CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

(No) Space for Prejudice! Varied Forms of Negative Outgroup Attitudes and Ethnic Discrimination and How They Develop or can be Prevented in the Classroom

Alaina Brenick, Maja K Schachner, Daniell Carvalheiro,and Emily Karr

Traditionally, prejudice and discrimination (P&D) have been housed within the domain of social psychology. Gordon Allport (1954), a seminal researcher in the field, defined prejudice as 'an antipathy based on faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole, or toward an individual because he [sic] is a member of that group' (p. 9). Through continued work in social psychology, this definition has been refined and expanded on over time; "typically [prejudice is] conceptualized as an attitude that, like other attitudes, has a cognitive component (e.g., beliefs about a target group), an affective component (e.g., dislike), and a conative component (e.g., a behavioral predisposition to behave negatively toward the target group)," the latter reflecting discrimination, or inequitable and unfair treatment of others based on prejudiced beliefs (Dovidio, Hewstone, Glick, & Esses, 2010, pp. 5-6). However, as developmentalists have taken to studying P&D in youth, these constructs have required a developmental and systemic contextualization that accounts for the varied ways in which P&D—and their consequences—might uniquely manifest in the lives of children rather than adults (see Acevedo-Garcia, Rosenfeld, McArdle, & Osypuk, 2013).

In this chapter, we discuss P&D that children face within the school context. Guided by socioecological models (e.g., Bronfenbrenner, 1979), several theoretical frameworks highlight the central role of P&D for minority youth's development (e.g., García Coll et al., 1996; Spencer, 2006). Spencer's (2006) Phenomenological Variant of Ecological Systems Theory (PVEST) asserts that in minority youth development, coping strategies and outcomes—adaptive and maladaptive—must be examined in relation to each individual's balance of risks (e.g., perceived experiences of P&D) and protective factors within a larger ecological context. Similarly, García Coll et al. (1996) suggest that how ethnic minority youth experience and cope with P&D depends on promoting and inhibiting factors in different contexts, such as school. In this chapter, we outline the forms that P&D take on for youth within the school context, the varied consequences of experiencing school-based P&D, and the socioecological characteristics that facilitate or hinder the expression of P&D within schools.

What does P&D look like in schools?

Research has demonstrated that P&D appear in both overt and subtle forms (see Boysen, 2012; Dovidio, Gaertner, & Pearson, 2017). The distinction between overt and subtle forms of P&D tends to be based on the intentionality of the actor and how blatantly the bias is expressed;

overt P&D is deemed intentional and blatant, whereas subtle P&D is considered unintentional and ambiguous. Moreover, as highlighted by Spencer's (1996) PVEST model, the *perception* of P&D—whether intentional or unintentional, whether obvious or ambiguous—is just as impactful on minority youth development. As a result, we provide examples of all of the aforementioned forms of P&D.

Overt P&D by Peers

Typically, overt P&D in schools might take similar forms to those experienced by adults across multiple settings. For instance, children in schools, like adults elsewhere, can be targeted by verbal harassment and physical attacks based solely on the target's social group membership (e.g., race/ethnicity, immigrant status). Verbal harassment can include slurs, epithets, offensive jokes, and derogatory name-calling (Boysen, 2012). In U.S. and European schools, for example, youth with immigrant backgrounds report pervasive anti-immigrant rhetoric and ethnic slurs (Moore & Ramsay, 2017; Romero, Gonzalez, & Smith, 2015; Taylor, 2015), and Asian-American youth are often victimized by race/ethnicity-related hate speech (Cooc & Gee, 2014) and physically targeted due to racial stereotypes about perceived weakness (Qin, Way, & Rana, 2008). The intersection between verbal harassment and physical attacks are readily apparent in the use of derogatory language in incidents of physical bullying. Jewish-Australian youth report having coins thrown at them while hate speech like, 'pick it up Jew,' 'stingy Jew,' and 'gas chamber,' would be yelled at them (Gross, & Rutland, 2014). Overall, verbal and physical bullying in schools is significantly related to and an expression of racism, sexism, religious intolerance, and sexual prejudice (Goodboy, Martin, & Rittenour, 2016), which can be further confounded by the fact that bystanders are typically less likely to intervene in incidents of prejudice- or bias-based bullying (Margie, Brenick, & Lawrence, under review; Palmer & Abbott, 2017).

Explicit and Implicit Discriminatory Social Exclusion by Peers

Prejudice via bullying, however, takes many more shapes than simply verbal or physical attacks. Relational bullying—which harms an individual's social status and relationships—is one additional form of bullying significantly related to prejudice and intolerance (Goodboy et al., 2016). Often, prejudice- or bias-based relational bullying is a subtler form of prejudice witnessed through the social exclusion of minority peers (see Brenick & Halgunseth, 2017; Cooley, Elenbaas, & Killen, 2016). Social minorities who, as a group, are culturally, ethnically, and/or linguistically different and hold lower status in the macro-level social hierarchy, can be prime targets for discriminatory social exclusion at the individual level (Hawley & Williford, 2015; Yeager, Fong, Lee, & Espelage, 2015). Ethnic majority youth in the Middle-East are less willing to befriend and play or work with an ethnic/religious minority peer (Berger, Brenick, Lawrence, Coco, & Abu-Raiya, in press; Berger, Brenick, & Tarrasch, 2018). At the same time, excluding or choosing not to remain friends with social minorities is often viewed as discriminatory by members of the social minority group (Titzmann, Brenick, & Silbereisen, 2015), yet can often go unrecognized as prejudiced, or even problematic, by members of the social majority (see Brenick & Halgunseth, 2017; Margie, Brenick, & Lawrence, under review).

Microaggressions

When prejudiced attitudes are internalized, they can be expressed as microaggressions, which are the everyday slights snubs, or exclusions, that perpetrators often do not even view as harmful or are completely unaware of their potential harm (Wing Sue, 2017). Although microaggressions can exist in a school environment between students, faculty, and parents, often they will be carried out in peer to peer interactions and are most commonly centered on a student's minority group status (Wintner & Hamilton, 2017). Minority students often experience microaggressions when others joke about their accents, exclude them or treat them as invisible, ascribe a level of intelligence based solely on their ethnicity, or deny that their (or societal) experiences of P&D exist (Hoshmand, Sara, Spanierman, Tarafodi 2014). Additionally, ethnic minority students may experience "permanent foreigner status" which could be exemplified by asking a minority student "where do you come from?" (Wing Sue, 2017). While these acts may or may not be purposeful or conscious, they are still reflections of a larger prejudiced society in everyday actions. Johnston-Goodstar and VeLure Roholt (2017) examined other incidents of microaggressions against Native American students and culture, such as having "Indians", "Chiefs", or "Redskins" as high school mascots, and found that increased rates of microaggressions led to a more negative school environment for *all* minority students and increased the dropout rate for Native American students. Due to their nature as everyday instances of prejudice, microaggressions can often go unnoticed or be considered as nothing of concern by those who use them or hear them, but this does not make them any less harmful.

