



ELSEVIER

Available online at [www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com)

SCIENCE @ DIRECT®

Applied Developmental Psychology 26 (2005) 714–733

**Applied  
Developmental  
Psychology**

## Messages about the uniqueness and similarities of people: Impact on U.S. Black and Latino youth<sup>☆</sup>

Sheri R. Levy<sup>a,\*</sup>, Tara L. West<sup>a</sup>, Rebecca S. Bigler<sup>b</sup>, Dina M. Karafantis<sup>c</sup>,  
Luisa Ramirez<sup>a</sup>, Elizabeth Velilla<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Department of Psychology, SUNY Stony Brook, Stony Brook, NY 11794-2500, United States*

<sup>b</sup> *Department of Psychology, University of Texas at Austin, United States*

<sup>c</sup> *Department of Psychology, Borough of Manhattan Community College, United States*

<sup>d</sup> *Department of Psychology, Columbia University, United States*

Available online 29 August 2005

---

### Abstract

This experiment examined the impact of messages about uniqueness and similarity between groups of people on Black and Latino children's social attitudes. Children (ages 11–14) read two brief science books embedded with a similarities message (“all people are basically the same”), unique message (“each person is unique”), combined similar-unique message (“all people are the same in a way, but each person is also unique”), or no additional message (control). Relative to the other conditions, the combined condition increased general social tolerance and decreased desired social distance from White children. No message appeared to negatively impact participants' attitudes toward their own group. Implications of these results for basic and applied anti-bias work on promoting similarities, differences, or both are discussed.

© 2005 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

*Keywords:* Dual identity; Individual differences; Intervention; Prejudice; Racial attitudes; Similarities; Social tolerance; Black and Latino attitudes

---

<sup>☆</sup> This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 0213660 to the first and third author.

\* Corresponding author.

*E-mail address:* [sheri.levy@sunysb.edu](mailto:sheri.levy@sunysb.edu) (S.R. Levy).

## 1. Introduction

In the 21st Century, intergroup tensions continue to create barriers to the learning, development, and future outcomes of children of all backgrounds (e.g., [National Science and Technology Council, 1997](#)). Favoring one's own group (ingroup) over other groups (outgroups) begins in childhood, and cross-race friendships that do form tend to dissipate by early adolescence (see [Aboud & Amato, 2001](#), for a review). Fortunately, researchers and educators continue to develop and test anti-bias strategies (see [Levy, West, Ramirez, & Pachankis, 2004](#); [Stephan, 1999](#)), and organizations continue to fund public anti-bias announcements and materials (e.g., [Anti-defamation League, 2004](#); [Southern Poverty Law Center, 2004](#)). One long-standing conceptual controversy across basic and applied anti-bias work is whether to focus people's attention on their similarities to others or differences with others (e.g., [Allport, 1954](#); [Banks, 1995](#); [Stephan, 1999](#)). Some contemporary work has tested a hybrid anti-bias message focusing on how people are both similar and different (e.g., [Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachman, & Rust, 1993](#); [Jones & Foley, 2003](#); [Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2000](#)). Fueling the controversy, there is some evidence supporting the effectiveness of all three approaches.

Yet anti-bias efforts, especially those funded by private agencies that impact millions of U.S. children (e.g., [Anti-defamation League, 2004](#); [Southern Poverty Law Center, 2004](#)), are often implemented without an assessment of their effectiveness, and, when assessed, the sample of participants tends to be predominately White (e.g., see [Levy et al., 2004](#); [Stephan, 1999](#)). Although attempting to increase social tolerance among Whites is consistent with the idea of targeting those who have historically been the perpetrators of racism in the U.S., an understanding of how these commonplace anti-bias messages are perceived by all members of society who receive them is needed (see [Shelton, 2000](#)), especially with the increasing diversity of our youth ([U. S. Bureau of the Census, 2002](#)). Moreover, anti-bias messages emphasizing similarities (e.g., "everyone is basically the same"), differences (e.g., "each person is unique"), or both (e.g., "all people are the same in a way, but each person is also unique") likely have different implications for members of different groups (e.g., [Van Oudenhoven, Prins, & Buunk, 1998](#); [Verkuyten, 2005](#); also see [Markus, Steele, & Steele, 2002](#); [Stephan, 1999](#)).

Thus, a primary goal of the present investigation was to assess the impact of these ways of framing messages about uniqueness and similarity on the social attitudes of Blacks and Latinos, two of the largest racial and ethnic numerical minority groups in the U.S.

### 1.1. "Similarities" message

The message that "everyone is basically the same" blurs the distinctions between groups, presumably removing the basis for prejudice (e.g., [Allport, 1954](#); [Gaertner, Mann, Murrell, & Dovidio, 1989](#)). Similarity generally leads to liking (e.g., [Byrne, 1971](#)) and thus should facilitate liking of others who otherwise would be viewed as outgroup members. In popular discourse, the "melting pot" metaphor suggests that differences between people immigrating to the U.S. will eventually melt away as they all become Americans ([Allport, 1954](#), p. 517). Educators, for example, have attempted to assimilate and "Americanize" immigrant children (e.g., see [García & Hurtado, 1995](#)). The utility of the similarities message is supported by some developmental and social psychological research.

According to the cognitive developmental approach (e.g., [Aboud, 1988](#); [Bigler & Liben, 1993](#); [Katz, 1973](#)), at around age eight, children acquire the ability to perceive similarities between members

of different groups and, in turn, their prejudice decreases (e.g., Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996; Doyle & Aboud, 1995). Once achieved, the skill may not always be utilized; thus, it can be strengthened through intervention (e.g., see Levy, 1999). The “similarities” message in diverting people’s attention from group information (e.g., race information) also achieves a goal of the long-standing colorblind approach. That is, the colorblind approach suggests that race differences are superficial, irrelevant, and uninformative bases to make judgments of people; hence, race should be ignored (e.g., Jones, 1997; Neville, Lilly, Lee, Duran, & Browne, 2000; Schofield, 1986). In one supportive experiment, Houser (1978) examined the effects of viewing films that suggested that “appearance or color should not be considered important in relating to others” (p. 119) on the prejudice of five- to nine-year-old racially and ethnically diverse U.S. children (Black, Mexican, Asian, & White). One film depicted the story of two puppets that were best friends until they realized that one had stripes and the other had spots. The toymaker reunited the friends by emphasizing their similarities, namely that they were both created by him. Although the film clips were brief (each 10–15 min), children who watched either or both films, compared to children who did not view any films, assigned more positive (e.g., hardest worker) and less negative (e.g., steals) attributes to drawings of Black, Asian, and Latino children, relative to drawings of White children. Analyses were not conducted separately by the ethnicity of the children; therefore, it is unclear whether social tolerance was improved for all participants.

Focusing on the similarity of people is also a main component of the Common Ingroup Identity Model of Gaertner et al. (e.g., Gaertner et al., 1989, 1993), which has been tested mostly with White adults, showing that a common ingroup identity (“we”), which transcends intergroup distinctions (“us” vs. “them”), can improve intergroup attitudes. For instance, in a four-week field experiment, Houlette et al. (2004) exposed U.S. children, ages six to eight, to classroom lessons encouraging the formation of a larger “circle of caring” to include people with various diverse characteristics (e.g., race, gender, body shape) and qualities, all of whom “share the same human feelings” (p. 40). Participants’ preference for people who differed from themselves increased between pre- and post-test. Control participants, who received no such lessons, instead demonstrated the opposite pattern, preferring people similar to themselves to a greater degree at post-test relative to pre-test. Participants were mostly White; thus, Houlette et al. were limited in their ability to examine the effects of the participant’s race on the results.

