Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Child interethnic prejudice in the Netherlands: social learning from parents and picture books

Bruijn, Y. de

Citation

Bruijn, Y. de. (2022, January 11). *Child interethnic prejudice in the Netherlands: social learning from parents and picture books*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3249963

Version:	Publisher's Version
License:	Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3249963

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Child Interethnic Prejudice in the Netherlands: Social Learning from Parents and Picture Books

Ymke de Bruijn

ISBN: 978-94-6423-539-5

Cover design: ProefschriftOntwerp.nl

Printing: ProefschriftMaken

© 2021, Ymke de Bruijn, Leiden University

All rights are reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, mechanically, by photocopy or otherwise, without prior written permission of the author.

Child Interethnic Prejudice in the Netherlands: Social Learning from Parents and Picture Books

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van

de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,

op gezag van rector magnificus prof.dr.ir. H. Bijl,

volgens besluit van het college voor promoties

te verdedigen op 11 januari 2022

klokke 11.15 uur

door

Ymke de Bruijn

geboren te Dordrecht in 1994

Promotor:

Prof. dr. J. Mesman

Co-promotor:

Dr. R.A.G. Emmen

Promotiecommissie:

Prof. dr. Paul Vedder (Leiden University)

Prof. dr. Berna Güroğlu (Leiden University)

Prof dr. Maykel Verkuyten (Utrecht University)

Dr. Sylvia Perry (Northwestern University)

Dr. Mitch van Geel (Leiden University)

The research described in this thesis was supported by a Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) VICI grant awarded to Judi Mesman (project number 453-16-008).

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	General Introduction	**7**
Chapter 2	Interethnic Prejudice against Muslims among White Dutch Children	**19**
Chapter 3	Maternal Attitudes Toward Child Interethnic Relations in the Netherlands: Facilitating Intergroup Contact Effects?	**41**
Chapter 4	Ethnic Diversity in Children's Books in the Netherlands	**61**
Chapter 5	Navigating Diversity: Maternal Ideologies and Associations with Child Interethnic Prejudice in the Netherlands	**79**
Chapter 6	What Do We Read to Our Children? Messages Concerning Ethnic Diversity in Popular Children's Books in The Netherlands	**101**
Chapter 7	General Discussion	**121**
Supplementary material	Chapter 4	**167**
	Chapter 6	**172**
Appendices	Nederlandse Samenvatting (Summary in Dutch)	**177**
	Dankwoord (Acknowledgements)	**185**
	Curriculum Vitae	**187**
	List of Publications and Presentations	**189**













Chapter 1

General Introduction

One of society's biggest challenges today is racism. All over the world, Black Lives Matter demonstrations in 2020 have increased attention for the subject, and have stirred up discussions on how to improve interethnic relations and create an anti-racist society. One aspect of these questions focuses on how to include children in this process. Children can already perceptually differentiate between people with different ethnic backgrounds at 3 months old (Kelly et al., 2005; Kelly, Liu et al., 2007). Later on, they develop the ability to categorize people based on race or ethnicity (Pauker et al., 2017). More problematically, children also develop different attitudes towards various ethnic groups, resulting in interethnic prejudice (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011). Although the research field examining children's prejudice is growing rapidly, the bulk of research is conducted in the United States (U.S.), and the specific ethnic composition of the population, as well as cultural and historical differences, limit generalizability to other countries (Zick et al., 2008). In the Netherlands, interpersonal discrimination experiences are common among underrepresented ethnic groups and there is growing awareness of structural racism (Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau, 2020; Ghorashi, 2020). To effectively improve interethnic relations from a young age, research tailored to the Dutch context is highly needed. Some studies have examined youth interethnic attitudes in the Netherlands (e.g., Vedder et al., 2016; Verkuyten & Thijs, 2001; Verkuyten, 2002; Verkuyten, 2007), but few have researched children in middle childhood, when prejudice against lower status outgroups is at its peak (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011). Theories on prejudice development and reduction in children that stem from social learning theory highlight the potential influence of various socialization agents, among which parents and media (Levy & Hughes, 2009). However, examinations of parental attitudes and ideologies as well as a thorough analysis of representation and messages regarding ethnic diversity in books that children in the Netherlands are exposed to, are lacking. The aim of this dissertation is to provide insight in interethnic prejudice of children in the Netherlands, and attitudes and ideologies that they are exposed to through two socialization agents (parents and children's books).

Development of Ethnic Prejudice

Definitions of ethnic prejudice vary. Some scholars describe ethnic prejudice as a relatively negative evaluation, meaning that it can be based on a positive ingroup or negative outgroup bias (Hewstone et al., 2002). Others describe ethnic prejudice as a negative evaluation of ethnic outgroup members, distinguishing it from ingroup favoritism (more positive evaluations of ethnic ingroup members, Nesdale, 2004). Ethnic groups can be based on common culture, origins and history, and are associated with race (Berreman, 1972; Brown & Langer, 2010). Although children's understanding of ethnicity seems to develop from a focus on physical, racial, characteristics (Quintana, 1994), 'ethnicity' rather than 'race' is preferred throughout this dissertation, as race has been argued to be an inappropriate term to describe humans (Keita et al., 2004), and is not commonly used in the European context (Berg et al., 2014). The term race, however, is very commonly used in international literature on prejudice in children and families. It will therefore be used in this dissertation when discussing previous literature using the term. In addition, in one chapter

(Chapter 2) the terms 'ethnic majority group' and 'ethnic minority group' are used. In response to reviewer feedback, the terms used in the other chapters written later are 'dominant ethnic group' and 'underrepresented ethnic group'.

Social Identity Development Theory (SIDT) proposes that ethnic prejudice is the fourth phase following (1) an undifferentiated phase, (2) an ethnic awareness phase, and (3) an ethnic preference phase (Nesdale, 2004). SIDT argues that not all children reach the phase of ethnic prejudice (Nesdale, 2017), making this a particularly interesting phase to examine in light of improving interethnic relations. The developmental pathway of prejudice depends on the status of the outgroup considered: children's interethnic prejudice towards lower status outgroups generally increases between early (2-4 years old) and middle childhood (5-7 years old), followed by a slight decrease towards late childhood (8-10 years old), whereas prejudice towards higher status outgroups does not change between early and middle childhood, yet increases towards late childhood (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011). In this phase between middle and late childhood, however, most divergence in prejudice development is found (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011), which suggests that children may be particularly sensitive to environmental factors or socialization agents in this phase. In the same period, children go through important developmental stages in terms of social perspective-taking skills (Selman & Byrne, 1974), better enabling them to grasp attitudes portrayed in their environment. At age six, most children are able to differentiate between their own and others' perspectives, while at age eight to ten they are increasingly able to understand these perspectives and relate them to their own perspective (Selman & Byrne, 1974). Therefore, it is highly relevant to examine interethnic prejudice in children and potential predictors in this developmental period. Interethnic prejudice can lead to discriminatory behaviors, which can have detrimental effects on individuals experiencing discrimination. For example, children experiencing discrimination are more likely to have poor mental and physical health outcomes (Paradies et al., 2015), and adolescents are more likely to disengage from school and engage in externalizing and risky behaviors (Benner et al., 2018).

Social Learning Theory

There are numerous approaches to explaining the development of interethnic prejudice, such as cognitive, social-cognitive developmental, and social learning approaches (Levy & Hughes, 2009). Although both social-contextual and cognitive factors are theorized to play a role in the development of prejudice, ideas about reducing prejudice stem primarily from research on social-contextual factors (Aboud et al., 2012), fitting the social learning approach. This branch of theoretical approaches specifically focuses on the role of others from whom children can learn (see Levy & Hughes, 2009). Two socialization agents that are frequently looked at in regard of preventing or reducing child prejudice are parents and media. Meta-analytic research shows a medium association between parent and child intergroup prejudice (Degner & Dalege, 2013), and interventions using forms of media can be effective in reducing children's prejudice (Aboud et al., 2012). Among the theories

that fit under the social learning branch are theories based on intergroup contact and diversity ideologies.

Intergroup Contact

Intergroup contact theory proposes that one social-contextual factor that has a prejudice-reducing effect is intergroup contact (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Whereas some longitudinal studies have found support for this association to be bidirectional (Binder et al., 2009; Levin et al., 2003), others only provide evidence for the contact effect on attitudes or report on mediation effects for this direction only (Brown et al., 2007; Vezzali, et al. 2010; Swart et al., 2011). Initially, it was argued that contact had to meet optimal conditions: (1) equal group status, (2) common goals, (3) intergroup cooperation, and (4) support of authorities, laws or custom. The negative association between intergroup contact and prejudice, however, has received meta-analytic support even when these criteria were not met, although these effects are stronger when they are met (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Pettigrew et al., 2011). Positive contact effects are found in both dominant and underrepresented groups, but are stronger for higher status groups (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005; Bikmen, 2011). Also for children specifically, contact with members from other ethnic groups is related to more positive interethnic attitudes, and thus less prejudice (Tropp & Prenovost, 2008). Presumably, children learn to develop more positive ideas about members from other ethnic groups by interacting with them. Two mediators in particular explain a large part of the association between intergroup contact and prejudice: intergroup contact reduces intergroup threat and anxiety and increases one's perspective-taking abilities and empathy (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). Both reduced anxiety and increased perspective taking in turn are related to reduced prejudice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008).

Young children, however, might be very dependent on their parents to facilitate social contact and relations, in line with the idea that intergroup relations are influenced by third parties (Kalmijn, 1998). Parents can have four different roles directly influencing and shaping peer relations: (1) designers, influencing the setting in which children can engage in social contact, (2) mediators, directly helping children engage in this social contact for example by arranging playdates, (3) supervisors, overseeing and regulating children's social relationships, and (4) advisors or consultants, assisting children with problems regarding social relationships (Ladd & Parke, 2021). In middle childhood, mothers most frequently act as mediators and supervisors (Cohen & Woody, 1991). Parental attitudes toward child interethnic relations, therefore, may have a big impact on the prejudice of their children, as parents may facilitate or restrict prejudice-reducing interethnic contact opportunities (unconsciously) based on these attitudes.

Taking the intergroup contact theory one step further is research on the effects of indirect forms of intergroup contact. For example, the extended contact hypothesis implies that learning about an ingroup member being in a close relationship with an outgroup member results in more positive intergroup attitudes and thus less prejudice (Wright et al., 1997). Similar to the intergroup contact theory, this

hypothesis has received meta-analytic support in the context of ethnic outgroups, independent of age (Zhou et al., 2019). In contrast to direct contact, extended contact has similar effects for dominant and underrepresented groups (Zhou et al., 2019). Apart from examples set by family members themselves (e.g., Turner et al., 2007), fictional examples of extended contact, such as in books, also relate to more positive child interethnic attitudes (e.g., Cameron et al., 2006; Cameron et al., 2007; Cameron et al., 2011). In addition, vicarious contact refers to observing a positive interaction between an ingroup and outgroup member (Dovidio et al., 2011). Like extended contact, vicarious contact through books has been shown to improve intergroup attitudes and relations (Vezzali et al., 2012). Similar to direct contact effects, indirect contact effects on intergroup attitudes are partly explained by reduced anxiety and increased empathy (White et al., 2021). Additionally, social ingroup and outgroup norms play a role (White et al., 2021). A study among children (aged 6 to 11 years old) showed that extended contact results in improved interethnic relations because children perceive the norms of the outgroup about cross-ethnic friendships to be more positive (Cameron et al., 2011). Perceived ingroup norms about cross-ethnic friendships only play a role for older children (Cameron et al., 2011).

Another hypothesis based on indirect contact is the parasocial contact hypothesis (Schiappa et al., 2005). This hypothesis combines intergroup contact theory with media research and suggests that exposure to positive portrayals of outgroup members (irrespective of the presence of interactions with ingroup members), so-called parasocial contact, also has prejudice reducing effects (Schiappa et al., 2005). Often, indirect contact is seen as easier to establish than direct contact, and therefore viewed as a prejudice-reducing method of great potential. To establish extended, vicarious, or parasocial contact effects through media in general or books in particular, however, ethnically diverse characters need to be represented. Therefore, it is relevant to examine ethnic diversity in books that children are most likely exposed to. Previous research in other countries shows an underrepresentation of characters of color (e.g., Koss, 2015; Koss et al., 2017; Lee, 2017), suggesting that opportunities for indirect contact through books might also be limited in the Netherlands. Taken together, the intergroup contact theory and theories on indirect contact propose that children can learn from exposure to intergroup contact, be it directly or indirectly, and that parents as well as forms of media such as books can help facilitate such prejudice-reducing processes.

Diversity Ideologies

Various theories on prejudice development and reduction have developed from diversity ideologies. Two commonly distinguished diversity ideologies, referring to beliefs about how diversity and demographic differences in society should be approached, are colorblindness and multiculturalism (Rattan & Ambady, 2013). Both have been used to theorize about the development of prejudice, and apply a social learning approach (Levy & Hughes, 2009). The colorblind ideology is based on the belief that prejudice stems from an emphasis on social categories and differences such as those based on ethnicity, and thus argues that not emphasizing ethnicity will

prevent bias (Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). According to this ideology, deemphasizing ethnicity and thereby reducing prejudice can be done in different forms, such as shifting children's attention to similarities or individual differences, rather than focusing on information on social groups or categories (Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). It is argued that there are two domains of the colorblind ideology, of which one is characterized by the denial of racial or ethnic differences, and the other by the denial of inequalities or discrimination based on race or ethnicity, and that this denial of racism is a form of racism in itself (Neville et al., 2013). In fact, Kendi (2019) describes how the term colorblind is related to terms such as 'not racist' and 'race neutral', which 'are bound to fail in identifying and eliminating racist power and policy' (pp. 189) and are 'a mask to hide racism' (pp.14). Throughout this dissertation, this ideology will be described as colorblind, as it has predominantly been done in other scholarly literature described in the chapters. Other scholars, however, also argue that this term does not cover the load and point towards alternatives such as color-evasiveness (Annamma et al., 2017).

Multiculturalism, on the other hand, is based on the belief that ethnic differences do need to be taken into account and need to be valued, because prejudice stems from a lack of knowledge and appreciation about other ethnic or cultural groups (Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). Therefore, it is argued that learning about other groups and learning to respect and appreciate differences improves children's interethnic attitudes. Other definitions of multiculturalism furthermore refer to the endorsement of cultural diversity and maintaining different cultures within a society, as opposed to assimilation (Berry & Kalin, 1995).

A substantial amount of research has focused on the association between diversity ideologies, among which colorblindness and multiculturalism, and prejudice within individuals. Meta-analytic research has shown that although both ideologies relate to lower levels of prejudice, multiculturalism is more beneficial (Leslie et al., 2020; Whitley & Webster, 2019). Less is known, however, about the effects of these ideologies on prejudice of children. Parental ideologies might be conveyed to children through engagement in explicit discussions, and the extent to which emphasis is put on social categories such as ethnicity. For example, there is evidence that parent-child discussions about race have more positive effects on child interethnic relations than colorblind parenting (Perry et al., 2020; Perry, Skinner-Dorkenoo et al., 2021; Vittrup & Holden, 2011). Some studies furthermore show that exposure to (aspects of) multicultural ideology at school has positive effects on children's interethnic attitudes (Apfelbaum et al., 2010; Verkuyten & Thijs, 2013). At the same time, parental ideologies might impact children in more implicit ways. For example, colorblindness is related to more negative nonverbal behaviors in interethnic interactions (Norton et al., 2006; Apfelbaum, Sommers et al., 2008), which children seem to pick up on (Castelli et al., 2008). Scholars however agree that more research on these ideologies and socialization practices in the context of parenting is needed (Perry, Skinner-Dorkenoo et al., 2021; Scott et al., 2020).

Apart from being exposed to parental attitudes and ideologies, children can be exposed to various ideologies through media, such as books. Ethnic diversity in its characters can help books reach their potential to serve as mirrors (providing opportunities to identify with characters), windows (providing opportunities to learn about other cultures and values), or glass sliding doors (taking windows one step further by actively engaging readers in the world created in the book; Bishop, 1990). However, whether books can function like this, and what messages are conveyed, is not only dependent on mere representation. Degrees of cultural specificity and authenticity presented (i.e., accurate cultural values and details, and the absence of stereotypes, Yoo-Lee et al., 2014), might impact the extent to which readers identify with characters, and the messages about cultures that readers perceive. Previously, scholars have identified colorblindness to prevail in children's literature, in the form of dismissal and neglect of ethnically specific experiences of people of color (Winograd, 2011). Exposure to colorblindness in this form, lacking cultural specificity and authenticity, might have similar effects as exposure to colorblind ideologies from parents or at school, as ideologies presented in books have the potential to impact children's worldviews (Sutherland, 1985). For example, experiments using children's books with counter-stereotypical information about gender roles have shown that exposure to these books influences children's perceived gender-appropriateness of characteristics, activities, and jobs (Ashby & Wittmaier, 1978; Karniol & Gal-Disegni, 2009). Furthermore, moral lessons in books can alter children's behaviors (Larsen et al., 2018; Yao et al., 2020). Apart from the colorblind ideology, other ideological positions and moral lessons regarding ethnic diversity and specific cultures may be presented in books through power relations between characters and cultures (Bothelho & Rudman, 2009). Therefore, a multi-method approach is needed to gain insight in both the quantitative and qualitative representation of ethnic diversity in books for children.

The Dutch Context

When studying interethnic attitudes or messages concerning ethnic diversity, sensitivity to the population and the context included is highly needed. The Netherlands provides an interesting multi-ethnic context for research on this topic, and ethnic diversity is expected to increase in the coming years (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2020). Whereas most research on interethnic prejudice has been performed in the U.S., the dissimilar ethnic composition of the population, as well as cultural and historical differences (Zick et al., 2008), call for a different approach in the Netherlands. The dominant ethnic group in the Netherlands is White, and two of the largest underrepresented ethnic groups are formed by Black (in this dissertation referred to as Afro-Dutch) people and people of Middle Eastern descent. The Afro-Dutch population has a variety of backgrounds, and the largest groups are of Surinamese and Antillean descent: 3.1% of the Dutch population has a Surinamese or Antillean background (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2021a). This is mostly due to postcolonial migration, although people from Surinam and the Dutch Antilles have migrated to the Netherlands for a wide range of reasons (Van Amersfoort & Van Niekerk, 2006). Similarly, a variety of Middle Eastern backgrounds is represented

in the Netherlands, but the largest groups are of Turkish and Moroccan descent, covering 2.4% and 2.3% of the Dutch population (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2021a). Turkish- and Moroccan-Dutch people overwhelmingly identify as Muslim (Huijnk, 2018), and are often characterized as such in the Netherlands. Migration from Turkey and Morocco, in contrast, has no relation to colonialism, rather it stems from labor migration starting in the 1960s (Akgündüz, 1993).

To give a full overview of racism and responses to racism in the Netherlands is beyond the scope of this dissertation, but some recent examples, societal patterns and developments will be discussed in order to provide a brief description of the Dutch context. In the past decade, scholars have described how there has been little acknowledgement of both interpersonal and institutionalized racism in the Netherlands (Ghorashi, 2014; Weiner, 2014). Nonetheless, approximately half of Surinamese-Dutch and Antillean-Dutch as well as Turkish-Dutch and Moroccan-Dutch people reported experiences of discrimination based on religion, ethnicity, or skin color in 2018 (Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau, 2020). In addition, although criticism on the anti-Black racist nature of Black Pete ('part of' the Dutch Sinterklaas festivity) dates back to the 1930s (Heilbron, Esajas, & de Abreau, 2018), the public debate about this issue is still ongoing (Rodenberg & Wagenaar, 2016). Furthermore, Islamophobic hate crimes against women wearing headscarves and attacks against mosques are reported (Abdelkader, 2017), and in the so-called *Toeslagenaffaire*, a scandal regarding false allegations of fraud with childcare benefits, tax authorities unlawfully specifically targeted parents with a double nationality (Autoriteit Persoonsgegevens, 2020). In response to the Black Lives Matter demonstrations in 2020, institutional racism has been a topic of debate in politics (Tweede Kamer, n.d.), awareness has increased, and racism has been a topic in media and public discussions more frequently (Ghorashi, 2020). In the same year reports of discrimination based on nationality or ethnic background have increased (Van Bon et al., 2021). Therefore, it seems that the Dutch society is in the middle of strong developments in terms of attention for (anti-)racism in the Netherlands among the general public, in the media, and in politics.

As prejudice, which can result in discriminatory behaviors and racism, already develops in childhood (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011), it is highly critical to expand the existing knowledge on interethnic attitudes and prejudice of Dutch children and their surroundings. Previous research on interethnic attitudes and prejudice among Dutch children, however, has mostly focused on children aged 10 or older (e.g., Vedder et al., 2016; Verkuyten & Thijs, 2001; Verkuyten, 2007). Furthermore, research on parental attitudes seems limited to measures of perceived rather than actual parent attitudes (Verkuyten, 2002), and diversity ideologies only seem researched among adults in general (e.g., Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2003; Verkuyten & Martinović, 2006). Moreover, although numerous initiatives and organizations call for more diversity in children's books, systematic quantitative research on the representation of different ethnic backgrounds in Dutch literature for children is lacking (Van den Bossche & Klomberg, 2020). Given that the majority of parents in the Netherlands (70%) reads to their child of 6 years or younger daily, and another 20% reads to them

two or three times a week (Duursma, 2014), books are an important medium through which children can be exposed to stories and experiences representing ethnic diversity similar to society.

Outline Of The Dissertation

The aim of this dissertation is to provide insight in interethnic prejudice of children in the Netherlands and attitudes and ideologies that they are exposed to through two socialization agents (parents and children's books). Attitudes and ideologies that are of particular interest are related to theories of prejudice development and reduction based on intergroup contact (Chapter 2, 3, and 4) and diversity ideologies (Chapter 5 and 6). In **Chapter 2**, levels of prejudice among 6-to 8-year-old White Dutch children towards children of other ethnic backgrounds (Black and Middle Eastern) and predictors in the form of maternal implicit bias and generalized attitudes toward child interethnic contact are examined. In **Chapter 3**, maternal attitudes toward child interethnic contact and its association to interethnic prejudice of their 6-to 10-year-old child are examined in more detail, as families of different ethnic backgrounds (White Dutch, Turkish-Dutch, and Afro-Dutch) are included, attitudes are measured towards specific outgroups, and child actual contact with outgroup friends is examined as a mediator. **Chapter 4** provides an insight in the degree of ethnic diversity that children in the Netherlands may come across, in the form of representation and prominence of characters of color in popular children's books aimed at young children (aged six or younger). In **Chapter 5**, the endorsement of specific diversity ideologies, namely colorblindness and multiculturalism, among mothers of different ethnic backgrounds (White Dutch, Turkish-Dutch, and Afro-Dutch) in the Netherlands and its association to interethnic prejudice of their 6-to 10-year-old child is examined. Results from a qualitative analysis of a subset of popular children's books using critical race theory and critical multicultural analysis are reported in **Chapter 6**, illustrating the messages and ideologies that are conveyed within these books. Finally, **Chapter 7** includes a general discussion in which the main findings presented in this dissertation as well as limitations, implications and future directions are discussed.

Positionality

Given recent societal developments regarding ethnicity and racism globally and in the Netherlands specifically, it should be noted that data on families used in the present dissertation were collected in April and May 2016 (Chapter 2), and between April 2018 and January 2020 (Chapter 3 and 5). The books studied in Chapters 4 and 6 were selected from sales, library, and award records between 2009 and 2018. Data were thus collected before racism started to receive more attention in the Netherlands after the Black Lives Matter demonstrations (Ghorashi, 2020). In addition, to further frame the research presented in this dissertation, it is important to reflect on researcher positionality. Although reflections on research positionality are more common in qualitative research (Holmes, 2020), all research can benefit from this approach (Hamby, 2018). This dissertation is written by a White Dutch

cisgender female. I was born in the Netherlands, as were my parents and grandparents, and have lived in the Western urban region of the Netherlands my whole life. Whereas I went to an ethnically diverse primary school, my other social environments (e.g., sports clubs, neighborhoods, high school, university, student associations) have predominantly consisted of White people. Apart from some relatively short-term contacts through volunteer work (e.g., tutoring), my in-depth experience with people of color and other cultures was therefore rather limited before starting this research. My privileged position as a member from the dominant ethnic group and my own biases could have impacted my work, and influences my understanding of interethnic prejudice and racism, which will not be the same to that of a person of color. As the families participating in the present research have different ethnic backgrounds (White Dutch, Turkish-Dutch, and Afro-Dutch), I have been both an insider and outsider in relation to participants at the same time. The fact that the research team that developed and conducted this study was ethnically diverse and had other experiences has enriched my view and helped me gain a better understanding of (research on) societal challenges related to racism and discrimination.













Chapter 2

Interethnic Prejudice against Muslims among White Dutch Children

Ymke de Bruijn, Chantal Amoureus, Rosanneke A.G. Emmen, Judi Mesman

Published in Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 2020, 51(3-4), 203-221.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022120908346

Abstract

Interethnic prejudice in children has been studied mostly in the United States, but less often in Europe, where the public discourse is increasingly negative about ethnic minorities, especially the Muslim minority. This study examined ingroup favoritism (White preference) and outgroup rejection of children of Middle Eastern descent (representing the Muslim minority) among White children in the Netherlands. Social preference for and rejection of children of Middle Eastern descent are compared to preference for and rejection of Black children. Social preference and rejection were measured using a task in which participants were presented with pictures of children with different ethnic appearances, and asked to select who they wanted to (not) play with, (not) sit next to, and invite for their birthday party. In addition, maternal implicit prejudice against people of Middle Eastern descent and explicit attitudes towards their children's interethnic contact were assessed. The study included 140 children aged 6-8 years (M = 7.26, SD = 0.77) and their mothers. The results reveal both ingroup favoritism and outgroup rejection. The Middle Eastern outgroup was preferred less than the Black outgroup. Reporting absolutely no reservations about children's interethnic contact by mothers was associated with less rejection of children of Middle Eastern descent. Findings reveal that young children already show interethnic prejudice and that particularly people of Middle Eastern descent are devalued. The results show that maternal acceptance of child interethnic contact seems to play a role, and provide starting points for further investigation of the relation between parental and child interethnic attitudes.

Keywords: interethnic prejudice, ingroup favoritism, outgroup rejection, children, Muslim

Interethnic prejudice, in the form of outgroup rejection (i.e., the negative bias towards members of an ethnic group other than own) and ingroup favoritism (i.e., the positive bias towards members of one's own ethnic group; Hewstone et al., 2002), forms the basis of one of the biggest societal challenges: racism. Even in young children, outgroup rejection and ingroup favoritism are present (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011). Most of the studies on interethnic prejudice in children have been conducted in the United States (U.S.), and have focused on the White ethnic majority's attitudes towards the Black minority. There is a need for studies on interethnic prejudice in children in a European context, given that experiences of discrimination are prevalent among first and second generation immigrants in European countries (André et al., 2008). Differences in ethnic composition as well as cultural and historical differences between the U.S. and Europe limit the generalizability of U.S. findings to the European context (Zick et al., 2008), that requires a focus on the Middle Eastern minority group in addition to the Black minority group. Evidence from a study on Dutch White children suggests that prejudice might be strongest towards the Middle Eastern minority group, as Turks and Moroccans are placed at the bottom of the ethnic hierarchy (Verkuyten & Kinket, 2000).

The aim of the current study is to examine ingroup favoritism (White preference as compared to Middle Eastern and Black preference) and outgroup rejection of children of Middle Eastern descent among young White children in the Netherlands. In order to compare levels of interethnic prejudice, preference for and rejection of the Black outgroup is also assessed. More specifically, the present study aims to examine whether the Middle Eastern outgroup is preferred less and/or rejected more than the Black outgroup, replicating the findings from Verkuyten and Kinket (2000) in younger children while distinguishing between preference and rejection. Furthermore, whereas meta-analytic evidence demonstrates a moderate association between parental and child interethnic prejudice (Degner & Dalege, 2013), little research has focused on various types of parental interethnic prejudice in relation to child interethnic prejudice simultaneously. Previous Dutch research does show an association between parental intergroup attitudes as perceived by children and child interethnic prejudice (Verkuyten, 2002). The present study adds to this knowledge by investigating the association between mothers' implicit interethnic prejudice as well as a form of mother's self-reported explicit interethnic attitudes, and child prejudice against people of Middle Eastern descent.

Interethnic Prejudice

Interethnic prejudice can be defined as a relative devaluation, so not necessarily a negative evaluation, of individuals perceived as belonging to a different ethnic group in terms of their racial, cultural, or religious characteristics (Eagly & Diekman, 2005). Interethnic prejudice can take many forms such as beliefs, likings and behavioral predispositions (Dovidio et al., 2010). Given that interethnic prejudice is a relative devaluation, this means that both ingroup favoritism and outgroup rejection can be seen as interethnic prejudice. Ingroup favoritism entails a more positive evaluation of the ingroup than of the outgroup, independent of whether the evaluation of the

outgroup itself is positive or negative. Outgroup rejection, on the other hand, inherently means a negative evaluation of an ethnic outgroup. Therefore, differences in ethnic prejudice against various outgroups can be based either on a difference in positive evaluation (level of preference) or a difference in negative evaluations (level of rejection). In addition to these forms of interethnic prejudice, interethnic prejudice can be either implicit or explicit.

