural practices and identities.

Chapter 4 reports study 2 which explored the same issues as study 1 but with 7- to 11-year-old white English majority children from multi-ethnic schools in London. Similar aims and methodology as had been employed in study 1 were employed in study 2. The results of study 2 were similar to those of study 1, but differed in that, for these majority group children, English, Christian and British identifications were the most important, and for some of these children their English and London identifications were stable across both public and private contexts.
Chapter 5 reports the research methodology for study 3, which used quantitative methods to explore inter-group attitudes, social identifications and cultural practices in 7- to 11-year-old British English, Indian and Pakistani children who attended multi-ethnic schools in London. A quantitative interview schedule (the design of which was partially based on the results of study 1 and 2) was administered one-to-one to 244 children and included the following measures: cognitive classification skill, levels of ethnic, British and religious identification, explicit attitudes towards four target groups, general affect towards these same four groups, levels of perceived discrimination, acculturation and cultural practices (including language use, celebration of cultural events, music, films, food, religiosity, sport, clothing) and inter-group friendships. Chapter 5 describes each of these measures, reports the reliabilities of the scales which were used, and describes how scale scores were derived from measures.

Chapter 6 reports the results of the analysis of the scale data from study 3. The analyses examined the children's identifications (ethnic, British, religious), inter-group attitudes and affect, as well as their cognitive classification skills, perceived discrimination (PD) and religiosity, looking in particular at age (year group) and ethnic group differences. In addition, the results were used to test the theoretical claims about the development of inter-group attitudes made by CDT and SIDT. The findings indicated that there was variability in children's identifications, PD, religiosity and inter-group attitudes (including ingroup favouritism) as a function of the children's ethnicity, and that there was a lack of variability in the children's classification skills, identifications, inter-group attitudes, PD and religiosity as a function of age. Interestingly, English and Indian children's identifications were positively correlated, but for Pakistani children their British and Muslim identities were negatively correlated. In addition, there was no evidence of negative prejudice; instead, outgroups were merely liked less than ingroups. These findings fail to support CDT's claim that prejudice is high in 7-year-olds and declines between 7 and 11 years, with this decline being linked to the development of children's classification skills across these ages. In relation to SIDT, limited support for the theory was found by the study. Ingroup favouritism was evident but was not
universal across all children and across all measures, but there was no evidence of negative prejudice in these children, which is consistent with SIDT.

Chapter 7 reports the results of the analysis of the study 3 frequency data which were collected on the children’s cultural practices and inter-group friendships. For the cultural practices data, correspondence analyses were conducted in order to establish whether there were any differences in the English, Indian and Pakistani children’s practices as a function of their ethnicity, gender and age. The findings revealed that there was great variability in the children’s practices linked to all three variables. In addition, it was found that there was variability in the children’s cultural practices according to the particular cultural domain involved (language, celebrations, music, films, food, religiosity, sport and clothing) and the particular context involved (the home, the school or the peer group). The chapter ends with analyses of children’s levels of close inter-group contacts, that is, their friendships. First, it was found that there were no differences in the number of inter-group friendships which the children had as a function of gender or age, but that there were differences linked to ethnicity, with the English children having fewer outgroup friends than the Indian and Pakistani children. Second, there were no effects of either age or gender on the total number of friends which the children had from each of the three targeted ethnic groups (i.e., English, Indian and Pakistani) but there were effects of ethnicity, with children from all three ethnic groups having more ethnic ingroup friends than friends from the other two target groups.

Chapter 8 reports the results of the analyses which explored the inter-relationships which existed between all of the different variables in study 3. Results indicated that the children’s inter-group attitudes were not related to their cultural practices (including their levels of religiosity), to their inter-group friendships, or to their cognitive classification skills. However, their ingroup attitudes were related to their identifications, but their outgroup attitudes were not related to their identifications. In addition, the minority children’s attitudes to English people were negatively correlated with their levels of perceived discrimination.
Chapter 9 presents a general discussion and summary of the main findings of the three studies in relation to the research questions which the research was designed to address. This chapter also summarises the empirical contributions which are made by the present research, and the theoretical implications of its findings. It is argued that CDT, SIDT and contemporary acculturation theory are all unable to account for the findings which were obtained in this body of research. The chapter concludes by presenting the overall limitations of the present research, and highlighting possible avenues for future research to explore.
This chapter reviews the existing literature on the development of prejudice and ethnic attitudes in children. It begins with an outline of some key concepts and the methods which have been used to study children’s ethnic attitudes, and some of the main findings which have been obtained through their use. Next, the two currently dominant theories of the development of ethnic prejudice are reviewed, followed by a review of research which suggests that children’s ethnic, national and religious identifications and inter-group contact might explain the variability which occurs in the development of ethnic attitudes. The focus of attention then shifts to acculturation, and how acculturation processes may also impact on children’s ethnic attitudes and identifications. Finally, the key aims and research questions of the present research are outlined.

2.1 Some Key Concepts Defined

To begin, some key definitions will be outlined. First, the term ‘race’ can be defined as a system of socially constructed categories based on people’s skin colour and physiognomy. However, these categories do not correspond to any clear divisions grounded in human biology, but these categories are nevertheless made very real for people belonging to racial minority groups through racism and racial discrimination (Banton, 1977; Barrett & Davis, 2008). Hence, in this thesis, the term ‘race’ is used as a synonym for ‘racialised group’ (Banton, 1977), without intending to imply that races are actual biological categories. The term ‘ethnic group’ instead refers to a cultural community with a collective name, shared beliefs and history, myths of common ancestry, and common practices, traditions and customs, as well as emotional and symbolic links to a homeland elsewhere in the world. Hence, ethnic groups do not physically occupy and live in their homelands in the same way that nations do, and this is one of the distinguishing features that differentiates ethnic groups from national groups (Hutchinson & Smith, 1996). However, the term ‘ethnicity’ can be viewed as problematic. Verkuyten (2005) suggests that an ethnic group is an imagined community, with shared beliefs about descent and common
origin being sufficient to make a group an ‘ethnic’ group. In other words, believing in a common origin, descent and history serves to distinguish ethnic identities from other identities. In addition, Verkuyten emphasises that ethnicity has to do with a subjective belief in the common origin, descent and history, with ethnicity being a dynamic, malleable and socially constructed system of categories. Hence, according to this conception, ethnicity is identifiable via the beliefs which are shared by the members of the group.

Ethnic attitudes are evaluations of one’s own ethnic ingroup and ethnic outgroups. ‘Prejudice’ may be defined as a “unified, stable and consistent tendency to respond in a negative way towards members of a particular (ethnic) group” (Aboud, 1988, p.6), or as “the holding of derogatory social attitudes or cognitive beliefs, the expression of negative affect, or the display of hostile or discriminatory behaviour towards members of a group on account of their membership of that group” Brown (1995, p.8). The term ‘stereotyping’ is defined as the making of simplified overgeneralisations (either positive or negative) about the characteristics of the people who belong to a particular group (Oakes, Haslam & Turner, 1994), while ‘discrimination’ is defined as harmful actions/behaviours towards others based on their particular membership of a group (Fishbein, 1996). These discriminatory behaviours can include verbal and physical abuse/assaults, with exclusion, name calling and unequal sharing being the most common in children (Brown & Bigler, 2005). Like prejudice and stereotyping, discrimination can be overt and explicit and/or covert and implicit (Brown, 1995).

2.2 The Measurement of Racial and Ethnic Attitudes in Children

Several different methods have been used over the years to measure racial and ethnic attitudes in children. All of these methods require children to evaluate members of their own ingroup and one or two outgroups. The most frequently used method before 1975 was the doll technique, invented by Clark and Clark (1947). Here, children were presented with a sequence of questions like ‘which is the nice colour?’ or ‘which looks bad?’ and were asked to indicate one doll (black or white) in response to these questions. The response frequencies for each question was
calculated and compared to chance levels of 50%. However, there are serious limitations to this test: due to its global and forced choice nature, it does not measure the degree of negativity/positivity towards the target, and it confounds preference with rejection (Aboud, 1988; Aboud & Amato, 2001).

The development of the multi-item Preschool Racial Attitude Measure (PRAM) by Williams, Best and Boswell (1975) and the Katz-Zalk Projective Prejudice Test (1978) made it possible to measure the level of prejudice in individual children and to overcome some of the problems of the doll test (Aboud, 1988; Aboud & Amato, 2001). In the PRAM, the child is presented with 24 racial and 12 gender ‘filler’ items. Each item illustrates a scenario/context involving two target children of different races and a positive or a negative quality. The child is asked to make a forced-choice response, that is, to pick the child who has that quality. The intensity and direction of a child’s attitude is calculated by aggregating the number of pro-white and anti-black responses. Some researchers claim that this multi-item method generates a more reliable prejudice score (Aboud & Amato, 2001) and a more generalisable evaluation (Aboud, 1988). However, this method still confounds ingroup acceptance with outgroup rejection and is still forced choice in design.

More recent multi-item measures include the Multiple-response Racial Attitude (MRA) measure (Doyle & Aboud, 1995) and the Free-Choice Attitude Measure (Doyle, Beaudet & Aboud, 1988). In studies utilising these measures, children are permitted to assign the same evaluations (positive and negative) to both racial group members. The advantage of these measures is that they allow the measurement of attitudes that run counter to ingroup bias (Aboud & Amato, 2001). However, Cameron, Alvarez, Ruble and Fuligni (2001) maintain that even though the MRA gives the child the option to pick both groups rather than choose between one group or another, the evaluation of attitudes to the ingroup and the outgroup is still problematic as the child is not given the option to pick neither group as having the attribute being tested. They also argue that this weakness is compounded by the fact that in analysing the results of the MRA, psychologists (i.e., Aboud & Doyle, 1996a, 1996b) often create a relational bias score (the number of positive attributes assigned to the ingroup plus the number of negative attributes assigned to the outgroup) and a
counter bias score (sum of negative evaluations of the ingroup and positive evaluations of the outgroup) rather than an overall positivity or negativity score.

By contrast, the post box technique used by Davey (1983) and Bennett, Lyons, Sani and Barrett (1988) used an unconfounded trait attribution task which allows children to assign both positive and negative traits to two or more groups independently of each other, as well as giving children the opportunity to discard traits that apply to none of the groups being tested. Attitudes are then measured in terms of the total number of positive traits and the total number of negative traits assigned to each group.

However, a criticism of all these measures is that children may be producing socially desirable answers which may mask the true nature of their attitudes (Nesdale, 2001). In older children, this is thought to be especially problematic as these children may not want to appear explicitly prejudiced in front of the experimenter because they are aware that prejudice is not socially accepted. Although Aboud and Doyle (1996a) and Aboud and Fenwick (1999) found no correlation between children’s responses on a social desirability scale and levels of prejudice measured using explicit methods, this does not entirely rule out the possibility of social desirability effects as the social desirability scale they used was also an explicit (i.e., conscious, volitional) measure.

Another type of technique, based on a social distance scale (Verma 1981), utilises continuous rating scales which provide quantitative rather than dichotomous response alternatives along a positive-negative bipolar scale (Aboud, 1988). The question typically asked is ‘How much do you like X person?’ or ‘How close would you like to sit to X person?’ This type of measure therefore allows children to evaluate each ethnic group member individually by locating that member on the scale. The advantage of this measure is that attitudes to each ethnic group can be evaluated independently. Furthermore, several members of each ethnic group can be evaluated to determine whether attitudes generalise to the group as a whole.

Most recently, a new measure, the Child Implicit Association Test (IAT), has been developed as a measure of children’s implicit rather than explicit attitudes (Baron &
Banaji, 2006). The IAT assesses children’s attitudes by measuring their differential reaction times for associating positive and negative adjectives (recordings of these spoken words) with faces (colour photographs) of children belonging to different racial or ethnic groups. It is argued that reaction times are much less prone to conscious or voluntary control by participants compared with measures of explicit attitudes. For this reason, critics of explicit measures (such as Nesdale, 2001) postulate that implicit measures may provide more accurate assessments of children’s racial and ethnic attitudes as they are less prone to social desirability effects.

2.3 Research Findings Obtained Using These Methods

This section reviews the research findings which have been obtained using these various methods. It reviews findings on the development of racial and ethnic awareness, the development of racial and ethnic self-categorisation, and the development of racial and ethnic attitudes.

2.3.1 Racial and Ethnic Awareness in Children

Awareness of racial or ethnic groups is often regarded as a necessary precursor to the development of racial and ethnic prejudice (Brown, 1995), and several researchers have sought to find out at what age awareness of these categories emerges (although most of the studies have focused on race rather than ethnicity). Clark and Clark’s (1947) famous doll studies led to decades of subsequent research being based on their paradigm. They presented white and black dolls to white and black American children aged 3 to 7 years, and asked them which one looks like a white (or a black) child. They found that even 3-year-old children were able to use racial cues as a basis for categorisation. Other studies have found similar results using different techniques. For instance, Williams and Morland (1976) reviewed studies using photographic stimuli where multiple black and white individuals were depicted, and found evidence of racial awareness in 4-year-old black and white American children.
Using a more open-ended technique, Davey (1983) asked British children to sort a sequence of photographs into different groups based on how they 'look alike'. The possible sorting criteria were gender, race and style of dress (to indicate socio-economic status). Davey found with 7- to 10-year-old children that race was the most popular sorting criterion. Yee and Brown (1988) used a similar method and found that by the age of 5, race was a significant sorting criterion (used by over a third of the children) and this tendency increased with age as race became the primary dimension.

In sum, the evidence from a multiplicity of studies has shown that children as young as 3 years are aware of racial categories.

2.3.2 Racial and Ethnic Self-Categorisation in Children

This section examines what is known about the development of children’s racial and ethnic self-identification, which is defined here as the ability to categorise oneself as a member of a particular racial or ethnic group (Aboud, 1988).

There is in fact a great deal of evidence which shows that children as young as 3 can self-categorise into ethnic and racial categories. Researchers have typically shown children pictures, photos or dolls representing different ethnic or racial groups, and asked questions such as ‘which one looks like you the most?’. With American children aged 3 to 7, responses to these questions typically reveal that children self-identify with the correct doll from the age of 3 onwards (Aboud, 1988). However, underneath this general trend are some important variations. For instance, Clark and Clark (1947) found that only 65% of black American children in their sample identified with the black doll. There were also some interesting age differences: over 60% of 3-year-olds actually self-identified with the white doll, compared with 87% of the 7-year-olds who identified with the black doll. Goodman (1952), on the other hand, found a much higher percentage (over 95%) of white American children identifying with the white stimuli from the age of 3. Hence, there appears to be an asymmetry between the self-categorisation of American majority white children and minority black children (Brown, 1995).
However, it is possible that these patterns have changed in more recent years. For example, Connolly’s (1998) ethnographic research in Britain has shown that young black and Asian children clearly identify with their own racial and ethnic groups from an early age. Davis, Leman and Barrett (2007) also found, using quantitative identification scales, that both black and white British children aged 5, 7 and 9 years identified with their ethnic category.

2.3.3 Racial and Ethnic Attitudes in Children

Between the 1940s and the 1970s, results were reported from a wealth of studies conducted in the US into the development of children’s attitudes towards their own racial and ethnic group (e.g., Asher & Allen, 1969; Clark & Clark, 1947; Williams & Morland, 1976). A pattern emerged from these decades: white children showed a clear positive preference for their ingroup, while black children were much more ambivalent, with some indicating ingroup preference but others expressing no preference or even outgroup preference. Similar results were obtained in a number of other countries (e.g., Great Britain, New Zealand, Canada) and with different ethnic and racial minority and majority groups (e.g., Asian-British, Maori, Pakeha white, West-Indian black), with majority group children expressing strong ingroup preference and minority group children showing much weaker ingroup preference with some favouring the majority outgroup (e.g., Jahoda, Thomson & Bhatt, 1972; Milner, 1973; Vaughan, 1964a).

Significantly, studies conducted from the 1970s onwards have shown a change in the pattern of findings, with majority and minority group children’s preferences now being more similar: white children’s pro-ingroup preferences have persisted, while black and other minority group children have switched to a clear preference for their own ingroup as well (Hraba & Grant, 1970; Braha & Rutter, 1980; Stephan & Rosenfield, 1978; Vaughan, 1978). Brown (1995) argues that this historical shift in minority attitudes is a consequence of socio-political developments, particularly of the black civil rights movement and the desegregation of schools in American society.
As far as the outgroup attitudes of white majority group children are concerned, Aboud (1988; Aboud & Amato, 2001) argues that these children at the age of 3 invariably show pro-white ingroup bias and prejudice against minority outgroups. She also claims that these biases initially increase with age, reaching a peak between 5 and 6 years, but that by age 7 a reduction in prejudice starts to occur, a decline which continues until the age of 12 and beyond (Bigler & Liben, 1993; Davey, 1983; Doyle & Aboud, 1995; Doyle, Beaudet & Aboud, 1988; Katz & Kofkin, 1997; Yee & Brown, 1992).

However, a number of other studies have produced findings which are not consistent with these age trends (e.g. Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996; Davis, Leman & Barrett, 2007; Dunham, Baron & Banaji, 2006; McGlothlin, Killen & Edmonds, 2005). For example, Black-Gutman and Hickson (1996) found that white Australian children aged 5-6, 7-9 and 10-12 years old were more positive towards their own group and towards Asian Australians than towards Aboriginal Australian people. In addition, their attitudes to both Asian Australian people and their ingroup did not change with age. Interestingly, the 7- to 9-year-olds were less negative towards Aborigines than the other two age groups, while the attitudes of the 10- to 12-year-olds were not significantly different from the attitudes of the 5- to 6-year-olds. These findings show variability in the development of attitudes depending upon the particular outgroup involved. They also show that the pattern of an increase in prejudice up to the age of 6 followed by a decline between 7 and 12 years does not always occur in white majority children.

Similarly, using the IAT, Dunham, Baron and Banaji (2006) found that white American children exhibit different developmental patterns in their implicit attitudes towards black vs. Japanese people, with attitudes to Japanese people becoming more positive between 6 to 10 years of age but negative attitudes to black people not changing across this same age range. This study therefore also shows variability in the development of attitudes towards different minority groups. Dunham et al. argue that the different patterns were due to the older children’s awareness of status differences (high vs. low) between the two outgroups. Interestingly, the explicit
measure which was also used by Dunham et al. with the same children replicated the standard finding of a decline in prejudice towards both outgroups between 6 and 10 years of age. In other words, the children’s implicit and explicit attitudes were dissociated. Similar results were found in a second study with Japanese children living in Japan using the same measures to examine their attitudes to whites and blacks. However, explicit bias was stronger in the Japanese sample, suggesting variability across cultural groups in the development of levels of explicit prejudice (Dunham et al., 2006).

As far as the outgroup attitudes of minority children are concerned, research conducted in America with Black, Hispanic, Native Indian and Asian children suggests that these children also begin to develop attitudes towards racial and ethnic outgroups from as early as 3 years of age (Aboud & Amato, 2001). However, it is now known that a great deal of variability exists in black children’s ethnic and racial evaluations between 5 and 7 years, with some samples being pro-black, some pro-white, some unbiased, and a few split with some children showing pro-black bias and others showing pro-white bias (Aboud, 1988; Aboud & Amato, 2001). Significantly, a number of studies with older minority children have found that, where pro-white bias does occur, between the ages of 7 and 10 it disappears and is replaced with pro-ingroup bias or unbiased attitudes instead (Aboud & Amato, 2001; Corenblum & Annis, 1993; Davey, 1983; Semaj, 1980; Williams & Morland, 1976).

Cultural heritage as well as national context may account for some of the heterogeneity in black children’s data. Bagley and Young (1998) found that most 5- to 6-year-old black children of Caribbean ancestry (living in Jamaica and England) expressed pro-white and anti-black attitudes but most black children of African ancestry (living in Ghana and Canada) showed no bias. Research with Mexican American children has also found variability in the development of inter-group attitudes (Bernal and Knight, 1993).

To conclude, the research literature suggests that children as young as 3 are aware of racial and ethnic categories, and from the age of 3 are able to self-identify and express preferences and biases. However, as children get older, it becomes harder to
pinpoint a single universal developmental pattern, as there is much variability in
development according to the specific target groups involved, the child’s own ethnic
group, and the cultural context.

2.4 Theories of the Development of Ethnic Group Attitudes

This section reviews the two currently dominant theories which are used to explain
the development of children’s ethnic group attitudes: Aboud’s Cognitive
Developmental Theory (CDT) and Nesdale’s Social Identity Development Theory
(SIDT).

2.4.1 Aboud’s Cognitive Developmental Theory of Prejudice

Drawing on Piaget’s (1955) cognitive developmental theory, Aboud (1988)
postulates that changes in ethnic attitudes and prejudice in childhood are directly
linked to children’s cognitive functioning. She proposes that children go through
three universal stages of development.

Initially, in the pre-operational period (3 to 5 years), affective responses and
perceptual appearances dominate. Here, children categorise their social environment
into broad categories (male/female, familiar/unfamiliar) and associate different
emotional reactions to these categories (like/dislike). Children also learn to
categorise themselves as members of some categories but not others. At this stage,
children focus on physical features like skin colour; hence, many children at an early
age display racial awareness, but they are nonetheless rigid in their thinking. During
this stage, they are egocentric as their attention is focussed on the self.

Then, from 5-7 years (stage 2), the child starts to make the transition from
preoperational thinking to concrete operational thinking and their focus on the
egocentric self changes to a group focus. Consequently, they become ‘group-centric’,
‘socio-centric’ or ‘ethnocentric’ in their attitudes. Thus, affective like-dislike
preferences for groups now give way to stereotype formation about traits that
characterise those groups. Aboud (1988) therefore posits that there are high levels of
ethnocentrism among 5- to 7-year-olds. Also at this age, children begin to understand that, despite superficial transformations in external appearance or age, many social groups remain stable and do not change (i.e., they acquire constancy understanding); this understanding parallels their mastery of conservation in the physical domain. In both of the first two stages, children can only attend to and categorise an individual along one dimension at a time. They also base their preferences on global group-based characteristics (i.e., race) and prefer their ingroup (i.e., those who are familiar to them) to outgroups. Thus, levels of ethnic group stereotyping, ingroup preference and outgroup prejudice are high in the first two stages, increasing between 3 and 6 years.

In the third stage (7 to 11 years), the transition from preoperational to concrete operational thinking is completed. Children become less rigid about stereotypes as they can now ascribe attributes to people and groups that are not directly observable (i.e., internal attributes). They are also more flexible in their cognitions (i.e., they can now attend to and categorise along multiple dimensions), and they are also more focused on individual traits rather than group characteristics (i.e., individual variation within groups). Therefore, ingroup preference, outgroup prejudice and inter-group stereotyping all decline in this period because the child is no longer focused on perceptual (and affective) processes. This is why children become more positive/less negative to outgroups, and less positive/more negative to their own ingroup.

Thus, CDT postulates that inter-group stereotyping, ingroup bias and outgroup prejudice increase from age 3-6 years and decrease from 7 years onwards. It also postulates that children move through two overlapping sequences: affective to perceptual to cognitive functioning, as well as a re-focusing of their attention from the self to the group then to the individual as they mature. More recently, Aboud and Amato (2001) have proposed that “several concrete operational capabilities, namely conservation, reconciliation, multiple classifications, perceived similarity of groups and attention to individual differences within groups, are influential in breaking down the over-use of exaggerated, homogeneous categories and reducing prejudice” (p.12).
To summarise, Aboud argues that children show an inverted U-shaped relationship between prejudice and age, with levels of prejudice increasing between 3/4 and 6/7 years of age, and then declining from 6/7 to 12 years. Aboud proposes that these changes in prejudice are driven by developments in the child’s underlying cognitive abilities.

As we have seen, there is evidence to support the claim that (white) children usually display ingroup favouritism in their racial and ethnic attitudes from the age of 3, with this bias increasing until about 6 or 7 years of age before declining (e.g., Aboud, 1977, 1980; Asher & Allen, 1969; Corenblum & Wilson, 1982; Doyle & Aboud, 1995; Hraba & Grant, 1970; Vaughan, 1964; Williams, Best & Boswell, 1975; Williams & Morland, 1976). However, while CDT does indeed explain why many children show a reduction in prejudice from 7 years of age onwards, it does not explain why some majority group children do not display this pattern of prejudice reduction (e.g. Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996; Davis et al., 2007; Dunham et al., 2006), or why minority children express variable attitudes to their own and other groups (e.g., Asher & Allen, 1969; Corenblum & Annis, 1993; Hraba & Grant, 1970; Katz & Kofkin, 1997; Semaj, 1980; Williams & Morland, 1976).

A body of research also exists in support of CDT’s claims that cognitive skills (i.e., multiple classification, conservation, reciprocity and reconciliation) are linked to the development of attitudes (e.g., Aboud, 2003; Bigler & Liben, 1993; Clark, Hocevar & Dembo, 1980; Doyle & Aboud, 1995; Doyle, Beaudet & Aboud, 1998; Katz, Sohn & Zalk, 1975). For instance, Bigler and Liben (1993) investigated the relationship between multiple classification skill and the development of stereotyping, and found that lower levels of racial stereotyping were related to the ability to classify individuals along multiple dimensions. Furthermore, in a study looking at the relationship between conservation skill and inter-group attitudes, Aboud (2003) found that attitudes were associated with high performance on conservation measures. In addition, Doyle and Aboud (1995) found that the skills of reciprocity (understanding that ethnic group members are likely to prefer their own group) and reconciliation (understanding that own group preferences are valid) were linked to decreases in levels of prejudice.
However, research testing the links between cognitive skills and inter-group attitudes has been conducted predominantly with majority group children; few researchers have examined the relationship between cognition and attitudes in minority group children. In addition, there is evidence against the view that cognitive skills always underpin attitude development in children. For example, Bigler, Brown and Markell (2001) found no relationship between multiple classifications and outgroup attitudes. Cameron, Rutland and Brown (2007) also found that neither multiple classification skills nor skills training was related to outgroup attitudes. And indeed, Doyle and Aboud (1995) themselves report that there was no significant correlation between racial attitudes and performance on conservation tasks.

This mixed evidence poses problems for CDT, as it suggests that attitude development in children is not driven solely by cognitive factors. In fact, more recently, CDT theorists themselves have begun to acknowledge that factors beyond cognitive development may need to be considered in order to explain children’s racial and ethnic group attitudes. For example, Aboud and Amato (2001) concede that ‘cognitive developmental theory lacks a clear explanation of why and in the process of acquiring attitudes children attach positive evaluations to one group and negative to others’ (p.78). Aboud (1993) also acknowledges that ‘we know that social forces such as equal status contact, friendship with an outgroup member, increased exposure to individuals from the outgroup, multicultural television programs, parental attitudes and peer attitudes have an impact in children attitudes’ (p.58). However, Aboud and Amato (2001) still posit a dominating role for cognitive development, arguing that, in processing social information, ‘changes taking place within the child, due to cognitive development, determine which social inputs will be influential’ (Aboud & Amato 2001, p.76).

However, as we have seen, there are several findings which CDT is unable to explain. These include:

i) the historical change in attitudes from pro-white to pro-black amongst black children that took place in the 1970s in the United States
ii) why the development of ethnic minority children's attitudes differs from that of ethnic majority children

iii) why some majority group children's attitudes do not display the developmental pattern predicted by CDT

iv) why children's implicit attitudes are dissociated from their explicit attitudes

2.4.2 Nesdale's Social Identity Development Theory

Nesdale's (2001, 2004) Social Identity Development Theory (SIDT) hypothesises that, in the development of racial and ethnic prejudice, children pass through four sequential phases: undifferentiated, ethnic awareness, ethnic preference and ethnic prejudice. Importantly, SIDT claims that children's movement through these phases is not related only to cognitive development but also to social motivational factors and social identity processes. Therefore, SIDT acknowledges the importance of social context (unlike CDT), and argues that ethnic prejudice is not inevitable in all children but depends on whether inter-group comparisons and ethnicity are made salient in the child's social milieu and on the child's own level of ingroup identification.

According to Nesdale, in phase one (undifferentiated) before the age of 2-3, ethnic cues are not usually salient to young children. Instead children tend to respond to stimuli in their environment in terms of what grasps their attention. Thus, they see people as 'undifferentiated'. At around 2-3 years of age, they enter the second phase of 'ethnic awareness', when they become aware that social and ethnic groups exist in their community. During this second phase, ethnic self-identification occurs, that is, understanding that the self is a member of a particular ethnic group. In phase three, which begins at about the age of 4, as a result of ethnic self-identification, ethnic ingroup preference emerges. However, Nesdale stresses that this does not mean outgroups are disliked or rejected but that children exhibit greater preference for and focus more on their ingroup over outgroups. In phase four, which occurs from about 7 years of age, the focus shifts from the ingroup to outgroups, and instead of merely preferring the ingroup, the child begins to actively dislike outgroups. Thus, prejudice emerges and crystallises. However, not all children enter this final phase. Nesdale
postulates that prejudice will only emerge in some children as a result of an interplay between factors such as ingroup status, level of ingroup identification, the extent of shared negative attitudes of the ingroup to outgroups, and level of threat or conflict experienced or anticipated (Nesdale, Griffiths, Durkin, & Maass (2005b). For Nesdale, ethnic prejudice implies an excessive focus on the outgroup and the child internalising negative attitudes to outgroups from people belonging to their ingroup. Hence, instead of merely liking an outgroup member less than an ingroup member, for SIDT, prejudice means that the outgroup members are disliked and/or discriminated against.

This account is contrary to CDT according to which ethnic prejudice diminishes from 7 years of age onwards as a result of cognitive capabilities developing. For SIDT, ethnic prejudice only begins to appear after the age of 7 in some children if their ingroup and/or their social environment advocates negative prejudice and if they identify with that ingroup.

A body of research supports SIDT’s first three phases, as white majority children do usually display ethnic awareness, ethnic self-identification and ingroup favouritism towards their own ethnic group from an early age (e.g., Aboud & Mitchell, 1977; Clark & Clark, 1947; Goodman, 1946; Katz, 1976; Nesdale, 1999b; Vaughan, 1963). In addition, the findings from several inter-group studies using the minimal group paradigm support the predictions of SIDT (Nesdale, Durkin, Maass & Griffiths, 2004; Nesdale, Durkin, Maass & Griffiths, 2005a; Nesdale & Flesser, 2001; Nesdale, Maass, Durkin & Griffiths, 2005b; Nesdale, Maass, Griffiths & Durkin, 2003).

For example, Nesdale et al. (2003) conducted a study in which 5-, 7- and 9-year-old white Australian majority children were randomly assigned to one of two teams: high versus low drawing ability. Other members of their team were either the same ethnicity as them or a different ethnicity (Pacific Islander). The rival team was also either white Australian children or Pacific Islander children. It was found that, irrespective of ethnicity, children showed a preference for their ingroup. Importantly, the children did not reveal negative dislike of the different ethnicity team; instead the different ethnicity team was simply rated less positively than the
same ethnicity rival team. Children also felt more similar to same-group and same-ethnicity members. According to SIDT, these findings show that the children were in the ethnic preference phase, focusing on the ingroup but not directing negative prejudice towards the outgroup.

Another minimal group paradigm study by Nesdale et al. (2005a) supports SIDT claims about the transition from ethnic preference to ethnic prejudice. They found that, compared to the ingroup, the outgroup was liked less but that this changed to negative prejudice when the children showed high levels of identification with their ingroup and when the ingroup was threatened by the outgroup. Likewise, Nesdale et al. (2005c) found that dislike of the outgroup was greater when the ingroup had an exclusion norm and when it perceived the outgroup to be a threat. These studies therefore provide evidence for the final phase of SIDT (ethnic prejudice), and support for the conditions which evoke prejudice in children (ingroup identification, outgroup threat and prejudiced group norms).

However, while these minimal group studies have found support for SIDT, studies conducted in more naturalistic contexts involving authentic ethnic group members are also required to test the efficacy of SIDT. Such studies do not always support the predictions of SIDT. For example, negative prejudice is sometimes displayed before 7 years of age (Barrett, 2007; Barrett & Short, 1992; Bennett, Barrett, Karakozov, Kipiani, Lyons, Pavlenko & Riazanova, 2004), and prejudice sometimes reduces rather than increases after 7 years of age (Aboud & Amato, 2001; Barrett, 2007). Moreover, there has been little examination of the ability of this model to explain ethnic minority children’s ethnic attitude development. Like CDT, SIDT also cannot explain why minority status group children express variable preferences for their own and other groups (e.g., Asher & Allen, 1969; Corenblum & Annis, 1993; Hraba & Grant, 1970; Katz & Kofkin, 1997; Semaj, 1980; Williams & Morland, 1976). It is potentially arguable that some of these problematic results are a consequence of these studies using measures of explicit rather than implicit attitudes, with the result that their findings are contaminated by social desirability effects. However, studies using implicit measures to investigate implicit attitudes have also produced results which are contrary to SIDT predictions. For example, Dunham et al. (2006), in their
study using the IAT, found that white American children exhibited declining rather than increasing levels of anti-Japanese bias between 6 and 10 years of age, while these children's negative anti-black attitudes did not change between these two ages (with parallel findings being obtained with Japanese children living in Japan). Neither of these patterns is compatible with the predictions of SIDT. In addition, Dunham, Baron and Banaji (2007) found that minority Hispanic American children aged 5 showed no ingroup preference over whites on the IAT (although these children did display ingroup preference over blacks). These studies using the IAT suggest that young children are aware of social status hierarchies, with status differentials being reflected in their attitudinal biases towards different ethnic groups. Davis et al. (2007) used a different method to assess children’s implicit attitudes which was based on biases and errors in children’s recall of stereotypical vs. counter-stereotypical information about ingroup and outgroup members. They found, with black and white British children aged 5, 7 and 9, that white majority children did not exhibit ingroup positivity but were instead, along with the black children, more pro-black on both the implicit task and a parallel explicit task. Therefore, contrary to SIDT, these white children did not display ethnic ingroup preference at any age.

In summary, despite Nesdale’s claim that SIDT provides a good fit to empirical findings, the theory has serious problems in accounting for the full range of findings that have been obtained in studies. It is arguable that this is because SIDT, much like CDT, proposes that exactly the same invariant pattern of development is displayed by children growing up in all cultural contexts. In other words, SIDT appears to fail because it claims that there is a universal pattern of development which is displayed by all children irrespective of the specific cultural contexts in which they live. As such, this theory appears to underestimate the amount of variability which actually characterises children’s development in this area.

2.4.3 Conclusion

Neither CDT nor SIDT is supported by the available evidence. Although each theory can account for some of the existing empirical findings, neither theory is able to explain all of the existing empirical evidence. Both theories try to provide a
comprehensive explanation of the development of ethnic prejudice in children by positing a universal developmental sequence. However, the evidence actually implies that there is no universal pattern in the development of racial and ethnic group attitudes, and that children’s development varies not only according to the child’s own ethnic group but also according to the particular cultural context in which the child lives and the status of the target outgroups which are tested. A major question which therefore needs to be addressed in this area is: how can the variability which occurs in the development of children’s racial and ethnic group attitudes be explained?

2.5 Factors Which May Be Linked to the Variability Which Occurs in the Development of Children’s Racial and Ethnic Attitudes

In this section, evidence concerning other influences that might impact on the development of children’s ethnic attitudes is discussed.

2.5.1 Ethnic Identification

This section considers the empirical research which has been conducted into how children’s subjective sense of ethnic identification (beyond mere ethnic self-categorisation) develops, and the impact which this subjective identification might have on the variability which characterises the development of children’s ethnic attitudes.

Empirically, ethnic identity has been treated in a number of different ways, for example, as the ethnic component of social identity, as ethnic self-identification or ethnic self-categorisation, as feelings of belongingness and commitment, and as a sense of shared practices, values and attitudes (e.g. Hutnik, 1991; Liebkind, 1996; Phinney, 1990; Verkuyten, 2005). Bernal and Knight (1993) provide a focused definition and conceptualisation of ethnic identity as a set of ideas and feelings concerning one’s own ethnic group membership. They argue that ethnic identity refers to knowledge of personal membership in a particular ethnic group and the related behaviours, values and feelings which are associated with that membership.
More specifically, Bernal and Knight (1993) conceptualise ethnic identity as having five components:

1) Ethnic self-identification is the categorisation of the self as a member of one’s ethnic group. This categorisation requires that children have their own ethnic group category with its appropriate label.

2) Ethnic constancy is the knowledge that one’s ethnic group membership is fixed and stable across time, contexts and development.

3) Ethnic role behaviours involve engaging in the varying behaviours that mark ethnic culture such as values, styles, customs, traditions and language.

4) Ethnic knowledge is the knowledge that certain behaviours, traits, values, styles, customs, traditions and language are related to one’s ethnic group.

5) Ethnic preferences and feelings are the feelings about one’s own ethnic group membership and preferences of ethnic members, behaviours, values, traditions, language etc.

Using this conceptual framework, Bernal, Knight, Organista, Garza and Maez (1993) demonstrated that Mexican American children younger than five years of age had either minimal or no understanding of ethnic identity, as children’s responses concerning ethnic concepts were no better than chance levels, indicating very limited knowledge in this domain. Bernal, Knight, Garza, Ocampo and Cota (1990) also found similar patterns from their first study with preschool Mexican-American children. Few of the children who were under the age of 7 produced the correct ethnic label and even these children could not give a reason why the label applied to them. In addition, those who self-sorted into the correct ethnic group rarely had a knowledgeable reason for doing so. Moreover, the children did not achieve ethnic constancy understanding and their knowledge of ethnic behaviours was minimal.

In a further study with Mexican American primary school aged children (aged 6 to 10), Bernal et al. (1990) found that, as children grow older, they are not only able to identify with ethnic labels or self-categorise but also appear to understand the concept of ethnic constancy. Ethnic knowledge and preferences also increased with age. Furthermore, children who were Spanish speakers tended to correctly group
more of their Mexican peers, knew that certain behaviours were characteristically Mexican, and had more ethnic preferences and ethnic knowledge as a function of their families’ teaching about Mexican culture and use of the Spanish language in the home. Bernal et al. argue that these findings highlight the importance of language and parental practices in the emergence of ethnic identity, at least in minority individuals.

Knight, Bernal, Cota, Garza and Ocampo (1993) went on to propose a model of ethnic identity and ethnic socialisation in which parents transmit ethnic identity to their children by a process of enculturation. In other words, parents model and reinforce ethnic behaviours as well as teach their children about the traditions, beliefs, and values connected with their cultural heritage. This socialisation model includes five basic clusters of variables that impact on children’s value-based social behaviours: 1) the broader social ecology of families, 2) socialisation by familial and non-familial agents, 3) children’s self-concept, 4) immediate contextual features, and 5) cognitive development. The social ecology of families includes the characteristics of the family background, including the generation of migration to the host country, acculturation, ethnic identity, language and cultural knowledge of parents; it also includes family structure, familial interdependence and family size. In addition, the broader social ecology of the children includes the urbanisation of the community, the socioeconomic status of the family and community, the children’s minority status, the dominant group and the effects of these characteristics on the social, economic and political status of minority people.

Studies with Mexican-American families (Knight et al., 1993; Quintana & Vera; 1999) have shown that parents who strongly identify with Mexican culture are more likely to teach their children about their cultural heritage and are therefore more likely to have children who also strongly identify with Mexican culture. Similarly, Quintana and Vera (1999) have found that Mexican American parents who teach their children about ethnic pride, knowledge about their ethnic group and discrimination, are more likely to have young children who have knowledge about Mexican heritage and a preference for Mexican cultural practices. These findings suggest that parents who have a strong sense of their ethnic identity may be positive
role models for their children and may influence their children’s ethnic identity formation and development.

Hughes, Rodriguez, Smith, Johnson, Stevenson and Spicer (2006) propose the term ‘cultural socialisation’ to denote ethnic and racial socialisation. This term refers to parenting repertoires that teach children about their cultural (racial and/or ethnic) traditions and history. They point out that the most common aspects of cultural socialisation investigated have been language use, ethnic pride, teaching of ethnic history and traditions, participating in cultural events and having ethnic objects in the family home, and that ethnic identity has been the most tested outcome. According to Hughes et al., most studies have found that children’s knowledge about their ethnic group, and the development of positive ingroup attitudes, are both aided by family socialisation. For example, with African American families, Branch and Newcombe (1986) found that parents’ racial attitudes were associated with more ethnocentric attitudes towards the ingroup than the white outgroup. Similarly, Spencer (1983) found that when African American parents taught their children about history, civil rights and prejudices, this resulted in ingroup bias in their children. More recently, Marshall (1995) found that African American parents who engaged in more ethnic socialisation practices had children who were more likely to express racial identity views that questioned allegiance to the white majority culture’s world outlook.

Davis et al. (2007) also looked at levels of both ethnic and racial identification in children. In their study, black and white British children aged 5, 7 and 9 completed measures of ethnic and racial identification. They found that both black and white children identified with their ethnic category (i.e., their familial heritage). However, only the black children identified with their racial skin colour category (black). It appeared that ‘whiteness’ was not a salient category or identity for these white British children. Interestingly, this study shows that minority children use multiple characteristics (both race and ethnicity) to define themselves.

Akiba, Szalacha and Garcia Coll (2004) examined ethnic identification amongst Cambodian, Dominican and Portuguese children aged 5-12 years old living in America. They argue that children in early middle childhood acknowledge multiple
dimensions of the self and can go beyond classifying themselves merely by concrete physical terms such as skin colour and expand to dimensions such as attitudinal, behavioural and cognitive characteristics as well as memberships to social groups. Consequently, these researchers examined the multidimensionality of ethnic identification. The children were presented with a wide variety of labels including gender, race, religion and more specific descriptors such as ethnicity (i.e. Cambodian) and hyphenated identities like Cambodian-American, and were asked to choose those which were relevant to them. The children were then asked to rank order the labels they chose, and finally asked why each label was about them. The results revealed that: older children selected more labels than younger children, Dominican children selected more labels than Cambodian or Portuguese children, and all children picked a gender label and at least one ethnic label (the selection of other labels was more variable). The most popular choices across all three groups were ethnic descriptors ('Dominican', 'Cambodian' and 'Portuguese') and this pattern increased with age. Then language-based descriptors such as 'Spanish' were next most popular, and least popular were superordinate categories like 'Asian'. The latter finding is in agreement with Lopez and Espiritu's (1990) view that these overarching categories are socially constructed and categorise people who have little in common. Interestingly, these children appeared to have knowledge of a wide range of descriptors that applied to them and even those which perhaps had little meaning to them (e.g., 'Asian').

The study also looked at prevalence and priority. Prevalence was the proportion of ethnic labels selected out of the total number of labels chosen. It was found that Portuguese children chose fewer ethnic labels than Dominican and Cambodian children. Priority or relative importance of ethnic identity, on the other hand, was the position ethnic identity labels ranked compared to other descriptors. For Cambodian and Dominican children, ethnic identity was the most important construct, then gender; however, the reverse was true for Portuguese children. The authors propose that ethnicity may be more salient for children of visible minorities than children of European descent. Predictably, when the youngest children were asked to give an explanation for choosing each label they were not able to give an informative answer. However, the older children gave a breath of responses which were of adult
sophistication. The older children also had knowledge about the necessary characteristics that make up and distinguish members of particular social groups.

Hutnik (1986, 1991), like Abika et al., found evidence of multiple identifications but with British-Indian adolescents. She found that identifications amongst this group were much more complex than has traditionally been assumed, with individuals simultaneously identifying with a range of social categories including their ethnic origins, their race, their religion, and Britishness. Hutnik has therefore argued the need for hyphenated identities for this group (e.g., British-Muslim).

In conclusion, work on ethnic identification has shown that factors other than cognitive development are important in the development of children’s ethnic identity. Parental heritage teaching and cultural practices, parental identifications, and ethnic language use, have all been implicated in the development of children’s ethnic identity. The multidimensionality and complexity of ethnic identity have also been emphasised by this body of research. If attitudes to ingroups and outgroups are linked to the strength of identification with the ingroup, as SIDT has proposed, then the variability which occurs in the development of ethnic group attitudes may stem ultimately either from variability in factors such as parental practices, parental identifications, and ethnic language use in the family home, or from variations in the complex multidimensional structure of children’s ethnic identifications, rather than only from the child’s own cognitive development, as CDT maintains.

2.5.2 Religious Identification

This section reviews work on religious identification in children and adolescents. Religion is a central feature of ethnic groups, and during the course of history, religion has been involved in many conflicts and clashes, for example in Northern Ireland between Protestants and Catholics, in Israel/Palestine between Jews and Muslims, and in India/Pakistan between Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs. Religion is often an emotionally charged component of identity, whether it is intertwined with ethnic identification or is construed as a social identity in its own right. With an increasing proportion of ethnic minorities entering UK society, how children today
feel about their religion and other religious/ethnic groups is of vital importance and could shape the future of the UK in terms of religious group relations (Takriti, Barrett & Buchanan-Barrow, 2006).

The literature on the development of religious identification in childhood, has, like the literature on racial and ethnic attitudes, been dominated by stage theories (e.g., Elkind, 1961; Goldman, 1964; Harms, 1944). Elkind (1971) argued that cognitive development has a profound effect on the children’s religious thinking, and put forward an analysis of the development of religious identity based on the Piagetian framework of cognitive development. However, because the Piagetian framework has been undermined by more recent research on cognitive development (e.g., Donaldson, 1978; Wellman & Gelman, 1998), so too has Elkind’s account of the development of religious identity.

According to Takriti et al. (2006), much of the research in this field has focused on Christian and Jewish children of differing denominations, and other religious groups such as Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims have been largely ignored. However, Modood, Beishon and Virdee (1994) have conducted research in this domain with adolescents from a variety of ethnicities, to assess the importance of religion in their identities and its impact on their lifestyle. The adolescents were asked to choose identities which were important to them and then to rank these in order of importance. It was found that South Asian adolescents were significantly more likely to choose religion as a way of describing themselves and consistently gave it more importance than any of the other ethnic groups. Modood et al. (1994) also asked the Christian, Muslim, Hindu and Sikh adolescents to rate the importance of their religion in their way of life on a 5-point Likert scale running from “not at all important” to “very important”. They found that Muslims gave more importance to religion than any other group. In addition, all groups rated religion as being more important than Christians.

Similarly, Ghuman (2003) found that Muslim adolescents rated their religion more important than their Hindu and Sikh counterparts. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that differences in children’s strength of religious identification may be due to influences stemming from their own religious group membership, not just their cognitive development. The existence of differences in identification in relation to
religious group membership has been explored by Takriti et al. (2006). They found using semi-structured interviews that children aged 5-11 years from Muslim, Hindu, Christian and Jewish backgrounds regarded religion as being highly salient, and that there were minimal age-related changes in understanding in this domain although religious group differences were apparent. Interestingly, language, nationality, ethnicity and religion appeared intertwined and closely related for these children. For instance, Arabic is the official language of Islam and the language used in the Quran but many Muslims speak a variety of languages and are from different ethnicities and nationalities, but Arabic was important for these Muslim children nevertheless.

Farver, Narang and Bhadha (2002) also argue that religion is an important facet of Asian Indian culture and an important potential influence on acculturation preferences. Williams (1988) notes that Asian Indian immigrants tend to be a highly religious group and are more so in the adopted society than in their country of origin. Researchers such as Dasgupta (1998) and Sheth (1995) have also found that religious activities strengthen individuals’ sense of ethnicity, help tie them more closely to their own ethnic community, and help to teach the next generation about their ethnic traditions and heritage. Zhou (1997) similarly found that religious participation made a large contribution to Vietnamese adolescents’ ethnic identifications and positive adjustment to the host American society. Williams (1988) concludes that among first generation immigrant adolescents, religious participation may strengthen ethnic identity across generations, provide psychological support and reinforce the socialisation of traditional values outside the home.

Jacobson (1997) conducted qualitative fieldwork with British Pakistani youths, and found that religious identity for these Muslim youths was pervasive and clear cut. However, their ethnic identity was more permeable in terms of boundaries. These individuals tended to differentiate between religious and ethnic identification, emphasising that religious identification played a more significant role in their lives than ethnic identification as it signified belonging to a global community. Two distinctions emerged from this research, the particularism of their Pakistani identity and the universalism of their Islamic identity, so that these individuals were able to
distinguish between ‘traditional’ and ‘cultural’ practices of Pakistaniness (e.g., the caste system or arranged marriages) and the ‘religious’ practices of Islam. Religion was also seen as constant, whereas ethnic culture was open to change. Muslim identity was also viewed as cross-cutting ethnic and national memberships. In other words, the two sources of identity in practice were closely tied up with one another but at the same time commonly regarded as separate or different self-descriptions.

In sum, religious identification is almost certainly an important social identity for many minority children and adolescents. Religious identification appears to be linked to ethnic identification and religious language. Given the undermining of the traditional Piagetian account, more research is required on the development of religious identification in children, and on the possible effects which religious identification might have on children’s attitudes to other racial and ethnic groups. It is possible that variations in the development of religious identifications are a further source of the variations which occur in the development of racial and ethnic attitudes, and new research is required to establish the extent to which children’s racial and ethnic inter-group attitudes may be linked to their religious identifications.

2.5.3 National Identification

National identification is also another variable that may impact on inter-group attitudes, especially attitudes to other national groups. This section will explore some of the research that has been conducted into how children’s sense of national identity develops and the relationship between children’s national attitudes and national identification.

National identification in Great Britain is complex, multifarious and a contested phenomenon (Barrett, 2007; Jacobson, 1997). The reasons are that there are a number of different national categories (such as British, English, Welsh and Scottish) with which people can identify, and each of these categories carries different connotations, in different locations of Britain, for different people.
Firstly, a distinction needs to be made here between the United Kingdom (UK) and Great Britain. Great Britain is made up of three countries: Scotland, Wales and England. The UK on the other hand, consists of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Therefore English, Welsh and Scottish people (amongst others ethnic groups with British citizenship) make up the British group. Interestingly, many English people tend to conflate their English and their British identities, believing one to be the same as the other (Condor, 1996; Jacobson, 1997; Barrett, 2007). However, this mistake is not common amongst Welsh and Scottish nationals, which may be due to their awareness of the distinction between the nation and the state. Thus, Britishness may be seen as a national, state or citizenship identity by some and/or an ethnic/racial identity for others (Kumar, 2003; Jacobson, 1997). Similarly English, Welsh and Scottish identities can be interpreted as either ethnic, national or racial categories. This makes Britain a complex context for investigating national identity development. Here, Britishness will be interpreted as a superordinate national (i.e., civic or state) identity and English identity will be taken to mean an ethnic/racial identity.

Barrett (2005) argues that for a child to have a sense of their national identity, it is not enough for that child to be aware of the national group; it is also necessary that they understand they are a member of that group (national self-categorisation). He goes on to argue that children may acquire knowledge of the existence of their national group first and only later include themselves within that national category. Once this has been achieved, children can then attribute different levels of importance to that membership. Another key aspect is a child’s sense of belonging, and whether they meet certain criteria (e.g., place of birth) or whether other people feel that they do or do not meet all the necessary criteria due to ethnic/racial markers. Further aspects of national identity include children’s levels of ingroup favouritism, knowledge of national stereotypes, national emblems and emotions such as national pride. For Barrett (2005), these aspects comprise the subjective sense of national identity. Furthermore, national identity is not a static structure but a dynamic psychological structure dependent on context and embedded in everyday behaviours (Barrett, 2007).
Piaget and Weil (1951) were the first developmental researchers to look at the development of national self-categorisations using open-ended questioning. They reported that from the age of 5, the Swiss Genevan children they tested showed evidence of knowing the name of the country in which they lived and the name of their own nationality. However, between 5 and 10-11 years of age, these children had problems in understanding that they were simultaneously both Genevese and Swiss, and were confused by the fact that they had multiple group memberships, thus sometimes denying that they were Swiss. In a much larger study of 6, 10 and 14 years olds, conducted in 10 different countries, Lambert and Klineberg (1967) found that children’s national and state group memberships were rarely mentioned in response to open-ended questions, but when they were asked directly about these groups, they found that all of the children held definite views about their own national or state group.

Barrett (2005, 2007) argues that although open-ended interviewing can be revealing, there are problems associated with this method when working with children. For example, the wording of a question can encourage particular types of answers, thus underestimating children’s knowledge and beliefs. Interviews are also subject to social desirability effects as well as being cognitively very demanding for children. A further limitation of these early studies is that none of them attempted to assess the strength of the children’s national identifications.

Therefore, in order to avoid some of these problems, Barrett and colleagues measured the strength of national and state identification in children during the 1990s in the CHOONGE and NERID projects (Barrett, 2007). Data were collected from over four thousand 6-, 9-, 12- and 15-year-old children, living in a number of different western and eastern European countries. One task was designed to assess the children’s own self-categorisations (in order to ascertain whether or not they spontaneously categorised themselves as members of a particular national or state group), while a second task was designed to measure the importance of the children’s subjective identification with each of the chosen self-categorisations.
The first task involved giving each child a set of cards with various possible identities written on them (such as English, European, Londoner, boy and 5 years old). The child was asked to choose all the cards which could be used to describe them. It was found that, by the age of 6, the majority of children knew the name of their own national group and spontaneously chose it in order to describe themselves.

In the second task, the child was asked to rank order all the cards which had been chosen in terms of their importance to the child. Two different developmental patterns were found. In the first pattern, from the age of 6 up to 15, very high importance was attributed to national identity in, for example, children from various regions within Spain. In the second pattern, national identity was not initially ranked as being very important at the age of 6 but its importance increased between 6 and 12 years of age, as occurred for example with Scottish children. Thus, although these Scottish children spontaneously chose their national identity as a self-description, they did not yet assign much importance to it.

A third measure was also used to assess the children’s degree of national and state identification, and was administered immediately after the second task. The child was asked ‘Which one of these do you think best describes you?’. For the children who potentially had multiple group memberships (e.g., English and British), the question was asked for each separate identity. The responses ranged from: very X, little bit X and not at all X (where X was the name of the child’s national or state group membership, e.g. Italian).

It was found that at age 6, many children did identify with their own national or state group to a comparatively high degree and that the degree of identification within these groups remained constant as age increased; for example, this pattern was shown by the children living in Catalonia in relationship to their Catalan identity. Other groups of children, however, identified with their national or state group to a lesser degree at the age of 6, and all of these groups displayed age-related changes in their degree of identification. Some showed increases in identification with age; for example, the children living in England showed this pattern in relationship to their British identity. However, other groups of children instead displayed decreases in
their degree of identification with age; for example, the children living in Catalonia and in the Basque Country showed this pattern in relationship to Spanish identity. Interestingly, different developmental patterns were sometimes exhibited by the same group of children in relationship to different identities. For example, the children living in England showed a significant increase in their degree of identification with being British between 6 and 9 years of age, but showed no age-related changes in their degree of identification with being English which was already high at the age of 6.

There is also evidence that there are variations in national identification according to the child’s geographical location within the nation/state, their ethnicity and their use of language. For example, Barrett (2002) found that children living in London attribute greater importance to both their British and their English identities than children living outside of London in the south-east of the country. Barrett (2005, 2007) offers several possible explanations for this difference: 1) knowing you live in the capital city of a county might serve to enhance the importance of that county; 2) being more familiar with national emblems like the Houses of Parliament in London may enhance the prominence of the country; 3) or the cosmopolitan and/or multicultural nature of capital cites and the tendency to attract tourists may give greater opportunity for inter-group contact therefore enhancing the salience of children’s national identity.

Another factor related to the importance attributed to national identity is ethnicity. Barrett (2002) measured the national identifications of white English, Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi and black African adolescents between 11 and 16 who were all born in London. A clear picture emerged: white English adolescents attributed higher importance to both their English and British identifications than the other four ethnic minority groups. The fact that the minority children identified to a lesser extent with the British as well as the English category is intriguing and suggests that both the British category and the English category may be racialised. Parekh (2000) comments that many people in England think of Englishness in ethnic or racial terms, in other words, an individual must be white in order to be English, and it may be the case that Britishness carries similar racial connotations.
A further factor related to national identification in children is their use of language. Data collected from the CHOONGE project in Catalonia and the Basque country revealed that the importance attributed to being Catalan or Basque varied systematically depending on whether children spoke only Catalan in the home or only Spanish in the home with parents. High levels of Catalan or Basque identification were exhibited by children who spoke only Catalan or Basque in the home, and high levels of Spanish identification by those children who only spoke Spanish in the home with parents (Vila, del Valle, Perera, Monreal & Barrett, 1998; Reizabal, Valencia & Barrett, 2004). Barrett suggests that this variability in children’s national identification, as a function of the home linguistic situation, is actually due to variations in the identifications and practices of the children’s parents. In other words, it is not just language use in the home which determines patterns of national identification but more the ideological choices and value systems of parents in relationship to the issues of national identity which are reflected in the choice of language (Barrett 2005, 2007).

It has also been found that, in the school context like the home context, the language of instruction can affect levels of national identification. For instance, in Georgia and Azerbaijan, children who attend Georgian or Azeri language schools attribute greater importance to their Georgian or Azeri national identity than children who attend Russian language schools in the same locations (Karakozov & Kadirova, 2001; Kipiani, 2001; Barrett, 2005, 2007). Again here, children’s language use at school is probably a reflection of parents’ ideological choices, which determine the types of schools to which they send their children. Thus, children’s language of education and subsequent levels of national identification are ultimately dependent, once again, on parental choices and values. However, other school factors may also impact on children’s national identifications, including the contents of the curriculum and school ethos (Barrett, 2007).

Thus, it is clear that children’s patterns of national and state identification vary considerably depending on many different factors, including the country they live in, their geographical location in that country, their ethnicity and their language use at
home and in school. Once again, this variability in national identifications may be a further course of the variability which exists in the development of children’s inter-group attitudes.

Evidence that national identifications are sometimes linked to national attitudes in children is reported by Barrett (2007). In addition to the national identification tasks mentioned above, the CHOONGE and NERID projects also measured the children’s attitudes to national groups using a trait attribution task and an affect task in which children were asked if they liked or disliked certain national groups using a 5 point Likert scale. Correlations were conducted between the national identification scores and the trait attribution and affect score, to see if there were any significant relationships. As far as attitudes to outgroups were concerned, the data from the Georgian children revealed that the stronger their Georgian identification was, the less positive they were towards Russian people. However, the Georgian children were unusual in showing this kind of pattern: most of the children did not show any relationship between their national identifications and their national outgroup attitudes. However, correlations between the strength of national identifications and ingroup attitudes revealed many more significant relationships. The children in Catalonia and the Basque country showed clear cases of this. However, the strength of the relationship between identifications and ingroup attitudes did vary from context to context, with Spanish children showing the strongest evidence, British children being in the middle, and Russian children showing the weakest evidence (Barrett, 2007).