Although promising both in theory and in the evidence with mostly White children and adults, the similarities message appears less suited to members of disadvantaged groups. A similarities message, in blurring group distinctions in a society still wrought with racism, can communicate that one does not notice or care about persistent racism (e.g., Jones, 1997; Neville et al., 2000; Schofield, 1986). From a young age, disadvantaged and stigmatized group members are indeed aware that their group is viewed and treated differently — even more aware than more advantaged group members (e.g., McKown, 2004; McKown & Weinstein, 2003). Further, emphasizing a common identity seems inappropriate for ethnic youth, such as African Americans, whose ethnicity can be key to their identity development and who rate their ethnic identity as more important than do White students (e.g., see Gonzales & Cauce, 1995).

Accordingly, the similarities theory could have a negative impact on people’s views of discriminated-against groups, including their own group, and could lead to negative feelings toward the dominant group, for trying to “cover up” persistent racism and for threatening their valued group identity (e.g., see Jones, 1997; Markus et al., 2002). There is some evidence that more advantaged racial/ethnic group

members show stronger endorsement of the similarities view (see Gonzales & Caucue, 1995; Van Oudenhoven et al., 1998; Verkuyten, 2005). Further, educational efforts to assimilate diverse communities, implicitly into a “white, middle-class mainstream culture,” have not been successful (see Garcia & Hurtado, 1995, p.163).

### 1.2. “Unique” message

A message about differences among people represents the opposite end of the spectrum and thus directly addresses some weaknesses of the similarities message. Like its counterpart, the differences message has a long history in social discourse in the U.S. and is supported by some developmental and social psychological research. One version of the differences message, which is a focus of the present investigation, is the uniqueness of people. It is captured by popular U.S. proverbs such as “You can’t tell a book by its cover,” and fits with the American emphasis on the individual. The unique message is also a derivative of the colorblind approach in that ignoring racial group information can be expressed by stressing individual differences.

The main message of a key intergroup contact model in social psychology, Brewer and Miller’s Decategorization Model (Brewer & Miller, 1984), is that individualizing or personalizing members of other groups can improve relations by taking the focus off group membership, thereby facilitating cooperation and friendship. Furthermore, the unique message has roots in the cognitive developmental theorizing that the abilities to perceive differences within the same group (Doyle & Aboud, 1995; Katz, Sohn, & Zalk, 1975) and classify others on multiple dimensions (Bigler & Liben, 1993; Katz, Sohn, & Zalk, 1975) develop around age eight, are related to reduced prejudice, and can be strengthened as part of prejudice reduction interventions.

In one supportive experiment, Katz (1973) trained seven- and eleven-year-old Black and White U.S. children to attend to the unique characteristics of people. In one condition, the uniqueness of individuals within a racial group was highlighted by having children associate names with a photograph of a child of a different race. In the other condition, children were explicitly prompted to determine whether pairs of photographs were the same (thus to attend to individual differences). Both experimental conditions led to reduced reported social distance and prejudice among both Black and White children of both age groups studied, when compared to a control condition in which children simply viewed the photographs. Katz and Zalk (1978) replicated these findings in an experiment combining the two experimental conditions among White students of the same age groups.

Aboud and Fenwick (1999) further extended these results via an eleven-week curriculum unit. Ten-year-old Canadian children were encouraged to learn the names and individual preferences (likes and dislikes, personality traits) of thirty unfamiliar, racially diverse children. Control participants followed the standard curriculum. White children in the experimental condition, compared to those in the control condition who all scored high on prejudice at the pre-test, demonstrated less prejudice toward Blacks (e.g., assigned more positive attributes such as “friendly”) at a four-month delayed post-test. There were no significant findings for Black participants, which Aboud and Fenwick attributed to their overall low pre-test prejudice levels.

All in all, a unique version of the differences approach has shown some promise in facilitating social tolerance, although the results are less conclusive for groups other than Whites (see Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). Like the similarities approach, the unique approach is problematic because it does not support the valued identity of members of racial and ethnicity

groups. Also, in general, the unique message does not seem feasible as a long-term anti-bias strategy because it works against people's needs for affiliation (e.g., see Baumeister & Leary, 1995) and to divide their world into distinct social categories (e.g., Gelman & Koenig, 2003; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). Furthermore, even when attending to the unique features of outgroup members, children and adults often fail to notice stereotype-disconfirming evidence (e.g., Bigler & Liben, 1993; Wilder, 1993) and, when they do, are likely to view stereotype-disconfirming group members as an exception or a subcategory, leaving group stereotypes intact (for review, see Hewstone, 1996).

### 1.3. Combined “similar-unique” message

A combination anti-bias approach has been championed in social psychology by several complementary models of intergroup contact that each point to the weaknesses of a pure similarities or pure differences message. For example, Brown and Hewstone (2005) and Hewstone & Brown (1986), in their Intergroup Contact Model, which has a substantial body of supportive evidence, propose that both similarities among and differences between groups need to be kept salient during intergroup contact situations so a positive contact experience reflects on both the outgroup member and his or her group. In a similar vein, Gaertner et al. (1993) advocated “dual identities,” suggesting that a “common in-group identity,” as proposed by their model of the same name, can be simultaneously highlighted while people maintain an original group identity (e.g., their racial identity). Indeed, emphasizing dual identities (simultaneous focus on subgroup identity as well as shared superordinate identity) has been shown to be more effective than emphasizing a common ingroup identity alone (focus on shared superordinate identity), especially for members of the numerical minority group (see Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). Dual identities would also satisfy people's conflicting needs for both assimilation (feeling part of a larger collective) and individuation (feeling differentiated from others; Optimal Distinctiveness Theory, see Brewer, 1991, 2003).

Thus, a combined similarities and differences message, such as one suggesting that “all people are the same in a way, but each person is also unique,” likely combines the positive aspects of both the similarities and differences messages while minimizing the negative aspects. The similarities part of the message provides a common identity for the former ingroup and outgroup members, thus fostering the benefits of ingroup positivity on those that had previously been outgroup members. Yet, the combination message does not completely blur boundaries between individuals because, with the inclusion of the unique part of the message, it acknowledges the unshared characteristics among people. Also, the combined message strengthens two cognitive-developmental skills rather than one skill strengthened by either the similarities or differences message.

Accordingly, drawing on both the Common Ingroup Identity model (e.g., Gaertner et al., 1989) and the Decategorization Model (Brewer & Miller, 1984), Jones and Foley (2003) recently tested the similar-unique message among children. Eight-to eleven-year-old U.S. children received lessons in biology and anthropology, highlighting similarities and individual differences among humans. A lesson entitled “The Melting Pot” suggested “we are all different and that is what we all have in common” (p. 559). Children in the experimental condition, relative to those in the control condition (who read a story by Dr. Seuss), demonstrated more positive beliefs about and positive feelings toward people differing in race or ethnicity. Although Jones and Foley (2003) found no significant difference when comparing Whites (75% of total sample) to a combined group that included Blacks

(9%), Asians (3%) and other ethnicities (12%), collapsing the data likely obscures differences that could be evident between the different groups.

Research with college students has also shown that a similar–unique message can increase some forms of social tolerance among Whites. [Wolsko et al. \(2000\)](#) found that U.S. White college students who were exposed to a message suggesting that “intergroup harmony can be achieved if we recognize that at our core we are all the same, that all men and women are created equal, and that we are first and foremost a nation of individuals” reported less negative affect toward Blacks compared to a control condition that received no message (p. 638; also see [Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004](#)).