Implicit interethnic prejudice is defined as automatically and unconsciously activated associations with certain groups (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995), whereas explicit prejudice refers to conscious expressions or behaviors. Implicit and explicit prejudice are distinct constructs, as is shown by meta-analytic evidence that reveals only a weak correlation between the two (Hofmann et al., 2005), and the fact that the two types of prejudice predict different aspects of racial behavior (i.e., implicit prejudice is related to nonverbal friendliness in interracial interactions, whereas explicit prejudice is related to verbal friendliness; Dovidio et al., 2002).

Interethnic Prejudice in Children

Infants already show a preference for looking at faces from their own ethnic group over those from other ethnic groups (Bar-Haim et al., 2006; Kelly et al., 2005). At six months old, they are better at recognizing individual faces from their ethnic ingroup than faces from an outgroup (Kelly, Quinn et al., 2007). Explicit interethnic prejudice is first observed in children of preschool and school age (Doyle & Aboud, 1995; Katz, 2003; Ramsey, 1991). Interethnic prejudice in general peaks at the age of five to seven years old, slightly decreases at ages eight to ten years old, and remains fairly stable in adolescence (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011).

Explicit measures of child interethnic prejudice often use pictures of children with different ethnic backgrounds, and include questions such as 'Who would you like to have as a friend?' and 'Who would you not like to have as a friend?' (Cramer & Anderson, 2003; Katz, 2003; Kowalski & Lo, 2001; Ramsey, 1991). Studies using this type of measure have demonstrated ingroup favoritism and outgroup rejection in young White U.S. children (i.e., three to six years old, Katz 2003; Ramsey, 1991). Doyle and Aboud (1995) in addition found that White Canadian kindergarten children aged six to nine years old assigned more positive adjectives to same-race children than to other-race children (ingroup favoritism), and assigned more negative adjectives to other-race children than to same-race children (outgroup rejection). Studies comparing responses to various outgroups have shown that ratings of different ethnic outgroups by children can vary (Griffiths & Nesdale, 2006; Stokes-Guinan, 2011). Analyzing responses towards multiple racial outgroups can provide insight in whether outgroup derogation is selective, to one outgroup only, or generalized, to all racial outgroups (Clark & Tate, 2008). Furthermore, it can provide insight in levels of prejudice towards different outgroups, and therefore provide information regarding which ethnic groups are particularly at risk of experiencing ethnic prejudice.

The Dutch Context

As compared to studies conducted in U.S. samples, less research on child interethnic prejudice has been conducted in Europe, with some exceptions from the United Kingdom (e.g., Rutland, Cameron, Bennet, et al., 2005; Rutland, Cameron, Milne, et al., 2005). Other European studies focused on other dimensions than ethnicity (i.e., language; Angerer et al., 2016; Angerer et al., 2017), or did not differentiate between attitudes towards different outgroups (Castelli et al., 2008; Castelli et al., 2009; Pirchio et al., 2018). Without devaluating discriminatory experiences of Black (and other) minorities, there is a particular need for research focused on (predictors of) prejudice in young children against people of Middle Eastern descent in Europe in general, and in the Netherlands specifically.

Although Middle Eastern is an ethnic identity, the majority of the White Dutch population is likely to equate a Middle Eastern appearance with the religious identity of being Muslim. Muslim extremist incidents that have received extensive media coverage mostly involved people from Middle Eastern countries, stressing the association between a Middle Eastern appearance and Muslim identity. In the Netherlands, people of Turkish and Moroccan descent make up more than two third of the Muslim population (Huijnk, 2018). The large majority of people of Turkish and Moroccan descent in the Netherlands identifies as Muslim (i.e., 86 and 94%; Huijnk, 2018). The salience of prejudice against the Muslim minority is shown by results from a survey conducted in the Netherlands in 2013, which showed that half of the Turkish and Moroccan minorities report discrimination experiences based on their ethnicity, compared to about a third of Surinamese and Antillean (Black) minorities (Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau, 2014). The need for a focus on prejudice against people of Middle Eastern descent (as an ethnic proxy for Muslims) is furthermore highlighted by individual ethnic majority attitudes such as (a) half of surveyed Dutch people wanting to stop immigration from Muslim countries (De Hond, 2013), by (b) the fact that majority group contact with the Muslim minority group is lower than with other minority groups (Koops et al., 2017), and (c) the increasing amount of support for a political party with explicit anti-Islam attitudes (i.e., 10% of the votes during elections for the House of Representatives in 2012 and 13% of the votes in 2017; Kiesraad, 2012; Kiesraad, 2017). This need is also highlighted by patterns in Dutch society such as, (a) high levels of discrimination that people of Moroccan and Turkish descent experience on the labor market (Ramos et al., 2019; Thijssen et al., 2019), (b) an increasing number of attacks on Mosques since 2011 (Van der Valk & Törnberg, 2017), and, (c) public discourse that is particularly hostile towards Muslims (Siebers & Dennissen, 2015).

Research on adolescent interethnic prejudice in the Netherlands has found evidence of anti-Muslim attitudes (Van der Noll et al., 2010; Velasco González et al., 2008), and ethnic ingroup favoritism (e.g., Fortuin et al., 2014; Verkuyten, 2007). This type of preference is also evident in research on sequences of social distance among ethnic groups, referred to as ethnic hierarchy. White Dutch children aged 10 to 12 years old rated their ethnic ingroup peers as being at the top of the ethnic hierarchy, Black

children below that, and Muslim children (Turkish and Moroccan) at the bottom (Verkuyten & Kinket, 2000). According to the developmental path of interethnic prejudice as demonstrated by Raabe and Beelmann (2011), the level of prejudice in that age range has already decreased from its peak, and remains fairly stable from then on. Although it is expected that the total level of interethnic prejudice is higher in younger White Dutch children, it is unclear whether this prejudice presents itself in the same way against multiple ethnic outgroups, and thus whether the ethnic hierarchy is perceived the same. The above-mentioned group-level findings on interethnic prejudice in the Netherlands co-exist with substantial individual variation that is particularly interesting to examine in relation to predictors of prejudice. Potential predictors of child interethnic prejudice against people of Middle Eastern descent are parental implicit and explicit intergroup attitudes.

Previous research in the Dutch context demonstrated a significant association between parental ethnic ingroup and outgroup evaluations as perceived by children aged ten to twelve years, and children's own ethnic ingroup and outgroup evaluations (Verkuyten, 2002). The risk of using perceived parental attitudes, however, is that results might be a consequence of children's projection. Previous studies outside the Netherlands have in addition examined parental implicit and self-reported explicit interethnic prejudice in relation to child interethnic prejudice, to avoid the association being based on the child's beliefs of parental attitudes rather than the actual parental attitudes.

Association between Parental and Child Interethnic Attitudes

A meta-analysis combining results of studies on parent-child similarity in intergroup attitudes demonstrated a corrected moderate association between parent and child interethnic prejudice of r = .31 (Degner & Dalege, 2013). Most research has focused on explicit forms of both parental and child interethnic prejudice, with studies on adolescents and their parents generally demonstrating a moderate positive relation (Dhont & Van Hiel, 2012; O'Bryan et al., 2004; Rodriguez-Garcia & Wagner, 2009). Research conducted in Costa Rica and the Netherlands suggests a unidirectional model from parent to child in adolescence (Rodriguez-Garcia & Wagner, 2009; Vollebergh et al., 2001). Other studies, however, discuss the possibility of projection of intergroup attitudes, implying that the projection of adolescents' own attitudes on attitudes of their parents contributes to the association (Gniewosz et al., 2008). Studies among younger children (i.e., below twelve years old) found no significant association between explicit forms of parental and child interethnic prejudice (Aboud & Doyle, 1996; Castelli et al., 2009; Pirchio et al., 2018; Vittrup & Holden, 2011).

One form of explicit parental interethnic prejudice can be found in parental involvement in and attitudes towards child interethnic relations. Although some research has been conducted on this topic for parents of adolescent or grown-up children (e.g., Smith et al., 2015; Van Zantvliet et al., 2015), less is known about parental explicit attitudes towards their young children's interethnic contact, and how these attitudes relate to child interethnic prejudice. Given that interethnic

prejudice is especially high in young children (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011), and that parents can have a big impact on the social contacts of their children by for instance choosing their school, choosing a neighborhood to live in, and arranging playdates, the relation between the explicit parental measure on attitudes towards their children's interethnic contact and child interethnic prejudice needs to be examined for younger children as well.

In contrast to forms of parental explicit interethnic prejudice studied previously, subtle and implicit forms of interethnic prejudice of adults do seem to be related to young children's (three to six years old) levels of interethnic prejudice (Castelli et al., 2008; Castelli et al., 2009). Implicit forms of interethnic prejudice can for example be found in uneasiness in interethnic interactions (Castelli et al., 2008), or in automatic responses in accordance with stereotypical associations (Castelli et al., 2009). Nonverbal unease by adults seems to be picked up by children, who accordingly perceive the interaction partner and others of the same ethnicity more negatively, independent of the content of the verbal exchange (Castelli et al., 2008). In addition, parental automatic responses in accordance with stereotypical associations are related to higher levels of child interethnic prejudice (Castelli et al., 2009).

The Present Study

In sum, the current study aims to investigate six-to-eight-year-old White Dutch children's attitudes towards White children and children of Middle Eastern descent (representing the Muslim minority), in terms of social preference and rejection, and examines potential parental predictors of child prejudice against children of Middle Eastern descent. For comparison purposes, attitudes towards Black children are also examined. The study contributes to the existing literature by measuring children's prejudice towards two minority groups (of Middle Eastern descent and Black) in a European country simultaneously, by including children younger than ten years, and by including different maternal predictors of child interethnic prejudice against people of Middle Eastern descent. More specifically, the study can add to previous research involving Dutch White children by (a) trying to replicate the previously found social hierarchy (Verkuyten & Kinket, 2000) in younger children, based on preference and rejection scores separately, and (b) by examining the association between parental implicit and self-reported explicit interethnic attitudes (instead of perceived parental attitudes) and young child explicit interethnic prejudice. We test the following hypotheses: (1) Children will show a stronger social preference towards their own group than towards the outgroups (ingroup favoritism); (2) Children will show more social rejection of both outgroups than of their ingroup (outgroup rejection); (3) The Middle Eastern outgroup is rejected more or preferred less than the Black outgroup; (4) Implicit maternal interethnic prejudice against people of Middle Eastern descent is significantly related to explicit child interethnic prejudice against people of Middle Eastern descent. In addition, we will explore the role of maternal attitudes towards their children's interethnic contact in predicting child interethnic prejudice against children of Middle Eastern descent.

Method

Sample

The sample consisted of 140 Dutch White children (60% girls) aged six to eight years old (M = 7.26, SD = 0.77) and their mother. In 81% of the families, the mother had a high educational level (bachelor's degree/higher vocational education or higher). In the general Dutch female population, this percentage lies around 28% (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2018a). All families were from the urban Western region of the Netherlands. This region was selected because of its relatively high degree of ethnic diversity as compared to other regions in the Netherlands. According to mother reports 64% of the children attended a school with fewer than 10% ethnic minorities, and 11% attended a school with 50% ethnic minorities or more. In addition, according to mother reports 30% of the children lived in a neighborhood without any children of ethnic minorities and 44% of the children lived in a neighborhood with fewer than 10% ethnic minorities. Furthermore, most mothers reported that they were not religious (71%). None of the mothers reported to be Muslim, whereas 6% of the mothers reported to be Catholic and 14% of the mothers reported to be Protestants. In addition, 9% of the mothers chose the answer-option 'Other'. These answers were specified as Mormon, Christian, Evangelical and Apostolic.

Procedure

Families were recruited through social media. Using a research project-specific Facebook page, mothers could find information on the content and procedures of the study and leave their personal details if they were interested in participating. Mothers received an online questionnaire to be filled out prior to the home visit. After obtaining informed consent from both parents, families were visited at home by a student assistant who administered a standardized task to the child to measure their social preference for and rejection of different ethnicities. Of the original 148 participating families, eight cases were excluded because the parent who completed the questionnaire was not the same parent present at the home visit (n = 2), because data from the home visit were missing (n = 1), or because the participating parent was not the mother (n = 5). Mothers were asked to keep a low profile and not interfere while the task was being administered to the child. The child task was videotaped to allow for post hoc coding. Afterwards, the mother performed a computerized task to measure implicit interethnic prejudice. At the end of the home visit, the child received a small gift. The study's procedures and methods were approved by an Ethics evaluation committee.

Measures

The child task and the computerized task for the mothers involved pictures of children and adults of three different ethnic groups (White, Black and of Middle Eastern descent) taken from the Internet. Although we acknowledge that the children

and adults of Middle Eastern descent in the pictures are not necessarily living in the Middle East, we will in the method and results section refer to them as 'Middle Eastern'. The ethnic groups White and Black are easily identified by their skin colors, and the Middle Eastern group is identifiable by their North-African/Middle Eastern features including a dark hair color, brown eyes, and a slightly colored skin tone, and by wearing headscarves for the selected females in the pictures. All groups are therefore ethno-racially distinguishable, yet, the White Dutch majority in addition tends to equate a Middle Eastern appearance to a religious identity, Muslim. Consistent with the other race effect (Meissner & Brigham, 2001), the White Dutch majority generally has difficulty distinguishing between specific ethnic subgroups within the broader Middle Eastern category. The type and colors of the clothes, hair styles and the background colors in the pictures were not standardized, but all children and adults in the pictures were facing the camera, visible from chest or shoulder height and smiling.

Child social preference and rejection. Children completed a *social preference task*, based on the work of Levy and colleagues (2005), in which they were presented with 12 pictures of children (two boys and two girls of each ethnic group: White, Black and Middle Eastern) collected from the Internet. All the children in the pictures were about the same age as the participating children. A pilot study with 33 White Dutch adults aged 20 to 62 (M = 35.09, SD = 15.46), of which 33% male, showed that the pictures were consistently classified in the correct ethnic target group. The four White children in the pictures were mostly classified as Dutch (97 to 100% of the times). Other classifications included Scandinavian (n = 1) and Spanish (n = 1). The four children of Middle Eastern descent in the pictures were mostly classified as Turkish or Moroccan (82 to 100% of the times). Other classifications included Middle Eastern (n = 2), Arab (n = 1), Iraqi (n = 1), Afghan (n = 1), Indonesian (n = 1), Caribbean (n = 1), African (n = 2) and Pakistani (n = 1). The four Black children in the pictures were mostly classified as Surinamese, Caribbean or African (97 to 100% of the times). Other classifications included Cape Verdean (n = 1).

In another pilot study, 16 White Dutch, 14 Turkish-Dutch and 11 Afro-Dutch adults, aged 18 to 57 (M = 29.68, SD = 11.78), 22% male, rated attractiveness, cuteness and positivity of facial expressions of the children in the pictures on scales ranging from 0 to 100. Results from this pilot study show that the Black children in the pictures (M = 83.80, SD = 11.06) were rated as more attractive than the Middle Eastern children (M = 76.79, SD = 12.57, $t(40) = 4.99$, $p < .001$) and the White children (M = 77.82, SD = 13.42, $t(40) = 3.23$, $p = .003$), while the difference between the Middle Eastern and White children was not significant ($t(40) = -0.53$, $p = .600$). A similar pattern was found for the positivity of the facial expression: the facial expression of the Black children in the pictures (M = 88.79, SD = 9.79) was rated as more positive than the expression of the Middle Eastern children (M = 83.89, SD = 12.89, $t(40) = 4.38$, $p < .001$) and of the White children (M = 84.05, SD = 12.16, $t(40) = 5.58$, $p < .001$), while the difference between the Middle Eastern and White children was not significant ($t(40) = -0.28$, $p = .786$). In addition, the White children (M = 75.18, SD = 13.93) were rated as less cute than the Black children (M = 81.39, SD = 12.06, $t(40) = 3.28$, $p =$

.002) and the Middle Eastern children (M = 80.09, SD = 12.69, $t(40) = 2.61$, $p = .013$), while the difference between the Black and Middle Eastern children was not significant ($t(40) = 0.99$, $p = .328$).

The twelve pictures were simultaneously presented to the participating children. Children were then asked five questions in a fixed order: (1) Who would you like to sit next to in class? (2) Who would you not like to sit next to in class? (3) Who would you like to invite for a play date at your house? (4) Who would you not like to invite for a play date at your house? (5) Who would you like to invite to your birthday party? For the first four questions the children were instructed to point to just one of the children in the pictures. For the birthday question, children were allowed to pick as many or few children as they wanted. Because there was no limit on the number of children that could be chosen for their birthday party, it was not necessary to ask the participating children who they would not like to invite to their birthday party. From these five questions, preference and rejection scores were computed for each ethnic group. Preference scores were created by summing the number of times a child chose a child of a specific ethnicity to sit next to, play with, or invite to a birthday party, and could range between 0 and 6. Rejection scores were computed by summing the number of times a child chose a child of a specific ethnicity to not sit next to and not play with, and could range between 0 and 2. In this sample, White preference scores as compared to Black and Middle Eastern preference scores reflect ingroup favoritism, whereas Black and Middle Eastern rejection scores as compared to White rejection scores reflect outgroup rejection.

Maternal implicit interethnic prejudice against people of Middle Eastern descent. The Implicit Association Task (IAT) was used to measure implicit interethnic prejudice of mothers, similar to the Race Attitude IAT (Nosek et al., 2002). This computerized task was built with E-prime 2.0. In this task, participants were asked to classify faces of males and females as Middle Eastern or White, while classifying words as positive or negative on a laptop computer. Classifying faces or words was done by pressing either the Z or the M button. The task consisted of congruent and incongruent test blocks, each consisting of 40 trials. In the congruent blocks, positive words and White faces needed to be sorted on the one side and negative words and Middle Eastern faces needed to be sorted on the other side. In the incongruent blocks, negative words and White faces needed to be sorted on the one side and positive words and Middle Eastern faces needed to be sorted on the other side. For each trial the reaction time and accuracy were recorded. Scores were computed using the improved scoring algorithm by Greenwald et al. (2003). Higher positive scores reflected more difficulties to link positive words with Middle Eastern faces, and therefore stronger implicit racial stereotypical ideas. Negative scores on the other hand reflected contra-stereotypical ideas. The number of practice trials in the fifth and sixth block of the IAT procedure was increased and two versions of the IAT were constructed in order to reduce possible order effects (Nosek et al., 2005). One version started with the congruent block, whereas the other started with the incongruent block. These versions were allocated randomly to the participants. No significant

difference in level of implicit interethnic prejudice emerged between the two versions, $t(138) = 0.68$, $p = .496$.

Maternal attitudes towards their children's interethnic contact. Prior to the home visit, mothers digitally completed four questions on their attitudes towards their children engaging with ethnic minorities, based on questions from the 'Tolerantiebarometer' (Ipsos Belgium, 2009). Mothers were asked to indicate to what extent they agree with statements about having a problem with their child (1) becoming best friends with a child of non-Dutch ethnicity, (2) dating someone of non-Dutch ethnicity, (3) marrying someone of non-Dutch ethnicity, and (4) having children with someone of non-Dutch ethnicity. The items were scored on a 5-point Likert-scale with answer options ranging from 1 (*totally disagree*) to 5 (*totally agree*), so that higher scores reflect more negative attitudes towards their children engaging with ethnic minorities. The sum of the four items was computed. The internal consistency of the scale was good ($\alpha = .92$). Because 55% of the mothers received a total score of 4, meaning that they answered *totally disagree* to every question, the variable was dichotomized into a variable indicating whether participants reported absolutely no reservations about child interethnic relations (0 = yes, 1 = no). To illustrate, the original scores in the second group ranged from 5 to 19 ($M = 8.62$, $SD = 2.63$).

Socio-demographic variables. Mothers reported on socio-demographic characteristics of the family in the online questionnaire. Gender and age of the child, maternal level of education, and ethnic diversity of the school and neighborhood will be examined as potential covariates, because previous studies have shown a relation with interethnic prejudice (Ekehammar et al., 2003; Raabe & Beelmann, 2011; Wagner & Zick, 1995), or on theoretical grounds (contact hypothesis; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). For these socio-demographic variables, correlations with the dependent variables of the regression analyses are examined to see whether they should be included as covariates. Mothers reported on their highest level of education (1 = primary school, 2 = middle school, 3 = high school, 4 = bachelor's degree/higher vocational education, 5 = master's degree). In addition, mothers reported on the percentage of children with a non-Dutch ethnicity in the neighborhood and school (1 = none, 2 = <10%, 3 = 25%, 4 = 50%, 5 = >50). As ethnic diversity in the neighborhood was positively skewed, a square root transformation was used. Level of education of the mother, on the other hand, was negatively skewed, and thus a power transformation was used.

Statistical Analyses

First, all variables were examined for possible outliers, defined as 3.29 *SD* above or below the mean (Field, 2005). Two outliers on main variables (one on Black preference scores and one on the maternal IAT score), were winsorized, that is, brought closer to the rest of the distribution while maintaining the same rank. Analysis were run before and after winsorizing, but results were similar. Therefore, results after winsorizing are reported. The associations between the main study

variables were examined using bivariate correlations. Given that Middle Eastern preference (Z_{skew} = 3.26) and White rejection (Z_{skew} = 7.51) were positively skewed, Spearman correlations were used for these variables instead of Pearson's correlations.

To examine whether children showed ingroup favoritism and outgroup rejection and to examine potential differences in preference for and rejection of the Middle Eastern and Black outgroup, Friedman Tests were conducted to compare the preference and rejection scores for the three ethnicities of the children in the pictures. Post hoc analyses were conducted using Wilcoxon signed-rank tests. In addition, Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were conducted to examine effects of backgrounds or clothing differences in the pictures, and overall patterns of results are compared with the results from the pilot study on attractiveness, cuteness and facial expression.

Of all computed preference and rejection scores, Middle Eastern rejection and Middle Eastern preference were of main interest. For these variables, multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to test whether maternal measures (implicit interethnic prejudice and attitudes towards children's interethnic contact) play a role. Potential covariates (gender of the child, age of the child, education of the mother, ethnic diversity of the neighborhood and ethnic diversity of the school) were included in the analyses in a first step, prior to adding the maternal measures, if they were significantly associated with the dependent variables.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of the main variables. Bivariate correlations between the main variables are presented in Table 2. Higher preference for one ethnic group was significantly associated with less rejection of the same group for all three ethnicities. Moreover, higher preference for the White group (ingroup favoritism) was significantly associated with lower preference for the other two ethnic groups. Higher preference for the Middle Eastern group was significantly associated with higher preference for the Black group as well. Furthermore, more rejection of one ethnic group was significantly associated with less rejection of the other two ethnic groups. More rejection of the White group, in addition, was associated with higher preference for the Middle Eastern and Black group. Bivariate correlations between the socio-demographic variables and dependent variables of the regression analyses are presented in Table 3. Because none of the socio-demographic variables was significantly associated with Middle Eastern preference or Middle Eastern rejection of the child, these variables are not included as covariates.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics of Child and Maternal Measures

Variable	*N*	Range	*M (SD)*
Child social preferences			
White preference	140	0 - 6	3.99 (1.38)
White rejection	140	0 - 2	0.36 (0.64)
Middle Eastern preference	140	0 - 4	1.16 (1.03)
Middle Eastern rejection	140	0 - 2	0.91 (0.74)
Black preference	140	0 - 5.50	1.71 (1.27)
Black rejection	140	0 - 2	0.72 (0.76)
Maternal measures			
Implicit interethnic attitudes	140	-0.90 - 1.42	0.33 (0.39)
Attitudes toward children's interethnic contact	140	0 - 1	.45 (.50)

Table 2
Bivariate Correlates between Child and Maternal Measures (*N* = 140)

	Variable	1	2[a]	3[a]	4	5	6	7
1	C White preference							
2	C White rejection[a]	-.28**						
3	C Middle Eastern preference[a]	-.35**	.20*					
4	C Middle Eastern rejection	.15	-.37**	-.29**				
5	C Black preference	-.55**	.28**	.25**	-.02			
6	C Black rejection	.11	-.46**	.09	-.64**	-.23**		
7	M implicit attitudes	.05	-.09	-.11	-.03	-.05	.12	
8	M attitudes on children's interethnic contact [b]	.07	-.09	-.11	.24**	.05	-.16	.16

Note. C = child, M = maternal. ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$. [a] = Spearman correlations. [b] = reporting absolutely no reservations about child interethnic relations (0 = yes, 1 = no).

Table 3
Bivariate Correlates between Dependent and Socio-Demographic Variables (*N* = 140)

Variable	C Middle Eastern preference[b]	C Middle Eastern rejection
C gender[a]	-.13	-.09
C age	-.08	-.01
M level of education	.03	-.10
Ethnic diversity school	.07	-.08
Ethnic diversity	.05	-.03

Note. C = child, M = maternal. [a] = 0 is boy, 1 is girl. [b] = Spearman correlations.

Social preference for and rejection of different ethnic groups in children

A significant difference in both preference scores, $\chi^2(2) = 136.15$, $p < .001$, and rejection scores, $\chi^2(2) = 34.51$, $p < .001$, was found for the different ethnicities of the children in the pictures, as depicted in Figure 1. White preference scores were significantly higher than both Middle Eastern ($Z = -9.50$, $p < .001$, $r = -.57$) and Black ($Z = -8.36$, $p < .001$, $r = -.50$) preference scores, and Middle Eastern preference scores were significantly lower than Black preference scores ($Z = -4.14$, $p < .001$, $r = -.25$). Furthermore, White rejection scores were significantly lower than both Middle Eastern ($Z = -4.65$, $p < .001$, $r = -.28$) and Black ($Z = -3.27$, $p < .001$, $r = -.20$) rejection scores. There was no significant difference between Middle Eastern and Black rejection scores ($Z = -1.31$, $p = .191$, $r = -.08$).

We also examined whether there were differences between overall preference/rejection scores regarding Middle Eastern girls or boys, because the Middle Eastern girls were different to all other children in the pictures as they wore headscarves, but no such differences were found (*ps* > .05). In addition, because picture backgrounds were not standardized we examined whether these could have influenced the results by comparing responses to pictures of different ethnicities with the same background (a White girl and a Middle Eastern girl against a light grey



Figure 1. Comparison of preference and rejection scores.
Note. Preference scores could range from 0 to 6, rejection scores could range from 0 to 2.

background, and a Black girl and a Middle Eastern girl against a brown background). Results from both comparisons were consistent with the overall results, and in addition showed that the Middle Eastern girl was rejected more than the Black girl. Moreover, we compared the pattern of preference and rejection results to the patterns we found in our pilot study on attractiveness, cuteness and facial expression. These patterns did not overlap: while the White children were preferred most and rejected the least, they were not rated as the most attractive, the most cute or having the most positive facial expression. This shows that the observed preference and rejection score patterns cannot be explained by the attractiveness, cuteness and facial expressions of the children in the pictures.

Relation between parental and child outcomes

Finally, we examined the relation between the ethnic preference and rejection scores of interest (Middle Eastern rejection and Middle Eastern preference) and maternal measures (implicit interethnic prejudice and attitudes towards children's interethnic contact). Initial correlation analyses showed that maternal implicit interethnic prejudice was not significantly associated with the child outcomes (see Table 2). Reporting absolutely no reservations about children's interethnic contact by mothers was associated with less Middle Eastern rejection by children. In addition, we performed two multiple linear regression analyses with Middle Eastern rejection and Middle Eastern preference as dependent variables and the maternal measures (implicit interethnic prejudice and attitudes towards children's interethnic contact) as independent variables, to control for confounding effects. One significant maternal predictor was found for Middle Eastern rejection, $R^2 = .06$, $F(2, 137) = 4.51$, $p = .013$, namely attitudes towards children's interethnic contact (see Table 4). Reporting absolutely no reservations about children's interethnic contact was associated with less Middle Eastern rejection. For Middle Eastern preference, $F(2, 137) = 2.30$, $p = .104$, no significant predictors were found.

Discussion

The results of the present study demonstrated interethnic prejudice in Dutch White children in the form of ingroup favoritism as well as outgroup rejection of children of Middle Eastern descent and Black children. In addition, overall preference scores for children of Middle Eastern descent were lower than overall preference scores for

Table 4

Multiple Regression for Child Middle Eastern Rejection Scores (N = 140)

Variable	*B*	*SE*	β
M implicit attitudes	-.13	.16	-.07
M attitudes on children's interethnic contact[a]	.37**	.13	.25**

Note. M = maternal. ** $p < .01$. [a] = reporting absolutely no reservations about child interethnic relations (0 = yes, 1 = no)

Black children. Furthermore, reporting absolutely no reservations about children's interethnic contact was found to be associated with less child interethnic prejudice in the form of rejection of the Middle Eastern outgroup. These findings give an insight in child interethnic prejudice in the European context, and how it relates to parental attitudes.

As expected, the White children in the present study had a stronger preference for White children in the pictures than for Black children and children of Middle Eastern descent, and showed more rejection of Black children and children of Middle Eastern descent in the pictures than of White children. These patterns were not consistent with the attractiveness, cuteness and positivity of the facial expression of the children in the pictures, as rated by adults in our pilot. The results mirror earlier findings of ingroup favoritism and outgroup rejection among young White children in U.S. samples (Katz, 2003; Ramsey, 1991). The fact that interethnic prejudice is found is not surprising given the numerous theories that have explained the existence of interethnic prejudice by describing human social cognitive processes, such as the skill to rapidly place environmental cues in categories (Bigler & Liben, 2007), the desire to be a part of a group (Ellemers & Haslam, 2012), and the need to defend oneself against potential threat that might be caused by opposing worldviews of other groups (Greenberg & Arndt, 2012). Other scholars argue that apart from these social cognitive processes, the cultural world in which individuals live is essential for understanding racism (Salter et al., 2018). The Dutch culture is argued by some to show discursive and institutionalized racism (Weiner, 2014). More research on the association between everyday cultural processes, for instance representations of history in schools and media representations of non-White people, and interethnic prejudice in general as well as in the Dutch context is needed to gain a more comprehensive understanding of racism.