Structural Inequality and Segregation

Discriminatory social exclusion and the microaggressions of being rendered invisible, excluded, and avoided on a larger scale can be seen as segregation within and between schools. One young Black American female student discussed her own school segregation experiences as being driven somewhat by student choice but, more importantly, by the structure of the school programs.

> *"And I don't know if it is as much self-segregation or we are separated because of the programs we are in, but you see that the kids in the IB [international baccalaureate] are majority White and the kids in traditional are majority Black. And there are opportunities in IB that kids in traditional don't have. So like we are separated and we don't get that chance to spend time together and you live the rest of your life with whatever thoughts and views you have of the other people, you keep those ideas because that's all you know."* (Joseph, Viesca, & Bianco, 2016, p. 16).

Acceptance of school segregation can come from students as well as families and communities. In Europe and the U.S., ethnic majority youth have been found to be more accepting of school segregation between ethnic minority and majority groups (Karakitsou & Houndoumadi, 2010). Outside of the school, parents and community members have, at times, explicitly expressed similar anti-inclusion/pro-segregation attitudes for schooling structure, which can undermine anti-prejudice efforts for diversity, equity, and inclusion (Crowson & Brandes, 2010; Wells, Holme, Atanda, & Revilla, 2005).

P&D can manifest both overtly and subtly in the curriculum content and how it is being taught, as well. The vast majority of curricula are designed from a national and ethnocentric perspective to the exclusion of social minority perspectives, histories, and contributions. (Barrett, 2018). This presents, at best, implicit P&D through complete omission of diverse content, or worse, tokenization of minority groups when they are sporadically entered into the curriculum and reinforcement of prejudiced social hierarchies when certain groups are prioritized and valued in curriculum. Even worse is when controversial and prejudiced views are explicitly introduced into the curriculum. Recently, explicit anti-immigrant/anti-minority rhetoric has increasingly found its way into the classroom (see Jones & Rutland, 2018), which has been coupled with increased levels of racial apathy and lack of concern about race relations (Forman & Lewis, 2015). Conversely, presenting culturally inclusive materials that are all equally valued (Barrett, 2018) or teaching about historical atrocities, such as the Holocaust, from a social justice perspective that encourages empathy rather than apathy, and critical thinking about how P&D at that time in history connect to P&D presently (Cowan & Maitles, 2007), help not only eliminate prejudice from the curriculum, but also encourage students to question P&D in their own lives.

P&D by Teachers

Minority students, often absent from or objectified in school curriculum, are also expected to have lower achievement expectations than their majority peers or are objectified by teachers. Overtly, minority students report teachers telling Latino boys not to wear certain clothing, lest they align themselves with gangs and criminal activity (Romero et al., 2015), proclaiming that a Latino student "looked guilty cuz [sic] he had his hood on," and that "all minority students are nothing but good for being in jail and stealing" (Joseph et al., 2016, p. 19). Young black females are objectified as "loud" and "having bad attitudes," stereotypes that contradict the prototypical "good student" (Joseph et al., 2016).

Furthermore, teachers often hold implicit beliefs that minority students are less teachable and hold worse perceptions of those students compared to their majority peers, regardless of actual academic achievement levels (Vervaet, D'hondt, Van Houtte, & Stevens, 2016). Although teachers are seemingly unconscious of their disproportionately low expectations for minority achievement (van den Bergh, Denessen, Hornstra, Voeten, & Holland, 2010), minority students are keenly perceptive of how their teachers view them and it directly impacts their self-confidence, motivation, and performance. One young Black female student said she left a prestigious and academically rigorous program in her school because her teachers "didn't think [she] was going to be able to succeed and so it didn't seem like they were trying as hard or giving as much effort toward [her] learning the same things as the other [White] people in [her] classes." (Joseph et al., 2016, p. 16). However, simply being aware of the stereotype that they are as not as intelligent or capable as their majority peers, elicits stereotype threat, a phenomenon that causes minority students' academic underperformance (Steele & Aronson, 1995).

P&D in teachers' treatment and expectations of minority students extend to disciplinary actions as well. In the U.S., it has been widely established that ethnic minority students are significantly disproportionately represented in disciplinary actions—both discretionary and mandatory—including suspensions and expulsions. Stereotypic expectations of minority youth, particularly young boys, often lead school staff to view their actions as more aggressive or

intentional than their majority peers, and thus more deserving of disciplinary actions. As a result of these punishments, educational opportunities are further limited for these minority students (Booker & Mitchell, 2011; Tajalli, & Garba, 2014). Furthermore, when teachers adopt a colorblind approach, it does little to address these issues; instead they hide the disparate treatment of minorities or reject that disparities exist—simply generating another form of subtle prejudice and discrimination (Vervaet, D'hondt, Van Houtte, & Stevens, 2016).

Consequences of Prejudice in Schools

Experiencing, perceiving, or witnessing P&D in school is harmful both in the moment, resulting in acute consequences, but also over the long term, having implications for development across middle school and high school, and into adulthood. Overall, experiencing P&D is associated with negative psychological consequences (Benner & Graham, 2013; Niwa, Way, & Hughes, 2014;), negative social outcomes (Tsai, 2006; Wong, Eccles, & Sameroff, 2003), negative physical outcomes (Grollman, 2012; Huynh, 2012), behavioral problems and delinquency (Hughes et al., 2016; Wong et al., 2003), and negative academic engagement (Benner, Crosnoe, & Eccles, 2015; Chavous, Rivas-Drake, Smalls, Griffin, & Cogburn, 2008). Longitudinal studies on these effects indicate that we must not only consider immediate and long-term effects of P&D, but also take into consideration how negative outcomes may be different and unique in the psychological, social, physical, behavioral, and academic domains of youths' lives across childhood and adolescence. Furthermore, studies show that the implications of P&D for youth can vary across gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and other expressions of variation in people's' lives (e.g. Chavous et al., 2008).

Psychological Consequences

Perhaps the most frequently studied and well-established consequences of P&D in schools fall in the psychological domain. Experiencing P&D in school is associated with multiple indicators of psychological maladjustment (e.g., lower self-esteem & self-worth, higher depression, social anxiety, & loneliness) in youth (Hughes et al., 2016; Benner & Graham, 2013). Several studies have shown that youth who perceive discrimination are more likely to report higher levels of depression and more depressive symptoms (Niwa et al., 2014; Zeiders et al., 2013; Priest et al., 2017; Wong et al. 2003). Interestingly, this relation with depression varies by intensity of discrimination that youth experience. As Niwa et al. (2014) found, youth who experienced moderate levels of peer discrimination were more likely to exhibit depressive symptoms than those who experienced little to no discrimination *and* those who experienced high levels of discrimination. Contrary to expectations that increasing levels of peer discrimination should be associated with a higher likelihood of depressive symptoms, the authors assert that youth who experience high levels of peer discrimination may become desensitized, thus lessening the effects of discrimination on depression over time.