#### *1.4. Overview of the present investigation*

Because messages about the similarities and differences among people are being readily espoused in society and have the potential for both positive and negative implications, it is essential that we understand their impact on members of all groups (see [Shelton, 2000](#)). Prior work has tended to focus on Whites with no firm conclusions for other groups; thus, as a step toward expanding our understanding of these messages, we studied Blacks and Latinos, two of the largest U.S. racial and ethnic numerical minority groups. We assessed the impact of three anti-bias messages, as reviewed above, on the social attitudes of these groups. We selected children approximately 12 years old because, by this age, children are knowledgeable about groups (e.g., [McKown, 2004](#); [McKown & Weinstein, 2003](#)) and are able to perceive cross-group similarities and individual differences (e.g., [Aboud, 1988](#); [Katz, 1973](#)).

Past work, mainly with White participants, would suggest that each of the three anti-bias messages (relative to a control condition) would promote greater social tolerance. Based on our critical review of the literature above, we predicted that the combined similar–unique message would be the most effective in promoting greater social tolerance (as assessed by an egalitarianism measure) without negatively impacting Black and Latino children’s attitudes toward their own group or toward the numerical majority group in society (as assessed by measures of social distance and perceptions of racial discrimination).

## **2. Method**

### *2.1. Participants*

Participants were recruited from sixth grade classrooms in a New York City middle school. The curriculum at the school did not include a prejudice reduction unit. The school was located in a low socioeconomic area, with 99% of the children eligible for a free lunch, compared to approximately 70% at the average city school. According to a school report posted the year before the experiment was conducted, students were predominately Latino (62.5%) and Black (34.5%), with backgrounds from Colombia, Dominican Republic, Guyana, Puerto Rico, Mexico, and Haiti. A small proportion of students were White (0.5%) and “Asian or other” (2.2%). The sixth grade had two bilingual classrooms; however, participants were drawn from five monolingual classrooms. From those classrooms, the sample included those children who agreed to participate and whose parents or legal guardians provided written

consent. Participants were asked to report the broad category that best fit them from the following list: Asian, Black, East Indian, Latino, White, or other. This made it possible to conduct exploratory analyses comparing the two broadest racial/ethnic categories in the school. Consistent with the population of the school at large, the majority of participants identified themselves as Latino (66.7%) whereas the remaining participants identified themselves as Black (33.3%). The final sample was comprised of 57 boys (21 Black, 36 Latino) and 63 girls (19 Black, 44 Latino) between the ages of 11 and 14 ( $M = 11.98$ ,  $SD = .79$ ).

## 2.2. Stimulus materials

Following in the tradition of presenting the anti-bias messages about similarities among and differences between people through classroom media (e.g., Aboud & Fenwick, 1999; Houlette et al., 2004; Houser, 1978; Jones & Foley, 2003), we selected children's books to convey the anti-bias messages to participants. Contemporary academic books tend to include pictures of people of different sexes and races; therefore, books were a fitting but subtle vehicle to carry our anti-bias messages.

Science was chosen as the context area for the messages because scientific topics can be non-social in nature; thus, the anti-bias messages would not be confounded by the addition of topics that may have made group membership salient (e.g., social studies topics, such as group-specific histories). All participants were asked to read two brief books (each approximately 14 pages or 350 words) representing one condition of the experiment: one about weather, the other about recycling. Each book of a given topic was essentially the same across conditions, with only the anti-bias message varying and with text added to the control condition to equate the books for length across conditions. The anti-bias message was repeated four times in each book, for a total of eight times across the two books read in each condition. Each anti-bias message was integrated as well as possible in the lessons about weather and recycling, and, across conditions, each anti-bias message appeared in the same place in the respective books.

The conditions were as follows, with a sample anti-bias message from a scene from the "weather" book in which the depicted children appear frightened by thunder and lightning: (1) *Similarities* condition, with messages supporting the shared qualities of people ("All humans are the same. Everyone gets scared sometimes"); (2) *Unique* condition, with messages supporting individual differences ("Each person is a unique individual. Different things scare different individuals"); (3) *Combined similar-unique* condition, with messages supporting both similarities and differences between people (e.g., "All humans are the same. Everyone gets scared sometimes, but each person also is a unique individual. Different things scare different individuals"), and (4) control condition, with each book covering only the main topic of the book (e.g., weather) and no anti-bias messages. The "weather" book is described in detail in the Appendix, with the text for each condition provided.

Each book featured an equal number of light- and dark-skinned males and females. Yet, to avoid potential effects of exposing participants to apparent intergroup friendships, in no scenes were light- and dark-skinned individuals pictured together. Also, the book was printed single-sided so that each scene or page appeared distinct. Because the participating school included Black and Latino students from a wide variety of backgrounds (e.g., Colombia, Dominican Republic, Guyana, Puerto Rico, Mexico, and Haiti), we attempted to use pictures in which the ethnicity of the dark skinned

children would be vague enough to be roughly consistent with the ethnic backgrounds of participating children. Thus, we chose books with simple line drawings, altered the features of individual pictures when necessary, and printed the books in black and white to further obscure the ethnicity of the pictures. In a pilot test in which 21 college students (9 Black, 12 Latino) checked off all the ethnicities with which the pictures were consistent, all agreed that the dark skinned pictures could be either Black or Latino individuals and that the light skinned pictures appeared to be White individuals.

### 2.3. Measures

#### 2.3.1. Egalitarianism–humanitarianism

Participants' general social tolerance was assessed using items based on Katz and Hass's (1988) conceptualization of egalitarianism and humanitarianism, which has been used in much research in social psychology as well as in work with children in which its reliability has been demonstrated (Levy, West, Ramirez, & Karafantis, *in press*). Two of the four items used in this experiment were taken directly from Katz and Hass (1988) and later used by Levy et al. (*in press*) with sixth-graders (i.e., "Everyone should be treated equally because we are all human"; "People should help others who are less fortunate than they are"). The other two items were written for this experiment to be age appropriate (i.e., "Everyone should make the same amount of money because everybody's job is equally important"; "Everyone should go to good schools and get good health care, no matter what job they have"). Agreement was assessed on a 5-point scale (1 = don't agree at all, 2 = agree a little, 3 = agree a medium amount, 4 = agree a lot, 5 = agree very, very much). The items were summed and averaged to create an overall index in which higher numbers indicate greater endorsement of egalitarianism–humanitarianism. The internal consistency reliability (coefficient alpha) of the four items was 0.48.

#### 2.3.2. Desired interracial closeness

The measure of desired social closeness was based on measures of social distance commonly used in the developmental (e.g., Karafantis & Levy, 2004; Katz, 1973; Katz & Zalk, 1978) and social psychological (e.g., Esses & Dovidio, 2002) literatures, including past studies on the unique message (Katz, 1973). Specifically, participants were shown 16 black and white photographs and were asked, "Who would you rather *NOT* sit next to at a movie theater? Circle as many pictures of people who you would rather *NOT* sit next to at a movie theatre. If you would be willing to sit next to all these people, do not circle any pictures." The photographs varied by race and gender such that half were of their racial ingroup (Latino or Black) and half were of their racial outgroup (always Whites); half were of male and half were of female children. We asked the social distance question in the form of increased social distance (negative form) rather than decreased social distance (positive form) to minimize the likelihood of having our results confounded with a positivity or agreement bias. For ease of interpretation and discussion, however, participants' responses were reverse-scored and then averaged such that higher numbers indicate greater willingness to sit next to others.

Given the growing body of theorizing and research in developmental and social psychological literatures suggesting that ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation are not necessarily mutually exclusive and, thus, should be assessed separately (e.g., Aboud, 2003; Brewer, 1999; Cameron, Alvarez,



Ruble, & Fuligni, 2001), we used our social distance measure to create two indices—one for desired closeness to their racial ingroup (Blacks or Latinos) and one for desired closeness to the numerical-majority racial outgroup (Whites). We also created an intergroup index, calculated as reported closeness to racial ingroup minus reported closeness to racial outgroup.