Although both outgroups were preferred less and rejected more than the ingroup, suggesting a form of generalized outgroup derogation (Clark & Tate, 2008), the results indicated a stronger ethnic prejudice against children of Middle Eastern descent than against Black children, as the preference scores for the children of Middle Eastern descent in the pictures were significantly lower than for the Black children in the pictures. Because there was no significant difference in the overall amount of rejection, this form of prejudice fits the definition of prejudice as a relative devaluation (i.e., not necessarily a negative, but a less positive evaluation; Eagly & Diekmann, 2005). This finding replicates the ethnic hierarchy as rated by Dutch White children in previous research, where minorities of Middle Eastern descent were rated lower in the hierarchy than Black minority groups (Verkuyten & Kinket, 2000), in a younger sample, and illustrates that this difference in evaluation is due to a difference in preference rather than rejection. These results are also in accordance with studies on older Dutch children and adolescents that revealed explicit prejudice towards Muslims, a religious group associated with Middle Eastern ethnicity (Van der Noll et al., 2010; Velasco González et al., 2008).

Attitudes towards Muslims might be shaped by recent events covered widely in the media. Muslim extremism and the refugee crisis in Europe, which mostly involves people from Middle Eastern countries, have received extensive media coverage and public debate. It is therefore likely that children have been exposed to some images and discussions regarding these topics. Even if these images and discussions are not explicitly negative, the general sense that the people displayed are associated with problems and threat may influence children's evaluations of children that look similar. Indeed, threat perception has been shown to exacerbate intergroup prejudice in children (Nesdale et al., 2005). Furthermore, the present study found some evidence for an association between parental and child interethnic prejudice.

Maternal attitudes towards their children's interethnic contact were found to be associated with children's Middle Eastern rejection in the present study. More specifically, reporting absolutely no reservations about children's interethnic contact was associated with less Middle Eastern rejection by children. This finding suggests that not only perceived parental attitudes (Verkuyten, 2002), but also self-reported explicit parental interethnic attitudes are related to child interethnic attitudes in the Dutch context evaluating people of Middle Eastern descent. Even though the items mothers answered about child interethnic relations did not specify a certain outgroup, rather the items referred to 'someone with a non-Dutch ethnicity', it may be that mothers mostly thought of Muslims, a religious group associated with an Middle Eastern appearance, when answering these questions, due to the often negative public discourse and media representation regarding the Muslim minority in the Netherlands. Future research will need to investigate parental attitudes towards child interethnic relations with persons of specific ethnic groups in relation to child interethnic prejudice. In contrast, no relation with Middle Eastern preference was found. Maternal attitudes were thus related to children's responses to the negative questions but not to the positive questions. Possibly, the transfer of attitudes towards children's interethnic contact is more often formulated negatively (i.e., who not to engage with) than positively (i.e., who to engage with instead). To investigate this proposition, future research will need to examine the socialization practices through which maternal attitudes are transferred.

Maternal implicit prejudice, unexpectedly, was not related to child interethnic prejudice against children of Middle Eastern descent in the current study. Previous research did find that implicit and subtle forms of prejudice of adults were related to explicit child interethnic prejudice (Castelli et al., 2008; Castelli et al., 2009). One possible explanation for the discrepancy between our finding and the results of these studies is that the children in the present study are older (six-to-eight years) than the children in the previous studies (three-to-six years, Castelli et al., 2008; Castelli et al., 2009). Perhaps younger children are more sensitive towards parental implicit and nonverbal signals as they might be less proficient in explicit linguistic communication. Another possible explanation may be that the focus of previous studies was on the White ethnic majority's attitudes towards Black people, instead of people of Middle Eastern descent or Muslims. The difference in appearance between the White ingroup and the Black outgroup might be more salient for young White

children than the difference in physical appearance between the White ingroup and the Middle Eastern outgroup. Perhaps children are more sensitive to implicit and subtle prejudice by their parents towards an outgroup whose physical appearance is more obviously different from that of the ingroup (i.e., Black versus White), than to implicit and subtle prejudice towards a less clearly distinct outgroup such as the Middle Eastern outgroup, in which people generally have a dark hair and eye color and a slightly darker skin tone, but sometimes also have a pale skin and light hair and eye color. Previous research, however, shows that White infants prefer White faces over Middle Eastern faces (Kelly et al., 2005), suggesting that they do see differences between these two ethnic groups. Therefore, future research will need to confirm our results and examine mechanisms through and contexts in which, especially concerning different ethnic outgroups, implicit forms of prejudice can be transferred from parent to child. To do so, future studies should collect data on implicit forms of prejudice against different ethnic outgroups and, in addition, also include measures of child implicit prejudice.

The study has some limitations. First of all, the child task used non-standardized pictures. Nevertheless, additional comparisons of responses to children from different ethnicities pictured on similar backgrounds in general confirmed the overall results of the analyses. Furthermore, the patterns of responses were not in line with rankings of attractiveness, cuteness, or positivity of facial expressions. This suggests that ethnicity rather than other factors influenced children's choices in this study. Yet, using completely standardized pictures would be preferable in future studies to rule out non-ethnic effects on children's choices. In addition, the girls of Middle Eastern descent in the pictures all wore headscarves, and earlier research demonstrated that implicit and explicit reactions towards Muslim women with headscarves are more negative than towards Muslim women without headscarves (Everett et al., 2015). Given that there were no significant differences in preference/rejection scores between the boys and girls of Middle Eastern descent in the pictures in this study, however, suggests that the overall pattern of prejudice towards children of Middle Eastern descent is not due to the headscarves only. Nonetheless, the fact that the females of Middle Eastern descent in the pictures wore a religious attire and the males did not may have confounded our results. Secondly, there are some limitations to the set-up of the child task. There was no option to choose 'nobody' in response to the social preference questions, thus children were forced to choose. Especially the level of outgroup rejection might therefore be slightly overrated (Kowalski, 2003), but forced choice cannot explain the differences found between prejudice towards children of Middle Eastern descent and towards Black children. Future studies would ideally not use a forced-choice design, and measure finer gradations of social preferences.

In addition, the fact that the child task was administered at home with pictures limits the generalizability towards real-life social encounters, and the self-report maternal measures of attitudes towards child interethnic contact might have been influenced by social desirability. Lastly, there are some limitations to the generalizability of the findings, because the sample in the present study was rather homogeneous in terms

of interethnic contact and parental education level. Most children in the sample attended schools with very low percentages of ethnic minorities and lived in neighborhoods with very little ethnic diversity. Furthermore, most mothers were highly educated, as compared to the average Dutch population. The study's recruitment method might have attracted especially highly educated mothers who are in general more interested in research. Previous research suggests that levels of prejudice are higher among people that have a lower level of education (e.g., Carvacho et al., 2013; Wagner & Zick, 1995). In addition, because ethnic diversity was mentioned in the advertisement we may have also attracted mothers with particularly egalitarian attitudes, as possibly mothers attracted by the social media add had a special interest in ethnic diversity, making it difficult to detect relations between parents' and children's attitudes. Moreover, the present study included mothers only, while fathers might also play a role as socializing agent in the shaping of children's interethnic attitudes, and has focused only on the urban region of the Netherlands. Future research in other, more rural, areas is needed to compare results and make generalizations about Dutch children.

The current study is the first to examine ethnic prejudice in the form of ingroup favoritism and outgroup rejection towards multiple outgroups in Dutch White young children, and found clear evidence for both social preference for White children, and rejection of Black children and children of Middle Eastern descent. Comparing results for the two outgroups revealed that the children of Middle Eastern descent were preferred less than the Black children, replicating the social hierarchy as found in older Dutch White children (Verkuyten & Kinket, 2000), and indicating that this difference in evaluation is due to a difference in preference rather than rejection. In addition, reporting absolutely no reservations about children's interethnic contact by mothers was related to less Middle Eastern rejection by children, suggesting that not only perceived parental attitudes are associated with child interethnic attitudes (Verkuyten, 2002), but that self-reported parental explicit interethnic attitudes also play a role. The study of children's attitudes towards different ethnic groups in general and people of Middle Eastern descent (representing the Muslim minority) in particular deserves more research attention, especially in European countries, where the public discourse about Muslim immigration is increasingly negative. Interethnic prejudice potentially leads to discriminatory behaviors, and experiencing discrimination in turn can have detrimental consequences for stigmatized groups of children in terms of mental and physical health outcomes (Paradies et al., 2015). Future research will need to focus not only on the White ethnic majority's attitudes, but also on attitudes of ethnic minority groups regarding their own and other ethnic groups and their experiences of prejudice, to increase knowledge on the normative and/or group-specific aspects of child interethnic prejudice from multiple perspectives. In addition, longitudinal studies are needed to examine the developmental path of prejudice in children. Furthermore, a positive framework might be applied to the study of interethnic prejudice, examining factors that are related to the absence of prejudice. The present study gives an insight in child interethnic prejudice in the European context, particularly prejudice against people of Middle Eastern descent, and provides starting points from which to further

disentangle the relations between parental interethnic attitudes and child interethnic prejudice in its various forms.













Chapter 3

Maternal Attitudes Toward Child Interethnic Relations in the Netherlands: Facilitating Intergroup Contact Effects?

Ymke de Bruijn, Rosanneke A.G. Emmen, Judi Mesman

Submitted for publication.

Abstract

Ethnic diversity and interethnic contact are increasing in Europe. Intergroup contact theory suggests interethnic contact to improve interethnic attitudes, but for young children parental attitudes toward child interethnic relations might be an important factor determining whether they are exposed to these potentially positive contact effects. This study therefore examined maternal attitudes toward child contact with different ethnic outgroups among 251 mothers (137 White Dutch, 69 Turkish-Dutch, and 45 Afro-Dutch) of a 6-to-10-year-old child (M = 7.51, SD = 0.98). Furthermore, associations between maternal attitudes toward child interethnic relations and child outgroup rejection were examined, as well as mediation effects of child actual outgroup contact. Neutral to positive maternal attitudes toward child interethnic relations were found, with relatively more negative attitudes among Turkish-Dutch than White Dutch and Afro-Dutch mothers, and toward child relations with Muslims as compared to another outgroup among White Dutch and Afro-Dutch mothers. Furthermore, results did not indicate that maternal attitudes were related to child actual outgroup contact or child outgroup prejudice and no support for the intergroup contact theory was found. These results suggest that intergroup contact theory does not easily apply, highlighting the need for more research on children in various populations and contexts using different measures and informants. Patterns from the present study suggest that most improvement in terms of maternal attitudes fostering child interethnic relations can be made in the interethnic relations including ethnic groups in the Netherlands that predominantly identify as Muslim.

Keywords: children, parents, interethnic prejudice, interethnic contact, intergroup contact theory

Interethnic prejudice refers to a negative evaluation of an ethnic outgroup (Nesdale, 2004) and is already present among young children (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011). Intergroup contact theory suggests that interethnic contact is related to reduced prejudice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). As ethnic diversity in European countries such as the Netherlands is increasing (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2020), interethnic contact is likely to increase with potential positive implications for children's interethnic attitudes. Parental approval, however, can be an important factor determining the degree of children's interethnic contact, and thus insight in parental attitudes toward child interethnic relations is needed. The present study examines attitudes towards child interethnic contact among White Dutch, Turkish-Dutch, and Afro-Dutch mothers of 6- to 10-year old children. In addition, whereas previous research suggests an association between generalized parental approval of child contact with outgroups and child interethnic prejudice in White Dutch families (de Bruijn et al., 2020), the present study examines whether these patterns are similar for parental approval of child contact with specific outgroups, and in families of different ethnic backgrounds. Moreover, based on intergroup contact theory (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), mediation of these associations through child actual interethnic contact is tested. The results will provide a more complete picture of parental attitudes to child interethnic contact in the Netherlands, and how they relate to children's actual contact and prejudice, and can help guide future work on improving interethnic relations and attitudes in children.

Young children already show varying degrees of interethnic prejudice (e.g., Doyle & Aboud, 1995; Katz 2003). Some scholars argue that prejudice can entail positive and negative evaluations (Fish & Syed, 2020), and refers to a relative group-devaluation (Eagly & Diekman, 2005). Social Identity Development Theory, however, describes prejudice as a negative evaluation and distinguishes it from positive evaluations or higher preferences for the ingroup (Nesdale, 2004). It is proposed to develop in four stages, (1) undifferentiated, (2) ethnic awareness, (3) ethnic preference, and (4) ethnic prejudice. Various factors, such as ingroup identification and ingroup beliefs that one's group is threatened or can benefit from outgroup negativity, are related to the shift to the fourth stage (Nesdale, 2004, 2017). Therefore, it is argued that not all children reach this final stage (Nesdale, 2017), making it specifically interesting for examining potential predictors. Generally, the level of prejudice toward lower status outgroups is at its peak in middle childhood (5-7 years) and slightly decreases towards late childhood (8-10 years), whereas prejudice toward higher status outgroups increases from middle to late childhood (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011). In this phase relatively high divergence is found, and environmental influences thus might play a particularly important role (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011). Interethnic prejudice can eventually develop into racism, with very negative effects on the physical and mental health of stigmatized individuals (Paradies et al., 2015), on social capital (Brondolo et al., 2012), and on social issues such as a lack of social cohesion (Dandy & Pe-Pua, 2015). Therefore, research on interethnic prejudice and its predictors is important and should start early in development.

One environmental factor that is argued to play an important role in the development of interethnic prejudice is intergroup contact. Intergroup contact theory proposes that interethnic contact reduces interethnic prejudice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Pettigrew et al., 2011). This negative association between intergroup contact, especially in the form of behavioral engagement with friends, and prejudice has received meta-analytic support in general (Davies et al., 2011; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Pettigrew et al., 2011). Contact effects are established within both dominant and underrepresented ethnic groups (e.g., Swart et al., 2011; Thomsen & Rafiqi, 2017), but are weaker among underrepresented groups (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005). Possibly, members from underrepresented groups are more aware of their group status and the threat of experiencing prejudice, inhibiting effects of intergroup contact (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005). Most studies on intergroup contact theory in underrepresented ethnic groups examined their relations with the dominant group. Research on contact between multiple underrepresented groups also supports the contact effect (Hindriks et al., 2014; Mähönen et al., 2013), with again stronger effects for groups with a higher status (Bikmen, 2011). Similarly, among children intergroup contact effects are found in the context of ethnic outgroups, most strongly among children from dominant groups (Tropp & Prenovost, 2008).

The degree of interethnic contact that children engage in, however, is likely to be influenced by their parents. Parents of adolescents tend to have various indirect and direct strategies to impact their children's peer selection, such as limiting time and inviting friends over at home (Mounts, 2000), in line with the idea that intergroup relations are influenced by third parties (Kalmijn, 1998). Such direct strategies are even easier to implement for parents of young children as they can influence the neighborhood they live in, school they go to, and arrange playdates, and are likely to stem from parental attitudes about with whom they want their children to engage. In the context of interethnic relations in particular, previous studies have exemplified that (perceived) parental attitudes on child interethnic relations seem to be 'effective' and related to actual engagement and levels of intimacy in interethnic contact of adolescents and adults (Carol, 2014; Edmonds & Killen, 2009). Children with migration backgrounds furthermore seem to experience less conflict with their parents about intergroup dating if their families have been living in the 'host country' for longer (Shenhav et al., 2017). Adolescents and adults in both dominant and underrepresented ethnic groups also seem to copy their parental attitudes on interethnic relations, specifically on interethnic marriage (Carol, 2014; Huijnk & Liefbroer, 2012; Maliepaard & Lubbers, 2013). Therefore, apart from an indirect effect through child interethnic contact, parental attitudes toward child interethnic relations may also directly relate to children's interethnic attitudes, although studies on young children seem lacking.

Meta-analytic results show a moderate association between parent and child interethnic prejudice (Degner & Dalege, 2013). Parental prejudice in the form of objection toward child interethnic relations might be particularly salient to and expressed in the direct environment of children. There are some first suggestions that parental attitudes toward child interethnic relations in general are indeed related

to young White children's interethnic prejudice (i.e., children whose parents object less show less outgroup rejection, de Bruijn et al., 2020). However, parent-child similarity in attitudes might be different for generalized forms of parental prejudice, reflecting broader values and ideologies, versus parents' prejudice towards specific outgroups (Degner & Dalege, 2013). A more sensitive analysis of this association will provide more insight in specific patterns, and potentially in more specific suggestions on how to improve child interethnic attitudes. As multiple ethnic groups are involved in interethnic contact, and parental attitudes towards child interethnic relations differ between different ethnic groups (Munniksma et al., 2011; Van Zantvliet et al., 2015), it is also important to include parents with different ethnic backgrounds.

Europe provides an interesting context for examining parental attitudes toward child interethnic contact, as ethnic diversity is increasing (Ziller, 2015), prejudice and discrimination are prevalent (Zick et al., 2008), and media coverage of immigration tends to be negative (Eberl et al., 2018). In the Netherlands the political and public discourse about immigrants in general, and about Muslims in particular, is also increasingly negative (Van Meeteren & Van Oostendorp, 2019). Although Muslim is a religious identity, members from the dominant ethnic group in the Netherlands likely equate Muslim with a Middle Eastern appearance, because people of Turkish and Moroccan descent make up two third of the Muslim population, and predominantly identify as Muslim (Huijnk, 2018). The Black population in the Netherlands (Afro-Dutch) has many different backgrounds, but the largest groups are of Surinamese and Antillean descent. The need to study interethnic prejudice in the Netherlands is illustrated by frequent experiences of discrimination based on ethnicity, religion, or skin color (Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau, 2020), and fierce societal debates about racism, for example about the anti-Black racist nature of Dutch traditions and language (Kiers et al., 2019; Rodenberg & Wagenaar, 2016). Given that opportunities for interethnic contact might grow because of the expected increase in ethnic diversity (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2020), it is important to examine parental attitudes towards child interethnic contact among different groups involved, and the associations with child interethnic prejudice. Therefore, the present study includes three ethnic groups in the Netherlands: White Dutch (dominant ethnic group), Turkish-Dutch (representing the Muslim underrepresented group) and Afro-Dutch (representing the Black underrepresented group).

Generally, Turkish-Dutch parents are more involved and less accepting of children's interethnic relationships than native Dutch parents, both towards the other outgroup and towards a different third group (Munniksma et al., 2011; Van Zantvliet et al., 2015). In addition, Afro-Dutch participants report less opposition to their child getting married to a native Dutch than their Turkish-Dutch counterparts, although no statistical comparisons were reported and it was unclear whether the participants actually had children (Martinović, 2013). Furthermore, parental attitudes toward child interethnic relations likely depend on the specific outgroup, based on perceived social distances, ethnic hierarchy, and religion. Research among White Dutch adults demonstrates that the Afro-Dutch underrepresented group is placed higher on the ethnic hierarchy, rated as closer to native Dutch, than the Turkish-Dutch

underrepresented group, whereas for Turkish- and Afro-Dutch adults social distances are smaller and feelings warmer towards the dominant than other underrepresented ethnic groups (e.g. Schalk-Soekar et al., 2004; Van Osch & Breugelmans, 2012; Verkuyten et al., 1996; Verkuyten & Kinket, 2000; Verkuyten & Martinović, 2016). Previously, no difference in attitudes toward child relations with individuals of either Turkish, Moroccan or Surinamese descent are found among White Dutch adults, but it was again unclear whether the participants actually had a child (Tolsma et al., 2008). Additionally, since then, the hostile public discourse towards Muslims has increased (Van Meeteren & Van Oostendorp, 2019), and attention for discrimination against Black people has grown in light of the Black Pete debate (Rodenberg & Wagenaar, 2016).

The Present Study

The present study will examine maternal attitudes toward child interethnic contact and the association to their 6-to 10-year-old children's prejudice towards different ethnic outgroups among the dominant (White Dutch) and two underrepresented ethnic groups (Turkish-Dutch and Afro-Dutch) in the Netherlands, while testing a mediating pathway through children's actual interethnic contact, based on intergroup contact theory (see Figure 1). It is expected that Turkish-Dutch mothers have less positive attitudes toward child interethnic relations than White Dutch and Afro-Dutch mothers (H1). Differences between White Dutch and Afro-Dutch mothers are explored. In addition, it is expected that White Dutch and Afro-Dutch mothers have more negative attitudes toward child relations with the Muslim outgroup than with the other outgroup (H2), and that Turkish-Dutch parents have more negative attitudes toward child interethnic relations with the Black than the native Dutch outgroup (H3). Moreover, it is expected that maternal attitudes toward child interethnic contact are negatively related to child outgroup prejudice (H4), and that this association is mediated by child outgroup contact (H5). The association between child outgroup contact and child outgroup prejudice is expected to be moderated by ethnicity, so that the association is strongest for the White Dutch and weakest for the Turkish-Dutch group (H6). Results will shed light on levels of maternal acceptance



Figure 1. Model examined in the present study.

of child interethnic contact in mothers with different ethnic backgrounds in the Netherlands, how these attitudes relate to their children's interethnic prejudice, and whether intergroup contact theory explains this association.

Method

Sample

Families were recruited through events aimed at children or the ethnic target groups, locations for children (like playgrounds), organizations aimed at the ethnic target groups, social media, researchers' networks and snowball sampling. Several inclusion criteria were used: (1) the child was between 6 and 10 years old, (2) parents were the biological parent and (3) living with the child, (4) parents did not have severe mental or physical illnesses, (5) the child did not have severe developmental disorders, and (6) families lived in the urban Western region of the Netherlands. In addition, White Dutch parents and their parents had to be born in a North-Western European country. Exceptions were made if grandparents were born in another country during a temporary stay, (grand)parents did not identify with the other cultural background, and their ethnic appearance was White. Turkish-Dutch parents had to be born in Turkey or a North-Western European country if their parents were born in Turkey. Afro-Dutch mothers, or at least one of her parents, had to be born in Surinam (identifying as Afro-Surinamese), Aruba, the Dutch Antilles, Ghana or Cape Verde. Background of the father was not a specified criterion, because romantic relationships with partners of different ethnic backgrounds are common among Afro-Dutch women (Kalmijn & Van Tubergen, 2007).

The sample consisted of 273 families, but relevant data was complete in 251 families (137 White Dutch, 69 Turkish-Dutch, 45 Afro-Dutch). Because data of fathers was missing in most of the families, they are not included in the study. Most White Dutch mothers and fathers (94%) were born in the Netherlands, whereas 35-38% of Turkish-Dutch mothers and fathers were born in the Netherlands. Of the Afro-Dutch mothers, most were born in the Netherlands (49%, of which 73% had a (mixed) Surinamese background), Surinam (29%), and the former Dutch Antilles (20%). Most of the fathers in the Afro-Dutch families were born in the Netherlands (34%), Suriname (27%), or the former Dutch Antilles (11%). The 251 participating children, 55% female, were between 6 and 10 years old (M = 7.51, SD = 0.98, see Table 1 and results section for differences between groups). Mothers were between 25 and 52 years old (M = 38.96, SD = 4.94). Most mothers were living with a partner (88%), had a high level of education (bachelor's degree/higher vocational education or higher; 64%), and were religious (57%). All Turkish-Dutch mothers were Muslim, most of the religious White Dutch and Afro-Dutch mothers were Catholic or Protestant and none were Muslim.

Table 1
Sociodemographic variables

		White Dutch *N* = 137	Turkish-Dutch *N* = 69	Afro-Dutch *N* = 45
Child gender	% female	54%	51%	67%
Child age	*M* (*SD*)	7.37 (0.88)	7.66 (1.08)	7.72 (1.08)
Mother age	*M* (*SD*)	40.05 (3.97)[a]	36.35 (4.48)[b]	39.65 (6.64)[a]
Marital status	% living with partner	93%[a]	96%[a]	60%[b]
Mother education	% higher level	83%[a]	28%[b]	62%[c]
Mother religious	% yes	29%*[a]	100%[b]	76%[c]

Note. Different superscript letters refer to significant between-group comparisons ($p < .05$).
* there was 1 missing data point.

Procedure

Families were visited at home by two researchers. After obtaining consent, several standardized parent-child interaction tasks and child tasks were administered. These tasks were videotaped to allow for post-hoc coding. In addition, parent(s) and child performed computer tasks, and the parent(s) answered some questionnaires, leading up to a total duration of 1.5-2 hours, after which the child received a small gift. The week after the visit, parents filled out an online questionnaire, after which they received a gift card. The study's procedures and methods were approved by an Ethics evaluation committee.

Measures

Child outgroup rejection. Children completed a social preference task based on work by Levy and colleagues (2005) with 12 pictures: two boys and two girls of three ethnic groups (White, Black, and Middle Eastern as an ethnic proxy of Muslim). The children in the pictures wore white t-shirts, faced the camera straight, smiled, and were placed against white backgrounds. A pilot was conducted among 74 adults (39% male, aged 18 to 53 (M = 26.96, SD = 6.91) of diverse ethnic backgrounds (31 White Dutch, 23 Turkish-Dutch, 20 Afro-Dutch). Results revealed that the White children were consistently classified as Dutch (100%), and the children of Middle Eastern descent were consistently classified as Turkish or Moroccan (90-100%), with the exception of 78% for one girl. The Black children were consistently classified as Surinamese or Caribbean (95-100%), with the exception of 34% for one boy. The two pictures that were classified 'correctly' less often were replaced with pictures of other children whose ethnicity was consistently classified correctly (95-100%), after 76% of the children had already participated. For the first set of pictures, no differences between the ethnic groups were found in terms of attractiveness, but the Black children were rated cuter (M = 6.16, SD = 1.63) than the Middle Eastern children (M = 5.93, SD = 1.49, $t(73) = 2.11$, $p = .039$). In the second set of pictures, the Black children were rated more attractive (M = 6.28, SD = 1.48) than the Middle Eastern children (M = 6.03, SD = 1.62, $t(72) = 2.47$, $p = .016$), and the Black (M = 6.02, SD =

1.65) and White children (M = 6.08, SD = 1.45) were rated cuter than the Middle Eastern children (M = 5.69, SD = 1.63, $t(73) = 3.06$, $p = .003$, $t(73) = -3.84$, $p < .001$).

The 12 pictures were presented simultaneously, and five questions were asked in a fixed order, of which two were formulated negatively: 'Who would you not like to sit next to in class? Who would you not like to invite for a play date at your house?'. The child could select one picture or select nobody. Rejection scores reflect the frequency of selecting a child of a specific ethnicity to not sit next to or play with, so that higher scores reflect more rejection (range 0-2). For each participating child two outgroup rejection scores were computed: Black and Middle Eastern rejection scores for White Dutch children, Black and White rejection scores for Turkish-Dutch children, and White and Middle Eastern rejection scores for Afro-Dutch children. The analyses testing the model (Figure 1) were run including moderation of the picture set on each path. As these moderation effects were not significant, overall results are reported.

Child outgroup contact. During the visit, mothers filled out questionnaires about the interethnic contact of their child. For several ethnic backgrounds (Dutch/Western, Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese, Antillean, Aruban, African) mothers indicated whether her child had a friend and how often they played together outside school (1 = *almost never*, 2 = *sometimes*, 3 = *often*). If a child did not have a friend of that background, the frequency of interethnic contact was scored 0 (*never*). Frequencies of contact with Turkish and Moroccan friends were combined into a Middle Eastern contact score, and frequencies of contact with Surinamese, Antillean, Aruban and African friends were combined into a Black contact score, by selecting the highest score on frequency of contact. Frequencies of contact with Dutch/Western friends formed the White contact score. For each participating child two outgroup contact scores were computed: Black and Middle Eastern contact scores for White Dutch children, Black and White contact scores for Turkish-Dutch children, and White and Middle Eastern contact scores for Afro-Dutch children. Higher scores indicate more contact (range 0-3). Using mother-reports for this construct ensured that children remained unaware of the emphasis on ethnicity.

Maternal attitudes toward child interethnic relations. Online, mothers filled out a questionnaire concerning their attitudes toward child interethnic relations, based on the 'Tolerantiebarometer' (Ipsos Belgium, 2009). Mothers indicated to what extend they would have a problem with their child (1) becoming best friends, (2) dating, (3) marrying and (4) having children with someone of a different ethnicity, on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*no problem at all*) to 5 (*a big problem*). White Dutch mothers answered these questions about Black ('with a dark skin') and Muslim individuals ('with an Islamic background'), Turkish-Dutch mothers about Black and White individuals ('with a Dutch/Western background'), and Afro-Dutch mothers about Muslim and White individuals. Scores were reverse coded and the sum was computed for each outgroup, so that higher scores reflect more positive attitudes toward children's interethnic relations (range 4-20). The internal consistency was good (for all outgroups and in all subgroups, Cronbach's $\alpha > .87$).

Sociodemographic variables. Mothers reported on sociodemographic characteristics in the screening, the interview during the visit, and the online questionnaire. Marital status was measured as (1) living with partner or (0) not, and religion was measured as (1) religious or (0) not. Maternal highest level of education was categorized in (0) lower and (1) higher level (a bachelor or master's degree at higher vocational education or university, or PhD).