Similarly, experiencing discrimination is associated with lower self-esteem, overall, (Niwa et al., 2014; Wong et al., 2003), but also impaired development of self-esteem in youth (Zeiders et al., 2013). Among Latino youth, experiencing discrimination in school was linked to lower self-esteem for males, but also impaired growth in self-esteem across time for both males and females—thus, hindering the normative developmental trajectory. Furthermore, Benner and

Graham (2013) found that being excluded from activities with peers because of one's own ethnicity was also associated with higher psychological maladjustment, and Hughes et al. (2016) demonstrated that overt and subtle peer discrimination yielded the same pattern of results longitudinally. However, declines in overt and subtle peer discrimination in 8th grade predicted better psychological adjustment in 11th grade. In addition, these studies highlight the need for developmental and intersectional analyses that consider differential effects of P&D overtime as well as over specific forms of psychological problems.

Social Consequences

Similarly, we can see that students' experiences of P&D in school have particular consequences for social well-being. In general and across contexts, discrimination can impact students' relationship quality with their friends and their teachers (Kiang, Witkow, & Thompson, 2016), and lead to lower social competence (Myrick & Martorell, 2011), and social isolation (Taylor & Peter, 2011). These consequences can range from relationship quality to more severe feelings of being threatened by peers. In terms of student-teacher relationships, adolescents who reported higher levels of peer discrimination, also reported lower teacher-student relationship quality (Niwa et al., 2014). For peer relationships, experiencing discrimination in school was associated with feeling less support from classmates by Arab-American students (Tabbah, Miranda, & Wheaton, 2012). Minority students who reported higher rates of discrimination by peers and teachers in the school also attributed more negative characteristics to their friends, higher rates of teacher discrimination was also associated with students attributing fewer positive characteristics to their friends (Wong et al., 2003). However, discriminated youth can even be prevented from making those social connections in the first place. Tsai (2006) found that school ESL programs to promote immigrant youth integration in American society can instead lead to opportunities for these youth to be mistreated (e.g., made fun of for accents) and considered different from native born peers, which leads to social isolation of these youth (e.g., Taylor & Peter, 2016).

Physical Consequences

In general for youth, P&D based of various social minority identities is associated with greater physical and physiological stress, including but not limited to higher ambulatory blood pressure and cortisol levels—higher levels of which are indicative of higher stress and can have significant consequences for learning, memory, immune system functioning, and risk for depression (see Puhl & Latner 2007). Higher rates of discrimination by adults or peers in school were also associated were more complaints of headaches, stomach aches, and poor appetite (Huynh & Fuligni, 2010). Acts of P&D do not need to happen on a large scale or be overt to have negative consequences; experiencing microaggressions is associated with increased somatic symptoms such as head, back, or stomach ache in adolescent students (Huynh, 2012). Moreover, students who faced multiple forms of discrimination are at even greater risk for these negative physical outcomes and reported overall worse global physical health than their peers who had not experienced discrimination at all, or in multiple forms (Grollman, 2012). This provides evidence that a "double disadvantage" exists in which the more discrimination a student faces, the worse their health problems could become.

Behavioral Consequences

Beyond psychological, social, and physical health, problem behaviors and delinquency are also significant negative outcomes of P&D. Numerous studies have found a strong relation between P&D in schools and substance use, including binge drinking and cigarette, alcohol, marijuana, inhalant, and methamphetamine use (Hershberger, Zapolski, & Aalsma, 2016; Respress, Small, Francis, & Cordova, 2013; Sanchez, Whittaker, & Hamilton, 2016). Yet, it is necessary to delineate substance abuse into specific behaviors, as the impact of discrimination on substance use can vary by the type of substance and type of use. For example, Hershberger et al.'s (2016) study on youth across a range of ethnicities found that although school-based discrimination was not associated with greater cigarette use, higher levels of discrimination predicted higher levels of cigarette addiction. Moreover, Respress et al. (2013) showed that Black high school students who perceived discriminatory treatment by their teachers were more likely to use marijuana, but not more likely to binge drink (Respress et al., 2013). Source of discrimination mattered, though; perceiving peers in school to be prejudiced was not associated with either binge drinking or marijuana use. Lastly, the relationship between school discrimination and substance use has important implications for adolescents' sexual risk. As Sanchez et al. (2016) showed, peer discrimination was associated with increased sexual behaviors and substance use for Mexican American preadolescents, and substance use mediated the relation between peer discrimination and sexual behaviors.

Additionally, delinquent and problem behaviors, such as aggression and skipping school, are highly relevant outcomes of P&D in schools (Le & Stockdale, 2011; Hughes et al., 2016; Wong et al., 2003). Le and Stockdale (2011) found that when students perceived their schools' student body to be more prejudiced, there were also higher rates of delinquency among students of all ethnicities. What is more, peer discrimination in school appears to have long term effects for youth's adjustment across the school years. Experiences of overt and subtle peer discrimination in 6th grade predicted more deviant behavior (e.g., aggressive behavior) in 8th grade, and overt discrimination had lasting effects into 11th grade. Increased levels of overt discrimination from 6th to 8th grade were further linked to heightened levels of deviant behavior for youth. It also appears that the effects of overt and subtle peer discrimination are not so easily lost. Decreased overt and subtle peer discrimination during high school was not associated with any decrease deviant behavior in 11th grade, even though there was an increase in academic and psychological well-being (Hughes et al., 2016).

Relatedly, the effects of discrimination on youth's problem behaviors may vary across victimized groups. Bogart et al. (2013) showed that both Black and Latino youth who experienced discrimination reported greater levels of problem behaviors (e.g., hitting, pushing, retaliating, skipping school). Both Black and Latino students reported more non-physical aggression and retaliatory behavior than White students, whereas, only Black students reported more physical aggression. Critically, the authors looked at group differences in problem behaviors accounting for discrimination experiences, the differences between the Black and White students reduced significantly and Latino student reported *less* problem behaviors than their White counterparts (Bogart et al., 2013). Thus, Black and Latino students' higher engagement in problem behaviors is largely driven by discrimination experiences; this holds significant implications for disparities in disciplinary actions.

Finally, the effects of school-based P&D on problem behaviors are likely to manifest as disruptive behaviors in school. In such cases, U.S.-born Hispanic adolescents experiencing high levels of acculturation stress, including peer discrimination, were reported by teachers to have more behavioral problems in school (Vega, Khoury, Zimmerman, Gil, & Warheit, 1995). Additionally, Puerto-Rican and African-American elementary school students who experienced discrimination were also more likely to engage in disruptive and rebellious behaviors in school. The authors posit that students "who have endured discrimination may be more likely to perceive their school as unsupportive of their learning, which, in turn, is linked to their rebellious behavior." (Brook, Brook, Balka, & Rosenberg, 2006, p.85).

Academic Consequences

As one might expect, disruptive problem behaviors can negatively impact a students' academic experiences. However, there are many other negative outcomes of P&D in the academic domain, including lower academic achievement (e.g., grade point average/GPA), feeling less connected to school, and decreased academic self-efficacy (Benner et al., 2015; Benner & Graham, 2013 Chavous et al., 2008; Wong et al., 2003). Still, as with the other aforementioned outcomes, the context of P&D matters.