### 2.3.3. *Perceptions of reduced societal racism*

To further assess beliefs relevant to the participants' own groups, we examined their perceptions of discrimination toward Blacks and Latinos in the U.S. Prior work indicates that messages that do not acknowledge race or racial differences may explicitly or implicitly convey the message that racism is no longer a problem, which undermines the experiences of members of socially stigmatized groups and is counterproductive to anti-bias efforts (e.g., Neville et al., 2000). Participants' perceptions of reduced societal racism were assessed using items adapted to be more age appropriate from the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (Neville et al., 2000), which was developed with adults. The two items were: "Racism (treating people badly because of the color of their skin) toward Blacks and Latinos in the U.S. happens very little"; "Racism (treating people badly because of the color of their skin) may have been a problem in the past, but it is not an important problem today." Agreement was assessed on the 5-point scale described above. Participants' responses to the two items were significantly correlated,  $r(115)=0.38$ ,  $p<.001$ , and thus were averaged to create a composite score for perceptions of reduced racism.

### 2.3.4. *Understanding and enjoyment of the books*

To check the equivalency of the books across conditions, we asked participants to rate their understanding and enjoyment of the books ("How much did you understand [enjoy] the 2 books you read?"; 1 = not at all, 2 = a little, 3 = a medium amount, 4 = a lot, 5 = very, very much).

## 2.4. *Procedure*

Two Latina female experimenters (one undergraduate and one graduate student) conducted the experiment. Each of the five classrooms was tested separately, but within each classroom the children participated as a group. After completing an assent form, participants were given a randomly selected envelope containing two books (one about weather, the other about recycling), each representing one condition of the experiment. Next, participants received a survey packet that included measures of egalitarian-humanitarianism, interracial social distance, their understanding and enjoyment of the books, and perceptions of societal racism.

It should be noted that no participant reported any discomfort with the experiment. While reviewing the assent form with the children and several times during the course of the experiment, experimenters reminded children to ask questions and to stop at any time without any penalty. Children were also explicitly asked at the end of the survey to write down questions and to report what they thought of the experiment. During the debriefing, the experimenters explained the purpose and design of the experiment. For example, they explained that the two books contained a message about people's similarities to others or differences with others or both and that such messages were at the center of a long-standing debate about how to best address racial and ethnic diversity in countries such as the U.S. Examples of the messages in popular discourse were given, and some benefits and costs of the messages were discussed.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Preliminary analyses

We began by examining whether participants perceived the books in similar ways. We first conducted a multi-analysis of variance (MANOVA) assessing enjoyment and understanding of the books as a function of participant condition (similarities, unique, similar–unique, control) and ethnicity (Black, Latino). This analysis revealed nonsignificant effects of condition on participants' reported levels of enjoyment and understanding of the books  $F(3, 119) = .028, ns$ , and  $F(3, 119) = 0.79, ns$ , respectively. As expected by the similarity of the books across conditions (except for added anti-bias messages), participants indeed reported similar levels of enjoyment and understanding of the books (see Table 1). Overall, participants reported that they understood the books; responses fell between “a lot” and “very, very much.” Participants also reported that they enjoyed the books; responses fell between “a medium amount” and “a lot.”

There were no significant interactions between ethnicity and condition, both  $F$ 's  $< 1$ , and a nonsignificant effect of ethnicity on understanding of the books,  $F(1, 119) = 1.60, p > .20$ . However, there was an unexpected significant main effect for ethnicity of participant on reported enjoyment of the books. Latino participants ( $n = 80, M = 3.59, SD = 0.98$ ) reported significantly greater enjoyment of the books than did Black participants ( $n = 40; M = 3.03, SD = 0.92$ ),  $F(1, 119) = 9.31, p < .01$ .

Preliminary analyses also revealed that participant sex did not moderate any effects; thus, in all subsequent analyses, we collapsed across sex of participant.

#### 3.2. Main analysis

We next tested our main hypothesis, that the combined similar–unique condition would yield greater social tolerance than the other conditions. We conducted a MANOVA involving the three

Table 1  
Means (and *SD*) for measures by condition

	Control ( <i>n</i> = 31)	Similarities ( <i>n</i> = 34)	Unique ( <i>n</i> = 26)	Similar–unique ( <i>n</i> = 29)
	Means ( <i>SD</i> )	Means ( <i>SD</i> )	Means ( <i>SD</i> )	Means ( <i>SD</i> )
Egalitarianism–Humanitarianism	3.73 (.67)	3.86 (.67)	4.01 (.65)	4.20 (.63)
Desired social closeness to racial ingroup	2.94 (2.34)	2.76 (2.02)	2.92 (2.43)	3.48 (1.96)
Desired social closeness to racial outgroup	1.97 (2.07)	3.12 (2.58)	2.77 (2.57)	3.72 (2.42)
Desired social closeness to racial ingroup minus outgroup	.97 (1.76)	–.35 (2.29)	.15 (1.22)	–.24 (1.88)
Perceptions of reduced societal racism	2.89 (1.02)	2.75 (1.27)	2.43 (1.05)	2.65 (1.15)
Understanding article	4.48 (.72)	4.29 (.68)	4.12 (.91)	4.52 (.51)
Enjoying article	3.42 (1.03)	3.26 (.96)	3.42 (.95)	3.52 (1.06)

*Note:* Egalitarianism–humanitarianism, perception of reduced societal racism, as well as understanding and enjoyment of the books were all evaluated on a 5-point scale (1 = don't agree at all, 2 = agree a little, 3 = agree a medium amount, 4 = agree a lot, 5 = agree very, very much). The items were summed and averaged to create an overall index in which higher numbers indicate greater endorsement of the construct. For the desired closeness measures, participants were able to select zero to eight ingroup members and likewise zero to eight outgroup members. The desired interracial closeness measure reflects the selection of racial ingroup members minus outgroup members.

dependent variables concerning social tolerance (egalitarianism–humanitarianism measure, desired social closeness to ingroup members, and desired social closeness to outgroup members) as a function of participants' ethnicity (Black, Latino) and condition (similarities, unique, similar–unique, control). There was a statistically significant main effect for condition for both egalitarianism–humanitarianism,  $F(3,120)=3.72$ ,  $p<.05$ , and desired social closeness to outgroups members,  $F(3,120)=2.86$ ,  $p<.05$ , but a nonsignificant effect of condition on desired social closeness to ingroup members,  $F(3,120)=0.62$ ,  $p>.60$ . There was a statistically significant main effect for participants' ethnicity on desired social closeness to ingroup members,  $F(1,120)=3.96$ ,  $p<.05$ , but nonsignificant effects for participants' ethnicity on both desired social closeness to outgroup members,  $F(1,120)=0.05$ ,  $p>.81$ , and on egalitarianism–humanitarianism,  $F(1,120)=0.32$ ,  $p>>.57$ . There were no statistically significant interactions between participants' ethnicity and condition.

Follow-up analyses to better understand the nature of these significant effects are described below, first for the egalitarianism–humanitarianism measure and then for the social distance measures. In terms of the significant main effects by condition, we began with a planned contrast comparing the combined similar–unique condition to the other three conditions. Then, we conducted four Bonferroni-protected comparisons (a family-wise error rate of .05 was established to guard against Type I error inflation), comparing each of the experimental conditions (combined similar unique, similarities, and unique) to the control condition as well as comparing the similarities condition to the unique condition. The means and standard deviations for all variables by condition are provided in Table 1.