To summarise, there is evidence of huge variability in children’s national identity development, not only between countries but also within countries. There is also variability in the relationship between children’s national identifications and their national attitudes. Hence, once again, there is the possibility that the variability which exists in the development of children’s racial and ethnic attitudes is at least partly due to the variability which exists in children’s national identifications, especially given the way in which national identifications sometimes interact with children’s own race and/or ethnicity.
2.5.4 Theories on the Context-Specificity of Identifications

As highlighted in the previous section, national identity is not a static structure but is highly dependent on context (Barrett, 2007). It was also found that, in the school context and the home context, the languages spoken by children can affect their levels of national identification (Barrett, 2007). Therefore, social identifications are context-specific. This context-specificity of social identifications is emphasised by Self-Categorization Theory (SCT) which was put forward by Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher and Wetherall (1987) and Haslam, Oakes, Turner and McGarty (1995). This theory contends that the self-concept is highly flexible and changes as a function of situational cues that activate different social identities. In particular, the theory proposes that an identity will be rendered salient to the extent to which the given context contains members of other social groups with which the individual’s own ingroup membership may be contrasted (the principle of meta-contrast). This principle therefore predicts that ethnic identity will not be salient in the home when there are no out-group members present in the home. It also predicts that outside the home, when individuals are in the company of out-group members, ethnic identity should become more salient. Furthermore, because individuals have multiple social identities, SCT argues that self-evaluations will become more consistent with the stereotypes associated with a given social identity when that identity is rendered salient by the context, and will become more consistent with the stereotypes associated with an alternative social identity when that alternative identity becomes salient in another context. SCT therefore proposes that both social identities and self-evaluations are fluid and dynamic, and very much context-dependant.

More recently, a different theoretical perspective has been put forward by Roccas and Brewer (2002) which also emphasises the context-specificity of identifications in one of its organisational structures of multiple identifications. The concept of social identity complexity reflects a person’s subjective representation of the inter-relationships between his or her multiple ingroup memberships. A ‘compartamentalisation’ structure is said to occur when multiple identities are important to a person and these multiple identities are activated and expressed through a process of differentiation and isolation (Roccas & Brewer, 2002). In this
structure, social group memberships are context- or situation-specific. That is, in specific contexts, one social identity becomes the primary social identity, while other group identities become primary in other contexts. So in this identity structure, multiple non-convergent identities are maintained, but a person does not activate these social identities at the same time. Therefore, multiple identities are fluid, flexible and context-dependent. Another structure for coping with multiple social identifications is ‘dominance’. Here, a person adopts one primary ingroup membership and all other affiliations are rendered subordinate to the primary one. The other social group affiliations are rooted within the primary group membership as aspects of intragroup variation.

2.5.5 Inter-group Contact

This section reviews findings concerning the effects of inter-group contact, which is another possible source of the variability which exists in the development of children’s racial and ethnic attitudes. Inter-group contact can be defined as real face-to-face relations between members of clearly distinct groups (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). As we shall see, a great deal of research on inter-group attitudes and prejudice has been guided by inter-group contact theory but the vast majority of studies have been carried out with adolescents, university students and adults. With children, there is far less evidence, which is a pity as inter-group contact and inter-group socialisation processes both in and outside of the school are highly likely to influence children’s inter-group attitudes (Phinney, Ferguson & Tate, 1997).

2.5.5.1 Inter-group Contact in Adults

Over half a century has passed since Gordon Allport formulated the ‘contact hypothesis’ which introduced the idea that inter-group contact under optimal conditions reduces inter-group prejudice. Allport (1954) described four key contact conditions that are most favorable for inter-group prejudice reduction: i) equal status of groups in the contact situation, ii) having common goals, iii) inter-group cooperation with relationship potential, and iv) support from authority or the law (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Thus, research borne out of direct inter-group contact
theory has spanned over five decades, has been conducted in various contexts and situations, with a broad range of groups, as well a mixture of research methods such as field studies, laboratory experiments and surveys (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) conducted a meta-analytic study on the empirical studies which have been conducted on direct contact. They found that the four conditions outlined by Allport are not necessarily essential but should be thought of as facilitating prejudice reduction (i.e., more positive attitudes and perceived variability of the outgroup). Those studies that adopted Allport’s optimal conditions achieved a strikingly larger mean effect size than other studies but only 19% of the meta-analytic samples included Allport’s conditions. However, the samples that did not use Allport’s optimal conditions still resulted in significant prejudice reduction.

Moreover, support from authority was found to be a particularly important condition for facilitating prejudice reduction but only in conjunction with the other conditions, not on its own.

Pettigrew and Tropp also found a significant inverse relationship between contact and prejudice in 94% of the samples. Furthermore, this relationship was not influenced by either publication bias or participant selection and moreover, the effect size for studies that allowed no choice were only a little higher in mean scores than the ones that did allow participants to choose. They are not alone in coming to this conclusion as other reviews also show support for contact theory (Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Hewstone, 2003).

However, contact research has been heavily criticised for its lack of generalisation effects in the past (Hewstone & Brown, 1986), with critics arguing that the effects may not go beyond the parameters of the research study (i.e., in terms of the immediate contact situation and the participants), or that they remain at the individual level of analysis but do not generalise to the group level (Forbes, 1997). However, Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) found that the positive effects of contact can generalise not only from the individual to the outgroup as a whole, but also from one outgroup to other outgroups (i.e. from black Americans to other minority groups in America), and even across contexts and situations.
Indirect or extended contact has also been found by Wright and colleagues to promote reductions in prejudice (Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe & Ropp, 1997). They posit that the mere knowledge that a fellow ingroup member has a close friendship with an outgroup member can act as a vehicle in encouraging more positive outgroup attitudes. Evidence in support of the effectiveness of indirect contact comes from adolescent and adult populations (Liebkind & McAlister, 1999; Paolini, Hewstone, Cairns & Voci, 2004) but little research has been conducted with children. With Ulster university students (Catholic and Protestant) in Northern Ireland, Paolini et al. (2004) found that direct and indirect contact were related to lower levels of prejudice. They measured how many religious outgroup friends students had, and also how many religious outgroup friends their friends who were the same religious group as them had. Both were related to levels of prejudice. Another advantage of using an indirect contact intervention before face-to-face direct contact is that it could lead not only to reductions in prejudice and improved inter-group relations during future direct contact situations but also encourage more direct contact (Cameron, Rutland, Brown & Douch, 2006).

In addition, there is a rapidly growing research area investigating how reductions in inter-group anxiety can also lead to decreases in prejudice. Inter-group anxiety refers to feelings of uncertainty or threat experienced by individuals in an inter-group context (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). Numerous studies have shown that contact can reduce feelings of threat and anxiety about future inter-group interactions (see Islam & Hewstone, 1993; Stephan & Stephan, 1985). Furthermore, recent studies have shown that inter-group anxiety mediates the relationship between contact and prejudice (Paolini et al., 2004; Voci & Hewstone, 2003). Moreover, Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) also found that around 21% of the effect of contact decreasing prejudice is mediated by contact also decreasing anxiety (Hewstone, 2003). Therefore, by reducing affective feelings like threat and anxiety, this paves the way for inter-group contact to reduce prejudice.

Another recent finding is the moderational effect of group salience (during the contact situation) on the contact-prejudice relationship. Group salience refers to emphasising group categories to promote generalisation from the target outgroup in
the contact situation to members of the target outgroup as a whole. For example, Voci and Hewstone (2003) found that anxiety mediated the relationship between contact and prejudice especially when group salience was high. Other studies (both experimental and correlational) have also found that generalisation of positive contact effects is more likely when group boundaries are made salient (Brown & Hewstone, 2005). Therefore, stressing group salience is now thought be a key moderator in the contact-prejudice relationship (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Hewstone, 2003).

For Pettigrew and Tropp, these developments call for a more multifarious and integrative framework of inter-group contact than Allport’s original contact hypothesis and optimal conditions. Recently such models have emerged, the most prominent being the decategorisation model (Brewer & Miller, 1984), the common ingroup identity model (Gaertner, Mann, Murrell & Dovidio, 1989), the dual identity model (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000) and the inter-group-contact model (Brown & Hewstone, 2005). Other complex structural models have also been developed (see Eller and Abrams, 2003; Paolini et al., 2004; Voci & Hewstone, 2003) with the hope that the positive effects of inter-group contact will increase under these new formulations.

In sum, there is now considerable evidence that inter-group contact can contribute to decreases in inter-group prejudice across a wide range of groups, ages and contexts and can also generalise from the individual level to the group level. For this reason, it seems highly likely that at least some of the variability which occurs in the development of children’s racial and ethnic attitudes stems from variations in children’s levels of inter-group contact. The following section reviews the work which has been conducted to date on children’s (rather than adults') inter-group contact.

2.5.5.2 Inter-group Contact in Children

As we have seen, direct inter-group contact in adult populations has been shown to reduce inter-group bias (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). In addition, forming close inter-
group friendships has been highlighted as a key mechanism for promoting positive outgroup attitudes (Hewstone, 2003). This suggestion is further supported by Aboud, Mendelson and Purdy’s (2003) finding with white majority children in North America: they found that children (grades 1 to 6) who expressed elevated levels of outgroup prejudice had less (black) outgroup friends and were more likely to reject these black classmates. Hallinan and Teixeira (1987) also looked at inter-racial friendships in 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th grade children in the US and found that the more black children there were in the classroom, the likelihood of a white child choosing a black child as their best friend increased. However, contact outside school may be more important to children’s inter-group attitudes than contact in school (Dubois & Hirsch 1990; Phinney et al., 1997). Dubois and Hirsch (1990) investigated inter-racial friendships in and out of school with black and white early adolescents in the U.S. They found that living in a neighbourhood with high inter-group diversity was related to a greater chance of having a close friend from another race outside school.

In another study but looking only at minority children and the impact of ethnic identity and inter-group contact on outgroup attitudes, Phinney et al. (1997) found no evidence of negative outgroup prejudice, only ingroup favouritism with adolescent populations (African, Latin and Asian Americans) in real-world settings (ethnically diverse schools in West coast America). Furthermore, ethnic identity was positively related to ingroup attitudes and these in turn predicted outgroup attitudes. In other words, ethnic identity had an indirect effect on outgroup attitudes. In addition, neighbourhood inter-group contact was related to more inter-group contact at school and more positive outgroup attitudes. Overall, two possible causal pathways emerged: attitudes to the ingroup on the one hand, and contact with outgroup members on the other hand, both influencing ethnic outgroup attitudes. Therefore, it seems likely from the findings of this study and that of Dubois and Hirsch that neighbourhood friendships spill over to the school context and as a result increase inter-group contact in school.

Turner, Hewstone and Voci (2007) also found that cross-group friendships among white primary school children predicted more positive explicit outgroup attitudes toward South Asians, and these effects of friendship were mediated by self-
disclosure and inter-group anxiety. That is, direct friendships with ethnic outgroup members were associated with higher levels of self-disclosure and lower levels of inter-group anxiety, and with an increase in liking that generalised to the entire ethnic outgroup. These findings therefore show that direct cross-group friendships can be a key factor in reducing prejudice towards members of ethnic outgroups.

Killen and colleagues (McGlothlin, Killen & Edmonds, 2005; Margie, Killen, Sinno & McGlothlin, 2005) have also looked at European American majority children’s and African, Latino and Asian American minority children’s inter-group attitudes. These 1st and 4th grade children attended two ethnically diverse schools in the U.S. The children’s implicit inter-racial biases were assessed using stories describing ambiguous situations involving black vs. white characters, with the children being asked to interpret and evaluate the characters’ actions. The findings revealed that the white majority American children did not show any implicit racial bias from the ambiguous situation task. The ethnic minority American children did express some implicit negative racial bias toward the white child, but only in one of the four ambiguous situations used. However, in another study using the same indirect measures and age groups but with white European American children from an ethnically homogeneous school and area in the US, McGlothlin and Killen (2006) did find evidence of implicit racial biases. These white majority children interpreted the ambiguous situations involving a black character more negatively than the version involving a white character. Furthermore, this bias was exhibited by both younger and older children. These two studies together suggest that levels of inter-group contact do indeed influence white American children’s inter-group attitudes.

Another line of research has been pursued by Cameron, Rutland, Brown and Douch (2006), who tested different models of indirect or extended contact with young children. They looked at British children’s attitudes towards refugees and examined the ‘indirect cross friendship hypothesis’ or ‘extended contact effect’, which suggests that knowledge alone that an ingroup member is friends with an outgroup member is enough to reduce bias (Wright et al., 1997). Cameron et al. tested white majority children aged 5-11 using an extended contact school intervention, which consisted of stories that described friendships between white British children and refugee
children. A control group who did not receive any intervention was also used. Children’s inter-group-attitudes, intended behaviours and ingroup identifications were measured. The results revealed that the extended contact conditions increased positive outgroup attitudes towards refugees compared to the control condition. Effects were especially strong when both the common ingroup identity (the school) and the children’s subordinate identities (refugee and English) were emphasised.

Cameron, Rutland and Brown (2007) conducted two follow up studies in which they once again used refugees as the target outgroup for one study and the disabled as the outgroup for the other study. However, the model under investigation in this study was Brown and Hewstone’s (2005) inter-group model of contact which contends that interpersonal qualities as well as inter-group boundaries must be emphasised in the contact situation as well as the typicality of outgroup members. In addition, ingroup identification was thought to be a potential moderator of extended contact, so was also examined. Finally, following Bigler and Liben’s (1993) proposal that multiple classification skill is negatively related to levels of prejudice, an intervention targeting children’s ability to classify along several dimensions was also included.

In study 1, British majority children aged 6-9 years were read a positive friendship story between a non-disabled ingroup child and disabled child, where individual characteristics and only subgroup boundaries were emphasised. In addition, the typicality of the disabled characters was also stressed. It was found that those who received the ‘inter-group’ extended contact intervention displayed more positive attitudes and intended behaviour towards the disabled outgroup. It was also found that ingroup attitudes were little affected by the intervention, and multiple classification skills exercise was unsuccessful in altering children’s attitudes and intended behaviour toward the target outgroup (Bigler, Brown & Markell, 2001).

In study 2, attitudes to refugee children were assessed, and a modified version of the multiple classification skills training intervention was administered. Three different intervention techniques were given to 3 different groups of English school children: 1) extended contact, 2) multiple classification skills training, and 3) both extended contact and multiple classification skill training interventions. In line with the
previous study, this study also found that the extended contact conditions resulted in more positive refugee attitudes than the control condition. However, the combined interventions of extended contact and multiple classification skills training was not as successful in changing outgroup attitudes as the extended contact condition alone. Once more, the multiple classification skills training was ineffective in reducing prejudice in spite of an improvement in the children’s multiple classification ability.

In addition, ingroup identification moderated the relationship between extended contact and positive intended behaviour towards the outgroup, and this was most effective among the high identifiers.

To conclude, relationships between outgroup contact and more favourable outgroup attitudes have been found not only in adults but also in children. Hence, it seems highly plausible that a further source of the variability which occurs in the development of racial and ethnic attitudes is the level of contact which children have with members of racial and ethnic outgroups.

2.5.6 Perceived Discrimination

Perceived discrimination (PD) may be another factor linked to the variability which occurs in the development of children’s ethnic attitudes. This section briefly reviews some of the research on perceived discrimination in adolescents and adults with immigrant minority groups which have typically in the past been subjected to varying levels of discrimination from the host society. Unfortunately, there has been little research on PD in children.

In the adolescent literature, Phinney, Berry, Vedder and Liebkind (2006) found that PD was only reported by immigrants, and not by majority group youth. Further to this, they found no consistent age differences in levels of PD. There has also been some research on PD and its relationship with identifications (Cozzarelli & Karafa, 1998; Schmitt & Branscombe, 2002). For instance, Romero and Roberts (1998) found that adolescents’ positive sense of ethnic ingroup belonging was related to lower perceived discrimination from a large study of diverse ethnic minority groups.
in America. Furthermore, Schmitt and Branscombe (2002) report that in certain immigrant groups, subjective perceptions of discrimination can lead to increased identification with the ethnic ingroup. These findings appear to offer support for Social Identity Theory (SIT) Tajfel, 1978), which predicts that threat (as indexed by perceived discrimination) can lead to stronger ingroup identifications (Brown, 1995). In addition, Berry, Phinney, Sam and Vedder (2006) suggest that perceived discrimination may strengthen ethnic ingroup identification and weaken identification to the national group but Phinney et al. (2006) found that ethnic and national identities were unrelated to perceived discriminations in adolescents.

There has also been research on the relationship between PD and attitudes but this is limited. Berry and Kalin (1979) and more recently Kalin and Berry (1996) found that attitudes of the host majority society towards immigrant minorities was likely to be reflected in the feelings of immigrant about the host society. That is, when immigrant groups perceive any discrimination or negativity towards their group by the majority group, they will be more likely to like this group less or to be negative towards this group.

2.5.7 Acculturation Processes

Further influences on the development of children's racial and ethnic attitudes potentially stem from acculturation processes. To date, acculturation has been studied mainly with adolescents and adults, but there is now a growing literature on acculturation in children. This section begins by reviewing the research which has been conducted with adolescents and adults, and then moves on to review the acculturation research which has been conducted with children.

2.5.7.1 Acculturation in Adolescents and Adults

Acculturation has been classically defined as “those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original cultural pattern of either or both groups” (Redfield, Linton & Herskovits, 1936, p.149). This definition incorporates
both minority individuals and members of the receiving indigenous culture, and acknowledges that changes can occur within both groups. In contrast to the emphasis in this definition on group changes, the concept of psychological acculturation was introduced by Graves (1967) to refer to changes in an individual as a result of inter-cultural contact.

Various models have been developed to describe acculturation in adolescents and adults (Berry, 1997; Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault, & Senecal, 1997; Coleman, Casali & Wampold, 2001; Hutnik, 1986; Rudmin, 2003). Theoretical conceptualisations have shifted from a unidimensional assimilation model to the recognition that acculturation is a complex, bidirectional process (Berry, 1997). Berry’s (1990, 1997, 2001) bidimensional model of acculturation is currently the most widely used in psychology. It is two dimensional in the sense that it recognises that ethnic groups and their members maintain (although in varying degrees) their cultural heritage while adapting to the dominant society’s culture. For Berry (1997), acculturation is the process of cultural and psychological change following inter-group contact which takes place for both groups, although one group is usually dominant. Thus, acculturation attitudes among immigrants are based on the individual’s responses to two central issues, the first of which relates to cultural maintenance (‘to what extent do immigrants wish to maintain (or give up) their cultural traits?’) and the second of which relates to the desirability of inter-group interactions (‘to what extent do immigrants wish to have contact with (or avoid) people not from their group?’) (Phinney et al., 2006).

These two dimensions allow for a fourfold classification of acculturation strategies, which encompass both attitudes and behaviours (Berry, 1990). If the individual embraces both the minority and the majority cultures, the integration strategy is selected. This implies that some degree of minority cultural heritage is maintained while the individual simultaneously seeks to participate as a member of the larger society. If an individual denies the minority culture but embraces the majority culture, assimilation is opted for. Here, an individual does not wish to maintain his or her cultural identity while moving into the mainstream society. If the minority culture is embraced and the majority culture is shunned, separation is the preferred
strategy, whereby the individual wants to hold onto his or her culture and avoid contact with the host society. Finally, marginalisation results when an individual refuses to embrace either culture; here there is little interest in either cultural maintenance or participation in the majority culture (Berry, 1997). Other models of acculturation propose alternative acculturation strategies, including: Bourhis and colleagues (Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault, & Senecal, 1997) who proposes five strategies, Coleman et al., (2001) who proposes five strategies, and Rudmin (2003) who proposes sixteen strategies.

Following Bourhis et al., (1997), more recently Berry, Phinney, Sam and Vedder (2006) have proposed that majority group individuals can also adopt attitudes to these two issues of intercultural contact and cultural maintenance. In other words, majority individuals too can hold ‘acculturation expectations’ (Berry, et al., 2006) of ethnic minority individuals. So it is not majority group acculturation per se that Berry and colleagues are incorporating into their model, but the majority group’s expectations of minority group immigrants. For Berry, these attitudes play an influential role in the way acculturation takes place for immigrant groups (Berry, 1979). For instance, if the larger dominant society is accepting of cultural diversity and the integration (what was once termed mutual accommodation) this is now referred to as multiculturalism (Berry et al., 2006). When the melting pot attitude is held by the dominant group this depicts their desire for immigrant groups to assimilate. When a segregation attitude is advocated by the majority group, this reflects a wish for immigrants to separate from society, and when marginalisation is enforced by the mainstream society it is a form of exclusion (Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault & Senecal, 1997).

For Berry, the concept of acculturation is used not only to refer to the cultural changes resulting from group encounters, but also to refer to the psychological changes, for example, changes in ethnic identification, and eventual outcomes that occur as a result of individuals experiencing acculturation. His research assessing the acculturation strategies of various immigrant groups in North America (Berry, Kim, Minde & Mok, 1987; Sam & Berry, 2006) has demonstrated that integration is the most psychologically adaptive pattern. Integrated or bicultural individuals
experience less acculturative stress and anxiety and manifest fewer psychological problems (in terms of mental health, self-esteem and life satisfaction) than those who are marginalized, separated, or assimilated. Overall, marginalized individuals suffer the most psychological distress, including problems with self-identification and cultural alienation, which adversely affect their self-esteem.

According to Montreuil and Bourhis (2001), a common shortcoming of classic acculturation models is the lack of importance given to how the dominant host majority can shape and be shaped by the acculturation orientations of immigrant groups (Berry, 1990; La Fromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993). Bourhis et al. (1997) as a result offer the Interactive Acculturation Model (IAM), a five type model of acculturation (integrationism, assimilationism, segregationism, exclusionism, and individualism) and have shown that acculturation attitudes of the dominant group toward migrant groups depend also on the perceived status and cultural similarity of the migrant group. In their study, the integration strategy was supported by the majority group for migrant groups with a higher status (i.e., more culturally similar and less social distance) whereas assimilation, segregation and exclusion were endorsed for lower status immigrant groups.

So depending on the combination of preferred and expected choices of acculturation attitudes by both groups, for Bourhis and colleagues (1997) the social relationship (or degree of fit) can be either consensual, problematic or conflictual. When members of the majority and minority groups share a view for integration or assimilation, this is described as a consensual relationship, resulting in positive communication and low inter-group tension. When migrants and members of the host culture only partly agree on an acculturation attitude (e.g., migrants prefer integration but the host majority group favours assimilation) this is termed a problematic relationship. A conflictual relationship emerges when the host majority group supports marginalisation but the migrant group endorses integration. The few studies that have compared minority and majority group members' acculturation attitudes have found that members of migrant groups usually support cultural maintenance more than natives, and that natives usually favour cultural adaptation for immigrants (Van Oudenhoven, Prins & Buunk, 1988; Verkuyten & Thijis, 2002).
Indeed, Zagefka and Brown (2002) found that the integration strategy was associated with better inter-group relations in the host German group and members of the immigrant group. These findings therefore, highlight the complexities involved in the acculturation experience.

Some studies have reported variations in acculturation strategies across life contexts. Indeed, Berry (1990) has also noted that acculturation may be unbalanced across different contexts of behaviour and social life, with economic assimilation being adopted at work but separation in the home. The main distinction is between private and public spheres/contexts. Minority individuals tend to prefer cultural maintenance in private spheres more than in public spheres (Phalet, Van Lotringen & Entzinger, 2000; Taylor & Lambert, 1996). For example, Arends-Toth and van de Vijver (2003) conducted research in the Netherlands with Turkish migrants and the Dutch. They found that in public spheres both cultural groups agreed that Turkish migrants should adopt Dutch culture. However, in the private spheres there was little agreement between the views of the Dutch and the Turkish-Dutch. The Turkish-Dutch endorsed integration in public contexts and separation in private contexts while the Dutch said they preferred assimilation in all aspects of life. These results suggest that views on acculturation can differ for host majority and immigrant minority group members according to context.

One model of acculturation that does explicitly incorporate the notion of context-specificity is that of Coleman (1995) and Coleman, Casali and Wampold (2001). They propose a fivefold model for coping with cultural adaptation, namely: assimilation, separation, alternation, integration, and fusion:

- A person who assimilates is one who attempts to join the host culture.
- A person who separates is one who withdraws from, or avoids contact with, persons who are not members of his or her culture of origin.
- The alternation conceptualization (Ogbu & Mature-Bianchi, 1986) assumes that it is possible to alternate between two cultures in the same manner as a bilingual person might alternate the use of different languages in different contexts.
• The integration conceptualization (Berry, 1997) assumes that it is possible to maintain the culture of origin while simultaneously interacting with others from different cultures.

• The fusion conceptualization (La Fromboise et al., 1993; Coleman, 1995) assumes that individuals can fuse cultures which are in contact to create a new culture that subsumes both of those different cultures.

Coleman (1995) hypothesises that the strategies individuals use to cope with cultural diversity are organised in a sequential manner (rather than linear) and that the use of these strategies is context-dependent. Coleman's account allows for greater flexibility than Berry’s, and it includes different forms of biculturalism (like alternation and fusion).

Perhaps of most direct relevance for the present research, there have been many studies conducted that have looked at the relationship between acculturation processes and identification in adolescents (Hutnik, 1991; Phinney et al., 2006; Ghuman, 2003; Farver, Narang & Bhadha, 2002). Phinney et al.'s (2006) study, the ICSEY project, examined the acculturation experiences, cultural identifications, attitudes and behaviours of immigrant adolescents in 13 different countries. Cultural identity was conceived as an aspect of acculturation that focuses on immigrants’ sense of self rather than on their behaviours and attitudes after immigration, and as encompassing both national and ethnic identity. As a result, the following intercultural variables were measured: acculturation attitudes, national and ethnic identities, national and ethnic language proficiency and usage, peer contact, family relationships and perceived discrimination. Results revealed that, across most countries, immigrant adolescents expressed the strongest preference for integration, then separation, then assimilation and finally marginalisation. National majority group adolescents' attitudes towards immigrants were however slightly different; they favoured integration, then assimilation, then separation and finally marginalisation. It was also found that immigrant adolescents had strong ethnic identities and slightly weaker national identities. However, they were also more proficient in the national language than their ethnic language but used the two languages equally. In addition, migrant adolescents had friends from their own and other cultural groups and generally did not feel discriminated against.
Using cluster analysis Phinney et al., found 4 distinct profiles of acculturation:

1. **Integration profile**: this was the most frequently occurring profile in their immigrant sample (36.4%). These adolescents had high involvement with ethnic and national cultures and were high on both ethnic and national identities. These adolescents exemplified the concept of integration. Therefore, these adolescents appeared comfortable in both ethnic and national contexts in terms of language, peer contacts, identity and values.

2. **Ethnic profile**: these adolescents (22.5%) showed a clear orientation towards their own ethnic group with high ethnic identification, ethnic language use and ethnic peer contacts. They endorsed the separation attitude and scored low on assimilation, national identity and national group contact. These adolescents were embedded within their own cultural heritage and showed little involvement with the larger society.

3. **National profile**: these adolescents (18.7%) showed a strong orientation towards the society in which they lived. They were high on national identity and assimilation and low on ethnic identity. They predominantly spoke and were proficient in national language, and most of their peer contacts were with members of the national group. These adolescents appeared to fit the idea of assimilation.

4. **Diffuse profile**: 22% of adolescents appeared ambivalent and uncertain about their situation and simultaneously favoured separation, assimilation and marginalisation attitudes. They also scored low on ethnic and national identities. They were not proficient in national language but expressed a desire to be a part of mainstream society. They also reported relatively high levels of discrimination.

Thus, integration was the most common profile for adolescents, the next most salient profile was the ethnic profile, then the diffuse and finally the national profile. The
profiles varied however in relation to demographic factors, highlighting the fact that no single pattern fitted all immigrant adolescents. For instance, the amount of time that had been spent in the new society (i.e., length of residence) was related to acculturation attitudes with a trend over time towards integration. Therefore, the findings of this study suggested that the adolescents become increasingly integrated as time went by but identity changes appeared to be slower than behavioural changes.

In another major study which was conducted in the UK, Hutnik (1986, 1991) examined the relationship between acculturation and identification in Indian adolescents in India and with British-Asian adolescents. Her fourfold model of acculturation styles is also bidimensional like Berry’s and has a similar structure, with cultural maintenance and cultural adaptation being construed as independent dimensions. She also argues that identification with one culture does not necessarily require disidentification with the other (Hutnik, 1991). Evidence from her study shows that adolescents may acculturate to some degree but still have the freedom to maintain or explore their ethnic identity (Hutnik, 1986, 1991). Hutnik’s findings are in contrast to Phinney et al.’s in the sense that she failed to find a clear link between identification and cultural behaviours, which led her to conclude that identifications and cultural practices may be relatively independent of each other. Hence, for example, an ethnic minority individual may feel very strongly Indian but may also be very British in his/her behaviour.

Other research has found that the acculturation pattern shown by the parents of minority adolescents may be similar to those of their children. For example, Farver, Bhadha and Narang (2002) conducted a study with US born Asian Indians and their parents. Results showed that adolescents and parents had similar styles of acculturation. Adolescents who had an integrated acculturation style also displayed more positive psychological outcomes such as higher perceived self-competence and higher academic performance. Other investigators have shown that adolescents whose immigrant parents have not adapted to the host culture (i.e., who preferred separation) had more psychological problems than did adolescents whose parents were integrated or assimilated (Barankin, Konstantareas & de Bosset, 1989; Koplow
Messinger, 1990). Similarly, in families where the immigrant parents were overly identified with their ethnic group, these strong ties to the ethnic culture served to separate or marginalize the family from the host culture (Keefe & Padilla, 1987). Thus, the ways in which parents relate to the majority culture may well affect their children’s attitudes toward the dominant culture and their own ethnic group.

Bowskill, Lyons and Coyle (2006) have also critiqued Berry’s account of acculturation, arguing that the ‘typological discourse (re-)produces a static and de-contextualized account of acculturation’ (p.794). For them, not only are ‘the participants methodologically fixed into a limited range of supposedly mutually exclusive positions (integrationist, assimilationist, etc.) but these positions are assumed to reflect the same underlying attitudes within and across particular studies’ (p.795). A second major criticism by these authors relates to how acculturation models focus attention on the individual and in doing so, threaten to remove responsibility from wider social and political forces. Thirdly, they note that the trend by acculturation theorists to concentrate on the acculturation strategies of minority group members downplays the role of the majority.

Berry’s account has also been criticised by Ghuman (2003). He points out that in the Berry model there is no allowance for individuals who reject some parts of their cultural heritage (for example, sexism/chauvinism) and those who also reject elements of the receiving society’s way of life (for example, materialism/individualism) and who instead create a new set of norms and values that fit their unique situation. For Ghuman, these individuals can only be called marginal in Berry’s model. Ghuman also points out like many others that the Berry model simplifies the process of acculturation, as the adaptation may depend upon the domain under consideration. Ghuman also argues that the behaviour of an immigrant group can only be fully understood and explained when the socio-historical background of the host country is taken into consideration.

Ghuman’s (2003) own research with South Asian origin adolescents was carried out in four different countries (UK, Canada, Australia and USA). He found that the boys and girls in his study (except for Muslim boys in England) were in favour of
integration into their host society. However, Ghuman also found national context differences. For example, Canadian South Asian adolescents were similar to the Australian Hindus (with high levels of assimilation), whereas the Australian Sikhs were more similar to the English Muslims (favouring separation), while the small group of US Muslims (mainly from a non-manual background) were similar to the Canadian Sikhs (high on assimilation). The conclusion that Ghuman draws from these findings is that religion is an important factor in shaping minority adolescents' attitudes to acculturation but its effect is mediated by SES, parental occupation and by the national context in which they live.

Gibson (1988) has also conducted research with South Asian adolescents in the US and found that teenagers of Indian origin retained the beliefs and values of their ethnic community while at the same time were American in their way of life. In other words, they displayed a synthesis of these two cultures (i.e. biculturalism). Gibson (1988) also found that Sikhs in Sacramento (US) used integration for economic situations but separation in cultural contexts. That is, domain/context specificity of acculturation strategies was found.

In sum, acculturation research has provided an extremely useful analytic conceptual framework which can potentially be applied to children.

2.5.7.2 Acculturation in Children

This section reviews the research literature on acculturation in childhood. In addition to his research with adolescents, Ghuman (1997) has also conducted research with British Asian primary school children. He used qualitative methods to question 7- to 8-year-olds about their home life, school life, leisure activities, food habits, religion and places of worship, the learning of the mother tongue, identity and racism. He focused on the contrast between school and home lives in terms of orientations and socialisation processes. He found that the children liked their school and had high ambitions, mirroring parental beliefs that had been internalised by the children. They were similar to their white counter-parts in terms of TV viewing, but they also listened to Asian radio stations, illustrating an interest in their cultural heritage. The
meals they ate at home were also a mixture of Asian and western food styles. These children were also conscious about religion and were bilingual at a spoken level (but were not fluent at reading or writing their ethnic language) and interestingly, despite saying their identity was British, their feelings about being British were ambivalent. They had also experienced racism and bullying but were finding ways to deal with this. From the children’s responses, it was clear that in their leisure time activities, foods practices and school life they were successfully straddling two cultures.

Another study by van de Vijver, Hels-Lorenz and Feltzer (1999) addressed acculturative strategies and cognitive performance among 118 Dutch immigrant children aged 7-12 years. Integration was the most popular strategy. The study found a bipolar unidimensional factor underlying Berry’s four acculturation strategies, with integration constituting one pole and the three remaining strategies the other pole. On the relationship between acculturation strategies and cognitive test performance, it was found that cognitive performance was related to acculturation strategy and age in the first but not the second generation, with those who favoured integration showing a higher degree of cognitive performance.

Knight, Kagan, Nelson and Gumbiner (1978) also looked at cognitive performance and generation changes/effects in second and third generation Mexican-American primary school aged children. They found that third generation children were more similar to their white/European-American counterparts in terms of reading and mathematical achievement than the second generation children.

Other researchers have also looked into the psychological functioning of children of immigrants, and have typically found that children of parents who adopt an integration approach tend to function within ‘normal’ limits while those whose parents are marginalised or separated tend to display problematic behaviours (Minde & Minde, 1976; Koplow & Messinger, 1990). However, in contrast, Atzaba-Poria, Pike and Barrett (2004) found that Indian children (7 to 9 years) living in Britain were best adjusted when their parents adopted a separation acculturation style (i.e., were more traditional in their way of life and used their Indian language to a greater extent).
Another variable which may be related to children’s psychological functioning is the gap between the acculturation styles of parents and of their children. This gap sometimes leads to family conflict (Sluzki, 1979). Other studies have investigated the effect of parental variables such as language ability, SES and social support on the psychological functioning of their children. On the whole, better psychological functioning has been found with children of migrant parents who have professional standing, speak the host language fluently, and have supportive circle of friends and family (Barankin, Konstantareas & de Bosset, 1989).

Pawliuk, Grizenko, Chan-Yip, Gantous, Mathew and Nguyen (1996) also examined the relationship between psychological functioning and acculturation style in 48 Asian children (aged 6-17) and their parents residing in Canada. Measures of externalising and internalising child behaviours were completed by parents and self-report measures of aspects of acculturative stress by children. They found that the acculturation style adopted by children did not greatly affect their psychological functioning. However, parental acceptance of the majority culture was associated with healthy psychological functioning and social competence of their children. Not surprisingly, children were more accepting of the majority culture than their parents. However, contrary to the authors’ expectations, child and parental acculturation style did not greatly affect children’s psychological functioning except on social-competence and self-esteem measures.

Another group of researchers who have examined aspects of childhood acculturation are Bernal and Knight and their colleagues (Bernal, Knight, Garza, Ocampo & Cota, 1990; Bernal, Knight, Organista, Garza & Maez, 1993; Knight, Bernal, Cota, Garza & Ocampo, 1993), whose work has already been noted earlier in this literature review under the heading of ethnic identification. As we saw there, Knight et al.’s (1993) socialisation model proposes that parents communicate ethnic content through their teaching and child-rearing practices. They further propose that what parents teach and model about their culture is influenced by variables such as their own acculturation status, their length of time in the new country, and their socioeconomic status. In addition, Bernal et al. postulate that non-familial agents (including peers, teachers, schools and the media), who may include both ethnic minority and
dominant group members, communicate information and views about ethnicity and ethnic group membership to minority children. Furthermore, there may be consistencies or inconsistencies between familial and non-familial agents. Children's own ethnic identity, in turn, mediates the effects of these familial and non-familial agents on their ethnic behaviours. Finally, children's level of cognitive development affects the influence of socialisation agents, placing constraints on their ethnic understanding and knowledge and consequently on their expression of ethnic concepts and information.

Knight and colleagues (Bernal & Knight, 1993; Knight, Bernal, Cota, Garza & Ocampo, 1993) report empirical support for this socialisation model. The results revealed that the mother's ethnic background was related to the mother's teaching about Mexican culture, which was related to the children's ethnic identity, which in turn was related to their ethnically reinforced social behaviours. These findings are consistent with Farver, Bhadha and Narang's (2002) findings noted earlier, which also lend support to Bernal et al.'s claim that ethnic socialisation takes place within the family. This body of research together suggest that: (1) key family background variables are related to what Mexican American parents teach their children about their culture; (2) children's ethnic identity is related to the children's family background, including parents' generational status, parents' own acculturation, and parents' language use; and (3) children's ethnic identity is related to what parents teach their children about their ethnic culture. However, despite Knight et al., acknowledging the role of acculturation (especially parental acculturation) on children's ethnic identification, they do not explore in any depth the second dimension of acculturation, namely minority children's acculturation to the culture of the dominant majority society, focusing instead on the other dimension of ethnic cultural maintenance.

To summarise, research exploring acculturation with children suggests that there is considerable variability in how children relate to their ethnic heritage culture on the one hand and to the national majority culture on the other hand. Insofar as acculturation strategies are linked to ethnic and national identifications as well as to the adoption of minority vs. majority cultural practices, variations in acculturation
strategies may also be linked to the variations which have been found to occur in the
development of children’s attitudes to the ethnic ingroup and to the majority national
group. The present research aimed, in part, to examine whether such links are in fact present.

2.6 Aims of the Present Research

The present research therefore aimed to explore some important questions that are raised by the research literature reviewed above. As we have seen, the currently dominant theories of how children’s racial and ethnic attitudes develop, CDT and SIDT, are both universalist in their claims, with both theories suggesting that children’s attitudes always develop through a set of age-related developmental stages. While the two theories differ sharply in their accounts of what occurs during particular stages of development, and they differ also in the ages at which certain stage transitions are supposed to occur, they share the characteristic of postulating that all children progress through a universal sequence of stages. However, as we saw in the evaluation of these two theories, there is good evidence to suggest that all children do not develop through the same stages of development, and that the development of children’s inter-group attitudes in fact varies according to children’s own ethnic group membership, the particular cultural contexts in which they live, and the status of the specific outgroups towards which their attitudes are directed.

It has also been argued in this literature review that the variability which characterises the development of children’s racial and ethnic attitudes may be linked to variability in children’s ethnic, religious and national identifications, to variability in children’s inter-group contact, and to variability in the acculturation patterns which either they or their parents adopt. Hence, the overall aim of the present research was to investigate the possible relationships which might exist between the development of ethnic attitudes in children, the development of children’s ethnic, religious and national identifications, children’s patterns of friendship with children from other ethnic groups, and children’s acculturation patterns.
For the studies reported in this thesis, data were collected from a variety of ethnic minority group children in study 1; from white English ethnic majority children in study 2; and from white English ethnic majority children and Indian and Pakistani ethnic minority group children in study 3. All children were aged between 7 and 11 years old. All the children lived in London and attended multi-ethnic schools. This specific age range was chosen for investigation because this is the critical age range about which CDT and SIDT make opposite predictions, with CDT maintaining that this is the period during which prejudice decreases and SIDT maintaining that this is the period during which prejudice is acquired (if it is acquired at all). The two ethnic minority groups which were chosen for inclusion in study 3 are the two largest minority groups in England (National Census, 2001) and are therefore socially important and salient groups to study.

The present body of research aimed to answer all of the following specific research questions. These questions were derived directly from the various bodies of research which have been reviewed in this chapter. While the rationale for each individual question is spelt out explicitly in the relevant chapters which follow, the questions are simply listed here together for ease of reference. The specific research questions were as follows:

1. Do ethnic minority and majority children hold multiple social identifications and, if so, what are the groups with which they identify?
2. Are ethnic minority and majority children’s social identifications invariant across different contexts, or does the relative salience of particular identities vary across contexts?
3. Are ethnic minority and majority children’s cultural practices invariant across different contexts, or do their cultural practices vary across contexts?
4. What is the relationship between ethnic minority and majority children’s social identifications and their cultural practices?
5. Do children’s cognitive skills (as indexed by their multiple classification ability) develop in the same way irrespective of their ethnic group membership?
6. Do children’s levels of ethnic, British and religious identification vary as a
function of age and ethnicity?
7. How are children's ethnic, national and religious identifications inter-related?
8. How do children's inter-group attitudes change across the course of middle childhood?
9. Does the extent of ingroup favouritism vary in children depending upon the specific ethnic group to which they belong?
10. Do children actually show negative prejudice towards outgroups, or do they just prefer some groups over other groups?
11. Do levels of perceived discrimination vary in children according to either age or ethnic group membership (especially according to whether children come from majority or minority groups)?
12. Do levels of religiosity vary in children according to either age or ethnic group membership?
13. Are there differences in children’s cultural practices as a function of their ethnicity?
14. Are there gender differences in children’s cultural practices?
15. Are there age-related differences in children’s cultural practices?
16. Are there differences in children’s cultural practices as a function of cultural domain and context?
17. Are there differences in children’s levels of inter-group friendships as a function of ethnic group, gender or age?
18. Is variability in the development of children’s ethnic group attitudes linked to variability in their cultural practices?
19. Is variability in the development of children’s ethnic group attitudes linked to variability in their patterns of contact with people from other ethnic groups?
20. Is variability in the development of children’s ethnic group attitudes linked to variability in their cognitive classification skills?
21. Is there a relationship between children’s ethnic and national identifications and cultural practices?
22. What is the relationship between children's identifications and perceived discrimination?
23. What is the relationship between children’s inter-group attitudes and perceived discrimination?
24. What is the relationship between religiosity and inter-group attitudes, and between religiosity and identifications, in children?

25. What is the relationship between identifications and inter-group attitudes in children?

Both qualitative and quantitative methods were employed in order to address these 25 research questions. The findings of the two qualitative studies are reported in Chapter 3 and 4, while the findings of the quantitative study are reported in Chapters 6 to 8.
Chapter 3: Study 1 – British Ethnic Minority Children’s Social Identifications and Cultural Practices

3.1 Aims

As the literature review in Chapter 2 has highlighted, research on children within this field has tended to focus on the development of prejudice and ethnic attitudes in children without paying very much attention either to the possible influence of children’s identifications on their ethnic attitudes, or to the possible role which acculturation processes might play in driving children’s ethnic attitudes. In addition, while there has been a great deal of research on acculturation processes in both adolescents and adults, there has been relatively little previous research into acculturation processes in children. However, the acculturation research which has been conducted with children so far suggests that there is a great deal of variability in how children relate to their ethnic heritage culture on the one hand and to the national majority culture on the other hand, and this variability may be the reason why children’s ethnic attitudes show a variety of different developmental patterns.

For this reason, the present research began with a qualitative study into ethnic minority children’s acculturation, focusing in particular on these children’s identifications and cultural practices. The aim was to examine how these children handle the demands of living with both a minority ethnic heritage culture and a majority national culture, whether or not they identified with one or other or both of these cultures, whether there were other social identifications which were also salient for these children, and whether they appropriated elements from just one culture or multiple cultures in their everyday practices. The purpose here was to build up an initial picture of the children’s identifications and cultural practices in preparation for a more detailed quantitative study of how these identifications and practices might be linked to the development of children’s ethnic attitudes.
Therefore, the study adopted qualitative methodology in order to address four main research questions that had been derived in the course of conducting the literature review. These were as follows:

1. **Do ethnic minority children hold multiple social identifications and, if so, what are the groups with which they identify?**

As highlighted in the literature review, Akiba et al. (2004) found that Cambodian and Dominican minority American children had multiple self-descriptors and social identities. The present study aimed to investigate whether British ethnic minority children also had multiple identifications, and if they did, to establish what the groups were with which they identified. Apart from the Akiba et al. study, there has been very little previous research on the nature of the multiple social identities which are held by children.

2. **Are ethnic minority children’s social identifications invariant across different contexts, or does the relative salience of particular identities vary across contexts?**

In addition, the study sought to explore whether or not ethnic minority children’s social identifications were context-specific. Context-specificity is emphasised by Turner et al.’s (1987) SCT, but once again there has been little previous research in this area with children. The present research also examined whether there were any conflicts between these children’s different identities. How these children organise or cope with their multiple identifications was also of interest in the present study. Roccas and Brewer (2002) suggest different forms of multiple identity structure, and the present study sought to examine whether any of these forms were exhibited by these children.

3. **Are ethnic minority children’s cultural practices invariant across different contexts, or do their cultural practices vary across contexts?**

The study further examined whether or not children’s cultural practices were context-specific. Coleman et al. (2001) found that acculturation was specific to the context.
and situation in adolescents, but, once again, very little corresponding research has been carried out into the possible context-specificity of cultural practices in children.

4. What is the relationship between ethnic minority children's social identifications and their cultural practices?

Finally, the study also examined the relationship between identifications and practices. Hutnik (1991) found some relationships but also some dissociations between identifications and practices in British-Indian adolescents. Once again, there has been little research on the relationship between identifications and practices in children. It is noteworthy here that mainstream acculturation theory (Berry et al., 2006) argues that identifications and practices are in fact directly related.

In addition to answering these four research questions, it was also intended to use the findings of the present qualitative study to inform and guide the design of the main quantitative study in this thesis. Due to the small sample size which could be used in a qualitative study, religious, ethnic, gender and age group differences were not investigated here, nor was the development of the children's inter-group attitudes. Instead, the intention was to use the main quantitative study (which is reported in Chapters 5 to 8) to address these kinds of questions about differences between different subgroups of children.

Hence, in this initial qualitative study, a relatively small number of children from a variety of ethnic groups and ages were interviewed individually in order to explore their different social identities, how they viewed these different identities, and the cultural practices which they adopted in different contexts and settings. A qualitative approach was judged to be especially appropriate here, as it enabled the children's own self-perceptions and definitions to be explored using an open-ended methodology.

The present study was novel in several respects: the participants were children rather than adolescents or adults, and were members of a variety of different ethnic minority groups. A modified grounded approach to analysis was employed in order
to explore in depth how these children viewed their own identifications and cultural practices.

3.2 Method

3.2.1 Location of the Present Study

London has been characterised as an ethnically super-diverse city (Vertovec, 2006), with very high levels of inter-group contact, particularly within multi-ethnic schools. It is also home to over 7 million people and over 300 languages are spoken. The National 2001 Census shows that 29 per cent of London's population belonged to a minority ethnic group. Also, one in five small businesses are owned or managed by members of minority ethnic communities (Greater London Authority, 2005). For these reasons, London is an ideal place to research social identities and cultural practices in minority group children. The present study focused on a co-educational junior school in North West London. This area (St. John's Wood) is very much a multicultural neighbourhood and the school advocates a policy of equality, unity, cultural diversity, acceptance and pride. “Multiculturalism is fundamental to our belief that all children are equal” (School Prospectus, 2005). “Multiculturalism ensures that all children can keep their identities, can take pride in their ancestry and have a sense of belonging. Acceptance gives children a feeling of security and self-confidence, making them more open to, and accepting of, diverse cultures. Experience has shown that multiculturalism encourages racial and ethnic harmony and cross-cultural understanding and discourages hatred, discrimination and violence” (School Website, 2005).

3.2.2 Participants

A heterogeneous sample of children was recruited to capture a diversity of perspectives (including varied ages, religious orientations, ethnicities, languages and gender). 32 children were interviewed (17 boys and 15 girls) aged 7 to 11 years (8 children from each year group 3, 4, 5 and 6) from a variety of ethnic minority backgrounds in London. The also children varied in terms of their social class, and levels of educational attainment. These age points were chosen to capture the major
developmental shifts in knowledge, identification, behaviours and attitudes which have been argued to take place between 7 and 11 years. Table 3.1 summarises the demographic constitution of the sample, and Figures 3.1 and 3.2 summarise the religious and ethnic breakdown of the sample.

*Figure 3.1 Study 1 - Religious Background*

*Figure 3.2 Study 1 - Ethnic Background*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Length of Residence</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Other Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tahmid</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Bengali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seena</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Iranian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British/Iranian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Farsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Urdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamdan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yemenite</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Yemenite</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asanka</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sinhalese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>Sinhalese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takumi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sinhalese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>R.C</td>
<td>Sinhalese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Korean/</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Chinese/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soha</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British/Egyptian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bashir</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tunisian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British/Tunisian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misake</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shogna</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Bengali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nishat</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Bengali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadah</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salman</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Bengali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazamin</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Iranian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Farsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>R.C</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariam</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Pashto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chinese/</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arman</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mai</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farhana</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Bengali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dil</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>Gujarati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jod</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lebanese</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British/Lebanese</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aisha</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Urdu/Punjabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustafa</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alana</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Saudi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Saudi</td>
<td>Saudi</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamilla</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Moroccon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aryan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Iranian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Farsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jani</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.3 Materials

The materials consisted of a printed interview schedule, an assortment of A8 cards with various identity labels printed on them, an MP3 player/recorder, and children’s stickers.

3.2.4 Procedure

Consent was granted by the head teacher of the school. The present researcher had previously worked at the school and was already familiar to the children. The interviews were conducted over a two week period before the end of the school year in the summer of 2005. The children were approached in their classroom and agreed to take part in discussions regarding their ethnicity and cultural practices. The one-to-one interviews lasted between 30 and 60 minutes and were conducted in a quiet room on school premises. In all interview discussions, participants were made aware of their ethical rights (i.e., informed consent, right to withdraw, confidentiality and anonymity), and knew that discussions would be recorded via the use of the MP3 player. After each interview, the children were thanked for their participation, debriefed and presented with a small gift. Discussions were all conducted in English by the present author (who is of British Asian/Sri Lankan background). All interview discussions were transcribed verbatim for analysis by the present author, and participants’ names were changed on transcripts to ensure confidentiality.

The semi-structured interview schedule (see Appendix A) began with demographic and background questions, followed by questions regarding the children’s spontaneous self-categorisations, identifications, the possible context-dependency of their self-categorisations and identifications (particularly when with family, at school, and with friends), and the balance between their cultural practices based on ethnic minority cultures, English culture and global culture (particularly in the domains of music, food, TV, movies, clothing, sport, role models and religion). The children’s perceptions of multiculturalism, prejudice and racial discrimination were also examined. An identification card task was also administered after children had been asked to spontaneously categorise themselves. In this task, the children were
given a set of cards with various possible identities written on them (such as English, British European, Londoner, Christian; see Appendix A for the full list). Each child was then asked to choose all the cards which could be used to describe themselves. This method does not require the child to recall his or her own self-categorisations; instead, the child only needs to recognise them. Therefore, the demands of the task on the child are reduced. In the second part of this task, the child was asked to rank order all the cards which had been chosen in terms of their importance to the child.

During the process of data collection, London suffered the 7/7 terrorist attacks and was announced as the host city for the 2012 Olympic Games. These events may therefore have influenced the children’s responses.

3.2.5 Analytical Framework

The data were analysed using a modified grounded approach to analysis (Willig, 2001). Access to the school was limited to two weeks (which were the final two weeks of the school year before the summer break), preventing the use of the ‘full’ or ‘classic’ version of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This modified version was also chosen as the researcher did not want to generate a theory or model like the ‘classic’ version of grounded theory purports but simply wanted to describe themes that emerged from the data and to look at patterns and relationships between themes. In others words, more of a thematic analysis of the data (in the modified approach) as opposed to theory generation (like the classic approach) was taken. The grounded approach was chosen as opposed to other frameworks such as Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA; Willig, 2001) as the present research wanted to explore contexts, processes and also meanings, and the researcher did not want to interpret the child’s experience or impose her own interpretive framework onto the data as IPA does. In other words, IPA looks more at the role of the researcher in the analysis (i.e. reflexivity) and the interaction of the participant and researcher. This research was also exploratory in nature so a grounded approach was judged to be best suited to this kind of research as little was previously known about these issues.
Therefore, in the modified grounded approach to analysis, interview transcripts were analysed using some of the principles of grounded theory such as coding, constant comparison analysis, negative case analysis and theoretical saturation.

The procedure of analysis was as follows. First, each transcript was labelled with an interview number. An indexing system was generated by taking each unit of meaning one after another (i.e., a word, or a phrase, or a line or a sentence) and giving this a label/category name which captured its essence. As this coding process continued, the number of categories grew, although when data were considered examples of existing categories they were simply added to those categories. As the categories developed, they were constantly compared (i.e., similarities and differences between categories were noted, and category names were either renamed or adjusted) so that links could be made and recorded. Negative case analysis was also carried out, where the present researcher looked for instances that did not fit within categories, to capture the full complexity of the data. The analytic process was thus a creative one that used the interpretative powers of the researcher but also stayed closely grounded in the data. Simultaneously, the researcher created theoretical memos to record any changes in category names, any splitting or amalgamation of categories, any thoughts that the researcher had about possible connections with existing literature or any hunches or reflections concerning the emerging categories. As the categories developed, the researcher eventually found that no more new examples were being produced that added more richness or diversity to the category. At this point, the category was therefore theoretically saturated. When the final set of saturated categories was produced, a definition of each category was written, which summarised the commonalities between the data extracts that constituted the category. Emerging categories were finally integrated, and core categories and sub-categories were established.

3.3 Results

Four core categories emerged from the modified grounded analysis of the data. These central categories were: multiple identities; contextual influences on identity;
cultural practices; and living in a multicultural environment. Each of these will be described in turn.

3.3.1 Multiple Identities

The first core category reflects the variety of identities that are important to the ethnic minority children in this study and includes the subcategories of: Personal identity, Ethnic identity, British identity, English identity, London identity, Religious identity, Superordinate ethnic identity and European identity. These subcategories will be discussed in turn.

3.3.1.1 Personal Identity

This subcategory reveals children’s individual and personal spontaneous self-descriptions. For instance, when children were asked to spontaneously describe themselves, all children used personality traits and individual characteristics to describe themselves:

(Interviewer) How would you describe yourself?

(Talmaid) Stubborn, that’s it (line 2)

(Aryan) I don’t want to be braggy but clever, fast, fussy, sometimes I show off which is not a good thing but I think that’s it (line 2)

(James) I am shy. I am always in a good mood. I am a bit grumpy (line 2)

(Seena) Strong, kind hearted person (line 11)

1 In the quoted extracts from the interviews, white space between lines indicates that the successive quotes represent different responses to the preceding question that were produced by different children in separate interviews. Where the successive quotes come from a single interview with the same child, no white space appears between the lines.
Interestingly, none of the children spontaneously used their ethnicity or nationality as a way of describing themselves. Perhaps ethnic and national components of social identity are not as important or salient to these children as their personal identity, or perhaps the social and cognitive demands of the open-ended questioning led the children to interpret this question as requiring only the production of personal identity terms.

However, a few children (3/32 or 9%) did use religious faith or religion in addition to personal traits to describe themselves. Two of these children were Muslim and one was Roman Catholic:

(Jamilla) Very shy and not very confident, religious, friendly, that's it I think (line 2)

(Tarin) Active, happy, bit naughty, and friendly. I'm a Christian (line 8)

Thus, for these three children, their religious identity appeared to be more salient than their ethnic or British (national) identity.

In sum, the children described themselves using mainly personal traits, while a few children used religion as well. However, ethnic and national identification did not appear in their spontaneous self-descriptions. This finding is in line with Lambert and Klineberg’s (1967) finding that children’s national and state group memberships were rarely mentioned in response to open-ended questions. However, it does need to be borne in mind that although open-ended interviewing can be revealing, there are problems associated with this method when working with children (cf. Barrett, 2005, 2007). For example, the specific wording of a question may encourage particular types of answers and thus underestimate children’s knowledge and beliefs. Interviews are also subject to social desirability effects, as well as being cognitively demanding for children.

3.3.1.2 Ethnic Identity

This subcategory refers to the salience or importance of minority children’s ethnic identities. As we have just seen in the previous sub-category, children did not
spontaneously describe themselves using ethnic categories. Therefore, participants were also asked: *Would you describe yourself as X or not* (where X was the name of the child’s ethnic group membership). Almost all of the children (30/32 or 94%) agreed that they would describe themselves in ethnic terms, for example as Bangladeshi or Pakistani or Indian.

Hence, even though the children did not spontaneously describe themselves using an ethnic category, they did acknowledge their ethnicity when directly asked about it. The reasons given for describing themselves using their ethnic group label were: their ability to communicate in their ethnic language and their parents’ ethnicity. The following selection of quotations illustrates these points:

(Interviewer) *Would you describe yourself as Iranian or not?*  
(Seena) Yes, quite a lot (line 18)

(Interviewer) *Would you describe yourself as Japanese or not?*  
(Misake) Yes, because my mum and dad is (line 13)

(Interviewer) *Would you describe yourself as Bangladeshi or not?*  
(Nishat) Kind of because I’m learning how to write in Bangladeshi (line 8)

In the last quote, the child’s ethnic identity appeared to be linked to her ability to communicate in her ethnic language. There were other examples of the children linking ethnicity to language use:

(Interviewer) *Would you describe yourself as Sri Lankan or not?*  
(Tarin) I’d say mum and dad were, but I don’t know many words (line 14)

Even though this child expresses that her parents were Sri Lankan, she does not unambiguously acknowledge that she too has the same ethnicity.