The effects of P&D can differ by gender, socioeconomic status, and strength of racial identity. As Chavous et al., (2008) showed, African-American male students' experiences of discrimination were associated with lower GPA, finding school as less important, and lower academic self-efficacy, whereas African-American female students' experiences of teacher discrimination, in some instances, were instead linked to positive academic achievement. This is exemplified by a young African-American female student's reflection on teacher discrimination in her school; "I feel like when I first walk into a classroom, the teacher expects, because of the way I dress and the people I talk to, they automatically expect that I'm going to be disrespectful, that I don't care about learning, that I'm only there, I'm being forced to be there, that I'm not going anywhere and that I'm only there because I would get in trouble for not being there. So, I feel like that is what they expect, so I try not to play into those stereotypes." (Joseph et al., 2016, p.18). In addition, these negative academic outcomes were more prevalent for males of lower socioeconomic status and females of higher socioeconomic status. When young African-American females held stronger racial identity, they were less likely to experience the negative academic outcomes of P&D, indicating that a strong racial identity may serve as a protective factor against discrimination for African-American girls (Chavous et al., 2008). At the same time, research with Turkish-minority students in Belgium who not only identified with their ethnic group—a strong ethnic/racial identity—but also with the cultural majority, conversely reported lower school engagement and academic performance when encountering discrimination (Baysu, Phalet & Brown, 2011).

Beyond these group differences in the effects of P&D on victims, students do not have to be direct victims to experience negative outcomes of P&D. Benner et al. (2015) found two outcome trajectories for P&D in high schools—one for when students experienced P&D directly, and one when students rated their schools to be more prejudiced, in general, regardless of their own personal experiences with P&D. The authors found that although lower GPA was associated

with students' ratings of their school being more prejudiced, overall, participants' own experiences of P&D was instead linked to feeling less attached to their school. Furthermore, when students' own perceptions of school-level prejudice exceeded those of their peers, they felt even more detached from their school. Thus, prejudice has important academic implications not just for minority groups being targeted, but also for bystanders who witness prejudice or perceive it to be present in their schools (Benner et al., 2015).

How classroom context can promote or prevent prejudice and ethnic discrimination

When looking at the classroom context, there are several aspects that are relevant for intergroup relations, and notably for the development (or prevention) of P&D. First, there are structural aspects like the classroom ethnic composition (Thijs & Verkuyten, 2014): What is the proportion of ethnic minority students and how diverse is this group? (The same question, and those that follow, can be posed for other social minority groups). These structural aspects determine which groups are a minority or a majority in the classroom, and the power dynamics between different ethnic groups represented (Graham, 2006). Yet, maybe more important for intergroup relations is the question of how the diversity in the classroom is dealt with by the individuals in that context. There may be shared norms or a perceived climate of how diversity is addressed (Schachner, 2017). At the same time, the classroom provides a context for individual relationships amongst diverse students. Cross-ethnic friendships have received particular attention in this context (Jugert & Feddes, 2015), as they have been identified as a condition of optimal intergroup contact that can reduce prejudice (Pettigrew, 1998).

Classroom Ethnic Composition

Quite a number of studies have looked into associations between classroom ethnic composition and intergroup relations, with divergent findings (see Thijs & Verkuyten, 2014, for a review). A higher proportion of ethnic minority students has been associated mostly with better interethnic relations, including more interethnic friendships (Schachner, Brenick, Noack, van de Vijver, & Heizmann, 2015), a higher popularity of ethnic minority students (Motti-Stefanidi, Asendorpf, & Masten, 2012), fairer and more equal treatment of diverse students by teachers (Juvonen, Kogachi, & Graham, 2017), lower levels of ethnic victimization amongst students (Agirdag, Demanet, Van Houtte, & Van Avermaet, 2011), and higher likelihood that teachers will both notice and intervene against microaggressions (Boysen, 2012). Yet, some studies also found negative associations with interethnic relations, including more negative outgroup attitudes (Vervoort, Scholte, & Scheepers, 2011), higher perceived discrimination among ethnic minority students (Brenick, Titzmann, Michel, & Silbereisen, 2012), and lower academic expectations of minority youth by teachers (Vervaet et al., 2016).

Such conflicting findings may be partly explained by a non-linear association between ethnic composition and intergroup outcomes (Baysu, Phalet, & Brown, 2014): Specifically, in classrooms with only few minority students, a higher proportion of minority students may be associated both with fewer opportunities for contact with majority students and with a higher likelihood of ethnic discrimination. Yet, when there are many minority students in the classroom, ethnic discrimination may decrease with a higher proportion of minority students

and the joint experience of discrimination amongst minority students may make these experiences less harmful.

A second important indicator of the ethnic composition which may be relevant for interethnic relations is the diversity in terms of number and relative size of ethnic subgroups. When there are many equally sized groups in class, power is distributed most evenly (Graham, 2006). Some studies therefore found that a higher ethnic diversity was associated with better interethnic relations (Schachner et al., 2015; van Houtte & Stevens, 2009). Other studies did not find any such positive effects of more diverse classrooms when they controlled for the proportion of ethnic minority students (Agirdag et al., 2011; Vervoort et al., 2011).

To conclude, several mechanisms are at play when studying associations between the classroom ethnic composition and intergroup outcomes. On the one hand, a higher proportion of ethnic minority students is associated with fewer opportunities for interethnic contact with majority students, and—up to a certain point—increases the likelihood of discrimination experiences. On the other hand, when the group of ethnic minority students is more diverse, relations between different ethnic groups in the classroom may become more equal and different ethnic groups may be more accessible in terms of their openness for interethnic contact. Still the overall picture about the relative effects of proportion and diversity of ethnic minority students is less clear as few studies systematically disentangle these two different mechanisms. In addition, effects of the classroom ethnic composition may further be moderated by the cultural diversity climate in schools.

Cultural Diversity Climate

The cultural diversity norms and climate are crucial for student outcomes, including intergroup relations, in culturally diverse schools (see Schachner, 2017). Cultural diversity norms and climate are reflected in students' and teachers' perceptions (Brown & Chu, 2012; Schachner, Noack, van de Vijver, & Eckstein, 2016), but are also manifested in school policies (Celeste, Baysu, Meeussen, Kende, & Phalet, 2017), and artifacts, including decoration on classroom walls and school building (Brown & Chu, 2012; Civitillo et al., 2017), but also the school website (Civitillo et al., 2017). The classroom cultural diversity climate can be conceptualized by two broad perspectives: A perspective of equality and inclusion captures to what extent there is support for positive intergroup contact at school, while a perspective of cultural pluralism captures to what extent cultural diversity is valued as a resource and included in the curriculum (Byrd, 2017; Schachner, 2017; Schachner, Noack, et al., 2016).

Rooted in the social psychology of intergroup contact (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998), an equality and inclusion perspective may be reflected in a climate that promotes equal treatment of students of different cultural background as well as intergroup contact and collaboration (e.g., through mixed seating arrangements, diverse work groups, and cooperative learning, but also a readiness by students to engage in interethnic contact and seek intergroup friendships). A cultural pluralism perspective on the other hand draws on concepts of multicultural education and culturally responsive teaching (Banks, 1993) and promotes active engagement with difference by providing opportunities to learn about different heritage cultures of students and ethnic communities in a culturally diverse society.