Analyses

First, all main variables were examined for outliers (i.e., 3.29 *SD* below or above the mean; Field, 2005). Four outliers (two on child White rejection and two on maternal attitudes towards child interethnic relations with Black people) were winsorized (i.e., brought closer to the distribution). No multivariate outliers were identified. Due to non-normality (i.e., standardized skewness > 3) of some of the main and sociodemographic variables, the preliminary analyses are run non-parametrically. Preliminary analyses included Kruskal Wallis tests, Mann Whitney U-tests, and Wilcoxon signed-rank tests to examine differences in sociodemographic variables and child outgroup rejection and contact between and within ethnic groups. Additionally, bivariate Spearman correlations between main variables, and between sociodemographic and dependent variables (maternal attitudes and child outgroup rejection) were performed to examine potential covariates.

The main analyses start with non-parametric tests (due to non-normality) to examine between- and within-group differences in maternal attitudes toward child interethnic relations (Mann Whitney U-tests, H1; Wilcoxon signed-rank tests, H2-3). The model presented in Figure 1 (H4-6) is tested for the ethnic outgroups separately (i.e., for White rejection, Middle Eastern rejection, and Black rejection with other variables accordingly aimed at the same outgroup). Model 14 from PROCESS is used, a macro designed by Hayes, with a bootstrapping procedure set at 20,000 samplings with replacement that does not assume normality and the confidence interval (CI) set at 95% (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). Results are recognized as significant if the CI does not include zero (Hayes, 2018). Significance of moderated mediation is tested with the index of moderated mediation. In these models, the dependent variable is child outgroup rejection, the independent variable is maternal attitudes towards child interethnic relations, the mediator is child outgroup contact, and the moderator is ethnicity of the family. Because the model is run for outgroup rejection variables separately, data of two participating ethnic groups are included in each model.

A priori power analyses with G*power 3.1 (Faul et al., 2007) showed that a total sample of at least N = 27 (paired t-test) and N = 142 (independent t-test with allocation ratio 0,3 reflecting the biggest group difference) was needed to detect medium effects with a power of .80 and α set at 0.05 for H1-3. Concerning H4-6, a Monte Carlo power simulation (Shoemann et al., 2017) revealed that based on moderate expected correlations a sample size of N = 156-180 was needed to detect indirect effects, and an analysis in G*Power 3.1 showed that a total sample of N = 77 was needed to detect the moderation effect with .80 power. Our sample is thus

sufficient for most of the proposed analyses, yet might be somewhat small for the analysis of the model in Figure 1 for the White outgroup (sample of N = 114).

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Descriptive statistics of sociodemographic variables are shown in Table 1. Maternal age (H (2) = 30.24, p < .001), marital status (H (2) = 38.94, p < .001), level of education (H (2) = 61.69, p < .001), and religion (H (2) = 102.36, p <.001) differed significantly between ethnic groups. Descriptive statistics of the main variables are shown in Table 2. White rejection was higher among Afro- than Turkish-Dutch children (U = 1160, p = .006), whereas no between-group differences emerged for Middle Eastern (U = 2628, p = .090) and Black rejection (U = 4123, p = .112). Among White Dutch (Z = -4.00, p < .001) and Turkish-Dutch children (Z = -5.18, p < .001) rejection was higher towards the Black than the other outgroup, whereas no within-group difference appeared among the Afro-Dutch children (Z = 0.25, p = .801). Afro-Dutch children had more contact than Turkish-Dutch children with White friends (U = 1135, p = .010), and than White Dutch children with Middle Eastern friends (U = 2358, p = .010), whereas no between-group difference emerged for contact with Black friends (U = 4154, p = .130). Afro-Dutch children more often had contact with White than Middle Eastern friends (Z = -3.57, p < .001), whereas no significant within-group differences in outgroup contact appeared among White Dutch (Z = -1.70, p = .090) and Turkish-Dutch children (Z = 1.93, p = .054).

Bivariate correlates between the main variables are presented in Table 3. In the White Dutch and Turkish-Dutch families, child rejection scores toward both outgroups were negatively interrelated, and measures of child contact with friends from both outgroups were positively interrelated. Similarly, maternal attitudes toward child relations with both outgroups were positively interrelated in all families. In White

Table 2
Descriptive statistics main variables

	Range	White Dutch N = 137	Turkish-Dutch N = 69	Afro-Dutch N = 45
		M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)
Child rejection White	0-2	-	0.28 (0.51)	0.58 (0.66)
Child rejection Middle Eastern	0-2	0.46 (0.65)	-	0.62 (0.65)
Child rejection Black	0-2	0.92 (0.79)	1.10 (0.75)	-
Child contact White	0-3	-	1.59 (1.10)	2.13 (0.87)
Child contact Middle Eastern	0-3	0.82 (1.09)	-	1.24 (1.00)
Child contact Black	0-3	1.04 (1.15)	1.29 (1.13)	-
Mother attitudes relations White	4-20	-	12.83 (3.81)	17.22 (2.95)
Mother attitudes relations Muslim	4-20	15.12 (4.25)	-	15.60 (3.92)
Mother attitudes relations Black	4-20	18.50 (2.50)	12.88 (4.05)	-

Dutch families, maternal attitudes toward child relations with Muslim and Black individuals were positively related to child Black rejection. In Afro-Dutch families, child contact with White friends was positively related to child White rejection. All other associations were not significant (*ps* 059 - .993). Bivariate correlates between sociodemographic and dependent variables in the main analyses revealed that marital status was related to maternal attitudes toward child interactions with Muslim (ρ = -.22, p = .003) and White people (ρ = -.26, p = .005), whereas maternal age, education, and religion were related to maternal attitudes toward child interactions with Black (ρ_{age} = .34, p < .001, $\rho_{education}$ = .50, p < .001, $\rho_{religion}$ = -.49, p < .001) and White people (ρ_{age} = .31, p = .001, $\rho_{education}$ = .32, p < .001, $\rho_{religion}$ = -.35, p < .001). Furthermore, maternal age (ρ = -.16, p = .023) and child gender (ρ = .14, p = .044) were significantly associated with child Black rejection. Main analyses were performed with and without controlling for these covariates. As results were similar, results from the more parsimonious models without covariates are reported.

Table 3
Bivariate correlates between main variables

White-Dutch (*N* = 136)	1	2	3	4	5
1. Child rejection Middle Eastern					
2. Child rejection Black	-.43**				
3. Child contact Middle Eastern	.10	.04			
4. Child contact Black	-.13	-.02	.17*		
5. Maternal attitude relations Muslim	-.15	.20*	.08	.12	
6. Maternal attitudes relations Black	-.10	.17*	-.11	.15	.63**
Turkish-Dutch (*N* = 68)	1	2	3	4	5
1. Child rejection White					
2. Child rejection Black	-.37**				
3. Child contact White	-.20	-.02			
4. Child contact Black	<.01	-.13	.28*		
5. Maternal attitudes relations White	<.01	-.19	.11	.14	
6. Maternal attitudes relations Black	-.03	-.18	.06	.16	.95**
Afro-Dutch (*N* = 45)	1	2	3	4	5
1. Child rejection White					
2. Child rejection Middle Eastern	-.28				
3. Child contact White	.37*	-.19			
4. Child contact Middle Eastern	.09	.17	-.20		
5. Maternal attitudes relations White	.05	-.06	-.21	-.20	
6. Maternal attitudes relations Muslim	.05	-.01	-.10	-.06	.37*

Note. ** p <.01, * p <.05.

Main Analyses

Maternal attitudes toward child interethnic relations. Between-group differences in maternal attitudes toward child interethnic relations appeared (Figure 2, Table 2). Turkish-Dutch mothers had less positive attitudes than White-Dutch mothers regarding child interethnic relations with Black individuals (Z = -9.13, p < .001, r = -.64) and than Afro-Dutch mothers regarding child interethnic relations with White individuals (Z = -5.84, p < .001, r = -.55). White Dutch and Afro-Dutch mothers' attitudes towards child interethnic relations with Muslims did not differ significantly (Z = -0.55, p = .581, r = -.04). Within- group differences also emerged: White Dutch (Z = -8.17, p < .001, r = -0.49) and Afro-Dutch mothers (Z = -2.60, p = .009, r = 0.27) were less positive towards child interethnic relations with Muslims than with the other outgroup. There was no difference in attitudes of Turkish-Dutch mothers toward child interethnic relations with the different outgroups (Z = -0.60, p = .551, r = -0.05).

Because the items for maternal attitudes toward child interethnic relations reflect increasing levels of intimacy, we explored patterns for the items separately. In all ethnic groups and in the context of all outgroups, mothers were more positive about child interethnic friendships than about dating, marrying and having children (p_s <.001). In addition, mothers were more positive about intergroup dating than marrying (in the context of the Muslim outgroup for White Dutch, p = .021, and Afro-Dutch mothers, p = .011, and in the context of the White outgroup for Turkish-Dutch mothers, p = .012), or having children (in the context of the Black outgroup for



Figure 2. Maternal attitudes toward child interethnic relations.

Turkish-Dutch mothers, p = .003). No other significant contrasts emerged. We examined group differences again while distinguishing between friendships and romantic relationships (dating, marrying and having children combined). Between-groups results for friendships and romantic relationships were similar to the overall results. Within-group results were also consistent with overall results in White Dutch and Turkish-Dutch mothers. For Afro-Dutch mothers, attitudes toward child friendships did not differ significantly between the two outgroups (Z = -0.91, p = .366, r = -0.09).

Maternal attitudes, child contact and child rejection. For all three models (modeling White, Black, and Middle Eastern rejection), no direct effects of maternal attitudes toward child interethnic relations on child rejection appeared (Table 4), although it approached significance for Middle Eastern rejection (p = .059). Similarly, maternal attitudes toward child interethnic relations did not predict child contact in any of the models. Child contact did not predict child Black or Middle Eastern rejection and there was no moderation effect of ethnicity. For White rejection, ethnicity did moderate the association with child contact (B = 0.38, SE = 0.10, 95% CI [0.18, 0.58]), revealing a non-significant association for Turkish-Dutch children (B = -0.08, SE = 0.06, 95% CI [-0.20, 0.03]), but a significant positive association for Afro-Dutch children (B = 0.29, SE = 0.09, 95% CI [0.11, 0.48]). The indirect effect of maternal attitudes toward child interethnic relations on child rejection through child contact did not reach significance in any of the models, as did none of the moderated mediation indices (for Muslim rejection: 0.001, 95% CI [-0.005, 0.008], for Black rejection: -0.001, 95% CI [-0.009, 0.003], for White rejection: 0.02, 95% CI [-0.002, 0.04]).

Table 4

Results from PROCESS Model 14 modelling White, Black, and Middle Eastern rejection

Model	Effect	*n*	*B*	*SE*	95% CI
White rejection	Direct effect	114	0.008	0.01	-0.02, 0.04
	Indirect effect Turkish-Dutch sample	45	-0.003	0.003	-0.01, 0.001
	Indirect effect Afro-Dutch sample	69	0.01	0.008	0.002, 0.03
Black rejection	Direct effect	206	0.004	0.02	-0.03, 0.04
	Indirect effect White Dutch sample	137	-0.0001	0.001	-0.003, 0.003
	Indirect effect Turkish-Dutch sample	69	-0.001	0.003	-0.008, 0.002
Middle Eastern rejection	Direct effect	182	-0.02	0.01	-0.05, 0.001
	Indirect effect White Dutch sample	137	0.0009	0.002	-0.002, 0.005
	Indirect effect Afro-Dutch sample	45	0.002	0.003	-0.004, 0.01

Discussion

The present study examined maternal attitudes toward child interethnic contact and their association to children's prejudice towards specific outgroups among the dominant (White Dutch) and two underrepresented ethnic groups (Turkish- and Afro-Dutch) in the Netherlands, while testing a mediating pathway through children's interethnic contact based on intergroup contact theory (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Results indicated that Turkish-Dutch mothers were less positive about their children engaging in interethnic relationships than White Dutch and Afro-Dutch mothers, and that these latter two groups of mothers were specifically less positive about child relations with Muslims. These maternal attitudes, however, were not related to actual child interethnic contact or child interethnic prejudice. Results also did not support intergroup contact theory, as child contact and prejudice were either not or positively related.

Between-group differences confirmed the hypothesis that Turkish-Dutch mothers were less positive about child interethnic relations than White Dutch and Afro-Dutch mothers. These results are in line with earlier patterns among White Dutch and Turkish-Dutch parents (Munniksma et al., 2011), and extend these to attitudes toward a different outgroup (Black people). They are also in line with suggested differences between Afro- and Turkish-Dutch participants (Martinović, 2013), and extend these to mothers of young children. However, also in the Turkish-Dutch group, attitudes on average were not particularly negative, as scores were just above midpoint. Factors such as educational qualification and religion are related to levels of individuals' own intra-ethnic marriage (Van Tubergen & Maas, 2007), and religion is an important factor in parental acceptance of children's interethnic relations (Munniksma et al., 2011). Although group differences in the present study remained significant after including sociodemographic variables such as maternal education and religion, we only asked participants whether they were religious, and not how important religion is to them. It can therefore not be ruled out that religious devotion still plays a role.

In line with expectations, White Dutch and Afro-Dutch mothers had more negative attitudes toward child interethnic relations with Muslims than with the other outgroup. These results reflect patterns of perceived social distance (e.g., Schalk-Soekar et al., 2004; Van Osch & Breugelmans, 2012), and are not surprising given the negative discourse on Islam in the Netherlands (Van Meeteren & Van Oostendorp, 2019). However, as mean levels were relatively positive (i.e., around 15 in a range from 4 to 20), mothers did not strongly object to child interethnic relations. Furthermore, among Afro-Dutch mothers this difference in attitudes toward the two outgroups was not found for friendships. Perceived intergroup differences (Van Osch & Breugelmans, 2012) suggested that Turkish-Dutch mothers would be more positive toward child interethnic relations with the White than Black outgroup, but no difference emerged. In previous work measures explicitly described the background of Black outgroups ('Surinamese' and 'Antillean'; Van Osch & Breugelmans, 2012), whereas the present study measured maternal attitudes toward

the Black outgroup as a whole. Although only a small percentage of Surinamese-Dutch people identifies as Muslim (9%), this identification is very common among Somali-Dutch people (95%, Huijnk, 2018) who generally are also Black. More detailed measures of attitudes toward specific Black subpopulations might reveal deviating patterns and should thus be included in future research. Taken together, these results show that mothers on average did not object to child interethnic relations, but that attitudes on relations with Muslims and of Turkish-Dutch mothers were least favorable. Improving these attitudes could decrease social distances and increase opportunities for interethnic contact among mothers themselves, and thereby benefit cohesion in society.

Contrary to expectations, results did not demonstrate significant associations between maternal attitudes toward child interethnic relations and child outgroup prejudice. Although meta-analytical results indicate that parental and child intergroup attitudes are moderately related (Degner & Dalege, 2013), methodological moderators might explain the non-significant results. For example, associations are weaker when parental attitudes are reported by parents, and when measures are not very similar (Degner & Dalege, 2013). The fact that mothers reported their own attitudes is also a strong aspect, as children's attitudes are less likely influenced by a desire to be similar to mothers, in order to reduce cognitive dissonance (Carol, 2014). Previous work with similar measures did find an association between generalized parental attitudes toward child interethnic relations and child outgroup prejudice in White Dutch families (de Bruijn et al., 2020). Parent-child similarity seems more pronounced for generalized or common components of prejudice, as it relates to similarity in broader ideological values like right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation (Meeusen & Dhont, 2015). More general rather than specific forms of parental interethnic attitudes may also be more strongly related to specific child prejudice. Future research needs to examine both common and specific components of prejudice among families with young children of various backgrounds.

The present study unexpectedly did not find associations between maternal attitudes toward child interethnic contact and child actual contact with outgroup friends, suggesting that mothers did not turn their attitudes into behavioral strategies, or that these strategies were not effective. Mean levels of maternal attitudes were above the midpoint, indicating that on average mothers did not find children's interethnic relations problematic. As the mean scores reflect the reversed degree to which mothers would have problems, positive scores however do not necessarily reflect how important mothers find interethnic relations for their children. Therefore, mothers might not have felt the urge to restrict nor promote children's interethnic contact. In addition, parental messages tend to be more direct about dating than friendships (Edmonds & Killen, 2009). These messages might thus be more salient and influential, but are less applicable to children in the age group of the present study. Future research should ideally include a measure of maternal attitudes tapping into multiple facets of interethnic friendships and thereby focusing on the current social developmental state of their children in more detail. Furthermore, factors

moderating the association between maternal attitudes toward child interethnic relations and child outgroup contact may have been overlooked. For example, parents may act upon their attitudes more strongly if there are more opportunities for interethnic contact. Additionally, children may be more or less compliant to parental rules based on their relationship quality (Kok et al., 2013).

Child contact with outgroup friends was furthermore expected to be negatively related to child outgroup rejection, based on intergroup contact effects (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), strongest for White Dutch and weakest for Turkish-Dutch children. Support for intergroup contact theory, however, was not found (i.e., not significant for Black and Middle Eastern rejection and opposing for White rejection), contradicting the meta-analytic finding that intergroup contact has a prejudice-reducing effect in children (Tropp & Prenovost, 2008). This may be due to the use of maternal rather than child reports (e.g., Feddes et al., 2009; Turner et al., 2007), possibly evoking social desirability and hindering the detection of associations with other constructs. A strength of the measure used is that it reflects behavioral engagement with friends, which is more strongly related to attitudes than other friendship measures (Davies et al., 2011). However, possibly different factors or forms of interethnic contact play a role among different ethnic groups. Among Hispanic students in the U.S., for example, ethnic composition of the school seems just as important as interethnic friendships (Carlson et al., 2003). Moreover, possible recent conflicts with friends, which are as frequent as with other children (Hartup et al., 1988), are not captured, and negative contact can have negative effects on interethnic attitudes (Barlow et al., 2012). This could possibly explain why more contact with White friends was related to more White rejection among Afro-Dutch children. Although the direction of the association is unexpected, it partly supports the expected moderation of ethnicity: stronger effects among higher status groups, i.e., stronger for Afro- than Turkish-Dutch children based on the hierarchy according to the dominant ethnic group (Schalk-Soekar et al., 2004).

The present study has some limitations. Firstly, the pilot revealed some differences in attractiveness and cuteness of the children in the pictures. However, children in the pictures that were rated most favorably in the pilot were actually rejected most often by participating children, suggesting that attractiveness and cuteness do not explain their responses. Secondly, the number of participating fathers was too small to include them. Including both maternal and paternal attitudes would provide a more complete picture, although for child attitudes about ethnic outgroups specifically, mothers seem most important (Castelli et al., 2007; O'Bryan et al., 2004). Thirdly, the correlational design of the present study inhibits inferences about causality. Lastly, sample characteristics like the high level of maternal education hinder the generalizability of results. The recruitment method additionally might have attracted mothers with relatively positive attitudes towards the topic of ethnic diversity, possibly painting an overly optimistic picture.

In conclusion, more research on the forms, conditions and specific contexts in which intergroup contact positively impacts children's interethnic attitudes is needed, in

order to further examine the role that parents can have in this process. In the present study, maternal attitudes toward child interethnic relations on average were not very negative. However, the results suggest that specifically ethnic groups that (predominantly) identify as Muslim are at higher risk of being isolated from interethnic contact. In light of general trends of Islamophobia in the Netherlands and Europe (Abdelkader, 2017), these results stress the need for further research on how to work towards a more inclusive society for all.













Chapter 4

Ethnic Diversity in Children's Books in the Netherlands

Ymke de Bruijn, Rosanneke A. G. Emmen, Judi Mesman

Published in Early Childhood Education Journal, 2021, 49(3), 413-423.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-020-01080-2

Abstract

The present study examined the representation of authors, illustrators and characters of color in books for young children (6 years old and under) that (1) have won awards, were (2) purchased most often, and (3) borrowed most often from libraries in the Netherlands from 2009 to 2018. Factors influencing the prominence of characters were explored. In total, 64 books and 2053 characters are coded, and representation statistics are compared to statistics of the national population. Results suggest a slight underrepresentation of authors of color as compared to population statistics, and an underrepresentation of characters of color as compared to the target audience. Results on some factors influencing prominence suggest that White characters and characters of color play an equally prominent role in the books. Results on other factors, however, suggest that characters of color, especially females, are less prominent in terms of their role in the story, whether they have a name and the number of other characters in the book. The results provide an insight in ethnic diversity in popular books for young children in the Netherlands, and show some room for improvement in terms of representation and prominence of characters of color, so that children of color have more opportunities to identify with characters and readers are exposed to ethnic diversity as represented in society.

Keywords: children's literature, books for young children, ethnic diversity, representation

Books specifically aimed at young children, mostly picturebooks or books containing a lot of illustrations, lend themselves perfectly for shared book reading and discussions concerning the content. The often page-filling pictures reinforce interactive story reading between parent and child (Greenhoot et al., 2014). Reading and discussing books with characters of different ethnic backgrounds can have a positive effect on children's interethnic attitudes (Cameron, et al., 2006; Cameron et al., 2007; So, 2016). Previous studies from the United States (U.S.) report that characters and authors of color (in this paper referring to all ethnic backgrounds that are not classified as White/European) in children's literature are rare (e.g., Eisenberg, 2002; Hughes-Hassell et al., 2009; Hughes-Hassell & Cox, 2010; Koss, 2015; Koss et al., 2017). Although some studies give percentages of the representation in books and the national representation in the population (e.g., Kaltenbach, 2005; Koss, 2015; Lee, 2017), statistical comparisons are lacking, a critical step to truly make inferences about over- or underrepresentation. In addition, such studies are rarely conducted in other multicultural countries than the U.S., whereas the national context may be related to a different representation and portrayal of ethnic diversity in children's books. The present study examines the representation of characters and authors/illustrators of color in books for young children (6 years old and under) in the Netherlands as compared to population statistics, as well as the characters' prominence in the stories.

Importance of Diversity in Books for Young Children

Joint reading of books at an early age can have various benefits, such as a positive effect on language development and reading (Duursma et al., 2008; Mol & Bus, 2011). All children need characters with whom they can identify, as this may positively influence their reading motivation (Hefflin & Barksdale-Ladd, 2001), and consequently the frequency with which they will read, and ultimately their reading literacy (Becker et al., 2010). The similarity-identification hypothesis implies that it is easier to identify with characters who are similar to the reader, although it remains unclear how identification works in specific contexts (Cohen et al., 2018). A basic form of similarity is based on demographic characteristics, such as age, gender, and ethnicity. Children aged five to six years old are already able to identify themselves based on ethnicity (Byrd, 2012). Ethnically diverse characters are particularly important as children of color in the Netherlands generally show lower reading literacy (Verhoeven & Vermeer, 2006). Apart from positive effects on language and reading, being able to identify with characters might also impact children's self-development (Roethler, 1998), because characters can act as potential role models (Weitzman et al., 1972). Exposure to ethnic diversity can also affect White children. Children learn from books by transferring knowledge as demonstrated in books to the real world (Ganea et al., 2011; Ganea et al., 2008), giving books the potential to reflect cultural values and teach children about society (Weitzman et al., 1972; Barker, 2010). Welch (2016, p. 369) for example argues that not presenting ethnic diversity in children's books can contribute '... to the cultivation of racial biases and stereotypes' and obstruct '... the cultivation of compassion for others'. In line with this argumentation, research has shown that children's outgroup attitudes were

more positive after reading stories about an ingroup member being close friends with an outgroup member (Cameron et al., 2006; Cameron et al., 2007). These results support the extended contact hypothesis: being exposed to examples of friendships between in- and outgroup members results in more positive intergroup attitudes (Wright et al., 1997), although the effect seems to depend on the level and quality of direct contact (Belet, 2018; Eller et al., 2012). In addition, other research found that reading and discussing books with a multicultural theme in an educational setting resulted in five-year old children showing notions of human equality and positive attitudes towards other racial groups in group discussions and individually written texts (So, 2016). Furthermore, courses for prospective teachers in which multicultural children's books were incorporated increased their cultural awareness (Iwai, 2013) and perceived ability to teach culturally responsive (Frye et al., 2010).

Ethnic diversity in children's books can therefore not only be beneficial for identification with characters by children of color, they might also contribute to White children's, and even adults', more inclusive world views. As childhood is described as a time of learning about the world (McIntyre, 2017), and interethnic prejudice already emerges at a young age (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011), it is important to provide books containing ethnic diversity. Books aimed at young children, containing both visual and textual information and designed to be co-read and discussed with an adult, can be the perfect tool for this means.

Previous Studies on Ethnic Diversity in Children's Books

Numerous studies have examined the degree of ethnic diversity within children's books and among the authors and illustrators (e.g., Eisenberg, 2002; Hughes-Hassell & Cox, 2010; Kaltenbach, 2005; Koss, 2015; Koss et al., 2017; Lee, 2017), and performed diversity audits on library youth collections (Mortensen, 2019; Williams & Deyoe, 2014). Most of the previously studied books (76 to 94%) were created by White authors and illustrators (Eisenberg, 2002; Hughes-Hassell et al., 2009; Koss, 2015; Koss et al., 2017). Authors and illustrators can inspire children as role models, and authors and illustrators of color may be particularly suited to create books portraying characters of color accurately (Bista, 2012). Indeed, multicultural children's books were less often written by White authors (33%) compared to other children's books (94%; Eisenberg, 2002), and almost all the authors of color had written books about their own ethnic group (Hughes-Hassell et al., 2009), but the vast majority of books containing multiple ethnic groups were written and illustrated by White authors/illustrators (Hughes-Hassell & Cox, 2010).

Most of the children's books previously studied (71-90%) contained White characters (Hughes-Hassell & Cox, 2010; Kaltenbach, 2005), and included at least one White protagonist or secondary character (84%; Hughes-Hassell et al., 2009). People of color were represented in 35% of the books (Hughes-Hassell & Cox, 2010), and were included as a protagonist or secondary character in 26% of the books (Hughes-Hassell et al., 2009). In addition, in 60% of the books all characters were White, while 10% of the books included only people of color (Hughes-Hassell & Cox, 2010). To be

able to speak of over- and underrepresentation, comparisons with population statistics are needed. Doing so, Kaltenbach (2005) reports an overrepresentation of books containing African American (31%) and Asian characters (12%) among the studied Caldecott books and an underrepresentation of books containing Hispanic (less than 1%), Native American (less than 1%) and White characters (71%). In addition, statistics of books depicting White characters (66%) are not that different from U.S. population statistics (63%, Koss, 2015). However, comparisons based on the number of characters are more informative.

Studies on the protagonists in children's books have reported that the majority was White (70-78%), while percentages for other ethnicities ranged from 0 to 15% (Eisenberg, 2002; Koss, 2015; Koss et al., 2017; Lee, 2017). Comparing the representation of ethnic appearances of protagonists to the ethnic backgrounds in the target audience, in this case Texas students in grade 3-6, Lee (2017) demonstrated that while Hispanic (9%) and African American protagonists (4%) were underrepresented as compared to the target audience (53% and 13%), White protagonists (78%) were overrepresented (28% in the target audience). It was, however, not tested whether the statistics differed significantly.

Apart from ethnic appearance, other factors may be related to the degree to which children identify with characters in the book. Both gender and age are suggested to be important characteristics influencing the level of identification with a character (Chen et al., 2016). In earlier studies on ethnic diversity among characters, age of the characters was coded, but not analyzed in relation to ethnicity (Eisenberg, 2002; Kaltenbach, 2015; Koss et al., 2017). Such an association might impact how easily children can identify with characters. Similarly, although ethnicity and gender representation in children's books are sometimes researched and discussed simultaneously (Harlin & Morgan, 2009; Koss, 2015; Lee, 2017), little research has included the intersection between the two. Intersectionality suggests that using a single-axis such as gender or ethnicity to analyze experiences is not sufficient and that the intersection and interaction between these dimensions needs to be taken into account (Crenshaw, 1989). McIntyre (2017) found an association between gender and ethnicity in books that were sold most often in the U.S., but not in books selected by teachers. Likewise, Eisenberg (2002) did not find a significant interaction between gender and ethnicity. More research including the interaction between gender and race when examining representations in children's books is needed.

Content Analysis

Representation only, defined as merely being present, does not address the roles and prominence of the characters. Factors impacting prominence can be character-specific, such as the role characters have in the story, whether they have a name, whether they are shown on the cover of the book, on how many pages or pictures they are shown, or book-specific, such as the number of other characters in the book. Most previous studies on the representation of characters of color in children's books have focused specifically on protagonists (Eisenberg, 2002; Koss, 2015; Koss et al.,

2017; Lee, 2017) or did not differentiate between different levels of the role of the characters (Hughes-Hassell & Cox, 2010; Kaltenbach, 2005). As Bishop (2013) suggests that children should be exposed to seeing characters of various ethnicities in everyday contexts, not only protagonists, but also secondary characters and even background characters are of interest. Content analyses should therefore focus on all human characters, and take factors influencing the prominence of characters into account.

The Present Study

The present study is conducted in the multicultural context of the Netherlands. In the Netherlands approximately 70% of parents with a child under the age of six read to their child every day, and 20% of the parents read to their child two or three times a week (Duursma, 2014). The Dutch population consists of various cultures and ethnicities, as demonstrated by the long list of countries of birth of the Dutch population (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2019a). Furthermore, 13-20% of the population has a non-Western migration background (depending on the definition; Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2019b). For children aged 0-5 years, the target audience of books included in the present study, this percentages lies between 18 and 28% (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2019b). Considering the frequency of reported discrimination experiences by various traditionally underrepresented ethnic groups (Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau, 2014), and the young age at which ethnic prejudice seems to emerge (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011), parent-child co-reading of ethnically diverse books might be helpful in preventing interethnic prejudice in children. In the Netherlands, the *Jenny Smelik/IBBY* award has awarded children's books portraying ethnic/cultural diversity in a positive manner since 1983. In addition, various initiatives with a focus on increasing ethnic diversity in Dutch children's books have been set up in the last few years, such as *Spinzi* (2011), *Zo Ook* (2015), and *Rose Stories* (2015). There are however to our knowledge no published studies on the representation of characters of color in the context of books for young children in the Netherlands.