One child of mixed heritage completely rejected his two possible ethnicities, partly on grounds of language use:

(Interviewer) *Would you describe yourself as Malaysian?*
(James) No (line 8)
(Interviewer) *Would you describe yourself as Chinese?*
(James) No (line 10)
(Interviewer) *Why would you not describe yourself as Chinese or Malaysian?*
(James) Chinese because I do not speak much Chinese at home and Malaysian because I was not born in that country (line 11)

Interestingly, this latter child also strongly identified with being British, and this may also have been related to his rejection of his ethnic group memberships. Thus, the two children who did not explicitly categorise themselves in terms of their ethnic group, their lack of ability to speak their ethnic language was linked to their rejection of the ethnic labels.

Later in the interview, the children were asked to choose as many descriptive labels as they wished from a set of cards which could be used to describe themselves, and to then rank order these cards in terms of their importance to themselves. 31 out of 32 (97%) children picked their ethnicity card in this task, and 9 out of 32 (28%) chose their ethnic card as the most important card to them (3 Japanese, 3 Iranian, 2 Bangladeshi, 1 Indian). The reasons given for picking their ethnic card were: their ability to speak their ethnic language, their country of birth, knowledge held about their county of ethnic origin, religious identity and family background. Sometimes, combinations of these factors appeared to be related to these children’s strength of identification with particular categories:

(Interviewer) *If you had to choose just one of the cards because it was the most important to you, which one would you choose and why?*
(Rugi) Um, I think it’s a Buddhist, because of the Buddhist faith and um my Mum also is and, um, because Buddhist is my religion and it’s kind of related to the Japanese culture (lines 31-32)

Here, despite the child picking the religious card (rather than the ethnic card) as being the most important to him, he explains that it is because it is related to being Japanese (his ethnicity), suggesting his awareness that Japanese culture and religion are closely connected. The same type of link was also exhibited by other children:

(Interviewer) *Which is the next most important card and why?*
(Alana) Saudi Arabian because it comes up to my religion as well. It's like my country, that's where I was born and all the prophets of Islam were there (line 32)

Again religion appears to have a relationship with ethnic identity as well as country of birth and origin.

(Interviewer) *Which is the next most important to you and why?*

(Jamilla) Moroccan, it's where I come from, what I speak, where all my family are from (lines 29-31)

This quote shows that familial background (i.e., country of origin) and the ability to speak one's ethnic language are linked to ethnic identification.

(Nazanin) Iranian. That's important because my mum is from Iranian and I know a lot about it, I do big projects about it. I speak a lot of Farsi (lines 34-35)

Once again, ability to speak the ethnic language, and the parents' country of ethnic origin, appear to be important, as well as having knowledge about that country of origin.

In summary, despite not spontaneously describing themselves in ethnic terms, when the children were directly asked about their ethnicity, the majority of children did know the name of their ethnic group and were willing to self-categorise in terms of their ethnic group (albeit to varying degrees). This is in line with the findings of both Barrett (2007) and Lambert and Klineberg (1967). Furthermore, the majority of the children did consider their ethnic identification to be important to them, but their reasoning and strength of ethnic identification varied. Ethnic language ability/practices was one of the most frequently cited reasons given for identifying with an ethnic group. This is similar to Bernal et al.'s (1990) finding that language plays a significant role in the formation of ethnic identity.

Although this is an interesting finding, it is not an unexpected one and is quite longstanding in the developmental literature. For example, Carrington and Short's (2000) research on national identity found that the criteria that children used to decide whether someone was or was not British were: being born in Britain, living in
Britain and speaking English. Similarly, the criteria which the present sample of children used to explain their own ethnicity included their ability to speak their ethnic language and their country of birth. However, in addition, in the present study, ethnic identity was linked to religious beliefs and practices for some children. This finding is similar to the previous findings of other researchers such as Dasgupta (1998) and Sheth (1995), who also found that religious activities reinforced participants' ethnicity and bound them more closely to their particular ethnic group.

3.3.1.3 British Identity

This subcategory concerns the participants' sense of Britishness. Once again, as the children did not spontaneously self-describe themselves as British, they were explicitly asked: Would you describe yourself as British or not? The majority of children (25/32 or 78%) agreed that they would describe themselves as British. However, there was an array of responses from “no” to “a bit” to “half” and “yes”, as highlighted in the following quotes:

(Jamilla) No (line 4)

(Tarmid) I don't know about that, but I think a tiny bit British (line 9)

(Matthew) Half, because I also speak Chinese (line 4)

(Bashir) Yes (line 4)

The reasons children gave for describing themselves as British were: because they were a British citizen, because they were born in England, and because they were able to speak English.

(Interviewer) Would you describe yourself as British or not?

(Mariam) Maybe, yes because I am a British citizen (line 4)

(Rugi) Um, I think I'm in the middle because I'm Japanese but I was born in England (line 7)

(Asanka) Well, I can't speak Singhalese but I can speak um English, so yes (line 5)
For some children, their British identity did not appear to be as significant as their ethnic identity, and 22% of the children rejected the label of British. The reasons for this were: their family was born in another country, they spoke another language, they were born in another country, they were from a different country, they had not lived for long enough in Britain, and their parents were from another country.

(Interviewer) *Would you describe yourself as British or not?*

(Tahmid) I don’t know about that, but I think a tiny bit British.

(Interviewer) *Ok, why only a tiny bit British?*

(Tarmid) Because I moved just 9 years ago but I went again when I was 7 years old and because I’ve seen the country I was born in, Australia (lines 8-12)

(Interviewer) *Would you describe yourself as British or not?*

(Misake) No, my mum and dad is Japanese and I was born in America, so no (line 9)

(Farhana) My motherland is Bangladesh, most of all I am Bangladeshi. I like doing British things (line 9)

(Seena) Kind of, well, most of my family were born in Iran, so I am mostly Iranian (line 13)

(Dill) At home I am speaking my language but at school I’m speaking English...I think I’d describe myself as Indian (lines 8-9)

For these children, there did not seem to be any emotional or affectionate bond towards Britain itself, only features related to the English language and doing British things.

When children were asked to pick as many self-descriptive labels as they wanted to from a set of cards, 20 out of 32 (63%) children picked the “British” card. As can be seen there is a slight discrepancy between the 78% of children who described themselves as British in response to the explicit question *Would you describe yourself as British or not?* and the 63% of children who picked the British card in this task. This could be a consequence of the interpretative frame elicited by the
explicit question and/or the fact that some of these children picked the English card instead of the British one in the card selection task.

When the children were asked to rank order the chosen cards in terms of their importance to themselves, only one child chose the British card as being the most important to her (but jointly with her ethnicity card):

Interviewer) Which of these cards is most important to you?
(Nazanin) I can't. I can pick out these two but I can't choose out of these two.
(Interviewer) Ok
(Nazanin) I think because I was born here and have lived here my whole life, I'd say British.
(Interviewer) Ok and the other card?
(Nazanin) Iranian. That's important because my mum is from Iran and I know a lot about it, I do big projects about it. I speak a lot of Farsi (lines 28-33)

For this child, her British identity as well as her Iranian ethnic identity were both equally important to her. However, for the remainder of the sample, Britishness was not as important as ethnicity on the card task.

The reasons given for picking British were: it was where they were born, they spoke English, they lived in Britain, they liked the country, they wanted to take care of Britain, they spent their whole life in Britain, it was a multicultural place, and its low levels of racism.

(Interviewer) What's the next most important card to you?

(Jad) British means I live in this country and I've spent my whole life here (line 9)

(Rugi) British because I was born in um, Great Britain and I now can speak British very well (line 45)

(Jamilla) British. I live in London, I speak the language. It's a part of me (line 33)

(Nazanin) I think because I was born here and have lived here my whole life, I'd say British (line 31)

(Mariam) British because I live in Britain and there are a lot of people from different countries and it's not a racist country and I like that (line 22)
(Farhana) British, because I was born here and I would like to take care of this country as well
(line 23)

(James) British, because I have spent my whole life here and I want to know everything about London
(line 25)

(Mustafa) British. Because I like British. I like the country (line 33)

As stated earlier, for some children, being British was seen as a label only. This meant that it held little affective significance. For those who did feel that there was some importance to being British, this feeling was related primarily to speaking the language, living and being born in Britain.

In sum, there was more variability in the children’s sense of Britishness (compared with their ethnic identity). On the whole, the children appeared to want to describe themselves as British, but only one child chose her British identity as the most important to her, while some other children completely rejected it. Interestingly, children who did not want to describe themselves as British were not British citizens and also had strong ethnic identification. Furthermore, there may have been an inverse relationship between English and British identity, as some children did identify with being English but not with being British (this point will be elaborated on in the next section). The main reasons children gave for describing themselves as British were due to being born in Britain, living in Britain and speaking English. These findings are once again in line with Carrington and Short’s (1995, 1996, 2000) findings with Scottish, British and American children who also used place of birth, living in the country and speaking the national language as criteria for ascribing a particular national identity to a person. Interestingly, this research is also in contrast to Susan Condor’s (2000) work with British adults. She found that British adults were reluctant to identify with their country and did not display much national pride or patriotism, whereas the children in this study did display national pride. This may be because these children were not yet aware of possible negative associations with Britishness (e.g., lager louts or football hooligans).
3.3.1.4 English Identity

This subcategory relates to the participants' sense of Englishness. When the children were explicitly asked *Would you describe yourself as English or not?*, the majority of children (20/32 or 63%) agreed that they would describe themselves as English. However, their degree of identification varied:

(Interviewer) *Would you describe yourself as English or not?*

(Aryan) Yes (line 10)

(Armed) A little bit (line 6)

(Nazanin) Maybe a bit, but not really (line 9)

(Jamilla) No (line 6)

Even though a majority of the children did declare that they would describe themselves as English, the reasons they gave for doing so were mixed. For example, they said it was because they liked English food, they spoke English well, they lived here, and they were raised in England.

(Interviewer) *Would you describe yourself as English or not?*

(Farhana) Yes because I like eating it (line 9)

(Rugi) Um, I'm quite good at English so I prefer I'll say um English (line 9)

(Bashir) Sort of. I have been raised in England but my parents are Tunisian (line 6)

(Aisha) Yeah I think so because I live in England (line 9)

Over a quarter (32%) of children also stated that being English was more significant to them than being British, which perhaps stresses the importance of locality for some children:
(Seena) I would describe myself as about 25% English. I feel more English than British (line 6)

(Interviewer) Out of the three, which would you describe yourself the most as?
(Mustafa) English. Then British, then Jordanian (lines 9-10)

When the children were asked to pick the self-descriptive cards, 15 out of the 32 (47%) children picked the English card. Again there is a discrepancy between the 63% of children who described themselves as English when asked the explicit question and the 47% of children who picked the English card in the card task. Hence, the majority of children did not pick the English card, suggesting that English identity was not as salient as either ethnic or British identity to these children. Furthermore, when the children rank ordered their chosen identities in terms of their importance, Englishness was usually ranked lower than either ethnic or British identity.

The reasons the children gave for picking the English card were: it was where they were born, where they were brought up, where they lived, they liked England, they liked the English language, they spoke English most of the time, and they spoke English better than any other language.

(Aryan) English, because I was born here, brought up here and I really like it here (line 24)

(Mustafa) English, because I like the language (line 31)

(Fahana) English because I talk English, like I’m talking now. At home I mostly speak English (lines 30-31)

(Aisha) English and British. England is where I live (line 34)

(Rugi) Um, I think it’s English, because I was born in England and I can speak English better than Japanese (line 38-39)

To summarise, for the most part English identity appeared to be significant to some of these children. However, there was a great deal of variability in the importance of their English identification. In comparison to ethnic and British identification, Englishness did not appear to be as important to these children. Unfortunately, the
children that did not want to be described as English could not give any reasons why when probed. These findings are similar to those of Barrett (2007), who found that, by the age of 6, the majority of children did know the name of their own national group and spontaneously chose it in order to describe themselves. Barrett also found that although many children did spontaneously chose their national identity as a self-description by the age of 6, many children nevertheless did not assign much importance to it at this age, once again this is similar to the children in the present study. In addition, these findings are consistent with those of Carrington and Short (2000) on the criteria which children use to ascribe national identities to people. Interestingly, there was no racialisation of the category English (i.e., not identifying with the category English due to the fact that it was perceived as a white category)

3.3.1.5 London Identity

This subcategory concerns the importance of the local context for these children. Their London identity was one of the significant social identities that emerged when the children were asked to pick the cards that described themselves and to rank order these cards. Over half the sample (17/32 or 53%) picked the card ‘Londoner’. However, no child ranked ‘Londoner’ as their most important label, although some did rank it above some other categories (like British, English or ethnicity). This highlights the importance of locale to these children.

The reasons the children gave for picking ‘Londoner’ were: it was where they lived, where they spent most of their life, where their school was, where they were born, its attractions and sights, its tourists, the fact that they had travelled around London, they liked London and, surprisingly, the weather! The following selection of quotations illustrates these points:

(Interviewer) Which is the next most important to you?

(Aryan) Londoner, because I live in London, I have seen the whole of London. I like London, it’s an interesting place. There are lots of tourists and it’s a nice place (line 27)

(Rugi) Londoner, because I was born in the London community, so I’m a bit of a Londoner (line 46)
(Bashir) Londoner, I was born in London and I spent most of my life here. I go to school here (line 20)

(Seena) Londoner, London is like one of the main places of the world... a lot of people come and visit it. I like it when it's the cold days and in the summer I get so excited (lines 31-34)

(Armed) Londoner, because it is my life, I like Big Ben and the balance between the weather. In Egypt is it always hot (line 20)

However, the importance of these children’s London identity did vary from child to child.

To summarise, being a Londoner was considered to be important for many of these ethnic minority children, which emphasises the meaning a more local identity may have for children, in addition to their national or ethnic identities.

3.3.1.6 Religious Identity

This subcategory concerns the significance of religion for the minority children of the present study. As stated earlier, religion was the only social category that a small number of children used to spontaneously describe themselves at the outset of the interviews. Moreover, out of all the social identities, religious identity emerged as the most important to them. Virtually all of the children (31/32 or 97%) picked a religious faith card to describe themselves (such as Muslim, Christian, Hindu, Roman Catholic, Buddhist) and the majority (75%) of the children felt that their religious card was the most important card to them irrespective of what religion they followed.

When the children were asked why they had picked that particular card, most children responded that it was simply their religion. Others gave a variety of answers: their family was religious and devout, the importance of practising your religion, religion was related to their culture and background, and religion was linked to their ethnic identity.
(Interviewer) *Which is the most important card and why?*
(Jamilla) Muslim, I am one. It’s my religion (line 21)
(Interviewer) *Why is religion important to you personally?*
(Jamilla) Not sure, practising your religion is a really big thing and if you don’t practise it well then you’re not a Muslim (lines 23-24)

The quotes above highlight the link between religious identity and religious practices for some of these children. For this child, you cannot be a Muslim unless you also practise your religion.

The following quotes also show the importance of practising one’s religion, but also reveal the children’s awareness of the influence that the family can have:

(Interviewer) *Which is the most important card and why?*
(Nishat) Muslim, because I’m Muslim and my whole family are Muslim, we have to pray and things like that. We have a special way to pray, different ways. We just have to be Muslim (lines 16-19)
(Senna) Muslim. Because it’s my religion and why I chose it is because loads of people in my family are like 100% Muslim and I want to be like that, I’m only about 90% Muslim, I don’t celebrate everything we do, like Eid (lines 36-38)

In the next quote, religion is very important to this child; the first two cards she picks are related to her religion (her religion and her denomination). The enthusiasm she displayed may have been due to her recent completion of a religious process at the time of interviewing.

(Tarin) Roman Catholic. Because I like believing in my faith and I have just received my First Holy Communion with a friend of mine in this school and I really want to welcome Faith.
(Interviewer) *Which is the most important to you?*
(Tarin) Christian. Christian is a Faith, you can be RC, and you can be C of E (lines 27-31)

In contrast, the following child picked his religious card as important to him but his comments were conflicting:

(Aryan) Muslim. We don’t really practice but we are Muslim and our relatives are. But they don’t practice a lot. I see myself more Zoroastrian than Muslim (lines 31-33)
The next few quotes once again show the connection between religious identity and ethnic culture, background and people:

(Rugi) Um, I think it’s Buddhist, because of the Buddhist faith and um my Mum also is and, um, because Buddhist is my religion and it’s kind of related to the Japanese culture (lines 31-32)

(James) Buddhist because I think Buddhist people are clever. Because of my country (Malaysia) and everyone is very friendly to me (line 18)

(Mariam) Muslim, it is most important as it is my religion and I respect it and it shows my background and shows that loads of Muslims are in Asia and Africa and not really in America and means a lot to me (line 18)

The last quote shows how religious identification can also signify belonging to a global community.

The following quotes illustrate the link between religious identity and ethnic identity for this child, as he believes that the relationship between being Indian and being Hindu are so similar that they are virtually the same thing:

(Interviewer) Hindu, why is that the most important?
(Dill) Because I think Hinduism is very respectful. You have to worship your God.
(Interviewer) What’s the next most important?
(Dill) Indian. Because it’s kind of like the same as Hinduism. It’s the same (lines 23-26)

There were also links between religious identity and superordinate ethnic identity and language. These connections will be discussed in the next section.

To summarise, despite the majority of the sample being of Islamic faith, children of different religions, as well as Muslim children, felt that their religion was important to them. Takriti et al. (2006) similarly found that children aged 5-11 years from Muslim, Hindu, Christian and Jewish backgrounds all regarded religion as being very important. However, in the present study, the Muslim children stressed religion the most, and were most likely to regard it as their most important social identity. These findings are in line with Modood et al., (1994), who found that South Asian
adolescents were significantly more likely to choose religion as a way of describing themselves and consistently gave it more importance than any other ethnic group. He also asked the Christian, Muslim, Hindu and Sikh adolescents to rate the importance of their religion in their way of life and found that the Muslims attributed more importance to religion than any other group. Similarly, Ghuman (2003) found that Muslim adolescents rated their religion as being more important than their Hindu and Sikh counterparts.

Moreover, religious identity appeared to be entwined with ethnic identity for some of the children in the present study, and this is similar to the findings of Dasgupta (1998) and Sheth (1995), who also found that religious activities reinforced their participants’ sense of ethnicity, heritage and traditions. In addition, Jacobson (1997) conducted some qualitative fieldwork with British Pakistani youths and found that religious identity for these Muslim youths played a more significant role in their lives than ethnic identification as it signified belonging to a global community. This was also found in the present study. Furthermore, Jacobson found that Muslim identity was also viewed as cross-cutting ethnic memberships. In other words, the two sources of identity in practice were closely tied up with one another but were at the same time commonly regarded as separate or different self-descriptions. Once again, these findings are similar to those obtained in the present study.

3. 3. 1. 7 Superordinate Ethnic Identity

This subcategory refers to the children’s Arabic and Asian identities and reflects the cultural background of the sample of children. When the children were asked to pick cards that described themselves, almost all of the children (29/32 or 91%) picked the Asian and/or Arabic cards. These labels were important to most children as it was linked to their specific ethnicity, language, people, culture, the geographical location of their country of origin and religion. Interestingly, 16% of children picked both the Asian and the Arabic cards, the former referring to the geographical location (continent) of their country of origin and the latter referring to the language of their Islamic faith and/or their people. The following selection of quotes illustrates these points:
(Interviewer) *Which is the next most important to you and why?*

(James) Asian because Asian people are strict (line 20)

(Tarmid) Asia that's where Bangladesh is (line 74)

(Nazanin) Well Turkey is in Asia and so is Iran (line 43)

(Nishat) Bangladeshi is like Asian and Bangladesh is in Asia (line 28)

Therefore, for these children their Asian identity is important to them as it is linked to their people and county of origin and is what makes them Asian, but more so it shows their awareness of the role of geographical location.

The next quote shows how one child may prefer to sometimes say he is Asian (superordinate category) rather than specifically Hindu, in order to protect himself if someone said anything negative about his religion:

(Dill) Asian. Because if someone asked me what kind of religion I am and I say Hindu and they don't like Hindu, and they say to me I don't like Hindu people, it would hurt my feelings so I just say Asian (lines 36-38)

The next few quotes highlight the link between religion and the Arab language and also how Arabic can be seen both as a language and as a way of describing people:

(Jamilla) Arabic. Because I am Arabic. Moroccan and Arabic are kind of similar but there are some words which are different (line 26-28)

(Senna) Iran speaks two languages, Arabic and Farsi. Iran used to rule most of Asia, the Persian Empire (lines 47-48)

(Tarmid) Arabic, because it's one of my languages (line 70)
These children were all Muslim and, in addition to knowing their ethnic language, for instance Iranian (Farsi) and Bengali, the Arabic language was also important to them as it the language that the Quran is written in.

In sum, superordinate ethnic identities appeared to be important to some children. However, considering that religion was the most important social identity and that ethnic identity was also salient, it is perhaps not surprising that religious language (Arabic) and Arab (cultural) identity were also important to most of the children as the majority of the sample was Muslim and Arab. These findings are in line with Takriti et al. (2006), who found that language, nationality/ethnicity and religion were intertwined and closely related for their 5- to 11-year-old Muslim, Hindu, Christian and Jewish children. Akiba et al. (2004) also found that superordinate descriptors were picked by their children in a card task, but were not given as much importance as other identifications (such as ethnic). This is also similar to the results of the present study.

3.3.1.8 European Identity

This subcategory refers to the children’s European identity, as a few children (5/32 or 16%) did pick the ‘European’ card in the card selection task. Although only a small number of children picked this card, their European identity was linked to: where they lived, travel experiences in Europe, liking Europe, being born in a European country, and where their friends came from. The following selection of quotes illustrates these points:

(Interviewer) Why did you pick the European card?

(Aryan) Because I have been to lots of places in Europe, I like Europe. It’s got good football teams and we live in Europe (lines 36-37)

(Ruji) European, because some of my friends come from Europe and I was born in a European country (lines 44-45)

(Seena) European, proud to be European (line 44)
In summary, for the majority of the children, European identity was not significant. For those children who felt that their European identity was important to them, this was due to them living and being born in Europe. However, European identity was not as important to these children as their other social identities. Interestingly, these children’s strength of British, English and London identity also tended to be of high importance.

3.3.1.9 Overview of Multiple Identities

In general, these children appeared to possess a variety of cross-cutting identities (Akiba et al., 2004; Hutnik, 1991) which vary in power with regard to importance and meaning but do appear to fit together unproblematically. Social category awareness was evident in all children from age 7 onwards, with clear self-identifications appearing from a young age. The overall picture that emerges is that these children had a multiplicity of self-categorisations and identifications, with religious, ethnic and British identities (respectively) appearing to be the most significant. In addition, and in contrast to Piaget and Weil’s (1951) argument about children younger than age 11 not understanding multiple group memberships, these children had no problems understanding they simultaneously held British, ethnic and religious group memberships.

Furthermore, there was an interplay between identity and language, especially in relationship to ethnic, religious, British, English and superordinate ethnic identities. Language appears to be embedded in children’s identities, with those who were more fluent speakers feeling more strongly attached to their respective identities (Bernal et al., 1990; Takriti et al., 2006). However, language use is also context-dependent as minority children are often able to switch languages from one context to another (Barrett, 2007; Coleman et al., 2001); as we shall see in the next section, identifications are also context-dependent.

As the majority of the sample was Muslim, and the sample size was small, it was not possible to examine religious group differences. However, it does appear that for Muslim children, religious and ethnic identifications were more important to them
than British and English identifications. There may also have been a relationship between religious identity and ethnic identity, as some children felt that religious practices were part of their ethnic culture. Thus, religion may be viewed as a component of ethnic identity (Hutnik, 1991) or, as Jacobson (1997) found, the two identities in practice may be closely tied up with one another but at the same time regarded as separate or different self-descriptions.

### 3.3.2 Contextual Influences on Identity

The fluid and contextual nature of identities was a further key theme which emerged from the data. Subcategories here included the home as a context (the private sphere) and the school as a context (a public sphere). These subcategories will be discussed respectively. The most common finding was a divide between the private and public spheres of the children’s lives.

#### 3.3.2.1 Home (Private Sphere)

This subcategory refers to the role of the home context on the salience of children’s identities. When the children were asked ‘*When you are at home, which card best describes how you feel?*’, the majority of children (21/32 or 66%) chose their ethnic group membership card as their most salient identity at home. The reasons given for this were: they communicated in their ethnic language, watched ethnic TV channels, the décor of their home was ethnic, the food they ate was ethnic, parental ethnic practices, parental ethnicity, and cultural and religious practices. The following quotes illustrate these points:

*(Interviewer)* *When you are at home, which card best describes how you feel?*

*(Rugi)* Um, I think it’s Japanese, because um, we um, communicate by speaking Japanese, like ‘thank you’ and ‘hello’ and all those things we speak Japanese so that’s why. Um, I think it’s Japanese (lines 50-53)

*(Aryan)* Iranian because most of the time we speak Iranian, we watch Iranian channels sometimes and our house feels Iranian, the style (lines 40-41)
(Tarin) Sri Lankan. My mum cooks Sri Lankan food (line 40)

(Nishat) Bangladeshi. My mum and dad are both Bangladeshi. My dad doesn't quite know how to speak English yet (lines 31-32)

These quotes therefore show how ethnic identity, language and parental practices are linked in driving the salience of ethnic identity, as they are in the next example. This child also states that doing traditional (cultural) things is why she feels Saudi Arabian at home:

(Alana) Saudi Arabian, because we speak Arabic with my Dad and I speak English as well with my Dad. Because we all like tradition and stuff and we do it at home (lines 65-66)

Interestingly, the next child states she feels more Pakistani at home not only because she speaks the language but also because she feels more comfortable being Pakistani at home than at school, suggesting that this part of her self-concept is more accepted and encouraged at home:

(Mariam) Pakistani because they all speak the language. I speak the language with them and I speak English with my mother but I feel more comfortable when I am at home to be more Pakistani than I do in school (line 26)

The following quote also highlights the importance of religious identity as well as ethnic identity in the home context and that religion may be entwined with ethnicity:

(Dill) Indian. Because my mum doesn't wear the robe that protects you but my dad wears it round the house and everyone else in my family wears it. I think she doesn't believe in God that much but she does do the worshipping (lines 32-33)

A few children (5/32 or 15%) picked both ethnic and religious cards together for the home context:

(Bashir) Tunisian and Muslim. We speak Tunisian at home to ensure we do not forget the language. My cousin's started speaking English at home and then soon forgot the language. I will not forget English as we speak it at school (line 30)
A smaller number of children (3/32 or 10%) chose their religious card as the identity they felt most at home. The grounds for picking this card were religious practices and parental behaviours:

(Farhana) Muslim. My mum prays after she does the cooking (line 34)

(Jad) Muslim, because I always see my dad praying and stuff like that (line 31)

There were, however, two children who felt more English or British at home and this was mainly due to the fact they spoke English at home. For James, it was also because he was born in England. Once again the importance of language can be seen and its connection with identification (Bernal et al., 1990):

(James) English because I was born in England and I speak lots of English (line 30)

(Jamilla) British. We speak it (line 36)

One child felt more Arabic because he spoke Arabic at home, but he did not specifically mention his ethnic identity but rather his superordinate ethnic identity which is related to his language:

(Mustafa) I feel Arabic the most at home because my family talk to me in Arabic (line 41)

In summary, the general trend within the data suggested that, in the context of the home, children’s ethnic identity was the most salient identity, but religious identity was also often salient to them in this context as well. However, while ethnic identity is highly salient in the home context, it is also salient in other contexts but, as we shall see, it is not as prominent in other contexts. The links between identity (ethnic and religious) and context (home) appear to be due to language and parental ethnic cultural practices (Knight et al., 1993).

According to SCT (Turner et al., 1987; Haslam, et al., 1995), ingroup identity should be more evident when engaged in inter-group comparisons. However, contrary to the predictions of SCT, these children had a stronger sense of their ethnic identity
within the home (an intra-group context) where there were no outgroup members present for comparison. Perhaps the multicultural context of London plays a role here in creating a psychological inter-group context for comparative purposes, or perhaps because these children are members of an ethnic minority group, this makes their ethnic identity more salient to them, with the home context being seen as a ‘safe’ place to express this identity fully.

3.3.2.2 School (Public Sphere)

This subcategory concerns the role that the school context has on the salience of children’s identities. When the children were asked ‘When you are at school, which card best describes how you feel?’, there was a mixed bag of responses. However, just over a quarter of children (9/32 or 28%) chose the British card as the most salient identity at school. The reasons given for feeling British at school were: they were British citizens, it was a British school, it had British things, people spoke in English and did English work. The following quotes illustrate these points:

(Nazanin) British, everyone speaks English, we do English work (line 48)

(Farhana) British because it is a British school and I’m a British Citizen. It’s a very British school and has British stuff (lines 37-38)

(Mustafa) British, because everyone talks to me in English (line 43)

(Jad) British, because all my friends are Arabic but we speak English to each other (lines 33-34)

(Tarin) Roman Catholic, I like to tell my friends that I’m a Christian. I have a friend called Emily who is doing it with me. I also feel British at school, we talk English. In different activities we do we speak English (lines 44-46)

After British, the most common pattern was that children felt English (21%) and then a Londoner (16%) at school. The main reasons they gave for this was because they only spoke and learnt English at school. From the above quotes, it can be seen that language once again was an important criterion in the children’s thinking, but this time in the school setting. Therefore, the ability to communicate with others, whether
it is in English or their ethnic language, appears to be related to their sense of national (British), English, London or ethnic identity. The use of language was context-specific, and so was the corresponding identity which was ‘switched on’ in various settings. The importance of language use as an identity trigger is underlined by the following quotes:

(Rugi) Um, I think it’s English because most of the time you speak English at school and we have English lessons and all those things, I think it’s English the best (lines 55-56)

(Bashir) English because I only speak English at school. I learnt English at school and everything I learn at school is in English like science and history (line 34)

(Aryan) English. We speak English. I feel a tiny bit Iranian. I feel like I belong here (line 43)

(Nishat) English. People all around me speak English and they don’t speak Bangladeshi (lines 34-35)

For the remaining children, a few (11%) picked their ethnic card, a few (11%) picked their religious card and a few (11%) picked the Asian card. Therefore, despite a change in context (from home to school), these particular children appeared to have very strong religious and ethnic identifications, as they not only picked these identities as most important overall, but also in the home context and in the school:

(Interviewer) So out of these cards that you have picked which card is most important to you?
(Misake) Japanese (line 38)

(Interviewer) So when you are home which of these cards do you feel the most?
(Misake) I feel Japanese (line 51)

(Interviewer) Ok. What about when you are school?
(Misake) Still Japanese (line 53)

One child picked their ‘Asian’ card at school and gave the following explanation (as quoted earlier on in this chapter):

(Dill) Asian, because if someone asked me what kind of religion I am and I say Hindu, and they don’t like Hindu, and they say to me I don’t like Hindu people, it would hurt my feelings so I just say Asian (lines 35-37)
It could be that this child wanted to pick his religious card but perceived that he may be discriminated against so he picked the superordinate category of Asian to protect himself.

But for James, as there are not many children of Chinese or oriental heritage at the school, perhaps he feels more distinct and so opts for Asian:

(James) Asian, because there are not much Asians (Chinese) in school (line 32)

In summary, the overall trend within the data suggests that, in the school context, children’s British identity was most salient, then English identity, and then London identity. Ethnic identity was not as salient in the school context as it was in the home context. However, a small number of children who felt that their ethnic identification was most important overall, and most important at home, also chose it as the most important at school as well, showing the robustness and high salience and importance of this membership for some ethnic minority children. Language practices such as speaking English at school with friends also appear to be related to this subcategory. Thus, once again, identity and context appear to be related through cultural practices. As Barrett (2007) found, the language of instruction at school was related to children’s strength of national identification.
3.3.2.3 Overview of Contextual Influences on Identity

In summary, there appeared to be a divide between the children's public and private spheres which is largely due to language use and parental practices within the home. The general trend within the data suggests that children's ethnic and religious identities were most salient at home, with British and English identities being more salient at school. This is not to say that the children's ethnic, religious or British/English identities had disappeared from one context to another; rather, they were just made more salient in a particular context. Even though ethnic and religious identities were present in the school context, they were not as prominent there as they were in the home context. These findings are consistent with the claim that minority individuals tend to prefer cultural maintenance in private spheres more than in public spheres (Phalet, Van Lotringen & Entzinger, 2000; Taylor & Lambert, 1996).

Coleman et al.'s (2001) contextual acculturation theory could also be of use in explaining the context-dependent nature of these children's identities. The alternation conceptualisation (Ogbu & Mature-Bianchi, 1986) suggests that it is possible to alternate between two cultures in the same manner as one alternates between the use of language in different contexts (as many of these children were found to do). Therefore, this form of biculturalism allows for different acculturation styles in different contexts. This could also be true for identities, with different identities being deployed in different contexts.

That said, for Muslim children, religious identity appeared to be more stable across contexts. Muslim identity may be more constant and enduring than a national or ethnic identity due to the greater levels of significance associated with this group membership. Indeed, Jacobson (1997) found that religious identity for Muslim Pakistani youths was pervasive, that is, their religious identification played a more significant role in their lives than ethnic identification as it signified belonging to a global community. Religion was also seen as constant by these respondents, whereas ethnic culture was open to change, and Muslim identity was also viewed as cross-cutting ethnic and national memberships. Furthermore, previous research has
suggested that Hindu and Sikh adolescents are more likely to integrate into the wider society than Muslims (Ghuman, 2003).

So, as the name of this core category suggests, identities appear to be linked to and influenced by context, with different identities (as well as languages and behaviours) being switched on and off, depending on the situation and setting. Moreover, the children in the present study did not perceive any conflict between their different identities, and were able to move effortlessly from one group membership to another according to the specific context.

### 3.3.3 Cultural Practices

This core category concerns the mix of children’s cultural practices in terms of behaviours and preferences, and includes the subcategories of Music, Food, Dress, Sport and Religion. Each of these will be discussed in turn.

#### 3.3.3.1 Music

This subcategory refers to children’s musical tastes and preferences. When children were asked what sort of music they like to listen to, the majority (74%) responded with specific genres of music or artists:

- *(Mustafa)* Rap. I like Eminem (line 112)
- *(Aisha)* Rock and Pop. A bit of R&B (line 112)
- *(Seena)* I like Pop and Hip Hop. Maroon 5, Heavy Metal, Eminem (line 116)

Some (26%) children however, answered in terms of ethnic group or language:

- *(Dill)* Mostly Indian, but sometimes English (line 135)
- *(Farhana)* Hindi (line 103)
However, this might have been due to the children being primed by the previous questions in the interview schedule enquiring about ethnicity and language.

The children described liking a wide range of music from western to eastern forms, and their preferences also varied. The majority (84%) of children said they liked British/American music when asked ‘Do you like British/American music?’, whereas less (77%) said they liked their ethnic music. Over half (63%) said they liked both British and ethnic music.

However, the majority (61%) of children reported that they preferred British music to their ethnic music when they were asked ‘Which do you prefer... (X ethnic group) or British/American music?’.

(Farhana) British, more than Indian and Bangladeshi (line 109)

(Jamilla) English music and then Arabic (line 112)

(Jad) Mostly British and American (line 121)

Hence, even though some children considered their ethnic identity to be important to them, this did not always correspond to them liking or preferring their ethnic music, with their cultural preferences and behaviours being related to dominant (British) and global (American) and other ethnic minority (like Indian) cultures rather than their ethnic culture. This finding is in line with Hutnik’s (1986, 1991) research with Asian British adolescents. She found that British-Indians may feel strongly Indian but be very British in their behaviours. In other words, self-categorisations and cultural behaviours were relatively independent of each other (i.e., there is a dissociation between identity and cultural behaviour). For instance, Mariam considered herself to be very Pakistani, but she preferred British music and did not even like Pakistani music:

(Interviewer) Which is the most important card and why?
(Mariam) Muslim, it is most important as it is my religion and I respect it and it shows my background and shows that loads of Muslims are in Asia and Africa and not really in America and means a lot to me.
(Interviewer) Which is the next most important?
(Mariam) Pakistani because it is my country and I always like it

........

(I) What sort of music do you like to listen to?
(M) R&B like Akon
(I) Do you like British/American music?
(M) Yes
(I) Do you like Pakistani music?
(M) No, too slow
(I) Which do you prefer Pakistani or British/American music?
(M) British (lines 73-80)

Likewise, James (ethnically Chinese/Malaysian) had a strong English identification, and rejected his cultural origin identities, but did not like British music and actually preferred Chinese music.

Parental preferences for music styles might have influenced the children's taste and preferences in music. The following extracts support this:

(I) Which do you prefer to listen to Iranian or British music?
(S) British.
(I) What kind of music do your parents listen to?
(S) My mum English and my dad is not a music lover.

........

(I) What music would you listen to together as a family?
(S) We listen to mostly English (lines 122-130)

(I) Which do you prefer, Arabic or British music?
(A) Arabic.
(I) What kind of music do your Mum and Dad listen to?
(A) Um, they like Arabic music.
(I) What type of music would you listen to at home as a family?
(A) Arabic.
(I) What kind of music do you listen to with your friends?
(A) Um, I don't really listen to music when friends come round but if I do, I listen to English.
(lines 223-230)
What can also be seen from the above quote is how music appeared to be context driven. Hence, as the context changed, and language used therefore changed, children were more likely to listen to ethnic music at home if parents preferred to listen to this type of music and English music with friends (especially if their friends did not speak the same ethnic language as themselves).

For instance, this child’s closest friends were all Arabic speakers and this is the reason why she would put on her ethnic music, but if her English friends came round she would switch to English:

(Interviewer) If your friends came over what music would you listen to with them?
(Jamilla) Traditional Moroccan music.
(Interviewer) If Edie and Hannah came round would you put that on or something else?
(Jamilla) No, I’d put on English Music (lines 131-134)

Again, in the next example, we can see this child switching from Indian to English music practices from the home context to the friends context because her friends would not understand the Indian music. However, this Pakistani child also was not that fond of Indian music (which is not her music of ethnic origin) but she had to listen to with her family; given the choice, she preferred to listen to British/English music:

(Interviewer) What type of music do you listen to at home with your family?
(Mariam) Indian, I am not a lover of it.
(Interviewer) What kind of music do you and your friends listen to?
(Mariam) English, they do not understand Indian music (lines 85-87)

A few children reported that with friends who spoke the same language (Arabic) they would listen to Arabic music:

(Jad) With my Arabic friends I might put Arabic music on (line 130)

Thus, we can see a relationship between context and cultural practices, and the influence that context had on music choices. Again, there seemed to be a divide between home (parents) and friends context, and even within contexts as children
switched their music choices when in the company of different ethnic groups of friends.

In summary, children have an array of different music tastes. In general, most children preferred British/American music to their ethnic music, and this signifies the importance of global and British culture for these children. Some children also reported that they listened to other types of ethnic minority music (like Indian music). However, some children may have been influenced by parental preferences and practices, as they also liked the same music as their parents. For instance, Knight et al. (1993) found a positive relationship between parental socialisation practices and children’s ethnic identity, and suggested that parents are indeed important agents in the enculturation of their children. The present study’s findings are in line with their research, especially in the private sphere of home. Context also appeared to influence musical practices, and there was a divide between the home and friends context, and also within the friends context due to different ethnic group friendships and common/shared languages. This is in line with Coleman et al.’s (2001) alternation strategy. One could say that, in this domain, children appear to opt for a multicultural integration or alternation acculturation strategy overall but in private contexts opt for separation and in public contexts assimilation (Berry, 1997; Coleman, 1995). There was also a divide in the relationship between identification and cultural practices, with some children showing a dissociation between the two (as in Hutnik’s, 1991, work).

3.3.3.2 Food

This subcategory refers to children’s tastes and preferences in the food domain. When children were asked what sort of foods they liked, about half (52%) categorised food in terms of countries, cultures or cuisines such as Italian, Indian etc., while the others referred to specific types of dishes, like pizza, chips or curry:

(Interviewer) What food do you like to eat?

(Tarmid) Fish fingers and chips, hotdogs, burgers, pasta, spaghetti, cucumbers, carrots and rice (line 319)
Therefore, these children described liking a wide range of foods from western to eastern styles. Almost all (95%) children liked their own ethnic cuisine, and almost all children (89%) liked British food. Interestingly, British food was conceived as a mix of western cuisines including American and European dishes, perhaps due to global influences and/or a lack of knowledge on what is typically British cuisine. For instance:

(Interviewer) Do you like British food?

(Mai) Yes, pizza, chips and little bit of ice-cream (line 177)

When children were asked if they preferred their ethnic food or British food, the majority (63%) said they preferred their ethnic food; some (21%) preferred British food; while some (16%) liked both types. The pattern of results here is in contrast to the previous domain of music, where British/American culture was preferred. This is therefore an example of the domain-specificity and variability of these children’s cultural practices:

(Interviewer) What kind of food do you like to eat?

(Mustafa) Arabic food. Vine leaves, rice with yoghurt.

(Interviewer) Do you like British food at all?

(Mustafa) I like chips, burger and chips.

(Interviewer) What do you prefer to eat, British food or Arabic food?

(Mustafa) About 50/50, some of it Arabic, some of it English. I prefer Arabic (lines 163-68)

Also, some children’s cultural practices/preferences (i.e., preferring to eat their ethnic food) appeared to be related to their ethnic identity.

(Interviewer) What is the most important card and why?

(Aryan) Iranian. Because my relatives are all Iranian, my whole background is Iranian. I have been there a lot of times (lines 21-22)

………..

(Interviewer) What kind of food do you like to eat?
(Aryan) Everything. Iranian food. Spinach, meat and yoghurt, rice (lines 156-157)

Interviewer) What do you prefer to eat, British food or Iranian food?
(Aryan) Iranian (lines 161-162)

Again, the home context, parental preferences and practices appeared to play a role in children’s preferences for foods:

(Interviewer) Which do you prefer Bangladeshi or British food?
(Nishat) Bangladeshi food.

(Interviewer) What food do your mum and dad like to eat?
(Nishat) Bengali food.

(Interviewer) What foods do you eat together as a family?
(Nishat) Normally Bengali food at the house (lines 171-176)

(Interviewer) Which do you prefer to eat, British food or Iranian food?
(Seena) Iranian

(Interviewer) What do your mum and dad like to eat?
(Seena) Iranian

(Interviewer) What sorts of food does your mum make at home?
(Seena) She cooks mainly Iranian, sometimes other things (lines 161-166)

When children were later asked if they ate differently in the school context compared to the home context, some children replied:

(Nishat) Packed lunch is different because I get it in a box and not on a plate. I have an apple, sometimes pasta; I have more British food for lunch (lines 179-181)

(Interviewer) Do you eat differently at school compared to home?
(Rugi) Yes

(Interviewer) Why?
(Rugi) At school, I eat kind of like English food and at home I eat Japanese food, coz the food at school is quite mixed (lines 312-316)

(Interviewer) What sorts of foods do you eat at home with your family?
(Mariam) Indian, Pakistani, rice, curries

(Interviewer) Do you eat differently at school compared to what you eat at home?
Again, these quotes suggest the role that context (school vs. home) played in these children's food practices and in the later quote the child also ate other Asian cuisines like Indian.

In sum, the children liked a range of different foods from many cultures (perhaps due to the multicultural nature of London and the ready availability of international cuisines). In this domain, the majority of ethnic minority children preferred to eat their ethnic food than British food and this perhaps indicates the influence of minority culture and identity. Alternatively, this could just be a simple preference on their part or a response to social pressure from the family. Therefore, these children's food preferences showed a different pattern from their music preferences. In this domain, ethnic identification and ethnic preferences and practices did correspond (as in Phinney et al., 2006), but in the music domain there was dissociation between identity and preferences/practices. This therefore shows the domain-specificity of cultural practices, and also the variability in the relationship between identification and practices. In line with research by Knight et al. (1993), there appeared to be a relationship between parental socialisation practices and children's ethnic identity and cultural practices. Once again, context also appeared to influence these children's food practices, as there was a divide between the home and school context, and this is in line with Coleman's (1995) alternation concept, that is, cultural practices being context-dependent. Overall, these children appeared to adopt a multicultural integration or alternation acculturation strategy in this domain. However, in the private sphere, they opted for separation (cultural maintenance) and in the public sphere assimilation (cultural adaptation).

3.3.3.3 Dress

This subcategory relates to ethnic minority children's choice of clothing/fashion. When children were asked what sort of clothes they liked to wear, the majority (79%) referred to specific types of clothing or 'looks' like jeans or sporty clothes,
while the rest categorised clothes in terms of culture, that is, English, Asian or ethnic dress. These children therefore liked to wear a wide range of clothing from western to eastern styles, and the vast majority (80%) said they liked wearing British clothes. Over half (53%) stated that they also liked wearing their ethnic clothing.

Later, the children were asked: Which do you prefer... (ethnic group) or British clothing? The majority (68%) of children described preferring more western forms (British/American) of clothing, while a few (11%) preferred traditional ethnic clothes and some (22%) said they liked both ethnic and British clothes. The following quotes illustrate the above points.

(Interviewer) What sort of clothes do you like to wear?
(Jamilla) English clothes. I do wear skirts, but I prefer jeans.
(Interviewer) Do you like British clothes?
(Jamilla) Yes. I find them comfortable, they’re more me.
(Interviewer) Do you ever wear Moroccan or Arabic clothing?
(Jamilla) Yes. When I go to weddings. They have dresses which are really traditional.
(Interviewer) Which do you prefer, Moroccan or British clothing?
(Jamilla) British
(Interviewer) What sort of clothes does your mum wear?
(Jamilla) English. When she goes out she covers herself in a long black dress and covers her hair with a long black cloth, with her eyes showing. I take off my scarf when I’m indoors, it’s only when I’m outside I wear it. So if I go to someone else’s house I take mine off.
(Interviewer) So if you visited family members would you have to wear English or Arabic clothing?
(Jamilla) Arabic (lines 189-202)

This child described preferring British clothes as they are more comfortable and more her style/personality but she did wear traditional ethnic clothes for special occasions and when she visited her relatives. Once again, the contextualised nature of cultural practices can be seen, as well as the influence of parental practices as this child wears a head scarf (Hijab) when she goes out, copying her mother because she wants to be like her mother (see quote below). Interestingly, this child also had a strong ethnic and religious identification; one could suggest that her Muslim identification can be seen in the act of wearing a head scarf as well:

(Interviewer) Do you have someone you really admire or would like to be like?
(Jamilla) My mum. She’s really fun and she’s herself. I’d like to be like her. I wear my headscarf to be like my mum (lines 218-219)

In the next example, the divide between the private home sphere and the public school sphere can be seen, as well as the relationship between clothes and Islamic religious practices.

(Interviewer) *What sort of clothes do you like to wear?*

(Mariam) In school I wear English because it’s what I have to wear here and at home I wear a traditional trouser suit.

(Interviewer) *Do you like British clothes?*

(Mariam) Yes, nice and fashionable

(Interviewer) *Do you like Pakistani clothes?*

(Mariam) Yes more comfortable and baggier than English

(Interviewer) *Which do you prefer, Pakistani or British clothing/style?*

(Mariam) I like both.

(Interviewer) *What kind of clothes do your parents wear?*

(Mariam) Mum wears both, at work she wears a uniform and at home traditional clothes. Dad wears traditional at home, baggy trousers and no scarf. Mum does not wear a headscarf and we tell her off for not being a good Muslim (lines 139-153)

The next example highlights children’s awareness of religious and ethnic practices in the domain of clothes and the split between eastern and western styles/practices:

(Interviewer) *Do you like Iranian clothes?*

(Nazanin) Well... Iranian clothes aren’t really fashionable to tell you the truth. In Iran we’re not allowed to wear tight stuff or to show your arms, and you have to cover your head. But the traditional clothes are beautiful, but it’s so annoying you always have to wear a headscarf, I hate that rule.

(Interviewer) *Which do you prefer Iranian or British clothing/style?*

(Nazanin) British

(Interviewer) *What does your mum wear?*

(Nazanin) She likes wearing simple clothes. She wears English clothes and doesn’t cover her head, she’s quite westernised.

(Interviewer) *What do you wear if family members come to visit like aunts and uncles or grandparents?*

(Nazanin) Traditional because that is the tradition and what you have to wear (lines 212-221)
In the next quote, the child describes not liking ethnic clothes and preferring British clothing, and describes the pressure to wear ethnic clothing when he gets older. His parents appear to have adopted an bicultural integration strategy but Tahmid opts for assimilation in this domain:

(Interviewer) *Do you like British clothes?*
(Tarmid) Yeah.
(Interviewer) *Why?*
(Tarmid) If I have to wear Bangladeshi, I have to wear a kinder skirt type of thing. When you are older you have to wear a longi. A longi is something like a long towel and you put it round you.
(Interviewer) *What about Bangladeshi clothes, do you like to wear them?*
(Tarmid) No, British clothes fit me more and I can walk better (lines 366-373)

........

(Interviewer) *What do your parents wear?*
(Tarmid) My mum wears a sari and skirts, sometimes jeans if she wants to.
(Interviewer) *What does your Dad wear?*
(Tarmid) When he gets home he wears his longi and when he goes out he wears jeans (lines 378-381)

Overall, these minority children preferred to wear British style clothes, and this preference appeared to be constant across contexts, suggesting the influence of the dominant culture. Therefore cultural practices once again appeared to be specific to the domain under consideration (Coleman et al., 2001). The fact that these children wore more British style clothes also suggests a dissociation between ethnic identification and ethnic practices for those children who were felt their ethnic identity was most important to them (Hutnik, 1991). However, there were some children who dressed in a more traditional manner when they were at home, when they went to see relatives and/or for special occasions (i.e., in familial or ethnic community contexts). Therefore, parental influence can once again be seen, especially in these contexts (Knight et al., 1993). So for the domain of clothing, the children mainly appeared to opt for bicultural integration or alternation acculturation strategies overall but in the home context separation or integration strategies were evident, while in the public context assimilation was expressed.
3.3.3.4 Sport

This subcategory describes children's support for nations in sport, and shows how the context of sport can play a role in terms of attachment to a nation and national pride, and can be a key part of ethnic or national identification.

When children were asked which country they supported in football, just under half (44%) said they would support England, a little less (31%) supported both teams, and a quarter (25%) said they would support their country of ethnic origin in football. Not many children watched cricket, so only 3 children supported their country of ethnic origin, 1 child supported England and 2 children supported both countries.

Later, children were asked which team they would support if England and their ethnic country played each other in either a cricket or football match. This question was based on Norman Tebbit's 'cricket test'. Tebbit (1990) proposed that this test would assess the acceptability of immigrants as British citizens. The 'true Brit', according to Tebbit, would always support the British side as opposed to their country of ethnic origin. Therefore, answers demonstrate whether they show loyalty and identification towards a particular nation. The findings with these minority children were varied, with about half (53%) supporting their ethnic country over England, a few (13%) supporting England over their ethnic country, and a quarter (25%) supporting both countries; the remainder wanted a draw or were not bothered which country won.

(Interviewer) What country do you support in football?
(Jamilla) Not sure. I think Morocco has a team but they don't always play.
(Interviewer) So if Morocco were playing England who would you support?
(Jamilla) Morocco (lines 209-214)

This child therefore appears to show strong Moroccan allegiance and ethnic identification.

(Interviewer) Which country do you support in football?
(James) England
James shows his support for England, but adds that he supports England because China is not good at football. Perhaps if he believed China was as good as England, his answer might have been different.

This child supported both England and Tunisia but could not choose one so wanted them both to win, suggesting dual allegiance to both countries.

One child, however, wanted a draw:

This child did not wish to pick one nation over another. This perhaps suggests an allegiance to both nations and a feeling that she belonged to both nations and perhaps a lack of conflict between the two identities (ethnic and English).

In the following extract, the family context seemed to be a strong influence in affirming their loyalty or support to their country of ethnic origin.

(Tahmid) Well it was kind of a tough decision because this country I was in was battling the country my mum and dad were in. Bangladesh won
(Tahmid) England

(Interviewer) Why the change?

(Tahmid) Because I supported Bangladesh last time (lines 397-409)

This child hints that he was a little ‘torn’ between who to support, but his way of dealing with this was to alternate support for each country when they come head to head.

(Interviewer) Which country do you support in cricket or football?

(Aisha) Pakistani in cricket and in football England.

(Interviewer) So if Pakistani were playing England in a football match who would you support?

(Aisha) Pakistani (lines 243-247)

This child interestingly states she supports England in football, but if Pakistan played football she would support Pakistan in football instead. Also, in the context of cricket she would support Pakistan, but in football, England. So the different sporting contexts of football and cricket can also bring out identification changes, or changes in allegiance, in children.

(Interviewer) Which country do you support in football?

(Aryan) England, Iran.

(Interviewer) So if Iran were playing England who would you support?

(Aryan) Iran (lines 190-195)

This child states that he supports both countries in football but if they played against each other he would support Iran, suggesting a stronger ethnic identification compared to English identification.

On the whole, children were able to report which country or countries they would support in sport with relative ease, which suggest a lack of conflict between their cross-cutting identities. They did not appear to be ‘torn’ between two cultures and were happy to support one or both countries. The majority of children supported their country of ethnic origin over England, and this corresponded with some of these children having strong ethnic identifications. Within the domain of sport, different sports/sporting contexts also appeared to influence which country they supported.
(i.e., in cricket or football). So once again the domain-specificity of children’s cultural practices and identifications can be seen, as well as their variability.

3.3.3.5 Religion

This subcategory relates to children’s religious beliefs and practices. Many children spoke about religious practices and beliefs such as praying, visiting places of worship and holy days even before being explicitly asked about them. As was noted earlier, religious identity appeared to be one of the most central, salient and important social identities for many of these children, regardless of context. Religious practices, as we shall see, seemed to be embedded in language, food, dress and parental teachings and modelling.

The majority (68%) of children engaged in religious practices such as praying or visiting the mosque/temple/church and this seemed to reflect their strength of religious identification.

(Interviewer) Do you pray?

(Mustafa) 5 times a day (line 217)

(Aisha) Yes, when we go to the mosque, but not that much at home. We go to the mosque every Friday (lines 254-255)

(Farhana) Yes every night. I pray like my mum, to keep the world safe. When the bomb happened, we pray to keep everyone safe (lines 195-196)

Parental influences appeared to be very influential this domain:

(Interviewer) Do your parents talk about religion with you?

(Bashir) Yes, when I was young they said a lot to me to teach me about it. What things I had to do and not do and tell me stories (line 192)

(Jamilla) Yeah, basically that you have to do what God says and stuff like that, that you should always read the Koran and know what happened in the past. Mum does a lot with me. Every weekend
(lines 234-236)

(Mustafa) They say don’t eat stuff that you can’t have like bacon (line 231)

(Farhana) They tell us the right thing to do. We have to wash our bodies before we pray (lines 204-206)

(Aisha) Yes, on and off. They talk about me growing up and how I should behave now I’m older. I should cover more of my body and they know I wouldn’t do anything silly, with boys or anything, but they have reminded me (lines 277-279)

The next child’s religious identity was the weakest of the sample, and this appeared to be related to parental teachings and lack of religious practices:

(Interviewer) What religion are you?
(Aryan) Nothing really. Mum and dad would say we’re Muslims but don’t practice.
(Interviewer) Do you pray?
(Aryan) No
(Interviewer) Do you ever go to the Mosque?
(Aryan) No
(Interviewer) Would you say religion was important to you?
(Aryan) Yeah. It’s not particularly important but it’s good to have one
(Interviewer) Is religion important to your family?
(Aryan) It’s not particularly important but they have the respect.
(Interviewer) Do your parents talk about religion with you?
(Aryan) They talk about when the Arabs attacked Iran and made the Muslims (lines 200-211)

Many (68%) children who were not of the Christian faith also appeared to ‘celebrate’ Christmas. This perhaps suggests the role that British/Christian culture had on these minority group children and the bicultural integration strategy or cultural adaptation some children and parents have opted for.

(Interviewer) Do you celebrate Christmas?

(Aryan) We celebrate Christmas. We have a tree, meal, presents (line 207)

(Seena) Yes, we get presents. On Christmas day we eat Turkey, we open crackers, we have an English Christmas. We have a tree (lines 205-206)
(Farhana) We get food; we don't pray we just celebrate for happiness. We draw a little Christmas tree. We do get presents; my grandpa gave me some earrings with Christmas trees on them (lines 192-193)

Some children were not happy with the word ‘celebrate’. They stated that they did not celebrate it as it was not their religion, but they did have Christmas decorations or a special meal or were given presents. For instance:

(Interviewer) Do you do anything for Christmas?
(Aisha) Yes we go over to friends houses but we don’t celebrate it ourselves.
(Interviewer) Do you have a Christmas tree or decorations?
(Aisha) We do, just for fun.
(Interviewer) Do you exchange presents?
(Aisha) Not really. If we go to other people’s houses sometimes we do. We usually do that on Eid (lines 253-265)

(Interviewer) What do you do at Christmas?
(Alana) I don’t celebrate Christmas (line 374)
(Interviewer) Do you send Christmas cards?
(Alana) Yes, sometimes with my friends (line 382)

(Interviewer) Do you celebrate Christmas?
(Jad) No. We set up a tree and have presents and stuff like that. Basically we do something for Christmas (lines 214-215)

The few children who didn’t do anything for Christmas described it as any other day:

(Jamilia) It’s just a normal day; we don’t celebrate it all (line 225)

In summary, religious practices appeared to be related to ethnic and religious identity but also to British culture, but alternative explanations such as simple preferences or family pressures may have played a role here too. The majority of children practised their religion, but also engaged in Christian religious practices, showing an integration of two cultures or cultural adaptation. Some children, however, did not ‘celebrate’ or do anything for Christmas and displayed a separation strategy in this domain. For those who did do something for Christmas, integration was favoured.
3.3.3.6 Overview of Cultural Practices

The overall picture that emerges is that children's cultural practices are multiple, multicultural, varied and domain- (i.e., music, food, dress, etc.) and context- (i.e., private sphere, public sphere) specific. Similarly, the acculturation strategies which they adopted were domain and context-specific. In the domain of religious practices, the children adopted integration and separation acculturation strategies, while in the domains of music, food and dress they adopted assimilation and/or separation and/or integration, or alternation strategies (Berry, 1997; Coleman et al., 2001). In line with previous research, these children tended to opt for cultural maintenance in private contexts more than in public contexts (Phalet et al., 2000; Taylor & Lambert, 1996). Therefore, not only are cultural practices domain-specific, they are also context-dependent, as Coleman et al., suggests.