A climate characterized by equality and inclusion was generally associated with better interethnic relations amongst students (see Schachner, 2017). For example, it has been associated with more cross-ethnic friendships (Jugert, Noack, & Rutland, 2011; Schachner et al., 2015; Tropp et al., 2016), better intergroup attitudes (i.e., higher outgroup orientation and less prejudice; Molina & Wittig, 2006; Schwarzenthal, Schachner, van de Vijver, & Juang, 2017) and less individually perceived ethnic discrimination (Bellmore, Nishina, You, & Ma, 2012; Closson, Darwich, Hymel, & Waterhouse, 2014; Schwarzenthal et al., 2017). Perceived equal treatment at school also buffered the negative effects of stereotype threat on school belonging and achievement of ethnic minority students (Baysu et al., 2016).

A climate of cultural pluralism has revealed similar, yet somewhat weaker and less consistent associations with interethnic relations (Schachner, 2017). As it was found for equality and inclusion, a stronger endorsement of cultural pluralism at school was also associated with better intergroup attitudes (Schwarzenthal et al., 2017). Similarly, multicultural education has been associated with lower levels of prejudice and higher outgroup tolerance by students across ethnic groups (see Verkuyten & Thijs, 2013). On the other hand, studies in both the U.S. and Germany revealed that students who perceived their school as more strongly endorsing cultural pluralism also reported more ethnic discrimination (Byrd, 2017; Schachner et al., 2018; Schwarzenthal et al., 2017). Yet, another study found that even though students perceived higher levels of discrimination in such schools, they were less affected by it in their sense of school belonging and academic attitudes (Brown & Chu, 2012).

In sum, both a perspective of equality and inclusion and a perspective of cultural pluralism were associated with more positive intergroup attitudes (e.g., lower levels of prejudice, higher outgroup orientation). A stronger endorsement of equality and inclusion was also associated with lower perceived ethnic discrimination. For schools endorsing cultural pluralism, it appears that in a larger societal context that strongly endorses multiculturalism (such as London, U.K.), this was associated with lower stereotype threat. On the other hand, in a more assimilative societal context, such as the U.S. or Germany, a stronger endorsement of cultural pluralism at school was associated with higher perceived ethnic discrimination. In such a societal context, discussions of cultural diversity may be more superficial and therefore also transmit stereotypical views of culture and cultural differences, which may induce or reinforce feelings of ethnic discrimination amongst ethnic minority students. At the same time, as in these contexts discussions about diversity (and ethnic discrimination and inequality) are less normative, these discussions may also have greater effects when taking place, and simply raise awareness for discrimination issues amongst students. Despite these differential effects on perceived discrimination though, both perspectives (equality and inclusion and cultural pluralism) were also found to buffer the negative effects of perceived ethnic discrimination or stereotype threat on other, school-related outcomes when taking place.

Cross-Ethnic Friendships

Cross-ethnic friendships are one of the most intimate forms of interethnic contact (Pettigrew, 1998). When it comes to interethnic relations, they can be regarded as an outcome in their own right, but they can also be a condition for improved interethnic relations beyond

the friendship dyad. Indeed, cross-ethnic friendships were found to be very effective in promoting positive intergroup attitudes and preventing or reducing prejudice amongst children (Brenick & Killen, 2014; for a meta-analysis, see Tropp & Prenovost, 2008). At the same time, cross-ethnic friendships were associated with decreases in relational victimization (Kawabata & Crick, 2011) and lower rates of discrimination (Benner & Wang, 2017). In addition, some studies from the U.K. and the U.S. suggest that cross-ethnic friendships can buffer the negative effects of perceived ethnic discrimination amongst ethnic minority children (Bagci, Rutland, Kumashiro, Smith, & Blumberg, 2014; Benner & Wang, 2017).

Yet, studies have employed different measures of cross-ethnic friendships (see Jugert & Feddes, 2015). It appears that stronger effects are observed in studies focusing on reciprocated (versus unidirectional) friendships. Also, quality (versus quantity) seems to be more important as a condition for positive intergroup outcomes. Davies et al. (2011) found that actual engagement in the friendship, as measured by the time spent with cross-ethnic friends, but also to what extent there was self-disclosure in these relationships, was the most important condition for improved intergroup attitudes. Self-disclosure, as well as intergroup trust and empathy, and reduced intergroup anxiety, was also identified as a key mediator of cross-ethnic friendship effects (Turner, Hewstone, & Voci, 2007). A more complex social identity was identified as an additional mediator, but only amongst children with a high proportion of cross-ethnic friends (Knifsend & Juvonen, 2014).

Most studies have looked into one particular kind of cross-ethnic friendship, between ethnic minority and majority children and adolescents. It seems that effects on intergroup attitudes are more often studied (e.g., Titzmann et al., 2015), but are also stronger (Feddes, Noack, & Rutland, 2009; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) amongst the cultural majority. Children of higher social status are also more likely to have cross-ethnic friends. This can mean that they are more popular or that they are better students, but also that they belong to a higher-status ethnic group. For example, Black children in the U.S. (Kawabata & Crick, 2011) and Turkish-heritage children and children of a Muslim background in Germany (Schachner, van de Vijver, Brenick, & Noack, 2016), which represent one of the lowest-status ethnic groups in the respective countries, were most isolated from other ethnic groups and were least likely to have cross-ethnic friends. Along similar lines, Chen and Graham (2015) found that after controlling for the respective share of each ethnic group at school, Asian American students were more likely to nominate majority-white students as friends than Latino and Black students. At the same time, cross-ethnic friendships with Black students were also least likely to change attitudes towards that group. Whereas in childhood, ethnic minority children are still more likely to nominate children from higher-status ethnic groups as their friends, by adolescence they seem to have understood that these friendships are often not reciprocated, and therefore their cross-ethnic friend nominations also decrease (see Jugert & Feddes, 2015).

Finally, effects of cross-ethnic friendships can be moderated by the social context that surrounds them. For example, more positive effects of cross-ethnic friends (on lower ethnic victimization) were observed in highly diverse classrooms (Kawabata & Crick, 2011). At the same time, it seems to be crucial how much support there is for this type of friendship in the surrounding context in terms of the multicultural climate and policies. For example, Brenick, Schachner, and Juggert (in press) did not find support for cross-ethnic friendships buffering

the negative effects of perceived ethnic discrimination amongst Turkish-heritage youth in Germany. Instead, cross-ethnic friendships with members of the cultural majority exacerbated the negative effects of perceived ethnic discrimination. This was especially the case when the intergroup climate in the classroom was less supportive of this type of friendship. On the one hand, this shows the importance of the immediate classroom context in moderating effects of cross-ethnic friendships. On the other hand, the fact that a buffering effect of cross-ethnic friends could be observed in some national contexts (such as in multicultural London, U.K.; Bagci et al., 2014), but not in others (such as in rather assimilative Germany; Brenick et al., in press), suggests that the broader societal context in terms of its multicultural climate and policies may also play a role. The importance of the national-level climate and policies for intergroup relations is increasingly recognized (Guimond, de la Sablonnière, & Nugier, 2014).