The main aim of the present study is to examine the representation of authors, illustrators and characters of color in books for young children (6 years old and under) in the Netherlands, similar to a diversity audit, and to compare these statistics to the Dutch population. In line with previous studies in other countries, less authors, illustrators and characters of color as compared to White authors, illustrators and characters are expected, and the authors, illustrators, and characters of color are expected to be underrepresented as compared to population statistics. The study also aims to explore other factors associated with the prominence of characters, while taking gender and age group of the characters into account. Results from the present study will provide insight in the current situation regarding ethnic diversity in books for young children in the Netherlands. These results can lead to suggestions and future directions for professionals, including authors, illustrators, and publishers, as well as costumers.

Method

Materials

When performing a content analysis on children's books, the selection of books is key. In previous research books were often selected based on their use in schools (e.g. Eisenberg, 2002; Hughes-Hassell et al., 2009), their received awards (e.g. Kaltenbach, 2015; Koss et al., 2017; Lee, 2017), library records (Poarch & Monk-Turner, 2001) or best-seller lists (Hamilton et al., 2006). Combining sources of information will give the most complete overview of books to which children are most likely exposed.

The first step of selecting the books (see Figure 1) therefore was to gather all children's books published in the Netherlands that had been (1) sold most, (2) borrowed most, and (3) received an award from 2009 until 2018, without any requirements as to (the diversity of) the content. Lists with books that were sold and borrowed most often were available from the CPNB (Stichting Collectieve Propaganda van het Nederlandse Boek, n.d.). Awards included in the selection process were *Prentenboek van het jaar*, *Kinderboekwinkelprijs, Wouter Pieterse prijs, Griffels en Penselen, IBBY Honour List, Boekensleutel, Hotze de Roos Prijs, Jenny Smelik-IBBY-Prijs* and *Prijs van de Kinderjury*. The second step was to delete all duplicates. The third step was to select books that were aimed at children of 6 years old and younger, as indicated by libraries in Amsterdam, Rotterdam and The Hague (three large cities in the Netherlands). Books labelled as AP (*A Peuter,* books aimed at toddlers) or AK (*A Kleuter,* books aimed at preschool children) were selected, as



Figure 1. Process of book selection

well as books from additional categories (e.g., informative books or poetry books) described as being aimed at children up to 6 years old. If libraries used different labels, books were selected if the majority of libraries in the three cities labelled the book as described above. The fourth step was to remove books that did not contain any human figures. After coding, but prior to the analyses, six books were excluded: one book was excluded because this large-size book contained more human characters (n = 3343) than all other books together (n = 2128) and five books were excluded because all characters in the books were coded as having an unclear ethnic appearance. Lastly, five books from the same series were treated as one book (i.e., scores in terms of representation of characters were added up), as were two books from another series, resulting in a total number of 64 analyzed books (for a list of titles, see Supplementary material A).

Procedure

Coding of the selected books started with general information on the book (publisher, number of pictures and labels of the book, for an overview of coded variables, see Supplementary material B). The label of the book could refer to a topic or genre and was based on the categorization by the Dutch libraries from which the books were borrowed (all in The Hague). Labels included were: (1) being different, (2) animals, (3) everyday life, (4) emotions, (5) family, (6) holidays/parties, (7) behavior, (8) learning, (9) body, (10) music, (11) nature, (12) on the road, (13) fairytales, (14) TV-characters, (15) friends, (16) poetry and (17) informative. For informative books, books received an additional topic categorization. If the libraries in The Hague used different labels, the label that was used most often was selected. Next, information on the authors and illustrators was coded (ethnicity, gender), based on information that was available about them online (using a combination of information from photographs, personal webpages or Wikipedia pages). A male-female dichotomy was applied, as we did not come across any information indicating other gender identities.

Finally, all human characters displayed in the book were coded, independent of whether they were discussed in the text. Animals and other objects with human characteristics were not coded. The following was coded for each human character: name, ethnic appearance, gender, age group, role in the story, representation based on number of pictures and representation on the cover. A White ethnic appearance was defined as not only a White skin color, but also a European ethnic appearance (e.g., Asian appearing characters could be drawn with a White skin color, but were not coded as White). Ethnic appearance was coded as of color if the ethnic appearance of a character was not (fully) perceived as White or European (e.g., had a darker skin tone and/or ethnic characteristics such as hair structure or eye shape that was not perceived as European), and could therefore be applied to characters with a wide variety of ethnic appearances. Unclear ethnic appearance was coded if the characters were drawn transparently (not using colors to distinguish the characters from the background), if the characters had an unnatural skin color (e.g., green), or if characters were drawn in such a position that ethnic features such as

skin color, face and hair could not be seen. The protagonist was defined as the most important character in the story. Multiple characters could be coded as protagonist, for instance when the book was about a duo. Secondary characters were defined as characters who were also mentioned in the text and contributed to the story line, but not as much as the protagonist. A background character was defined as a character who was visible in the pictures, but was not mentioned in the text and did not contribute to the story. Human characters who did not contain enough detail to code two out of three main characteristics (ethnic appearance, gender and age) were not included in the dataset. Relative representation in terms of pictures was calculated by dividing the number of pictures on which the character was presented by the total number of pictures in the book.

To assess the reliability of the coding system, two independent coders coded ten random books from the set, including 98 human characters. Interrater reliability was good for most variables (> .91 Cronbach's α for numeric variables and > .88 Cohen's κ for nominal variables), and lower for two character variables: .69 Cohen's κ for ethnic appearance and .78 Cohen's κ for representation on the cover. For this last variable, differences appeared because the coding book did not specify whether the back of the book should also be taken into account. This was therefore specified afterwards. For ethnic appearance, only 14 out of 98 characters were coded as of color, and 6 were coded as unclear. The differences in coding occurred mostly because one of the coders thought the ethnicity of the characters was not clear enough because they were drawn in the shadow. Without these 'unclear' characters, interrater reliability was .90 Cohen's κ. The two independent coders reached consensus scores for the ones that diverged, and clarified coding rules where necessary, after which one of the coders proceeded to code the rest of the books. Reliability between that coder's original coding and the consensus reliability set was above .99 (Cronbach's α) for numeric variables and above .82 (Cohen's κ) for nominal variables. Books that contained a large number of characters in the background, and books with ambiguous or unclear pictures (n = 25) were discussed with the other coder of the reliability set. If the two coders did not reach a consensus, the books (n = 4) were discussed in a bigger, ethnically diverse, research team that focuses on interethnic bias and prejudice in children to reach a final coding.

Population Statistics

Target audience. Demographics of the target audience are based on statistics about children aged 0 to 5 years old in the Netherlands in 2019 (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2019b). In accordance with the coding of ethnic appearance, percentages of White (Western) children and children of color (non-Western) in the population are calculated. Percentages of White (Western) children are based on the number of children with a Dutch and first or second generation Western migration background, and percentages of children of color (non-Western) are based on the number of children with a first or second generation non-Western migration background. Non-Western is defined as countries in Africa, Latin-America, Asia, and Turkey (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek's definition, Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, n.d.) as well

as Indonesia, Japan, and countries in Oceania (apart from Australia and New Zealand). Results are shown in Table 1 (G1-2 method). One could argue that the percentage of children of color (non-Western) might be higher in the actual population, as some children of second-generation migrant parents might also be of color. Percentages are recalculated while taking third-generation backgrounds into account (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2018b; Table 1, G1-3 method). One could argue that this percentage of children of color (non-Western) might be lower in the actual population, as not all children of second-generation non-Western migrants might be seen as of color. Therefore, the true percentages will lie somewhere in between.

General population. Demographics of the general population are also based on data from 2019 from Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, without distinguishing between age groups (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2019b). Again percentages of the White population and population of color are calculated in two ways, similar to the statistics of the target audience. Results are shown in Table 1.

Analyses

The final dataset consisted of 64 books and 2053 characters. Characters whose ethnic appearance was coded as unclear (n = 371) were excluded from analyses on the character level. After calculating descriptive statistics, the association between ethnicity of the authors and illustrators and ethnic diversity in the books was examined using Pearson Chi-Square tests. Fisher's Exact Tests are reported if the expected count in more than 20% of the cells was below five. Associations between ethnic appearance, and gender and age group of the characters were also examined using Pearson Chi-Square tests. In addition, ethnic representation among the authors, illustrators and characters was compared to population statistics using the following formulas:

$$(1)\quad p = \frac{X1+X2}{n1+n2}$$

$$(2)\quad SE = \sqrt{p(1-p)(\frac{1}{n1} + \frac{1}{n2})}$$

$$(3)\quad z = \frac{p1-p2}{SE}$$

Table 1
Population Statistics in the Netherlands

	G1-2 Method[a]		G1-3 Method[b]	
	Age 0-5	General	Age 0-5	General
White, Western	81%	84%	72%	80%
Of color, non-Western	19%	16%	28%	20%

Note. a = children of second-generation non-Western migrants are White, b = children of second-generation non-Western migrants are of color.

Furthermore, Pearson Chi-Square tests were conducted to examine the relation between ethnic appearance of the characters (White or of color) and prominence factors (role of the character, having a name, being represented on the cover). In addition, a Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to examine potential differences in representation in terms of pictures for White characters versus characters of color, as the variable was highly skewed (Z_{skew} > 3.29). These analyses were conducted separately per gender and per role of the character (protagonist, secondary, background). Moreover, books containing ethnic diversity (i.e., both White characters and characters of color) were compared to books without ethnic diversity in terms of number of characters using a Mann-Whitney U test, as the variable again was highly skewed (Z_{skew} > 3.29).

Results

Descriptive Statistics

The 64 books analyzed contained 2053 characters in total, and ethnic appearance could be coded for 1757 characters. Descriptive statistics at the book level can be found in Table 2. The books were published between 2005 and 2018. Most books were published by Querido (*n* = 12), De Eenhoorn (*n* = 10), and Gottmer (*n* = 9). Most books were labelled as containing stories about emotions (*n* = 9), fairytales (*n* = 8), or as informative (*n* = 7). These informative books were about visual arts (*n* = 3), health (*n* = 1), religion (*n* = 1), fairytales and folk tales (*n* = 1), and appearance (*n* = 1).

Representation

Diverse and non-diverse books. In 27 books (42%) all characters presented were White. In another 9 books (14%), all characters presented were either White or had an unclear ethnic appearance. Further, 28 books (44%) contained at least one human character of color, but all of these also included White characters, meaning that none of the books included only human characters of color. Most books containing both

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics at the Book Level (*N* = 64)

	Min	Max	*M*	*SD*
Year of publication	2005	2018	2013.16	3.17
Number of characters	1	182	32.08	45.94
Number of White characters	1	143	23.09	34.41
Number of characters of color	0	52	4.36	9.96
Number of pictures	8	166	25.42	25.51
Number of pages	16	174	35.55	25.63
Number of words	0	16425	1056.42	2413.94

White characters and characters of color (n = 28) were labelled as being about emotions (n = 4), informative topics (n = 4) or nature (n = 3). The informative books were about visual arts (n = 1), health (n = 1), religion (n = 1), and appearance (n = 1).

Authors and illustrators. Most books (n = 59) were written by one author, while three books were written by two authors. Two books were wordless books, and thus no author was coded. The books were written by 49 different authors, of which 49% (95% CI [0.36, 0.63]) were female and 92% (95% CI [0.81, 0.97]) were White. For 26 books, the illustrations were also made by the author. Most books (n = 62) were illustrated by one illustrator, two books were illustrated by a duo. The books were illustrated by 52 different illustrators, of which 42% (95% CI [0.30, 0.56]) were female and 90% (95% CI [0.79, 0.96]) were White. Ethnicity of the author and illustrator were not significantly related to ethnic diversity in the books (see Table 3). Comparisons between ethnic representation among authors and the general population showed that the percentage of authors of color (8%, 95% CI [0.03, 0.19]) did not significantly differ from population statistics based on G1-2 method (i.e., 16%, z = -1.42, p = .156). However, the percentage of authors of color was significantly lower than the population percentage from G1-3 method (i.e., 20%, z = -2.07, p = .038). In addition, the percentage of illustrators of color (10%, 95% CI [0.04, 0.21]) did not significantly differ from population statistics based on G1-2 method (i.e., 16%, z = -1.17, p = .242) or based on G1-3 method (i.e., 20%, z = -1.87, p = .061), although the latter comparison showed a trend towards significance.

Characters. Of the 1757 characters for whom an ethnic appearance could be coded, 84% (95% CI [0.82, 0.86]) of the characters were White and 16% (95% CI [0.14, 0.18]) were of color. Patterns were similar for protagonists (87 versus 13%), secondary characters (89 versus 11%), and background characters (83 versus 17%). There were no significant associations between ethnic appearance of the characters and age group or gender (Table 4). For both White characters and characters of color, most of the characters were adults. In terms of gender, for both White characters and characters of color, a gap between the representation of male and female characters was found. Excluding the characters coded to have an unclear gender resulted in percentages of 61% (95% CI [0.59, 0.63]) male and 39% (95% CI [0.37, 0.41]) female characters. Comparing the ethnic representation of the characters to the target

Table 3
Ethnic Diversity in Books in Relation to Author and Illustrator Ethnicity

		Non-diverse Books	Diverse Books	*p*
Ethnicity author	White	93%	92%	1.000
	Of color	7%	8%	
Ethnicity illustrator	White	90%	91%	1.000
	Of color	10%	9%	

Note. Fisher's Exact Test produces p-values only.

audience showed that the percentage of characters of color (16%) was lower than the percentage of children of color (non-Western) in the target audience (i.e., 19% based on G1-2 method, z = -2.83, p = .005, 28% based on G1-3 method, z = -11.55, p < .001).

The drawings of the characters were often not detailed enough to code specific ethnicities. Most of the characters of color were described as dark skinned (n = 155), having a slightly darker skin tone (n = 45), having an East Asian appearance (n = 35), or having an Arab appearance (n = 29). When the description 'having a slightly darker skin tone' was used, it was not clear what specific ethnicity the characters were (e.g., Arab, Latin American, bicultural), but they were perceived as not being White. In some cases, it was possible to give a more specific description based on the context given in the pictures. These descriptions included a Native American (n = 1), a Latin American (n = 3), a South Asian (n =3), a Hawaiian (n =1), and an Inuit appearance (n = 7).

Prominence

Overall analyses. Results of Pearson Chi square tests to examine the association between ethnic appearance and prominence factors are presented in Table 4. No significant associations were found between ethnic appearance and role of the character, having a name, and representation on the cover. A Mann-Whitney U test indicated that the relative representation (representation on number of pictures relative to total number of pictures in the book) was significantly higher for

Table 4
Characteristics of White Characters and Characters of Color

		White (N = 1478)	Of color (N = 279)	χ	*df*	*p*
Gender	Male	852 (58%)	164 (59%)	0.20	2	.906
	Female	550 (37%)	100 (36%)			
	Unclear	76 (5%)	15 (5%)			
Age group	Child	390 (26%)	82 (29%)	2.07	4	.723
	Teenager	13 (1%)	3 (1%)			
	Adult	1028 (70%)	186 (67%)			
	Elderly	31 (2%)	4 (1%)			
	Unclear	15 (1%)	4 (1%)			
Role	Protagonist	95 (6%)	14 (5%)	5.15	2	.076
	Secondary	196 (13%)	25 (9%)			
	Background	1187 (80%)	240 (86%)			
Name	Yes	142 (10%)	19 (6%)	2.21	1	.137
Rep cover	Yes	79 (5%)	15 (5%)	0.00	1	.985

Note. Rep = representation.

characters of color (*Mdn* = .07) than for White characters (*Mdn* = .05, *U* = 190319.50, *p* = .039). Furthermore, another Mann-Whitney U test revealed that books containing ethnic diversity had significantly more characters (*Mdn* = 30) than books without ethnic diversity (*Mdn* = 4; *U* = 139.00, *p* < .001).

Gender analyses. Male and female characters were also analyzed separately. Results of Pearson Chi square tests showed no significant associations between ethnic appearance and having a name, or being represented on the cover for males and females separately. For role of the character, there was no significant association with ethnic appearance for males, but there was for females (χ^2 (2, *N* = 650) = 6.33, *p* = .042). Female characters of color were more likely to be background characters (90%) than White female characters (79%, χ^2 (1, *N* = 650) = 5.45, *p* = .020, OR 2.22, 95% CI [1.12, 4.42]). In addition, A Mann-Whitney U test showed no significant difference in relative representation on pictures between White males or females and males or females of color.

Analyses per role of the character. Similar tests were conducted for protagonists, secondary and background characters separately. Results of Pearson Chi square tests showed no significant associations between ethnic appearance and representation on the cover for the different types of roles. Although there were no significant associations between ethnic appearance and having a name for secondary and background characters, there was for protagonists (χ^2 (1, *N* = 109) = 4.89, *p* = .027, OR 0.27, 95% CI [0.08, 0.91]). Protagonists of color were less likely to have a name (29%) than White protagonists (60%). In addition, while Mann-Whitney U tests showed no significant differences between protagonist and secondary White characters and characters of color, the relative representation in terms of pictures was significantly higher for background characters of color (*Mdn* = .07) than for White background characters (*Mdn* = .05, *U* = 116209.50, *p* < .001).

Discussion

The present study aimed to provide more insight in the ethnic diversity of characters, authors, and illustrators of books for young children (6 years old or under) in the Netherlands that (1) have won awards, (2) were purchased most often, and (3) were borrowed most often from libraries, in the Netherlands from 2009 to 2018. Following multiple studies in the U.S., the present study sheds light on books to which children are likely to be exposed in another multicultural national context. Results do not suggest a strong underrepresentation of authors and illustrators of color as compared to population statistics. In contrast, as compared to the target audience (i.e., young children in the Dutch population), characters of color are more clearly underrepresented. In terms of factors influencing prominence, some contrasts suggest that White characters and characters of color play an equally prominent role in the book. Other contrasts, however, indicate less prominence of characters of color, especially females, in terms of their role in the story, whether they have a name and the number of other characters in the book.

Results of the present study reveal that 8% of the authors and 10% of the illustrators are of color, as expected based on previous studies reporting higher percentages of White authors and illustrators (Eisenberg, 2002; Hughes-Hassell et al., 2009; Koss, 2015; Koss et al., 2017). These percentages show an underrepresentation of authors and illustrators of color to some extent (only in comparison to the population when taking third generation backgrounds into account, and for illustrators the result only showed a trend towards significance), and are thus less extreme than expected. There was no association between ethnicity of the authors/illustrators and the presence of characters of color in books. Previous studies suggested that especially books featuring one ethnic group of color were more often created by professionals of color (Hughes-Hassell et al., 2009; Hughes-Hassell & Cox, 2010). The set for analysis in this study, however, did not include any books that featured characters of color only. Future research will need to replicate these results in larger samples. Professionals of color might be in a specifically good position to create books about characters of color in a culturally authentic manner (Bista, 2012), without stereotypes and depicting accurate cultural values and details (Yoo-Lee et al., 2014).

In addition, the majority of the characters were White (84%), as expected based on previous studies reporting lower numbers of characters of color than White characters (Eisenberg, 2002; Hughes-Hassell & Cox, 2010; Kaltenbach, 2005; Koss, 2015; Koss et al., 2017; Lee, 2017). The gap between White characters and characters of color was largest for protagonists and secondary characters, and smaller for background characters. In line with previous research (Lee, 2017), comparisons with the target audience (aged 0 to 5 years old; 19-28% of color), show an underrepresentation of characters of color (16%). Kaltenbach (2005), in contrast, found an overrepresentation of books containing African American and Asian characters and an underrepresentation of books containing White characters. This study focused on numbers of books and not numbers of characters within those books, and results are therefore not directly comparable.

Results from the present study suggest that children of color in the Netherlands have less opportunities to be exposed to characters more similar to them in terms of ethnic appearance than White children, which might have an impact on their reading motivation and self-development (Hefflin & Barksdale-Ladd, 2001; Roethler, 1998). As the degree of ethnic diversity in books for young children in the Netherlands is lower than in society, they do not seem to use their full potential in terms of teaching children about society (Weitzman et al., 1972, Barker, 2010), and providing pathways to more positive intergroup attitudes (Cameron et al., 2006; Cameron et al., 2007; So, 2016). To establish these effects, however, merely the representation of characters of color in books for young children might not be sufficient, but examples of friendships between in- and outgroup members (Cameron et al., 2006; Cameron et al., 2007) or a multicultural theme (Frye et al., 2010; Iwai, 2013; So, 2016) might be needed. However, it is safe to say that when fewer characters of color are represented, chances are smaller that books contain examples of extended contact or focus on a multicultural theme inviting (co-)readers to start discussions.

Gender and age were explored as other identity salient factors in the present study (Chen et al., 2016). No age or gender differences between White characters and characters of color were found, suggesting that based on the similarity-identification hypothesis (Cohen et al., 2018), it is not more difficult for children to identify with either White characters or characters of color in the studied books based on the characters' gender or age. These results are line with previous studies reporting no significant interaction between gender and ethnicity (Eisenberg, 2002; McIntyre, 2017). Methods of book selection seem to make a difference, as McIntyre (2017) reports no association in books selected by teachers, but a significant association in books selected based on sale numbers. Although gender representation and gender stereotypes are beyond the scope of the present study, it is important to note that the results do show a clear underrepresentation of female characters (39%). These findings are in line with earlier studies on gender representation among protagonists in children's books (e.g., Hamilton et al., 2006; Koss, 2015), and highlight the need for diversity in children's books beyond ethnicity. Among authors and illustrators in this study, on the contrary, an approximately equal gender distribution is found, suggesting that both boys and girls have role models in these professions to look up to.

In addition, the present study showed that ethnic appearance of the characters was not related to being represented on the cover, but protagonists of color were less likely to have a name than White protagonists. In contrast, characters of color were represented on a relatively higher number of pictures than White characters. This difference, however, was only found for background characters in the books, who do not play a meaningful role in the story. Furthermore, ethnic appearance was not related to role of the characters in general, but an association was found for the female characters: female characters of color were more likely to be background characters than expected. These results highlight the need for intersectionality in studies focusing on race (Crenshaw, 1989), as especially female characters of color seem to be devalued in terms of the role they play.

Secondly, factors influencing the prominence of characters can be book-specific, such as the number of other characters surrounding them. While 42% of the books contained only White characters, there were no books containing only characters of color. The results show that ethnically diverse books included more human characters than books without diversity. Characters in diverse books, the only books in which characters of color are included, will therefore generally play a less prominent role based on the number of other characters surrounding them than characters in non-diverse books. Although not all comparisons on prominence factors revealed unfavorable results for characters of color, the significant contrasts show that there is room to improve the prominence of characters of color.

Several limitations of this study should be noted. Firstly, the two coders of the present study were both White. Although the coders consulted a bigger, ethnically diverse, research team if they did not reach a consensus, bias based on experience with and exposure to other groups (i.e., their propriospect) might be present in codings on

which they agreed (Hughes-Hassell et al., 2009; Wolcott, 1991). Secondly, the ethnicity of the characters is based on drawings, because explicit mentions of ethnicity, cultural background or nationality were scarce (only 1% of the cases). Drawings are often not very detailed, making it difficult to determine specific ethnic or cultural backgrounds, so that the characters could only be analyzed in general terms of White and of color (or unclear). More specific information on the representation of various ethnic groups of color would provide an even clearer picture of ethnic diversity in books for young children.

Future research will need to more closely examine the ways in which characters are portrayed. Although the present study has already looked beyond the mere numbers of representation and examined aspects promoting prominence, a qualitative examination of the characters would provide insight in the quality of the representation and their cultural authenticity (Yoo-Lee et al., 2014). A qualitative approach could also examine the messages that are conveyed in the books and the role that culture or ethnicity plays. This information could be used to identify the nature of books including ethnic diversity: socially conscious books (those that deal with racial conflicts), melting pot books (those that do not emphasize any cultural issues or contexts), or culturally conscious books (those that do pay attention to cultural contexts; Bishop, 2012).

The present study adds to existing literature by examining books for young children (6 years old and under) in the Netherlands, by using multiple sources of information in the book selection process, and by focusing not only on numbers of representation but also on factors influencing prominence. Results from the present study suggest that there is a slight underrepresentation of authors of color, and room for improvement in terms of representation and prominence of characters of color, especially females, in books for young children in the Netherlands. Improvements will provide more opportunities for children of color to identify with characters and for White children to get familiar with ethnic diversity as also represented in society. Professionals such as publishers, authors and illustrators, as well as consumers, such as parents and other co-readers, should be aware of the current situation regarding ethnic diversity and take this information into account whenever deciding to publish, write, illustrate, or read a new book.













Chapter 5

Navigating Diversity: Maternal Ideologies and Associations with Child Interethnic Prejudice in the Netherlands

Ymke de Bruijn, Rosanneke A.G. Emmen, Judi Mesman

An adapted version of this chapter is currently in press at Social Development.

Abstract

Parental diversity ideologies are linked to their own interethnic prejudice, but how do they relate to children's prejudice? This study examined self-reported endorsement of colorblindness and multiculturalism among mothers (138 White Dutch, 65 Turkish-Dutch and 45 Afro-Dutch) of 6-to 10-year old children (55% girls), and its association with child interethnic prejudice. Endorsement of multiculturalism was lowest among White Dutch mothers, and endorsement of colorblindness was lowest among Afro-Dutch mothers. Maternal endorsement of multiculturalism was negatively related to child outgroup prejudice among White Dutch families, and results suggest no or opposite associations for colorblindness. Future research should explore what parenting based on these ideologies looks like, but the present study points parents in the direction of a multicultural, rather than colorblind, approach.

Keywords: children, interethnic prejudice, parents, diversity ideologies, colorblindness, multiculturalism

Although one frequently made suggestion to reduce bias in children is parent-child discussions about race and racism (Scott et al., 2020), parents, especially from dominant ethnic groups, are often reluctant to engage in these discussions (Pahlke et al., 2012; Vittrup & Holden, 2011). Parents might differ in their willingness to discuss these topics based on their diversity ideologies, such as colorblindness and multiculturalism, advocating different approaches regarding the emphasis that should be put on differences between ethnic groups (Rattan & Ambady, 2013). Within adults, multiculturalism seems to be more strongly related to lower levels of ethnic prejudice than colorblindness (Leslie et al., 2020; Whitley & Webster, 2019), but few studies have focused on the transfer effects of parental ideologies to interethnic prejudice in children. In addition, national context and group status are important factors related to diversity ideologies and associations with interethnic prejudice (e.g., Leslie et al., 2020; Whitley & Webster, 2019), highlighting the need for research in previously left-out populations. Whereas there is some research in the Netherlands on diversity ideologies among native Dutch and Turkish-Dutch people (e.g., Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2003; Verkuyten, 2005), the Afro-Dutch community and parent-child transfer effects have to our knowledge not yet been studied. Therefore, the present study examines endorsement of colorblindness and multiculturalism in White Dutch, Turkish-Dutch, and Afro-Dutch mothers, and its association to child interethnic prejudice.

Colorblindness and multiculturalism are two commonly studied diversity ideologies (i.e., beliefs about how diversity and demographic differences in society should be approached, Leslie et al., 2020; Rattan & Ambady, 2013). Colorblindness refers to beliefs that prejudice stems from emphasis on social categories like ethnicity or race, and that racial bias can be prevented by not noticing race (Apfelbaum et al., 2012; Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). However, others describe colorblind attitudes as denial or unawareness of racial dynamics (Neville et al., 2000), and a form of racism in itself (Neville et al., 2013). Multiculturalism, on the other hand, refers to beliefs that differences in ethnicity and skin color deserve attention and should be valued (Rattan & Ambady, 2013), and that creating knowledge and appreciation for differences improves interethnic attitudes (Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). Others describe multicultural ideology as endorsement of cultural diversity in society, while maintaining and sharing cultures (Berry & Kalin, 1995). Stronger endorsement of multiculturalism is found in members of underrepresented than dominant ethnic groups (e.g., Ryan et al., 2010; Wolsko et al., 2006). Opposite patterns are sometimes found for endorsement of colorblindness (Ryan et al., 2007), but group differences are not always found (Rosenthal & Levy, 2012; Ryan et al., 2010).

Although both colorblindness and multiculturalism are based on arguments to improve interethnic relations, colorblindness is associated with more negative behaviors of members of dominant ethnic groups in interethnic interactions (Apfelbaum, Sommers, et al., 2008; Holoien & Shelton, 2012; Norton et al., 2006; Vorauer et al., 2009), and less positive effects on members of underrepresented ethnic groups than multiculturalism (Birnbaum et al., 2020; Holoien & Shelton, 2012; Plaut et al., 2009; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008). In contrast, multiculturalism can also

have negative effects: it is associated with increased stereotyping (Wolsko et al., 2000), and racial essentialism, i.e., beliefs that group differences are biologically based and fixed (Wilton et al., 2019). The association between diversity ideologies and different aspects of interethnic relations is therefore not straightforward, and needs to be studied in detail. Prejudice, the affective component of interethnic relations, generally refers to negative attitudes towards or evaluations of (a member of) a group (Stangor, 2016), and is studied in the context of colorblind and multicultural ideologies most frequently (Leslie et al., 2020). Meta-analytic results show that both multiculturalism and colorblindness are negatively related to explicit prejudice, but that the association with multiculturalism is stronger (Leslie et al., 2020; Whitley & Webster, 2019). In addition, although the association between multiculturalism and prejudice is present in dominant and marginalized groups, it is stronger for the dominant group, while there are no group differences for the association between prejudice and colorblindness (Leslie et al., 2020).