In addition, parental practices appear to affect not only children's ethnic identity and acculturation strategies but also their cultural practices, consistent with the findings of Knight et al. (1993) and Farver, Narang and Bhadha (2002). In the present study, the links between parental practices (as reported by the children) and children's self-reported practices were similar to those found in the study by Farver et al. with US-born Asian youth. In addition, Knight et al.'s research found that Mexican children's ethnic identity was related to the children's family background, including their parents' acculturation and language use, and to what parents taught their children about their ethnic culture. Similar findings were also obtained in the present study.

Therefore, these findings reveal the context- and domain-dependent nature of the children's cultural practices, and the multiple acculturation strategies which these children were able to use in different contexts and domains. A relationship between children's patterns of ethnic identification and some of their ethnic cultural practices was also apparent, and this relationship appeared to be related to parental influences, religious practices, language and the familial context (although another explanation is that the children simply preferred these practices, which therefore had no real connection with their identifications). At the same time, however, there was also a dissociation between ethnic identification and ethnic cultural practices in the
domains of dress and music.

Overall, these findings are similar to those obtained by Ghuman (1997) in his qualitative research with primary school children. He found that Asian ethnic minority children were similar to their white counterparts in terms of TV viewing, but these children also listened to Asian radio stations illustrating an interest in their cultural heritage. The meals they ate at home were also a mixture of Asian and western food styles. These children were also conscious about religion and were bilingual at the spoken level although not fluent in reading or writing. Interestingly, despite saying their identity was British, their feelings were ambivalent. From the children’s responses it was clear that in their leisure time activities, foods practices and school life, they were straddling across two cultures without problems or conflict (Ghuman, 1997).

3.3.4 Living in a Multicultural Environment

This category refers to the children’s awareness of the multicultural nature and setting of the city of London and of the school which the children were attending where opportunities for multi-group contact/relations were high. Racism, knowledge, celebrating diversity, school spirit and friendships were the subcategories that emerged from the analysis, and each of these will be discussed in turn.

3.3.4.1 Racism

The subcategory of racism covered the children’s experiences of racism. When the children were asked if they had ever experienced racism, the majority (24/32 or 75%) of children reported that they themselves had not experienced any form of racism either in school or out of school:

(Interviewer) Have you ever experienced racism?

(Ahmed) No (line 189)

(Tarin) No but I got taught about it in our class (line 225)
(Farhana) Not to me, but I have seen racism. People cussing countries (line 220)

(Tarmid) No, they help me (line 483)

The fact that the majority of the children reported that they had not experienced racism is a positive sign and reflects well on the school ethos and the environment they lived in.

In the next two examples, even though these two children had not personally experienced racism, they told stories about what happened to their parents, showing their awareness of racism:

(James) No, but my dad has. He went to this market to buy oranges and man said a bad word to my dad (line 201)

(Alana) It happened to them. My mum and dad and then this man started screaming at my mum and started swearing at them. I forgot the word but you don’t belong here go back to where you came from, because my mum wears a scarf (line 430)

On the whole, the children appeared to be knowledgeable about the concept of racism, and were able to define it or describe a situation illustrating it, and this seemed largely due to school and parental teachings. The few children who were unable to describe what racism was (but had vaguely heard of the concept) were amongst the youngest children (aged 7 and 8). These children had received none to very little instruction from parents, and perhaps had not covered this topic at school yet (or were absent when it was covered).

A quarter of the sample of children (25%), however, did report unpleasant incidents involving racism in and outside school.

(Dill) Yeah in the classroom. We were studying India and these two boys asked me how many gods I had and I said more than 18, and they laughed at me (lines 281-282)

(Mariam) Not really, once a girl in year 4 when I was 9 called me a Paki and I told the teacher and she got in really big trouble. She was a bit silly and annoying (line 192)
(Aisha) Yes. There was one thing that happened in school. I couldn’t play a skipping game because I wasn’t white. I was in year 3 (lines 295-296)

(Jad) Yes. Outside school they were cussing me because I was Muslim (line 240)

(Jamilla) Yes, one time mum picked me up from school and there was a man who was shouting at my mum saying “go back to your country”. He was shouting at her not me. Something has happened to me. I was walking down the street with my friend the other day and these two men came up to us and started saying “oh my god why are you wearing that, take it off”. I ignored them and walked off. I told mum when I got home (lines 253-258)

These children had experienced discrimination in the forms of name calling, verbal abuse, exclusion and teasing. These are the most common sorts of discrimination in childhood (Brown & Bigler, 2005). Despite these instances, these children were, in general, upbeat about cultural diversity and their school, as we shall see.

In summary, the majority of children did not report any instances of racism in which they themselves had been involved. It could be suggested that the school ethos and curriculum towards eradicating racism, as well as the multi-ethnic nature of the school, may have played a role in creating a safe and diverse environment in which the children could be themselves and proud of who they were and of their families’ countries of origin. Therefore, on the whole, there appeared to be no negative threat to their ethnic or religious identities but mainly acceptance from the host group and other ethnic minorities. It is noteworthy that Allport’s (1954) conditions under which inter-group contact is most favorable for inter-group prejudice reduction were met by the school setting: the school had a policy of equal status between all children, common school goals supportive of multiculturalism, a common ingroup school identity, and the school also encouraged inter-group cooperation on tasks such as sports and group projects.

3.3.4.2 Knowledge

This sub-theme refers to the diversity of knowledge that existed within this sample of children, including the variability and plurality of knowledge regarding religions,
geography, countries, ethnicities, nationalities, continents, cultures and languages. The range of such knowledge was impressive for children of this age range.

(Interviewer) *What other groups of children are there in the class?*

(Aryan) Arabic, Bangladeshi, Kurdish, one Chinese and one Turkish (line 87)

(Jamilla) Egyptian, Jordanian, Lebanese, German, Nigerian, Bosnia, Jewish people and I think that’s it (line 85)

(Nishat) Buddhists, Chinese, Japanese, Saudi Arabia, the triplets are from Egypt, Leila is from Africa, I think (line 78-79)

(Mustafa) There are African people, Asian people. That’s it (line 83)

Not only were the children able to identify the different groups that were represented within their class, they were also able to identify correctly the English children as well as the children who were of the same ethnicity as themselves:

(Interviewer) *Are there a lot of English children in your class?*

(Seena) To be honest, no, I can think of about two or three. Abraham, Harry, Chester (line 79)

(Interviewer) *What about Iranian children, any others in your class?*

(Seena) Just me and Zinat (lines 86-87)

(Interviewer) *Are there a lot of English children in your class?*

(James) No, lots of cultures. There are some English children like Jordan, Lauren, Eleanor, Ella (lines 89-90)

In sum, the data revealed the awareness that these children had of these concepts and their repertoire of knowledge. The diversity of cultures present in the school, as well as the school philosophy supporting multiculturalism, are likely to have had an impact on these children. In addition, contact research has found a relationship between contact with outgroup members and levels of liking of those outgroups (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). The high levels of such exposure within the sample of children in this study may well be the reason why not many of the children had experienced much racism within the school.
3.3.4.3 Celebrating Diversity

This subcategory describes the children’s positive feelings about multiculturalism. When the children were asked ‘How do you feel about people from different parts of the world all living together in Britain?’, all of them responded very positively, with some sophisticated answers:

(Bashir) I think it is a great thing because Britain would not be the place it is without all these different things; there would not be all these kebab shops, Chinese takeaways, Indians. It has changed the landscape with loads of Hindu mosques and synagogues and worshiping shrines (line 210)

(Tarin) I think it’s nice to have so many people from different countries in Britain. Our aim in this school is to have as many cultures as we can (lines 230-231)

(Jad) It’s nice, a mixed culture. Like, it’s free of racism because English people can communicate with other people and they are really good friends and stuff (lines 248-249)

(Farhana) I feel good because we are sharing this country all together. Britain is for sharing the country. Sharing everything (lines 226-227)

(Alana) Well I think it’s a good thing. It’s good to know people from all round the world. It’s a really good community and very good because you can all be friends and learn about their culture (line 434)

(Jamilla) I feel fine. Its ok, it’s good. It’s nice to see different people from different cultures play, listen to what they do, learn different things (lines 263-264)

These quotes suggest that the children understood the concept of cultural diversity and the multicultural philosophy of the school.

In sum, the children saw cultural diversity as a good thing and all of them appeared to support the notion of multiculturalism. Their positive outlook was probably due to the sheer diversity of cultures in the school offering ample opportunities for multi-group contact as well as the school ethos of tolerance and equality.
3.3.4.4 School Spirit

This subcategory explains children's thoughts and feeling towards their school’s ethos. When the children were asked to describe their school, the people and how they felt about their school, all children responded positively and on the whole described an environment where people were “all together and all get on ok” (Bashir, line 72). There appeared to be a good community spirit within this school, where school ethos and philosophy regarding celebrating diversity appeared to have been internalised by the children:

(Interviewer) How would you describe the school?

(Aryan) Good, safe, fun, big, multicultural, that means there are lots of different mixtures of culture. Culture is a bit like someone's background (line 79-80)

(Seena) Out of all the schools I’ve seen it seems the biggest school in London and one of the best (line 71-72)

(Interviewer) Do you think all these different groups of children get on well with each other?

(Aryan) Yes. Because we all have similar personalities (line 90)

(Jamilla) Yes. I’m not sure why, we all get along with each other it doesn’t matter where you’re from (line 98)

To summarise, the multi-ethnic nature of the school as well as the school’s encouragement of cultural diversity appeared to have influenced the children’s discourse and attitudes toward the school. On the whole, there appeared to be no negative threats within the school to these children’s social identities.
3.3.4.5 Friendships

The children’s circles of friends were also found to be multi-cultural and context-dependent. This subcategory illustrates the children’s variety of friends. When children were asked “who are your friends?” virtually all children reported that they had a broad mixture of friends and did not select their friends in terms of ethnicity, nationality, race or religion (although there appeared to be a gender bias). Instead, friendships were based on personalities and shared interests:

(Interviewer) *Who are your friends?*
(Bashir) I have quite a lot of friends. Amil and Walt because we all like science (line 74)
(Interviewer) *Do you have any Tunisian friends?*
(Bashir) One other boy from Tunisia in the school called Ziad. My mum knows his mum but we are not close friends. Not really any other Arabic friends (line 76)

(Interviewer) *Who are your friends?*
(Tahmid) Seena, Sina, Steven, Jonathan, Ava, Chester, Ahmed, Ahmed, Harry, Mason, Omar. That’s it. I’ve got 11
(Interviewer) *So are you friends with any Bangladeshi kids?*
(Tahmid) Yes
(Interviewer) *Do you have any English friends?*
(Tahmid) yeah Steven (lines 190-198)

(Interviewer) *Who are your friends?*
(Jamilla) Adewale, Aisha, Hannah, Edie, Alana, Daniel, Courtney (line 92)

From the above extracts, we can see that the children had multiple and diverse friends including friends from their own ethnic culture, English/white friends, as well as friends from other minority ethnic groups. Having these outgroup friends may have helped the children to understand that not all individuals of a group are the same (i.e., that there is variability within groups) and that individuals from different groups may share similarities despite being from different groups. Indeed, ethnicity was not important to these children when choosing friends; more important was who they were as people and their shared interests:

(Interviewer) *What do you have in common with your friends?*
(Ahmed) We like to play ball games. Nothing really hectic, for example every other week on the pitch. We all like the same things, for example we all do not like football, things like that (line 80)

(Bashir) Science, personality (line 88)

(Farhana) They're kind and they like sharing, they ask what's wrong, are you ok, do you need anything, they solve problems (line 101)

However, three children did choose friends who were of the same ethnicity, language or religion as themselves. One child explained why:

(Mariam) I get along more with the children from Asia because I can share more things with them and they know about my country and I know about their country (line 56)

Most of the children spoke English with the other children at school, but if they met friends outside school they were more inclined to speak their ethnic language with them. Once again the relationship between context and language can be seen:

(Interviewer) What language do you talk to your friends in?

(Aisha) English, always English. With Mariam sometimes I speak a few words of Urdu (lines 109-110)

(Mustafa) English. Only Jared and Ahmed I speak Arabic, a little bit (line 108)

(Dill) English, with Faharna, when we talk about Bella, we talk in Hindi, because Bella doesn't have any other language, she just has English. Me and Farhana, coz she's from Bangladesh we can understand Hindi so we can understand each other (lines 129-131)

(Alana) In school, English. Outside of school, Arabic (line 212)

These contextual influences can also be seen within the school context, when the children were with people of the same ethnicity as themselves, they sometimes spoke their minority language with them instead of English. And a few children who attended language or faith schools in the evenings or weekends (e.g., a Chinese or Muslim school) reported that they would mostly speak in their ethnic language in this
context. Again, language use appeared to have a relationship with certain social identities, contexts and groups of people/friendships:

(Interviewer) So your friends in school what language do you speak to them in?
(Misake) In this school it's English (line 179)
(Interviewer) And the friends in Japanese school?
(Misake) Erm, just Japanese (line 181)

In summary, due to the levels of multi-ethnic contact and relations which were possible in this school, most of the children had diverse friendships but choose their friends based on personal and individual traits and qualities rather than on their ethnic group memberships. Friendships were also linked to language and context.

3.3.4.6 Overview of Living in a Multicultural Environment

To summarise, this core category highlights the importance of living in a multicultural context and attending a culturally diverse school where opportunities for multi-group contact and relations are high. These factors appeared to have influenced not only the children’s experiences and outlooks on racism, but also the range of their knowledge, their acceptance of cultural diversity and their multi-group friendships. Interestingly, these minority children focused on shared interests rather than race or ethnicity when choosing their friends. This is in line with the findings of McGlothlin et al. (2005) and Margie et al. (2005) who also found that both majority and minority children focused on shared interests rather than race when making judgements about whether cross-race pairs could be friends.

3.4 Discussion

The present study set out to look at children’s social identifications and cultural practices. The analysis revealed that these children had multiple social identities, with religious, ethnic and British identifications being the most important. However, their self-categorisations appeared to be context-dependent, with context influencing the salience of these different identities. Furthermore, there did not appear to be any conflict amongst these different identities, and the children were able to move from
one context to another smoothly. Ethnic and religious identities and languages were more salient in parental/familial contexts, while British and English identity and language were more salient in public spheres such as the school. In other words, there was a divide between public and private spheres. It must be noted, however, that religious identity was, for some Muslim children, highly salient across all contexts.

Cultural practices were also multiple, diverse and domain-specific, and there was once again a split between public and private contexts. There was also, at times, a relationship between the children’s strength of ethnic or British identity and the children’s choice of acculturation strategy or preferences for cultural practices, but there was also a dissociation in the relationship between identification and practices in other domains, illustrating the variability in this relationship due to context, language, domain, levels of identification and parental practices. On the whole, it could be suggested that these minority children appeared to favour integration or alternation strategies but these strategies were also context- and domain-specific. That is, acculturation strategies varied from one domain to another (e.g., from food to music to clothing) and also from private to public contexts. In private contexts, the children appeared to favour separation or integration strategies, while in public contexts they appeared to favour assimilation or integration strategies. The multicultural context of London and the school children attended also appeared to have influenced the children’s cultural practices, identities, friendships and experiences of racism. The children did not appear to be threatened in any way in terms of their social identities. Instead, they felt accepted and proud of who they were and of their cultural backgrounds.

In short, the present study produced four main findings relating to the original four research questions which motivated this study. The first of these research questions was: *Do ethnic minority children hold multiple social identifications and, if so, what are the groups with which they identify?* It was found that religious identity was the most important identity to these minority children, and this may have been due to the majority of the sample being Muslim. Religious identity was also the only category that some of the children (including non-Muslims) used spontaneously to self-
describe themselves, which emphasises the importance of religious identification for some of these children. However, ethnic and British identities were also important to most of the children, especially ethnic identities. Interestingly, however, identities such as Londoner and European were also important to these children, but not as much as their ethnic or national/state identities. The children’s London identity may have been heightened due to the London terrorist bombings and the announcement that London would host city the 2012 Olympics, both of which took place during data-collection. In line with Akiba et al. (2004), these children had multiple identifications and superordinate ethnic identities were also important to some of these children. Importantly, all of these multiple identities did not clash in any way for these children, who did not report any conflicts or express any sense of being ‘caught’ between memberships or cultures.

These children’s multiple identities may be a by-product of living in a multi-ethnic setting where multi-group salience and opportunities for contact are high, but where there are nevertheless common identities which are shared by all of the children, such being Londoners and being members of the same school. This kind of multi-ethnic setting provides a rich context for children to acquire multi-group memberships, including cultural heritage memberships (ethnic, religious and superordinate ethnic identities), dominant host society memberships (British and English), local memberships (London) and other superordinate or global memberships (such as European).

The present study’s findings are also similar to Hutnik’s (1986, 1991) findings which were obtained with British-Indian adolescents. She also found that identifications amongst this group were much more complex than has traditionally been assumed, with individuals simultaneously identifying with a range of social categories, including their ethnic origins, their race, their religion, and Britishness. She argues the case for hyphenated identities for this group (e.g., British-Muslim). The findings of the present study concerning the presence of multiple self-categorisations in minority children are consistent with the findings which Hutnik obtained with older teenagers.
Recently, researchers of inter-group processes have increasingly acknowledged the importance of multiple identities and group memberships (e.g., Cinnirella, 1996; Crisp & Hewstone, 2000; Deaux, 1996; Stryker & Statham, 1985; Tajfel, 1978), but there has been relatively little previous research on the nature of multiple identities in children. The present study has clearly shown that not only adults but also children hold multiple identities which can be very important to them.

The second research question was: Are minority children’s social identifications invariant across different contexts, or does the relative salience of particular identities vary across contexts? The study examined whether children’s social identifications are constant and stable across different contexts, or whether their salience fluctuates according to context. What emerged from the data was the context-dependent nature of these children’s social identifications, with ethnic and religious identifications being primary in the home context (the private sphere) and British and English identification being primary in the school (public) sphere.

The context-specificity of social identifications is emphasised by Turner et al.’s (1987) SCT in which social identities are presumed to be context-dependent. SCT contends that the self-concept is highly flexible and changes as a function of situational cues that activate different social identities. However, interestingly and contrary to the predictions of SCT, the intragroup context of the home provided the children in the present study with a greater rather than a lesser sense of ethnic identity. The meta-contrast principle of SCT predicts that ethnic identity will not be salient in the home as there are no out-group members present in the home. It also predicts that outside the home, when individuals are in the company of out-group members, ethnic identity should become more salient. This was not the case for these children: in the school, their British identity became more salient, rather than their ethnic identity. An additional finding which is problematic for SCT to explain is the finding that, for some Muslim children, their religious identity remained the most important in most situations and did not show contextual variability.

The present finding does however offer support for Roccas and Brewer’s (2002) social identity complexity perspective. One multiple identity structure they propose
appears to fit with the result obtained in the present study: compartmentalisation is said to occur when more than one group identity is important to a person and multiple identities are activated and expressed through a process of differentiation and isolation. With compartmentalisation, social identities are context or situation specific. In other words, in specific contexts, one group membership becomes the most important social identity, while other group identities become important in other contexts. In the school, for instance, these ethnic minority children’s English or British identity became primary and ethnicity was less relevant and not activated in this setting unless children came into contact with friends of the same ethnicity. In the home, however, religious affiliation or ethnic group membership were most important due to parental and family practices. So in line with this form of identity structure, multiple non-convergent identities are maintained, but not activated at the same time. The present study provides support for this conceptualisation, with these children’s multiple identities being fluid, flexible and context-dependent.

The third research question was: Are minority children’s cultural practices invariant across different contexts, or do their cultural practices vary across contexts? The study examined the cultural practices of the children to see if these practices were context-specific. It emerged that these ethnic minority children not only engaged in a multiplicity of cultural practices, but that these practices were both domain-specific and context-specific. For instance, a single child might watch ethnic films, but listen to American rap music, eat Chinese food, and wear an English football shirt. In other words, different ethnic, global or English/British cultural practices might be adopted depending upon the specific domain (e.g., film, music, food, clothing, etc.) involved. In addition, the children often adopted different cultural practices in the home and at school, revealing that these practices were also context-dependent.

In line with Berry’s (1997, 2001) finding that integration is the most popular strategy, the children in the present study also appeared to favour integration overall. However, acculturation processes and cultural practices were also context- and domain-specific which is not accounted for by Berry’s theory. Instead, the present findings are more in line with the alternation strategy described by Coleman et al., (2001), who argues that people are able to alternate between cultural maintenance
and cultural adaptation according to the specific situation. In the present study, in the private (home, familial) contexts, the children appeared to favour separation or integration strategies (depending on the domain concerned), while in public contexts (such as the school) they appeared to favour assimilation or integration strategies (depending on the domain).

The fourth research question was: What is the relationship between minority children’s social identifications and their cultural practices? It was found that there was a great deal of variability in this relationship: some children showed a relationship between their ethnic identification and their ethnic cultural practices (or British identification and British cultural practices), others showed a dissociation between ethnic identification and ethnic cultural practices, while others simultaneously showed both a relationship as well as a dissociation depending on the identification, the domain and the context. This relationship was influenced by language, the importance of the child’s group membership, the context (home, school, friends), parental practices and the specific domain of cultural practice which was involved. These findings are in line with Hutnik’s (1991) work which found some relationships but also dissociations between identification and practices in her sample of British-Indian adolescents. However, it must be noted that these associations or dissociations between identification and practices may simply reflect affective preferences by children (i.e., liking curry may not always correspond with a positive orientation to an Asian identification).

Interestingly, language played a central role in nearly every aspect of the children’s lives, and appeared to be related to their strength of national, ethnic, religious and superordinate ethnic identifications, as well as their cultural practices and friendships. This in turn was related to specific contexts such as the home and family, school or friends. Language and context were clearly related, with children being readily able to switch language depending on the context. As a result, language appeared to have links and relationships with all the core categories and many subcategories. Thus, the variability in relationship between identifications and cultural practices could well be related to the use of ethnic, religious and English language. Language seemed to act like a bond between children’s ethnicity, strength of ethnic
identification, ethnic practices and preferences (the same can be said for national identity and national practices). If a child cannot communicate or understand their ethnic language, they are less inclined to enjoy and embrace ethnic culture (i.e. music and films) and, therefore, less likely to practice or prefer it. At the same time, the English language can help to strengthen their English and British identifications, as this is the language spoken not only in school but in most of contexts outside the home and is salient in host and global music, TV, film and other mass media.

Once again, the present findings are consistent with the work of Ghuman (2003), who also found that most young ethnic minority adolescents are bilingual at a spoken level and the vast majority of them speak English with their peers and siblings, but many switch to their ethnic language when speaking to their parents and grandparents. He also found that minority adolescents attach great importance to their ethnic language in terms of meaning and having a sense of belonging. The findings of the present study echo Ghuman’s findings, with most of these younger children in the present study being bilingual at the spoken level (ethnic language and English language) and capable of switching language use from parental to peer situations.

3.5 Limitations of the Present Study

It should be acknowledged here that there are several limitations of the present study. The heterogeneity and diversity of the sample is perhaps the most notable limitation. While there were differences between the subgroups in terms of religion and ethnicity, there were also differences evident within each of these groups in terms of cultural practices and language. Although the majority of the children were Muslim, their families had come from a variety of countries. Thus, due to the ethnic diversity of the school, reflected in the presented sample, there were perhaps too many ethnic groups included in the study, which prevents clear conclusions being drawn about any one ethnic group. In the main quantitative study which is reported later on in this thesis, only three ethnic groups (i.e., white English, Indian and Pakistani children) were sampled in order to enable much larger numbers of participants within each of these groups to be recruited and tested.
In addition, the present study did not include a white English group of children, and it was therefore unknown whether the identifications and practices of majority group children would show the same patterns as those of the minority group children who were questioned in the present study. For this reason, a second qualitative study was conducted with white English children prior to running the main quantitative study, to ascertain the extent to which these children show similar or different patterns of acculturation to the minority children in the present study.

A modified grounded approach to analysis was used in the present study, and there are limitations to this method. Firstly, the researcher had conducted literature reviews on some but not all of the relevant areas prior to the research being carried out, which may have influenced the categories which emerged from the analysis. Although every effort was made to ensure that the emerging categories were developed from the data, this cannot be entirely ensured due to the possible influence of the researcher’s pre-existing knowledge. Secondly, a modified grounded approach to analysis is more of a thematic analysis of data rather than a method of theory generation. This modified approach produces a system of categories and associations regarding the issues under investigation rather than a theory of children’s identifications and cultural practices. Thirdly, a modified grounded approach to analysis is subject to the premature closure of categories as categories may have been refined, developed and even extended if a full grounded theory methodology (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) had been possible with further data collection (although the present study did try to obtain a diversity of perspectives to limit this problem as much as possible).

In addition, the fairly small sample size and the specific context (with all of the children being drawn from one school) limit the generalisability of findings to similar aged children in other contexts. The particular time in which the interviews were conducted also turned out to be problematic, with the terrorist bombings in London and the announcement that London would host the 2012 Olympic Games occurring during the course of the interviews. Furthermore, the interview schedule asked specific questions with regard to these children’s ethnic minority and British
majority (as well as global American) cultural practices and preferences. However, in addition to these cultures, explicitly examining the children's adoption of other ethnic minority cultural practices (which would be present in a multi-ethnic context like London) would been useful and would perhaps have produced further insights into their acculturation patterns. Finally, the fact that the present author and interviewer was a British Asian female may have had an influence on the views which these children were willing to express in the interviews. Also there is the possibility that the interviewer may have brought her own cultural positioning to the research.

With all of this said, however, the present study has served to clarify a number of important issues concerning 7- to 11-year-old ethnic minority children's identifications and cultural practices. In the next chapter, attention is turned instead to the identifications and cultural practices of white English children.
Chapter 4: Study 2 – British English Majority Children’s Social Identifications and Cultural Practices

4.1 Aims

The literature review in Chapter 2 highlighted the fact that acculturation research has focused mainly on members of ethnic minority groups rather than on members of the host majority group. However, many majority individuals do not live within bicultural societies, as the acculturation literature has assumed (Berry, 1997). In many locations (such as London, where the data for the present study were collected), they live within multicultural societies in which many different ethnic groups reside alongside one another. Therefore, it should not be assumed that acculturation is only experienced by minority individuals; particularly within multicultural contexts, the majority group can also undergo significant change and adaptation in response to intercultural contact (Rudmin, 2003; Solomos & Back, 1995; Werbner & Modood, 1997).

Following the results of the first qualitative study (Chapter 3) looking at ethnic minority children’s social identifications and cultural practices, the present chapter reports a second qualitative study which examined English ethnic majority children’s acculturation in terms of identifications and cultural practices. The aim here was to examine how these children handle the demands of living with a range of minority cultures as well as their own majority culture, whether or not they identified with the majority culture, whether there were other social identifications which were also salient for these children, and whether they appropriated elements from other cultures in their everyday practices. The purpose here was to continue to build an initial picture of the children’s identifications and cultural practices in preparation for the quantitative study of both minority and majority children which was to follow.

This second study adopted the same qualitative methodology as the previous study in order to address the same four main research questions, but this time in relationship to majority rather than minority children:
1. Do English majority children hold multiple social identifications and, if so, what are the groups with which they identify?

2. Are English majority children's social identifications invariant across different contexts, or does the relative salience of particular identities vary across contexts?

3. Are English majority children's cultural practices invariant across different contexts, or do their cultural practices vary across contexts?

4. What is the relationship between English majority children's social identifications and their cultural practices?

The rationales for these research questions were similar to the ones stated in Chapter 3, Section 3.1 in relationship to study 1: to establish the nature of the multiple identifications which are held by majority children, to establish whether their identifications are context-specific, to establish whether their cultural practices are context-specific, and to examine the relationship between majority children's identifications and practices.

Once again, as this was a qualitative study, a small sample size was used and religious, gender and age group differences were not investigated here, with the intention of using study 3 instead to address these kinds of questions about differences between different subgroups of children.

Hence, in this second qualitative study, a relatively small number of children from the English ethnic majority group, aged 7 to 11, were interviewed individually in order to explore their different social identities, how they viewed these different identities, and the cultural practices which they adopted in different contexts and settings.

The present study was novel in the following respects: the participants were children rather than adolescents or adults, and they were members of the white English ethnic majority group rather than of ethnic minority groups. The focus of the study was on these children’s understanding and personal appropriation of the cultural practices of
the many different ethnic minority groups which it is possible to encounter in London at the present time.

4.2 Method

4.2.1 Location of the Present Study

The location for the present study was London (as in study 1).

4.2.2 Participants

The participants were recruited from seven schools in West London which were all co-educational multi-ethnic primary and junior schools. There was an active policy of multiculturalism within all of the schools, with information about different ethnic/cultural groups being displayed all over the schools and talked about during assemblies. The most common ethnic minorities in these schools were from Asian (Indian and Pakistani) backgrounds. 10 children from white English ethnic majority group backgrounds were interviewed individually for study 2. They consisted of 5 boys and 5 girls, aged 7 to 11 years old, and they were drawn from school year groups 3, 4, 5 and 6. This age range was chosen to capture the major developmental shifts in knowledge, identification, behaviours and attitudes which have been argued to take place between 7 and 11 years. Table 4.1 summarises the demographic constitution of the sample.
Table 4.1 Demographic Information for Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Year Group</th>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollie</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flora</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3 Materials

The materials consisted of a printed interview schedule, an assortment of A8 cards with various identity labels printed on them, a laptop and children’s stickers.

4.2.4 Procedure

Schools were recruited using the letter shown in Appendix D. A few days later, the letter was followed up with a phone call to the head teacher in which a face-to-face meeting was arranged to discuss the intended research. It was explained to the head teacher that a small number of white English children would be required for these qualitative interviews which would make up study 2, but that white English, Indian and Pakistani children would also be required in much larger numbers for study 3 which was being planned as a follow-up study to study 2. Seven head teachers granted their consent for the studies to take place in their school. Two weeks before the research began in each school, a letter outlining the study and seeking parental consent was sent to parents of all children in years 3 to 6 (see Appendix E). 10% of parents refused consent and so these children were not interviewed for either study 2 or study 3.
The interviews for study 2 were conducted in a quiet room on school premises. The children were approached in their classroom and agreed to take part in discussions regarding their ethnicity and cultural practices. The one-to-one interviews lasted between 40 and 60 minutes. In all interview discussions, participants were made aware of their ethical rights (i.e., informed consent, right to withdraw, confidentiality and anonymity), and that discussions would be digitally recorded onto a laptop using a recording software program Audacity. After each interview, the children were thanked for their participation, debriefed and presented with a small gift. Discussions were all conducted in English by the present author (who is of British Asian/Sri Lankan background). All interview discussions were transcribed verbatim for analysis by the present author, and participants' names were changed on transcripts to ensure confidentiality.

The semi-structured interview schedule (see Appendix B) was similar to that used in study 1. It began with demographic and background questions, followed by questions regarding the children's spontaneous self-categorizations, identifications, the possible context-dependency of their self-categorizations and identifications (particularly when with family, at school, and with friends), and their cultural practices based on other cultures (these questions were different from those in the schedule used in study 1), English culture and global culture (particularly in the domains of music, food, TV, movies, clothing, sport, role models and religion). The children's perceptions of multiculturalism, prejudice and racial discrimination were also examined. An identification card task was also administered after children had been asked to spontaneously categorise themselves. In this task, the children were given a set of cards with various possible identities written on them (such as English, British European, Londoner, Christian; see Appendix B for the full list). As in study 1, each child was asked to choose all the cards which could be used to describe themselves, while in the second part of this task, the child was asked to rank order all the cards which had been chosen in terms of their importance to the child.
4.2.5 Analytical Framework

As in study 1, the data were analysed using a modified grounded approach to analysis (Willig, 2001). To be consistent with the method used in study 1, in study 2 a modified grounded approach was also chosen, for the same reasons given in the previous chapter. The procedures which were used were exactly the same as the ones which were described in the previous chapter in relationship to study 1.

4.3 Results

The same four core categories emerged from the analysis of the data that also emerged in study 1. These central categories were: multiple identities, contextual influences on identity, cultural practices and living in a multicultural environment, will be described in turn.

4.3.1 Multiple Identities

The first core category reflected the variety of identities that were important to the white English children in this study, and included the subcategories of: Personal identity, English identity, British identity, Christian identity, London identity and European identity. These subcategories will be discussed in turn.

4.3.1.1 Personal Identity

This subcategory reveals children’s individual and personal spontaneous self-descriptions. For instance, when children were asked to spontaneously describe themselves, almost all (9/10 or 90%) of the children used personality and individual characteristics to describe themselves, like physical appearance, emotions, moods and behaviours.

(Interviewer) How would you describe yourself?

(Anna) I think that I’m quite funny and I make people laugh (line 2)
(Boyd) Like coz sometimes my hair goes blonde then like in other times it goes brown, so like blondish and brownish hair, hazel eyes, middle-ish, light skin (line 2)

(Hollie) I would describe myself as chatty and grumpy sometimes and sometimes annoying. Sometimes quiet. Short (line 2)

(Charlie) Sometimes I would describe myself as silly, sometimes I get scared. I’m a happy boy sometimes (line 2)

Interestingly, only two children spontaneously used their ethnicity/nationality (English) as a way of describing themselves, suggesting that this identity is not as important or salient for the rest of the children as their personal identity. Alternatively, it is possible that the demands of the open-ended questioning led the children to interpret the question as requiring only the production of personal identity terms.

(Rebecca) Kind, English, helpful…err…kind to other people…erm…I help my family at home and stuff and…erm I am a nice person (line 2)

(Jessica) I would describe myself as English and I’m from England (line 2)

In sum, the children spontaneously described themselves using mainly personal traits while a couple children used the English category. Hence, English identity is not as prominent as personal identification in their spontaneous self-descriptions.

4.3.1.2 English Identity

This subcategory expresses participants’ sense of Englishness and the salience or importance of white English children’s ethnicity. As just reported, most children did not spontaneously describe themselves using the category ‘English’. Therefore, participants were asked: Would you describe yourself as English or not? All the children agreed that they would describe themselves as English.

So even though most children did not initially describe themselves using the English category, they did acknowledge being English when directly asked about it. The
reasons given for describing themselves as English were: because they were born in 
England, they were from England, they know what it is to be English and what 
English people do, their parents are from England, they know only the English 
language and have only lived in England, it is their country and also their parents’ 
ethnicity. The following selection of quotations illustrates the above points.

(Interviewer) Would you describe yourself as English or not?

(Anna) Yes, because I was born in England (line 8)

(Jessica) Yes, because I’m from England (line 7)

(Charlie) Yes I can, yeah, because I know what English is all about, what English people do, what 
English people learn, I know all that kind of stuff (line 6)

(Flora) Mmm, yeah, I’m from England, my mum and dad are from here, there are a few people from 
Ireland but mainly from England is my family (line 6)

(Boyd) Yeah because there’s no other languages I know, I’ve never lived in a different country, I’ve 
just stayed in England all my life (line 15)

(Josh) Yes, it’s mostly my whole country and everything (line 4)

(Jake) yeah, erm I have lived here my whole life and my mum and dad are British (line 4)

So even though all children did declare that they would describe themselves as 
English, the reasons they gave for doing so were mixed. The latter quote by Jake 
also highlights that perhaps English and British may be the same thing for young 
children who do not yet understand the distinction between the two terms.

Later in the interview, the children were asked to choose as many descriptive labels 
as they wished from a set of cards which could be used to describe themselves, and 
to then rank order these cards in terms of their importance to themselves. All children 
picked the English card and some children (3/10 or 30%) chose this card as the most 
important card to them. Hence, English identity was an important identity for these 
children, but for the majority of them it was not their most important identity.
The reasons children gave for picking the English card were: they come from England, they can speak English, they lived in England their whole life, they are English, it was their country, it was important to be English and not mistaken as anything else, and the country was more important that the town (i.e. London). These factors thus appear to be related to these children’s strength of English identification, as the following quotes highlight:

(Hollie) English, because then I know that I come from England and I know that I’m not another language (line 18)

(George) I picked English because I speak English and...there’s nothing else to say (line 24)

(Anna) Because, um, I lived in England all my life (line 26)

(Charlie) English, because I am from England and I am English. It’s important to me because I don’t know what I’d do without being English (line 20)

(Josh) English, coz it’s my country and mostly erm it’s just my country (line 17)

(Boyd) Because some people mistake me like from another country. Some people mistake me from Spain once and I said no I’m English. So that’s important (line 33)

(Jake) English, because the country is more important than the town (line 16)

To summarise, even though most children did not spontaneously describe themselves in English category terms, when they were directly asked about their Englishness, all children were willing to self-categorise in terms of this category. This finding is in line with the findings of both Barrett (2007) and Lambert and Klineberg (1967). Furthermore, all children considered their English identification to be important to them, but their reasoning did vary. There was also some variability in their strength of English identification as some ranked being English higher than others and some felt it was their most important social identity. Carrington and Short (2000) also found that the criteria that British children use to describe themselves or other people as British are being born in Britain, living in Britain and speaking English. Hence,
the criteria which were used by the present sample of children were similar to those found by Carrington and Short.

4.3.1.3 British Identity

This subcategory was derived from the participants’ sense of Britishness. Once again, as children did not spontaneously self-describe using the term ‘British’, they were asked: *Would you describe yourself as British or not?* The majority of children (7/10 or 70%) agreed that they would describe themselves as British.

The reasons children gave for describing themselves as British were: their family was British, they were born in England, they knew lots about England, they parents were British and they were white skin colour.

(Flora) Yeah, basically because pretty much everyone in my family is British (line 4)

(Rebecca) Because I was born in England and I know lots of England and other people are British (line 8)

(Jake) Err probably yeah, erm, just because of my mum and dad (line 6)

(Jessica) Yes because...I'm a plain colour, a white colour (line 8)

Interestingly, in the last quote, one child refers to being ‘white’ as a characteristic of being British. White to this child is a plain colour, perhaps meaning unmarked or neutral or normative. Also a few of these children refer to being born in England and knowing lots about England as opposed to saying Britain, again suggesting that they perhaps used these terms interchangeably (Condor, 1996; Barrett, 2007).

For some children, their British identity did not appear to be as significant as their English identity and 30% of children rejected this label. The only reason given was that they did not know what ‘British’ was, and this lack of understanding of the term ‘British’ may be why they did not describe themselves as British.

(Charlie) No, because...I don’t know. Because I have no idea what British is (line 4)
When children were asked to pick as many descriptive labels as they liked from a set of cards and then to rank order them, most (7/10 or 70%) children picked the British card and a few of these children (3/10) chose the British card as the most important to them.

The reasons given for picking British were: England was in Britain, they were British, they lived in Britain, it was the same as English, and not everyone in their family was English.

(Anna) Probably British, because England is in Britain (line 28)

(George) Because I am British actually and I live in Britain (line 20)

(Hollie) It’s kind of the same as English (line 22)

(Jessica) British, because it’s important for some people to know (line 28)

(Jake) I’d say more British, coz I’m a quarter Irish and a quarter Welsh (line 14)

The last quote suggests that this child partly understood the concept of Britishness as a superordinate category subsuming other categories. However, for other children such as Hollie, the terms ‘English’ and ‘British’ were difficult to distinguish.

However, one child (Rebecca) agreed that she would describe herself as British when asked ‘Would you describe yourself as British or not?’ but did not pick the British card in the card task, and another child (Josh) did not want to describe himself as British but then picked the British card.

(Interviewer) Would you describe yourself as British or not?
(Rebecca) I would describe myself as British (line 6)

(Interviewer) Would you describe yourself as British or not?
(Josh) No (line 6)
Perhaps for these children being British was seen as a label only. This meant that it held little affective significance. For those who did feel that there was some importance to being British, it was related primarily to living in Britain.

In sum, there was more variability in the children's sense of Britishness (compared to Englishness). On the whole, the children appeared to want to describe themselves as British, with some children choosing their British identity as the most important identity, while some others rejected it. Interestingly, children who did not want to describe themselves as British had strong English and/or Christian identifications. Furthermore, some children did identify with being English but not British and some thought they were the same thing. The main reasons children gave for describing themselves as British were: their family was British, they were born in England, they knew lots about England, they were white skin colour, England was in Britain, they were British, they lived in Britain, it was the same as English and it was important for people to know. Similarly, Carrington and Short (1995, 1996, 2000) found that the concepts of 'British' and 'American' for British and American children mostly denoted surface features such as place of birth, living in the country and speaking the national language. Once again, this research stands in contrast to Condor's (2000) work, which found that British adults were reluctant to identify with Britain and displayed no national pride or patriotism. However, the children in this study and in study 1 did show such pride, possibly because they were not yet aware of the negative associations of Britishness (e.g., lager louts or football hooligans).

4.3.1.4 Christian Identity

This subcategory indicates the significance of the Christian religion for these English children. Most children (8/10 or 80%) picked the Christian faith card to describe themselves and some (3/10 or 30%) children felt that the Christian card was the most important card to them.

2 ..... Represents lines in an interview transcript that have been omitted.
When children were asked why they had picked that particular card, some children responded that it was their religion. Others gave the following variety of answers as to why religion was important to them: they believed in God, they went to church, it was special to them, they loved being a Christian, their parent was a Christian so they were too, and being a Christian was linked to speaking English.

(Boyd) Christian, coz I’m one of the people like, not many people in our class believe in God but like I’m one of the people that believes in God, and like we go to church like every Thursday and I go there every Saturday (line 29)

(Flora) It’s what I am, and kind of special. English and British are really similar, so Christian is really special to me, it’s my religion (line 22)

(Rebecca) Because it’s what my religion is. I am a Christian, I can speak English (line 38)

(Hollie) Christian. Because it means that you’re religious and you believe in God and everybody (line 16)

(Charlie) Christian, because I am a Christian, and that’s just what I’m like. Christian because I am Christian, and if someone asked me what are you, a Hindu... any of them, then I’d say Christian, coz that’s the only one I’m from. I love being a Christian and I am a Christian (line 16)

(Anna) Christian, I’m not really... I am one, but I don’t know what I’d call myself, I could call myself no religion, my mum was like a Christian, she is so I am, but we don’t like praying or anything (line 28)

In the last quote, even though this child picks the Christian card, her comments were conflicting but the fact that her mum is a Christian seems to have some relationship with her picking the Christian card. In the first quote, for this child his Christian identity is related to religious practices like going to church. For another child, speaking English was seen as related to being Christian. Thus, the English language and Christian culture may be entwined for this child.

To summarise, most children in the sample felt that their religion (Christianity) was important to them and some felt it was their most important social identity.
Similarly, Takriti et al. (2006) found that children aged 5-11 years from Muslim, Hindu, Christian and Jewish backgrounds all regarded religion as being very important. Even though the majority of the sample declared themselves as Christian when gathering demographic information, a few more children chose the Christian card despite answering that they had no religion. For the children who did declare they were Christian right from the start of the interview, they seemed to have a stronger religious identification as they ranked being Christian as the most or second most important card to them.

4.3.1.5 London Identity

This subcategory denotes the importance of locality for these children. Their London identity was one of the significant social identities that emerged when children were asked to pick cards that described themselves and to rank order them. Half (5/10 or 50%) the children picked the card ‘Londoner’ and one child ranked Londoner as the most important label for them. Furthermore, a few children (2/10 or 20%) even identified with being a Londoner over and above other categories like British or English. This highlights the importance of local context.

The reasons the children gave for picking ‘Londoner’ were: it was where all their family was from, everyone they knew were in London, it was where they lived, it was the same as England, they were from London, and they liked to visit London and the attractions and sights of London. The following selection of quotations illustrates the above points.

(Anna) Because it’s like mainly, London is really where all my family is and all that and everyone I know is here and all that. Obviously English but London mostly, I like London best (line 18)

(Boyd) Because I don’t think it’s really important to me, it’s just that I live in London, a person that lives in London (line 33)

(Jake) People say England and London, and sometimes they mean the same thing (line 18)

(Charlie) Londoner. Because I’m from London and I visit there. I go to the giant wheel and I go around it loads of times, I go to shops and buy stuff, play in the park, eat, loads of stuff (line 18)
Because I live in London... I don’t really go to London but I live in London because Brentford is in London! (line 26)

However, the importance of these children’s London identity did vary from child to child.
To summarise, being a Londoner was considered to be important for half of the children, which emphasises the meaning a more local identity may have for these children, in addition to their English or British identities.

4.3.1.6 European Identity

This subcategory refers to some of the children’s European identity, as two children (20%) did pick the ‘European’ card. This European identity was linked to: coming from Europe and being in Europe. The following two quotes illustrate these points.

(Hollie) European, I think it’s important to me coz it shows that I come from a part of Europe (line 20)

(Jessica) Because I am in Europe (line 28)

So for the majority of English children, a European superordinate identity was not important. For those children who felt that their European identity was important, this was due to them coming from and being in Europe. However, even for these two children, European identity was not as important to them as their other social identities. Interestingly, these children’s British and English identities were also of high importance, but not their London identity.

4.3.1.7 Overview of Multiple Identities

In general, these children appeared to possess a variety of cross-cutting identities (Akiba et al., 2004; Roccas & Brewer, 2002) which varied in importance and meaning but did appear to fit together unproblematically. Social category awareness was evident in all children from age 7 onwards, with clear self-identifications
appearing from a young age. These findings are similar to those which emerged from the ethnic minority children in study 1.

As the majority of the sample were Christian, it was not possible to examine religious group differences. However, it does appear that for Christian children, religious and English identifications were more important than British identification. Englishness and Britishness were sometimes but not always confused by these children, with some using these terms interchangeably and others appearing to favour one term over another. As highlighted earlier, one child did not know what British meant, and another child explicitly said that British and English were the same. Furthermore, there seems to be an interplay between identity and language, especially in relationship to English, Christian and British identification, and the English language appeared to be embedded in these children’s identities.

4.3.2 Contextual Influences on Identity

The contextual nature of identities was a further theme in the data and includes the subcategories of: Home (private sphere) and School (public sphere). These subcategories will be discussed respectively. There was much variability in the data, as for some children there was a divide between the private and public spheres of their lives, while for other children there was stability in identity (especially English identity) between private and public contexts.

4.3.2.1 Home (Private Sphere)

This subcategory describes the role that the home context has on the salience of children’s identities. When the children were asked: ‘When you are at home, which card best describes how you feel?’, the majority of children (6/10 or 60%) chose the English card. The reasons given for feeling English at home were: their whole family was English, they spoke English at home, they don’t do anything Christian at home, they speak in an English accent and they feel English like their family. The following quotes illustrate these points.
(Interviewer) *When you are at home, which card best describes how you feel?*

(Josh) English, because my whole family is English (line 27)

(Rebecca) English, because I normally speak English and I don’t do anything Christian at home (line 40)

(George) Because erm...if I spoke a different language than my mother and my father and my nana and my auntie then nobody else would understand....If I spoke another language they wouldn’t understand so I feel English (line 30)

(Jake) English, because we don’t speak in a Welsh accent or an Irish accent we just speak in an English accent (line 20)

(Hollie) English because I don’t pray at home and I don’t feel like I come from Europe...just feel the same as my family (line 24)

These quotes suggest that English identity and speaking English are linked in the home context, and that having family members that are English is also linked to feeling English at home.

Two children did, however, pick the Londoner card as the card they felt the most at home. This was related to living in London, being from London and having fun in London with their family.

(Interviewer) *When you’re at home which one do you feel the most?*

(Anna) Londoner

(Interviewer) *Why do you feel Londoner the most when you are at home?*

(Anna) Because I, erm, I live here (lines 29-32)

(Charlie) Londoner, because I’m from London and when you’re a Londoner you have great fun and when my mum, my dad and sister make me go and do all kinds of stuff, nice stuff and we do good things (line 22)

One child chose the Christian religion card as the card they felt most at home. Their reason for picking this card was due to religious practices in the home context.
Interviewer: When you're at home which one do you feel the most?

Boyd: Christian.

Interviewer: Why do you feel Christian the most when you are at home?

Boyd: Because like whenever there's like at night, whenever there's something on, sometimes I pray, and whenever there's stuff on about God I watch it (lines 36-39)

There was also one child who felt more British at home, saying that this was due to the fact that her family were British.

Interviewer: When you're at home which one do you feel the most?

Flora: Probably British as my family is (line 26)

In summary, the general trend within the data suggests that in the context of the home, for the majority of children, English identity was the most important, after which it was Londoner, then Christian or British. Therefore, as we have seen in the multiple identities category, for these children their English identity was an important social identity, and it appears to be important in the private sphere of home. The links between English identity and the home context appear to be mainly due to speaking the English language within this context. This is similar to Bernal et al.'s (1990) finding that language plays a significant role in the formation of ethnic identity. Thus, identity appears to be embedded in cultural practices in particular contexts.

As in the case of the minority children in study 1, and once again contrary to the predictions of SCT (Turner et al., 1987; Haslam et al., 1995), the participants had a strong sense of English identity within the home, despite the home being an intra-group context where there were no outgroup members present as a comparative groups. However, perhaps the multicultural context of London played a role here in creating a psychological inter-group context for comparison: because these children were members of the host majority group but were surrounded in their locale by members of other ethnic groups outside the home, this might have made their English identity more salient within the home context.
This subcategory concerns the role that the school context has on the salience of children’s identities. When the children were asked: ‘When you are at school, which card best describes how you feel?’, half of the children (5/10 children or 50%) chose the English card as the most salient at school. The reasons given for feeling English at school were: they do English work at school, they were English, they loved and liked being English, being English made them specific to their country, they watched only English videos at school and they spoke English at school. Interestingly, two of the five children who picked the English card in the school context also picked the English card in the home context, showing the high importance of English identity for those children across contexts.

(Charlie) That’s a tricky question because I feel all of them...English. Because we do English as work and I am English, I like English and I love English because I don’t know what I’d be without being English, being English is the wickedest thing I’ve done in my life (line 24)

(Flora) Because, there are lots of other people from different countries, I don’t want to make me separate but it makes me individual to my country (line 32)

(Boyd) Coz we watch a lot of English videos and stuff, we do a lot of English stuff. We don’t watch any other videos, like videos from Spain and stuff, you’d have to be in that country to know what they’re saying (line 43)

One child chose feeling both English and Christian at school as she speaks English at school with friends and when she has religious education this heightens or primes her own Christian identity. Interestingly, in the home context Rebecca felt English the most.

(Interviewer) So when you’re at home which one of these cards do you feel the most?
(Rebecca) English. Because I normally speak English and I don’t do anything Christian at home
(Interviewer) What about when you are at school which one of these cards do you feel the most?
(Rebecca) Both of them because sometimes we are learning about lessons like R.E lessons and learning about different religions. English because I speak it to my friends at school (lines 40-43)
After English, some children (3/10 or 30%) felt mostly British at school and the main reasons they gave for this were: because they just felt British at school, being British made them different from other groups in school and they were around British people.

(Josh) British, coz err I feel British (line 29)

(Jessica) Because some people are Muslim or Hindu, I am different to them (line 42)

(Jake) British, coz there’s loads of different people around, and they’re either from a different country or from Britain or a different part of Britain (line 22)

Thus it appears from the latter two quotes that contrasts with other groups seem to be important in the school setting as it is in the following quote as Flora changes from feeling British to English from the home to the school context for this reason as well.

(Interviewer) When you are at home which card do you feel the most?
(Flora) British
(Interviewer) What about at school?
(Flora) English
(Interviewer) Why?
(Flora) Because, there are lots of other people from different countries, I don’t want to make me separate but it makes me individual to my country (lines 25-30)

One child chose her London identity as most salient at school because she was a Londoner, other people at school were Londoners and the school is located in London.

(Anna) Coz loads of people are as well and so am I and it’s in London and all that (line 36)

This child also chose Londoner in the context of home so this appears to be a very important identity to this child.

The following quotes compare children at home and at school who claim different identities in the two contexts. Their switch in identity seems to be due to inter-group dynamics and doing English things in the school setting.
(Interviewer) *When you’re at home which one do you feel the most?*

(Jake) English, because we don’t speak in a Welsh accent or an Irish accent we just speak in an English accent

(Interviewer) *What about at school?*

(Jake) British, coz there’s loads of different people around, and they’re either from a different country or from Britain or a different part of Britain. I’m around people who are British (lines 19-22)

(Interviewer) *Why do you feel Christian the most when you are at home?*

(Boyd) Because like whenever there’s like at night, whenever there’s something on sometimes I pray, and whenever there’s stuff on about God I watch it

(Interviewer) *What about at school?*

(Boyd) English

(Interviewer) *Why?*

(Boyd) Cos we watch a lot of English videos and stuff, we do a lot of English stuff. We don’t watch any other videos, like videos from Spain and stuff, you’d have to be in that country to know what they’re saying (lines 38-43)

In summary, the common trend within the data suggests that in the school context children’s English identity was most important, then British, and then English and Christian together, or London (respectively). As we have already seen, English identity was most salient in the private sphere of home too, and for a small number of children who felt that their English identification was most important at home, it was also the most important at school as well, showing the robustness and high salience and importance of this membership for a few English majority children. Language practices such as speaking English at school with friends and doing English work at school appears to be related to this subcategory. Thus, once again, identity and context appear to be related through cultural practices, and as Barrett (2007) found, the language of instruction at school was related to children’s strength of national identification.

In relation to SCT (Turner et al., 1987), ingroup identity should be more evident when engaged in inter-group comparisons. Consistent with predictions of SCT, some of these children had a strong sense of their ethnic English identity within the school (an inter-group context) where there were outgroup members present for comparison.
4.3.2.3 Overview of Contextual Influences on Identity

To conclude, there appears to be connection and divide between children’s public and private spheres. One trend within the data suggests that children’s English identity is salient both in the context of home and in the context of school, and this is largely due to English language use in home and school context. This is not to say that their Christian or British or London identities had disappeared from one context to another, rather they were simply more salient in other situations. The other trend highlights the fact that there was a switch from one context to another in identifications (i.e., less stability across contexts). For these children, Coleman et al.’s (2001) contextual acculturation theory could be of use in explaining the context-dependent nature of these children’s identities, with alternation between two identities occurring in the same manner as one might alternate between the use of language in different contexts. Thus, identities appear to be linked to context for those children for whom different identities are switched on and off depending on the context. Moreover, these same children did not perceive a conflict between their different identities.

4.3.3 Cultural Practices

This core category captures the mix of the children’s cultural practices in terms of behaviours and preferences and includes the subcategories of: Music, Food, Dress, Sport and Religious practices. Each of these will be discussed in turn.

4.3.3.1 Music

This subcategory refers to children’s musical tastes and preferences. When children were asked what sort of music they like to listen to, all children responded with specific genres of music or artists.

(Josh) Eminem and things like that (line 81)

(Flora) Um, jazz and rock. That’s the music I like (line 86)
No children answered in terms of ethnic group or language (i.e. English or Indian Bollywood music).

The children described liking a wide range of music but all from western cultures like the US and UK. These included: rap, R&B, pop, rock and jazz music, with pop and rap being the most popular, respectively. Artists and music who were American seemed to be most popular. However, all children said they liked English music when asked ‘Do you like English music?’, whereas less (60%) said they liked American music when asked ‘Do you like American music?’.

When children were asked ‘Do you like any other kind of music, like foreign music?’ Two children expressed a liking for French music and one child for Indian music. This is perhaps due to having friends of those particular ethnicities with such tastes, and suggests that in contexts with friends of different ethnicities they may be more likely to listen to these types of music.

The majority of children (6/10 or 60%) reported that they preferred English music to foreign types of music when they were asked ‘Which do you prefer English or other forms of music?’. The remainder said they preferred American music (2/10 or 20%) or both English and American music (2/10 or 20%). The reason children gave for preferring English and American music was that they could understand it better and most of the artists came from those countries.

(Rebecca) Sometimes like when I do a dance with my friend we were going to do a talent show but we never got to go in the end, we had to do like an Indian dance (line 149)

(Flora) Um, English, because I understand it more (line 94)

(Jessica) English, I understand the language (line 128)

(Hollie) Well I like English and American music. Because most of the people that I like they are mostly American. There’s only a few people I like that are English (line 96)
(Anna) American, because most of the rappers are American. I like Eminem mostly because he talks about real things. People think he talks rubbish but he talks about his life and stuff but I understand him, people think he’s talking rubbish but he aint, he talks about real things and so does fifty cent (line 95)

Hence, English majority children’s identity appears to be related to dominant (English) and global (American) English speaking cultures (or could simply be preferences for these types of music).

However, parental preferences for music also sometimes appeared to influence children’s tastes and preferences in music.

(Interviewer) What sort of music do you like to listen to?
(Flora) Um, Jazz and Rock. That’s the music I like
(Interviewer) Do you like American music?
(Flora) A little bit
(Interviewer) Do you like English music?
(Flora) A little bit.
(Interviewer) Do you like any other types of music?
(Flora) I find foreign music interesting but I haven’t bought a CD.
(Interviewer) So do you prefer English music or other types of music?
(Flora) Um, English, because I understand it more.
(Interviewer) What do your parents like to listen to?
(Flora) They kind of like, my mum likes Jazz, my dad kind of likes heavy metal.
(Interviewer) What music would you listen to together at home as a family?
(Flora) Err we’d listen to Jazz and stuff...
(Interviewer) OK. What about with friends?
(Flora) Erm sort of stuff like, Rock or something, I dunno, like, something like Franz Ferdinand or something (lines 85-102)

What can also be seen from the above quote and the quote below is how music appears to be context driven. Hence, as the context changes children were more likely to listen to different music at home if parents preferred to listen to this type of music and different music with friends.

(Interviewer) What do your parents like to listen to?
(Anna) My dad likes old Rock music and also likes Eminem. My mum likes stuff like Green Day and rock music, but she does like Eminem, so both my parents like the same as me...

(Interviewer) *What music would you listen to together at home as a family?*

(Anna) Probably Rap music.

(Interviewer) *OK. What about with friends?*

(Anna) Most of my friends like Pop music and stuff. I do sometimes like songs that people sing, that aren’t Rap, I like RnB, also like singing, I like that as well so do my friends, we both like to listen to it. Like Pussycat Dolls and stuff (lines 96-103)

Thus, we can see a relationship between context (home and with friends) and cultural practices.