Summary and Key Points

To conclude, there is considerable evidence for the beneficial effects of cross-ethnic friendships on interethnic relations. They are associated with better intergroup attitudes, less perceived discrimination and in some contexts may have a buffering function for the negative effects of ethnic discrimination. The most positive effects can be observed when these friendships are of a high quality, and self-disclosure appears to be an important mechanism which brings about these positive effects. As with climate and composition though, they can interact with other characteristics of the diversity context in the classroom or in the society at large, and their effects seem to differ across ethnicity. More understanding of these moderators is critical to fully actualize the potential of these relationships in the context of culturally diverse schools and as a powerful means to develop positive interethnic relations.

P&D manifest in social relationships from a variety of sources—teachers, peers, families, communities, curricula, and school structure can all take on many intentional and explicit, as well as seemingly innocuous, subtle, and implicit forms of prejudice. These harmful acts of P&D bring a wide array of consequences not just for victims, but also for perpetrators and bystanders. P&D affects the whole school community. This warrants the need for a whole school—and even broader, a whole community—approach to P&D reduction. This stance against P&D cannot act as a one size fits all cure, as each marginalized group has faced its own history of P&D. Each of these groups deserves to have its struggle—historical and present—with P&D be assessed in developmentally, culturally, and contextually valid ways that address the needs of the specific minority group. We focused on ethnic, racial, and cultural groups, but this work extends to other social minorities (e.g., gender & sexual minorities, lower socioeconomic individuals) and should assess the universalities and individualities specific to each group as well as the intersectionality of various social group memberships. Moreover, the school norms and practices must not reflect simply “anti-prejudice” attitudes but must also incorporate inclusive attitudes for all students in classroom structure, content, and attitudes to create an environment that is equal for all (Barrett, 2017; Brenick & Halgunseth, 2017; Schachner, 2017). Research should explore various new ways to authentically promote equity and inclusivity. Finally, although research highlighted in this chapter has shown that P&D impacts students in the psychological, social, physical, behavioral, and academic domains across development, future research should expand upon this to assess the impact of P&D both within and across these domains. With these research avenues pursued, the field is well situated to help makes schools safer and more welcoming environments

for all school community members.

References

Acevedo-Garcia, D., Rosenfeld, L. E., Hardy, E., McArdle, N., & Osypuk, T. L. (2013). Future directions in research on institutional and interpersonal discrimination and children's health. *American Journal Of Public Health*, *103*(10), 1754-1763.

Agirdag, O., Demanet, J., Van Houtte, M., & Van Avermaet, P. (2011). Ethnic school composition and peer victimization: A focus on the interethnic school climate. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35*, 465-473. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2010.09.009

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.

Bagci, S. C., Rutland, A., Kumashiro, M., Smith, P. K., & Blumberg, H. (2014). Are minority status children's cross-ethnic friendships beneficial in a multiethnic context? *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 32*, 107-115.

Banks, J. A. (1993). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. *Review of Research in Education, 19*, 3-4

Barrett, M. (2018). How schools can promote the intercultural competence of young people. *European Psychologist*, *23*(1), 93-104.

Baysu, G., Celeste, L., Brown, R., Verschueren, K., & Phalet, K. (2016). Minority adolescents in ethnically diverse schools: Perceptions of equal treatment buffer threat effects. *Child Development, 87*, 1352-1366.

Baysu, G., Phalet, K., & Brown, R. (2014). Relative group size and minority school success: The role of intergroup friendship and discrimination experiences. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 53*, 328-349.

Baysu, G., Phalet, K., & Brown, R. (2011). 'Dual' Identity as a two edged sword: Identity threat and minority school performance. Social Psychology Quarterly, 74, 121-143.

Bellmore, A., Nishina, A., You, J.-i., & Ma, T.-L. (2012). School context protective factors against peer ethnic discrimination across the high school years. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 49*, 98-111.

Benner, A. D., Crosnoe, R., & Eccles, J. S. (2015). Schools, peers, and prejudice in adolescence. *Journal Of Research On Adolescence, 25*, 173-188.

Benner, A. D., & Graham, S. (2013). The antecedents and consequences of racial/ethnic discrimination during adolescence: Does the source of discrimination matter?. *Developmental Psychology, 49*, 1602-1613.

Benner, A., & Wang, Y. (2017). Racial/ethnic discrimination and adolescents' well-being: The role of cross-ethnic friendships and friends' experiences of discrimination. *Child Development, 88*, 493-504.

Berger, R., Brenick, A., & Tarrasch, R. (2018). Reducing stereotyping and prejudicial attitudes in Israeli-Jewish elementary school children with a mindfulness and compassion-based social-emotional program. *Mindfulness.*

Berger, R., Brenick, A., Lawrence, S. E., Coco, L., & Abu-Raiya, H.(in press). Contact in the context of conflict: Examining the effectiveness of contact- and skills-based approaches to prejudice reduction in Israeli-Palestinian youth. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology.*

Bogart, L. M., Elliott, M. N., Kanouse, D. E., Klein, D. J., Davies, S. L., Cuccaro, P. M., & ...

Schuster, M. A. (2013). Association between perceived discrimination and racial/ethnic disparities in problem behaviors among preadolescent youths. *American Journal Of Public Health, 103, 1074-1081.*

Booker, K., & Mitchell, A. (2011). Patterns in recidivism and discretionary placement in disciplinary alternative education: The impact of gender, ethnicity, age, and special education status. Education and Treatment of Children, 34(2), 193–208.

Boysen, G. A. (2012) Teacher and Student Perceptions of Microaggressions in College Classrooms, *College Teaching, 60,* 122-129

Brenick, A. & Killen, M. (2014). Moral judgments about Jewish-Arab intergroup exclusion: The role of culture and contact. *Developmental Psychology, 50,* 86-99.

Brenick, A., Titzmann, P. F., Michel, A., & Silbereisen, R. K. (2012). Perceptions of discrimination by young diaspora migrants. *European Psychologist, 17*, 105-119.

Brook, J. S., Brook, D. W., Balka, E. B., & Rosenberg, G. (2006). Predictors of Rebellious Behavior in Childhood: Parental Drug Use, Peers, School Environment, and Child Personality. *Journal Of Addictive Diseases, 25*, 77-87. doi:10.1300/J069v25n02_11

Bronfenbrenner U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brown, C. S., & Chu, H. (2012). Discrimination, ethnic identity, and academic outcomes of Mexican immigrant children: The importance of school context. *Child Development, 83*, 1477-1485.

Byrd, C. M. (2017). The complexity of school racial climate: Reliability and validity of a new measure for secondary students. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 87*, 700-721.