Exposure to diversity ideologies might also affect interethnic attitudes of children. Being exposed to a colorblind ideology at school as compared to multiculturalism, for example, results in children being less aware of discrimination (Apfelbaum et al., 2010). Similarly, various forms of multicultural education are related to more positive interethnic attitudes among Dutch children (Verkuyten & Thijs, 2013). Parents can expose their children to diversity ideologies through socialization and their engagement in explicit discussions. Parental discussions about race, in contrast to colorblind parental behaviors, seem to have positive effects on outgroup attitudes of White children (Perry et al., 2020; Perry, Skinner-Dorkenoo et al., 2021; Vittrup & Holden, 2011). Parental diversity ideologies might also affect children in more implicit and subtle ways. For example, colorblindness is related to more negative interactions with members from underrepresented groups among people from the dominant ethnic group (Holoien & Shelton, 2012; Vorauer, et al., 2009), also in terms of nonverbal behaviors (Norton et al., 2006; Apfelbaum, Sommers, et al., 2008). Children seem especially sensitive to these nonverbal behaviors of adults in interracial interactions (Castelli et al., 2008), and thus might also pick up on the ideologies underlying these behaviors. Children also seem sensitive to normative pressure, although evidence mostly comes from the United States (U.S.). Studies conducted there demonstrate that both White children (Apfelbaum, Pauker, et al., 2008) and children of color (Pauker et al., 2015) between 9 and 12 years old show the behavioral tendency not to acknowledge race, in line with colorblind behavior as frequently observed in adults (Apfelbaum, Sommers, et al., 2008; Norton et al., 2006). This line of thought matches with the social learning branch of theoretical approaches that tries to explain the development of interethnic prejudice in children, focusing specifically on the role of other people from whom children learn (see Levy & Hughes, 2009). Together the available research suggests that compared to parental endorsement of the colorblind ideology, parental endorsement of the multicultural ideology is associated with less prejudice among children, yet direct examinations of these associations are scarce and diversity in samples studied is limited.

Children already notice differences between people with different ethnic appearances and develop a preference for faces from their own ethnic group as very young infants (i.e., 3 months old; Kelly et al., 2005; Kelly et al., 2008). In addition, differences in explicit attitudes towards ethnic in- and outgroups and levels of implicit, less consciously activated, bias towards outgroups are found in White children in young age groups (e.g., 3-6 years old, Ramsey, 1991; Dunham et al., 2008). Although there is less research on children from underrepresented groups, similar reports of explicit and implicit bias towards other underrepresented groups have been found (Dunham et al., 2007). Meta-analytic results show a developmental path consisting of an increase in prejudice against lower status outgroups between early (2-4 years) and middle childhood (5-7 years), followed by a slight decrease towards late childhood (8-10 years), while prejudice against higher status outgroups stays equal between early and middle childhood, and increases towards late childhood (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011). Specifically in the period between middle and late childhood developmental paths show most variance (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011), suggesting that social and environmental influences, for instance exposure to parental diversity ideologies, are particularly important for children in this age group.

When studying (parental) diversity ideologies and associations with (child) interethnic prejudice, sensitivity to the population and the context is highly needed. The association between colorblindness and prejudice has been predominantly studied in the U.S., while the negative association between multiculturalism and prejudice is actually stronger outside the U.S. (Whitley & Webster, 2019). In addition, as diversity ideologies may be differently associated with prejudice between various groups within a population (Leslie et al., 2020), investigations in different populations and groups are needed. The Netherlands provides an interesting context for this type of research, as ethnic diversity is increasing (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2020), and problems in terms of interpersonal and institutionalized racism are identified, yet argued to be ignored or even denied (Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau, 2020; Weiner, 2014). Although behavioral colorblindness in terms of denying or silencing racism has been described as a common societal pattern (Hondius, 2014; Weiner, 2014), empirical studies on the endorsement of colorblindness in individuals in the Netherlands are lacking.

Studies on diversity ideologies in the Netherlands have thus far focused on multiculturalism, mostly among White Dutch and Turkish-Dutch, and to a lesser extent Moroccan-Dutch, participants. These studies showed that multiculturalism is more strongly endorsed among members of underrepresented ethnic groups (e.g., Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2003; Verkuyten, 2005; Verkuyten & Martinović, 2006), and that, consistent with meta-analytic conclusions (Leslie et al., 2020), multiculturalism is negatively associated with negative intergroup attitudes and prejudice in the dominant ethnic group (e.g., Vedder et al., 2016; Verkuyten, 2005; Velasco González et al., 2008). In contrast to meta-analytic results (Leslie et al., 2020), no significant associations between multiculturalism and outgroup attitudes were found in underrepresented ethnic groups (Vedder et al., 2016, Verkuyten, 2005). The positive association with ingroup evaluations among Turkish-Dutch participants

suggests that multiculturalism is associated with improved attitudes towards underrepresented groups only (Verkuyten, 2005). Other underrepresented ethnic groups in the Netherlands, however, have received little attention in previous research. Specifically research on the Black Dutch population (referred to as Afro-Dutch in the present study) is missing. While the Turkish-Dutch population makes up 2.4% of the Dutch population, 3.1% of the Dutch population has a Surinamese or Antillean background (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2021a), highlighting the need for inclusion of Afro-Dutch people in research on diversity and interethnic relations. In addition, whereas there is evidence of interethnic prejudice among children in the Netherlands (de Bruijn et al., 2020; Verkuyten & Kinket, 2000), to our knowledge no research has previously linked these to parental diversity ideologies.

The Present Study

The present study examines endorsement of colorblindness and multiculturalism among mothers in the Netherlands and its association with child outgroup prejudice, in three ethnic groups: White Dutch (representing the dominant ethnic group), Turkish-Dutch (representing the largest predominantly Muslim underrepresented groups) and Afro-Dutch (representing the Black underrepresented group). It is expected that (1) endorsement of multiculturalism is higher among Turkish- and Afro-Dutch mothers than White Dutch mothers. The difference in endorsement of colorblindness and differences between mothers from the underrepresented ethnic groups will be explored. In addition, it is expected that (2) maternal colorblindness and (3) multiculturalism are negatively related to child outgroup prejudice, that (4) multiculturalism is more strongly negatively related to child outgroup prejudice than colorblindness, and that (5) ethnicity moderates the association between multiculturalism and child outgroup prejudice, so that the association is strongest for the dominant ethnic group. Analyses of the associations between maternal ideologies and child prejudice towards underrepresented outgroups only (so excluding the White outgroup for Turkish- and Afro-Dutch children) are exploratory. Results will provide insights in the current endorsement of diversity ideologies among mothers in different ethnic groups in the Netherlands, and how endorsement of these ideologies relates to interethnic prejudice of their children.

Method

Sample

Families were recruited at locations, events, or through organizations aimed at children or the included ethnic groups, through social media, through the network of researchers, and with the snowball procedure. Participation of mothers was a criterion, participation of fathers was optional. Other inclusion criteria were: (1) the child was between 6 and 10 years old, (2) parents were the biological parents, (3) participating parents lived with the child, (4) parents did not have severe mental or physical illnesses, (5) children did not have severe developmental disorders such as autism, and (6) families lived in the urban Western region of the Netherlands. Other

inclusion criteria were: (1) White Dutch families: parents and their parents were born in a North-Western European country, (2) Turkish-Dutch families: parents were born in Turkey or in a North-Western European country if their parents were born in Turkey, (3) Afro-Dutch families: the mother, or at least one of her parents, was born in Surinam (identifying as Afro-Surinamese), Aruba, the Dutch Antilles, Ghana or Cape Verde. Background of the father was not a criterion for Afro-Dutch families, because interethnic romantic relationships are common among Afro-Dutch women (Kalmijn & Tubergen, 2007). Exceptions for White Dutch families were made if (grand)parents were born in another country during a temporary stay, did not identify with that cultural background, and the ethnic appearance of parents was White.

The sample originally consisted of 273 families, yet data from mother and child were complete in 252 families (138 White Dutch, 66 Turkish-Dutch and 48 Afro-Dutch). Because data from fathers were missing in most families (62%), fathers are not included in the present study. Most of the White Dutch parents were born in the Netherlands (94% of mothers and fathers), whereas most of the Turkish-Dutch parents were born in Turkey (59% of mothers and 65% of fathers). Almost half of the Afro-Dutch mothers were born in the Netherlands (48%), others were born in Suriname (29%), the former Dutch Antilles (21%) or Cape Verde (2%). Most of the fathers in the Afro-Dutch families were born in the Netherlands (33%), Suriname (28%), or the former Dutch Antilles (11%). The 252 participating children (56% female) aged between 6 and 10 years old (M = 7.53, SD = 0.99), mothers aged between 25 and 52 years old (M = 38.86, SD = 5.01). Demographics per ethnic group can be found in Table 1. Most of the mothers were living with a partner (86%), were highly educated (bachelor's degree/higher vocational education or higher, 65%) and were religious (57%).

Procedure

Two researchers visited the participating families at home for 1.5 to 2 hours, during which several standardized parent-child interaction and child tasks were conducted and videotaped to allow for post hoc coding. Both parents and child also performed several computer tasks, and parents answered some questionnaires. The child received a small gift at the end of the visit. Parents received a gift card of 20 euros, after they filled out an online questionnaire that was sent to them after the visit. Turkish-Dutch parents had the option to answer all questionnaires and receive instructions in Dutch or Turkish. The study's procedures and methods were approved by an Ethics committee.

Measures

Maternal endorsement of colorblindness. Mothers completed a selection of items from the Color-Blind Racial Attitude Scale in the online questionnaire after the visit (Neville et al., 2000). Items that loaded above .60 on one of the three factors

Table 1
Descriptives of sociodemographic and main variables

		White Dutch *N* = 138	Turkish-Dutch *N* = 65	Afro-Dutch *N* = 45
C gender	% female	54%	49%	67%
C age	*M* (*SD*)	7.37 (0.88)	7.66 (1.08)	7.76 (1.08)
M age	*M* (*SD*)	39.93 (4.09)[a]	36.18 (4.45)[b]	39.74 (6.36)[a]
M education	% higher level	83%[a]	28%[b]	64%[c]
M religion	% yes	29%[a*]	100%	76%[b]
M marital status	% living with partner	92%[a]	95%[a]	60%[b]
M colorblindness	*M* (*SD*)	2.73 (0.52)[a]	2.87 (0.46)[a]	2.14 (0.53)[b]
M multiculturalism	*M* (*SD*)	4.77 (0.83)[a]	5.07 (0.78)[b]	5.49 (0.79)[c]
C overall outgroup prejudice	*M* (*SD*)	-0.55 (2.12)	-0.46 (1.78)	-1.33 (1.61)
C underrepresented outgroup prejudice	*M* (*SD*)	-0.55 (2.12)[a]	0.68 (2.49)[b]	-0.52 (2.41)[a]

Note. C = child. M = maternal. Different superscript letters refer to significant between-group comparisons. * there was 1 missing data point on this variable in this group.

(unawareness of racial privilege, institutional discrimination, and blatant racial issues) reported by Neville et al. (2000) were selected for the questionnaire. To better fit the Dutch context, one item was excluded ('Race plays a major role in the type of social services (such as type of health care or day care) that people receive'), and one item was adapted ('Dutch should be the only *spoken* language', rather than official language). This resulted in a total of twelve items, with answer options ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Six reverse items were recoded, with higher scores reflecting stronger endorsement of colorblindness. Based on negative inter-item correlations and Cronbach's alpha statistics, three items were excluded, resulting in nine items in total (four on racial privilege, three on institutional discrimination, and two on blatant racial issues). Scores were summed and averaged, so that scores could range from 1 to 5. Reliability was acceptable overall, and for White Dutch and Afro-Dutch mothers (Cronbach's $\alpha > .75$). For Turkish-Dutch mothers, reliability was somewhat lower (Cronbach's $\alpha = .64$).

Maternal endorsement of multiculturalism. Mothers completed the Dutch Multiculturalism Ideology Scale in the online questionnaire after the visit (Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2003), which is based on the Canadian Multiculturalism Ideology Scale measuring support for a culturally diverse society (Berry & Kalin, 1995). Eight items were selected in accordance with the scale analysis among Dutch and Turkish-Dutch participants (Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2003), including for example the item 'A society that has a variety of cultural groups is more able to tackle new problems as they occur'. Answer option ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Three reverse items were recoded, with higher scores reflecting

stronger endorsement of multiculturalism. Based on negative inter-item correlations and Cronbach's alpha statistics, one item was excluded. Scores on the remaining seven items were summed and averaged, so that scores could range from 1 to 7. Reliability was acceptable overall, and for White Dutch and Afro-Dutch mothers (Cronbach's $\alpha > .75$). Reliability was somewhat lower for Turkish-Dutch mothers (Cronbach's $\alpha = .66$).

Child outgroup prejudice. Children completed a social attributions task, adapted from the Multi-Response Racial Attitude Measure (MRA; Doyle & Aboud, 1995). Children were presented with six envelopes with pictures of children (three boys and three girls, White, Black, and Middle Eastern) and one with a picture of a trash bin. Children in the pictures wore white t-shirts, were placed against a white background, smiled, and faced the camera straight. Results from a pilot among 74 adults (39% male), aged 18 to 53 ($M = 26.96$, $SD = 6.91$) of diverse ethnic backgrounds (31 White Dutch, 23 Turkish-Dutch, 20 Afro-Dutch), demonstrated that the Black children in the pictures were classified as Surinamese or Caribbean by 92-96% of the participants. The children of Middle Eastern descent were classified as Turkish or Moroccan by 95-96%, and the White children were classified as Dutch by all (100%) of the participants. No differences between the ethnic groups of the children in the pictures were found in terms of rated attractiveness ($p > .05$), but the children of Middle Eastern descent were rated less cute ($M = 6.09$, $SD = 1.70$) than the Black ($M = 6.51$, $SD = 1.39$, $t(72) = 3.56$, $p = .001$) and White children ($M = 6.72$, $SD = 1.38$, $t(72) = -4.42$, $p < .001$).

Participating children put cards with attributes in the envelopes of the children they applied to according to them, and remaining cards in the trash bin-envelope. Ten attributes were included: five positive and five negative (e.g., sweet, kind, stupid, annoying). Children received six cards of each attribute and could give it to as few or many children as they wanted (ranging from nobody to all). For each ethnic group in the pictures, a prejudice score was calculated by subtracting the number of positive from the number of negative attributes, similar to procedures by Rutland, Cameron, Milne et al. (2005), and dividing the score by 2 (as there were two pictures of children in each ethnic group). Overall outgroup prejudice was determined by averaging the prejudice scores of the two included ethnic outgroups: Black and Middle Eastern prejudice scores for the White Dutch participating children, Black and White prejudice scores for the Turkish-Dutch participating children, and Middle Eastern and White prejudice scores for the Afro-Dutch participating children. A second outgroup prejudice score was calculated while including prejudice towards underrepresented ethnic groups only (referred to as child underrepresented outgroup prejudice). This second score was similar to the first for White Dutch participating children, but consisted of Black or Middle Eastern prejudice only for Turkish- and Afro-Dutch children. Outgroup prejudice scores could range from -5 (very favorable) to 5 (very unfavorable).

Sociodemographic variables. Parents reported on sociodemographic variables in the screening, questionnaire during the visit and online questionnaire. Gender of child was dichotomized as (0) male or (1) female (no parents reported differently),

maternal level of education as (0) lower or (1) higher (bachelor or master's degree at higher vocational education or university, or PhD), and maternal marital status as (1) living with a partner or (0) not.

Analyses

Main variables were examined for outliers in the three ethnic groups separately. Two outliers on maternal multiculturalism, defined as 3.29 SD above or below the mean (Field, 2005), were winsorized (i.e., brought closer to the rest of the distribution), after which the main variables had a normal distribution. Four multivariate outliers were identified based on Mahalonobis distances, and excluded from further analyses, resulting in a total sample of N = 248 (138 White Dutch, 65 Turkish-Dutch, 45 Afro-Dutch). Preliminary analyses to examine group differences include Kruskal Wallis tests (for sociodemographic variables due to skewness) and analyses of variance (ANOVA's, for child outgroup prejudice scores). Furthermore, bivariate correlations between main variables (Pearson), and bivariate correlations between sociodemographic variables and main variables (Spearman) are examined.

Main analyses include a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to examine group differences on maternal colorblindness and multiculturalism. A multivariate analysis of covariance is run to control for covariates based on associations between sociodemographic and dependent variables. After, multiple regression analyses including relevant covariates and maternal multiculturalism and colorblindness as independent variables and child overall outgroup prejudice as dependent variable are run for the ethnic groups separately and in the overall sample, followed by similar exploratory analyses predicting child underrepresented outgroup prejudice. Next, hierarchical multiple regression analyses are conducted to examine the moderating effect of ethnicity on the association between maternal multiculturalism and child outgroup prejudice. Dummy variables for ethnicity were created, predictors were centered and interaction terms between dummy variables and maternal multiculturalism were created. Child overall outgroup prejudice was entered as dependent variable, and independent variables were entered in steps: covariates based on associations between sociodemographic variables and the dependent variable (step 1), maternal colorblindness and maternal multiculturalism (step 2), dummy variable for ethnicity (step 3), interaction term (step 4). These analyses are run three times, including two ethnic group and one dummy variable for ethnicity at a time. This approach will ensure direct comparisons of the association between maternal multiculturalism and child outgroup prejudice between all ethnic groups. The exploratory analyses include similar hierarchical multiple regression analyses with child underrepresented outgroup prejudice as dependent variable. A priori power analyses using G*Power 3.1 (Faul et al., 2007) showed that a sample size of at least N = 99 (MANOVA), N = 68 (regression analyses without interaction) and N = 85 (regression analysis with interaction) was needed to detect medium effects with a power of 0.80 and α set at 0.05, and thus that our overall sample size (N = 248) was sufficient, yet that the Turkish-Dutch (n = 65) and Afro-Dutch (n = 45) subgroups were somewhat small for some of the analyses.

Results

Preliminary analyses

Table 1 shows socio-demographic statistics and descriptive statistics of the main variables. Child age and gender did not differ significantly between the ethnic groups. There were significant differences in maternal age (H (2) = 29.53, p < .001), maternal level of education (H (2) = 60.17, p < .001), maternal marital status (H (2) = 36.21, p < .001), maternal religion (H (2) = 97.73, p < .001), child overall outgroup prejudice (F (2, 245) = 3.19, p = 043), and child outgroup prejudice towards underrepresented groups (F (2,245) = 6.91, p =.001, see Table 1). Bonferroni post-hoc comparisons were non-significant for overall prejudice, but Turkish-Dutch children showed more prejudice towards underrepresented outgroups only than White Dutch (p = .001) and Afro-Dutch children (p = .021).

Table 2 shows bivariate correlations between main variables. Endorsement of colorblindness was negatively correlated to endorsement of multiculturalism overall and in all ethnic groups. In Turkish-Dutch families and overall, endorsement of colorblindness was positively related to child outgroup prejudice. In White Dutch families and overall, endorsement of multiculturalism was negatively related to child outgroup prejudice. Child overall outgroup prejudice and child underrepresented outgroup prejudice were highly correlated in both the Turkish- and Afro-Dutch group. Of the sociodemographic variables, maternal level of education (ρ = -.27, p < .001), marital status (ρ = .18, p = .004), and maternal age (ρ = -.16, p = .011) were related to endorsement of colorblindness, whereas child age was related to endorsement of multiculturalism (ρ = .13, p = .043). Furthermore, ages (child ρ = -.16, p = .010, mother ρ = -.17, p = .009) and gender of the child (ρ = -.15, p = .020) were significantly associated with child overall outgroup prejudice.

Table 2

Bivariate correlates between main variables

Total sample (N = 248)[b]/White Dutch (N = 138)[a]	1	2	3	
1. Maternal colorblindness		-.44**	.10	
2. Maternal multiculturalism	-.48**		-.26**	
3. Child overall outgroup prejudice	.17**	-.20**		
Turkish-Dutch (N = 65)[b]/Afro-Dutch (N = 45)[a]	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
1. Maternal colorblindness		-.53**	-.03	-.17
2. Maternal multiculturalism	-.36**		.23	.28
3. Child overall outgroup prejudice	.26*	-.19		.76**
4. Child underrepresented outgroup prejudice	.25*	-.09	.84**	

Note. *p <.05, **p <.01. [a] = above diagonal, [b] = below diagonal.

Main analyses

Significant differences in diversity ideologies between the ethnic groups were found (F (2, 488) = 18.54, p <.001, Wilk's λ = .75, Figure 1): there was a significant difference for both maternal colorblindness (F (2,245) = 30.63, p <.001, ω^2 = .19) and maternal multiculturalism (F (2,245) = 14.20, p <.001, ω^2 = .10). Bonferonni post-hoc comparisons showed that endorsement of colorblindness was lower among Afro-Dutch than White Dutch and Turkish-Dutch mothers (ps <.001). Endorsement of multiculturalism was higher among Afro-Dutch than White Dutch (p <.001) and Turkish-Dutch mothers ideologies most results were similar, yet the pairwise comparison between Afro-Dutch and Turkish-Dutch mothers on multiculturalism no longer was (p = .022), and higher among Turkish-Dutch than White Dutch mothers (p =.041). After including sociodemographic variables related to diversity ideologies most results were similar, yet the pairwise comparison between Afro-Dutch and Turkish-Dutch mothers on multiculturalism no longer was significant (p = .301). Exploratory analyses showed that specifically after entering maternal level of education, the difference did not remain significant.

Results from the multiple regression analyses predicting child overall outgroup prejudice showed that maternal multiculturalism and colorblindness did not significantly predict child prejudice in the whole sample or in the Turkish- and Afro-



Figure 1. Group differences in maternal multiculturalism and colorblindness.

Dutch groups separately, but there was a significant negative association between maternal multiculturalism and child outgroup prejudice in White Dutch families (Table 3). Exploratory analyses predicting child underrepresented outgroup prejudice similarly revealed no significant associations in the whole sample nor in the Afro-Dutch group, but maternal colorblindness positively predicted child underrepresented outgroup prejudice in the Turkish-Dutch families (β = .27, *p* = .040). Table 4 shows the results from the hierarchical multiple regression analyses predicting child overall outgroup prejudice in two ethnic groups at a time. Two of the final models (model 4) revealed significant interaction effects between maternal multiculturalism and ethnicity, showing that the association between maternal multiculturalism and child overall outgroup prejudice was significantly different among the Afro-Dutch families as compared to the other families (see Figure 2).

The exploratory hierarchical multiple regression analyses predicting child underrepresented outgroup prejudice similarly revealed a significant interaction effect between maternal multiculturalism and ethnicity when including the White Dutch and the Afro-Dutch families, but not when including the Turkish-Dutch and the Afro-Dutch families. In addition, a significant main effect of ethnicity was found when including Turkish-Dutch and White Dutch families, (β = -.24, *p* = .001), confirming earlier results that child outgroup prejudice towards (an) underrepresented outgroup(s) is higher among Turkish-Dutch than White Dutch children.

Discussion

The present study examined levels of endorsement of multiculturalist and colorblind ideologies among White Dutch (representing the dominant ethnic population), Turkish-Dutch (representing the underrepresented Muslim population), and Afro-Dutch mothers (representing the underrepresented Black population), and its association with child outgroup prejudice. Results show that endorsement of multiculturalism is higher among mothers from both underrepresented groups than mothers from the dominant ethnic group, and that endorsement of colorblindness was highest among White Dutch and Turkish-Dutch mothers. Furthermore, whereas maternal endorsement of colorblindness was not related to child outgroup prejudice in the dominant ethnic group, a negative association was found between maternal endorsement of multiculturalism and child outgroup prejudice, suggesting that in White Dutch families, parental multiculturalism has more positive effects on child interethnic attitudes than parental colorblindness. Associations between maternal multiculturalism and child outgroup prejudice were less clear in the other ethnic groups, but maternal colorblindness was related to increased levels of child prejudice against the Black outgroup in Turkish-Dutch families.

Table 3
Multiple regression analyses predicting child overall outgroup prejudice

	Overall *N* = 248			White Dutch *N* = 138			Turkish-Dutch *N* = 65			Afro-Dutch *N* = 45		
	B	*SE*	β	*B*	*SE*	β	*B*	*SE*	β	*B*	*SE*	β
Child age	-0.27	.13	-.13*	-0.21	.21	-.09	-0.31	.20	-.19	-0.21	.24	-.14
Maternal age	-0.04	.03	-.11	-0.07	.05	-.13	-0.06	.05	-.14	-0.02	.04	-.09
Child gender	-0.58	.24	-.15*	-0.54	.35	-.13	-0.89	.43	-.25*	-0.11	.52	-.03
Maternal colorblindness	0.29	.25	.08	-0.15	.38	-.04	0.89	.49	.23	0.53	.56	.17
Maternal multiculturalism	-0.30	.16	-.13	-0.64	.24	-.25**	-0.07	.30	-.03	0.66	.37	.33
R^2		.10			.11			.17			.09	
F model statistic		5.32**			3.30**			2.46*			0.81	

Note. *p <.05, **p <.01

Table 4
Final models from hierarchical multiple regression predicting child overall outgroup prejudice

	White Dutch & Turkish-Dutch families (*N* = 203)			White Dutch & Afro-Dutch families (*N* = 183)			Afro-Dutch & Turkish-Dutch families (*N* = 110)		
	B	*SE*	β	*B*	*SE*	β	*B*	*SE*	β
Child age	-0.25	.15	-.12	-0.22	.16	-.10	-0.27	.15	-.17
Maternal age	-0.06	.03	-.12	-0.04	.03	-.10	-0.04	.03	-.11
Child gender	-0.64	.27	-.16*	-0.44	.29	-.11	-0.58	.33	-.16
Maternal colorblindness	0.15	.30	.04	0.04	.32	.01	0.75	.36	.26*
Maternal multiculturalism	-0.43	.19	-.17*	-0.11	.22	-.05	0.02	.24	.01
Dummy ethnicity (DE)	-0.04[a]	.33	-.01[a]	0.76[a]	.42	.16[a]	-0.46[b]	.44	-.13[b]
Maternal multiculturalism x DE	-0.31[a]	.37	-.06[a]	-1.09[a]	.42	-.21[a]*	0.88[b]	.41	.24[b]*
R^2		.11			.13			.18	
F model statistic		3.57**			3.56**			3.22**	

Note. *p <.05, **p <.01. [a] dummy is coded as 1 = White Dutch, [b] dummy is coded as 1 = Afro-Dutch.



Figure 2. Associations between multiculturalism and child overall outgroup prejudice.

The identified ethnic group differences in multiculturalism are in line with expectations, based on research demonstrating higher levels of endorsement among members of underrepresented than members of dominant ethnic groups (e.g., Berry & Kalin, 1995; Ryan et al., 2010; Wolsko et al., 2006). The results replicate findings of stronger endorsement of multiculturalism among Turkish-Dutch than White Dutch participants (e.g., Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2002; Verkuyten, 2005), and extend this by showing stronger endorsement among Afro-Dutch than White Dutch mothers. Group interests might explain these differences: multiculturalism is thought to be more beneficial for underrepresented ethnic groups (as multiculturalism implies maintaining their culture and rising in status) than for dominant ethnic groups (as multiculturalism implies a threat to their dominant status, Berry & Kalin, 1995). In all ethnic groups, however, mean scores were above the midpoint, indicating a relatively positive view on multiculturalism. Afro-Dutch mothers scored higher on multiculturalism than Turkish-Dutch mothers, but this contrast was non-significant after controlling for maternal level of education. A higher level of education is indeed identified as the most important demographic predictor of higher endorsement of multiculturalism (Van de Vijver et al., 2008). The difference in education between Turkish- and Afro-Dutch mothers in the present study resembles

the pattern in the general population, suggesting that patterns of endorsement of multiculturalism might also reflect the general population. However, the Afro-Dutch mothers were more highly educated than the general Afro-Dutch female population (64% had a higher level of education in the study as compared to 27-33% of women with a Surinamese or Antillean background, Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2021b).