In summary, children prefer English language music to other ethnic music and this could signify the influence of global American and English culture (or it could simply reflect musical preferences on their part). However, some children may have been influenced by parental preferences and practices, as they also liked the same music as their parents. This is in line with Knight et al. (1993), who found a positive relationship between parental socialisation practices and children’s ethnic identity and suggested that parents are indeed important agents in the enculturation of their children, especially in the home private sphere. Context also appeared to influence musical practices and there was a divide between the home and friends context. This finding is in line with Coleman et al.’s (2001) alternation strategy. That is, in different contexts, children have different musical practices. There was also symmetry in the relationship between English/British identifications and English cultural (musical) practices, with children showing an association between the two as in Phinney et al.’s work. So, for the domain of music, the children mainly appeared to opt for a separation acculturation strategy.
4.3.3.2 Food

This subcategory describes children’s tastes and preferences in the domain of food. When children were asked what sort of foods they liked, almost all children (9/10 or 90%) categorised food into specific types, like pizza, chips or curry.

(Flora) Erm, I just like pasta and fish fingers, really (line 134)

(Boyd) I really like pizza chips and beans, I like mayonnaise (line 167)

(Charlie) Shepherd’s Pie, Spaghetti Bolognaise, just food that…like, curry (line 126)

(Anna) I like Burger King and I like Chinese (line 135)

Almost all children (9/10 or 90%) reported that they liked English food and almost all (9/10 or 90%) liked other ethnic cuisines (like Italian, Indian or Chinese).

Therefore, the children described liking a wide range of foods from western to eastern styles.

When children were asked if they preferred English food or other types, only one child said they preferred English cuisine, half (5/10 or 50%) preferred other cuisines such as Chinese, Indian or Italian, and about half (4/10 or 40%) liked both English and other types of cuisine.

(Interviewer) Do you prefer English food or other types of food?

(Charlie) Chinese and English, sometimes I have a bit of both, coz I like it (line 134)

(Jessica) Chinese food, because they do nice food (line 186)

(Boyd) Mostly other types of food like Chinese and Indian (line 173)

The pattern of results here is in contrast to the previous domain of music, where English music was preferred. This is therefore an example of the domain-specificity and variability of these children’s cultural practices, as in this domain children either
preferred to eat food from other countries or both English food and food from other countries.

For the children who preferred to eat other ethnic foods, this shows a dissociation between their English identification and their cultural practices. Thus, some cultural practices were not always directly related to their identifications for some children. This finding is in line with Hutnik (1991), who also found a divide in the relationship between identification and cultural practices, with some children showing a dissociation between the two.

As in the domain of music, the home context and parental preferences and practices appeared to play a role in children’s preferences in this domain as well.

(Interviewer) What sort of foods do you like to eat?
(George) Mozzarella, this is Italian
(Interviewer) Which do you prefer, English or other types of food?
(George) Italian, definitely, I love that Mozzarella!
(Interviewer) What about your parents, what do they like to eat?
(George) Mum would have mozzarella, and dad would (lines 157-162)

(Interviewer) What sort of foods do you like to eat?
(Jake) Roast dinners, pizza, pasta, um... (line 128)
......
(Interviewer) What sorts of foods do you eat at home with your family?
(Jake) On weekends roast dinner (line 142)

(Interviewer) What do you prefer, English food or other types?
(Boyd) Mostly other types of food like Chinese and Indian.
(Interviewer) What about your parents, what do they like to eat?
(Boyd) If there’s nothing they like in the cupboard then they order Chinese, but mostly the cupboards are full with like jacket potato and beans (lines 172-175)
..........
(Interviewer) Do you go to restaurants or get takeaways?
(Boyd) We go to Chinese, mostly Indian or Chinese (lines 182-183)
In sum, the children liked a range of different foods from many cultures, which is perhaps due to the multicultural nature of London and the ready availability of international cuisines. In this domain, half the English children preferred to eat other ethnic cuisines than English food and this perhaps indicates the influence of minority cultures and inter-cultural contact (but could also simply refer to their preferences). Therefore, some of these children’s food preferences, that is, preferring other ethnic cuisines to English food, showed a different pattern from music preferences where English language music was preferred (although language knowledge could be a factor with the latter). This finding, once again shows the domain-specificity and variability of English children’s cultural practices, and suggests a multicultural integration acculturation style in the domain of food. In line with research by Knight et al. (1993), there also appeared to be a relationship between parental socialisation practices and children’s English identity and cultural practices.

4.3.3.3 Dress

This subcategory denotes the clothes English children like to wear. When children were asked what sort of clothes they liked to wear, the majority if children (8/10 or 80%) referred to specific types of clothing or fashions like jeans or sporty clothes. These children therefore described liking a variety of clothing but mainly from western cultures such as England and the U.S. All children said they liked English clothes and almost half (4/10 or 40%) stated they liked or had worn other ethnic clothing.

(Interviewer) Do you like to dress in foreign clothes or have you ever dressed in foreign clothes?

(Rebecca) I have two lengas at home. I wear those if it’s a special occasion or something (line 260)

(Flora) Um I once did this Indian dance and I bought some Indian clothes. It was this club I went to and we went to this place and did a competition (line 162)

(Jake) Nah, I don’t like them coz like they say weird things on them and I just don’t get it (line 154)
As can be seen, some children have been influenced by minority culture fashion but others are not so keen.

The next example highlights this child’s awareness of religious and ethnic practices in the domain of clothes for Indian ethnic minority children and the split between eastern and western styles/practices.

(Interviewer) Do you like English clothes?

(Boyd) Yeah, it’s like saying you don’t like Indian, but Indian clothes are not the same as ours coz it's part of their religion (line189)

Later children were asked: Which do you prefer English or other types of clothing? The majority of children (8/10 or 80%) described liking and wearing English clothing, while one child preferred English and American clothing, and another child said they liked both English and other ethnic clothes. The following quotes illustrate the above points.

(Jake) Um well yeah basically, English and American. Um, I just wear them a lot (line 152)

(Interviewer) Do you like to dress in foreign clothes or have you ever dressed in foreign clothes?

(Charlie) I would.

(Interviewer) Which do you prefer English or other types of clothing?

(Charlie) All kinds of clothes, because it’s just so amazing to try different clothes on (lines 149-152)

(Interviewer) Do you like to wear English clothes?

(Hollie) Um yeah, because then I just look like I’m from this country and it shows that I like it.

(Interviewer) So do you prefer English clothes or other types of clothing?

(Hollie) Yes English, I don’t like saris and all that (lines 156-161)

Overall, English majority children prefer to wear English clothes, suggesting a lack of influence of minority cultures in the domain of dress. However, there were a few children who on special occasions dressed in other types of clothing from different cultures. Thus, the pattern of findings here is different from the domain of food. The fact that these children wore more English/British style clothes also suggests a relationship between English identification and English cultural practices, consistent
with Phinney et al. (2006), although an alterative interpretation may be that it is just a straightforward clothing preference on the part of these children which is independent of their identifications. Whatever the interpretation, however, in the domain of clothing, the children mainly opted for a separation acculturation strategy.

4.3.3.4 Sport

This subcategory describes children’s support for nations in sport. When the children were asked if they supported England in football, the majority of children (8/10 or 80%) agreed they would support England. The remaining children did not watch or like football. When they were asked if they supported England in cricket, again the majority of children (7/10 or 70%) agreed, while the remainder did not follow cricket.

Here, children’s answers should demonstrate whether they show loyalty and identification towards their home nation (i.e. England).

(Interviewer) *Do you support England in football?*
(Charlie) I don’t like football.
(Interviewer) *Do you support England in Cricket?*
(Charlie) I don’t like cricket (lines 159-162)

(Interviewer) *Do you support England in football?*
(Boyd) Yeah I want them to win the world cup.
(Interviewer) *Do you support England in Cricket?*
(Boyd) Yeah, any sports team in England (lines 200-203)

This present study was conducted during the summer of the 2006 Soccer World Cup and this could have heightened children’s support for England and other nations as we shall see.

Later children were asked if they supported any other county in any sports. Some children (4/10 or 40%) revealed that, if England were not playing, they would support another teams such as Brazil in football.
(Interviewer) Do you ever support any other countries?

(Jake) Well sometimes if England or Brazil is not playing, if like, like Portugal vs Ghana, I'd normally support the underdog, coz I just like them (line 168)

(Rebecca) Erm like if say if England are versus anyone else ... I would support England or if India were versus Australia I would support Australia because I've been there (lines 277-278)

On the whole, most children supported England in cricket and football, consistent with their English identification.

4.3.3.5 Religion

This subcategory refers to children's religious beliefs and practices. Many children spoke about religious practices and beliefs such as praying and visiting places of worship before being explicitly asked about them. As noted earlier, Christian identity appears to be one of the most important and salient social identities.

The majority of English children (8/10 or 80%) engaged in religious practices such as praying or visiting church and this seems to reflect the strength of their Christian identity.

(Interviewer) Do you pray?

(Boyd) Every day at night and sometimes in the morning (line 211)

(Hollie) I pray in church but I don't pray at home. I go to church with school (line 179)

(Charlie) Yeah, I go to Sunday school. Friday is school club. Sunday and Friday (line 168)

Parental influences were less evident here as most children reported that their parents did not talk about religion with them. However, one child with a strong Christian identity did make the following comment.

(Interviewer) Do your parents talk about religion with you?
(Charlie) They talk about God and Jesus, they say never stop believing in God and Jesus (line 178)

All children, even those who were not Christian, ‘celebrated’ Christmas. On the whole, this involved Christmas decorations and/or a special meal and/or presents and/or going to church. This perhaps suggests the influence that Christian culture has on non-Christian children as well.

(Interviewer) Do you celebrate Christmas?

(Flora) We go to Church and we eat Christmas lunch and open presents (line 187)

(Rebecca) Yeah I decorate my house and I put some Christmas lights around the room (line 292)

(Jessica) Yeah. I open my presents and on Sunday I have Christmas dinner (line 241)

When children were asked: ‘Do you ever celebrate Eid or Diwali or Chinese New Year?’; the majority of children (6/10 or 60%) responded ‘no’ but some children (4/10 or 40%) said that they did do something for Chinese New Year. No other religious or cultural occasion was celebrated. The fact that Chinese New Year was, is perhaps related to the fact that there is a Chinatown in London.

(Anna) Well there’s like Chinese New Year at the dragon thing. I’ve been there (line 187)

(Rebecca) I just like Chinese New Year we don’t celebrate things but sometimes I go to shows and stuff on New Year and they give you like a lucky thing. I do celebrate Guy Fawkes night (line 296)

(Boyd) We kind of celebrate Chinese New Year; we get a Chinese take away (line 217)

(Charlie) Yeah Chinese New Year. We go out to a Chinese restaurant (line 174)

In summary, Christian religious practices appear to be related to Christian identity and British/English culture for most English children. The majority of children practised their religion and celebrated Christmas, but some also engaged in one other ethnic cultural celebration (i.e. Chinese New Year), suggesting a multicultural integration acculturation style, although other children did not ‘celebrate’ or do
anything for other cultures’ special days/festivals, suggesting a separation acculturation style in this domain.

4.3.3.6 Overview of Cultural Practices

The overall picture that emerges is that children’s cultural practices are multiple, multicultural, and both domain (i.e., music, food, dress, etc.) and context (i.e., private vs. public sphere) specific. Similarly, the acculturation strategies which they adopted were also domain-specific. In the domain of religious practices, these children adopted either a multicultural integration or a separation acculturation strategy; in the domains of music and clothing, they adopted a separation strategy; and in the domain of food they adopted a multicultural integration strategy.

In addition, parental practices in the home context appear to affect not only children’s cultural practices and resulting acculturation strategies but perhaps also their strength of English identification. This was evident that most in the domains of music and food, for example when they spoke about what music they and they parents liked to listen to and what music they would listen to at home. This is consistent with the work of Knight et al., (1993). Similarly, the links between parental practices (as reported by the children) and children’s self-reported practices were similar to those found in the study by Farver, Narang and Bhadha (2002). The finding that cultural practices were also context-dependent and domain-dependent is also in line with the work of Coleman et al.’s (2001).

A relationship between children’s patterns of English identification and some of their cultural practices was also apparent, and this relationship appeared to be related to parental influences, religious practices, English language and the home context. At the same time, however, there was also sometimes a dissociation between English identification and English cultural practices for some children in the domain of food.
4.3.4 Living in a Multicultural Environment

This category relates to the children's awareness of the multicultural nature of London and of the schools which the children attended. As in the case of the ethnic minority children, the themes of racism, knowledge, celebrating diversity, school spirit and friendships emerged from the analysis. Each of these will be discussed in turn.

4.3.4.1 Racism

The subcategory of racism refers to children's awareness of racism. When the children were asked if they themselves had ever experienced racism, all children reported that they had not experienced any form of racism in school or out of school.

(Interviewer) Have you ever experienced racism?

(Rebecca) I don't think someone has been racist to me (line 314)

(George) No (line 221)

However, the children did appear to be quite knowledgeable about the concept of racism and were able to define it or describe a situation illustrating it, and this seemed largely due to school and parental teachings.

(Interviewer) Have your parents told you about racism?

(Boyd) They just say if someone is racist to ignore them, and you shouldn't be racist coz it's not their fault that they're that colour (line 235)

(Anna) Yeah they say that obviously we've spoken about it and all that...I actually once got a book about racism and I read about it in that, me and my mum just talk about anything really, we chat about it and say it's horrible and all that (line 203)

(Rebecca) I don't think so, I know what it is coz I learned it at school (line 316)
The few children who were unable to describe what racism was (but had vaguely
heard of the concept) were amongst the youngest children (aged 7 and 8). These
children had received none to very little instruction from parents, and perhaps had
not covered this topic at school yet (or were absent when it was covered).

(Interviewer) *Have your parents told you about racism?*

(George) Yeah they have, they said beat up your brother and you won’t have one (line 223)

As can be seen from the above quote this child had not quite grasped what racism
really is yet.

In summary, none of the children reported any instances of racism directed at
themselves. School ethos and the school curriculum aimed at eradicating racism, and
the multi-ethnic nature of the schools which they attended, may have played a role in
creating environments which were relatively free from racism. There did not appear
to be any negative threat towards these children’s identities from other ethnic
minority children.

4.3.4.2 Knowledge

This sub-theme captures the diversity of knowledge that exists within this sample of
children, including knowledge about religions, geography, countries, ethnicities,
nationalities, continents, cultures and languages. As in the case of the ethnic minority
children in study 1, the children’s knowledge was impressive.

(Interviewer) *What other groups of children are there in the class?*

(Boyd) There’s Germany and Indian…there’s loads of people in our class from India, one person
who’s German, there’s Paulo, he’s from…I can’t remember, it’s a really weird country, I don’t know
it’s got a really weird name...yeah Lithuania (line 86)

(Flora) Err...Muslim people, there are two girls who have families from Africa, and well, Sri Lanka,
well yeah then there’s Alexia (line 60)

(Jake) Icelandic, Japanese, Jamaican, and a boy left, erm, erm, Italian, Moroccan (line 56)
(Anna) Asian and Irish and African...some people’s parents are Jamaican (line 68)

(Rebecca) Not that many but some of them are Hindu and some of them are Sikh. Not sure about Thomas because he’s like deaf and I’m not sure what religion he is I think he might be Christian (line 90)

Not only were the children able to identify the different groups that existed in their class, but they were also able to identify correctly the English children. However, some children were unclear about who the British children were in the class, once again emphasising the lack of comprehension of this term in some children.

(Interviewer) Who are the English people in your class?
(Jake) Will, Derek, Mark, Anna, Lilia, no...she’s Icelandic. There’s loads (line 40)

(Interviewer) Who are the English people in your class?
(Hollie) Yeah. The people that are English? Angel, Amelia, Georgia, Taylor, Chloe, James.
(Interviewer) What about British children, are there any British people in your class?
(Hollie) Well I’m not very sure about that. It’s the same question as before (lines 43-46)

(Interviewer) Are there any British children in your class?
(Rebecca) No I don’t think so.
(Interviewer) What makes someone British?
(Rebecca) I don’t know but like if they act a bit posh, like when they act a bit posh (lines 79-82)

To summarise, the children revealed an awareness of a wide range of cultures in their classes. This high level of daily inter-group contact with such a wide diversity of cultures, coupled to their schools’ commitment to multiculturalism, may be the reason why none of the children had experienced racism at school.

4.3.4.3 Celebrating Diversity

This subcategory describes children’s feelings about multiculturalism. When the children were asked ‘How do you feel about people from different parts of the world all living together in Britain?’, the majority of children (7/10 or 705) responded either neutrally or positively about multiculturalism.
Hollie) I don’t mind really (line 205)

(Anna) Erm... I don’t really think about it that much. It’s alright, it doesn’t bother me. It bothers some people. I think it’s alright. Some people think its England and people from another country shouldn’t be here, I think it’s alright.... (line 207)

(Flora) I think it’s good (line 213)

(Charlie) I feel OK by it. It’s nothing wrong with it. It’s just other people, it doesn’t matter. They’re just like me, I’m just a different colour, different language (line 192)

(George) It’s just quite different, it doesn’t bother me, I think let’s be friends, black people should not be treated differently to white. That’s my reason (line 227)

These quotes suggest that the children understood the concept of cultural diversity and the multicultural philosophies of the schools.

The following quote, however, shows that, after the 7/7 London bombings in 2005, this has had an impact on the way this child feels towards Muslims, but she does emphasise that she doesn’t feel any threat from her own Muslim friends.

(Rebecca) I don’t feel no harm, sometimes you know like the London bombings I was about to go on the tube because we were going to the Science Museum. They said you can’t come on, something has happened, it was the bombs. I felt really scared I thought what’s going on I was really scared. I don’t find any harm from my friends if they are Muslim but it is Muslim people bombing I was feeling it was their fault. No offence to my friends I don’t hate them but it is other people in their religion, it is their fault (line 320)

However, some (3/10 or 30%) children were not so positive about cultural diversity in Britain.

(Boyd) I feel a bit unsafe with people who come from India, coz they’re the people that mostly kill people in our area, like drive bys and stuff (line 239)

(Jake) Well... I don’t really get it, why they do it, why can’t they just stay in that country, because like why did they have to come over here when they have their own country... (line 196)
(Jessica) I feel a bit funny, because some people are different colours. 
(Interviewer) You feel funny because some people are different colours... Do you think it is a good thing or a bad thing, all these people living here in Britain? 
(Jessica) A bad thing because sometimes they do other things (lines 268-271).

These children appear to be uncomfortable with people from other countries and with different colour skins. The first quote suggests this child is quite fearful of people from India, similar to Rebecca’s fear of Islamic people after the 7/7 bombings.

In sum, most children saw cultural diversity as a good thing and seem to support the notion of multiculturalism. Their positive outlook was probably linked to the diversity of cultures in their own schools. Some children however, were not so positive about multiculturalism, they could not understand why foreigners came to Britain and were uncomfortable with people of a different colour or felt unsafe.

4.3.4.4 School spirit

This subcategory explains children’s thoughts and feelings towards their school. When children were asked to describe their school, the people and how they felt about their school, they responded positively, describing the school as a place where people get on with each other.

(Interviewer) How would you describe the school?

(Rebecca) A nice school and a healthy school (line 64)

(Charlie) It’s like my home but home isn’t like teaching and because we don’t have breakfast here...I feel comfortable in school, really comfortable (line 36)

(Flora) Err well it’s kind of quite multi-cultural and well I quite like the fact that it’s multi-cultural. It can sometimes be quite rough but generally quite good and I think the teachers are nice as well (line 44)

The last quote is interesting as this child talks about the concept of multiculturalism and that is why she likes her school.
The following quotes also suggest that different groups of children get along in school and were friends.

(Interviewer) Do all the different groups get along well?

(Boyd) Well this is how my friends put it. It doesn’t matter about your skin type or where you come from, we’re all friends and it doesn’t matter your skin tone or anything (lines 89-90)

(Jake) Well yeah because in our class they don’t really care about anything and make friends. Because even they from a different country, you speak to them and make friends with them (line 58)

(Hollie) Yeah, they are always playing together and they speak nicely, they’re just nice (line 58)

(Anna) Yeah. Erm, I think there’s no racism or anything, no one’s racist and people are just used to it. Everyone’s really friendly with each other really (line 70)

(Jessica) Yes, because we all speak the same language and that’s it (line 84)

These quotes once again suggest that these school environments are free from prejudice and it doesn’t matter what other countries or colour people are.

To summarise, the multi-ethnic nature of the schools as well as the schools’ encouragement of cultural diversity appear to have impacted positively on the children’s views of their schools.

4.3.4.5 Friendships

This subcategory refers to children’s variety of friends which were found to be multicultural. When children were asked ‘Who are your friends?’, all children reported that they had a broad mixture of friends and they did not appear to select their friends in terms of their ethnicity, nationality, race or religion (although there was a gender bias). Instead, friendships were based on personalities and interests such as sport.

(Interviewer) Who are your friends?
Anna) Most of my friends are from English, Adele erm... there’s Melissa, who’s from Ghana, who’s my friend. I have some Asian friends like Mohan and Laile; I don’t actually know if it’s Asia, Mohan is actually from Syria, I’m not sure where Laile is from. I think Tyler’s dad is Jamaican, I think, coz she’s like half Jamaican and most of my friends are like English but their parents might not have been English (line 74)

(Charlie) Amir, from Syria, Pierre from France, Kushna he’s Hindu, Stacey she’s from this country, she speaks English. I’ve got this friend Jamal, he’s a real good friend, he talks like a Jamaican (line 60)

(Flora) My closest friends are CC, her dad’s from Africa, she’s half black half white, then there’s Chloe, she’s just English, then there’s Mya she’s gone to a different school now she’s just English. I’ve got like a wider group of friends, Sachini, she’s from Sri Lanka and there’s Alexia she’s from Spain (line 68)

Interestingly, in the first quote Anna describes her friends as English even though their parents may not be English. Perhaps her criteria for being English do not require someone’s parents or family to have come from England.

The above extracts show that the children had multiple and diverse friends including friends from their own culture (i.e., English/white friends), as well as friends from other minority ethnic groups. Ethnicity was not important to these children in choosing friends, and it was more important was who they were as people and their shared interests:

(Interviewer) What do you have in common with your friends?

(Jake) Erm, well we like computer games, we like the same sports and that (line 82)

(Interviewer) Why are you friends with them?

(Rebecca) Because they are quite nice people and Devon is like me a bit shy and quiet but I think he might be loud at home and at play time he is quite nice boy to play with (line 110)

When children were asked if they had any British friends, some (3/10 or 30%) said no. This may be once again due to the lack of understanding these children have of the concept ‘British’.
(Rebecca) Not British friends. They don’t act posh and they...some of them are like Sikh and stuff (line 106)

This child appears to have misunderstood the term.

Some children did not have many or any British or English friends because their class was culturally so diverse:

(Interviewer) Do you have any British friends in your class?
(Jessica) No.
(Interviewer) Why don’t you have any British friends?
(Jessica) Because there aren’t many people from this country (lines 91-94)

In summary, due to the levels of multi-ethnic contact and relations which were possible in these schools, most of the children had diverse friendships, choosing their friends based on personal and individual traits.

4.3.4.6 Overview of Living in a Multicultural Environment

To summarise, this core category suggests that living in a multicultural context and attending culturally diverse schools influences not only children’s experiences and outlooks on racism, but also the range of their knowledge, their acceptance of cultural diversity and their multi-group friendships. The finding that friendships were based on shared interests rather than race or ethnicity is consistent with the findings of McGlothlin et al. (2005) and Margie et al. (2005).

4.4 Discussion

The present study examined white English children’s social identifications and cultural practices. The findings reveal that the children had multiple social identities, with English, Christian and British identifications being the most important. In addition, for some children their self-categorisations were relatively stable across public and private contexts, while for other children their self-categorisations were context-dependent, with a divide between public and private spheres. However, the
children did not appear have any conflicts arising from their different identities. English, Londoner, Christian or British (respectively) were salient in private parental/familial contexts, while English, British and then English and Christian together or Londoner (respectively) were salient in public spheres (such as the school). It must be noted, however, that English identity was, for a few children, highly salient across both contexts.

Cultural practices were also multiple, multicultural and domain-specific, and there was a split between home and friends contexts. There was also, at times, a relationship between the children’s strength of English identity and the children’s choice of acculturation strategy or preferences for cultural practices, but there was also a dissociation in the relationship between identification and practices in other domains, illustrating the variability in this relationship according to context, domain, levels of identification and parental practices. On the whole, it could be suggested that these English children appeared to favour multicultural integration and/or separation strategies, but these strategies varied from one domain to another (e.g., from food to music to clothing). The multicultural context of London and the schools which the children attended also appeared to have influenced the children’s cultural practices, identities and friendships.

There were four specific research questions which motivated this study. The first of these was: *Do English majority children hold multiple social identifications and, if so, what are the groups with which they identify?* It was found that English, Christian and British identities were the most important social identities for these English children. English identity was also the only category that a few children used spontaneously to describe themselves, which emphasises the importance of this membership for these children. Interestingly, however, identities such as Londoner and European were also important to these children, but not as much as their English, British and religious identities. The finding that these children had multiple identities and that European superordinate identity was important to a few of these children is consistent with Akiba et al. (2004). They found that superordinate identities such as Asian were also important to Asian minority (Cambodian) children.
living in the US as well as multiple self-descriptors. Furthermore, in the present study these children’s multiple identities did not conflict.

Social psychologists have increasingly acknowledged the importance of multiple social identities and group memberships in recent years (e.g., Cinnirella, 1996; Crisp & Hewstone, 2000; Deaux, 1996; Stryker & Statham, 1985; Tajfel, 1978), but there has been relatively little previous research on the nature of multiple identities in children. The present study has shown that not only adults but also children hold multiple identities which can be important to them.

The second research question was: *Are English majority children’s social identifications invariant across different contexts, or does the relative salience of particular identities vary across contexts?* Interestingly, both these patterns emerged from the data: some children’s social identifications were relatively stable, with English and London identifications being primary in the home context (the private sphere) and in the school (public) sphere, but other children switched from one social identification in the home to a different social identification in school (e.g., from English identity in the home to British identity in school). SCT contends that social identities are fluid and dynamic, and very much context-dependant. However, this was only found to be the case for some of the children in this study. For other children, their English and London remained the most important in most situations and did not show any contextual variability.

In addition, and also contrary to the predictions of SCT, the intragroup context of the home provided the children with a greater rather than a lesser sense of English identity. The meta-contrast principle of SCT predicts that ethnic identity will not be salient in the home as there are no out-group members present in that context. It also predicts that outside the home, when individuals are in the company of out-group members, ethnic identity should become more salient. This however was not the case for some of these children: in the school, their British identity became more salient, rather than their English identity, although for other children their English identity was more salient in the school inter-group content (which is consistent with SCT).
The fact that English identity was stable across contexts for some children could be explained by Roccas and Brewer’s (2002) ‘dominance’ structure. This is said to occur when a person adopts one primary group affiliation, all other affiliations are rendered subordinate to the primary one. Therefore, perhaps for some of the children in the present sample, their English identity was the most important and their other social identities were subordinated to this identity in a hierarchy.

The fact that some English children showed variations in identifications across contexts is also consistent with Roccas and Brewer’s compartmentalisation structure. To recap, in this multiple identity structure, social identities are context or situation specific. In the school, for instance, some English majority children’s British identity became primary and English was less relevant. In the home, however, English group membership was most important due to parental and family practices.

The third research question was: Are English majority children’s cultural practices invariant across different contexts, or do their cultural practices vary across contexts? It was found that these English majority children are not only engaged in a multiplicity of cultural practices, but that some of these practices were both domain-specific and context-specific. For instance, one child might watch American films, but listen to British pop music, eat Indian food, and wear an English football shirt. In other words, different cultural practices were adopted depending upon the specific domain (e.g., film, music, food, clothing, etc.) involved. In addition, some of the children adopted different cultural practices in the home and with friends, revealing that these practices were also context-dependent.

Berry (1997, 2001) found that integration is the most popular strategy, however only some of the children in the present study appeared to favour integration, while others favoured separation. In addition, these children showed multicultural integration and not just bicultural (as Berry would also assume). However, the finding that acculturation processes and cultural practices were domain-specific is not accounted for by Berry’s theory. Instead, some of the present findings are also consistent with the alternation strategy described by Coleman et al., (2001), who argues that people are able to alternate between cultural maintenance and cultural adaptation according to the specific situation. In the present study, in the domains of music and dress, the
children appeared to favour separation, while in the domain of food children favoured integration, while in the domain of cultural celebrations, some children favoured separation while other children favoured integration. But in contrast to Coleman these children show multicultural alternation not just bicultural as Coleman also assumes.

The fourth research question was: What is the relationship between English majority children’s social identifications and their cultural practices? It was found that there was a good deal of variability in this relationship: some children showed a consistency between their identifications and cultural practices, others showed a dissociation between their identifications and cultural practices, while others simultaneously showed both a relationship as well as a dissociation depending on the identification and the domain and context. These findings are similar to those which emerged in the previous study with minority participants. However, it should be noted that an alternative explanation is that cultural practices merely reflected simple preferences which may or may not have corresponded with the children’s identifications.

Not surprisingly, the English language played a central role in many aspects of the children’s lives and judgements, and appeared to be related to their strength of English and Christian identifications, and possibly some of their cultural practices (music in particular) as well. The English language seemed to act like a bond between children’s English identifications and some of their English cultural practices and preferences. Clearly, if a child cannot communicate or understand other ethnic languages, they will probably be less inclined to embrace some aspects of other ethnic cultures (such as their music and films).

4.5 Limitations of the Present Study

It should be acknowledged here that there are several limitations of the present study. A modified grounded approach to analysis was used in the present study, and there are limitations to this method. Firstly, the researcher had conducted literature reviews on these issues prior to the research being carried out, which may have influenced the
categories which emerged from the analysis. In addition, this study was conducted after study 1 had been completed, and the categories which had emerged from that study are highly likely to have influenced the interpretation of the data which emerged in this second study. Indeed, there was very substantial similarity in the sets of categories which emerged from the two studies (although the specific contents of these categories differed across the studies due to the very different cultural positions of the participants in the two studies). The most likely explanation of this similarity is the knowledge and the theoretical orientation of the investigator through which the data were interpreted.

Secondly, as in the previous study, it is possible that there was a premature closure of categories in the present study. This is because the categories which emerged may possibly have been refined, developed and extended further if a full grounded theory methodology had been used with further data collection. However, it should be noted that the present study did try to obtain a diversity of perspectives by sampling children from 7 different schools to limit this problem as much as possible. In addition, the small sample size and the specific context (with all of the children being from West London) limit the generalisability of findings to similar aged children in other contexts. Also, other context effects may have been applicable here due to many different schools used and the differences in the ethnic mix of each school (i.e. the multiculturalism). Finally, the fact that the present author and interviewer was a British Asian female may have had an influence on the views which these English majority children were willing to express in the interviews and also the possibility of interviewer bringing her own cultural positioning to the research. However, notwithstanding all of these limitations, the present study has helped to clarify a number of issues concerning acculturation processes in 7- to 11-year-old white English majority group children, a topic which has not hitherto been investigated.
Chapter 5: Study 3 - British Indian, Pakistani and English Children’s Inter-group Attitudes, Social Identifications and Cultural Practices

On the basis of the findings of the qualitative interviews, a quantitative interview schedule was developed in order to examine some of the key issues identified in the interviews more extensively with larger samples of children. One of the aims of the quantitative study was to establish whether the trends and patterns which were identified in the two qualitative studies were statistically robust. To recap, the findings of these qualitative studies indicated that ethnic, national and religious identifications were important to British ethnic majority (white English) and minority (Asian) children aged 7-11 living in London. In addition, these two studies suggested that the personal appropriations of cultural practices of these groups of children were diverse and mixed, as well as being context- and domain-dependent. Study 3 was therefore designed to explore these phenomena concerning identifications and cultural practices further, but using quantitative rather than qualitative methods, to discover whether the same findings would emerge using this alternative methodology.

In addition, study 3 was designed to look at the development of inter-group attitudes and prejudice in 7- to 11-year-old children, in order to test the contrasting predictions made by SIDT (that attitudes towards outgroups would either show no changes in positivity with increasing age, or become more negative with increasing age) and CDT (that attitudes towards outgroups would become more positive with increasing age). The study tested these predictions using children drawn from three distinct ethnic groups, namely British children of white English, Indian and Pakistani heritage. A further aim of the study here was to find out whether children exhibited different developmental patterns depending upon the particular ethnic group to which they themselves belonged and the particular target outgroup towards which the attitudes were displayed.
Study 3 was also designed to examine whether the children’s inter-group attitudes were related to: their levels of ethnic, national and religious identification; their patterns of friendship with children from other ethnic groups (used as an index of their levels of inter-group contact); and their levels of appropriation of cultural practices drawn from ethnic cultures other than their own. The purpose here was to examine whether any of these factors are systematically related to children’s inter-group attitudes in ways which are not considered by either SIDT or CDT.

The specific research questions which were addressed by this quantitative study are outlined in the introductions to Chapters 6, 7 and 8 in which the results of the quantitative study are reported. In this present chapter, the methods which were used in this study are first described.

5.1 Method

5.1.1 Location of the Present Study

The study took place in London. The children were recruited from the same co-educational primary and junior schools in West London that had participated in study 2.

5.1.2 Recruitment and Consent

The schools were recruited using the procedures described in Chapter 4, Section 4.2.4.

5.1.3 Participants

The total sample for the study consisted of 244 children, 123 males and 121 females from school years 3, 4, 5 and 6. 82 were Indian, 82 were Pakistani and 80 were from white English ethnic backgrounds. A power analysis indicated that for a 3 (ethnic group) x 4 (year groups) analysis of variance, with an effect size of 0.25 (for ethnic group differences in children of this age: see, for example, Davis et al., 2007), an
alpha of 0.05 and power of 0.80, the minimal sample size should be 225. A target sample size of 240 was therefore set. Children were divided into 4 groups according to year group (3, 4, 5 and 6), with approximately equal numbers of boys’ and girls’ from each ethnic group in each year group. The two Asian ethnic groups (Indian and Pakistani) were chosen as these groups are politically salient and vary in terms of their religion, social class, and levels of educational attainment. The age range of 7 to 11 years was chosen to capture developmental shifts in identifications and attitudes, in particular to capture the developmental changes in levels of prejudice which are postulated by CDT and SIDT to occur across this age range.

5.1.4 Materials

The materials consisted of an interview schedule (see Appendix C) and sixteen A6 sized colour photographs/pictures, each representing one of 16 different children (2 black boys faces, 2 black girls faces, 2 white boys faces, 2 white girls faces, 2 black boys in ethnic clothes, 2 Asian boys in western clothes, 2 Asian girls in ethnic clothes and 2 Asian girls in western clothes). The pictures were printed and laminated (see Appendix F for some examples of the pictures which were used). In addition, 12 little cards with 12 different trait adjectives printed on them were used, as well as A4 sheets of paper with response scales and smiley faces printed on them for the identifications and attitudes assessments.

5.1.5 Procedure

One-to-one interviews were conducted with the children. The interviews lasted between 40 and 60 minutes and were conducted in a quiet room on school premises. In all interview discussions, participants were made aware of their ethical rights (i.e., they were asked for informed consent, and they were told about their right to withdraw and issues of confidentiality and anonymity). After each interview, participants were thanked for their participation and debriefed. Discussions were all conducted in English by the present author (of British Sri Lankan background). The one-to-one interviews involved assessments of the following variables, after demographic and background information had been collected:
1. cognitive classification skill
2. levels of ethnic, British and religious identification
3. explicit attitudes towards specified target groups, using an unconfounded trait attribution task, and questions assessing general affect towards the target groups
4. levels of perceived discrimination
5. acculturation and cultural practices (including language use, celebration of cultural events, music, films, food, religion, sport, clothing)
6. inter-group friendships

5.1.6 The Interview Schedule

A full copy of the interview schedule is given in Appendix C. It contained the following sections.

5.1.6.1 Demographic Information

The initial questions in the schedule asked for information about the child’s date of birth, age, gender, school year, place of birth, family migration history if the child’s parents were not born in Britain, nationality, ethnicity and religion. A summary of the demographic information which was collected is shown in Table 5.1.
Table 5.1 Demographic Information for English, Indian and Pakistani children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number (N)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age (SD)</td>
<td>9.74 (1.24)</td>
<td>9.81 (1.17)</td>
<td>9.78 (1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>7.00-11.72</td>
<td>7.72-11.72</td>
<td>7.48-11.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in Britain</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Nationality</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother same ethnicity as child</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father same ethnicity as child</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Religion</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.6.2 Cognitive Classification Task

The schedule then continued with a cognitive classification task. The aim here was to obtain a direct measure of the child’s cognitive capability that CDT researchers (e.g., Aboud & Amato, 2001; Bigler & Liben, 1993) claim is directly related to the child’s levels of prejudice. The task was adapted from Bigler and Liben (1993). The stimuli for the task consisted of a set of 16 pictures of children who differed according to gender (males, female), race (black, Asian, white), pose (i.e. head shot and full body) and clothing (western and ethnic) (see Appendix F for four example pictures). The children depicted varied in their poses. These photos were scattered onto a table and children were asked to sort the cards into two groups by putting children who go together into the same pile. After the first sort, the child was asked to explain their reason for sorting the individuals into the two different piles. The interviewer then asked the child if there was another or different way to sort the cards. The process was repeated until the child could not produce any more additional sorts. The score was the total number of different sorts which the child was able to make. This task...
was administered first to avoid the other tasks priming the children into using race or ethnicity to sort the photos.

5.1.6.3 Levels of Ethnic, British and Religious Identification

The Strength of Identification Scale (SoIS, Barrett, 2007) was then used to assess the strength of the children’s identification with their ethnic group, the British group and their religious group. The measure consisted of five questions measuring the degree of identification, pride, importance, feeling and internalisation. Responses were based on 4 and 5 point scales, some using ‘smiley faces’. The response scales and ‘smiley faces’ were printed on A4 sheets of paper which were read out to the child. The left-right spatial positioning of the set of possible responses for each question was counterbalanced across successive questions and successive children. The questions were (where X represents the name of the identity being questioned):

**Degree of Identification**
Which one of these do you think best describes you?
Response scale: *very X, quite X, a little bit X, not at all X*

**Pride**
How proud are you of being X?
Response scale: *very proud, quite proud, a little bit proud, not at all proud*

**Importance**
How important is it to you that you are X?
Response scale: *very important, quite important, not very important, not important at all*

**Feeling**
How do you feel about being X?
Response scale: *very happy, quite happy, neutral, quite sad, very sad*
(administered using a set of five ‘smiley’ faces)
Internalisation

Response scale: How you would feel if someone said something bad about X people?
very happy, quite happy, neutral, quite sad, very sad
(administered using a set of five ‘smiley’ faces)

The researcher read out each question, and then read out the set of accompanying possible responses one by one with the child. The order of questioning the children about their three group memberships (ethnic, British and religious) was randomised, and the order of administering the five questions within each block of questions was randomised. The measure was administered before the attitudes and affect measures in order to prime the children into thinking about their ingroup identities prior to assessing their attitudes and affect.

In the case of the children who said that they did not have a religion at the outset of the interview, religious identification was not tested. However, these children were asked again at the time when the British and ethnic identification measures were being administered if they or their family were Christian or any other religion, and if they responded yes at that point, then their strength of religious identification measure was administered. All the children had their strength of British identification measured, on the grounds that all were British residents.

The responses were scored on scales ranging from 1 to 5 as shown in Tables 5.2 to 5.4. The scale displayed acceptable reliabilities for each of the three identities, as follows: Ethnic identification: Cronbach alpha = 0.63, British identification: Cronbach alpha = 0.67, Religious identification: Cronbach alpha = 0.73. Three separate mean strength of identification scores were therefore derived for each of these three identities by averaging the scores across the five questions which related to that identity.
Table 5.2 Derivation of Degree of Identity, Pride and Importance Question Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree, Pride, Importance</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Not very</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 Derivation of Feeling Question Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Very happy</th>
<th>Quite happy</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Quite sad</th>
<th>Very sad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 Derivation of Internalisation Question Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internalisation</th>
<th>Very happy</th>
<th>Quite happy</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Quite sad</th>
<th>Very sad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.6.4 Attitudes and Affect to Ingroups and Outgroups

The trait attribution task and affect questions were administered next. Before the task began, an introductory preamble was given to each child creating an explicit inter-group comparative context by naming all the national groups to be tested (see Appendix C). Then, the child was asked to think about one of the four target groups of Indian, Pakistani, British and white English people. The child’s ingroup was assessed first, followed by the other target groups in a randomised order. Then 12 cards were read out to children, each with one of the following trait adjectives printed on it: polite, rude, friendly, unfriendly, clever, stupid, lazy, hardworking, happy, sad, honest and dishonest. The order of the cards was randomised. After being shown each card, the child was asked to indicate the proportion of the target group who had that attribute, using the following responses scales: None of them, A few of them, Half of them, A lot of them, All of them. The left-right ordering of these response cards was counterbalanced across successive target groups.
Responses were translated into scores as shown in Tables 5.5 (positive adjectives) and 5.6 (negative adjectives). The scores obtained for the six positive adjectives were averaged, resulting in one positive adjective score for each target group, while the scores obtained for the six negative adjectives were also averaged, resulting in one negative adjective score for each target group. Because of the direction of scoring, the higher the score on both scales, the more positive the attitude towards the target group.

In addition, bivariate correlations were conducted for each target group individually to see whether the scores on each positive and negative pair of antonyms were related to each other. This revealed that out of the 24 correlations, 23 were statistically significant (only the happy-sad correlation for the British target group was not significant). Furthermore, when the scale consisting of all 12 adjectives as a whole was examined, it displayed very good reliability (Cronbach alpha = 0.90). Hence, for each target group individually, the positive adjective score and the negative adjective score were averaged, to create an overall positivity score for that group. However, the positive adjective and negative adjective scores were still analysed in addition to the overall positivity score, in order to examine the specific claims made by CDT (Doyle et al., 1988; Aboud & Amato, 2001) that developmental changes between the ages of 7 and 11 years consist of an increase in the attribution of negative traits to the ingroup, and an increase in the attribution of positive traits to outgroups.

Table 5.5 Derivation of Positive Adjective Scores from the Trait Attribution Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive attribute e.g. Honest</th>
<th>None of them</th>
<th>A few of them</th>
<th>Half of them</th>
<th>A lot of them</th>
<th>All of them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.6 Derivation of Negative Adjective Scores from the Trait Attribution Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative attribute</th>
<th>None of them</th>
<th>A few of them</th>
<th>Half of them</th>
<th>A lot of them</th>
<th>All of them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g. Dishonest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Directly after the trait attribution had been administered in relationship to a particular target group, an affect measure was then administered. This consisted of a pair of linked questions. The children were first asked if they liked or disliked the target group. They were then asked if they liked/disliked them a lot or a little. Responses were scored on a five point scale, as shown in Table 5.7.

Table 5.7 Derivation of Affect Score from Affect Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affect question</th>
<th>Like a lot</th>
<th>Like a little</th>
<th>Neither like or dislike</th>
<th>Dislike a little</th>
<th>Dislike a lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.6.5 Acculturation Behaviours: Language

After the trait attribution and affect questions, the children were then asked a sequence of questions about whether they spoke any languages apart from English and, if so, which languages, and which of these languages they spoke the most in three different contexts: at home; at school with friends; and outside school with friends.

5.1.6.6 Perceived Discrimination

The child’s level of perceived discrimination (PD) was then assessed, using a perceived discrimination scale developed by Cassidy, O’Connor, Howe and Warden.
(2005). This consists of six questions, enquiring about how frequently the child was ignored or excluded, bullied or made fun of, and called names or teased because of their ethnic or religious background, and how often they felt that other people did not see them as British and how often they felt that British people did not accept them. Responses were made along a five-point scale ranging from Never to Very often. The responses were then translated into scores as shown in Tables 5.8.

Table 5.8 Derivation of Perceived Discrimination Scores from the Perceived Discrimination Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD scale question</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Hardly ever</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This scale showed good reliability (Cronbach alpha = 0.77). The scores obtained for the 6 questions were therefore averaged, resulting in one overall PD score.

5.1.6.7 Acculturation Behaviours: Cultural Practices and Preferences

The interview then asked the children a range of questions about their cultural practices and preferences. The questions in this section of the interview schedule were adapted from those used by Barrett, Eade, Cinnirella and Garbin (2006) in their study of the cultural practices of British Bangladeshi and mixed-heritage adolescents.

The first set of questions covered:

- Whether the children celebrated certain cultural and religious festivals and events from all over the world (i.e., Christmas, Easter, Guy Fawkes, Eid, Halloween, Passover, Chinese New Year and Diwali).
- What kinds of music they liked to listen to, and their favourite music.
- What type of films they liked to watch, and their favourite type of film.
- What foods they consumed at home and when they were out with friends, and their favourite type of food.
The children's levels of religiosity were assessed using a four item scale, where they were asked how often they attended a mosque/church/mandir/temple, attended religious school, prayed, and studied religious texts. The responses were made along a five-point scale ranging from Never to Daily. These responses were then translated into a score as shown in Table 5.9. The four questions showed good reliability (Cronbach alpha = 0.70). The scores obtained on the 4 questions were therefore averaged, resulting in one overall religiosity score.

Table 5.9 Derivation of Religiosity Scores from the Religiosity Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RP scale question</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following this, the children were asked which national teams they supported in international cricket and football matches, and whether they ever wore the traditional clothes of their ethnic or religious group, and if so which clothes and on which occasions.

Finally, the children were asked to name their three best friends and to give the gender and ethnic group of these friends. The crucial information here was their friends' ethnicity. The total number of friends who were the same ethnicity as the child (from 0 to 3) was then calculated. In addition, the total number of English friends, the total number of Indian friends, and the total number of Pakistani friends, was calculated for each child, as measures of their levels of contact which each of these three ethnic groups.

The children were then thanked for their time, and were debriefed using child-appropriate terminology.
5.2 Conclusion

The results of the statistical analyses of the data which were collected in the interviews are reported in the following three chapters. Chapter 6 reports the results of the analyses of the scale data, using ANOVAs and correlations. Chapter 7 reports the results of the analyses of the cultural practices and preferences data, using correspondence analysis. Chapter 8 looks at the relationship between the scale data and the cultural practices data.
Chapter 6: Study 3 – Analysis of Scale Data

6.1 Research Questions

The analyses reported in this chapter were conducted in order to answer the following specific research questions:

1. Do children’s cognitive skills (as indexed by their multiple classification ability) develop in the same way irrespective of their ethnic group membership?

This question is of interest to the present research as CDT postulates that children’s cognitive abilities improve with age in the same universal manner, irrespective of their specific cultural background. In addition, Aboud and Amato (2001) claim that the concrete operational ability to perform multiple classifications, which develops between 7 and 11 years of age, is a key factor in the reduction of prejudice between these ages. The present research therefore examined the development of multiple classification skills in white English and Indian and Pakistani minority children, to see if CDT’s claim about the universality of the development of these skills is correct.

2. Do children’s levels of ethnic, British and religious identification vary as a function of age and ethnicity?

This second research question was of interest to the present study as there has been limited research on the quantitative levels of children’s social identifications. The small amount of research which has been conducted with children on this issue has found variability as a function of both age (Barrett, 2007) and ethnicity (Davis et al., 2007). Therefore, the present study aimed to establish what patterns and levels of ethnic, British and religious identification were present in these English, Indian and Pakistani children.
3. How are children’s ethnic, national and religious identifications inter-related?

The present study also examined the inter-relationships between the children’s ethnic, national and religious identifications. In the adult literature, an incompatibility between British and Muslim identification has been reported (ETHNOS, 2006). In addition, study 1 revealed that ethnic and religious identifications were related in minority children. Study 3 therefore examined whether the children’s ethnic and religious identifications were quantitatively related, and whether there was any incompatibility between British and Muslim identifications in Pakistani children.

4. How do children's inter-group attitudes change across the course of middle childhood?

The present research tested the prediction of CDT that patterns of attitude development between 7 and 11 years of age are universal. Past research has actually found a great deal of variability in children patterns of prejudice, with some research quite clearly showing that both ingroup positivity and outgroup prejudice decline between 7 and 11 years of age (e.g., Asher & Allen, 1969; Corenblum & Wilson, 1982; Doyle & Aboud, 1995) but other studies not finding these changes as a function of age (e.g. Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996; Davis et al., 2007; Dunham et al., 2006). The vast majority of previous research into children’s inter-group attitudes has been conducted with white majority children and black minority children, mostly in North America. The present study therefore examined this prediction of CDT using data from white English majority and Indian and Pakistani minority children living in Britain.

5. Does the extent of ingroup favouritism vary in children depending upon the specific ethnic group to which they belong?

The research also examined CDT’s claim that pro-white bias occurs in all majority group children and that minority group children show much weaker ingroup preferences than majority children, with some minority children even favouring the
majority outgroup over their own ingroup when they make evaluations of in- and out-groups. The present research examined this claim made by CDT using data from these white English majority and Indian and Pakistani minority British children.

6. Do children actually show negative prejudice towards outgroups, or do they just prefer some groups over other groups?

The present study also aimed to investigate if children actually show negativity toward outgroups. Nesdale (2004) claims that children merely like outgroups less than ingroups, but are nevertheless still positive towards outgroups, with negative prejudice only sometimes emerging after the age of 7 under certain specific conditions. This research therefore examined whether or not these white English, Indian and Pakistani children were negative towards any of the tested outgroups, and whether negative prejudice emerged after the age of 7.

7. Do levels of perceived discrimination vary in children according to either age or ethnic group membership (especially according to whether children come from majority or minority groups)?

This research question was of interest to the present study as there has been very little previous research on PD in children. In the adolescent PD literature, Phinney et al. (2006) found that PD was only reported by immigrants, and not by majority youth, and that there were no consistent age effects. The present study aimed to establish the extent to which PD was present in these white English, Indian and Pakistani children and whether it varied with age or ethnicity.

8. Do levels of religiosity vary in children according to either age or ethnic group membership?

Previous research with adolescents has found that for ethnic minority children, and especially for Muslim adolescents, religion is highly important (e.g. Ghuman, 2003; Jacobson, 1997; Modood et al., 1994). Given that in study 1, religion was found to be one of the most important identifications of minority Muslim children, the present
study aimed to examine the children’s levels of religiosity to see whether or not they varied according to either age or ethnicity.

6.2 Results

6.2.1 Cognitive Classification Skill

As reported in Chapter 5, a score was derived from the cognitive classification task which represented the total number of different sorts which the child was able to make on the task. The means and standard deviations are presented in Tables 6.1. A 3 (child ethnicity) x 4 (year group) independent groups ANOVA was used to analyse these scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child ethnicity</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no main effects of year group or ethnicity, but the ANOVA revealed that there was a significant interaction between child ethnicity and year group (F (6, 243) = 4.97, p < 0.001). In order to explore this interaction, three one-way ANOVAs (with year group as the independent variable) and post hoc Tukey tests were conducted on each ethnic group individually. These revealed that, for the English and Pakistani children, there were no significant differences in classification skill between all four
year groups. However, for the Indian children, there was an effect of year group (F (3, 81) = 7.69, p < 0.001), with year 3 (M = 1.95), year 5 (2.05) and year 6 (2.32) children being significantly less cognitively capable than year 4 children (M = 3.65) in the classification task.

Furthermore, four one-way ANOVAs (with child ethnicity as the independent variable) and post hoc Tukey tests were conducted on each year group individually. These revealed that, for year 3 and year 6 children there were no significant differences in classification skill between the three ethnic groups. However, for year 4 children, there was an effect of ethnicity (F (2, 63) = 5.95, p < 0.005) with Pakistani children (M = 2.19) having a lower score than Indian children (M = 3.65) in the classification task. There were, however, no significant differences between English children’s (M = 2.85) scores and the other two ethnic groups in this year group. For year 5 children, there was also an effect of ethnicity (F (2, 58) = 13.3, p < 0.001) with Indian (M = 2.05) and also Pakistan (M = 2.32) children having significantly lower scores on the classification task than English children (M = 3.35). There were also no significant differences between the Indian and Pakistani children’s scores for this year group.

There were no other significant effects.

6.2.2 Mean Strength of Ethnic, British and Religious Identity

These mean strength of ethnic, British and religious identification scores were analysed with a 3 (identity) x 3 (child ethnicity) x 4 (year group) mixed ANOVA with repeated measures on the first factor and independent groups on the other two factors. The means and standard deviations are presented in Tables 6.2-6.4.
Table 6.2 Descriptive Statistics for Mean Strength of Ethnic Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th></th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3 Descriptive Statistics for Mean Strength of British Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th></th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.4 Descriptive Statistics for Mean Strength of Religious Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant main effects of child ethnicity or year group were found. However, there was a significant main effect of identity (F (2, 192) = 11.47 p < 0.001). Post hoc paired samples t-tests revealed that the strength of identification scores for British, ethnic and religious identity were all significantly different from each other, with British identity (M = 4.04) being lower in strength than religious identity (M = 4.21) and ethnic identity (M = 4.32) respectively.

In addition, the ANOVA revealed a significant interaction between identity and child ethnicity (F (4, 384) = 3.77, p < 0.01), which was explored by conducting three one-way ANOVAS (with child ethnicity as the independent variable) and post hoc Tukey tests on each identity (ethnic, British and religious) individually. These revealed that, for ethnic and British identity there were no significant effect of child ethnicity. However, for religious identity, there was an effect of child ethnicity (F (2, 204) = 3.29, p < 0.05) with Indian children (M = 4.33) having a significantly stronger religious identity than the English children (M = 4.06). The scores for the Indian and Pakistani children (M = 4.17) were not significantly different from each other, and the scores for the English and Pakistani children were also not significantly different from each other.

Furthermore, three repeated measures one-way ANOVAs (with identity as the independent variable) were conducted for each ethnic group individually. These revealed that there were no significant differences between the three identities for
Pakistani children. However, for Indian children there was a significant effect of identity \( (F(2, 80) = 13.60, p < 0.05) \) and also for English children \( (F(2, 40) = 10.00, p < 0.05) \). Post hoc paired-samples t-tests revealed that the English children rated their English ethnic identity \( (M = 4.35) \) significantly more positively than their British \( (M = 4.02) \) and religious identities \( (M = 4.06) \), which were not different from each other. The Indian children rated their religious \( (M = 4.33) \) and Indian identities \( (M = 4.32) \) similarly, but these were both significantly more positive than their British identity \( (M = 3.94) \).

There were no other significant effects in the ANOVAs.

Partial correlations were also carried out for the three identities while controlling for age for each of the three ethnic groups of children individually (see Table 6.5 for the correlation coefficients). For the English children, all three identities were positively correlated with each other, while for the Indian children, religious identity was positively correlated with ethnic and British identity and ethnic identity was marginally correlated with British identification. For the Pakistani children, only ethnic and religious identities were positively correlated. British identity was not correlated with ethnic identity, and religious identity was negatively correlated with British identity. So the more Muslim that Pakistani children felt, the less British they felt. This is a very different pattern from the Indian children (who instead resembled the English children more than the Pakistani).
Table 6.5 Correlation Coefficients for Mean Strength of Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>British identity</th>
<th>Religious identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic identity</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British identity</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indian children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic identity</td>
<td>.21†</td>
<td>.48***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British identity</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pakistani children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic identity</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British identity</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† p = 0.057, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001.

6.2.3 Positive Adjective Scores

The scores derived from the positive adjectives in the trait attribution task were analysed using a 4 (target group) x 3 (child ethnicity) x 4 (year group) mixed ANOVA with repeated measures on the first factor and independent groups on the other two factors. The mean scores and standard deviations are presented in Tables 6.6-6.8.

Table 6.6 Descriptive Statistics for Positive Adjective Scores for English Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.7 Descriptive Statistics for Positive Adjective Scores for British Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.8 Descriptive Statistics for Positive Adjective Scores for Indian Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.9 Descriptive Statistics for Positive Adjective Scores for Pakistani Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 3</strong></td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 4</strong></td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 5</strong></td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 6</strong></td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No main effects of child ethnicity or year group were found. However, there was a significant main effect of target ($F (3, 229) = 5.61, p < 0.05$). Post hoc paired-samples t-tests revealed that the positive adjective scores for the Pakistani target ($M = 3.46$) were significantly lower than those for the English ($M = 3.57$), British ($M = 3.59$) and Indian ($M = 3.63$) targets; the scores for the English, British and Indian targets were not significantly different from each other.

In addition, the ANOVA revealed that there was an interaction between child ethnicity and target ($F (6, 458) = 6.94, p < 0.001$). In order to explore this interaction, four one-way ANOVAs (with child ethnicity as the independent variable) and post hoc Tukey tests were conducted on each target group individually. These revealed that, for the English and the British target groups, there were no significant effects of child ethnicity. However, for the Pakistani target group, there was an effect of child ethnicity ($F (2, 240) = 6.58, p < 0.05$), with the Indian children ($M = 3.29$) being significantly less positive than the Pakistani children ($M = 3.65$); the English children ($M = 3.43$) were not significantly different from either of the other two groups. In addition, for the Indian target group, there was also an effect of child ethnicity ($F (2, 241) = 4.33, p < 0.05$), with the English children ($M = 3.50$) being
significantly less positive than the Indian children (M = 3.77), but with the Pakistani children (M = 3.62) not being significantly different from either of the other two groups.

Furthermore, three repeated measures one-way ANOVAs (with target group as the independent variable) were conducted for each ethnic group individually. These revealed that there were no significant differences between the four target groups for the Pakistani children. However, for the English children, there was a significant effect of target (F (3, 234) = 3.60, p < 0.05). Post hoc paired-samples t-tests revealed that their ratings for English (M = 3.59) and British (M = 3.63) people were significantly higher than their ratings for the Pakistani target group (M= 3.43). There were no significant differences in the English children’s positivity scores for the other groups. For the Indian children, there was also a significant effect of target (F (3, 243) = 15.32, p < 0.001). Post hoc paired-samples t-tests revealed that they rated Indian people (M = 3.77) significantly more positively than any other group, they rated English (M = 3.60) and British (M = 3.55) people similarly, and rated Pakistani people (M = 3.29) significantly less positively than any other group. In other words, the Indian children showed clear evidence of ingroup favouritism, the English children showed ingroup favouritism in relationship to Pakistani people, but the Pakistani children did not show any evidence of ingroup favouritism.