### 3.2.1. *Egalitarianism–humanitarianism*

To better understand the nature of the significant main effect for condition on egalitarianism–humanitarianism, we first compared participants' ratings of egalitarianism–humanitarianism in the combined similar–unique condition to participants' ratings in the other conditions. As predicted, participants in the combined similar–unique condition reported higher levels of egalitarianism–humanitarianism than those in the other conditions,  $t(116)=2.36$ ,  $p<.05$ . We next conducted Bonferroni protected comparisons, comparing each of the three experimental conditions to the control condition and comparing the similarities condition to the unique condition. Participants in the combined similar–unique condition reported higher levels of egalitarianism–humanitarianism than those in the control condition,  $t(116)=2.74$ ,  $p<.01$ , whereas participants' reported levels of egalitarianism–humanitarianism in the unique condition and similarities condition did not differ significantly from the control,  $t(116)=1.58$ ,  $p=.12$  and  $t(116)=0.78$ ,  $p=.44$ , respectively. In addition, participants' reported levels of egalitarianism–humanitarianism in the unique condition did not significantly differ from the similarities condition,  $t(116)=0.87$ ,  $p=.38$ .

### 3.2.2. *Desired interracial closeness*

Following up on the significant main effect for condition on desired closeness to the numerical-majority racial outgroup (Whites), a planned contrast revealed that participants in the combined similar–unique condition selected more outgroup members to sit next to them than participants in the other conditions,  $t(116)=2.14$ ,  $p<.05$ . While applying a Bonferroni correction controlling for multiple comparisons of conditions in subsequent analyses, one significant effect emerged: participants in the combined similar–unique condition reported greater social closeness to racial outgroup members than

participants in the control condition,  $t(116)=3.01$ ,  $p<.001$ . Thus, the most effective message in improving egalitarianism–humanitarianism in general and specifically social closeness to an outgroup (Whites) was the combined similar–unique message.

As revealed in the MANOVA described earlier, there was a significant main effect for ethnicity of participant on desired social closeness to ingroup members. The pattern of the means revealed that Latino participants ( $n=80$ ,  $M=3.31$ ,  $SD=2.15$ ) reported significantly greater desire for social closeness to ingroup members than did Black participants ( $n=40$ ;  $M=2.43$ ,  $SD=2.12$ ),  $F(1, 118)\geq 4.58$ ,  $p<.05$ .

We also conducted auxiliary analyses on the desired social closeness measures. Although recent theorizing and work point to the importance of separately examining ingroup and outgroup attitudes, which prompted our main analysis above (e.g., Aboud, 2003; Brewer, 1999), past work on the anti-bias messages similar to our experiment assessed *intergroup* closeness (e.g., see Aboud & Fenwick, 1999; Wolsko et al., 2000). Thus, we also conducted analyses using an intergroup closeness index, which was calculated as the desired social closeness to ingroup minus desired closeness to outgroup. The intergroup index was entered in a MANOVA similar to the one described earlier with egalitarianism–humanitarianism as the other dependent variable analyzed as a function of participants' condition (similarities, unique, similar–unique, control) and ethnicity (Black, Latino).

There was a significant main effect for condition,  $F(3, 119)=3.91$ ,  $p<.05$ . Yet participants in the combined similar–unique condition did not significantly differ from participants in the other conditions in terms of preference for racial ingroup members relative to outgroup members,  $t(116)=1.25$ ,  $p=.22$ . Bonferroni-protected subsequent comparisons revealed one significant effect: participants in the similarities condition, compared to the those in the control condition, reported less preference for racial ingroup members relative to outgroup members  $t(116)=2.85$ ,  $p<.01$ .

The MANOVA auxiliary analysis also yielded a significant main effect for ethnicity,  $F(1, 119)=7.20$ ,  $p<.01$ , but a nonsignificant condition by ethnicity interaction. The pattern of the means revealed that Latino participants ( $n=80$ ,  $M=0.43$ ,  $SD=1.85$ ) reported significantly greater desire for intergroup closeness than did Black participants ( $n=40$ ;  $M=-.48$ ,  $SD=1.93$ ). This is consistent with the significant finding that Latino participants reported significantly greater desire for social closeness to *ingroup* members than did Black participants.

### 3.2.3. Perceptions of reduced societal racism

Analyses revealed no significant effects on perceptions of reduced societal racism. That is, the analysis of participants' ratings of societal racism as a function of their ethnicity and condition revealed nonsignificant main effects for ethnicity and condition as well as a nonsignificant interaction between ethnicity and condition, all  $F$ 's  $<1$ .

## 4. General discussion

The present investigation examined prevalent anti-bias messages at the heart of a long-standing conceptual debate regarding whether U.S. intergroup relations can be best improved by emphasizing the similarities among people or differences between people, or, newer to the debate, by emphasizing both similarities and differences. We aimed to demonstrate that a combined message would yield positive effects on the social attitudes of two understudied and large racial/ethnic

groups in the U.S., Blacks and Latinos. We found that a combined similar–unique message improved participants' social tolerance toward people in general and improved desired social closeness to Whites, relative to the other conditions. The unique message and similarities message, however, did not significantly differ from the control condition or one another on these main measures of social tolerance.

As foreshadowed in the literature review, these findings are consistent with the idea that a pure similarities or differences message, although showing promise as effective anti-bias messages among Whites, would be less effective among Blacks and Latinos. The pure similarities and pure differences messages used herein, which respectively focused attention on either everyone's commonalities or each person's uniqueness, minimized and disregarded group level histories and experiences, including racism experienced by disadvantaged groups. This could have led to negative attitudes toward the majority outgroup (Whites) or to a rejection of one's own group and denial of current racism. However, we did not find differences in increased outgroup bias, and none of the anti-bias messages appeared to negatively affect participants' views of their own group. For example, there was a nonsignificant effect of condition on desired closeness to ingroup members along with a significant main effect of condition on desired closeness to Whites. This may suggest that outgroup attitudes, relative to ingroup attitudes, are more malleable or that ingroup attitudes were not affected by the brief classroom materials.

There were also no significant differences as a function of condition on participants' perceptions of racism. Participants' responses suggest that participants are aware that societal racism still exists, as would be expected (e.g., see [McKown, 2004](#)). Yet, unlike our other measures, which assessed preferences or desires, perceptions of racism may be less malleable because they require a change in perception of the presence or absence of a societal condition. Also, although the null findings could suggest that the anti-bias messages do not impact Black and Latino children's beliefs about the presence of societal racism, it is possible that the subtleness and brevity of the messages in the current experiment were not strong enough to reveal the negative impact of the anti-bias messages. A long-term follow-up of the impact of the anti-bias messages would have shed light on this issue, and, thus, the lack of a follow-up is a weakness of our experiment.

#### *4.1. Implications and future directions*

Results from the present investigation converge with other recent research suggesting that emphasizing similarities or differences are unlikely to serve as the best approaches for facilitating social harmony, especially for members of numerical-minority or disadvantaged groups. As U.S. research increasingly focuses on the effect of anti-bias messages on children from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds, greater focus will likely be on which type of combined similarities–differences message best fits the needs of the differing groups, while simultaneously improving social attitudes and relations. Similar to recent work on a combined message ([Jones & Foley, 2003](#); also see [Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004](#); [Wolsko et al., 2000](#)), the current experiment used the narrowest level of difference (“each person is a unique individual”) and a very broad level of similarities (“all humans are the same”), providing individuation and affiliation. It is possible, however, that targeting mid-level categories rather than these extreme levels may prove even more effective. For example, research with adults has used racial or ethnic identity to provide individuation within the context of a shared nationality (e.g., Canadians; [Esses, Dovidio, Jackson,](#)

& Armstrong, 2001). Future work should test the effectiveness of messages stating that racial and ethnic groups are both different from, and the same as, each other for reducing children's intergroup biases.