As previous studies on ethnic group differences in endorsement of colorblindness were mixed (Ryan et al., 2007; Ryan et al., 2010), these were explored. Results showed lower levels of colorblindness among Afro-Dutch (just below midpoint) than White Dutch mothers (just above midpoint), in line with previous work in the U.S. (Ryan et al., 2007). The difference between Afro- and Turkish-Dutch and similarity between White Dutch and Turkish-Dutch mothers is more surprising. When thinking of colorblindness as ignoring or avoiding the topic of skin color, the pattern could be explained by the fact that white skin color is still perceived as the norm in the Netherlands, making it easier for both White Dutch and Turkish-Dutch mothers to avoid this topic. In the present study, however, colorblindness was measured as unawareness of racial privilege, institutional discrimination, and blatant racial issues. The high levels of experienced discrimination based on ethnicity and religion among Turkish-Dutch people (Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau, 2020), would suggest more awareness of racism (less colorblindness) among Turkish-Dutch than White Dutch mothers. One possible explanation for the present finding could be the recruitment methods: Turkish-Dutch mothers were more often recruited through the network of the researchers and snowballing than White Dutch mothers, who were more often recruited in more general ways (e.g., online or at playgrounds). The White Dutch mothers therefore may have participated primarily because they felt that the subject (societal diversity in the context of children) was important, and thus possibly were more aware of ethnic inequalities than the general White population. The Turkish-Dutch mothers may have participated mainly because of social reasons, for example wanting to help researchers involved. Afro-Dutch mothers may have lower levels of colorblindness than Turkish-Dutch mothers because of more contact with the dominant ethnic group (Martinović, 2013; Koops et al., 2016), potentially exposing them to a higher frequency of interpersonal discrimination experiences. The fact that anti-Black racism in the form of Black Pete has played a large role in the public debate on racism (Rodenberg & Wagenaar, 2016), and that Black activism has a long history in the Netherlands (Esajas & de Abreu, 2019) might also play a role. Future research will need to further examine colorblindness among various ethnic groups in the Netherlands and what drives and explains this endorsement, while distinguishing between the different dimensions of colorblindness in detail (i.e., color-evasion and power-evasion, Neville et al., 2013).

As expected, stronger maternal endorsement of multiculturalism was related to less child outgroup prejudice in the White Dutch families. Although we expected associations to be weaker in the Afro- and Turkish-Dutch families based on meta-analytic research within adults (Leslie et al., 2020), the associations were absent. Our non-significant results in these groups, however, are similar to previous studies in

the Netherlands finding negative associations within the dominant, but not in an underrepresented ethnic group (Vedder et al., 2016; Verkuyten, 2005; Vescalo González et al., 2008), suggesting that patterns within Dutch individuals are similar to patterns of transfer effects between mothers and children. It has been suggested that multiculturalism is associated with attitudes towards underrepresented groups only (Verkuyten, 2005), but results from the exploratory analysis examining child attitudes towards underrepresented outgroups specifically do not support this idea. The interaction effects illustrate that the association between multiculturalism and child outgroup prejudice differed significantly between the Afro-Dutch families and other families, but that the association did not differ between White Dutch and Turkish-Dutch families. This cautiously suggests that maternal multiculturalism might have some potential for reducing child prejudice in Turkish-Dutch families as well, but future research will need to examine these association among larger samples of families from underrepresented groups. The lack of association between maternal multiculturalism and child outgroup prejudice could be explained by ceiling effects in the underrepresented ethnic groups (Leslie et al., 2020). The relatively small Turkish- and Afro-Dutch samples (N = 65 and N = 45) and the limited variability in their endorsement of multiculturalism (i.e., 57-76% between 5 and 7 on a 7-point scale) might have hampered finding significant associations with other constructs. In addition, effects of endorsement of multiculturalism on prejudice depend on national policies and perceived norms on diversity (Guimond et al., 2013). Perceptions of these norms can differ between ethnic groups, and need to be examined in future research on diversity ideologies in the Netherlands. Future research also needs to disentangle the influence of different societal contexts such as the school environment and the family, as multicultural education can simultaneously impact children's interethnic attitudes (Verkuyten & Thijs, 2013), and might decrease the (added) impact of parental ideologies. As multicultural education might be more common in ethnically diverse schools, parents' ideologies of children from underrepresented ethnic groups who typically attend such schools might play a smaller role.

Maternal endorsement of colorblindness was also expected to be negatively associated with child outgroup prejudice, but this association was not significant for overall outgroup prejudice in any of the groups when both ideologies were taken into account. In fact, results suggest either no effects or undesired effects of maternal colorblindness: bivariate correlational results show that higher levels of maternal colorblindness were associated with more child outgroup prejudice overall and in Turkish-Dutch families, and higher endorsement of colorblindness significantly predicted more prejudice against the Black outgroup among Turkish-Dutch families. Whereas within adults, colorblindness is negatively related to interethnic prejudice (Leslie et al., 2020; Whitley & Webster, 2019), transfer effects from parents to children thus do not seem beneficial for intergroup relations. Children are unable to not notice race, which is the hypothesized prejudice-reducing component of colorblindness by its proponents. In fact, they already perceive racial differences in infancy (Bar-Haim et al., 2006), and are able to categorize based on race by 3- to 4-years of age (Pauker et al., 2017). As children are also aware of societal inequalities at a young age (Bigler et al., 2003; Olson et al., 2012), colorblind messages reflecting

unawareness or denial of racism and racial privilege might tell children that these inequalities can be attributed to people themselves, resulting in negative perceptions of ethnic groups that are on the downside of inequality. Moreover, previous studies show that mothers who more strongly endorse colorblindness demonstrated more negative nonverbal behaviors in interethnic contact (Apfelbaum, Sommers, et al., 2008; Norton et al., 2006), which could have been picked up by their children (Castelli et al., 2008).

The present findings do support the hypothesis that maternal endorsement of multiculturalism is more strongly related to lower child outgroup prejudice than maternal endorsement of colorblindness. These results are in line with the more positive effects of a value-diversity ideology at school as compared to a colorblind ideology (Apfelbaum et al., 2010) and with research on parental ethnic-racial socialization among White families that suggests that having ethnicity- or race-related discussions results in more positive child interethnic attitudes than not having these discussions (Perry et al., 2020; Perry, Skinner-Dorkenoo et al., 2021; Vittrup & Holden, 2011). It thus seems that multiculturalism 'works' specifically for children in the dominant ethnic group, but it is less clear what diversity approach benefits interethnic attitudes of children in underrepresented ethnic groups. From the present results, it is unclear how mothers transfer their diversity ideology to their children and thus what related socialization practices look like. Applications of multiculturalism and colorblindness can take many forms (Rosenthal & Levy, 2010), highlighting the need for detailed studies on socialization in the family context, to examine the operationalization and content of messages related to parental diversity ideologies and their effects on child interethnic attitudes.

There are some limitations of the present study to take into account. Firstly, unfortunately data on fathers were limited and thus were not included. Secondly, although colorblindness and multiculturalism are two very prominent diversity ideologies, analyzing them in one construct each did not allow for examinations of different forms or aspects such as emphasizing similarities or individual uniqueness (colorblindness) and a focus on learning about differences, on appreciating contributions, or on maintaining cultures (multiculturalism, Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). Future research could examine diversity ideologies in the Netherlands in more detail to take into account various forms, and include additional more recently identified diversity ideologies, such as polyculturalism or interculturalism (Rosenthal & Levy, 2012; Verkuyten et al., 2020). Attention should also be paid to the validation of measures on diversity ideologies in various populations, as in the present study reliability of the questionnaires was somewhat lower in the Turkish-Dutch group (Cronbach's α = .64-66). Thirdly, generalizability of the present results are somewhat hampered by relatively high levels of maternal education as compared to the Dutch population.

The current study adds to previous research on diversity ideologies by examining levels of endorsement in three large ethnic groups in the Netherlands, and by focusing on the transfer effects of endorsement on children's outgroup prejudice.

Results indicate that higher maternal endorsement of multiculturalism is related to lower child outgroup prejudice among White Dutch families, and suggest that maternal colorblindness might actually have opposite effects, especially in Turkish-Dutch families. Future research therefore will need to look more closely at different components of parental ideologies and child outgroup prejudice in underrepresented families specifically. Furthermore, future research is needed to explore what parenting approaches based on diversity ideologies look like, and how they shape socialization processes and child interethnic attitudes. The present study implies that, in order to foster more inclusive child interethnic attitudes, parents should move in the direction of multicultural, rather than colorblind, approaches.













Chapter 6

What Do We Read to Our Children? Messages Concerning Ethnic Diversity in Popular Children's Books in The Netherlands

Ymke de Bruijn, Rosanneke A.G. Emmen, Judi Mesman

Published in SN Social Sciences, 2021, 1(206), 1-21.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-021-00221-7

Abstract

Children's books can create opportunities for children to see themselves as well as others in different settings and stories, but cultural details and specificity within these stories can play an important role in the messages that children take away. Therefore, the present study aims to provide insight in the messages concerning ethnic diversity and various cultures in a subset of popular books that Dutch young children are likely to be exposed to. Books aimed at young children that were sold or borrowed most often or were awarded between 2009 and 2018 in the Netherlands are examined through the combined lens of critical race theory and critical multicultural analysis. Specifically, books including a protagonist or secondary character of color were selected. The study provides insight in the degree of cultural specificity and cultural authenticity, as well as prevailing power relations between characters and ideologies that are portrayed within the books. Results indicate that while subtle cultural stereotypes and implicit forms of ideologies including White supremacy and eurocentrism are found only in a few books, cultural details are generally lacking and colorblindness is common in books aimed at young children. The study therefore underlines the particular need for books that are culturally specific and include authentic cultural details, to improve the reflection of various cultures and experiences of characters of color.

Keywords: children's literature, ethnic diversity, critical race theory, critical multicultural analysis

Picturebooks are a form of children's literature that is characterized by the combination of visual and textual information (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001). These and other books aimed at young children are often read together with an adult, and can help children learn about themselves as well as about others (Bishop, 1990). Scholars have advocated for the representation of ethnically diverse characters, so that all children can identify with characters and learn about other cultures. Various studies have established that characters of color in children's books are rare or underrepresented (e.g., de Bruijn et al., 2021; Koss, 2015; Koss et al., 2017). In addition, mere representation is not enough for readers to identify with characters, or for books to teach children about various cultures: it is also important how these characters of color and their environments are portrayed, and what values and messages are conveyed within the stories. Two frameworks can combinedly be applied to examine these issues: critical race theory (CRT), which focuses on race and the role of racism, and critical multicultural analysis (CMA), which more specifically focuses on power relations (Solórzano, 1997; Botelho & Rudman, 2007). The present study will examine popular books for young children (i.e., 6 years or younger) including protagonists or secondary characters of color in the Netherlands through the combined lens of CRT and CMA. Results from the present study will provide insight in the content of stories to which Dutch children are exposed: even if characters of color are included, how are they portrayed and what messages about these characters and their relations with others are conveyed?

The Purpose of Children's Books

Bishop (1990) argued that books have to act as mirrors, as windows, and as glass sliding doors. The description of books as mirrors implies that ethnically diverse characters are needed, so that all children can identify with characters, which can impact their self-development (Roethler, 1998) and potentially provide examples to learn from. In addition, being able to identify with characters might motivate children to read, which can positively impact their reading literacy (Becker et al., 2010). The description of books as windows, on the other hand, implies that children can learn about other cultures and cultural values. Windows can at the same time function as glass sliding doors, so that readers can pass through them and engage in the world created in the book (Bishop, 1990), but whether this potential is reached seems dependent on factors such as readers' emotional connection, response, and reflection (Johnson et al., 2018). Books can therefore serve different functions for different readers. Indeed, previous studies have demonstrated that reading multicultural literature can have an impact on children's interethnic attitudes (So, 2016), as well as on the cultural awareness and perceived ability to be culturally responsive of (prospective) professionals in education working with multicultural literature (Frye et al., 2010; Iwai, 2013). Furthermore, books featuring characters with various ethnic backgrounds have the potential to establish extended contact effects, meaning that examples of characters with an ethnic appearance similar to that of the reader being friends with characters with a different ethnic appearance can positively influence readers' interethnic attitudes (Wright et al., 1997). Previous studies have

demonstrated this positive effect among children between ages 5 and 11 years (e.g., Cameron et al., 2006; Cameron et al., 2007).

Focus on Ethnicity and Race

A review of work on the development of racial categorization describes that children can already perceptually differentiate between faces from people with different racial backgrounds in infancy, and are able to categorize based on race by 3- to 4-years of age (Pauker et al., 2017). Thus, from very early on racial differences are recognized by children. A focus on ethnicity and race when analyzing literature for these young age groups seems essential to examine whether children's literature makes use of its full potential to work as mirrors and windows (or even glass sliding doors), as well as to provide examples of interethnic contact and friendships. Race and ethnicity are highly debated socially constructed terms, sometimes used to refer to 'groups' of people based on either features that are argued to be biologically based (race), or on sociological or anthropological features such as shared customs (ethnicity, Quintana, 1998). Although from this perspective these terms are distinct, it is argued that children's understanding of ethnicity is initially mostly based on physical, racial characteristics (Quintana, 1994). Other scholars, in addition, have described that race is an inappropriate term to describe biological variation in humans (Keita et al., 2004), and argue that ethnic groups are based on common culture, origins and history (Brown & Langer, 2010), and are associated with race (Berreman, 1972). In this paper, we follow this latter perspective and thus 'ethnicity' is predominantly used when examining physical characteristics and cultural details of characters. However, the term 'race' is used when discussing previous literature that refers to race.

CRT encompasses a framework with a specific focus on race and racism (Solórzano, 1997). Although CRT stems from legal studies, it has been applied to numerous fields in the social sciences, including education and psychology (Crenshaw, 2010). CRT in education research is guided by five tenets: (1) centrality and intersectionality of race and racism, (2) challenge to dominant ideology, (3) centrality of experiential knowledge, (4) an interdisciplinary perspective, and (5) commitment to social justice (Solórzano, 1998). In a research note, Huber, Gonzalez and Solórzano (2018) propose that these tenets can also be applied to the analysis of children's literature, exemplified with the following questions:

> What identities or characteristics are assigned by race and/or its intersections with class and gender? How are the experiences of People of Color represented, or not? In what ways does the story become raced, or not? Is there a context to situate race and/or its intersections (e.g., historical, political, social)? How/do dominant ideologies operate (e.g., white supremacy, patriarchy, cultural deficits)? In what other ways does power operate (e.g., vantage point, resolution, and/or assumptions of the story)? (Huber et al., 2018, pp.16)

Through these questions, the authors state that they center race (tenet 1), while focusing on dominant ideologies (tenet 2), and recognizing the importance of experiences of people of color (tenet 3). In addition, Huber et al. (2018) state that questions concerning the interplay of race and power, and the contexts ask for an interdisciplinary approach (tenet 4), and together challenge the interposal of oppression in children's literature (tenet 5).

Previous studies have applied CRT to the analysis of children's literature. One branch of research has focused on the representation of authors, illustrators and characters of color in children's literature, and demonstrated that their representation was rare (e.g., Hughes-Hassell et al., 2009; McNair, 2008a). This suggest that the range of available children's books do not use their full potential of providing all children examples and characters to identify with and teaching them about various cultures and worldviews, nor of providing examples of intergroup friendships. In addition, CRT has been used to assess the content of and messages conveyed in multicultural books (e.g., Brooks, 2009; McNair, 2008b), using concepts such as permanence of race, interest convergence (i.e., equality and equity for people of color will only be pursued when it is in line with the interest and ideologies of White people; Milner, 2008), whiteness as property (i.e., along lines of property rights, being born White carries privileges; Hughes-Hassell et al., 2009), colorblindness (i.e., the dismissal and neglect of the cultural, racial or ethnic experience of people of color; Winograd, 2011), and counter-storytelling (for an overview see Huber et al., 2018).

Another framework applicable to analyzing how people of color and their environments are portrayed and what values and messages are conveyed, is CMA: a framework developed to encourage teachers and educators to critically analyze and read children's literature, and help children acquire these same skills (Botelho & Rudman, 2009). CMA necessitates a focus on power relations of class, race, and gender, and a connection to issues of social change and justice (Botelho & Rudman, 2009). The authors refer to example critical questions to be used:

> What (or whose) view of the world, or kinds of behaviors are presented as normal by the text? Why is the text written that way? How else could it have been written? What assumptions does the text make about age, gender, class and culture? Who is silenced/heard here? Whose interests might be best served by the text? What ideological positions can you identify? What are the possible readings of this situation/event/character? How did you get to that reading? What moral or political position does a reading support? How do particular cultural and social contexts make particular readings available? How might it be challenged? (Wooldridge, as cited in Botelho & Rudman, 2009, pp.4)

The authors highlight that the point of view, social processes among characters, story ending, and imbedded assumptions need to be considered, and that both linguistic and visual information in children's literature are important (Botelho & Rudman, 2009).

Previous studies have used CMA to analyze children's literature, examining power in various ways (e.g., Johnson & Gasiewicz, 2016; Kelley, 2008; Malcolm & Lowery, 2011; Richards, 2013). Richards (2013) for example focused on power in terms of ideologies that are represented in Jamaican children's literature. Similarly, Malcolm and Lowery (2011) examined power by studying representations of the Caribbean in children's literature while identifying thematic trends and assessing authenticity. Johnson and Gasiewicz (2016) examined the characterization of immigrant characters and cultures, but in addition investigated power relations among characters. Kelley (2008) looked at power in relation to characters too, but focused on character's actions and responses to power, and whether and how characters benefited from power.

These previous analyses exemplify that CRT and CMA show some overlap in focus, can simultaneously be applied to both the character- and story-level, and can be used to analyze race as well as ethnicity. Whereas CRT provides more detailed guidelines and exemplary questions on how to examine race and racism, CMA provides a more detailed and specific focus on power relations. As both theoretical frameworks have been applied to children's literature in various ways, combining these methods allows for the present research to be inspired by a wide range of exemplary analyses of race and/or ethnicity and related power issues within children's literature.

Analyzing Characters

In accordance with CMA, important issues when examining the quality of the representation of characters are whether the character has an active rather than a passive or subservient role, and whether the character is described in a positive manner (e.g., Al Hazza & Bucher, 2008; Cole & Valentine, 2000). Further, in light of the extended contact theory (Wright et al., 1997) characters' relationships with others across ethnic boundaries should be examined, and the representation needs to be culturally authentic. Although this concept is complex and somewhat controversial (Short & Fox, 2003), it generally refers to the absence of stereotypes and the depiction of accurate cultural values and details (Yoo-Lee et al., 2014). Imaginably, reading books in which only very stereotypical characters of color are presented might impact children's interethnic attitudes in a negative way. High-quality multicultural literature has indeed been previously described as showing cultural authenticity at the character-level in terms of actions, thoughts, emotions, and language use (e.g., Al Hazza & Bucher, 2008; Salas et al., 2002).

Analyzing the Story

Cultural authenticity at the story-level can be found in values, traditions, aspects of history, and beliefs that are described (e.g., Al Hazza & Bucher, 2008; Salas et al., 2002). Apart from cultural authenticity, CRT and CMA call for an analysis of perspectives and ideologies that predominate. Ideologies that are particularly relevant in relation to ethnicity and culture are ideologies favoring White people (White supremacy) or Western cultures (eurocentrism). In addition, colorblindness

and race neutrality have been identified as normative presuppositions in children's literature (Huber et al., 2018), implying that specific experiences of people of color related to their ethnicity tend to receive little attention in these stories.

Based on the role and importance given to ethnic and cultural details, different types of books can be distinguished. Bishop's work (Bishop, 2012) formed the basis for a framework applied to general multicultural children's literature, using the categories culturally specific (or culturally authentic), culturally generic (or generically American), and culturally neutral (Adam & Barrat-Pugh, 2020; Möller, 2016). Culturally specific books highlight the unique experience of characters of color and include cultural details to do so, while culturally generic books also feature characters of color in important roles, but do not contain any cultural details and instead focus on universal experiences. Culturally neutral books, in addition, feature people of color, but are about a very different topic. Culturally specific books generally are high in cultural accuracy and authenticity, while culturally generic and neutral books are not (Möller, 2016). Studies outside the Netherlands applying this framework earlier concluded that there is a need for more culturally specific, and thus authentic, children's books in order for children's literature to become more inclusive (Adam & Barrat-Pugh, 2020).

The Present Study

The present study will provide a qualitative analysis of popular books for young children featuring characters of color in the Netherlands through the combined lens of CRT and CMA. Results from the present study will provide an insight in the messages concerning diversity and the portrayal of various cultures in books that young children in the Netherlands are likely to be exposed to. These insights will in addition be informative in terms of the types of multicultural children's books that are represented. Results can lead to suggestions for authors, illustrators, publishers, and consumers regarding room for improvement in terms of cultural specificity and authenticity in books, as well as underlying power relations that predominate children's books.

Method

Materials and Procedure

The book selection process consisted of several steps (see Figure 1). We selected books that had been (1) sold most, (2) borrowed most, or (3) received an award from 2009 until 2018 in the Netherlands, based on information from the CPNB (*Stichting Collectieve Propaganda van het Nederlandse Boek*, a foundation aimed at the promotion of reading and book ownership) and various awards (*Prentenboek van het jaar*, *Kinderboekwinkelprijs, Wouter Pieterse prijs, Griffels en Penselen, IBBY Honour List, Boekensleutel, Hotze de Roos Prijs, Jenny Smelik-IBBY-Prijs* and *Prijs van de Kinderjury*). Duplicates, books not aimed at children of 6 years old and younger (as indicated by the majority of libraries in three large cities in the Netherlands:

Amsterdam, Rotterdam and The Hague), and books without human figures whose ethnic appearance could be coded were excluded. In addition, one outlier regarding the number of human characters (estimated at 3343) was excluded[1]. The remaining books were firstly coded quantitatively (for the complete quantitative coding process, see de Bruijn et al., 2021), after which the selection process for the qualitative analysis continued.

Of the 69 remaining books, 21 books included a protagonist or secondary character of color, which was defined as a character with an ethnic appearance that was not White, European/Caucasian, based on physical characteristics such as skin color, hair



Figure 1. Process of book selection.

[1] *Nederland* by Charlotte Demantons was excluded because the book contained an extreme number of characters that would skew the quantitative analysis. Furthermore, as there was no story line, rather the book consists of separate scenes, the book could not be analyzed qualitatively.

structure, and cultural aspects such as traditional clothing. Books without any characters of color (n = 37) or with only background characters of color (n = 11) were not included for the qualitative analysis, because these books would not include enough detail about characters of color to serve the purpose of the study. In addition, three books that did not contain one storyline throughout the book but were made up of either short poems (n = 2), or only pictures and single words (n = 1) were excluded. The remaining 18 titles, of which two were translated from English and others were in Dutch originally (see Supplementary material for the full list), were selected to be read multiple times and analyzed qualitatively, while focusing on both images and text to capture all the information presented and applying both CRT and CMA. It should be noted that five of the remaining titles were part of the same series, and thus partly featured the same characters (books number 13 to 17, Supplementary material).

During each reading, observations in the following categories were noted: cultural specificity, cultural authenticity, power relations. These categories were derived from example questions on how to apply CRT and CMA by Huber and colleagues (2018) and by Botelho and Rudman (2009). The example questions were interpreted as implying a necessary focus on the ways in which the story 'becomes raced' (cultural specificity), the identities and characteristics assigned to people of color (cultural authenticity), dominant ideologies, other power operations, and social processes among characters (power relation; Huber et al, 2018; Botelho & Rudman, 2009). Observations for the category cultural specificity were guided by the following questions: (1) Is the cultural background of the character of color mentioned or specified, and if so, to what purpose (i.e., how does it play a role in the story)? (2) How specific is the ethnic appearance of the character of color (i.e., is there only a difference in skin color or are other ethnicity related features used)? (3) Are any ethnicity-related features mentioned in the text and if so, to what purpose? Cultural authenticity was examined by assessing the degree of stereotypes and culturally accurate details portrayed in (1) character behaviors, emotions, and descriptions (i.e., are these positive or negative and are they stereotypical?), (2) settings in which characters are portrayed, and (3) values that are transmitted through character actions. Positive and negative descriptions are based on adjectives used to describe characters, inspired by (but not limited to) distinctions between positive and negative adjectives as used in child attitude measures (e.g., Preschool Racial Attitude Measure, Williams et al., 1975). Stereotypes were conceptualized as characteristics, behaviors, descriptions, or attributes with negative connotations or othering effects, often or typically associated with an ethnic group, distinguishing them from other ethnic groups. However, we acknowledge that there is some tension between stereotypes and accuracy (Judd & Park, 1993), which highlights that our interpretation might be different from how readers read and identify with characters. Observations in terms of power relations were guided by the following questions: (1) What relations does the character of color have with White characters? (2) How is power distributed among characters (e.g., in terms of status or active/passive behavior)? (3) Do dominant ideologies such as White supremacy, eurocentrism and colorblindness prevail and if so, how? Results were combined to make inferences about the types of books as defined based on work by Bishop (Adam & Barrat-Pugh, 2020; Möller,

2016). Given that all books featured a character of color as a protagonist or supporting character we did not expect any culturally neutral books, and results on cultural specificity and authenticity were indicative of books being culturally specific (featuring unique experiences of characters of color) or culturally generic (featuring more universal experiences without cultural details).

One third of the books was coded by three members of the research team (a White female, an Asian-European female and an Afro-Dutch male). The coding of the other books was done by one coder, a White cisgender female. Results from her observations were presented to the other authors and discussed. Specifically the distinction between accuracy and stereotypes posed some initial difficulties that were discussed among the authors to reach consensus. The research team is ethnically diverse, and the other authors are a White Dutch and Asian-European female (all cisgender). The team has extensive experience with research among different ethnic groups on interethnic attitudes, stereotypes, and prejudice of parents and children, as well as with service to public organizations through advice on intercultural issues.

Results

Cultural Specificity

In five of the 18 books explicit references were made to the cultural background or nationality of characters of color. In these stories, the reference is used to describe (1) an adoption process (*Baby'tje in mama's buik, Vriendjes van overal*), (2) migration and homesickness (*Bij ons in de straat, Dit is voor jou, Jan Toorop – Lied van de tijd*), and (3) aid to countries in the Global South (*Vriendjes van overal*). In three of these cases the cultural background or country of origin was not named specifically but descriptions as 'from far' or 'the country of parrots' were used (*Baby'tje in mama's buik, Bij ons in de straat, Dit is voor jou*). In the other two books, a specific heritage was mentioned in the context of the current country of residence (*Jan Toorop - Lied van de tijd, Vriendjes van overal*).

In four of the 18 books, indirect descriptions are identified that in combination with appearances help understand the specific cultural background of the characters of color. These descriptions included languages characters speak or clothing (i.e., being able to speak Arabic and wearing a hijab; *Vriendjes van overal*), characters' food preferences (i.e., couscous; *Slagroom op je snoet*), specific language use (i.e., 'dushi', a word from Papiamento*; Naar opa en oma pannenkoek*), and the setting surrounding characters (i.e., living in a palace in Islamic architectural style; *Beste Bregje Boentjes*). Although the last description was clearly used to create an unfamiliar, but exotic and adventurous setting, the other descriptions did not serve such a clear purpose in the story and were used in settings very familiar to young children: in the classroom and while visiting family. Although this was not a predefined question to guide coding, it was noticeable that responses to these implied references by White characters were mixed: whereas the White character in the Middle Eastern palace seemed impressed and interested (*Beste Bregje Boentjes*),

another White character was worried when a character of color used an unfamiliar word (*Naar opa en oma pannenkoek*). A similar reaction tapping into fear of the unknown, and specifically fear of Africa, is found in a book in which the main character is a bit scared of the African department of the museum (*Omdat ik je zo graag zie*).

In the majority of the 18 books (n = 10) no explicit nor implicit reference to a specific cultural background was provided, and ethnic appearance was the only indicator that characters were not White. The appearances of the characters of color were mostly culturally specific: the characters not only had a different skin tone, but also other ethnicity-related characteristics, such as facial features, hair structure, hair style and clothing. These ethnicity-related characteristics were rarely mentioned in the text, rather, it seems that most books (n = 14) did not include these descriptions in text. One book for example did mention several other details of a character's appearance (i.e., her dress, the flower in her hair), but did not mention skin color or hair structure (*Verliefd*). In four books, ethnicity-related physical characteristics are mentioned. In three of these cases, the description is very brief and broadly applicable, as it only concerns hair color (*Vriendjes van overal)*, or the mention of a beard (*Alle dieren drijven, Held op sokken*). The other exception is a more extensive discussion with a specific purpose, as it explains similarities and differences in appearance between the character of color and his (adoptive) parents (*Baby'tje in mama's buik*).

Cultural Authenticity

Character level. Cultural authenticity can be examined at character and story level. At character level, this includes their behaviors, emotions, and descriptions. Because books for young children mostly contain relatively short story lines with few words, the description of characters is often not very detailed. In none of the books the characters of color were explicitly described negatively or disliked by other characters. On the contrary, the characters were explicitly described with positive adjectives in several books (e.g., sweet, intelligent, kind, working hard, strong, *Alle dieren drijven, Held op sokken, Verliefd*). Because of the limited details, in half of the books descriptions of characters' behavior and emotions were neither culturally authentic nor stereotypical (n = 9). In two books in the context of migration, the characters of color showed emotions and behaviors that could be described as appropriate and culturally authentic, as they are similarly identified in real-world populations. A Middle Eastern character, about whom the suggestion was aroused that he was a refugee, was described as being homesick (*Bij ons in de straat*), which is in line with self-reported stressors of refugees in the Netherlands (Gerritsen et al., 2005), but could at the same time reinforce the potentially stereotypical notion that migrants' main tie will be with their country of origin. A Black character, in addition, re-migrated to live with his family (*Dit is voor jou*), which is one of the main reasons of remigration to for example Suriname (General Bureau of Statistics, 2013). In addition, an example of a counterstereotype is found in the book *Handje*, displaying a Black father and his son in the zoo, which counters the stereotype that Black fathers are absent or less involved in the caretaking of children (Thomas et al., 2008).