There were no other significant effects in the mixed ANOVA.

Finally, one sample t-tests were conducted to examine if the mean positive adjective scores were significantly higher than the mid-point of the scale (3) for each child ethnicity. For English, Indian and Pakistani children, the scores were all significantly above the midpoint of 3 (see Table 6.10). Thus, all scores were towards the positive end of the scale.
Table 6.10 Results of the One Sample t-Tests on the Positive Adjective Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Ethnicity</th>
<th>Positive adjective score to English</th>
<th>Positive adjective score to Indian</th>
<th>Positive adjective score to Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>$t(79) = 10.0$</td>
<td>$t(81) = 8.2$</td>
<td>$t(81) = 7.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p &lt; 0.001$</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.001$</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.001$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>$t(81) = 11.9$</td>
<td>$t(81) = 9.9$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p &lt; 0.001$</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.001$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>$t(81) = 9.4$</td>
<td>$t(81) = 9.3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p &lt; 0.001$</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.001$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.4 Negative Adjective Scores

Similar analyses were performed on the scores derived from the negative adjective scores (note that, because of the direction of scoring here, high scores represent more positive attitudes, and low scores represent more negative attitudes). A 4 (target group) x 3 (child ethnicity) x 4 (year group) mixed ANOVA with repeated measures on the first factor and independent groups on the other two factors was used to analyse the scores for each of the target groups. The means and standard deviations are presented in Tables 6.11-6.14.
Table 6.11 Descriptive Statistics for Negative Adjective Scores for English Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.12 Descriptive Statistics for Negative Adjective Scores for British Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.13 Descriptive Statistics for Negative Adjective Scores for Indian Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.14 Descriptive Statistics for Negative Adjective Scores for Pakistani Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No main effects of child ethnicity or year group were found. However, there was a significant main effect of target ($F(3, 229) = 3.26$, $p < 0.05$). Post hoc paired-samples t-tests revealed that the negative adjective scores for the Indian target ($M = 3.82$) were significantly higher than those for the English ($M = 3.69$) and British ($M = 3.70$) targets, but there was no significant difference between Indian and Pakistani ($M = 3.78$) targets. The scores for the English and British targets were not
significantly different from each other, as were the scores for the British and Pakistani targets. However, the scores for the Pakistani target were significantly higher than those for the English target.

In addition, the ANOVA revealed that there was an interaction between child ethnicity and target \( (F(6, 458) = 3.09, p < 0.001) \). In order to explore this interaction, four one-way ANOVAs (with child ethnicity as the independent variable) and post hoc Tukey tests were conducted on each target group individually. These revealed that, for the English, the Indian and the British target groups, there were no significant effects of child ethnicity. However, for the Pakistani target group, there was an effect of child ethnicity \( (F(2, 242) = 3.12, p < 0.05) \), with the Indian children \( (M = 3.68) \) being significantly less positive than the Pakistani children \( (M = 3.91) \); the English children \( (M = 3.76) \) were not significantly different from either of the other two groups.

Furthermore, three repeated measures one-way ANOVAs (with target group as the independent variable) were conducted for each ethnic group individually. These revealed that there were no significant differences between the four target groups for English children. However, for Indian children there was a significant effect of target \( (F(3, 79) = 3.32, p < 0.05) \) and also for Pakistani children \( (F(3, 79) = 3.82, p < 0.05) \). Post hoc paired-samples t-tests revealed that the Indian children rated Indian people \( (M = 3.91) \) significantly more positively than English people \( (M = 3.73) \) and British people \( (M = 3.76) \), which were not significantly different from each other, and rated Pakistani people \( (M = 3.68) \) significantly less positively than any other group. The Pakistani children rated English \( (M = 3.67) \), British \( (M = 3.64) \) and Indian \( (M = 3.75) \) people significantly less positively than Pakistani people \( (M = 3.91) \), but there were no significant differences between the ratings of English, British and Indian people. In other words, the Indian and Pakistani children showed evidence of ingroup favouritism.

There were no other significant effects in the mixed ANOVA.
Finally, one sample t-tests were conducted to examine if the mean negative adjective scores were significantly higher than the mid-point of the scale (3) for each child ethnicity. The results are shown in Table 6.15. For English, Indian and Pakistani children, the scores were all significantly above 3, the midpoint of the scale, therefore all towards the positive end of the scale. In other words, the children were not negative towards any outgroups.

Table 6.15 Results of the One Sample t-Tests on the Negative Adjective Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative adjective score to English</td>
<td>t(79) = 12.8</td>
<td>t(81) = 12.7</td>
<td>t(81) = 10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative adjective score to Indian</td>
<td>t(79) = 13.3</td>
<td>t(81) = 17.9</td>
<td>t(81) = 12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative adjective score to Pakistani</td>
<td>t(78) = 12.3</td>
<td>t(81) = 9.9</td>
<td>t(81) = 13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative adjective score to British</td>
<td>t(76) = 13.6</td>
<td>t(81) = 13.8</td>
<td>t(81) = 10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.5 Overall Positivity

The overall positivity scores for each target group are shown in Tables 6.16-6.19. A 4 (target group) x 3 (child ethnicity) x 4 (year group) mixed ANOVA with repeated measures on the first factor and independent groups on the other two factors was used to analyse these scores.
Table 6.16 Descriptive Statistics for Overall Positivity Scores for English Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Ethnicity</th>
<th>English M</th>
<th>English SD</th>
<th>Indian M</th>
<th>Indian SD</th>
<th>Pakistani M</th>
<th>Pakistani SD</th>
<th>Total M</th>
<th>Total SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.17 Descriptive Statistics for Overall Positivity Scores for British Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Ethnicity</th>
<th>English M</th>
<th>English SD</th>
<th>Indian M</th>
<th>Indian SD</th>
<th>Pakistani M</th>
<th>Pakistani SD</th>
<th>Total M</th>
<th>Total SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.18 Descriptive Statistics for Overall Positivity Scores for Indian Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.19 Descriptive Statistics for Overall Positivity Scores for Pakistani Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No main effects of child ethnicity or year group were found. However, there was a significant main effect of target ($F(3, 229) = 3.31, p < 0.05$). Post hoc paired-samples t-tests revealed that the positivity scores for the Indian target ($M = 3.72$) were significantly higher than those for the English ($M = 3.65$), British ($M = 3.65$) and Pakistani ($M = 3.62$) targets; the scores for the English, British and Pakistani targets were not significantly different from each other.
In addition, the ANOVA revealed that there was an interaction between child ethnicity and target ($F(6, 458) = 5.96, p < 0.001$). In order to explore this interaction, four one-way ANOVAs (with child ethnicity as the independent variable) and post hoc Tukey tests were conducted on each target group individually. These revealed that, for the English and the British target groups, there were no significant effects of child ethnicity. However, for the Pakistani target group, there was an effect of child ethnicity ($F(2, 240) = 5.82, p < 0.05$), with the Indian children ($M = 3.49$) being significantly less positive than the Pakistani children ($M = 3.78$); the English children ($M = 3.60$) were not significantly different from either of the other two groups. In addition, for the Indian target group, there was also an effect of child ethnicity ($F(2, 241) = 3.70, p < 0.05$), with the English children ($M = 3.65$) being significantly less positive than the Indian children ($M = 3.84$), but with the Pakistani children ($M = 3.69$) not being significantly different from either of the other two groups.

Furthermore, three repeated measures one-way ANOVAs (with target group as the independent variable) were conducted for each ethnic group individually. These revealed that there were no significant differences between the four target groups for English and Pakistani children. However, for Indian children there was a significant effect of target ($F(2, 80) = 12.7, p < 0.001$). Post hoc paired-samples t-tests revealed that the Indian children rated Indian people ($M = 3.84$) significantly more positively than any other group, English ($M = 3.67$) and British ($M = 3.65$) people the same, and Pakistani people ($M = 3.49$) significantly less positively than any other group. In other words, only the Indian children showed evidence of ingroup favouritism.

There were no other significant effects in the mixed ANOVA.

Finally, one sample t-tests were conducted to examine if the mean overall positivity scores towards each target group, in all three groups of children, were significantly higher than the mid-point of the scale (3). For all of the children, the scores were all significantly above 3 (see Table 6.20). In other words, the children did not show negative prejudice towards any of the outgroups.
Table 6.20 Results of the One Sample t-Tests on the Overall Positivity Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall positivity to English</td>
<td>$t(79) = 13.9$</td>
<td>$t(81) = 11.6$</td>
<td>$t(81) = 10.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.001$</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.001$</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall positivity to Indian</td>
<td>$t(79) = 11.7$</td>
<td>$t(81) = 16.7$</td>
<td>$t(81) = 12.9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.001$</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.001$</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall positivity to Pakistani</td>
<td>$t(78) = 10.5$</td>
<td>$t(81) = 7.0$</td>
<td>$t(81) = 13.2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.001$</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.001$</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall positivity to British</td>
<td>$t(79) = 14.7$</td>
<td>$t(81) = 13.4$</td>
<td>$t(81) = 11.1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.001$</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.001$</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.001$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.6 Affect

The means and standard deviations of the affect scores are presented in Tables 6.21-6.24. A 4 (affect target group) x 3 (child ethnicity) x 4 (year group) mixed ANOVA with repeated measures on the first factor and independent groups on the other two factors was used to analyse the scores.

Table 6.21 Descriptive Statistics for Affect Scores for English Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Table 6.22 Descriptive Statistics for Affect Scores for British Target Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.23 Descriptive Statistics for Affect Scores for Indian Target Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.24 Descriptive Statistics for Affect Scores for Pakistani Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No main effects of child ethnicity or year group were found. However, there was a significant main effect of target (F (3, 179) = 5.61, p < 0.005). Post hoc paired-samples t-tests revealed that the affect scores for the English (M = 4.20), British (M = 4.18) and Indian target (M = 4.08) targets were all significantly higher than for the Pakistani (M = 3.84) target, but these three scores were not significantly different from each other.

In addition, the ANOVA revealed that there was an interaction between child ethnicity and target (F (6, 358) = 21.0, p < 0.001). In order to explore this interaction, four one-way ANOVAs (with child ethnicity as the independent variable) and post hoc Tukey tests were conducted on each target group individually. These revealed that, for the British target group, there was no significant effect of child ethnicity. However, for the Pakistani target group, there was an effect of child ethnicity (F (2, 217) = 22.5, p < 0.001), with the Indian (M = 3.39) and English (M = 3.66) children being significantly less positive about the Pakistani target group than the Pakistani children (M = 4.50). In addition, for the Indian target group, there was also an effect of child ethnicity (F (2, 222) = 20.6, p < 0.001), with the English (M = 3.73) and Pakistani children (M = 3.88) being significantly less positive than the Indian children (M = 4.60). There was also an effect of child ethnicity for the English target group (F (2, 236) = 11.5, p < 0.001), with the Pakistani (M = 4.02) and Indian (M =
4.12) children being significantly less positive about the English target group than the English children (M = 4.48).

Furthermore, three repeated measures one-way ANOVAs (with target group as the independent variable) were conducted for each ethnic group individually. This revealed that there were significant differences between the four target groups for English children (F (3, 59) = 12.4, p < 0.001), Indian children (F (3, 64) = 22.1, p < 0.001) and Pakistani children (F (3, 61) = 7.40, p < 0.001). Post hoc paired-samples t-tests revealed that the English children liked the English (M = 4.48) more than the British (M = 4.24) target group and liked both of these more than the Indian (M = 3.73) or the Pakistani (M = 3.66) target groups, but there were no significant differences between the Indian and Pakistani target groups for English children. The Indian children liked Indian people (M = 4.60) significantly more than any other group, with English (M = 4.12) and British (M = 4.21) people the same, and Pakistani people (M = 3.49) significantly less than any other group. Finally, the Pakistani children liked British (M = 4.08), English (M = 4.02), and Indian people significantly (M = 3.88) less than Pakistani people (M = 4.50), but otherwise there were no other significant differences in their ratings of the other target group pairs. Thus, there was ingroup favouritism on this measure for all 3 ethnic groups.

There were no other significant effects in the mixed ANOVA.

Finally, one sample t-tests were conducted to examine if the mean affect scores were significantly higher than the neutral mid-point of the scale (3) for each child ethnicity (see Table 6.25). For English, Indian and Pakistani children, the scores were all significantly above 3. In other words, none of the children were negative towards any of the groups.
Table 6.25 Results of the One Sample t-Tests on the Affect Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect to English</td>
<td>( t(78) = 48 )</td>
<td>( t(78) = 42 )</td>
<td>( t(78) = 30.1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p &lt; 0.001 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; 0.001 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; 0.001 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect to Indian</td>
<td>( t(72) = 30 )</td>
<td>( t(73) = 59 )</td>
<td>( t(75) = 33 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p &lt; 0.001 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; 0.001 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; 0.001 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect to Pakistani</td>
<td>( t(68) = 28 )</td>
<td>( t(72) = 23.4 )</td>
<td>( t(75) = 44.1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p &lt; 0.001 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; 0.001 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; 0.001 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect to British</td>
<td>( t(76) = 43 )</td>
<td>( t(76) = 46.1 )</td>
<td>( t(77) = 35.4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p &lt; 0.001 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; 0.001 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; 0.001 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.7 Perceived Discrimination

The means and standard deviations for the perceived discrimination scores are presented in Table 6.26. A 3 (child ethnicity) x 4 (year group) independent groups ANOVA was used to analyse these scores.
Table 6.26 Descriptive Statistics for PD Score for each Child Ethnicity and Year Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Ethnicity</th>
<th>English M SD</th>
<th>Indian M SD</th>
<th>Pakistani M SD</th>
<th>Total M SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>1.85 .75</td>
<td>2.24 .85</td>
<td>2.35 .79</td>
<td>2.15 .81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>1.99 .75</td>
<td>1.93 .50</td>
<td>2.26 .88</td>
<td>2.06 .72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>1.43 .48</td>
<td>2.13 .90</td>
<td>2.35 .92</td>
<td>1.96 .87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>1.36 .48</td>
<td>1.95 .62</td>
<td>2.24 .76</td>
<td>1.86 .73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.66 .67</td>
<td>2.06 .73</td>
<td>2.30 .82</td>
<td>2.01 .79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No main effects of year group were found. However, there was a significant main effect of child ethnicity (F (2, 232) = 15.8, p < 0.001). Post hoc Tukey tests revealed that English children (M = 1.66) had a lower PD score than Pakistani (M = 2.30) and Indian children (M = 2.06). There were no significant differences between the Indian and Pakistani children though. There were no other significant effects in the ANOVA.

6.2.8 Religiosity

The means and standard deviations of the religiosity scores are presented in Table 6.27. A 3 (child ethnicity) x 4 (year group) independent groups ANOVA was used to analyse these scores.
Table 6.27 Descriptive Statistics for Religiosity Scores for each Child Ethnicity and Year Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th></th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M    SD</td>
<td>1.63    .97</td>
<td>3.00    .98</td>
<td>3.08    .81</td>
<td>2.57    1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>2.08    .93</td>
<td>2.57    .67</td>
<td>3.25    1.00</td>
<td>2.64    .98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>2.19    .81</td>
<td>2.74    .78</td>
<td>3.32    .85</td>
<td>2.74    .93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>1.84    .89</td>
<td>2.43    .88</td>
<td>3.49    .88</td>
<td>2.61    1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>1.93    .91</td>
<td>2.68    .84</td>
<td>3.29    .89</td>
<td>2.64    1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No main effect of year group was found. However, there was a significant main effect of child ethnicity (F (2, 242) = 47.3, p < 0.0001). In order to explore this main effect, post hoc Tukey tests were conducted. These revealed that all three ethnic groups were different from each other. Pakistani children (M = 3.29) had the highest scores, then Indian children (M = 2.68), and finally English children (M = 1.93) had the lowest religiosity. There were no other significant effects in the ANOVA.

6.3 Discussion

The preceding results analysed the children's identifications (ethnic, British, religious), inter-group attitudes and affect, as well as their cognitive classification skills, perceived discrimination and religiosity, looking in particular at age (year group) and ethnic group differences. In addition, the results tested theoretical claims about the development of inter-group attitudes made by CDT and SIDT.

The first research question was: Do children's cognitive skills (as indexed by their multiple classification ability) develop in the same way irrespective of their ethnic group membership? This question was based on Aboud and Amato's (2001) claim that the ability to perform multiple classifications is responsible for the development of less prejudiced inter-group attitudes through middle childhood, and their argument that such skills develop in a universally similar way (with the result that prejudice
also declines through middle childhood in a universally similar way). However, the present analyses found little evidence of universally similar age-related trends in the development of multiple classification ability. First, there was no main effect of year group on classification skill. Second, it was found that, for year 4 children, Pakistani children had lower scores than Indian children, while for year 5 children, Indian and Pakistani children had lower scores than English children. These results differ from those of Cameron, Rutland and Brown (2007), who did find a significant relationship between age and multiple classification skill, although they failed to find any relationship between this skill which increased with age and the children's outgroup attitudes (the relationship between classification skills and inter-group attitudes in the present study will be reported in Chapter 8, which reports on the inter-relationships between all of the variables which were measured in this study).

The next set of research questions concerned children's strength of ethnic, British and religious identifications. First, the research sought to answer the question: Do children's levels of ethnic, British and religious identification vary as a function of age and ethnicity? It was found that there were no differences in levels of identification as a function of the children's age. Instead, the present study shows that children can already exhibit strong identifications by the age of 7, which is in line with the work of Barrett (2007), Bernal et al. (1990) and Davis et al. (2007): it is noteworthy that, in the present study, all of the children identified with their ethnic, British and religious groups to a high degree.

However, there were differences in identification as a function of the children's ethnicity. In particular, while the Pakistani children showed no significant differences in the strength of their ethnic, British and religious identifications, the English children had stronger English ethnic identifications than British and religious identifications, and the Indian children had stronger religious and ethnic identifications than British identifications. Akiba et al. (2004) found that ethnic identification was more important to visible minority children than white European descent children. However, in the present study, ethnic identification was important to all children whether white majority English or visible minority Asian.
In addition, the finding that the Indian (Sikh and Hindu) children had stronger religious identifications than English children is similar to Modood et al.'s (1994) finding that Sikhs and Hindus rated religion as more important than Christians. However, the present findings: that levels of religious identification were similar in English and Pakistani children, that levels of religious identification were similar in Indian and Pakistani children, and that the Pakistani children identified equally with all three identities, stand in contrast to the standard finding which is usually obtained with Muslim adolescents (rather than children), namely that religious identification usually holds the highest importance for Muslim adolescents (Ghuman, 2003; Jacobson, 1997; Modood et al., 1994).

As far as national identity is concerned, Barrett (2002) found a divide between majority English adolescents' and minority Indian and Pakistani adolescents' strength of English and British identification, with white English adolescents having stronger national identifications than either of the other two groups. By contrast, the English children in the present study did not attribute more significance to their British identification than the Pakistani and Indian children.

A further research question in relationship to identifications was: How are children's ethnic, national and religious identifications inter-related? The data from the present study revealed that, while the English and Indian children's ethnic, British and religious identifications were all positively correlated with each other, the Pakistani children showed a negative correlation between their religious identity and their British identity. So the more Muslim the Pakistani children felt, the less British they felt. This was a very different pattern from that shown by the Indian and English children. Instead, the Pakistani children were distinctive insofar as there appeared to be an incompatibility between their religious (i.e., Muslim) and British identifications. This finding seems plausible considering the current political climate and Muslim relations in Britain after 9/11 and the 7/7 attacks, and the choices which many British Muslims feel that they are now being expected to make between being British and being Muslim (ETHNOS, 2006).
The next set of research questions concerned the children's inter-group attitudes. The first question here was: How do children's inter-group attitudes change across the course of middle childhood? The study revealed that there were no age-related trends in the development of the children's attitudes to either ingroups or outgroups, irrespective of whether these were measured in terms of positive trait attributions, negative trait attributions, overall positivity score or affect. Hence, the predictions of CDT were not supported by the present study. Instead, the present study shows quite clearly that the common finding that both ingroup positivity and outgroup prejudice decline between 7 and 11 years of age (e.g., Aboud, 1977, 1980; Asher & Allen, 1969; Corenbhun & Wilson, 1982; Doyle & Aboud, 1995; Hraba & Grant, 1970; Vaughan, 1964; Williams et al., 1975; Williams & Morland, 1976) is nevertheless not a universal patterns of development.

The lack of age-related changes in inter-group attitudes which were found in the present study, however, are consistent with the prediction of SIDT that prejudice does not always emerge in children aged 7 years and older. The present findings are also consistent with Black-Gutman and Hickson (1996) who found that the attitudes of white Australian children to their own ingroup and to Asian Australians did not change as a function of age between 5 and 11 years.

The study also attempted to answer the research question: Does the extent of ingroup favouritism vary in children depending upon the specific ethnic group to which they belong? The study revealed that only the Indian children showed clear evidence of ingroup favouritism on the positive adjective, negative adjective and overall positivity measures. The Pakistani children instead only showed evidence of ingroup favouritism on the negative adjective measure, while the English children did not show clear evidence of ingroup favouritism on any of the measures derived from the trait attribution task. These findings serve to highlight the variability which occurs in the development of ethnic attitudes, and that even the phenomenon of ingroup favouritism is not universally present but instead varies according to children's own ethnic group membership.
The finding that the majority white English children did not display clear ingroup favouritism on the trait attribution task is consistent with Davis et al.’s (2007) finding with white British children aged 5-9 years. However, these findings are counter to CDT’s postulation that pro-white bias occurs in all majority group children when they make trait attributions. The present findings are also counter to CDT’s claim that minority group children show much weaker ingroup preferences than majority children with some minority children even favouring the majority outgroup over their own ingroup (Jahoda, Thomson & Bhatt, 1972; Milner, 1973; Vaughan, 1964). There was also no evidence in the present study of minority self-hatred or ingroup negativity or white preference amongst the minority children.

That said, on the affect measure, as opposed to the trait attribution measures, all three groups of children did exhibit ingroup favouritism. This finding is identical to the finding which Barrett (2007) reports in relationship to attitudes towards national groups: that ingroup favouritism is only sometimes exhibited on trait attribution tasks but is invariably displayed on general affect measures.

A further research question was: *Do children actually show negative prejudice towards outgroups, or do they just prefer some groups over other groups?* The evidence from the study revealed that there was no evidence of negative prejudice amongst these children. All of the scores on all of the attitude scales were significantly above the mid-points of those scales. In addition, the fact that the Indian children were less positive about the Pakistani group may be due to longstanding inter-group relations between the two nations, with India and Pakistan being traditional enemies, and with and Muslim-Hindu conflict in the north east of India. Knowledge about these relations may well have been passed on to the children by family members. But it must be stressed that the Indian as well as English children were merely less positive about certain groups rather than actually negative towards those groups, findings which are in line with Bennett et al. (2004) and Barrett (2007), as well as the findings of Nesdale et al. (2003).

The findings that there was no evidence of negative prejudice (which is consistent Nesdale’s et al.’s research) in these children raises the question of whether in a
super-diverse context such as London, levels of prejudice in children are low due to the high levels of inter-group contact in multi-ethnic schools and a multicultural school ethos. This possibility will be addressed in Chapter 8, when the attitudinal data are correlated with the data concerning levels of inter-group contact. It is of course possible that using a different target outgroup would have produced different results (e.g., the English children may have been negative to Germans, as Bennett et al., 2004 found). However, that said, the present findings are consistent with SIDT and appear to reflect the multicultural school effects and ethos.

A further research question investigated in this study was: Do levels of perceived discrimination vary in children according to either age or ethnic group membership (especially according to whether children come from majority or minority groups)? The data revealed that there were no differences in levels of PD as a function of age, but that there were indeed differences as function of ethnicity, with Indian and Pakistani minority group children having higher perceived discrimination scores than English majority children. Unfortunately there is very little previous research on PD in children with which the present findings may be compared. However, with adolescents the present findings are in line with Phinney et al. (2006) who found that PD was not reported by majority youth but was by immigrants and that there were no consistent age differences. The possible relationship between levels of PD and inter-group attitudes in children will be addressed later on in Chapter 8 in this thesis.

Finally, the study also addressed the research question: Do levels of religiosity vary in children according to either age or ethnic group membership? The data revealed that there were no differences in levels of religiosity according to age, but that there were differences according to ethnicity, with all three ethnic groups being different from each other. The Pakistani children were the highest on religiosity, then the Indian children, with the English children being the lowest. These results are in line with the findings of Modood et al., (1994), Ghuman (2003) and Jacobson (1997), all of whom found that religion was highly important to Muslim youth and, in the case of Ghuman’s study, more important than it was to Indian Hindus and Sikhs. Interestingly, these results are in contrast to the religious identification results.
reported earlier, where the Indian children held identifications with religion that were just as strong as those displayed by the Pakistani children.

In summary, the findings from the present analyses found no evidence of age related changes in children's inter-group attitudes, classification skill, identifications, PD or religiosity. There were however differences in ingroup favouritism, identification, PD and religiosity due to children's ethnic groups memberships. In addition, there was no evidence of negative outgroup prejudice in any of the children. Finally, for Pakistani children, the relationship between their British and religious identities (i.e., being negatively correlated) was different from the relationship shown by Indian and English children, who were more similar to each other with both these identities being positively correlated. Some of the finding presented here may be thought of as counterintuitive, but the specific context of this research need to be borne in mind, as well as the specific groups that were used, and this may be why results were different from previous findings and contexts. Another explanation of some of the counterintuitive findings may be the role played by environmental factors which were not examined in this research. Finally, due to the fact that a large number of tests have been conducted in this chapter, it must be noted that the possibility of type 1 error therefore increases.
Chapter 7: Study 3 – Cultural Practices Data Analysis

7.1 Research Questions

The following analyses focused on the data which were collected on the children's cultural practices. The specific research questions addressed by the analyses which are reported in this chapter are as follows:

1. **Are there differences in children's cultural practices as a function of their ethnicity?**

   Previous research with adolescents (e.g., Ghuman, 2003) has found variability in cultural behaviours from one ethnic group to another. Therefore, it was expected that there would also be differences in the children’s cultural practices linked to their different ethnic group memberships. However, what was of greater interest here was whether the different ethnic groups would be dealing with the multiple cultures in their everyday environments in different or similar ways. A particular focus here was whether the children were appropriating more than just one or two cultures, as Berry (1997, 2001) assumes, and whether these patterns of appropriation differed according to the children’s ethnicity. In addition, previous acculturation research has mainly looked at acculturation attitudes (Berry et al., 2006). However, actual acculturation behaviours, that is, cultural practices, have been less well researched. In the present study, these cultural behaviours were examined to see whether they reflected particular acculturation styles in children. In addition, past research has also tended to look at acculturation from the perspective of minority individuals; the present study was novel in also examining English majority children’s cultural practices.

2. **Are there gender differences in children's cultural practices?**

   Ghuman (2003) also found differences in adolescents’ cultural practices according to their gender, with girls being more likely to adopt a separatist acculturation orientation than boys (possibly as a result of differential parental expectations of
boys vs. girls). The present study examined whether similar gender differences were present in the children’s cultural behaviours and acculturation.

3. Are there age-related differences in children’s cultural practices?

The present study also examined the children’s cultural practices to see whether and how these practices changed with age.

4. Are there differences in children’s cultural practices as a function of cultural domain and context?

This research question was of fundamental interest, as previous research has found that minority adults tend to prefer cultural maintenance in the private sphere than in public spheres (Phalet, Van Lotringen & Entzinger, 2000; Taylor & Lambert, 1996). Study 1 suggested that the same applies to ethnic minority children. In addition, Coleman’s (1995) acculturation theory postulates that acculturation strategies are not fixed or mutually exclusive, and that instead they can vary depending on the context (Ogbu & Mature-Bianchi, 1986). The present research aimed to test Coleman’s theory that it is possible to alternate between two cultures, but using data from children rather than from either adolescents or adults.

5. Are there differences in children’s levels of inter-group friendships as a function of ethnic group, gender or age?

The study also examined the children’s inter-group friendships to see if their friendship networks were ethnically marked. Hallinan and Teixeira (1987) found that cross-race friendships depend on the availability of cross-race individuals in the child’s environment. Linked to this, Howes and Wu (1990) found that white American children have more same-race friends while black American children have more cross-race friends. The present children all attended multi-ethnic schools where there were ample opportunities for cross-race friendships. Aboud, Mendelson and Purdy (2003) found an age-related decline in cross-race friendships. The robustness of these North American findings were tested with the present children in a different
national context. Gender differences were also examined, as some past research has shown that gender differences are related to inter-group friendships (Beal, 1994), a point which was noticed in studies 1 and 2 as well.

7.2 Results

The data on the children’s cultural practices in the domains of music, films, festivals and foods were analysed using correspondence analysis (CA) (Hammond, 1988). CA uses geometric principles to generate a graphical illustration of the relationship between response categories and particular subgroups of participants. In the geometric plot which CA generates, the distance between a particular subgroup and a particular response category provides a measure of the relative degree of association between that subgroup and that response, with a shorter distance representing a closer degree of association and a longer distance representing a less close degree of association. Chi-squared statistics are used to ascertain whether the spatial separations along the horizontal and vertical axes of the plot are statistically significant or a result of random variation in the data. In the present analyses, CA plots were used to determine the categories of cultural practices which were most closely associated with each ethnic subgroup (i.e., Indian, Pakistani and English) and with particular age and gender subgroups within each ethnic group (i.e., younger boys, younger girls, older boys, older girls, where the younger groups were composed of children from school years 3 and 4, and the older groups were composed of children from school years 5 and 6).

Firstly, frequency counts of the specific cultural practices reported by each ethnic subgroup, and by each age x gender subgroup within each ethnic group, were compiled for each of the relevant questions in the interview schedule. Then a series of individual correspondence analyses was run on these frequencies. Cultural practices with a response frequency count of less than 5 were not included in the analyses to avoid the results being unduly biased by low frequency responses, a procedure recommended by Hammond (1988).
7.2.1 Music

The CA analysing the children's reports of their music practices, using ethnic groups as the blocking variable with all age and gender groups combined together, revealed that there was only one significant dimension ($\chi^2 (14) = 179.4, p<0.0001$, % of inertia explained = 92.2), allowing interpretation of distances only along the horizontal axis of the plot only. The plot (Figure 7.1) should therefore only be interpreted as a simple horizontal line, with all differences in the vertical dimension collapsed down onto this single line. The separations along the single horizontal dimension reveal that the English children's preferences were different from the Indian and Pakistani children's.

*Figure 7.1 Music Choices for Each Ethnic Group with All Age and Gender Groups Together*

Punk and Funk were more closely associated with the English children. However, Bollywood music (both traditional and remix) were more closely associated with Indian and Pakistani children. Dance was non-discriminatory between the three groups. Table 7.1 shows the most frequently occurring responses.
Table 7.1 Percentages of Children from Each Ethnic Group who Reported Liking Rap RnB, Pop, Bollywood Traditional and Remix Music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child’s ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rap</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RnB</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollywood traditional</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollywood remix</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.2 Music Choices for the English Children Divided into Four groups: Young Boys (YB), Young Girls (YG), Older Boys (OB), Older Girls (OG)

The CA analysing the English children's music choices with these children broken down into their age and gender subgroups revealed that there were two significant dimensions, allowing interpretation of the plot in terms of both the horizontal and the vertical axes (dimension 1: $\chi^2 (18) = 148.7$, $p<0.001$, % of inertia explained = 58.7; dimension 2: $\chi^2 (16) = 76.4$, $p<0.001$, % of inertia explained = 30.7; N.B. in the plots which are shown in the Figures, dimension 1 is always the horizontal axis and dimension 2 is always the vertical dimension). The plot (see Figure 7.2) shows that
the first dimension differentiated between the young boys and old girls, and the second differentiated between the young girls and the other three groups.

Figure 7.2 also shows that Dance, Pop and Classical were non-discriminatory between the 4 groups, but Reggae and Heavy Metal were more closely associated with both young and old boys, while traditional Bollywood music was more closely associated with both young and old girls. Rap and Drum and Bass were more closely associated with old boys, while Bollywood remix, Indie, African and Punk were more closely associated with older girls. Table 7.2 shows the most frequently occurring responses.

**Table 7.2 Percentages of English Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Liking Rap RnB, Pop, Rock and Dance Music**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rap</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RnB</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7.3 Music Choices for Indian Children Divided into Four Groups: Young Boys (YB), Young Girls (YG), Older Boys (OB), Older Girls (OG)

The CA on the Indian children's music choices with these children broken down into age and gender subgroups revealed that there were two significant dimensions (dimension 1: $\chi^2 (13) = 118.1$, $p<0.0001$, % of inertia explained = 58.0; dimension 2: $\chi^2 (11) = 78$, $p<0.0001$, % of inertia explained = 39.1). The plot (see Figure 7.3) shows that the first significant dimension differentiated between the young boys and older girls, and the second differentiated between old boys and young girls.

Figure 7.3 also shows that Bollywood music (remix and traditional) was non-discriminatory between the 4 groups, but Rap and Rock were more closely associated with boys, while Pop and Dance were more closely associated with girls. Young boys were more closely associated with Classical and Jazz, while old girls were more closely associated with Indie. Table 7.3 shows the most frequently occurring responses.
Table 7.3 Percentages of Indian Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Liking Rap RnB, Pop and Bollywood Traditional (T) and Remix (R) Music.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rap</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RnB</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollywood T</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollywood R</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.4 Music Choices for Pakistani Children Divided into Four Groups: Young Boys (YB), Young Girls (YG), Older Boys (OB), Older Girls (OG)

The CA on the Pakistani children’s music choices with these children broken down into age and gender subgroups revealed that there were two significant dimensions (dimension 1: $\chi^2 (12) = 77.6$, $p<0.0001$, % of inertia explained = 66.7; dimension 2: $\chi^2 (10) = 26.9$, $p<0.005$, % of inertia explained = 24.0). The plot (see Figure 7.4) shows that the first significant dimension differentiated between the girls and boys and the second differentiated between younger and older children.
Figure 7.4 also shows that Bollywood music (remix and traditional) was non-discriminatory between the 4 groups, but Drum and Bass was more closely associated with young and old boys, while Pop and Dance were more closely associated with both younger and older girls. Rock and RnB were more closely associated with older than younger children. Table 7.4 shows the most frequently occurring responses.

Table 7.4 Percentages of Pakistani Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Liking Rap RnB, Pop and Bollywood Traditional (T) and Remix (R) Music.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rap</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RnB</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollywood T</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollywood R</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2.2 Films

Figure 7.5 Film Choices for Each Ethnic Group with All Age and Gender Groups Together

The CA on the children's film choices, broken down by ethnic group, revealed that there was only one significant dimension, which only allows interpretation of distances along the horizontal axis of the plot (see Figure 7.5). This shows that English children's preferences were different from Indian and Pakistani children's ($\chi^2 (6) = 44, p< 0.0001$, % of inertia explained = 98.0).

Figure 7.5 also shows that British, American and Kung Fu films were non-discriminatory between the 3 ethnic groups. However, Indian Bollywood films were more closely associated with both Indian and Pakistani children. Table 7.5 shows the most frequently occurring responses.
Table 7.5 Percentages of Children from Each Ethnic Group who Reported Liking American, Cartoon, British, Indian Bollywood and Kung Fu Films

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoon</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kung Fu</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Bollywood</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.6 Film Choices for English Children Divided into Four Groups: Young Boys (YB), Young Girls (YG), Older Boys (OB), Older Girls (OG)

The CA on the film choices for English children divided into age and gender subgroups revealed that there were two significant dimensions, allowing interpretation of the plot in terms of both the horizontal and the vertical axes (dimension 1: \( \chi^2(7) = 67, p<0.0001 \), % of inertia explained = 68.3; dimension 2: \( \chi^2(5) = 27, p<0.001 \), % of inertia explained = 28.1). The plot (see Figure 7.6) shows that the first significant dimension differentiated between the young boys and older
girls, and the second differentiated between the young girls and the other three groups.

Figure 7.6 also shows that British films and Cartoons were more or less non-discriminatory between the 4 groups, but Kung Fu films were more closely associated with young boys, while Indian Bollywood films were more closely associated with older girls. American films were more closely associated with older children. Table 7.6 shows the most frequently occurring responses.

Table 7.6 Percentages of English Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Liking American, Cartoon, British, Indian Bollywood and Kung Fu Films

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoons</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kung Fu</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollywood</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CA on the Indian children's film choices broken down by age and gender revealed that there was only one significant dimension. The plot (see Figure 7.7) shows that the significant dimension differentiated between the girls and the boys (girls (χ² (7) = 55.8, p< 0.0001, % of inertia explained = 80.2).

Figure 7.7 also shows that American and Indian Bollywood films were more closely associated with girls, while Kung Fu films were more closely associated with both younger and older boys. Table 7.7 shows the most frequently occurring responses.
Table 7.7 Percentages of Indian Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Liking American, Cartoon, British, Indian Bollywood and Kung Fu Films

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoons</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kung Fu</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollywood</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.8 Film Choices for Pakistani Children Divided into Four Groups: Young Boys (YB), Young Girls (YG), Older Boys (OB), Older Girls (OG)

The CA on the Pakistani children's film choices broken down by age and gender revealed that there were two significant dimensions (dimension 1: $\chi^2 (7) = 70.8$, $p<0.0001$, % of inertia explained = 73.9; dimension 2: $\chi^2 (5) = 24.1$, $p<0.005$, % of inertia explained = 25.6). The plot (see Figure 7.8) shows that the first significant dimension differentiated between the girls and boys and the second differentiated
between young and old children but was crossed by gender (i.e. differentiated for the boys and for the girls).

Figure 7.8 also shows that Indian Bollywood films were more closely associated with girls but Kung fu films were more associated with boys. American films were more closely associated with young boys and least with young girls. Table 7.8 shows the most frequently occurring responses.

Table 7.8 Percentages of Pakistani Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Liking American, Cartoon, British, Indian Bollywood and Kung Fu Films

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoons</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kung Fu</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollywood</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2.3 Festivals

Figure 7.9 Festival Participation for Each Ethnic Group with All Age and Gender Groups Together

The CA on the children's participation in festivals broken down only by ethnic group revealed that there were two significant dimensions, allowing interpretation of the plot in terms of both the horizontal and the vertical axes (dimension 1: $\chi^2 (8) = 289.7$, $p<0.001$, % of inertia explained = 68.5; dimension 2: $\chi^2 (6) = 123.7$, $p<0.001$, % of inertia explained = 31.5). The plot (see Figure 7.9) shows that the first significant dimension differentiated Pakistani children’s festival participation from Indian and English children, and the second differentiated between the English and Indian children.

Figure 7.9 also shows that Eid was more closely associated with Pakistani children, Diwali with Indian children and Guy Fawkes with English children. Table 7.9 shows the most frequently occurring responses.
Table 7.9 Percentages of Children from Each Ethnic Group who Reported Participating in Christmas, Eid, Easter, Halloween, Diwali and Guy Fawkes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child’s ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halloween</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diwali</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Fawkes</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.10 Festival Participation for English Children Divided into Four Groups: Young Boys (YB), Young Girls (YG), Older Boys (OB), Older Girls (OG)

The CA on the English children’s festival participation broken down into age and gender subgroups revealed that there was only one significant dimension, which only allows interpretation of distances along the horizontal axis of the plot (see Figure 7.10). This shows that the significant dimension differentiated between the young girls and the young boys ($\chi^2(7) = 20.2$, $p<0.01$, % of inertia explained = 66.9).
Figure 7.10 also shows that Chinese New Year was more closely associated with young girls. Table 7.10 shows the most frequently occurring responses.

Table 7.10 Percentages of English Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Participating in Christmas, Chinese New Year (NY), Easter, Halloween and Guy Fawkes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese NY</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halloween</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Fawkes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CA on the Indian children's festival participation broken down into age and gender subgroups revealed that there were no significant dimensions in the plot. Hence, these children's participation in festivals was similar irrespective of their age and gender. Table 7.11 shows the most frequently occurring responses.

Table 7.11 Percentages of Indian Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Participating in Christmas, Chinese New Year(NY), Easter, Halloween, Diwali and Guy Fawkes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese NY</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halloween</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diwali</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Fawkes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CA on the Pakistani children's festival participation broken down into age and gender subgroups revealed that there was one significant dimension ($\chi^2 (8) = 24.1$, $p<0.005$, % of inertia explained = 83.2). The plot (see Figure 7.11) shows that the significant dimension differentiated between the old boys and the other three groups.

Figure 7.11 also shows that Eid and Easter were non-discriminatory between the four groups, but Christmas and Guy Fawkes were more closely associated with young boys, young girls and older girls. However, Diwali was more closely associated with older boys. Table 7.12 shows the most frequently occurring responses.
Table 7.12 Percentages of Pakistani Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Participating in Christmas, Eid, Easter, Halloween, Diwali and Guy Fawkes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eid</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halloween</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diwali</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Fawkes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.4 Foods Eaten at Home

Figure 7.12 Foods Eaten at Home for Each Ethnic Group with All Age and Gender Groups Together

The CA on the children's foods eaten at home broken down only by ethnic group revealed that there were two significant dimensions, allowing interpretation of the
plot in terms of both the horizontal and the vertical axes (dimension 1: $\chi^2 (7) = 218.9$, $p<0.0001$, $\%$ of inertia explained = 88.4; dimension 2: $\chi^2 (5) = 26.2$, $p<0.001$, $\%$ of inertia explained = 11.6). The plot (see Figure 7.12) shows that the first significant dimension differentiated Pakistani children from Indian and English children, and the second differentiated between English children and Indian children.

Figure 7.12 also shows that fast food and English food were more or less non-discriminatory between the 3 ethnic groups, while Pakistani food was more closely associated with the Pakistani children and Indian food was more closely associated with Indian children. Table 7.13 shows the most frequently occurring responses.

---

**Table 7.13 Percentages of Children from Each Ethnic Group who Reported Eating English, Fast Food, Indian, Pakistani, Italian and Chinese Foods in the Home Context**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast food</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CA on the foods eaten at home by English children broken down into age and gender subgroups revealed that there were two significant dimensions (dimension 1: \( \chi^2 (9) = 73.1, p<0.0001 \), % of inertia explained = 65.7; dimension 2: \( \chi^2 (7) = 26.9, p<0.001 \), % of inertia explained = 24.6. The plot (see Figure 7.13) shows that the first significant dimension differentiated between the young vs old children, and the second differentiated between the young girls and the other three groups.

Figure 7.13 also shows that English, Italian and Chinese food were more or less non-discriminatory between the 4 groups, but Caribbean, Indian and the ‘other’ food category was more closely associated with older children. Fast foods were more closely associated with young boys than young girls. Table 7.14 shows the most frequently occurring responses.
Table 7.14 Percentages of English Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Eating English, Fast Food, Indian, Italian and Chinese Foods in the Home Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast food</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.14 Foods Eaten at Home for Indian Children Divided into Four Groups: Young Boys (YB), Young Girls (YG), Older Boys (OB), Older Girls (OG)

The CA on the foods eaten at home by Indian children broken down into age and gender subgroups revealed that there was only one significant dimension. The plot (see Figure 7.14) shows that the significant dimension differentiated between the younger and older children (χ² (7) = 17.1, p< 0.05, % of inertia explained = 61.9).
Figure 7.14 also shows that English, Chinese and Indian foods were more or less non-discriminatory between the 4 groups, while Italian and fast foods were more closely associated with older boys and girls. Table 7.15 shows the most frequently occurring responses.

Table 7.15 Percentages of Indian Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Eating English, Fast Food, Indian, Italian and Chinese Foods in the Home Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast food</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.15 Foods Eaten at Home for Pakistani Children Divided into Four Groups: Young Boys (YB), Young Girls (YG), Older Boys (OB), Older Girls (OG)
The CA on the Pakistani children's foods eaten at home broken down into age and gender subgroups revealed that there were two significant dimensions (dimension 1: \( \chi^2 (8) = 28.3, p<0.001, \% \) of inertia explained = 54.4; dimension 2: \( \chi^2 (6) = 17.3, p<0.05, \% \) of inertia explained = 33.4). The plot (see Figure 7.15) shows that the first significant dimension differentiated between the young and old boys and the second differentiated between old boys and old girls.

Figure 7.15 also shows that fast foods and Indian foods were more closely associated with older boys and girls and Italian food was more closely associated with all groups except older boys. Table 7.16 shows the most frequently occurring responses.

*Table 7.16 Percentages of Pakistani Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Eating English, Fast Food, Indian, Pakistani, Italian, and Chinese Foods in the Home Context*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast food</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2.5 Foods Eaten with Friends

Figure 7.16 Foods Eaten with Friends for Each Ethnic Group with All Age and Gender Groups Together

The CA on the foods which are eaten with friends broken down by ethnic group revealed that there was only one significant dimension, which only allows interpretation of distances along the horizontal axis of the plot (see Figure 7.16). This shows that Pakistani children’s choices were different from Indian and English children’s ($\chi^2(0) = 138.5$, $p<0.0001$, % of inertia explained = 92.1).

Figure 7.16 also shows English food was more or less non-discriminatory between the 3 ethnic groups, while Pakistani food was more closely associated with the Pakistani children. Chinese food was more closely associated with both English and Indian children than Pakistani children. Table 7.17 shows the most frequently occurring responses.
Table 7.17 Percentages of Children from Each Ethnic Group who Reported Eating English, Fast Food, Indian, Pakistani, Italian and Chinese Foods in the Friends Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child’s ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast food</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.17 Foods Eaten with Friends for English Children Divided into Four Groups: Young Boys (YB), Young Girls (YG), Older Boys (OB), Older Girls (OG)

The CA on the foods eaten with friends by English children subdivided by age and gender revealed that there was only one significant dimension. The plot (see Figure 7.17) shows that the significant dimension differentiated between the older boys and the other 3 groups ($\chi^2 (7) = 26.3, p< 0.005$, % of inertia explained = 87.2).
Figure 7.17 also shows that English, Chinese, Italian and Fast foods were more or less non-discriminatory between the 4 groups, but Indian food was more closely associated with older boys. Table 7.18 shows the most frequently occurring responses.

**Table 7.18 Percentages of English Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Eating English, Fast Food, Indian, Italian and Chinese Foods in the Friends Context**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast food</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7.18 Foods Eaten with Friends for Indian Children Divided into Four Groups: Young Boys (YB), Young Girls (YG), Older Boys (OB), Older Girls (OG)**
The CA on the foods eaten with friends by Indian children subdivided by age and gender revealed that there were two significant dimensions (dimension 1: \( \chi^2 (7) = 32.4, p<0.001, \% \text{ of inertia explained} = 66.8; \) dimension 2: \( \chi^2 (5) = 14.6, p<0.05, \% \text{ of inertia explained} = 30.4). \) The plot (see Figure 7.18) shows that the first significant dimension differentiated between the older girls and the other 3 groups and the second differentiated between young boys and the other three groups.

Figure 7.18 also shows that Chinese food was more closely associated with older girls, and English food was more closely associated with the other three groups. Italian food was more closely associated with young boys than the other 3 groups. Table 7.19 shows the most frequently occurring responses.

Table 7.19 Percentages of Indian Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Liking English, Fast Food, Indian, Italian and Chinese Foods in the Friends Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast food</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CA on the foods eaten with friends by Pakistani children subdivided by age and gender revealed that there were two significant dimensions (dimension 1: $\chi^2 (7) = 39.7$, $p<0.0001$, % of inertia explained = 64.9; dimension 2: $\chi^2 (5) = 15.3$, $p<0.05$, % of inertia explained = 25.3). The plot (see Figure 7.19) shows that the first significant dimension differentiated between the younger vs older children and the second differentiated between young boys and young girls.

Figure 7.19 also shows that English food was more or less non-discriminatory between the 4 groups, while fast foods were more closely associated with all groups except for young girls. However, Indian and Pakistani food was more closely associated with both older boys and girls, and Italian food was more closely associated with young girls. Table 7.20 shows the most frequently occurring responses.
Table 7.20 Percentages of Pakistani Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Liking English, Fast Food, Indian, Pakistani and Italian Foods in the Friends Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast food</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.6 Favourite Music

Figure 7.20 Favourite Music Choices for Each Ethnic Group with All Age and Gender Groups Together

The CA conducted on the children's favourite music comparing the three ethnic groups revealed that there was only one significant dimension, which only allows interpretation of distances along the horizontal axis of the plot (see Figure 7.20).
This shows that English children’s preferences were different from Indian and Pakistani children’s ($\chi^2 (5) = 55.9$, $p<0.0001$, % of inertia explained = 99.1).

Figure 7.20 also shows that Pop and Rock were more closely associated with the English children. However, Bollywood music and Rap were more closely associated with Indian and Pakistani children. Table 7.21 shows the most frequently occurring responses.

Table 7.21 Percentages of Children from Each Ethnic Group who Reported Liking Rap Pop, Rock and Bollywood Traditional Music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child’s ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rap</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollywood traditional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.21 Favourite Music Choices for English Children Divided into Four Groups: Young Boys (YB), Young Girls (YG), Older Boys (OB), Older Girls (OG)
The CA on the favourite music choices for English children broken down by age and
gender revealed that there were two significant dimensions, allowing interpretation
of the plot in terms of both the horizontal and the vertical axes (dimension 1: \( \chi^2 (6) = 
36.3, p<0.0001, \% \text{ of inertia explained} = 58.3; \) dimension 2: \( \chi^2 (4) = 23.1, p<0.0001, 
\% \text{ of inertia explained} = 37.7 \)). The plot (see Figure 7.21) shows that the first
significant dimension differentiated between the young children and the older
children, and the second differentiated between girls and the boys.

Figure 7.21 also shows that Rock music is more closely associated with young boys,
Pop music with young girls, Rap music with old boys and RnB with older girls.
Table 7.22 shows the most frequently occurring responses.

*Table 7.22 Percentages of English Children from Younger and Older Age and
Gender Groups who Reported Liking Rap RnB, Pop and Rock Music*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rap</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RnB</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CA on the favourite music choices for Indian children broken down by age and gender revealed that there were two significant dimensions (dimension 1: $\chi^2 (6) = 75.5, p<0.0001$, % of inertia explained = 76.1, dimension 2: $\chi^2 (4) = 13.3, p<0.05$, % of inertia explained = 14.8). The plot (see Figure 7.22) shows that the first significant dimension differentiated between the boys and girls, and the second differentiated between older boys and younger boys.

Figure 7.22 also shows that Rap was more closely associated with boys, Pop and Bollywood traditional with girls, and RnB with older children. Table 7.23 shows the most frequently occurring responses.
Table 7.23 Percentages of Indian Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Liking Rap RnB, Pop and Bollywood Traditional Music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music Type</th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rap</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RnB</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollywood traditional</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.23 Favourite Music Choices for Pakistani Children Divided into Four Groups: Young Boys (YB), Young Girls (YG), Older Boys (OB), Older Girls (OG)

The CA on the favourite music choices for Pakistani children broken down by age and gender revealed that there were two significant dimensions (dimension 1: $\chi^2 (6) = 78.5$, $p<0.0001$, % of inertia explained = 79.4; dimension 2: $\chi^2 (4) = 18.3$, $p<0.005$, % of inertia explained = 20.1). The plot (see Figure 7.23) shows that the first significant dimension differentiated between the girls and boys and the second differentiated between younger and older children.
Figure 7.23 also shows that Rap was more closely associated with young and old boys, while RnB was more closely associated with older children. Pop and Bollywood traditional were more closely associated with girls. Table 7.24 shows the most frequently occurring responses.

Table 7.24 Percentages of Pakistani Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Liking Rap RnB, Pop and Bollywood Traditional (T) Music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rap</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RnB</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollywood T</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.7 Favourite Films

Figure 7.24 Favourite Film Choices for Each Ethnic Group with All Age and Gender Groups Together
The CA on the children's favourite films broken down by ethnic group revealed that there was only one significant dimension, which only allows interpretation of distances along the horizontal axis of the plot (see Figure 7.24). This shows that the three ethnic groups had different favourite films ($\chi^2 (5) = 49.9, p< 0.0001$, % of inertia explained = 98.8).

Figure 7.24 also shows that US films were more or less non-discriminatory between the groups but Cartoons were more closely associated with English and Indian children, while British films were more closely associated with English children. However, Indian Bollywood films were more closely associated with Indian and Pakistani children. Table 7.25 shows the most frequently occurring responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US films</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoons</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British films</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollywood films</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CA on the English children's favourite films broken down by age and gender revealed that there were two significant dimensions, allowing interpretation of the plot in terms of both the horizontal and the vertical axes (dimension 1: $\chi^2(6) = 117.6$, $p<0.0001$, % of inertia explained = 79.0; dimension 2: $\chi^2(4) = 27.2$, $p<0.0005$, % of inertia explained = 20.9). The plot (see Figure 7.25) shows that the first significant dimension differentiated between the younger girls and the older girls) and the second differentiated between girls and the boys.

Figure 7.25 also shows that British films are more or less non-discriminatory between the groups. However, US films are more closely associated with older girls, while cartoons are more closely associated with younger girls. Kung Fu is more closely associated with boys. Table 7.26 shows the most frequently occurring responses.
Table 7.26 Percentages of English Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Liking US Films, Kung Fu Films, Cartoons and British Films

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US films</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kung Fu films</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoons</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British films</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.26 Favourite Film Choices for Indian Children Divided Into Four Groups: Young Boys (YB), Young Girls (YG), Older Boys (OB), Older Girls (OG)

The CA on the Indian children's favourite films broken down by age and gender revealed that there were two significant dimensions (dimension 1: $\chi^2 (7) = 69.1$, $p<0.0001$, % of inertia explained = 47.9; dimension 2: $\chi^2 (5) = 59.9$, $p<0.0001$, % of inertia explained = 42.1). The plot (see Figure 7.26) shows that the first significant dimension differentiated between the old boys and old girls and the second differentiated between young girls and young boys.
Figure 7.26 also shows that Kung Fu films were more closely associated with boys, while Indian Bollywood films were more closely associated with girls. US films, on the other hand, were more closely associated with young boys and old girls, Cartoons with all groups except old girls, and British films with young girls and old boys. Table 7.27 shows the most frequently occurring responses.

Table 7.27 Percentages of Indian Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Liking US Films, Kung Fu Films, Cartoons, British and Indian Bollywood Films.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US films</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kung Fu films</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoons</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollywood films</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.27 Favourite Film Choices for Pakistani Children Divided into Four Groups: Young Boys (YB), Young Girls (YG), Older Boys (OB), Older Girls (OG)
The CA on the Pakistani children’s favourite films broken down by age and gender revealed that there were two significant dimensions (dimension 1: \( \chi^2 (6) = 79.4, p<0.0001, \% \text{ of inertia explained} = 78.9; \) dimension 2: \( \chi^2 (4) = 18.4, p<0.005, \% \text{ of inertia explained} = 20.0 \)). The plot (see Figure 7.27) shows that the first significant dimension differentiated between old boys and the other three groups, and the second differentiated between young girls and the other three groups.

Figure 7.27 also shows that Kung Fu films more were more closely associated with old boys, while US films were more closely associated with boys. However, Indian Bollywood films were more closely associated with girls, and British films were more closely associated with old girls and young boys. Table 7.28 shows the most frequently occurring responses.

*Table 7.28 Percentages of Pakistani Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Liking US Films, Kung Fu Films, British and Indian Bollywood Films*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US films</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kung Fu films</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British films</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollywood films</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2.8 Favourite Foods

Figure 7.28 Favourite Food Choices for Each Ethnic Group with All Age and Gender Groups Together

The CA of the children's favourite foods broken down by ethnic group revealed that there was only one significant dimension, which only allows interpretation of distances along the horizontal axis of the plot (see Figure 7.28). This shows that Pakistani children's preferences were different from Indian and English children's \( \chi^2 (5) = 91.9, p < 0.0001, \) % of inertia explained = 96.7).

Figure 7.28 also shows that English food was more or less non-discriminatory between the groups, while Pakistani food was more closely associated with Pakistani children. Italian food and Indian however, were more closely associated with English and Indian children. Table 7.29 shows the most frequently occurring responses.
Table 7.29 Percentages of Children from Each Ethnic Group who Reported Liking English, Indian, Pakistani and Italian Foods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child’s ethnicity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English food</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian food</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani food</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian food</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.29 Favourite Food Choices for English Children Divided into Four Groups: Young Boys (YB), Young Girls (YG), Older Boys (OB), Older Girls (OG)

The CA on the favourite foods of the English children broken down by age and gender revealed that there were two significant dimensions, allowing interpretation of the plot in terms of both the horizontal and the vertical axes (dimension 1: $\chi^2 (7) = 62.5$, $p<0.0001$, % of inertia explained = 79.6; dimension 2: $\chi^2 (5) = 13.9$, $p<0.05$, % of inertia explained = 18.9). The plot (see Figure 7.29) shows that the first significant dimension differentiated between the young boys and old boys, and the second differentiated between boys and girls.
Figure 7.29 also shows that English food was more or less non-discriminatory between the groups. However, Fast food was more closely associated with young boys, Indian food with old boys, and Italian and Chinese were more closely associated with girls. Table 7.30 shows the most frequently occurring responses.

Table 7.30 Percentages of English Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Liking English Food, Fast Food, Indian Food, Italian Food and Chinese Food

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English food</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast food</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian food</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian foods</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese foods</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.30 Favourite Food Choices for Indian Children Divided into Four Groups: Young Boys (YB), Young Girls (YG), Older Boys (OB), Older Girls (OG)
The CA on the favourite foods of the Indian children broken down by age and gender revealed that there was only one significant dimension, which only allows interpretation of distances along the horizontal axis of the plot (see Figure 7.30). This shows that older boys’ preferences were different from the other three groups’ ($\chi^2 (7) = 54.1, p < 0.0001, \% \text{ of inertia explained} = 88.2$).

Figure 7.30 also shows that English food was more or less non-discriminatory between the groups, but Fast food was more closely associated with older boys, while Indian, Italian and Chinese foods were more closely associated with all groups except old boys. Table 7.31 shows the most frequently occurring responses.