An emphasis on race or ethnicity also is consistent with a key “differences” approach that was not addressed in the present investigation, the multicultural approach. Multicultural messages recognize and respect different group's cultures and experiences (e.g., Banks, 1995; Verkuyten, 2005). Through multiculturalism, ingroup identity and ingroup positivity can be enhanced particularly for ethnic minority members, and outgroup attitudes may be improved for all groups (e.g., Banks, 1995; Verkuyten, 2005). The multicultural message combined with a similarities message may be particularly effective because the combination overcomes a major criticism of the multicultural approach, which is that emphasizing racial and cultural differences can inadvertently increase racial stereotyping (see Bigler, 1999; Kehoe & Mansfield, 1993). Moreover, such a combined message is supported by research on biculturalism in which people focus on two cultural identities (e.g., Mexican and American; see Gonzales & Cauce, 1995).

Although it would be convenient if one type of combined similarities–differences message would be shown to work equally well for all groups and in all settings, it seems unlikely that one will be found, especially given that desired social identities tend to shift by context (e.g., Brewer, 1991; Turner et al., 1987). The anti-bias messages would likely need to be tailored to the setting and to the message recipients, taking into consideration not only their ethnicities but also their age and other factors. For example, if the messages are given to children who are just developing the relevant cognitive skills, such as 7-year-olds as in Katz's works (Katz, 1973; Katz & Zalk, 1978), then the messages may need to be more explicit and repeated more times than if the messages were given to older children who have more experience noticing similarities and differences (as was the case for participants in our experiment).

Another important consideration in future work comparing and contrasting various combined similarities–differences messages is sustaining the message, particularly the dual focus. It seems unrealistic for people to simultaneously focus on two levels of identity to the same degree for a long period of time. Thus, the best combined messages may also need to include a plan for when to focus on one identity versus the other and how much to focus on one identity versus another in a given setting. Hewstone and Brown, in testing and refining their Intergroup Contact Model (Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Hewstone & Brown, 1986), have been addressing issues such as these. Their work, for example, shows that a distinct group membership (e.g., race) needs to be salient during the contact (although the contact may be also individualized); otherwise, the effects of a positive intergroup contact situation are unlikely to generalize beyond the initial contact situation with that person or to one's views of that person's group. Also, advocating a careful balance between focusing on individual and group identities, Schofield (1995) suggested: “the best course of action may be to encourage students to deal with each other as individuals while recognizing, in setting policies and making decisions, that attention to how various groups are faring is not only appropriate but likely to be constructive as well.” (p. 279).

The present findings also contribute to developmental and social psychological literatures showing that ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation are not necessarily mutually exclusive and thus should be assessed separately (e.g., Aboud, 2003; Brewer, 1999; Cameron et al., 2001). We used a social distance measure that allowed a test of whether the anti-bias messages affected children's evaluations of their ingroup (Blacks or Latinos), the numerical-majority outgroup (Whites), or both. For example, our

results indicated that the combined similar-unique condition, relative to the control condition, promoted greater desired social closeness to the outgroup (Whites), while leaving views toward the ingroup (Latinos or Blacks) unchanged. Thus, consistent with recent work among children (e.g., Aboud, 2003; also see Cameron et al., 2001), changes in the attitudes toward the racial outgroup were not accompanied by an opposite pattern of changes in attitudes toward the ingroup, suggesting that these attitudes can indeed be independent entities. Importantly, these findings indicate that it is possible to improve children's attitudes toward a racial outgroup without causing a negative impact on their feelings toward their racial ingroup.

At the same time, these findings add to the mounting evidence showing that intergroup attitude measures, combining ingroup and outgroup attitudes in the form of a difference score can be difficult to interpret. That is, significant effects on the desired intergroup distance measure were not accompanied with significant effects in desired social closeness to both ingroup and outgroup members. For instance, it may be that the significant difference between the Latino and Black participants in desired intergroup closeness is due to a difference in desired *ingroup* closeness. Thus, to understand more fully the impact of anti-bias messages, it is important to separately analyze ingroup and outgroup judgments.

#### 4.2. *Limitations*

The present investigation has several important limitations. As noted earlier, a second and delayed post-test, which was not included in the present investigation, would help provide a fuller understanding of the impact of the anti-bias messages on the social attitudes of our participants. Additionally, future work would benefit from the use of pre-test measures to assess change in social attitudes as a function of condition, in addition to comparing across conditions at post-test (as was done in the current experiment).

The potential costs and benefits of each anti-bias message may also be better understood with less subtle and more intense methods of delivering the messages used herein. The discouraging results for the similarities message and unique message compared to more promising past results for these messages may be due in part to the messages being repeated just four times in each book (or eight times total), with the science lesson on either recycling or weather as the competing central point of each book. For example, in the Houser experiment (1978), which improved the social tolerance of a diverse group of children, the main point of the brief films, indeed, the conclusion, was the similarities message. Katz's (1973) inductions of the "unique" message were also brief but direct, active, and intense, with each child receiving one-on-one instruction, and showed positive effects among Black and White children. However, Aboud and Fenwick's (1999) curriculum unit, repeating the unique message over time with many activities, improved White participants' social tolerance levels but not Black participants', presumably because their prejudice levels were already low. Differences in methodology unlikely fully account for differences in findings because the combined similar-unique message yielded significant effects, although presented in the same manner as the other messages, and our participants, unlike those of most other similar experiments, were Black and Latino.

Our findings are indeed confined to our sample, which was drawn from a predominately Black and Latino community in a low socioeconomic area. Future work needs to include children from other racial and ethnic backgrounds and from integrated school and neighborhood environments. It would be

particularly useful to have a comparative group of White participants since most prior work has been done with Whites, albeit with slightly different methods.

Further, our findings may be specific to the use of Latina experimenters, who were part of the ingroup for some participants and outgroup for others (but not members of the race majority group). Our inclusion of Latina experimenters may have contributed to the finding that Latino participants reported significantly greater desire for social closeness to ingroup members and enjoyed the books more than did Black participants.

Although race of the experimenter is rarely varied in experiments, work that has examined experimenter effects has indicated its importance (e.g., Katz, 1973; Katz & Zalk, 1978). Specifically, when tested by a White experimenter, the “unique” intervention by Katz (1973), as reviewed earlier, appeared to have detrimental effects on the younger (second grade) Black children’s desired social distance from Whites. Because members of socially stigmatized groups are aware of their own diverse histories and experiences (e.g., McKown, 2004), which is not acknowledged by some anti-bias messages, it may be particularly important that the message provider not be from a more privileged group. For instance, less privileged participants may be particularly resistant to a similarities message from a more privileged presenter.

Future work would also benefit from better partnerships with educators. Researchers have long lamented the difficulty of securing participation from schools (e.g., Verma & Bagley, 1979) especially those with race-related problems (e.g., Gimmestad & de Chiara, 1983). Indeed, the present investigative team was refused by 10 predominately White schools, one of which would have served as a comparison group. Some noted that their discomfort with their students answering questions that pertained to groups or race while others reported time pressures. Therefore, future interventions may need to be integrated into the regular lessons, a method that the results of the current experiment suggests would be feasible.

#### 4.3. Conclusion

In conclusion, the debate in the United States as well as other diverse societies about whether social harmony is best achieved by emphasizing similarities or differences or both will likely continue as one approach becomes in and out of favor among educators and politicians (e.g., see Markus et al., 2002; Verkuyten, 2005). Theorizing and research in developmental and social psychology, however, is increasingly showing that a pure similarities or differences message is not the best solution and, further, the latest wave of work, including the present investigation, suggest that this may be especially the case for non-majority group members.