Celeste, L., Baysu, G., Meeussen, L., Kende, J., & Phalet, K. (2017). *School diversity policies create (un)welcoming environments: A multi-level analysis of minority and majority school belonging and success.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Chavous, T. M., Rivas-Drake, D., Smalls, C., Griffin, T., & Cogburn, C. (2008). Gender matters, too: The influences of school racial discrimination and racial identity on academic engagement outcomes among African American adolescents. *Developmental Psychology, 44*, 637-654.

Chen, X., & Graham, S. (2015). Cross-ethnic friendships and intergroup attitudes among Asian American adolescents. *Child Development, 86*, 749-764.

Civitillo, S., Schachner, M. K., van de Vijver, F. J. R., Juang, L., Handrick, A., & Noack, P. (2017). Towards a better understanding of cultural diversity approaches at school - A multi-informant and mixed-methods study. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction, 12*, 1-14.

Closson, L. M., Darwich, L., Hymel, S., & Waterhouse, T. (2014). Ethnic discrimination among recent immigrant adolescents: Variations as a function of ethnicity and school context. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 24*, 608-614.

Cooc, N., & Gee, K. A. (2014). National trends in school victimization among Asian American adolescents. *Journal Of Adolescence*, *37*(6), 839-849.

Cooley, S., Elenbaas, L., & Killen, M. (2016). Social exclusion based on group membership is a form of prejudice. In S. S. Horn, M. D. Ruck, & L. S. Liben (Eds.), Equity and justice in developmental science: Implications for young people, families, and communities (pp. 103-129). San Diego, CA, US: Elsevier Academic Press.

Cowan, P., & Maitles, H. (2007). Does addressing prejudice and discrimination through Holocaust education produce better citizens?. *Educational Review*, *59*(2), 115-130.

Crowson, H. M., & Brandes, J. A. (2010). Predicting community opposition to inclusion in schools: The role of social dominance, contact, intergroup anxiety, and economic conservatism. *The Journal Of Psychology: Interdisciplinary And Applied*, *144*(2), 121-144.

Davies, K., Tropp, L. R., Aron, A., Pettigrew, T. F., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Cross-Group Friendships and Intergroup Attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 15*, 332-351.

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Pearson, A. R. (2017). Aversive racism and contemporary bias. In C. G. Sibley, F. K. Barlow, C. G. Sibley, F. 0. Barlow (Eds.) , *The Cambridge handbook of the psychology of prejudice* (pp. 267-294). New York, NY, US: Cambridge University Press.

Dovidio, J. F., Hewstone, M., Glick, P., & Esses, V. M. (2010). Prejudice, Stereotyping and Discrimination: Theoretical and Empirical Overview. *The SAGE Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping and Discrimination,* pp. 3-28, Washington, DC: Sage.

Feddes, A., Noack, P., & Rutland, A. (2009). Direct and extended friendship effects on minority and majority children's interethnic attitudes: A longitudinal study. *Child Development, 80*, 377-390.

Goodboy, A. K., Martin, M. M., & Rittenour, C. E. (2016). Bullying as an expression of intolerant schemas. Journal Of Child & Adolescent Trauma, 9(4), 277-282.

Graham, S. (2006). Peer victimization in school. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 15*, 317-321.

Grollman, E. A. (2012). Multiple forms of perceived discrimination and health among adolescents and young adults. *Journal Of Health And Social Behavior, 53*, 199-214.

Gross, Z., & Rutland, S. D. (2014). Combatting antisemitism in the school playground: An Australian case study. *Patterns Of Prejudice*, *48*(3), 309-330.

Guimond, S., de la Sablonnière, R., & Nugier, A. (2014). Living in a multicultural world: Intergroup ideologies and the societal context of intergroup relations. *European Review of Social Psychology, 25*, 142-188.

Hershberger, A., Zapolski, T., & Aalsma, M. C. (2016). Social support as a buffer between discrimination and cigarette use in juvenile offenders. *Addictive Behaviors, 5*, 97-11.

Hughes, D., Del Toro, J., Harding, J. F., Way, N., & Rarick, J. D. (2016). Trajectories of Discrimination Across Adolescence: Associations With Academic, Psychological, and Behavioral Outcomes. *Child Development, 87,* 1337-1351.

Huynh, V. W. (2012). Ethnic microaggressions and the depressive and somatic symptoms of Latino and Asian American adolescents. *Journal Of Youth And Adolescence, 41*, 831-846.

Huynh, V. W., & Fuligni, A. J. (2010). Discrimination hurts: The academic, psychological, and physical well-being of adolescents. Journal Of Research On Adolescence, 20(4), 916-941.

Johnston-Goodstar, K., & Roholt, R. V. (2017). "Our Kids Aren't Dropping Out; They're Being Pushed Out": Native American Students and Racial Microaggressions in Schools. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work, 26*(1-2), 30-47.

Jones, S., & Rutland, A. (2018). Attitudes toward immigrants among the youth: Contact interventions to reduce prejudice in the school context. *European Psychologist*, *23*(1), 83-92.

Joseph, N. M., Viesca, K. M., & Bianco, M. (2016). Black female adolescents and racism in

schools: Experiences in a colorblind society. *The High School Journal*, *100*(1), 4-25.
Jugert, P., & Feddes, A. R. (2015). Children's and adolescents' cross-ethnic friendships. In A. Rutland, D. Nesdale & C. S. Brown (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of group processes in children and adolescents*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
Jugert, P., Noack, P., & Rutland, A. (2011). Friendship preferences among German and Turkish preadolescents. *Child Development, 82*, 812-829.
Juvonen, J., Kogachi, K., & Graham, S. (2017). When and how do students benefit from ethnic diversity in middle school? *Child Development*.
Karakitsou, C., & Houndoumadi, A. (2010). In-group favoritism and out-group prejudice of Greek and Albanian pupils attending primary school: Methodological implications. *Psychology: The Journal Of The Hellenic Psychological Society*, *17*(2), 176-194.
Kawabata, Y., & Crick, N. R. (2011). The significance of cross-racial/ethnic friendships: Associations with peer victimization, peer support, sociometric status, and classroom diversity. *Developmental Psychology, 47*, 1763-1775.
Kiang, L., Witkow, M. R., & Thompson, T. L. (2016). Model minority stereotyping, perceived discrimination, and adjustment among adolescents from Asian American backgrounds. *Journal Of Youth And Adolescence*, *45*, 1366-1379.
Knifsend, C. A., & Juvonen, J. (2014). Social identity complexity, cross-ethnic friendships, and intergroup attitudes in urban middle schools. *Child Development, 85*, 709-721.
Le, T. N., & Stockdale, G. (2011). The influence of school demographic factors and perceived student discrimination on delinquency trajectory in adolescence. *Journal Of Adolescent Health, 49*, 407-413.
Molina, L. E., & Wittig, M. A. (2006). Relative importance of contact conditions in explaining prejudice reduction in a classroom context: Separate and equal? *Journal of Social Issues, 62*, 489-509.
Motti-Stefanidi, F., Asendorpf, J. B., & Masten, A. S. (2012). The adaptation and well-being of adolescent immigrants in Greek schools: A multilevel, longitudinal study of risks and resources. *Development and Psychopathology, 24*, 451-473.
Myrick, S. E., & Martorell, G. A. (2011). Sticks and stones may break my bones: Protective factors for the effects of perceived discrimination on social competence in adolescence. *Personal Relationships, 18,* 487-501.
Niwa, E. Y., Way, N., & Hughes, D. L. (2014). Trajectories of ethnic-racial discrimination among ethnically diverse early adolescents: Associations with psychological and social adjustment. *Child Development, 85*, 2339-2354.
Palmer, S. B., & Abbott, N. (2017). Bystander responses to bias-based bullying in schools: A developmental intergroup approach. Child Development Perspectives,
Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65-85.
Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 751-783.
Priest, N., Perry, R., Ferdinand, A., Kelaher, M., & Paradies, Y. (2017). Effects over time of self-reported direct and vicarious racial discrimination on depressive symptoms and loneliness among Australian school students. *BMC Psychiatry, 17.*
Respress, B. N., Small, E., Francis, S. A., & Cordova, D. (2013). The role of perceived peer prejudice and teacher discrimination on adolescent substance use: A social determinants approach. *Journal Of Ethnicity In Substance Abuse, 12*, 279-299.
Romero, A. J., Gonzalez, H., & Smith, B. A. (2015). Qualitative exploration of adolescent