*Table 7.31 Percentages of Indian Children from Younger and Older Age and Gender Groups who Reported Liking English Food, Fast Food, Indian Food, Italian Food and Chinese Food*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English food</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast food</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian food</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian foods</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese foods</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CA on the favourite foods of the Pakistani children broken down by age and gender revealed that there were two significant dimensions (dimension 1: $\chi^2 (6) = 39.1, p<0.0001$, % of inertia explained = 57.9; dimension 2: $\chi^2 (4) = 20.5, p<0.005$, % of inertia explained = 31.2). The plot (see Figure 7.31) shows that the first significant dimension differentiated between younger and older children and the second differentiated between girls and boys.

Figure 7.31 also shows that English food was more closely associated with young boys and girls, while Pakistani food was more closely associated with old boys and girls. However, Indian food was more closely associated with girls. Table 7.32 shows the most frequently occurring responses.
Table 7.32 Favourite Food Choices for Pakistani Children Divided into Four Groups: Young Boys (YB), Young Girls (YG), Older Boys (OB), Older Girls (OG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young Boys</th>
<th>Young Girls</th>
<th>Old Boys</th>
<th>Old Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English food</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian food</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani food</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian food</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.9 National Affiliations in Sporting Competitions

The remainder of the analyses of the children’s cultural practices were analysed using other statistical methods, including hi log linear analysis, ANOVAs, non-parametric statistics and correlations.

The children’s national affiliations in international sporting competitions were analysed using an ethnicity (3) x year group (4) x gender (2) x support for cricket team (2: yes vs. no) hi log linear analysis, in order to see if there were any significant associations between supporting a national team in cricket and their ethnicity, age or gender. This analysis revealed a gender difference. Boys were more likely than girls to support a national team in international cricket (82.8% vs. 57.0%, $\chi^2 (1) = 20.56$, $p < 0.001$). There were no other significant associations. An ethnicity (3) x year group (4) x gender (2) x support for football team (2: yes vs. no) hi log linear analysis was also conducted, to see if there were any associations with supporting a national team in football. This similarly revealed only a gender difference. Boys were more likely than girls to support a national team in international football (95.0% vs. 72.7%, $\chi^2 (1) = 25.71$, $p < 0.001$). There were no other significant associations.

A series of ethnicity (3) x year (4) x gender (2) x support for international cricket team (2: yes vs. no) hi log linear analyses was carried out to see which particular countries the children supported in cricket. This revealed that for children who supported England in cricket, there was a main effect of ethnicity (94.2% vs. 5.8%, $p < 0.001$).
\( \chi^2 (2) = 126.1, p < 0.001 \). Post hoc \( \chi^2 \) analyses showed that English children (81.7\%) were more likely to support England in cricket than either Indian (13.3\%) or Pakistani children (5.0\%). For children who supported India in cricket, there was also a main effect of ethnicity (83.0\% vs. 17.0\%, \( \chi^2 (2) = 150.2, p < 0.001 \)). Post hoc \( \chi^2 \) analyses showed that Indian children (100\%) were more likely to support India in cricket than either English (0\%) or Pakistani children (0\%). For children who supported Pakistan in cricket, there was a similar main effect of ethnicity (92\% vs.8\%, \( \chi^2 (2) = 174.3, p < 0.001 \)), with post hoc \( \chi^2 \) analyses showing that Pakistani children (98.3\%) were more likely to support Pakistan in cricket than English (1.7\%) or Indian (0\%) children.

A similar series of ethnicity (3) x year (4) x gender (2) x support for particular national football teams (2: yes vs. no) hi log linear analyses was carried out to see which countries the children supported in football. There was only a significant association in the analysis of support for the English football team. For children who supported England in football, there was a main effect of ethnicity (94.2\% vs.5.8\%, \( \chi^2 (2) = 126.1, p < 0.001 \)). Post hoc \( \chi^2 \) analyses showed that English children (81.7\%) were more likely to support England in football than either Indian (8\%) or Pakistani (3\%) children.

7.2.10 Wearing Traditional Clothes of the Ethnic or Religious Group

An ethnicity (3) x year (4) x gender (2) x wearing traditional ethnic or religious clothes (2: yes vs. no) hi log linear analysis revealed there was a main effect of ethnicity (\( \chi^2 (2) = 104.4, p < 0.001 \)) in the wearing of traditional clothes. Post hoc \( \chi^2 \) analyses revealed that Pakistani (48.8\%) and Indian children (40\%) were both more likely to wear traditional clothes than English (11.3\%) children.

7.2.11 Languages Used in Different Contexts

The percentages of English, Indian and Pakistani children who reported speaking English, Punjabi, Urdu and Hindi when they were at home, when they were at school and when they were out with friends outside school are shown in Table 7.33.
Statistical analyses of the data within each row in the table using Friedman tests (followed up by post hoc McNemar tests to locate where significant differences were falling) revealed that the use of language differed significantly across the three contexts, as shown in Table 7.33. As the table reveals, the use of language by the minority children was context-dependent, with the use of ethnic/community languages being more highly associated with the home context, and the use of English being more highly associated with the other two contexts but most of all with the school context.
Table 7.33 Percentages of English, Indian and Pakistani Children who Reported Speaking English, Punjabi, Urdu or Hindi at Home, in School and with Friends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>English children</th>
<th>Indian children</th>
<th>Pakistani children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home context</td>
<td>School context</td>
<td>Friends context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friedman $\chi^2(2)=48.77$, $p&lt;0.001$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post hoc McNemar analyses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home vs. school: $\chi^2(1)=28.03$, $p&lt;0.001$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home vs. friends: $\chi^2(1)=20.35$, $p&lt;0.001$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School vs. friends: exact $p&lt;0.05$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friedman $\chi^2(2)=34.10$, $p&lt;0.001$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post hoc McNemar analyses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home vs. school: exact $p&lt;0.001$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home vs. friends: exact $p&lt;0.001$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School vs. friends: ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friedman $\chi^2(2)=34.10$, $p&lt;0.001$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post hoc McNemar analyses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home vs. school: $\chi^2(1)=41.02$, $p&lt;0.001$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home vs. friends: $\chi^2(1)=36.03$, $p&lt;0.001$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School vs. friends: ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| English    | 0.0              | 0.0             | 0.0                |
|            | 0.0              | 0.0             | 0.0                |
|            | Friedman $\chi^2(2)=34.10$, $p<0.001$ |
|            | Post hoc McNemar analyses: |
|            | Home vs. school: exact $p<0.001$ |
|            | Home vs. friends: exact $p<0.001$ |
|            | School vs. friends: ns |
|            | 3.7              | 0.0             | 1.2                |
| Urdu       | 53.7             | 0.0             | 7.3                |
|            | Friedman $\chi^2(2)=34.10$, $p<0.001$ |
|            | Post hoc McNemar analyses: |
|            | Home vs. school: $\chi^2(1)=41.02$, $p<0.001$ |
|            | Home vs. friends: $\chi^2(1)=36.03$, $p<0.001$ |
|            | School vs. friends: ns |

| English    | 0.0              | 0.0             | 0.0                |
|            | 0.0              | 0.0             | 0.0                |
|            | Friedman $\chi^2(2)=34.10$, $p<0.001$ |
|            | Post hoc McNemar analyses: |
|            | Home vs. school: exact $p<0.001$ |
|            | Home vs. friends: exact $p<0.001$ |
|            | School vs. friends: ns |
|            | 4.9              | 0.0             | 3.7                |
| Hindi      | 53.7             | 0.0             | 7.3                |
|            | Friedman $\chi^2(2)=34.10$, $p<0.001$ |
|            | Post hoc McNemar analyses: |
|            | Home vs. school: $\chi^2(1)=41.02$, $p<0.001$ |
|            | Home vs. friends: $\chi^2(1)=36.03$, $p<0.001$ |
|            | School vs. friends: ns |
|            | 0.0              | 0.0             | 0.0                |
| Hindi      | 53.7             | 0.0             | 7.3                |
|            | Friedman $\chi^2(2)=34.10$, $p<0.001$ |
|            | Post hoc McNemar analyses: |
|            | Home vs. school: $\chi^2(1)=41.02$, $p<0.001$ |
|            | Home vs. friends: $\chi^2(1)=36.03$, $p<0.001$ |
|            | School vs. friends: ns |
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7.2.12 Foods Eaten at Home vs. When Out with Friends

Table 7.34 shows the percentages of children who reported eating different kinds of foods when they were at home and when they were out with friends. The differences within each row were analysed using McNemar tests. As can be seen from the table, the children’s food practices were context-dependent, with the consumption of ethnic food (i.e., English, Indian and Pakistani food) in particular being more highly associated with the home context rather than the friends context. Table 7.34 also shows the variety of cuisines which were consumed in the home and in the friends context by all three groups of children.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child ethnicity</th>
<th>Cuisine</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Friends</th>
<th>Significant differences, McNemar analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: exact p &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: exact p &lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: exact p &lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Fast Food</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Fast Food</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: exact p &lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>Fast Food</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: exact p &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: $\chi^2(1) = 44.02$, p &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: exact p &lt; 0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: $\chi^2(1) = 34.03$, p &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: $\chi^2(1) = 4.32$, p &lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: exact p &lt; 0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: exact p &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: $\chi^2(1) = 18.38$, p &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: $\chi^2(1) = 20.35$, p &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: exact p &lt; 0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Home vs. Friends: ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2.13 Inter-group Friendships

In the interview, children were asked to think of their three best friends and were then asked about their ethnicity and gender. An inter-group friendship score (an inverse score indexing the child’s overall level of close inter-group contact) was derived by adding up the total number of friends who were the same ethnicity as the child. A 3 (child ethnicity) x 4 (year group) x 2 (gender) independent groups ANOVA was used to analyse these scores. No main effect(s) of year group or gender were found. However, the ANOVA revealed that there was a main effect of ethnicity ($F(2, 243) = 15.56, p < 0.001$). The means and standard deviations are presented in Table 7.35.

Table 7.35 Mean Inter-group Friendship Scores Broken Down by Child Ethnicity and School Year Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th></th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to explore this main effect, post-hoc Tukey tests were conducted. This revealed that English children ($M = 1.75$) had a higher score for same ethnicity friends than Pakistani ($M = 0.90$) and Indian children ($M = 1.12$). There was no significant difference between the Indian and Pakistani children. There were no other significant effects in the $3 \times 4 \times 2$ ANOVA.

In addition, the total number of English friends, the total number of Indian friends, and the total number of Pakistani friends which each child reported amongst their
three best friends were calculated. The mean scores are shown in Table 7.36. A 3 (child ethnicity) x 4 (year group) x 2 (gender) x 3 (friend ethnicity) mixed ANOVA with independent groups on the first three factors and repeated measures on the fourth factor was used to analyse these scores. This revealed a significant main effect of friend ethnicity \( (F(2, 464) = 26.49, p < 0.001) \) which, however, was qualified by a significant child ethnicity x friend ethnicity interaction effect \( (F(4, 464) = 33.17, p < 0.001) \). No other effects were significant.

**Table 7.36 Mean Numbers of English, Indian and Pakistani Friends which the Children had Amongst Their Three Best Friends**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friend ethnicity</th>
<th>Child ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to explore the interaction effect, three one-way ANOVAs were run with child ethnicity as the independent variable and with number of English friends, number of Indian friends and number of Pakistani friends as the dependent variables. All three ANOVAs showed significant effects of child ethnicity (respectively: \( F(2, 243) = 32.47, p < 0.001; F(2, 243) = 25.02, p < 0.001; F(2, 243) = 26.34, p < 0.001) \). Post hoc Tukey tests revealed that: in the case of English friends, the English children had higher scores than both the Indian and Pakistani children, whose scores were not significantly different from one another; in the case of Indian friends, the Indian children had significantly higher scores than the Pakistani children, who in turn had significantly higher scores than the English children; and in the case of Pakistani friends, the Pakistani children had higher scores than both the Indian and English children, whose scores were not different from one another.
7.3 Discussion

The results will be discussed in two blocks, the first block dealing with the results of the correspondence analyses, the second block dealing with the remaining results which were obtained using the other statistical techniques.

The correspondence analyses of ethnic, gender and age group differences in children’s cultural practices and preferences were conducted in order to establish whether there were any differences in these English, Indian and Pakistani children’s cultural practices as a function of their ethnicity, gender and age. The findings revealed that there was great variability in the children practices linked to all three variables.

The first specific research question was: *Are there differences in children’s cultural practices as a function of their ethnicity?* It was found that there were pervasive differences in the children’s practices as a function of ethnicity. For example, in the domains of music and films, there was a divide between the majority English children and the minority Asian children’s cultural practices, with the English children being more closely associated with English language (or western) films and music (i.e., British and American films and music) and Indian and Pakistani children being more closely associated with Bollywood films and music. However, all groups of children did listen to and watch British and American music and films. Hence, Indian and Pakistani children do show cultural adaptation to the majority culture as well as maintenance of their own heritage/ethnic culture, displaying an integration acculturation style (Berry, 1997) which was either bicultural or multicultural. The English children, on the other hand, were more associated with western/British culture than the other two groups, but nonetheless were also associated (but just to a lesser extent) with an array of multi-ethnic choices. Thus, even the English children showed a multicultural acculturation strategy (i.e., one which was not just bicultural but involved many different cultural appropriations).

However, in the domain of festival celebration, there were differences between all three ethnic groups, with each ethnic group celebrating their own corresponding
cultural festival more than the other groups (i.e., Indian children were more associated with Diwali, Pakistani children with Eid, and English children with Guy Fawkes). In the food eaten with friends domain, Pakistani children differed from Indian and English children; even though all three groups consumed English food with friends, Pakistani children consumed their own ethnic food more with friends than the other two groups. Therefore, with regard to children’s cultural practices, there was a good deal of variability linked ethnicity.

On the whole, however, these English, Indian and Pakistani children across all domains tended to exhibit a multicultural acculturation strategy, drawing upon a mixture of eastern and western choices from their own ethnic group and from the host majority culture as well as other minority ethnic cultures present in London. This is an important and novel finding, as previous research has only conceptualised children’s cultural practices in relationship to monocultural and bicultural strategies. Instead, the present research has shown that children living within a multicultural context such as London actually draw upon a multiplicity of different cultures in their practices, not just one or two cultures (as Berry, 1997, and Berry et al., 2006, assume).

However, with regard to the favourite food and film questions, in general, it was found that Pakistani children preferred their own ethnic culture more than the other two groups, while Indian and English children were more similar in that they preferred elements drawn not from their own ethnic culture but also from other ethnic cultures. For instance, the English children liked Indian and Italian food, which was similar to the pattern shown by the Indian children. These results are in line with those of Ghuman (1997), who also found variability from one ethnic group to another as well as within ethnic groups.

The second research question was: Are there gender differences in children’s cultural practices? The CAs revealed that there was much variability related to the children’s gender. For instance, there was a divide between boys and girls in the domain of films, as the boys were more associated with Kung Fu films and the girls were more associated with Bollywood films irrespective of ethnicity. However, in
the domain of festival celebration, there were no differences linked to gender for the Indian children, but there was an age by gender effect for some English and some Pakistani children. This variability in cultural practices linked to gender is once again in line with Ghuman’s (1997) findings. In general, both boys and girls children showed a multicultural acculturation strategy.

The third research question was: _Are there age-related differences in children’s cultural practices?_ Again, the CAs found much variability linked to age. For example, in the domain of foods eaten at home, there were clear age group differences between younger and older children in the English sample, while the Pakistani children’s practices varied in a more complex way according to both age and gender. Overall, older children appeared to have a wider array of ethno-cultural practices than younger children, and this is probably due to their greater exposure to different cultural groups over the years from the media and from inter-group contact in school and in their neighbourhoods. However, overall, both younger and older children showed a multicultural acculturation strategy.

The fourth research question was: _Are there differences in children’s cultural practices as a function of domain and context?_ The CAs revealed that there was a good deal of variability in the children’s cultural practices linked to both domain and context, depending on the children’s ethnicity, age or gender. For example, in the domains of foods eaten at home vs. foods eaten with friends, there was a difference linked to context for the Indian children. However, this same effect did not appear with the Pakistani children, as in both the home and friends contexts, the Pakistani children were more associated with their own ethnic foods than the other two groups. Indian children, on the other hand, switched from the home (private sphere) to the friends (public sphere) context from being more associated with their own ethnic food to other ethnic minority foods such as Chinese. These results are consistent with findings from other studies which have reported variations in strategies across contexts (i.e., between private and public spheres). For instance, it has been found that minority adults tend to prefer cultural maintenance in the private sphere than in public spheres (Phalet, Van Lotringen & Entzinger, 2000; Taylor & Lambert, 1996).
The latter pattern is similar to that shown by the Indian children in the present study, but not that shown by the Pakistani children.

There were also differences in the children’s cultural choices depending on cultural domain. For instance, English children were more associated with pop and rock in the domain of favourite music (i.e., English language and western music) and with cartoons and British films in the domain of favourite films, but in the domain of favourite foods they were more closely associated with Indian food. This shows that this particular ethnic group of children were adopting different acculturation strategies in different domains. In the first two domains, they were more aligned with their own culture, but in the food domain they were more aligned with the minority culture of another ethnic group, thus exhibiting, once again, a multicultural acculturation style overall. Coleman (1995) would describe this kind of switching as consisting of context/domain alternation. His model of acculturation incorporates the notion of domain-specificity, and the alternation conceptualisation (Ogbu & Maturi-Bianchi, 1986) assumes that it is possible to alternate between cultures in a similar manner to the way in which a bilingual individual may alternate the use of language in different contexts.

Turning now to the second block of results which were obtained using the other statistical techniques, it was found that the children’s support for international cricket and football teams only varied according to the children’s gender, with boys being more likely than girls to support a particular national team in international cricket and football. This finding is not especially surprising, as previous research has consistently found that sport is more appealing to boys than to girls (see Beal, 1994, for a review). In addition, in relationship to cricket, it was found that each ethnic group supported their corresponding ethnic ingroup team more than any other national team (i.e., Indian children supported India in cricket, Pakistani children supported Pakistan in cricket and English children supported England in cricket). However, when it came to football, there were less marked effects for Indian and Pakistani children, as only the English children were more likely to support their own ethnic ingroup (England) in football. None of these findings are surprising as India and Pakistan are not prominent in world football, but are prominent in international
cricket, and the children otherwise displayed support for their own ethnic team. There were no differences as a function of age in the sports domain.

The analyses of the data concerning children’s wearing of traditional ethnic and/or religious clothing revealed there were no differences as a function of either age or gender, but wearing traditional clothing was associated with ethnicity, with Indian and Pakistani children being more likely to wear traditional clothes than English children. This finding serves to underline the conclusion derived from the CAs that there are ethnic group differences in children’s cultural practices.

However, rather more notable from a theoretical perspective are the findings concerning the use of language in different contexts. It was found that there were significant context effects in the case of the minority children: both the Indian and the Pakistani children’s use of language was context-dependent, with their ethnic language being more highly associated with the home context (private sphere), and the English language being more highly associated with the school context and the friends context (public spheres). There were no significant differences for the English children as the only language which this group of children spoke was English. The finding that many Asian minority children switch their ethnic and national language use from one context to another is consistent with previous studies which have researched adolescents and children (e.g., Barrett, 2007; Coleman et al., 2001). Furthermore, this finding reinforces the earlier conclusion based on the CAs that there are significant differences in minority children’s cultural practices as a function of context. Nevertheless, it should be noted that while both the Indian and Pakistani children spoke the national language (English) the most in school and with friends, when it came to the home sphere, there were differences between the two groups of children: in the home sphere Pakistani children spoke their ethnic language just over 50% of the time, whereas the Indian children still spoke more English than their ethnic language. This difference in ethnic language use in the home between the Indian and Pakistani children indicates the variability between these two Asian ethnic minority groups. Ghuman (2003) also found that British-born South Asian adolescents preferred to speak English at home with their siblings.
Comparing the foods which the children ate at home and the foods which they ate when they were out with friends, it was found that there were differences as a function of context, ethnic group membership and type of cuisine. Thus, these data once again reinforce the conclusion which was based on the CAs that the children’s food practices were context-dependent, with the consumption of their ethnic cuisine (i.e., English, Indian and Pakistani food) being more highly associated with the home context rather than the friends context.

The final research question was: Are there differences in children’s levels of inter-group friendships as a function of ethnic group, gender or age? This was addressed by the analyses examining the children’s levels of close inter-group contact. The principal purpose of examining close inter-group contact was to ascertain whether the children’s inter-group attitudes were related to their levels of contact, and the analyses reporting this relationship will be reported in the following chapter. The analyses conducted in the present chapter were instead directed at establishing whether there are differences in levels of inter-group friendships as a function of ethnic group, gender or age. There were no effects of either age or gender on the children’s friendships. However, there were effects of ethnicity. This revealed that English children had more same ethnicity friends than Pakistani and Indian children. In addition, when examining the total number of English friends, the total number of Indian friends, and the total number of Pakistani friends that each child reported amongst their three best friends, it was found that English children had more English friends than both the Indian and Pakistani children, the Indian children had more Indian friends than the Pakistani and English children, and the Pakistani children had more Pakistani friends than the Indian and English children. Again, these findings are not especially surprising, but they serve to underline the fact that, even within an ethnically diverse context such as London, children’s friendship networks are still ethnically marked.

The finding that there were no differences in the children’s friendships as a function of age is in contrast to Aboud et al.’s (2003) finding of an age related decline in cross-race friendships. However, the present finding that English children had a higher number of same ethnicity friends than Pakistani and Indian children is
consistent with Howes and Wu's (1990) finding that white American children have more same-race friends while black American children have more cross-race friends. Insofar as cross-race friendships depend on the availability of cross-race individuals in the child's environment (Hallinan and Teixeira (1987), the finding that the majority group children in the present study (i.e., the English children) had fewer cross-race friendships than the minority children is not especially surprising.

Overall, the analyses that have been reported in this chapter have revealed that there are widespread differences in children's cultural practices as a function of their ethnicity, their gender and their age, and that children's cultural practices also vary as a function of both cultural domain and context. However, it must be noted that in this chapter a lot of analyses have been run, therefore the probability of type 1 errors is high. The next chapter reports analyses which examined whether this variability which exists in children's cultural practices is related to the variability which exists in their inter-group attitudes.
Chapter 8: Study 3 – Analysis of the Relationship between Variables

8.1 Research Questions

This chapter reports the findings of analyses which explored the inter-relationships between all of the different variables in the quantitative study. The principal research questions addressed in these analyses were as follows:

1. Is variability in the development of children’s ethnic group attitudes linked to variability in their cultural practices?

The data collected in study 3 were examined to see if children’s inter-group attitudes were related to their cultural practices. This relationship has not previously been examined in children.

2. Is variability in the development of children’s ethnic group attitudes linked to variability in their patterns of contact with people from other ethnic groups?

This research question was generated from inter-group contact theory (Allport, 1954; Hewstone, 2003; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). It was anticipated that there would be a relationship between inter-group friendships and inter-group attitudes as previous studies have found contact effects on outgroup attitudes to be robust (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). In addition, cross-group friendships have been found to be especially effective in reducing inter-group prejudice compared with other forms of inter-group contact (Brown and Hewstone, 2005; Hewstone, 2003; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). The study examined actual contact in majority and minority groups, as opposed to imagined or indirect contact.

3. Is variability in the development of children’s ethnic group attitudes linked to variability in their cognitive classification skills?

The present research tested CDT’s (Aboud & Amato, 2001) claim that children’s cognitive skills are responsible for driving developmental changes in children’s inter-
group attitudes, by examining whether there is a relationship between these variables. Previous findings supporting this claim have been mixed (Bigler et al., 2001; Bigler & Liben, 1993; Cameron et al., 2007), and have been drawn largely from research conducted with white majority children. The present research investigates this relationship with white majority children as well as with children drawn from two different ethnic minority groups.

4. Is there a relationship between children’s ethnic and national identifications and cultural practices?

The literature review highlighted that there is no consistent relationship between identifications and cultural practices. Some researchers have found associations (e.g., Phinney et al., 2006), while others have found identifications and practices to be dissociated (e.g., Hutnik, 1991). The present study examined this relationship, and tested Berry et al.’s (2006) claim that identifications and practices are inter-related.

5. What is the relationship between children’s identifications and perceived discrimination?

There has been little research on the levels of PD in children, or research on its relationships with identifications in childhood. This research question was of interest as SIT (Social Identity Theory, Tajfel, 1978) predicts that threat (as indexed by perceived discrimination) can lead to stronger ingroup identifications (Brown, 1995), and research with adolescents (Romero & Roberts, 1998) had found that positive sense of ethnic ingroup belonging predicted lower perceived discrimination in American ethnic minority adolescents. In addition, perceptions of discrimination may strengthen ethnic ingroup identification and weaken national identification in minority individuals (Berry et al., 2006). The present study examined these relationships in children.
6. What is the relationship between children's inter-group attitudes and perceived discrimination?

Again there has been little research on this relationship in children. This research question is of interest as PD may be a cause of the variability in children’s inter-group attitudes. Research with older age groups on perceived discrimination in immigrant groups suggests that attitudes of the majority host society towards immigrants are likely to be reflected in the feelings of immigrant about the host majority (Berry & Kalin, 1979, Kalin & Berry, 1996). In other words, if immigrants perceive discrimination by the majority group, they are more likely to like this group less or to be negative towards this group. However, it is not only the attitudes of the host majority culture which can impact on minorities; in a super-diverse context such as London, ethnic minority groups’ attitudes toward other ethnic groups (including towards the majority group) also need to be considered (Vertovec, 2006). There is also a possible intersection here with religion: Muslim Pakistani children’s perceptions of discrimination may be higher than Indian children’s due the aftermath of the 7/7 terror attacks in London and the perception that both the English majority group and other non-Muslim ethnic groups (including Indian non-Muslims) now hold more discriminatory attitudes towards Muslims.

7. What is the relationship between religiosity and inter-group attitudes, and between religiosity and identifications, in children?

Given the high importance of religion found in study 1, and that previous research with adolescents has found that religion is highly important for ethnic minority children (especially Muslim children) (e.g. Ghuman, 2003; Jacobson, 1997; Modood, et al., 1994), the relationship between religiosity and inter-group attitudes, and between religiosity and identifications, was explored.
8. What is the relationship between identifications and inter-group attitudes in children?

The final research question in this study asked if the variability in the development of children's inter-group attitudes is linked to variability in children's levels of identification. SIDT proposes that the level of identification with the ethnic ingroup plays a role in the development of children's ethnic preferences and ingroup favouritism, and also that the strength of ingroup identification is linked to the development of outgroup prejudice or denigration after the age of 7 years. Previous research (Barrett, 2007) has found a relationship between the strength of national identification and national ingroup attitudes but not outgroup attitudes. The present study investigated whether these relationships were exhibited by the present sample of children.

The first half of this chapter reports the results of $\chi^2$ analyses which examined whether there were any significant associations between the scores on the scale variables (strength of ethnic, British and religious identification, perceived discrimination, overall positivity to each of the four target groups, affect towards each of the four target groups, religiosity, and number of same ethnicity friends) and the children's cultural practices. The second half of the chapter then reports the results of correlational analyses which examined whether there were any significant inter-relationships between the various scale variables themselves, and between the scale variables and the other quantitative variables (multiple classification and inter-group friendships).

8.2 Results

8.2.1 Associations between the Scores on the Scale Variables and the Children's Cultural Practices

In order to see whether there were any associations between the children's cultural practices and their scores on the scale variables, median splits were first conducted on each of the scale variables in order to split the children into two groups, namely a
group with high scores on that variable and a group with low scores on that variable. These two groups were then compared to see whether there were any significant differences between them on the various cultural practices. Median splits were performed on all of the following variables: strength of ethnic identification, strength of British identification, strength of religious identification, perceived discrimination, overall positivity to British people, overall positivity to English people, overall positivity to Indian people, overall positivity to Pakistani people, affect towards British people, affect towards English people, affect towards Indian people, affect towards Pakistani people, and religiosity. In addition, the children were split into two groups depending upon whether they had either 2 or 3 friends who were the same ethnicity as themselves, or fewer than 2 friends who were the same ethnicity as themselves, with analyses then being performed to see whether these two groups differed on any of the cultural practices.

Analyses were conducted for each ethnic group individually, using Bonferroni corrected $\chi^2$ analyses (with $p$ set at 0.0036 for significance due to the fact that 14 analyses were performed on each individual cultural practice variable). The children's cultural practices in all of the following domains were analysed using this method: music, films, festivals, foods eaten at home, foods eaten with friends, favourite music, favourite films, favourite foods, national affiliations in sporting competitions, wearing traditional clothes, and languages used in different contexts. Each category of response in each of these areas was analysed, to see if there were any differences in frequencies of responses between those children who were high and those who were low on each of the split variables.

The analyses revealed the following significant differences:

Among the English children, those who were low on religiosity were more likely to support England at cricket (100% vs. 66.6%, $\chi^2 (1) = 15.21, p < 0.001$) and at football (also 100% vs. 66.6%, $\chi^2 (1) = 15.21, p < 0.001$).
Among the English children, those who were high on ethnic identification were more likely to say that rap music was their favourite music (76.9% vs. 32.8%, \( \chi^2 (1) = 8.82, p < 0.003 \)).

Among the Indian children, those who had 2 or 3 same ethnicity friends were more likely to watch US films than those who only had 0 or 1 same ethnicity friends (79.3% vs. 43.4%, \( \chi^2 (1) = 9.82, p < 0.002 \)).

Among the Indian children, those who had 2 or 3 same ethnicity friends were more likely to eat Italian food at home than those who only had 0 or 1 same ethnicity friends (79.3% vs. 41.5%, \( \chi^2 (1) = 10.81, p < 0.001 \)).

Among the Indian children, those who had 2 or 3 same ethnicity friends were more likely to eat Chinese food with their friends than those who only had 0 or 1 same ethnicity friends (55.2% vs. 15.1%, \( \chi^2 (1) = 14.54, p < 0.001 \)).

Among the Pakistani children, those who had 2 or 3 same ethnicity friends were more likely to eat Pakistani food with their friends than those who only had 0 or 1 same ethnicity friends (82.6% vs. 45.8%, \( \chi^2 (1) = 9.12, p < 0.003 \)).

No other \( \chi^2 \) analyses were significant. Given that there were 67 cultural practice variables in these analyses, and there were therefore \( 14 \times 67 = 938 \) analyses conducted in total, it is noteworthy that only 6 of these 938 \( \chi^2 \) analyses yielded significant differences, which is below the level which one would expect to arise by chance. It is especially noteworthy that none of the inter-group attitude variables were related to the children’s cultural practices.

8.2.2 Correlational Analyses of the Quantitative Variables

Pearson’s partial correlation coefficients, controlling for age, were run on each ethnic group individually to see whether inter-group friendship scores (i.e., total number of same ethnicity friends) were related to any of the scale variables (i.e., strength of ethnic identification, strength of British identification, strength of religious
identification, perceived discrimination, overall positivity to each of the four target
groups, affect towards each of the four target groups, positive adjective scores for
each of the four target groups, negative adjective scores for each of the four target
groups and religiosity). Table 8.1 shows the correlation coefficients for the English,
Indian and Pakistani children. As this table reveals, out of the 63 correlations, only 3
were statistically significant at the 0.05 level, which could have been due to chance.

Tables throughout this chapter use the following abbreviations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEOP</td>
<td>White English Overall Positivity Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>British Overall Positivity Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOP</td>
<td>Indian Overall Positivity Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP</td>
<td>Pakistani Overall Positivity Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEA</td>
<td>White English Affect Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>British Affect Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Indian Affect Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Pakistani Affect Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEPA</td>
<td>White English Positive Adjective Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPA</td>
<td>British Positive Adjective Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>Indian Positive Adjective Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPA</td>
<td>Pakistani Positive Adjective Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENA</td>
<td>White English Negative Adjective Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNA</td>
<td>British Negative Adjective Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INA</td>
<td>Indian Negative Adjective Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNA</td>
<td>Pakistani Negative Adjective Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Ethnic Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>British Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Religious Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Perceived Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Religiosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cognitive Classification Skill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.1 Correlation Coefficients between Inter-group Friendship Score and the Various Quantitative Measures for English, Indian and Pakistani Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English Inter-group Friendship Score</th>
<th>Indian Inter-group Friendship Score</th>
<th>Pakistani Inter-group Friendship Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEOP</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOP</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEA</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-0.36*</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEPA</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPA</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPA</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENA</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNA</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INA</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNA</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05

In addition, the total number of English friends, the total number of Indian friends, and the total number of Pakistani friends were calculated for each child as indices of their levels of contact with each of the three target ethnic groups. Pearson's partial
Correlations were then run for each ethnic group individually (while controlling for age) to see if the number of friends from a particular target group was related either to attitudes and affect towards that group, or to ethnic, British and religious identifications, perceived discrimination and religiosity. The results are shown in Tables 8.2-8.4.

**Table 8.2 Correlation Coefficients between Total Number of Friends from Each Target Group and the Various Quantitative Measures for the English Children**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of</th>
<th>Total number of</th>
<th>Total number of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English friends</td>
<td>Indian friends</td>
<td>Pakistani friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEPA</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENA</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEOP</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INA</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOP</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPA</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNA</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBA</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05

Table 8.2 reveals that, for the English children, out of the 51 correlations, only 4 were statistically significant. Furthermore, two of these were contrary to the contact hypothesis: the higher the number of Indian friends, the lower the positive adjective score and the lower the overall positivity towards Indians (however, it should be
noted that although these are two different scores, they are inter-dependent scores as the positive adjective score was one of the two scores used to calculate overall positivity, and so this is effectively only a single finding contrary to the contact hypothesis). However, the third correlation was consistent with the contact hypothesis: the higher the number of Pakistani friends, the higher the affect towards Pakistani people. In addition, religious identification was positively correlated with the number of Indian friends.

Table 8.3 Correlation Coefficients between Total Number of Friends from Each Target Group and the Various Quantitative Measures for the Indian Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of English friends</th>
<th>Total number of Indian friends</th>
<th>Total number of Pakistani friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEPA</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENA</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEOP</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INA</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOP</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPA</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNA</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEA</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>-0.28*</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05
Table 8.3 reveals that, for the Indian children, out of the 51 correlations, only 4 were statistically significant. Of these, only one has relevance to the contact hypothesis: the higher the number of English friends, the higher the English positive adjective scores. In addition, ethnic identification was positively correlated with the number of Indian friends, while religiosity was negatively correlated with the number of English friends.

Table 8.4 Correlation Coefficients between Total Number of Friends from Each Target Group and the Various Quantitative Measures for the Pakistani Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of English friends</th>
<th>Total number of Indian friends</th>
<th>Total number of Pakistani friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEPA</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENA</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEOP</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INA</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOP</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPA</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNA</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEA</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>-0.27*</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>-0.28*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05

Table 8.4 shows that, for the Pakistani children, there were no significant correlations between the attitudinal variables and numbers of friends from each ethnicity. In addition, the number of English friends was negatively correlated with British
identification, positively correlated with religious identification, and negatively correlated with religiosity; the number of Indian friends was positively correlated with British identification; while the number of Pakistani friends was negatively related to religious identification, but positively related to perceived discrimination (as already noted in connection with Table 8.1).

Overall, and generalising across all three tables, evidence in support of the contact hypothesis is very slim.

Pearson's partial correlation coefficients (controlling for age) were also run for each child ethnicity individually to see whether there were any inter-relationships between the various scale scores themselves (i.e., strength of ethnic identification, strength of British identification, strength of religious identification, perceived discrimination, overall positivity to each of the four target groups, affect towards each of the four target groups, positive adjective score for each of the four target groups, negative adjective score for each of the four target groups and religiosity), and between the scale scores and the multiple classification skill score. Tables 8.5-8.7 show the correlation coefficients for the English, Indian and Pakistani children respectively (* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001).
### Table 8.5 Correlation Coefficients between the Scale Scores and Classification Skill (C) for the English Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WEA</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>WEOP</th>
<th>BOP</th>
<th>POP</th>
<th>ICP</th>
<th>WENA</th>
<th>BNA</th>
<th>PHA</th>
<th>NNA</th>
<th>WEPA</th>
<th>BPA</th>
<th>PPA</th>
<th>IPA</th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>BI</th>
<th>RI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEOP</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENA</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNA</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHA</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNA</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEPA</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPA</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPA</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WEA</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>WEOP</td>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>IOP</td>
<td>WENA</td>
<td>BNA</td>
<td>PNA</td>
<td>INA</td>
<td>WEPA</td>
<td>BPA</td>
<td>PPA</td>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEA</td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOP</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. 7 Correlation Coefficients between the Scale Scores and Classification Skill (C) for the Pakistani Children
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It is noteworthy that there were no correlations between any of the attitudinal measures and classification skills in the English and Pakistani children, and only a single significant correlation in the Indian children, namely a negative correlation between classification skill and overall positivity to white English people (which is counter to the argument that higher cognitive skills are related to lower levels of prejudice).

In addition, it should be noted that, in Tables 8.4 to 8.6, many of the inter-correlations between the different inter-group attitude measures were positive and significant. Although some of these correlations can be explained in terms of the fact that the overall positivity scores were not independent of the positive adjective and the negative adjective scores (being the average of these two scores), there were nevertheless many other significant correlations between attitudinal measures which were independent of each other. These latter positive correlations suggest that if a child is highly positive towards one group, that child is also likely to be highly positive to other groups as well, while if a child is more negative towards one group, that child is likely to be more negative towards other groups. In other words, the correlations in Tables 8.4 to 8.6 suggest that there are individual differences in overall levels of positivity towards all ethnic groups.

Other notable patterns which are present in Tables 8.4 to 8.6 are discussed in the following section.

8.3 Discussion

The first research question which was addressed by the analyses reported in this chapter was: *Is variability in the development of children’s ethnic group attitudes linked to variability in their cultural practices?* The present analyses failed to find any evidence for a relationship between cultural practices and attitudes to British, English, Indian and Pakistani people in these children. Instead, the present analyses show that, whatever the causes of the variability in the development of children’s inter-group attitudes might be, this variability is not linked to the variability in children’s cultural practices.
The second research question was: *Is variability in the development of children's ethnic group attitudes linked to variability in their patterns of contact with people from other ethnic groups?* The analyses revealed that, for English children, the more Pakistani friends they had the more they liked Pakistani people, while for Indian children, the more English friends they had the higher their positive adjective scores for English people. However, for Pakistani children, there were no significant correlations between contact and attitudes. Furthermore, there were also many other non-significant correlations among the English and Indian children. There was also the finding from the English children that the more Indian friends that they had, the lower their positive adjective scores and their overall positivity scores (which are two inter-dependent scores) towards Indian people, a finding which runs counter to the contact hypothesis. Hence, overall, the anticipated relationship between inter-group friendships and inter-group attitudes did not emerge in this study, with there being few relationships between the number of best friends which a child had from a particular ethnic group and the child’s attitudes towards those groups.

This finding was surprising, given the robustness of contact effects in the literature (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). The present finding may have been due to the specific measure of inter-group contact which was used. It is possible that had different measures been used, such as the social contact and individuating contact scales developed by Walker and Hewstone (2006), the study might have produced different findings. However, it would have been problematic to use Walker and Hewstone's scales in this study, as the social contact scale consists of 8 items and the individuating contact scale consists of 7 items, and administering 15 additional items in relationship to at least two outgroups would have required an additional 30 items to be administered to each child, increasing the length of the interview and hence the burden on each child considerably. That said, the findings of the present study using the friendship measure are still somewhat surprising insofar as cross-group friendships in particular have been found to be especially effective in reducing inter-group prejudice compared with other forms of inter-group contact (Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Hewstone, 2003; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). However, it may be the case that in an ethnically super-diverse city such as London, there are high levels
of inter-group contact and low levels of prejudice amongst most children, with there being insufficient variance across children to detect any statistically significant relationships between contact and attitudes in such children.

The present study found some slight evidence for relationships between children’s inter-ethnic friendships and their ethnic, national and religious identifications and levels of perceived discrimination. For example, the number of Pakistani friends that the Pakistani children had was positively related to their levels of perceived discrimination; in the case of the Indian children, the number of Indian friends which they had was positively related to the strength of their ethnic identification, and the number of English friends which they had was negatively related to the strength of their religious identification. However, there was also some counter-evidence here: the number of Pakistani friends which the Pakistani children had was negatively related to their strength of their religious identification. In addition, there were many non-significant relationships.

The third research question was: Is variability in the development of children's ethnic group attitudes linked to variability in their cognitive classification skills? It was found that, in the English and Pakistani children, there were no significant correlations between classification skills and any of the inter-group attitude variables, while the Indian children showed a negative correlation between classification skill and overall positivity to white English people. These findings suggest that there is no relationship between cognitive classification skills and inter-group attitudes in children, contrary to the claims of Aboud and Amato (2001). It is relevant to note here that Cameron, Rutland and Brown (2007) have also found that training in multiple classification skills does not improve children's outgroup attitudes, while Bigler, Brown and Markell (2001) also found no relationship between this cognitive ability and outgroup attitudes in white American children. Therefore, the present finding is consistent with this body of other research, and provides further evidence against CDT's postulate that changes in children's cognitive skills are responsible for driving developmental changes in children's inter-group attitudes.
The fourth research question which was addressed by these analyses was: *Is there a relationship between children's ethnic and national identifications and cultural practices?* The data revealed there were very few significant relationships between children's cultural practices on the one hand and their identifications on the other hand. The number of relationships which were found were fewer than might have been expected by chance. Thus, no consistent relationship was found between ethnic identification and ethnic cultural practices, nor between British identification and British cultural practices. Hence, the answer to the fourth research question is that there appears to be no relationship between identifications and cultural practices. This outcome is in fact in line with Hutnik's (1991) work, which also found dissociations between identifications and practices in her sample of British-Indian adolescents. However, the present findings do run counter to the claim made by Berry et al. (2006) that it is possible to identify acculturation profiles in which identifications and practices are inter-related.

The fifth research question was: *What is the relationship between children's identifications and perceived discrimination?* The correlational analyses revealed that there were no significant relationships between perceived discrimination and identification, except for religious identification being negatively correlated with perceived discrimination in Pakistani children. This particular finding is in line with Romero and Roberts (1998), who found that a positive sense of ingroup belonging predicted lower perceived discrimination in American ethnic minority adolescents. However, the findings of the present study overall do run counter to the expectation from SIT that threat (as indexed by perceived discrimination) can lead to stronger ingroup identifications (Brown, 1995).

The sixth research question was: *What is the relationship between children's inter-group attitudes and perceived discrimination?* The correlational analyses revealed that, for minority Indian and Pakistani children, there were relationships between perceived discrimination and inter-group attitudes (see Tables 8.5 and 8.6). For instance, as perceived discrimination increased, positive attitudes to white English and British outgroups decreased in the Pakistani and Indian children. As Indian and Pakistani children are members of ethnic minority groups, these findings are not
entirely surprising and results are in line with some previous research (Berry & Kalin, 1979, Kalin & Berry, 1996). However, it should also be noted that, in the Indian children, overall positivity to the ethnic ingroup also decreased with increased perceived discrimination. There were no significant correlations between perceived discrimination and inter-group attitudes in the English children.

Religiosity was included in the present study to explore the question: *What is the relationship between religiosity and inter-group attitudes, and between religiosity and identifications, in children?* Somewhat surprisingly, for all three ethnic groups of children, there were no significance relationships between religiosity and either attitudes or identifications (including religious identification). Given that religiosity concerns the frequency with which a number of cultural practices are performed, this finding is consistent with the finding that has already been noted that there were no consistent relationships between cultural practices and identifications in these children.

The final research question was *What is the relationship between identifications and inter-group attitudes in children?* In general, it was found that ethnic identification was positively correlated with attitudes to the ingroup (see Tables 8.4 to 8.6). For example, in the English children, ethnic identification was positively correlated with: affect towards English people, overall positivity towards English people, and positive adjective score for English people (the last two being inter-dependent measures). In Indian children, ethnic identification was positively correlated with affect towards Indian people. And in Pakistani children, ethnic identification was positively correlated with affect towards Pakistani people, overall positivity towards Pakistani people and negative adjective score for Pakistani people (the last two being inter-dependent measures). However, ethnic identification was *not* correlated with attitudes to any of the outgroups in any of the children. Nesdale’s (2004) SIDT proposes that the level of identification with the ethnic ingroup plays a role in the development of children’s ethnic preferences and ingroup favouritism, a claim which is consistent with the present findings. However, contrary to SIDT’s further proposal in relationship to children older than 7 years, the strength of ingroup identification was *not* linked to the development of outgroup prejudice or denigration after the age
of 7 years (although this may have been because the other conditions which SIDT argues may lead to the emergence of prejudice after the age of 7 – e.g. consensually shared negative representations of an outgroup amongst ingroup members – were not present).

There were no significant correlations between British identification and inter-group attitudes in the Indian and Pakistani children, but in the English children British identification was positively correlated with overall positivity towards English people and with higher negative adjective scores for English people (which are interdependent measures). The fact that British identification was positively correlated with attitudes to English people suggests that that Britishness might have been confused with Englishness by these white English children. Interestingly, once again, British identification was not correlated with attitudes to any of the outgroups in any of the three ethnic groups.

Religious identification, on the other hand, was positively correlated with ingroup affect for English children; for Indian children, religious identification was positively correlated with positive adjective scores for Indian people; while for Pakistani children, religious identification showed the most relationships, being positively correlated with attitudes and affect to British and white English people, and with negative adjective scores for Indian people (but not with ingroup attitudes).

Some of these findings concerning the relationship between identifications and attitudes are in line with those of Barrett (2007), who found a relationship between the strength of national identification and national ingroup attitudes in particular. However, Barrett also found variability in the strength of the relationship between identifications and attitudes depending upon the particular national groups to which children belonged. In the present study, the strength of the relationship between ethnic inter-group attitudes and identifications also varied according to children’s ethnic group membership.

In conclusion, the findings of the analyses reported in the present chapter are somewhat surprising, in that they suggest that these children’s inter-group attitudes
were not related to their cultural practices, to their inter-group friendships, or to their cognitive classification skills. However, their ingroup attitudes were related to their identifications, while their outgroup attitudes were not related to their identifications in the manner which might have been expected on the basis of either SIT (Tajfel, 1978) or SIDT (Nesdale, 2004). Therefore, some of the results presented in this chapter are somewhat counterintuitive but the specific context of this research may be why results were different to previous findings. In addition, it is again worth noting that a lot of tests have been performed, and the probability of type 1 errors is therefore high.
Chapter 9: Discussion and Conclusions

The overall aim of the present research was to examine inter-group attitudes, acculturation and social identifications in English, Indian and Pakistani British children aged 7 to 11 years. A large number of research questions derived from theoretical and methodological limitations and gaps in the current literature were used to frame this research (see Chapter 2). The aim of the present concluding chapter is to summarise the answers to these research questions which the present research has produced, and to reflect on the implications of these answers for some of the currently dominant theories in this field.

The first section of this chapter comprises of a summary of the answers provided by the present research to the research questions. The second section contains an examination of the theoretical implications of the present research. Following this, the limitations of the present research and directions for future research are discussed. The chapter ends with a summary of overall conclusions that can be drawn from this research.

9.1 Summary of the Main Research Questions and Findings

9.1.1 Do ethnic minority and majority children hold multiple social identifications and, if so, what are the groups with which they identify?

Studies 1 and 2 addressed this first research question about whether the children held multiple social identifications. In these studies, qualitative methodology was employed using semi-structured one-to-one interviewing with 7- to 11-year-olds to explore their different social identities and how they viewed these identities. Results revealed that both the minority and the majority group children who were studied did have multiple social identifications. However, the relative importance of these memberships varied between the minority and majority children. In study 1, it was found that religious identity was the most important identity for the minority children. This may have been due to the majority of the sample being Muslim. In addition, ethnic, British and English identities were also important to most of these
minority children, especially ethnic identities. Furthermore, identities such as Londoner, Asian, Arab and European were also sometimes important for these children, but not as much as their religious, ethnic or national/state identities. In study 2, it was found that English, Christian and British identities were the most important for the English majority children who were studied. Identities such as Londoner and European were also important to these children, but not as much as their other social identifications. Thus, these British minority and majority 7- to 11-year-old children held multiple social identifications, including ethnic, national/state, religious, local (Londoner) and superordinate (European and/or Asian and/or Arab) identities.

These findings are comparable with those of Akiba et al. (2004), who examined the multidimensionality of ethnic identification amongst Cambodian, Dominican and Portuguese children aged 5-12 years old living in America. They also found that children acknowledged multiple dimensions of the self which included memberships of social groups. The most popular choices across all three groups were ethnic descriptors, then language-based descriptors (such as 'Spanish'), and least popular were superordinate categories like 'Asian'. This is consistent with the present research's findings, as ethnic identification was found to be one of the most important categories (although not always the most important), while superordinate categories were found to be less important. Akiba et al. also found that Portuguese white children chose fewer labels than Dominican and Cambodian children, and this was also consistent with the present research in which the white English children tended to have fewer salient group memberships than the minority children. Furthermore, for the Cambodian and Dominican children, ethnic identity was the most important identity, but for the Portuguese children it was their second most important (after gender). This finding by Akiba et al. is actually in contrast to the findings of the current research, as religious identity was most important to the minority children (with ethnic identity second), while English (ethnic) identification was the most important social identity for the English majority children. Therefore, in the present study, ethnic identity was just as important to the majority children as it was to the minority children. This may have been because of the ethnic contrasts provided by the super-diverse setting of London in which they lived.
The present research's findings are also similar to Hutnik's (1986, 1991) findings which were obtained with British-Indian minority adolescents. She found that identifications amongst this group were also multiple, with individuals identifying with a range of social categories including their ethnic origins, their race, their religion, and Britishness. The findings of the present research concerning the presence of multiple self-categorisations in majority and minority children are therefore also consistent with Hutnik's findings.

Multiple social identities among adult populations have been examined for a number of years (e.g., Cinnirella, 1996; Crisp & Hewstone, 2000; Deaux, 1996), but there has been relatively little previous research on the nature of multiple identities among children, with the study by Akiba et al. (2004) being a notable exception. The present study has revealed that not only adults but also children hold multiple identities which can be very important to them.

The precise nature of the present children's multiple identities may have been an outcome of living in a multi-ethnic setting where multi-group salience and opportunities for contact are high but where common identities such as being Londoners are shared by children. This kind of multi-ethnic setting provides a rich context for children to acquire multi-group memberships, including cultural heritage memberships (ethnic, religious and superordinate ethnic identities), dominant host society memberships (British and English), local memberships (London) and other superordinate or global memberships (such as European).

9.1.2 Are ethnic minority and majority children's social identifications invariant across different contexts, or does the relative salience of particular identities vary across contexts?

Studies 1 and 2 aimed to answer this second question regarding whether or not children's social identifications vary across contexts. What emerged from the qualitative studies was the context-dependent nature of these children's social identifications. In study 1 with ethnic minority children, ethnic and religious identifications were most important in the private sphere of the home, while British
and English identifications were most important in the school (public) sphere. However, in study 2 with English majority children, both constant and fluctuating patterns emerged from the data, with some children’s social identifications being relatively stable. That is, for some children, English and London identifications were primary in both the home and the school context, but for other children one social identification (e.g., English) might be primary in the home but a different social identification (e.g. British) might be primary in the school.

It is noteworthy that the intragroup context of the home provided both the minority and the majority children in the present study with a greater rather than a lesser sense of their ethnic identity, while in the school, British identity rather than ethnic identity tended to become more salient for some minority and majority children. These findings are contrary to the predictions of Self-Categorisation Theory (SCT) (Turner et al., 1987), which postulates that intragroup contexts should reduce the salience of the common identity, while inter-group contexts should enhance the salience of differentiating rather than common identities. In addition, and also problematic for SCT, is the finding that for some Muslim children in study 1, their religious identity remained the most important identity in most situations and did not show contextual variability, and the finding that for some English children in study 2, their English or London identity was most important in the home as well as the school context.

However, the present findings are consistent with Roccas and Brewer’s (2002) concept of ‘compartamentalisation’ according to which social identities can be context-specific, a strategy which has been found to occur in adults and adolescents (e.g. LaFromboise, Coleman & Gerton, 1993; Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997). The present findings are also consistent with Roccas and Brewer’s concept of ‘dominance’ where the individual adopts one primary group affiliation, with all other affiliations being rendered subordinate to the primary one, a strategy which has also been found to occur in both adults and adolescents (Berry, 1990; Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997).
In summary, the present research has revealed the context-dependent nature of some children's multiple group memberships and has shown that this kind of contextual variability occurs not only in adults and adolescents but also in children.

9.1.3 Are minority and majority children's cultural practices invariant across different contexts, or do their cultural practices vary across contexts?

Study 1 and 2 tackled the third research question as to whether or not children's cultural practices are context-specific. What emerged from these qualitative studies was that these children engaged in a multiplicity of cultural practices, but that these practices were domain-specific as well as context-specific. That is, different ethnic, global or British cultural practices might be adopted depending upon the specific domain (e.g., film, music, food, clothing, etc.) or context (i.e., home, school, friends) involved.

In study 1, minority children appeared to favour integration. However, this did not consist of just bicultural integration, as Berry (1997, 2001) postulates, but multicultural integration. The present research's finding that children's cultural practices and acculturation were multicultural as opposed to bicultural is a novel finding. Furthermore, while the finding that integration was a popular acculturation strategy amongst these minority children is partially in line with Berry's (1997, 2001) claim that integration is usually the most popular strategy, the findings that these children showed a multicultural acculturation style, and that their multicultural practices were both context-specific and domain-specific, are not accounted for by Berry's theory. Instead, the findings of study 1 are more in line with the alternation strategy described by Coleman et al., (2001), in which people are able to alternate between cultures according to the specific situation. Thus, in study 1, in the private (home, familial) contexts, the children appeared to favour separation or integration strategies (depending on the domain concerned), while in public contexts (such as the school) they appeared to favour assimilation or integration strategies (depending on the domain). However, in the present research, children were not just alternating between two cultures but between many of the different cultures which are present in London.
In study 2, some English majority children appeared to favour integration, while others favoured separation (depending on the domain). So in study 2, integration was not as popular as it was in study 1 with the minority children, nor was it the most popular strategy. However, as in the case of the minority children, these majority children also displayed a multicultural integration acculturation strategy and not just bicultural integration. Furthermore, study 2’s finding that these English children’s acculturation processes and cultural practices were domain-specific is once again not accounted for by Berry’s model, but is instead more consistent with the alternation strategy described by Coleman et al. (2001). Thus, in study 2, in the domains of music and dress, for example, the children appeared to favour separation, in the domain of food, many children favoured integration, while in the domain of cultural celebrations, some children favoured separation while other children favoured integration (but multicultural integration rather than bicultural).

In summary, the present research adds to the small but growing body of research on acculturation in children by demonstrating not only the multiplicity, multiculturality and context-specificity of children’s cultural practices, but also the variability in cultural practices between different groups of children.

9.1.4 What is the relationship between minority and majority children’s social identifications and their cultural practices?

The qualitative studies (study 1 and study 2) also sought to answer the fourth research question concerning links between minority and majority children’s social identifications and cultural practices. The present research revealed that there was a great deal of variability in this relationship as some children showed a consistency between their identifications and cultural practices, others showed a dissociation between their identifications and cultural practices, while others simultaneously showed both a consistency as well as a dissociation depending on the identification and the domain and context. These findings are in line with Hutnik’s (1991) research with British-Indian adolescents, which found some relationships but also dissociations between identification and practices. In the present research, this relationship appeared to be influenced not only by the importance of the child’s
ingroup memberships, the context (home, school, friends) and the specific domain of cultural practice, but also by language and parental practices.

In summary, the present research shows that the relationship between identifications and cultural practices is variable and complex in children. This is a novel finding which has not previously been reported in relationship to children.

9.1.5 Do children’s cognitive skills (as indexed by their multiple classification ability) develop in the same way irrespective of their ethnic group membership?

Study 3 addressed directly the fifth research question, which concerned whether children’s cognitive classification skills develop in a universal manner for all children. This question is important, given the universal causal role which is attributed to children’s cognitive classification skills in driving the development of their inter-group attitudes between 7 and 11 years of age by Aboud’s (1988; Aboud & Amato, 2001) Cognitive Developmental Theory (CDT) of the development of prejudice. Unlike studies 1 and 2 which relied on qualitative methodology, study 3 used quantitative methodology to test English, Indian and Pakistani British children aged 7 to 11 years. The data revealed that there was little evidence of universal age-related trends in the development of multiple classification ability. This finding is in contrast to CDT’s claim that the ability to perform multiple classifications increases with age in a universal manner in all children, and with the findings of Bigler and Liben (1993) which were obtained with North American children.

9.1.6 Do children’s levels of ethnic, British and religious identification vary as a function of age and ethnicity?

Study 3 also aimed to answer the sixth research question concerning whether children’s strength of ethnic, British and religious identification varied as a function of age and ethnicity. It was found that there were no differences in levels of identification as a function of the children’s age. This is consistent with the work of Maehr and Barrett (2005) who found that the strength of German identification did not change as a function of age, and with the work of Barrett (2007) who found that
the degree of English identification for English children remained constant as age increased. However, the present finding is in contrast to the findings of Davis et al. (2007), Barrett (2002), Penny, Barrett and Lyons (2001) and Trimby and Barrett (2005), all of whom did find age-related changes in levels of identification; Davis et al. (2007) found age differences in black British children’s strength of ethnic and racial identification; Barrett (2002) found that Scottish national identity was not initially ranked as being very important at the age of 6 but its importance increased between 6 and 12 years of age; Penny et al. (2001) found that Scottish children’s strength of identification with being Scottish increased with age; and Trimby and Barrett (2005) found that Welsh children’s national identification increased with age.

However, there were differences in levels of identification as a function of the children’s ethnicity. This is in line with the findings of Akiba et al. (2004) who also found that identification patterns were different for visible minority children vs. white European descent children in the US. The present findings are also in line with Barrett (2002), who found differences between majority English adolescents’ and minority Indian and Pakistani adolescents’ strength of English and British identification. However, the present research is in contrast to Barrett’s specific finding that white English adolescents had stronger national identifications than any of the other two groups. In the present research, the English children did not attribute more significance to their British identification than the Pakistani and Indian children.

In summary, the present research adds to the small but growing body of research which shows that levels of identification in children may not necessarily vary with age, and that there is variability in children’s levels of identification according to the particular ethnic group which they belong, and according to the particular identification which is being measured. Once again, the present findings emphasise the lack of universal developmental trends across the 7-11 year age-range.
9.1.7 How are children’s ethnic, national and religious identifications inter-related?