In the current investigation with Black and Latino participants, a combination message suggesting that people are both similar and unique was the most effective in improving social tolerance levels. Other forms of a combination message need to be tested with a wide variety of groups to identify which ones best facilitate social tolerance, benefiting society and the self in a diverse world, while also not denying one’s needs to be both similar and different. Along with recent research emphasizing the need to consider ingroup and outgroup beliefs separately, a focus on the benefits and costs to the self can signal a significant expansion in the focus of prejudice reduction interventions. Ultimately the success of an intervention hinges not only on developing an effective social tolerance message, but also on conveying that message in a manner that recognizes and protects the needs of the message recipient.



## Appendix A. Contents of book about weather

Each paragraph below refers to a different page of the book about weather, with the pages numbered. Added text to reflect the message of the condition are labeled and provided in parentheses. Text was also added to the control condition to equate the conditions for length. The scene for each page is described in italics.

1. The day is quiet. The air is still and hot. There are big white clouds in the sky. [*Near a lake, a dark-skinned boy is playing with a kite, while a dark-skinned girl is sitting with a dog*]. [*Similarities*: People are having fun. All humans are the same. Everyone likes to have fun. *Unique*: People are having fun. Each person is unique. Each person likes to participate in different activities; *Combined*: People are having fun. All humans are the same in a way but each person is a little different too. Everyone likes to have fun, but each person likes to participate in different activities; *Control*: no added text].
2. \*There is no text on this page. [*A light-skinned couple appears to be having a picnic. The woman is reading in a chair, while the man is reading while leaning against a tree*].
3. The clouds are getting darker and darker. A thunderstorm is coming. [*A light-skinned woman is looking at a dark sky. A light-skinned man is packing his car while a light-skinned boy is running toward him. A light-skinned girl is packing up a picnic basket*].
4. There's electricity in the clouds. It makes a giant spark—a flash of lightning. [*A big black cloud with lightning striking through it is shown*]. [*Control*: So, it is known that electricity can move in the clouds and make lightning; *Other conditions*: no added text].
5. The lightning heats the air. The hot air makes sound waves all along the streak of lightning. The first sound is a loud crash. The second sound is the thunder. [*A frightened dark-skinned boy is pictured. The page has waves of different shades of gray (to simulate sound waves) with the words "roll, rumble, crash" inside the waves*].
6. The sound of a balloon popping is like the sound of thunder. There's only a little air in the balloon, so there's not much noise. [*A light-skinned boy is popping a balloon and looks frightened by the loud noise; "POP!" is written next to the balloon*]. [*Control*: So, the sound of thunder is louder than the sound of a balloon popping; *Other conditions*: no added text].
7. Sound waves travel slowly. Because light goes so fast, lightning can be seen the moment it flashes. But it may take several seconds for the thunder to be heard. If 5 s go by, the storm is 1 mile away. If 10 s pass, the storm is 2 miles away. [*No pictures appear on this page*]. [*Control*: So, a storm can be tracked by counting the seconds until the thunder comes; *Other conditions*: no added text].
8. [*Similarities*: All humans are the same. Everyone can count the seconds to track a storm; *Unique*: Each person is unique. Each person can count the seconds in their own way; *Combined*: All humans are the same. Everyone can count the seconds to track a storm, but each person is unique. Each person can count them in their own way; *Control*: the word "FLASH" appears in squiggly letters where the text is written for the other conditions]. [*Similarities and Control*: *A light-skinned girl is counting "California's" to track the seconds of the storm. Combined and Unique*: *A dark-skinned girl is counting "Mississippi's" while another dark-skinned girl is counting "California's" to track the seconds of the storm*].
9. The thunder will be very loud. It may be scary, but thunder doesn't hurt. [*A scared looking dark-skinned boy is pictured in bed*]. [*Similarities*: All humans are the same. All humans get scared sometimes; *Unique*: Each person is a unique individual. Different things scare different individuals; *Combined*: All humans are the same but each person is a little different, too. Everyone gets scared but different things scare different people; *Control*: no added text].
10. Here's how to stay safe during a lightning storm. [*A dark-skinned boy and dark-skinned girl are running into a house, by a lake. The boy is wearing a bathing suit and the caption above him says, "Swimmers should get out of the water." The girl is running up the steps and the caption below her says, "Being outside is dangerous"*].
11. A field is not a safe place to be because lightning strikes the highest thing around. It's safer to get all the way down on the ground. [*A scared looking light-skinned boy is crouching down in a field somewhat near a metal fence, and the caption below them reads, "Metal fences, or metal pipes can carry electricity." There is a tree in the field and the caption below it says, "Lightning usually strikes the highest thing. It might strike the tree"*].
12. A car is a safe place to be because if lightning hits it the electricity goes through the car and doesn't hurt. [*Similarities and Control*: *A dark-skinned woman, boy, and girl in a car are looking out of the window, seemingly fascinated by the storm. A bolt of lightning hits the roof of their car; Unique and Combined*: *A dark-skinned woman is driving a car. A bolt of lightning hits the roof of her car*].

13. *Similarities*: All humans are the same. Everyone has watched a thunderstorm; *Unique*: Each person is unique. Each person likes to watch lightning or listen to thunder a different amount. *Combined*: All humans are the same. Everyone has watched a thunderstorm, but each person is unique and likes to watch lightning or listen to thunder a different amount. *Control*: no text on this page]. [*A light-skinned woman, man, and girl in a car are all watching the rain with apparent fascination. The sky is filled with black clouds.*].
14. But there's no reason to fear storms. [Similarities and control: *On a bright, sunny day, a dark-skinned man and woman are setting up a picnic area near a lake while a dark-skinned girl is running toward the lake with a butterfly net*; Unique and combined: *On a bright, sunny day, a dark-skinned man and woman are setting up a picnic area near a lake*].

## References

- About, F. E. (1988). *Children and prejudice*. New York: Blackwell.
- About, F. E. (2003). The formation of ingroup favoritism and outgroup prejudice in young children: Are they distinct attitudes? *Developmental Psychology*, *39*, 48–60.
- About, F. E., & Amato, M. (2001). Developmental and socialization influences on intergroup bias. In R. Brown, & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes* (pp. 65–85). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- About, F. E., & Fenwick, V. (1999). Evaluating school-based interventions to reduce prejudice in preadolescents. *Journal of Social Issues*, *55*, 767–785.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Anti-defamation League (2004). *Anti-bias education and training*. Retrieved from <http://www.adl.org/education/>.
- Banks, J. A. (1995). Multicultural education for young children: Racial and ethnic attitudes and their modification. In W. D. Hawley, & A. W. Jackson (Eds.), *Toward a common destiny: Improving race and ethnic relations in America* (pp. 236–250). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*, 497–529.
- Bigler, R. S. (1999). The use of multicultural curricula and materials to counter racism in children. *Journal of Social Issues*, *55*, 687–705.
- Bigler, R. S., & Liben, L. S. (1993). A cognitive-developmental approach to racial stereotyping and reconstructive memory in Euro-American children. *Child Development*, *64*, 1507–1518.
- Black-Gutman, D., & Hickson, F. (1996). The relationship between racial attitudes and social-cognitive development in children: An Australian study. *Developmental Psychology*, *32*, 448–456.
- Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*, 475–482.
- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, *55*, 429–444.
- Brewer, M. B. (2003). Optimal distinctiveness, social identity, and the self. In M. R. Leary, & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 480–491). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Brewer, M. B., & Miller, N. (1984). Beyond the contact hypothesis: Theoretical perspectives on desegregation. In N. Miller, & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 281–302). New York: Academic Press.
- Brown, R., & Hewstone, M. (2005). An integrative theory of intergroup contact. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Vol. 37, (pp. 255–343) San Diego, CA: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.
- Cameron, J. A., Alvarez, J. M., Ruble, D. N., & Fuligni, A. J. (2001). Children's lay theories about ingroups and outgroups: Reconceptualizing research on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *5*, 118–128.
- Doyle, A. B., & About, F. E. (1995). A longitudinal study of white children: Racial prejudice as a social-cognitive development. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *41*, 209–228.
- Esses, V. M., & Dovidio, J. F. (2002). The role of emotions in determining willingness to engage in intergroup contact. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*, 1202–1214.
- Esses, V. M., Dovidio, J. F., Jackson, L. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (2001). The immigration dilemma: The role of perceived group competition, ethnic prejudice, and national identity. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*, 389–412.
- Gaertner, S., & Dovidio, J. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*. Hove: Psychology Press.
- Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J., Anastasio, P. A., Bachman, B. A., & Rust, M. C. (1993). The common ingroup identity model: Recategorization and the reduction of intergroup bias. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *4*, 1–26.