discrimination: Experiences and responses of Mexican-American parents and teens. *Journal Of Child And Family Studies*, *24*, 1531-1543.

Sanchez, D., Whittaker, T. A., & Hamilton, E. (2016). Perceived discrimination, peer influence and sexual behaviors in Mexican American preadolescents. *Journal Of Youth And Adolescence, 45*, 928-944.

Schachner, M. K. (2017). From equality and inclusion to cultural pluralism – evolution and effects of cultural diversity perspectives in schools. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*.

Schachner, M. K., Brenick, A., Noack, P., van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Heizmann, B. (2015). Structural and normative conditions for interethnic friendships in multiethnic classrooms. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 47*, 1-12.

Schachner, M. K., Noack, P., van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Eckstein, K. (2016). Cultural diversity climate and psychological adjustment at school – Equality and inclusion versus cultural pluralism. *Child Development, 87*, 1175-1191.

Schachner, M. K., van de Vijver, A. J. R., Brenick, A., & Noack, P. (2016). Who is friends with whom? –Patterns of inter- and intraethnic friendships of mainstream and immigrant early adolescents in Germany. In P. Denoux, C. Roland-Lévy & C. Sabatier (Eds.), *Unity, diversity and culture.* Reims, France: International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology.

Schwarzenthal, M., Schachner, M., van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Juang, L. (2017). Equal but different? Effects of Equality/Inclusion and Cultural Pluralism on intergroup outcomes in multiethnic classrooms. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*.

Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, *69*, 797-811.

Tabbah, R., Miranda, A. H., & Wheaton, J. E. (2012). Self-concept in Arab American adolescents: Implications of social support and experiences in the schools. *Psychology In The Schools, 49*, 817-827.

Tajalli, H. & Garba, H. A. (2014) Discipline or prejudice: Overrepresentation of minority students in disciplinary alternative education programs.The urban review, 46, 620-631.

Taylor, C., & Peter, T. (2011). 'We are not aliens, we're people, and we have rights.' Canadian human rights discourse and high school climate for LGBTQ students. *Canadian Review Of Sociology, 48*, 275-312.

Thijs, J., & Verkuyten, M. (2014). School ethnic diversity and students' interethnic relations. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*, 1-21.

Titzmann, P., Brenick, A., & Silbereisen, R. (2015). Friendships fighting prejudice: A longitudinal perspective on adolescents' cross-group friendships with immigrants. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 44*, 1318-1331.

Tropp, L. R., O'Brien, T. C., Gutierrez, R. G., Valdenegro, D., Migacheva, K., Tezanos-Pinto, P., ...Cayul, O. (2016). How school norms, peer norms, and discrimination predict interethnic experiences among ethnic minority and majority youth. *Child Development, 87*, 1436-1451.

Tropp, L. R., & Prenovost, M. A. (2008). The role of intergroup contact in predicting children's inter-ethnic attitudes: Evidence from meta-analytic and field studies. In S. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup relations: An integrative developmental and social psychological perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tsai, J. H. (2006). Xenophobia, ethnic community, and immigrant youths' friendship network

formation. *Adolescence, 41*, 285-298.
Turner, R. N., Hewstone, M., & Voci, A. (2007). Reducing explicit and implicit outgroup prejudice via direct and extended contact: The mediating role of self-disclosure and intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*, 369-388.
van den Bergh, L., Denessen, E., Hornstra, L., Voeten, M., & Holland, R. W. (2010). The implicit prejudiced attitudes of teachers: Relations to teacher expectations and the ethnic achievement gap. *American Educational Research Journal*, *47*(2), 497-527.
van Houtte, M., & Stevens, P. A. J. (2009). School ethnic composition and students' integration outside and inside schools in Belgium. *Sociology of Education, 82*, 217-239.
Vega, W. A., Khoury, E. L., Zimmerman, R. S., Gil, A. G., & Warheit, G. J. (1995). Cultural conflicts and problem behaviors of Latino adolescents in home and school environments. *Journal Of Community Psychology, 23*, 167-179.
Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2013). Multicultural education and inter-ethnic attitudes: An intergroup perspective. *European Psychologist, 18*, 179-190.
Vervaet, R., D'hondt, F., Van Houtte, M., & Stevens, P. J. (2016). The ethnic prejudice of Flemish teachers: The role of ethnic school composition and of teachability. *Cultural Diversity And Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *22*(4), 552-562.
Vervoort, M. H., Scholte, R. H., & Scheepers, P. L. (2011). Ethnic composition of school classes, majority-minority friendships, and adolescents' intergroup attitudes in the Netherlands. *Journal of Adolescence, 34*, 257-267.
Wells, A. S., Holme, J. J., Atanda, A. K., & Revilla, A. T. (2005). Tackling Racial Segregation One Policy at a Time: Why School Desegregation Only Went So Far. Teachers College Record, 107(9), 2141-2177.
Wing Sue, D. (2017). Microaggressions and "Evidence": Empirical or Experiential Reality?. *Perspectives On Psychological Science*, *12*, 170-172. doi:10.1177/1745691616664437
Wintner, S., Almeida, J., & Hamilton-Mason, J. (2017). Perceptions of microaggression in K-8 school settings: An exploratory study. *Children and Youth Services Review, 79*, 594-601.
Wong, C. A., Eccles, J. S., & Sameroff, A. (2003). The influence of ethnic discrimination and ethnic identification on African American adolescents' school and socioemotional adjustment. *Journal Of Personality, 71*, 1197-1232.
Zeiders, K. H., Umaña-Taylor, A. J., & Derlan, C. L. (2013). Trajectories of depressive symptoms and self-esteem in Latino youths: Examining the role of gender and perceived discrimination. *Developmental Psychology, 49*, 951-963.