Study 3 also addressed the seventh research question of whether and how children's ethnic, national and religious identifications are inter-related. The research revealed that the English and Indian children's ethnic, British and religious identifications were all positively correlated with each other but that the Pakistani children showed a negative correlation between their religious identity and their British identity. Thus, the Pakistani children were different from the other two ethnic groups, and there appeared to be an incompatibility between their Muslim and British identifications. The present research’s finding with Pakistani Muslim children in consistent with the finding reported by ETHNOS (2006) that many adult British Muslims feel that they are now being expected to make a choice between being British and being Muslim due to the fact that the white majority population in Britain views these two identities as being incompatible with each other. The striking finding of the present study is that this perceived incompatibility between Muslim and British identifications is reflected in the responses of 7- to 11-year-old children. No such incompatibility was exhibited by the minority Indian children.

Hence, the present research suggests that there is not only variability in the development of ethnic, national and religious identification according to children’s ethnic group membership, but that there is also variability in the relationship which exists between children’s ethnic, national and religious identifications according to children’s ethnic group membership.

9.1.8 How do children's inter-group attitudes change across the course of middle childhood?

Study 3 also aimed to answer the eighth research question concerning children's inter-group attitudes, and how these change across the course of middle childhood. The present research revealed that there were no age-related trends in the development of the children’s attitudes to either ingroups or outgroups, irrespective of whether these attitudes were measured using positive trait attributions, negative trait attributions, overall positivity or levels of general affect. This lack of age-related
changes in inter-group attitudes is consistent with the prediction of SIDT that prejudice does not always emerge in children aged 7 years and older, and is also in line with research by Black-Gutman and Hickson (1996), Davis et al. (2007) and Dunham et al. (2006) who similarly failed to find significant changes in inter-group attitudes across this age range.

However, the present findings are in sharp contrast to previous research that has found that both ingroup positivity and outgroup prejudice sometimes decline between 7 and 11 years of age (e.g., Aboud, 1977, 1980; Asher & Allen, 1969; Corenblum & Wilson, 1982; Doyle & Aboud, 1995; Hraba & Grant, 1970; Vaughan, 1964; Williams et al., 1975; Williams & Morland, 1976), and to the theoretical claim made by CDT (Aboud, 1988; Aboud & Amato, 2001) that these age-related trends are universal. The present research, coupled to the findings of Black-Gutman and Hickson (1996), Davis et al. (2007) and Dunham et al. (2006), show quite clearly that changes in ingroup positivity and outgroup prejudice between 7 and 11 years of age are not universal, contrary to the claims of CDT.

9.1.9 Does the extent of ingroup favouritism vary in children depending upon the specific ethnic group to which they belong?

Study 3 also sought to answer the ninth research question concerning whether ingroup favouritism varies in children depending on their ethnic group membership. The present research revealed that, on the trait attribution task, only the Indian children showed clear evidence of ingroup favouritism on the positive adjective, negative adjective and overall positivity measures. The Pakistani children instead only showed evidence of ingroup favouritism on the negative adjective measure, while the English children did not show any clear evidence of ingroup favouritism from any of the trait attribution task measures. Therefore, the present research shows that ingroup favouritism varies according to the child’s ethnic group membership. The present finding that white majority English children did not display ingroup favouritism on the trait attribution task is consistent with Davis et al. (2007) who also found that white British children aged 5-9 years did not show ethnic ingroup
favouritism and Bennett et al. (2004) who found no evidence of national ingroup favouritism in British and Russian children.

The present findings therefore contradict CDT’s postulate that pro-white bias occurs in all majority group children when they make trait attributions. The present findings are also counter to CDT’s claim that minority group children show much weaker ingroup preferences than majority children with some minority children even favouring the majority outgroup over their own ingroup (Aboud, 1988). There was no evidence of weaker ingroup preference, outgroup favouritism, minority ingroup negativity or white preference in the minority children in the present study.

Therefore the present findings highlight the variability which occurs in the development of ethnic ingroup attitudes, and the fact that even the phenomenon of ingroup favouritism is not universal when assessed using trait attributions but instead varies according to children’s ethnic group membership.

That said, on the affect measure, as opposed to the trait attribution measures, English, Indian and Pakistani children did all display ingroup favouritism. Therefore, ingroup favouritism was a consistent and common phenomenon with these children when an affect measure was used. The same finding has previously been reported by Barrett (2007) in relationship to national attitudes, where ingroup favouritism was also only clearly displayed when affect measures rather than trait attribution measures were used.

In summary, the phenomenon of ingroup favouritism is dependent both on the ethnic group tested and on the type of measure which is used to assess it, with ingroup favouritism only emerging clearly when affect measures are used to assess it.

9.1.10 Do children actually show negative prejudice towards outgroups, or do they just prefer some groups over other groups?

Study 3 addressed the tenth research question concerning whether children show negative prejudice towards outgroups or just prefer some groups over other groups.
The present research found no evidence of negative prejudice amongst the children who were tested. This finding is in line with Black-Gutman and Hickson (1996), who also found no evidence of negative prejudice amongst white Australian children towards Asian Australian children. Instead, in the present research, children simply preferred some groups over others. However, there was variability in their preferences linked to their own ethnic group membership and the outgroup target. For instance, the English and Indian children showed different attitudes towards different outgroups, while the Pakistani children did not differ in their ratings of the outgroups. However, as has just been noted, all three groups of children did show ingroup favouritism on the affect measure. These findings are consistent with the findings of Bennett et al., (2004), Barrett (2007) and Nesdale et al., (2003).

These findings are in line with SIDT’s claim that negative prejudice does not emerge in all children, and that ethnic ingroup preference may only be displayed instead (Nesdale, 2004). In contrast to CDT, SIDT stresses that outgroups are not always disliked and that children may only exhibit a greater preference for their ingroup over outgroups. However, the findings obtained from the Pakistani children run counter to SIDT, postulation that ethnic ingroup preference is always displayed by children.

In summary, the present research demonstrated that children are not necessarily negative about outgroups, but are often merely less positive towards outgroups than they are towards their own ingroup. Hence, contrary to the claims of CDT, negative prejudice does not always emerge in all children.

9.1.11 Do levels of perceived discrimination vary in children according to either age or ethnic group membership (especially according to whether children come from majority or minority groups)?

Study 3 examined the eleventh research question concerning levels of perceived discrimination (PD) and whether this varies according to minority/majority status and age. The present research revealed that there were no differences in levels of PD as a function of age, but that there were indeed differences as a function of group status, with Indian and Pakistani minority group children having higher perceived
discrimination scores than English majority children. The present findings are in line with Phinney et al., (2006) who found that PD was reported by immigrant youth only (and not majority youth) and that there were no consistent age differences.

9.1.12 Do levels of religiosity vary in children according to either age or ethnic group membership?

Study 3 also addressed the twelfth research question about whether levels of religiosity vary in children according to either age or ethnic group membership. The research revealed that there were no differences in levels of religiosity according to age, but that there were differences according to ethnicity, with all three ethnic groups being different from each other. The Pakistani children were the highest on religiosity, then the Indian children, with the English children being the lowest. These results are consistent with the findings of Modood et al., (1994), Ghuman (2003) and Jacobson (1997), all of whom found that religion was highly important to Muslim youth and, in Ghuman’s research, more important than it was to Indian Hindus and Sikhs. The present research demonstrates the robustness of this finding, and that this pattern occurs not only in adolescents and adults but also in children.

9.1.13 Are there differences in children’s cultural practices as a function of their ethnicity?

Study 3 tackled the thirteenth research question, namely whether there are differences in children’s cultural practices as a function of their ethnicity. Perhaps not surprisingly, and consistent with the findings of studies 1 and 2, study 3 revealed that there was great variability in the children’s cultural practices as a function of their ethnicity. For example, in the domains of music and films, there was a divide between the majority English children and the minority children's cultural practices, with the English children being more closely associated with English language films and music and Indian and Pakistani children being more closely associated with Bollywood films and music. However, in the domain of festival celebration, there were differences between all three ethnic groups, with each ethnic group celebrating their own corresponding cultural festival more than the other groups. Furthermore,
in the food eaten with friends domain, Pakistani children differed from Indian and English children, as they consumed their own ethnic food more with friends than the other two groups. These findings are similar to those of Ghuman (1997), who also found variability from one ethnic group to another amongst children.

In addition, the findings of study 3 were similar to those of studies 1 and 2 in showing that, overall, English, Indian and Pakistani children across all domains tended to exhibit a multicultural integration acculturation strategy, drawing upon a mixture of eastern and western choices from their own ethnic group, from the host majority (British) culture, as well as from other minority ethnic cultures present in London. These findings are important and novel, especially given the theoretical claim in the literature that acculturation processes can be adequately characterised in simple binary bicultural terms (Berry, 1997, 2001).

9.1.14 Are there gender differences in children’s cultural practices?

Study 3 also examined whether there are gender differences in children’s cultural practices. The present research revealed that there was a great deal of variability in the children’s cultural practices as a function of their gender. For instance, there was a divide between boys and girls in the domain of films, as the boys were more associated with Kung Fu films and the girls were more associated with Bollywood films and this was irrespective of their ethnicity. There were also many other gender differences which emerged in the children’s practices. This variability in cultural practices linked to gender is in line with Ghuman’s (1997) findings, and is not an especially surprising finding, given both the pervasive gendering of children behaviour during middle childhood (see Beal, 1994, for a review) and the fact that Indian and Pakistani minority cultures also hold very different expectations of boys vs. girls (Ghuman, 2003). That said, the present research demonstrates that both male and female children show a multicultural integration acculturation strategy.
9.1.15 Are there age-related differences in children’s cultural practices?

Study 3 aimed to answer the fifteenth research question concerning whether there are age-related differences in children’s cultural practices. The research revealed that there was much variability in children’s cultural practices as a function of age. For example, in the domain of foods eaten at home, there were clear age group differences between younger and older children in both the English and Indian samples, while the Pakistani children’s practices varied in a more complex way according to both age and gender. Overall, older children appeared to have a wider array of multicultural practices than younger children, and this was probably due to their greater exposure to different cultural groups over the years from the media and from inter-group contact in school and in their neighbourhoods, although it should also be noted that both the younger and the older children did show evidence that they had adopted a multicultural acculturation strategy.

9.1.16 Are there differences in children’s cultural practices as a function of domain and context?

Study 3 addressed the sixteenth research question which was concerned with differences in children’s cultural practices as a function of domain and context. Consistent with the findings of studies 1 and 2, the quantitative methods used in study 3 confirmed that there was indeed a good deal of variability in the children’s cultural practices which was linked to both domain and context. For example, in relation to contextual differences, in the domains of foods eaten at home vs. foods eaten with friends, there were context differences for the Indian children: the food they ate varied from the home (private sphere) to the friends (public sphere) context, with the former being more associated with their own ethnic food and the latter being more associated with other ethnic minority foods. The present finding is consistent with findings from other studies which have reported variations in strategies across contexts (i.e., between private and public spheres). For instance, minority adults tend to prefer cultural maintenance more in the private sphere than in public spheres (Phalet, Van Lotringen & Entzinger, 2000; Taylor & Lambert, 1996).
In relation to cultural domain differences, English children, for instance, displayed different patterns in different domains. For example, they were more associated with pop and rock in the domain of music and with cartoons and British films in the domain of films (all in the English language), but in the domain of favourite foods they were more closely associated with Indian food. Thus, these English children adopted different acculturation strategies in different domains. In the first two domains, they were more aligned with their own culture, but in the food domain they were more aligned with the minority culture of another ethnic group, exhibiting, once again, a multicultural acculturation style overall. The present finding is consistent with Coleman’s (1995) model which advocates context/domain switching through the alternation strategy, and with previous findings from research designed to test this model (Coleman, Casali & Wampold, 2001). However, it must be stressed that these children were adopting a multicultural acculturation strategy and not just a bicultural strategy as Coleman’s model assumes.

9.1.17 Are there differences in children’s levels of inter-group friendships as a function of ethnic group, gender or age?

Study 3 also examined whether there are differences in children’s levels of inter-group friendships as a function of ethnic group, gender or age. The study revealed that there were no differences in children’s inter-group friendships as a function of age. The finding that there were no age effects in the children’s inter-group friendships is in contrast to Aboud, Mendelson and Purdy’s (2003) finding of an age-related decline in cross-race friendships amongst North American children. The present research also revealed that there were no differences in children’s inter-group friendships as a function of gender. The present research, however, did reveal that there were differences in children’s inter-group friendships as a function of children’s ethnic group membership. For instance, each ethnic group had more friends from their own ethnic group than the other target outgroups. This finding is similar to Hallinan and Teixeira’s (1987) and Davey’s (1983) findings that cross-race friendships were lower than same race friendship among school children (black and white) in the US and UK. In addition, it was also found that the English children had fewer cross-ethnicity friendships compared to minority Indian and Pakistani children.
The present finding that English children had a higher number of same ethnicity friends than Pakistani and Indian children is consistent with Howes and Wu's (1990) finding that white American children had more same-race friends (while black American children had more cross-race friends). Therefore, the present research shows that even within a multi-ethnic context (such as London) children’s choice of friends is still linked to ingroup ethnicity.

In summary, the present research demonstrated that there were no age or gender differences in the children’s inter-group friendships, but there were differences in these friendships as a function of the children’s own ethnicity.

9.1.18 Is variability in the development of children’s ethnic group attitudes linked to variability in their cultural practices?

Study 3 also addressed the research question of whether the variability in children’s ethnic group attitudes is linked to the variability in their cultural practices. The study revealed that there was no relationship between children’s cultural practices and their attitudes to British, English, Indian and Pakistani people. No other research has been conducted to date examining this particular issue. It is an open question awaiting further research as to whether or not the same applies in other populations living in other national contexts.

9.1.19 Is variability in the development of children’s ethnic group attitudes linked to variability in their patterns of contact with people from other ethnic groups?

In addition, study 3 examined whether there was a relationship between the variability in the development of children’s ethnic group attitudes and the variability in their patterns of friendships with people from other ethnic groups. The study revealed that there were no systematic links between the children’s inter-group friendships and their inter-group attitudes. This finding was surprising, and in contrast to the literature on the positive effects of contact on outgroup attitudes (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). The present findings may have been due to the specific measures of inter-group contact which were used, and it is possible that had different
measures been employed, the study might have produced different findings. That said, the findings of the present study using the friendship measure are still somewhat surprising insofar as cross-group friendships in particular have been found to be the most effective form of inter-group contact in reducing inter-group prejudice (Brown and Hewstone, 2005; Hewstone, 2003; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). In addition, it may be the case that in an ethnically diverse city such as London, there are high levels of inter-group contact and low levels of prejudice amongst most children, with there being insufficient variance across children to detect any statistically significant relationships between contact and attitudes in such children.

9.1.20 Is variability in the development of children’s ethnic group attitudes linked to variability in their cognitive classification skills?

Study 3 also examined whether the variability in the development of children’s ethnic group attitudes is linked to their cognitive classification skills. The study failed to find a relationship between cognitive classification skills and inter-group attitudes in children. This finding is in fact in line with Cameron, Rutland and Brown’s (2007) study which found that training in multiple classification skills did not improve children’s outgroup attitudes, and with Bigler et al.’s (2001) study which also found that there was no relationship between this cognitive ability and outgroup attitudes in white American children. Therefore, the present research provides additional evidence against CDT’s postulation that changes in children’s cognitive skills are responsible for driving the developmental changes in children’s inter-group attitudes between 7 and 11 years of age (Aboud, 1988; Aboud & Amato, 2001). However, it is possible that had other measures of cognitive development been used, relationships might have emerged. However, as it stands, the current research failed to provide any support for CDT’s claim that inter-group attitudes are related to children’s cognitive classification skills.
9.1.21 Is there a relationship between children’s ethnic and national identifications and cultural practices?

In addition, study 3 examined whether there was a relationship between children’s ethnic and national identifications and cultural practices. The study found no relationship between identifications and cultural practices. This outcome is consistent with the findings of study 1 and study 2, which revealed that there was variability in this relationship, with some children showing a consistency between identifications and cultural practices, others showing a dissociation between their identifications and cultural practices, and others simultaneously showing both a consistency and a dissociation depending on the identification and the domain and context. Hence, the lack of overall statistical relationships between identifications and practices in study 3 is not surprising. These findings are contrary to the theoretical claims made by Berry et al. (2006) that it is possible to identify acculturation profiles in which identifications and practices are inter-related.

9.1.22 What is the relationship between children’s identifications and perceived discrimination?

Study 3 also explored whether there was a relationship between children’s identifications and their levels of perceived discrimination. There was little evidence of links between identification and perceived discrimination. The main exception here was that religious identification was negatively correlated with perceived discrimination in the Pakistani children, which is contrary to the suggestion made by Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1978) that threat (as indexed by perceived discrimination) will lead to stronger ingroup identifications (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears & Doosje, 1999; Brown, 1995). However, this finding is consistent with the findings of Romero and Roberts (1998), who found that a sense of ingroup belonging was negatively related to perceived discrimination in American ethnic minority adolescents.
9.1.23 What is the relationship between children's inter-group attitudes and perceived discrimination?

Study 3 revealed that there were differences in the relationship between inter-group attitudes and perceived discrimination depending on children's ethnic group membership. For instance, there were no relationships between perceived discrimination and inter-group attitudes in the English children, but for minority Indian and Pakistani children, there were relationships between perceived discrimination and inter-group attitudes. For instance, as perceived discrimination increased, positive attitudes to white English and British outgroups decreased in the Pakistani and Indian children. These findings are not entirely surprising as Indian and Pakistani children are members of ethnic minority groups and they exhibited higher levels of PD than the English children.

9.1.24 What is the relationship between religiosity and inter-group attitudes, and between religiosity and identifications, in children?

Study 3 addressed the issue of whether there were any relationships between religiosity and other variables, in particular between religiosity and inter-group attitudes, and between religiosity and identifications. It was found that there were no links between religiosity and either attitudes or identifications. Given that religiosity concerns the frequency with which a number of cultural practices are performed, this finding is consistent with the finding that has already been noted that there were no consistent relationships between these children's cultural practices and their attitudes or their identifications.

9.1.25 What is the relationship between identifications and inter-group attitudes in children?

The final research question concerned the links between identifications and inter-group attitudes in children. Study 3 revealed that, in general, children's ingroup attitudes were related to their identifications, but their outgroup attitudes were not related to their identifications. This outcome is consistent with the work of Davis et
al. (2007) who found a relationship between black British children’s ethnic ingroup identification and implicit ingroup attitudes, and with the work of Barrett (2007) who found that national ingroup attitudes are typically related to levels of national identification while national outgroup attitudes are not.

These findings are consistent with SIDT (Nesdale, 2004), which proposes that the level of identification with the ethnic ingroup can play a role in the development of children’s ethnic preferences and ingroup favouritism. However, it is important to also note that ethnic and British identifications were not correlated with attitudes to any of the outgroups in any of the children, and this finding is contrary to the specific proposal made by SIDT that the development of outgroup prejudice or denigration is linked to the strength of ingroup identification after the age of 7 years. Thus, the present findings do not provide support for SIDT overall.

9.1.2.6 Conclusions to Main Research Findings

To summarise, the findings from the present research indicate that there is very great and widespread variability in children’s ethnic, British and religious identifications, inter-group attitudes, inter-group friendships, perceived discrimination and religiosity as a function of their ethnicity. However, there were no age-related differences in the children’s cognitive classification skills, inter-group attitudes, inter-group friendships, identifications, religiosity or perceived discrimination. The present research also found no evidence of negative prejudice in these children. Furthermore, there were widespread differences in the children’s multi-cultural practices as a function of their ethnicity, their gender and their age, and the children’s cultural practices also varied as a function of both cultural domain and context. On the whole, the children appeared to have adopted a multicultural integration acculturation strategy with their cultural practices alternating according to the specific situation. Also, these children’s inter-group attitudes were not related to their cultural practices, to their inter-group friendships, to their levels of religiosity or to their cognitive classification skills. However, their ingroup attitudes were related to their ingroup identifications, but their outgroup attitudes were not related to these identifications.
Finally, their identifications were not related to their cultural practices, their levels of perceived discrimination or their levels of religiosity.

9.2 Theoretical Implications

In this section, the theoretical implications of the findings are discussed. The implications of the findings for cognitive-developmental theory, social identity development theory, Berry's acculturation theory, and inter-group contact theory, will be discussed in turn.

9.2.1 Cognitive Developmental Theory (CDT)

The present research failed to find any support for CDT’s perspective that changes in the development of prejudice and inter-group attitudes are driven by developments in the child’s underlying cognitive abilities (Aboud, 1988; Aboud & Amato, 2001). For example, in the present research there was no evidence of any of the following phenomena, all of which are predicted by CDT:

i. changes in the children’s cognitive classification skills with age;
ii. changes in the children’s inter-group attitudes with age;
iii. a relationship between cognitive classification skills and inter-group attitudes;
iv. negative prejudice against outgroups;
v. a decline after the age of 7 in both ingroup positivity and outgroup negativity, with more positive/less negative trait attributions being made to outgroups with age, and less positive/more negative trait attributions being made to the ingroup with age;
vi. minority group children showing weaker ingroup preferences than majority children or minority children even favouring the majority outgroup over their own ingroup.

CDT is also unable to account for the variability which occurred in the children's inter-group attitudes as a function of their own ethnicity. CDT offers no explanation of why the development of children's attitudes differs across different ethnic groups.
It also cannot explain why there was no decline with age in the children's preferences for members of their own ethnic ingroup in terms of their friendships.

These findings suggest a need for a reappraisal of CDT's excessive focus on cognitive processes as the sole driver of the development of children's inter-group attitudes and levels of prejudice (Barrett, 2007, Connolly, 1998). Indeed, Aboud and Amato (2001) themselves have acknowledged this need. In a more recent publication, Aboud (2005) has speculated that parents and peers may have an influence on children's inter-group attitudes, but the mechanisms through which such influences might occur, and the way in which these mechanisms might relate to cognitive-developmental factors, are not discussed by Aboud, and it is not possible to draw any concrete testable predictions from her speculations.

9.2.2 Social Identity Development Theory (SIDT)

The present research has provided limited support for Nesdale's (2004) SIDT. The findings of the present research which were in agreement with SIDT were:

i. the presence of both ethnic awareness and ethnic self-identification by the age of 7;

ii. the lack of age-related changes in inter-group attitudes between 7 and 11 years of age;

iii. outgroups were not disliked but were simply liked less than the ingroup;

iv. negative prejudice did not emerge in these children even by the age of 11, which is consistent with SIDT's postulate that, after the age of 7, ethnic prejudice does not always emerge, and that it only emerges if fellow ingroup members share consensual negative attitudes towards particular outgroups.

However, there were also some findings from the present research which were counter to SIDT. For example, SIDT cannot explain why there was no consistent evidence for clear ingroup preference on the three trait attribution measures. In addition, SIDT does not explain the variability which occurred in the children's inter-group attitudes as a function of their ethnicity. Whereas SIDT postulates a universal
sequence of phases in the development of inter-group attitudes, much of the evidence from the present body of research actually suggests that there is no universal pattern of development, and that development varies not only according to the particular ethnic group to which children belong and its status, but also according to the particular target outgroups which are tested and their statuses. Insofar as SIDT proposes that exactly the same invariant pattern of development is displayed by children growing up in all cultural contexts (the only exception being whether prejudice does or does not emerge after the age of 7), this theory also appears to underestimate the sheer amount of variability which actually characterises children's development in this area.

9.2.3 Berry's Acculturation Theory

Even though the children's acculturation attitudes were not measured using the standard methods of assessing attitudes towards cultural maintenance and towards intercultural contact, the children's actual cultural practices and behaviours were assessed, and some aspects of the findings are consistent with Berry's (1997, 2001; Berry et al., 2006) fourfold model. For example:

i. integration was a popular acculturation strategy in children, although it is important to note that this strategy was not fixed or mutually exclusive of other strategies;

ii. a separation strategy was adopted by some children in certain situations;

iii. an assimilation strategy was adopted by some children, but again, only in certain situations.

However, there were also findings from the present research which were counter to Berry's model. For example:

i. there was no evidence of marginalisation in any of the children;

ii. variations in acculturation strategies were found to occur across both cultural domains and social contexts (especially private vs. public spheres), which is not accommodated by Berry's model;
multicultural rather than bicultural acculturation occurred in many of the
children, which again is not accommodated by Berry’s model as this model
only acknowledges the existence of two cultures in its approach, namely the
majority host national culture and the minority heritage culture of the
acculturating individual.

These findings suggest that a re-evaluation of Berry’s decontextualised fourfold
model of acculturation is needed (Bowskill et al., 2006). His four acculturation styles
are not only limited in range but are also not mutually exclusive. Although Berry’s
model can account for some of the findings of the present research, it is not able to
explain the variability in these children’s cultural practices across domains and
contexts, and it is inherently unable to address the issue of the multiple cultures with
which children in a city like London are in contact on an everyday basis and how
children (and indeed adolescents and adults) can appropriate elements from many of
these different cultures. Berry (1990) himself has conceded that acculturation may be
unbalanced across different domains of behaviour and social life, but the analysis and
model presented in his most substantial publication in recent years (Berry et al.,
2006) does not take any notice of this fact, not does it pay any attention to the
acculturation processes which occur in multicultural (as opposed to bicultural)
societies.

9.2.4 Inter-group Contact Theory

Surprisingly, the present research failed to find any support for inter-group contact
theory, as the children’s attitudes to particular ethnic outgroups were not linked to
friendships with members of those outgroups. This finding is in contrast with a great
deal of research supporting the beneficial effects outgroup contact on outgroup
attitudes both in adults and in children (see Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), and that
forming cross-group friendships is the optimum form of inter-group contact in
reducing inter-group prejudice (Brown and Hewstone, 2005; Hewstone, 2003;
Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). The present finding was also in spite of Allport’s (1954)
‘optimal conditions’ for prejudice reduction (equal group status, common goals,
inter-group cooperation, and institutional support) being met in the present study: in
all of the schools in which data were collected, equal status between all children was emphasised with no educational streaming and a clear common ingroup school identity, there were common school goals (such as the promotion of multiculturalism), inter-group cooperation occurred on school tasks such as group projects, and there was strong support of policies and practices designed to promote tolerance.

The most plausible explanation of the failure to find a relationship between inter-group contact and outgroup attitudes is that there was insufficient variance in the data, due to the fact that the data were collected in an ethnically highly diverse city in which the children experienced high levels of inter-group contact on an everyday basis and did not exhibit any negative prejudice towards ethnic outgroups. For this reason, there was probably insufficient variance across the children to detect any statistically significant relationships between levels of inter-group contact and levels of inter-group attitudes.

9.2.5 Conclusions to Theoretical Implications

Overall, the findings from the present research present some direct challenges to the efficacy of the existing dominant theories of ethnic attitude development in children. The variability in the children’s inter-group attitudes, and the lack of cognitive age-related change, argues against models based purely on social identity processes and models based purely on cognitive processes. Instead, children may be drawing on a common system of knowledge or social representations (Moscovici, 1988) from their society and from their own specific ethnic group when making evaluations about ethnic targets. The variability in inter-group attitudes as a function of ethnicity also highlights the specificity of group membership for this development. Together these findings point to a variety of influences on the development of children’s ethnic group attitudes, over and above age-related cognitive-developmental changes and social identity and motivational processes. In relation to Berry’s model of acculturation, partial support was found by the present research for 3 out of 4 acculturation strategies, separation, assimilation and especially integration. However, these strategies varied across cultural domains and contexts and according
to the specific ethnic group tested. These findings are not accounted for by the Berry model, nor is the finding that majority and minority children displayed multicultural acculturation and not just bicultural acculturation as assumed by the Berry account. Finally and most surprisingly, the present research failed to support contact theory. Children's friendships with outgroup members were not linked to more positive attitudes to those particular outgroups.

9.2.6 Theoretical Implications of the Present Research for Theory – A New Theory of Children's Intergroup Attitudes

As just discussed, the present research makes it very clear that existing theories of intergroup attitudes cannot account for the findings of the present study. In this section, an alternative theory which appears to accommodate the findings of the present research will be outlined. The Societal-Social-Cognitive-Motivational Theory (SSCMT) (Barrett, 2007) is a more comprehensive theory of the development of children's intergroup attitudes than existing theories and incorporates four different levels of factors (i.e., societal, social, cognitive and motivational factors). In addition, this theory acknowledges there may be considerable variability in the development of intergroup attitudes. It also suggests that different factors may be the primary drivers of intergroup attitudes in different children or groups of children, depending on the child's psychological processes and their societal context. In other words, SSCMT accommodates the multiplicity of different factors which have been found to impact on children's intergroup attitudes, but also the variability which has been found in the development of these attitudes. This theory therefore explains the main findings of this research, that is, context specificity (that findings will change from one context to another) and the lack of universal patterns in the development of inter-group attitudes (such as those predicted by other theories; i.e., we cannot generalise from findings obtained with one ethnic group to another group). The bi-directional interplay between contextual, environmental, cultural, emotional as well as cognitive factors all need to be included in models of attitude development as it is in SSCMT.
9.3 Limitations of the Present Research and Suggestions for Future Research

The present findings represent a picture of children’s acculturation, social identifications and inter-group attitudes in London as they existed in the years 2005 to 2006 (when the data collection took place). Therefore, the generalisation of the present findings to other locations and other time periods is problematic due to ever-changing ethnic relations and attitudes in the UK, not to mention the implications/impact of major events such as the 7/7 terrorist bombings in London in 2005. Generalisation of the present findings, even within their own time frame, to children living in other parts of the UK, or to children living within other less diverse parts of London, is also problematic. The present research was conducted in areas in North West and West London, the most diverse and multicultural city in the UK (Lakey, 1997). Therefore, these present findings are likely to have been heavily influenced by these children’s greater access to, familiarity with and opportunities for relations with individuals from diverse ethnic and cultural groups. Perhaps if the research had been conducted in another area of England (e.g., a more rural area) or areas where there have been significant inter-ethnic tensions or conflicts (such as Bradford), then it is possible that different findings would have emerged. Further research is needed in order to ascertain how specific the present findings are to the particular location in which the data were collected.

Furthermore, the findings of the present research remain specific to the particular ethnic groups which participated in the present study. Different patterns of acculturation, ingroup identifications and group evaluations might have resulted if children from different ethnic groups, such as Chinese or black African or black Caribbean children, had participated. Indeed, different patterns of group evaluations may have also emerged if different target groups (such as Chinese or black British) had been evaluated in the attitude and affect measures. In addition, the results may not even be generalisable to other Asian immigrant groups (or even to other white dominant groups in other societies); the Asian group is not a homogenous group, but neither is the Indian or Pakistani group, as many different cultural groups exist within both India and Pakistan. Hence, there may well be within-group variations in
these populations, which were not explored in the present research. Further research is required to examine these issues.

Another limitation of the present research concerns the ethnicity of the researcher. All data collection was conducted by an Asian (Sri Lankan) female researcher (the present author). This is in contrast to much of the research in the area of ethnic attitudes in children, where the majority of researchers testing children have been white majority group individuals. Research regarding the race of experimenter and its effect on participants' evaluations has produced mixed results, with some studies suggesting that the presence of a black researcher (as opposed to a white researcher) can result in white participants evidencing less prejudice in relation to black targets (Lowery, Hardin & Sinclair, 2001) and more positive ingroup attitudes for minority group children (Schaffer, 1980). However, Williams et al., (1973) have found no effects of the researcher's ethnicity on children's responses. The possible effects which the present researcher might have had upon the present data are therefore unknown. Future research could examine the extent to which the present research methods might produce biased results as a consequence of the race or ethnicity of the person collecting the data.

A further limitation of the present research was the lack of inclusion of any measures of environmental factors which might have impacted upon the children's practices, identifications and attitudes, such as the media, school, teachers, and parental acculturation, identifications and attitudes. For instance, Aboud (2005) and Aboud and Amato (2001) have now acknowledged that influences such as multicultural television programs, parental attitudes and peer attitudes may impact on children's attitudes. In addition, these factors have been incorporated into models of child development. In Knight et al.'s (1993) socialisation model, which was reviewed in Chapter 2, the broader social ecology of families and socialisation by familial and non-familial agents are emphasised (in addition to the child's self-concept, immediate contextual features, and level of cognitive development). Furthermore, Barrett (2007) suggests that both exogenous social-environmental factors and endogenous cognitive factors are important in determining children's inter-group attitudes, and he has recently proposed a new framework called societal-social-
cognitive-motivational theory (Barrett, 2007) which postulates that social influences (societal and familial), personal experiences and cognitive-motivational factors can all underpin children’s attitudes to groups. As has been seen in the qualitative studies of the present research (studies 1 and 2), parental influences do appear to be related to children’s cultural practices and identification, and other studies have suggested this too (e.g., Knight et al., 1993; Marshall, 1995; Quintana & Vera, 1999), and have also found that parental attitudes can impact on children attitudes to other groups (Barrett, 2007; Branch & Newcombe, 1986; Spencer, 1983). There is also evidence that the school curriculum and school textbooks can affect children’s attitudes (e.g., Aboud & Fenwick, 1999; Barrett & Short, 1992; Cameron, Rutland, Brown & Douch, 2006; Kinket & Verkuyten, 1999), as can teachers’ practices in the classroom (e.g., Kinket & Verkuyten, 1999; Verkuyten, 2002). In addition to parents and the school, the media have also been found to influence children’s attitudes (Graves, 1999; Holloway & Valentine, 2000). For these reasons, investigating environmental factors may have been beneficial and would have enabled a more systematic understanding of these aspects of children’s acculturation, identification and inter-group attitudes. These remain areas for future work to investigate.

Another limitation of the present research concerns the fact that only explicit measures of attitudes and affect were used. Using an implicit attitude method (such as the child IAT; Dunham et al, 2006) in addition to or instead of explicit attitude measures would have perhaps reduced social desirability effects and may have produced different results. However, adding an implicit measure would have increased the length of the interview and hence the burden on each child considerably.

Finally, a major strength of the present research is that actual cultural practices were measured in children, as opposed to just the acculturation attitudes of minority and majority individuals (e.g. Phinney et al., 2006). From children’s patterns of cultural practices, acculturation orientations were then assessed. However, perhaps the addition of an acculturation attitude measure would have been useful in profiling children into different acculturation strategies, and this would then have helped the
research to test Berry’s model more directly. However, once again, this would have increased the length of the quantitative interview schedule substantially.

9.4 Overall Conclusions

Overall, the findings from the present research challenge the existing and dominant theories of ethnic attitude development in children, as well as the dominant theory of acculturation. The present research has found that children’s inter-group attitudes are largely independent of other factors (such as cognitive skills, cultural practices, identifications and inter-group contact). It is highly likely that there are other environmental factors that influence children’s development in this area, and recent theoretical frameworks such as Barrett’s (2007) may provide a possible way forward in explaining the development of both minority and majority children’s social attitudes as this type of model explicitly integrates a complex bi-directional interaction between societal, social, motivational as well as cognitive factors, and is explicitly aimed at explaining the variability which occurs in the development of children’s attitudes. What was consistent across the areas studied in the present thesis was: the lack of age-related changes in identifications and inter-group attitudes; the lack of any evidence of negative prejudice in these children; the presence of contextual and domain specificity in children’s multi-cultural practices; and the presence of substantial variability in identifications, inter-group attitudes and cultural practices according to children’s own ethnic background. The latter finding suggests that there may even be different processes operating for children from different ethnic groups. Finally, to end on a positive note, the fact that across all three studies negative prejudice was not an issue reflects positively on the context of London and the effectiveness of the multicultural approaches which were adopted both in the children’s schools and in the wider society in which they were living.
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Appendices
APPENDIX A

MINORITY INTERVIEW SCHEDULE – STUDY 1

Hi my name is Shash (and I’m British Sri Lankan), thank you for helping me with my project. I’d like to talk to you today about yourself and your life and the people in it and how you think and feel about various things. There are no right or wrong answers, so just be as honest as you can, OK? If any point you do not want to answer a particular question or want to stop the interview just let me know. Whatever you tell me will be not be revealed to anyone else and your name will be kept a secret.

Name:
Date of Birth:
Age:
Gender:
Year at school:
Place of residence:
County and city of Birth:
When did you move to Britain?
Which family members first came to Britain? When?
Parents’ occupation: Father: Mother:
Nationality (passport held):
Ethnicity:

Ethnic Self-Identification

1) How would you describe yourself? What else?
2) Would you describe yourself as British or not? (counterbalance) Why?
3) Would you describe yourself as English or not? Why?
4) Would you describe yourself as …..(whatever the child’s ethnicity) or not?
5) What would you say if someone asked you where do you come from?
6) And if you were on holiday in America and someone asked you where you were from what would you say?
7) Can you tell me where your family comes from?

8) [Give the respondent a set of cards with the following words written on them: British, English, Asian, Londoner, Indian, Chinese, Pakistani, European, Japanese, Bangladeshi, Iranian, Arabic, Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim, Christian, Roman Catholic] Here are some cards. All of these words can be used to describe people. Which ones would you use to describe yourself?

9) If you had to choose just one of the cards because it was the most important to you, which one would you choose? Why? Which is the next most important? Why? Which is the next? [Until all have been ranked.]

10) When you are at home, do you feel ...... or British, [or any other relevant cards they chose]? Why?

11) When you are at school, do you feel ...... or British, or ......? Why?

12) When you are with your friends, do you feel ...... or British, or ......? Why?

13) If you could chose to be from anywhere in the world, where would you chose?

Family

14) Describe your family and who you live with?

15) Do you think you behave the same at home and as you do in school? Why/why not?

16) In what language do you speak to your parents? Anything else? Why?

17) Do you speak English at home? Who with? Why/why not?

18) Which language do you speak the most at home?

19) How well do you speak ......(if the child cannot respond – ask on a scale of 1 to 10)?

20) What language do you answer your parents back in, English or ......?

School

21) How would you describe your school?

22) Do you like your school? Why/why not?

23) Are there a lot of English children in your class?

24) Are there any ...... (same ethnicity) children in your class?
25) What other groups of children are in your class?
26) Do all the different groups get along well? Why/why not?
27) Are there any differences in how you behave here at school and at home?

Friends/peers

28) Who are your friends?
29) Do you have any ...... (same ethnicity) friends? Why/why not?
30) Do you have any English friends? Why/why not?
31) What do you like to do with your friends?
32) Do you see any school friends outside of school? If yes, where?
33) Are your friends outside of school similar to your friends in school or are they different? How are they similar/different?
34) What language do you talk to with your friends? Anything else? Why/why not?
35) What do you have in common with your friends?

Acculturation

Music

36) What sort of music do you like to listen to?
37) Do you like British/American music?
38) Do you like ...... (their ethnic) music?
39) Which do you prefer ...... or British/American music?
40) What kind of music do your parents like listen to?
41) Do they say anything about the music you listen to? Why/why not?
42) What type of music do you listen to at home with your family?
43) What kind of music do you and your friends listen to?

Films

44) What sort of films/movies do you like to watch?
45) Do you like British/ American films?
46) Do you like …… (their ethnic) films?
47) Which do you prefer ……. films or British/American films?
48) What films do your parents like to watch?
49) Do they say anything about the films you watch? Why/why not?
50) What films do you watch at home with your family?
51) What films do you and your friends like to watch?

**TV**

52) What sort of TV programmes do you like to watch?
53) Do you watch British channels/programmes?
54) Do you watch …… (their ethnic) channels?
55) Which do you prefer …… channels or British channels?
56) What TV channels do you parents like to watch?
57) Do they say anything about the TV programmes you watch? Why/why not?
58) What programmes do you watch at home with your family?
59) What programmes do you and your friends like to watch?

**Food**

60) What sort of foods do you like to eat?
61) Do you like British food?
62) Do you like …… (their ethnic) food?
63) Which do you prefer …… food or British food?
64) What foods do your parents like to eat
65) Do they say anything about the food you like to eat? Why/why not?
66) What sorts of foods do you eat at home with your family?
67) Do you eat differently at school compared to what you eat at home?
68) Do you go to fast foods places or get takeaways or go to restaurants? Which ones, how often, and who do you go with?
Dress

69) What sort of clothes do you like to wear?
70) And is it linked to any kind of style/fashion? Why?
71) Do you like British clothes? Why/why not?
72) Do you like....... (their ethnic) clothes? Why/why not
73) Which do you prefer..... or British clothing/style?
74) What kinds of clothes do your parents wear?
75) Do they say anything about the kinds of clothes you wear? Why/why not?
76) What do you wear if family members come to visit like aunts and uncles or grandparents?
77) Do you dress the same at home and when you are not at home?

Sports

78) What sort of sports do you like to play or watch?
79) Do you support England in football? Why/why not?
80) Do you support ......... in cricket/football? Why/why not?
81) Which team did you support in the Olympics?
82) If England played ........(their country of ethnic origin) in a cricket match or football match, which team would you support and why?

Role models

83) Name some people you really admire or would like to be like when you get older? Why do you admire them?

Religion

84) What religion are you if any?
85) Do you pray?
86) Do you go to church/mosque/synagogue/temple?
87) Do you celebrate Christmas? If yes what do you do?
88) Is religion important to you?
89) Is it important to your family/parents?
90) Do your parents talk about religion with you? What do they say?

Country of ethnic origin

91) Have you ever been to ...........(country of ethnic origin)? If not, would you like to go? Why/why not?
92) If yes, did you like/dislike it there?
93) How many times have you been there and when?
94) When you were there who did you stay with?
95) How did you feel when you were there?
96) Would you like to live in ......? Why/why not?

Prejudice

97) Have you ever experienced racism?
98) Have your parents told you anything about racism? What did they tell you?
99) How do you feel about people from different parts of the world all living together in Britain? (If they cannot respond, ask, is this a good thing or not?)
100) Have you ever been called names or teased or bullied at school? When?
     How? What happened?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME (Debrief)
APPENDIX B

MAJORITY INTERVIEW SCHEDULE – STUDY 2

Hi my name is Shash and I'm British Sri Lankan, thank you for helping me with my project. I'd like to talk to you today about yourself and your life and the people in it and how you think and feel about various things. There are no right or wrong answers, so just be as honest as you can, OK? If any point you do not want to answer a particular question or want to stop the interview just let me know. Whatever you tell me will be not be revealed to anyone else and your name will be kept a secret.

Name:
Date of Birth:
Age:
Gender:
Year at school:
Place of residence:
Country and city of Birth:
Parents’ ethnicity and county of birth: Father: Mother:
Nationality (passport held):
Ethnicity:
Have you lived in Britain all your life?

Ethnic self-identification

101) How would you describe yourself? What else? Why?
102) Would you describe yourself as British or not? (counterbalance) Why?
103) Would you describe yourself as English or not? Why?
104) Is there any difference between the two (i.e. being English and being British)?
105) What would you say if someone asked you where do you come from?
106) And if you were on holiday in America and someone asked you where you were from what would you say?
107) Can you tell me where your family comes from?
108) [Give the respondent a set of cards with the following words written on them: British, English, Londoner, European, Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim, Christian, Roman Catholic] Here are some cards. All of these words can be used to describe people. Which ones would you use to describe yourself?
109) If you had to choose just one of the cards because it was the most important to you, which one would you choose? Why? Which is the next most important? Why? Which is the next? [Until all have been ranked.]
110) When you are at home, which one of these cards do you feel? Why?
111) When you are at school, which one of these cards do you feel? Why?
112) When you are with your friends, which one of these cards do you feel? Why?
113) If you could choose to be from anywhere in the world, where would you chose? Why?

Family

114) Describe your family and who you live with?
115) Do you think you behave the same at home and as you do in school? Why/why not?
116) In what language do you speak to at home? Anything else? Why?

School

117) How would you describe your school?
118) Do you like your school? Why/why not?
119) Are there a lot of English children in your class? Who are they?
120) What makes someone English?
121) Are there any British children in your class? Who are they?
122) What makes someone British?
123) Is everyone who lives in this county British? Why can/cant they?
124) What other groups of children are in your class?
125) Do all the different groups get along well? Why/why not?
126) Are there any differences in how you behave here at school and at home? Why?
127) What languages do you speak at school?

Friends/peers

128) Who are your friends? Where are they from?
129) Do you have any British friends? Why/why not?
130) Do you have any English friends? Why/why not?
131) Do you have friends from any other groups?
132) What do you like to do with your friends?
133) Do you see any school friends outside of school? If yes, where?
134) Are your friends outside of school similar to your friends in school or are they different? How are they similar/different?
135) What language do you talk to with your friends? Anything else? Why/why not?
136) What do you have in common with your friends?

Acculturation

Music

137) What sort of music do you like to listen to?
138) Do you like American music?
139) Do you like English music?
140) Do you like any other kind of music (like foreign music)?
141) Which do you prefer, English or other types of music? Why?
142) What kind of music do your parents like to listen to?
143) Do they say anything about the music you listen to? Why/why not?
144) What type of music do you listen to at home with your family?
145) What kind of music do you and your friends listen to?
Films

146) What sort of films/movies do you like to watch?
147) Do you like American films?
148) Do you like English films?
149) Do you like any other kind of films (like foreign films)?
150) Which do you prefer, English or other types of films? Why?
151) What films do your parents like to watch?
152) Do they say anything about the films you watch? Why/why not?
153) What films do you watch at home with your family?
154) What films do you and your friends like to watch?

TV

155) What sort of TV programmes do you like to watch?
156) Do you watch any foreign channels/programmes?
157) Which do you prefer, English channels or other types of channels? Why?
158) What TV channels do you parents like to watch?
159) Do they say anything about the TV programmes you watch? Why/why not?
160) What programmes do you watch at home with your family?
161) What programmes do you and your friends like to watch?

Food

162) What sort of foods do you like to eat?
163) Do you like British food? What kinds?
164) Do you like English food? What kinds?
165) Do you like any other kinds of food (like foreign food)? What kinds?
166) Which do you prefer, English or other types of food? Why?
167) What foods do your parents like to eat?
168) Do they say anything about the food you like to eat? Why/why not?
169) What sorts of foods do you eat at home with your family?
170) Do you eat differently at school compared to what you eat at home? Why?
171) Do you go to fast foods places or get takeaways or go to restaurants? Which ones, how often, and who do you go with?

Dress

172) What sort of clothes do you like to wear?
173) And is it linked to any kind of style/fashion? Why?
174) Do you like English clothes? Why/why not?
175) Do you like other kinds of clothes, like foreign clothes and would you ever wear them?
176) Which do you prefer English clothes or other types of clothing/style? Why?
177) What kinds of clothes do your parents wear?
178) Do they say anything about the kinds of clothes you wear? Why/why not?

Sports

179) What sort of sports do you like to play or watch?
180) Do you support England in football? Why/why not?
181) Do you support England in cricket? Why/why?
182) Which team did you support in the Olympics?
183) Do you support any other county in any sports?

Role models

184) Name some people you really admire or would like to be like when you get older? Why do you admire them?

Religion

185) What religion are you if any?
186) Do you pray? How often?
187) Do you go to church/mosque/synagogue/temple?
188) Do you celebrate Christmas? If yes what do you do?
189) Do you ever celebrate Eid or Diwali or Chinese New Year?
190) Is religion important to you? Why?
191) Is it important to your family/parents?
192) Do your parents talk about religion with you? What do they say?

Travel/ Country of ethnic origin

193) Have you ever been on holiday in Britain? If not, would you like to go? Why/why not?
194) If yes, did you like/dislike it?
195) Have you ever been abroad on holiday? Where? How long?
196) How many times have you been abroad and when?
197) How did you feel when you were abroad?
198) Would you like to live in another country? Where? Why/why not?

Prejudice

199) Have you ever experienced racism?
200) Have your parents told you anything about racism? What did they tell you?
201) Have you ever been called names or teased or bullied at school? When? How? What happened?
202) How do you feel about people from different parts of the world all living together in Britain? (If they cannot respond, ask, is this a good thing or not?)

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME (Debrief)
APPENDIX C

STUDY 3 - QUANTITATIVE SCHEDULE

Hi my name is Shash and I’m British Sri Lankan, thank you for helping me with my project. I’d like to talk to you today about yourself and your life and the people in it and how you think and feel about various things. There are no right or wrong answers, so just be as honest as you can, OK? If any point you do not want to answer a particular question or want to stop the interview just let me know. Whatever you tell me will be not be revealed to anyone else and your name will be kept a secret.

Name:
Date of Birth:
Age:
Gender:
School and year at school:
Country and city of birth:
When did you move to Britain?
Which family members first came to Britain? When?
Nationality (passport held):
Child ethnicity:
Mother’s ethnicity:
Father’s ethnicity:
Religion:

Ok so let’s begin...
Cognitive classification task

Here are some cards [scatter set of 16 cards on a table].
Can you sort these cards into two piles by putting the people who go together into the same pile?

OK, well done, can you tell me why you have done that?

OK great, now is there another or a different way to sort these same cards?
[carry on until child stops producing additional sorts]

Strength of identification

[Ethnic, British and religious identities measured in a randomised order]
I want to ask you some questions about being (ethnic ingroup, British and religion ingroup).

Degree of identification

Which one of these do you think best describes you?

very X, quite X, a little bit X, not at all X

Pride

How proud are you of being X?

very proud, quite proud, a little bit proud, not at all proud
Importance

How important is it to you that you are X?

very important, quite important, not very important, not important at all

Feeling

How do you feel about being X?

very happy, quite happy, neutral, quite sad, very sad [administered using a set of five ‘smiley’ faces]

Internalisation

How you would feel if someone said something bad about X people?

very happy, quite happy, neutral, quite sad, very sad [administered using a set of five ‘smiley’ faces]

OK, that’s the end of this task, well done.

Trait Attribution and Affect Task

OK, I’d like to know what you think about different groups of people. I’d like to talk about X (child’s ethnic ingroup), British, white English and Pakistani/Indian (child’s outgroups) so it is very important that you think about them while we are talking, OK?

Here are some cards with words on them that describe people. So, we can say that some people are (word on first card). [Remove first card, and show the child the second card.] And some people are (word on second card). [Remove second card.] And some people are (word on third card). Right? Now, what I want you to do is to go through all these words one by one, and I want you to say whether
you think they can be used to describe certain people. Can you do that for me please? [Give child the complete set of cards.]

So now we’re going to talk about British, English, Pakistani/Indian people.

Let’s talk about X people [child’s ethnic ingroup always first]

Can you point to the card which shows how many X people are: [give response cards: None of them, A few of them, Half of them, A lot of them, All of them]

Polite.......... Rude.......... 
Friendly...... Unfriendly.....
Clever......... Stupid....... 
Lazy......... Hardworking.... 
Happy......... Sad............ 
Honest......... Dishonest.....

[Gather up the cards in a randomly ordered pile, ready for the next target group.]

Now, I just want to ask you one more thing about X people. Do you like or dislike X people?

How much? Do you like/dislike them a lot or a little?

like a lot [ ] like a little [ ] neither like or dislike [ ]

dislike a little [ ] dislike a lot [ ] don't know [ ]

other:

Right, now let’s do the same thing again but let’s now talk about Y people [randomise order of administering other target groups]
Can you point to the card which shows how many Y people are: [give response
cards: None of them, A few of them, Half of them, A lot of them, All of them]

Polite........... Rude...........
Friendly....... Unfriendly.....
Clever......... Stupid.........
Lazy.......... Hardworking....
Happy......... Sad...........
Honest........ Dishonest.....

[Gather up the cards in a randomly ordered pile, ready for the next target group.]

Do you like or dislike Y people?

How much? Do you like/dislike them a lot or a little?

like a lot [ ] like a little [ ] neither like or dislike [ ]

dislike a little [ ] dislike a lot [ ] don't know [ ]

[Same trait attribution and affect questions repeated for each target group in turn.]
**Language use**

Do you speak any languages other than English?

Yes ☐  No ☐

If answer is No, go straight to perceived discrimination questions. If answer is Yes, ask the following questions.

What language(s) other than English do you speak:

- Gujarati.......☐
- Punjabi.......☐
- Urdu..........☐
- Hindi..........☐
- Bengali.......☐
- Sylheti.......☐
- Arabic........☐
- Other ........☐ specify:

In the next three questions, I would like to know whether you use English or another language the most in three different places.

When you are at home, which language do you speak the most?


When you are at school with your friends, which language do you speak the most?

When you are out with your friends outside school, which language do you speak the most?

Perceived Discrimination

How often are you ignored or excluded because of your ethnic or religious background?

Never    Hardly ever    Sometimes    Often    Very often

How often are you bullied or made fun of because of your ethnic or religious background?

Never    Hardly ever    Sometimes    Often    Very often

How often do you feel that other people do not see you as British?

Never    Hardly ever    Sometimes    Often    Very often
How often do you *not* feel accepted by British people?

Never    Hardly ever    Sometimes    Often    Very often

How often are you called names and teased when you are at school because of your ethnic or religious background?

Never    Hardly ever    Sometimes    Often    Very often

How often are you called names and teased when you are outside school because of your ethnic or religious background?

Never    Hardly ever    Sometimes    Often    Very often

**Cultural Practices and Preferences**

Do you ever do anything for?

Christmas [ ]    Easter [ ]    Guy Fawkes [ ]

Eid [ ]    Halloween [ ]    Passover [ ]

Chinese New Year [ ]    Diwali [ ]
What kind of music do you like to listen to? [Mark as many boxes as apply.]

Rap/hip hop

R&B

Reggae

Drum & Bass/Jungle

UK Garage

Funk

Rock

Indian/Bollywood (traditional)

Punk

Indie

Dance

Indian/Bollywood (remix)

House

Pop

African

Classical music

Ragga

Jazz

Heavy Metal

Other

specify:

Which is your favourite type of music?

What kind of films do you like to watch? [Mark as many boxes as apply.]

American films

Animated/Cartoon

British films

Kung Fu/Martial Arts films

Indian/Bollywood films

Other

specify:

What is your favourite type of film?

How would you describe the food you eat at home? [Mark as many boxes as apply.]

English

African

Pakistani

Italian

Caribbean

Indian

Bengali

Chinese

Fast food

Other

specify:
What is your favourite type of food?

How would you describe the food you eat when you are out with your friends? [Mark as many boxes as apply.]

- English
- African
- Pakistani
- Italian
- Caribbean
- Indian
- Bengali
- Chinese
- Fast food
- Other

How often do you attend a mosque/church/mandir/temple? [mark just one box, whichever is the closest to their usual practice.]

- Never
- Occasionally
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

How often do you attend religious school? [mark just one box, whichever is the closest to their usual practice.]

- Never
- Occasionally
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

How often do you pray? [mark just one box, whichever is the closest to their usual practice.]

- Never
- Occasionally
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

How often do you study religious texts? [mark just one box, whichever is the closest to their usual practice.]

- Never
- Occasionally
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily
In international cricket matches, do you usually support a team from a particular country?

No ☐
Yes ☐ specify which country

In international football matches or competitions, do you usually support a team from a particular country?

No ☐
Yes ☐ specify which country:

Do you ever wear the traditional clothes of your ethnic or religious group?

No ☐ Yes ☐ specify what clothes:

**Inter-group friendships**

Please think of your three best friends, and tell me what their ethnic background (where they come from) and their gender is.

Best friend 1's ethnic group: 
Best friend 1's gender: Male  □  Female  □

Best friend 2's ethnic group: ____________________________
Best friend 2's gender: Male  □  Female  □

Best friend 3's ethnic group: ____________________________
Best friend 3's gender: Male  □  Female  □

The end, thank you for your time! [Debrief]
Dear X

Re: ESRC funded research on identification and acculturation styles in children aged 7-11.

I am writing to enquire whether it would be possible for your school to participate in my PhD research. My research is funded by the Economic and Social Research Council, and is being supervised by Professor Martyn Barrett at the University of Surrey. The study will investigate the relationship between children’s acculturation strategies and the development of identity and attitudes in young children. This project was awarded prestigious funding, because past research in this area has only been conducted with adults and adolescents.

For this study, I am looking to interview children from years 3-6 within the next few weeks. Would it be possible for me to interview a number of girls and boys from the school? It is anticipated that the interviews will take no longer than an hour, and could be completed during times under your suggestion and jurisdiction, to minimise potential burden or disruption to the school day. The interview would involve pupils answering a range of questions concerning their thoughts and feelings about different groups in Britain, their ethnic background, their acculturation behaviours and their sense of identity. Children’s names will be kept confidential and their responses will remain anonymous.
These interviews will form a key part of my PhD research. We believe the results obtained in the research will be of use to psychologists, educationalists and those involved in social policy debates concerning ethnicity and multiculturalism.

I would be very grateful indeed for any help which you might be able to offer me. I will telephone in the next few days in order to see whether it might be possible to meet to discuss this matter further. In the meantime if you require any further information about this research, you may telephone either Professor Barrett on 01483 XXXXXX or me on XXXXXXXXXXX.

I look forward to meeting with you soon.

Yours sincerely,

Shash Vethanayagam
Doctoral Student
Department of Psychology
University of Surrey
Guildford
GU2 7HX
01483 XXXXXX
APPENDIX E

Dear Parent,

My name is Shash and I am a PhD student at the University of Surrey. I am hoping to conduct research on X School students’ to investigate the relationship between children’s acculturation strategies and the development of identity and attitudes. This research is funded by the Economic and Social Research Council, and is being supervised by Professor Martyn Barrett. My project was awarded prestigious funding, because past research in this area has only been conducted with adults and adolescents.

For this study, I am looking to interview children from years 3-6 in a two week’s time. It is anticipated that the interviews will take no longer than an hour and children’s names will be kept confidential and their responses will remain anonymous. If at any time the students wish not to answer any of the questions they may leave them out. Most children find the questions interesting and really enjoy taking part.

These interviews will form a key part of my PhD research. We believe the results obtained in the research will be of use to psychologists, educationalists and those involved in social policy debates concerning ethnicity and multiculturalism.

However, if, for any reason, you feel strongly that your child should not be part of this study, then please return the slip below to X (Head teacher).

Thank you very much for your help. For further details, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Shash Vethanayagam
Childs name and class:

I do not wish my son/daughter to take part in the questionnaire

Signature: ............................................................... Date

........................................
APPENDIX F

EXAMPLES OF THE PICTURES WHICH WERE USED IN STUDY 3