- Gaertner, S. L., Mann, J., Murrell, A., & Dovidio, J. F. (1989). Reducing intergroup bias: The benefits of recategorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *57*, 239–249.
- Garcia, E. E., & Hurtado, A. (1995). Becoming American: A review of current research on the development of racial and ethnic identity in children. In W. D. Hawley, & A. W. Jackson (Eds.), *Toward a common destiny* (pp. 163–184). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gelman, S. A., & Koenig, M. A. (2003). Theory-based categorization in early childhood. In D. H. Rakison, & L. M. Oakes (Eds.), *Early category and concept development: Making sense of the blooming, buzzing confusion* (pp. 330–359). London: Oxford Press.
- Gimmetstad, B. J., & de Chiara, E. (1983). Dramatic plays: A vehicle for prejudice reduction in the elementary school. *Journal of Educational Research*, *76*, 45–49.
- Gonzales, N. A., & Cauce, A. M. (1995). Ethnic identity and multicultural competence: Dilemmas and challenges for minority youth. In W. D. Hawley, & A. W. Jackson (Eds.), *Toward a common destiny* (pp. 131–162). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hewstone, M. (1996). Contact and categorization: Social psychological interventions to change intergroup relations. In C. N. Macrae, C. Stangor, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Stereotype and Stereotyping* (pp. 323–368). New York: Guilford.
- Hewstone, M., & Brown, R. (1986). Contact is not enough: An intergroup perspective on the ‘Contact Hypothesis’. In M. Hewstone, & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters* (pp. 1–44). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Houlette, M. A., Gaertner, S. L., Johnson, K. M., Banker, B. S., Riek, B. M., & Dovidio, J. F. (2004). Developing a more inclusive social identity: An elementary school intervention. *Journal of Social Issues*, *60*, 35–55.
- Houser, B. B. (1978). An examination of the use of audiovisual media in reducing prejudice. *Psychology in the Schools*, *15*, 116–122.
- Jones, J. M. (1997). *Prejudice and racism*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Jones, L. M., & Foley, L. A. (2003). Educating children to decategorize racial groups. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *33*, 554–564.
- Karafantis, D. M., & Levy, S. R. (2004). The role of children’s lay theories about the malleability of human attributes in beliefs about and volunteering for disadvantaged groups. *Child Development*, *75*, 236–250.
- Katz, I., & Hass, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and American value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *55*, 893–905.
- Katz, P. A. (1973). Stimulus predifferentiation and modification of children’s racial attitudes. *Child Development*, *44*, 232–237.
- Katz, P. A., Sohn, M., & Zalk, S. R. (1975). Perceptual concomitants of racial attitudes in urban grade-school children. *Developmental Psychology*, *11*, 135–144.
- Katz, P. A., & Zalk, S. R. (1978). Modification of children’s racial attitudes. *Developmental Psychology*, *14*, 447–461.
- Kehoe, J. W., & Mansfield, E. (1993). The limitations of multicultural education and anti-racist education. In K. A. McLeod (Ed.), *Multicultural education: The state of the art* (pp. 3–8). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto.
- Levy, S. R. (1999). Reducing prejudice: Lessons from social-cognitive factors underlying perceiver differences in prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues*, *55*, 745–766.
- Levy, S.R., West, T., Ramirez, L., and Karafantis, D. M. (in press). The Protestant work ethic: A lay theory with dual intergroup implications. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*.
- Levy, S. R., West, T., Ramirez, L., & Pachankis, J. (2004). Racial and ethnic prejudice among children. In J. L. Chin (Ed.), *The psychology of prejudice and discrimination: Vol. 1: Ethnicity and multiracial identity* (pp. 37–93). Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.
- Markus, H. R., Steele, C. M., & Steele, D. M. (2002). Color blindness as a barrier to inclusion: Assimilation and nonimmigrant minorities. In R. A. Shweder, M. Minow, & H. R. Markus (Eds.), *Engaging cultural differences: The Multicultural challenge in liberal democracies* (pp. 453–472). New York, NY, US: Russell Sage Foundation.
- McKown, C. (2004). Age and ethnic variation in children’s thinking about the nature of racism. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *25*, 597–617.
- McKown, C., & Weinstein, R. S. (2003). The development and consequences of stereotype-consciousness in middle childhood. *Child Development*, *74*, 498–515.
- National Science and Technology Council (1997). *Investing in our future: A national research initiative for America’s children for the 21st century*. Retrieved April, from <http://www.ostp.gov/children/Report.html>.
- Neville, H. A., Lilly, R. L., Lee, R. M., Duran, G., & Browne, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *47*, 59–70.

- Richeson, J. A., & Nussbaum, R. J. (2004). The impact of multiculturalism versus color-blindness on racial bias. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 417–423.
- Schofield, J. W. (1986). Causes and consequences of the colorblind perspective. In J. F. Dovidio, & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 231–253). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Schofield, J. W. (1995). Promoting positive intergroup relations in school settings. In W. D. Hawley, & A. W. Jackson (Eds.), *Toward a common destiny* (pp. 257–289). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Shelton, J. N. (2000). A reconceptualization of how we study issues of racial prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4, 374–390.
- Southern Poverty Law Center (2004). *Teaching tolerance*. Retrieved from <http://www.splcenter.org/center/tt/teach.jsp>.
- Stephan, W. G. (1999). *Reducing prejudice and stereotyping in schools*. New York: Columbia University.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. New York, NY: Basil Blackwell.
- U. S. Census Bureau (2002). *Population division, population projects branch*. Retrieved December 5, 2003, from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/projections/natsum-T5.html>.
- Van Oudenhoven, J. P., Prins, K. S., & Buunk, B. (1998). Attitudes of minority and majority members towards adaptation of immigrants. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 995–1013.
- Verkuyten, M. (2005). Ethnic group identification and group evaluation among minority and majority groups: Testing the multiculturalism hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 121–138.
- Verma, G. K., & Bagley, C. (1979). Measured changes in racial attitudes following the use of three different teaching methods. In G. K. Verma, & C. Bagley (Eds.), *Race, education and identity* (pp. 133–143). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Wilder, D. A. (1993). The role of anxiety in facilitating stereotypic judgments of out-group behavior. In D. Mackie, & D. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition, and stereotyping* (pp. 87–109). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Wolsko, C., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2000). Framing interethnic ideology: Effects of multicultural and color-blind perspectives on judgments of groups and individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 635–654.