In contrast, the behavior of characters in some books seemed more stereotypical. A Black boy, for example, was described as very flexibly swinging in the trees, while his White female friend was very cautious and not able to do the same (*Kersenhemel*), which could be seen as both a gender stereotype and an ethnic stereotype, linking to the dehumanization of Black people by associating them with monkeys (Goff et al., 2008), or to the stereotype of heightened athletic ability (Harrison, 2001). In addition, the only classmates of color (one Moroccan and one Black) in the books from the same series (*Series Jimmy and Lisa*) were described as the most busy, outgoing, funny and cheeky in the classroom, which could tap into both an ethnic and gender stereotype about problematic behaviors and externalizing problem behavior. Generally, externalizing problem behaviors are reported more often for boys and children from underrepresented groups, specifically Moroccan and Surinamese, in the Netherlands, although it is unclear whether these differences reflect actual behavior differences or rater bias (Zwirs et al., 2011). However, the characters were not explicitly described as having externalizing problem behaviors. Therefore, the characters might also be perceived by children very positively and provide opportunities for children with similar behavioral patterns to identify with. There was also one example of characters of color together with White characters showing behaviors stereotyping others, as the characters in *Vriendjes van overal* dressed up as different nationalities in very traditional ways.

Story level. At the story level, cultural authenticity can be found in appropriate settings and values. In most of the 18 books studied (n = 13), characters of color were not displayed in culturally specific settings, but were found in more general settings such as at home (without cultural references), at school, in public places like a park or zoo, on the street, in the city, or in fantasy-like worlds. In one of the books, cultural decorations and festivities (i.e., with references to dragons and lanterns) accurate for Chinese culture are portrayed (Wang et al., 2014), even though cultural background did not play a significant role in the story (*De tuinman van de nacht*). In two books covering migration stories, thus in which cultural background did play a role, the characters of color were displayed in culturally accurate settings representing their country of origin, by displays of landscapes and forms of nature common in those countries and very different from the other settings in the book, representing the Western country (*Dit is voor jou, Jan Toorop – Lied van de tijd*). In another migration story, in contrast, the house of a Middle Eastern character resembling Islamic architecture was more stereotypical, as the story is situated in a Western society (*Bij ons in de straat*). It should be noted, however, that all other homes introduced were also very stereotypical for those characters (e.g., a sailor living in a boat and an old lady living in a knitted house). Although in another book a palace with Islamic architecture is more appropriate, as that part of the story is set in the Middle East, details such as a dressed monkey, a magic carpet and a harem of women in the background make the setting more stereotypical (*Beste Bregje Boentjes*), with some aspects reminding readers of Disney's Aladdin (Elturki & Shaman, 2013).

Given the short and often not very detailed stories, in most of the 18 books studied no culturally authentic nor stereotypical values were identified (*n* = 13). A few examples of culturally authentic values were found. To start, two books referred to values appropriate for the Middle Eastern characters (without a reference to a specific cultural background), such as hospitality, working hard to reach achievement and the importance of family (*Alle dieren drijven, Bij ons in de straat*). Indeed, family solidarity and (academic) aspirations for children generally tend to be of great importance to migrants from for instance Turkey and Morocco (Merz et al., 2009; Phalet & Schönpflug, 2001), and hospitality is in line with interdependent ideals common in Middle Eastern cultures (Buda & Elsayed-Elkhouly, 1998). In another book, interdependent values commonly associated with Asian cultures (Markus & Kitayama, 1991) were portrayed through an Asian character whose main goal was to improve society, without being acknowledged for it (*De tuinman van de nacht*). Simultaneously, however, this could be interpreted as a serving role of this character. Lastly, in the story featuring a remigrating Black character, a degree of patriotism and love for the home country was portrayed (*Dit is voor jou*), which seems common in the context of remigration, as Suriname being the home country is most often named of as the reason for remigration (General Bureau of Statistics, 2013). In contrast, the harem of women in the Middle Eastern palace in another book touched upon stereotypical power relations among dominant males and submissive females (*Beste Bregje Boentjes*).

Power Relations

In most of the 18 books (*n* = 10), the characters of color had interethnic friendships with White characters (*Dit is voor jou, Held op sokken, Kersenhemel, Series Jimmy and Lisa, De tuinman van de nacht, Verliefd*). In four books, the characters of color had White family members with whom they had a close and positive relationship (*Baby'tje in mama's buik, Heb jij misschien olifant gezien?, Naar opa en oma pannenkoek, Omdat ik je zo graag zie*). In terms of power relations, the characters of color were generally portrayed as equal to the White characters in interethnic friendships. In one case, the character of color is clearly in a passive role of being someone's love interest (*Verliefd*), while in other (*n* = 7) cases, the characters of color were more active and dominant. Jimmy in the *Series Jimmy and Lisa*, for example, often took the lead and decided what to do, at the same time resembling gender stereotypical role patterns, and the characters of color in *Dit is voor jou* and *De tuinman van de nacht* taught others their skills and, implicitly, important values and life lessons. In three books, however, the power relations furthermore resembled another power structure. In one, a character of color seemed dependent on and worked on the property of a White character (*Kersenhemel*). In another, the character of color living abroad was rich and seemingly powerful, yet his family member living in a Western society had a low-status profession (*Beste Bregje Boentjes*). Furthermore, the description of the only character of color in a book introducing all residents in a street (i.e., as being very sad and singing songs about homesickness at night), seems intended to evoke pity while this is not the case for the White characters (*Bij ons in de straat*).

Although there are no explicit examples of White supremacy in the books, the three examples mentioned above do suggest that these characters of color in Western settings have a relatively low status. In addition, eurocentrism is identified in two stories in which Western countries 'help out' individuals in non-Western countries, through adoption processes or aid programs (*Baby'tje in mama's buik, Vriendjes van overal*). Furthermore, one example of applying Western standards is a character of color offering to adapt accordingly (i.e., abandon his harem, *Beste Bregje Boentjes*). One of the books in contrast seems to highlight diversity in the illustrations (showing flags from numerous countries, a lot of diversity in people, mannequins in the shop window, and types of dogs), but without explicitly mentioning it (*Omdat ik je zo graag zie*). Earlier, it was already established that few references to cultural background were made, that these were mostly non-specific, and that in few of the books ethnicity-related physical characteristics were mentioned in text. In combination with the lack of cultural authenticity as described above, these statistics imply a degree of colorblindness, as little attention is paid to cultural and ethnic details and experiences.

Types of Books

In 7 of the books studied, no aspects of cultural specificity or authenticity were identified for the characters of color, indicating that these are culturally generic, as they do not include any cultural details or stereotypes at character or story level. In the eleven other books, there was an explicit or implicit reference to a specific cultural background, or some degree of cultural authenticity was identified.

A combination of both was found in only three books (*Bij ons in de straat, Dit is voor jou, Jan Toorop – Lied van de tijd*). These could be categorized as culturally specific, although the degree of cultural specificity is limited to descriptions of a 'different' (but no specific) background in two of these books (*Bij ons in de straat, Dit is voor jou*), some degree of stereotypes is also identified in one of the books (*Bij ons in de straat*), and only one of these books showed aspects of cultural authenticity on both the character and story level (*Dit is voor jou*). Therefore, even within books categorized as culturally specific, there is room for more cultural specificity and authenticity to fully meet the description of highlighting the unique experience of characters of color and including cultural details to do so. The other books in which some degree of cultural specificity or cultural authenticity was found (n = 8) can be divided into two groups: in five of these books, explicit or implicit references to cultural backgrounds were made but no other cultural details or authentic aspects were included or stereotypes were shown, while in the other three no references to cultural backgrounds were made, but culturally authentic values in accordance with the ethnic appearance of characters were portrayed in the story. These eight books fall somewhere in between the categories culturally generic and culturally specific, as they do not contain no cultural details at all (culturally generic), but also do not use enough cultural details to highlight the unique experience of characters of color (culturally specific).

Discussion

In this study, popular children's books in the Netherlands that featured characters of color as protagonists or secondary characters were analyzed through the lens of CRT and CMA, to examine messages about various cultures and characters of color that are conveyed to young children. Combining information on cultural specificity and authenticity revealed that only three out of 18 books could cautiously (as there was still room for more specificity and authenticity) be categorized as culturally specific. Other books included less or no cultural specificity or authenticity, and some (implicit) examples of prevailing ideologies including colorblindness, White supremacy and eurocentrism were identified.

In terms of cultural specificity, findings showed that in only a few books, an explicit reference to the cultural or ethnic background of a character of color was made. These references were not always specific but for instance referred to 'being from far away'. These descriptions imply that although the fact that the character was 'from elsewhere', and thus different from the other characters, was important to mention, the specific cultural background did not matter. Therefore, the degree of cultural specificity is debatable and descriptions could reflect a form of othering. The explicit references were only made in very specific situations, namely in stories about adoption, migration or development aid. This could convey the message that explicitly talking about cultural backgrounds should only happen in very specific situations that explicitly concern differences between people or countries. In contrast, most implicit references to cultural or ethnic backgrounds did not serve a clear purpose in the story and were used in stories about the daily lives of children, such as talking about language knowledge at school. On the one hand, these examples ensure that children are exposed to culturally specific details in contexts that are very familiar to them, potentially normalizing these details, but on the other hand it is unlikely that young readers can easily understand these implied references and link them to specific cultures. Although characters of color were drawn with ethnicity-related characteristics in addition to skin color, such as hair styles or in some cases clothing, most books did not refer to these characteristics in text. These results imply that most stories did not 'become raced', to answer the exemplary question based on CRT (Huber et al., 2018).

Avoiding the topic of ethnicity is a key feature of the colorblind ideology (Winograd, 2011) that has been described as normative in children's literature (Huber et al., 2018), and is often practiced by White parents (Pahlke et al., 2012). Notably colorblindness refers to the avoidance of topics on all ethnicities, including White, although the depiction and discussion of White characters was not analyzed in the present study, in line with common applications of colorblindness in White normative settings. Although the use of group labels is thought to contribute to othering and negative intergroup attitudes (e.g., Bigler & Liben, 2007), using colorblind strategies can also result in bias (e.g., Apfelbaum et al., 2010). Increasingly, scholars argue that silence on the topic contributes to the problem and thus encourage discussions about race and racism by parents (Perry, Skinner-Dorkenoo et al., 2021) and teachers

(Boutte et al., 2011). Specifically shared-book reading is thought to be a strategy to discuss concrete and observable physical aspects of diversity with young children (Kemple et al., 2016). The results from the present study, showing that references to these aspects were not often made in text, imply that the initiation of these conversations is very dependent on the adults reading the books, even more so then when textual references would create openings. Given that White parents generally seem reluctant to initiate conversations about ethnicity (Vittrup, 2018), explicit discussions of this topic in children's books might help them start a conversation. These parent-child race- or ethnicity-related discussions, in contrast to colorblind parenting, could eventually help improve children's intergroup attitudes and thereby reduce bias (Vittrup & Holden, 2011), although more detailed research on the content of these discussions and socialization practices is highly needed.

Apart from not mentioning ethnicity-related characteristics of appearance, the lack of details in stories in books aimed specifically at young children is an obstacle in examining cultural authenticity or stereotypes. Therefore, in the majority of books no cultural authenticity or stereotypes were found on the character or the story level. Descriptions of the characters of color were not explicitly negative (i.e., no negative adjectives were used, the characters were not disliked by other characters), on the contrary, they were either neutral (i.e., no negative or positive adjectives were used) or explicitly positive (i.e., positive adjectives such as intelligent and kind, were used). Interestingly, characters of color for whom either stereotypical or cultural authentic characteristics were found, were all male. This result highlights the importance of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989), which emphasizes the importance of taking into account the interaction between dimensions of identity such as ethnicity and gender, and fits the first tenet of CRT that centralizes intersectionalities (Solórzano, 1998). Authenticity at the story level in terms of settings and values, was found for a wide variety of cultures (Asian, Middle Eastern, Caribbean). All stereotypes found at the story level, in contrast, referred to Middle Eastern settings and values, suggesting that children are especially exposed to stereotypes pertaining to this culture. This might reinforce the relatively large perceived distance to people of Middle Eastern descent and the relatively high degree of prejudice by the White dominant ethnic group in the Netherlands (de Bruijn et al., 2020; Schalk-Soekar et al., 2004). Therefore, the characteristics assigned by ethnicity and the representation of people of color, to answer the exemplary questions of CRT application (Huber et al., 2018) were mostly positive but generic (i.e., without cultural details and thus accuracy). However, some examples of stereotypes specifically for males and Middle Eastern characters were found.

Nevertheless, friend or family relationships between characters of color and White characters were commonly presented in the studied books. This suggests that the books contain numerous examples of interethnic friendships, which could be conducive to the extended contact effect (Wright et al., 1997). In line with the extended contact hypothesis, the interethnic attitudes of readers could benefit from being exposed to examples of characters with an ethnic appearance similar to that of the reader being friends with characters with a different ethnic appearance.

Previous studies have demonstrated that stories for children are capable of establishing this effect (Cameron et al., 2006; Cameron et al., 2007). A specific focus on power within these relationships revealed that the characters of color were mostly equal to or even more dominant than the White characters in most of the books. However, some examples of power relations in line with the view of White supremacy were also identified, as were examples of eurocentrism, favoring White people and Western countries. These results tap into exemplary questions of both CRT and CMA that highlight the need to analyze ideologies and how they operate (Botelho & Rudman, 2009; Huber et al., 2018). Despite the fact that not all examples were very pronounced, these ideologies can impact children's worldviews, as Sutherland (1985, p. 11) argues that 'if ideologies have potential powers of persuasion, they are no less persuasive because they are hidden'.

Although the present study investigated only a subset of books available to young children in the Netherlands, the set reflects the most popular books, as books sold most often, and borrowed from libraries most often, were combined with award-winning books. As the selected subset is based on records from 2009 to 2018, it would be interesting to examine books from more recent and future records to establish patterns over time. Unfortunately, the relatively small sample in the present study, and the fact that most books (n = 13) were included based on having won an award, precluded comparisons between categories. It is important to note that the selection process resulted in the inclusion of five books from the same series, which were the only books included based on sale ranks rather than awards (books number 13 to 17, Supplementary material). Although this means that the same characters were represented in multiple books studied, results showed that levels of cultural specificity and authenticity among characters were different in the different books, and thus that each provides a unique perspective on messages about diversity. An important observation in the selection process was that a large proportion of books was excluded because no protagonists or secondary characters of color were represented. Additionally, the results from the present study revealed that there is a limited supply of culturally specific books that include cultural details and thereby highlight the unique experience of characters of color and often include most cultural accuracy and authenticity (Möller, 2016). This result is in line with earlier studies that conclude that there is a need for more children's books that are culturally specific and authentic (e.g., Adam & Barrat-Pugh, 2020).

The research team is ethnically diverse and has experience with research on the topic of interethnic attitudes and stereotypes, but it is important to note that it cannot be ruled out that their positionality and own experiences have influenced their interpretations of the materials. Although categories and accompanying questions were outlined to guide the coding process, the positionality of the research team may have played a role. We tried to diminish this risk by having one third of the books coded by three ethnically diverse researchers, and by discussing results from all of the books with the ethnically diverse research team. However, there still is a risk that potentially descriptions that are perceived as stereotypical by others or are less familiar reflections of cultural details may have been missed in the remaining set, as

most of the initial coding was done by a White scholar, and thus from a privileged perspective. Furthermore, although the questions guiding the coding process in the present study were based on CRT and CMA, other interpretations derived from both frameworks could not easily be applied to the books in the present study, and deserve attention in future research. For example, the historical and political contexts (CRT, Hubert et al., 2018) were not included in the present study as the focus was on books for very young children with relatively short and simple, respectively, storylines. Studies zooming in on fewer books in even more detail and on books aimed at (slightly) older children could include these aspects of the theoretical frameworks as well, adding to the present results. Moreover, in addition to the content of the books, the way in which adults discuss the books with children is of great importance (see Farago et al., 2015). Future research should examine how books are read to children by parents of different ethnic backgrounds to truly examine the explicit and implicit messages that children receive during shared book reading, for example using observational studies guided by the ethnic-racial socialization framework (Hughes et al., 2006). In addition, it would be interesting to examine books focusing on the topic of diversity specifically, to see what ideologies are presented there.

The present study gives insights in the messages that are conveyed in books including characters of color aimed at young children in the Netherlands. The results highlight that the inclusion of characters of color in children's literature still deserves attention, and that this should not be focused on mere representation, but also the portrayal of enough cultural specificity and authenticity to reflect the experiences of characters of color. Only in this way can children's books reach their full potential as mirrors, windows, and glass sliding doors (Bishop, 1990), and can different viewpoints and ideologies challenge the dominant ones.













Chapter 7

General Discussion

The aim of this dissertation was to provide insight in interethnic prejudice of children in the Netherlands and attitudes and ideologies that they are exposed to through two socialization agents (parents and children's books). Specifically attitudes and ideologies based on intergroup contact theories and diversity ideologies were of interest. Results from Chapter 2 showed interethnic prejudice among White Dutch children (6-to 8-years old) in the form of ingroup favoritism and outgroup rejection, with children of Middle Eastern descent evaluated least positively. Maternal attitudes toward child interethnic relations in general were related to child outgroup prejudice in White Dutch families (Chapter 2), but not when maternal attitudes were measured towards specific outgroups in White Dutch, Turkish-Dutch, and Afro-Dutch families (Chapter 3). Furthermore, maternal attitudes toward child relations with specific ethnic outgroups were relatively positive, but results suggested that ethnic groups that (predominantly) identify as Muslim are specifically at risk of being isolated from interethnic contact (Chapter 3). Results from Chapter 4 suggested that opportunities for indirect contact through books for young children are limited, as an underrepresentation of characters of color, as compared to the target population, was found. Moreover, results from Chapter 5 showed that maternal endorsement of multiculturalism, rather than colorblindness, was positively related to child interethnic attitudes in White Dutch families, and suggested that endorsement of colorblindness can have negative effects. Colorblindness was commonly identified in popular books for young children analyzed in Chapter 6, as cultural details were generally lacking. In addition, some examples of White supremacy, eurocentrism, and stereotypes, and a lot of examples of positive interethnic relations were found (Chapter 6). In the current chapter, the main findings are reviewed and elaborated upon, and limitations, future directions, and implications are discussed.

Child Interethnic Prejudice in the Netherlands

Definitions of interethnic prejudice differ in whether they focus on negative evaluations only (i.e., Nesdale, 2004), or whether they also include less positive evaluations based on ingroup favoritism (Hewstone et al., 2002). Results in this dissertation showed both forms of prejudice in young (6-to 8-years old) White children in the Netherlands (Chapter 2): participating children preferred the White children depicted in the pictures the most, and rejected the Black and Middle Eastern children more often. These results mirror earlier findings among young White children in the U.S. (Katz, 2003; Ramsey, 1991). In addition, prejudice in terms of a relative devaluation (less preference) was stronger towards children of Middle Eastern descent than towards Black children, mirroring the ethnic hierarchy as previously rated by older White Dutch children (Verkuyten & Kinket, 2000). In Chapter 3, however, prejudice in terms of negative evaluations among White Dutch children (6-to 10-years old) was higher towards Black children than towards children of Middle Eastern descent.

Some notable differences between procedures and measures might explain these conflicting patterns. Data presented in Chapter 2 were collected in April and May 2016, whereas data presented in Chapter 3 were collected from April 2018 to January

2020. The period in which data from Chapter 2 was collected was just following the peak of migration by refugees, mostly from Syria in the Middle East, to the Netherlands in 2015. In this year, European media coverage of the refugee 'crisis' shifted from a more sympathetic frame to a frame of suspicion or even threat (Georgiou & Zaborowksi, 2016). Threat perception increases intergroup prejudice in children (Nesdale et al., 2005), and might have elevated White children's prejudice toward people of Middle Eastern descent during the collection of data described in Chapter 2. During the collection of data described in Chapter 3, this media storm had mostly passed, but the increasingly hostile and violent debate on the anti-Black racist nature of Black Pete was widely covered (Bahara & Ezzerioli, 2019; Soetenhorst, 2019), also by the news broadcast specifically aimed at youth (NOS Jeugdjournaal, 2019).

In addition, the pictures used in the social preference task were different. Pictures used in Chapter 2 were selected from materials freely available online, and thus not standardized, whereas pictures used in Chapter 3 were standardized in the sense that all children wore similar t-shirts, were placed against a similar background, and were instructed to smile similarly. In pilot studies reported in Chapter 2 and 3 differences between the ethnic groups represented in the pictures were found in terms of rated attractiveness and cuteness. However, in both studies, the patterns of attractiveness and cuteness did not coincide with the patterns of prejudice of children, suggesting that attractiveness was not the most important factor determining social preferences and rejection. Another important difference in the pictures is that girls of Middle Eastern descent wore headscarves in the pictures used for Chapter 2, but not in those used for Chapter 3. In general, reactions towards Muslim women with headscarves are more negative than towards Muslim women without headscarves (Everett et al., 2015). Although children evaluated Middle Eastern boys just as negatively as Middle Eastern girls in Chapter 2, which suggests that the headscarves were not the driving force behind evaluations, future research among children is needed to examine their responses to different aspects of appearances of ethnic outgroups.

Chapters 3 and 5 report on levels of outgroup rejection among children (6-to 10-years old) of other ethnic backgrounds: Turkish-Dutch and Afro-Dutch. Although some research has included Turkish-Dutch youth before (e.g., Verkuyten, 2007), to our knowledge this is the first study to include young Turkish- and Afro-Dutch children simultaneously. Afro-Dutch children showed more prejudice towards the dominant ethnic group than Turkish-Dutch children (Chapter 3), but Turkish-Dutch children showed more prejudice toward an underrepresented outgroup than Afro-Dutch children (Chapter 5). Although a focus on prejudice among members from the dominant ethnic group is very logical and also deserves attention, given that members from their outgroups experience most discrimination, these results imply that research on interethnic attitudes and prejudice among members from underrepresented ethnic groups is also worthwhile in order to improve intergroup relations and decrease intergroup tension.

Intergroup Contact

Chapters 2 to 4 were inspired by intergroup contact theory (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) and theories on indirect contact such as the extended contact hypothesis (Wright et al., 1997), vicarious contact (Vezzali et al., 2012), and the parasocial contact hypothesis (Schiappa et al., 2005). These theories propose that exposure to direct and indirect contact with outgroup members benefits children's interethnic attitudes, and thus decreases their prejudice. In light of these assumptions, attitudes of mothers with different ethnic backgrounds (White Dutch, Turkish-Dutch, and Afro-Dutch) towards child interethnic relations with specific outgroups were explored (Chapter 3). Results show that maternal attitudes were relatively positive, but that attitudes of Turkish-Dutch mothers were more negative than those of Afro-Dutch and White Dutch mothers. In these latter two groups, in addition, attitudes towards interethnic contact with Muslims were more negative as compared to contact with the other outgroup. These findings suggest that specifically the Turkish-Dutch community and other ethnic groups that predominantly identify as Muslim risk being isolated from intergroup contact. Previous research has indeed demonstrated that Turkish-Dutch people are engaged in fewer intergroup contact than other underrepresented groups in the Netherlands (Martinović, 2013; Koops et al., 2017). Considering the more general trends of Islamophobia in Europe (Abdelkader, 2017), these findings highlight the need for more research on how to improve relations with groups that identify as Muslim.

Relations between maternal attitudes toward child interethnic relations and child prejudice appear to be complex. Whereas White children of mothers who did not object to interethnic relations in general (i.e., with someone with a non-Dutch background) showed less rejection towards the Middle Eastern group (Chapter 2), maternal attitudes toward child relations with specific outgroups were not related to child rejection towards the same outgroup (Chapter 3). Parent-child similarity in interethnic attitudes is more pronounced for generalized or common components of prejudice, related to similarity in broader ideological values like right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation (Meeusen & Dhont, 2015). Perhaps more general forms of parental interethnic attitudes therefore also more strongly predict specific child outcomes, but more research is needed to explore this hypothesis and examine underlying mechanisms. In addition, maternal attitudes toward child interethnic relations were unrelated to child actual outgroup contact. The present study, however, does not elucidate whether attitudes were not translated into strategies or roles that parents tend to use (Ladd & Parke, 2021), or not effective. Future research is thus needed to examine the role that parents have in facilitating interethnic contact in more detail.

Results from the present study furthermore exemplify that intergroup contact effects in young children with different ethnic backgrounds are complex (Chapter 3). Although the prejudice-reducing effect of intergroup contact has received meta-analytic support in general (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), and in children specifically (Tropp & Prenovost, 2008), these effects were not replicated in the sample of 6-to

10-year old White Dutch, Turkish-Dutch, and Afro-Dutch children. In fact, child contact with outgroup friends and outgroup rejection were not related among White Dutch and Turkish-Dutch children, but there was a positive association between contact with friends from the White outgroup and White rejection among Afro-Dutch children. Therefore, whereas promoting intergroup contact is a common suggestion on how to improve interethnic attitudes (Scott et al., 2020), research must not lose sight of the potential negative consequences. Negative contact, for example, is found to be a stronger predictor of prejudice than positive contact (Barlow et al., 2012). Friendships are expected to meet all conditions under which intergroup contact was originally hypothesized to reduce prejudice (i.e., equal group status, common goals, cooperation, support of authorities; Pettigrew, 1997), and specifically behavioral engagement and time spent with outgroup friends seem important for reducing prejudice (Davies et al., 2011). The present research suggests, however, that even in friendships situational aspects or conditions could result in undesired intergroup contact effects. Future research should look into interethnic contact within friendships among young children more closely to examine what aspects elicit positive and negative effects on interethnic attitudes, for example by combining information from multiple informants (e.g., self-report, parent-report, teacher-report).

Several theories propose that different forms of indirect contact also have positive effects on intergroup attitudes, such as examples of an ingroup member engaging in positive contact with an outgroup member (extended contact; Wright et al., 1997), observing positive interactions between an ingroup and outgroup member (vicarious contact; Vezzali et al., 2012), and exposure to positive portrayals of outgroup members (parasocial contact; Schiappa et al., 2005). To elicit these indirect contact effects in terms of improved interethnic attitudes through books, ethnic diversity among characters is a prerequisite. Characters of color, however, are underrepresented as compared to population statistics in popular children's books (i.e., those most sold, most borrowed from libraries, and awarded between 2009 and 2018) in the Netherlands (Chapter 4). Most characters were White (84%), and most of the books (56%) did not include any character of color. Books that did include (a) character(s) of color, always also included (a) White character(s). These findings are in line with studies reporting on underrepresentation of characters of color in other countries (e.g., Koss, 2015; Koss et al., 2017; Lee, 2017), and suggest that opportunities for indirect contact may be limited. In a subset of the books including a character of color as protagonist or supportive character, nevertheless, these characters were not described explicitly negatively and most books did include examples of interethnic friendships and ethnically mixed families with positive relations (Chapter 6). Thus, whenever books are ethnically diverse, they seem to provide opportunities for children to be exposed to extended contact. Again, however, parents can play an important role in facilitating these forms of indirect contact, and we do not know to what degree parents take advantage from what is on offer. Similarly, other book-providers in the environment of young children, such as teachers and schools, can impact the extent to which children are actually exposed to these examples. To illustrate, about half the children in Dutch primary schools read non-school books at school almost daily (DUO Onderwijsonderzoek, 2017).

Diversity Ideologies

Multiculturalism and colorblindness are two commonly distinguished diversity ideologies that advocate a different approach to demographic differences such as ethnicity (Rattan & Amady, 2013). Based on social learning theory, both the colorblind and multicultural diversity approach are argued to reduce prejudice: either through not emphasizing racial or ethnic differences (colorblindness) or through emphasizing and valuing ethnic differences (multiculturalism, Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). Although within adults both ideologies have been associated with reduced levels of prejudice, multiculturalism is demonstrated to be more beneficial (Leslie et al., 2020; Whitley & Webster, 2019). In line with this notion, overall correlational results in Chapter 5 show that child prejudice was negatively related to maternal multiculturalism, but positively related to maternal colorblindness. These results are consistent with research demonstrating that a multiculturalism-based ideology at school has more beneficial results than a colorblind-based ideology (Apfelbaum et al., 2010), and with research showing that ethnicity- or race-related conversations between parents and children (i.e., not colorblind parenting) can have positive impacts on children's interethnic attitudes (Perry et al., 2020; Vittrup & Holden, 2011). Given that children can perceive racial differences and are aware of societal inequalities from a young age (e.g., Bar-Haim et al., 2006; Olson et al., 2012), colorblindness might teach children that inequalities can be attributed to people themselves, leading to more negative perceptions of people and ethnic groups that are structurally disadvantaged.

However, associations between diversity ideologies and child prejudice differ between ethnic groups. Whereas maternal multiculturalism was related to lower levels of child prejudice in White Dutch families, these associations were not found in the Turkish- and Afro-Dutch families (Chapter 5). Although multiculturalism thus seems beneficial for interethnic attitudes of children in the dominant ethnic group, it is less clear what diversity approach 'works' for the interethnic attitudes of children in underrepresented ethnic groups. Group differences in maternal endorsement of multiculturalism, in addition, were in line with previous research in the Netherlands (e.g., Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2003; Verkuyten, 2005) and other countries (e.g., Ryan et al., 2010; Wolsko et al., 2006), showing that endorsement of multiculturalism is higher among members from underrepresented ethnic groups than members from the dominant ethnic group. This pattern could be explained by the different proposed consequences of multiculturalism: a possible threat to the status of the dominant ethnic group, and a possible rise in status for underrepresented ethnic groups (Berry & Kalin, 1995). Afro-Dutch mothers in contrast were less likely to endorse colorblindness, in the form of unawareness of racism and racial inequalities than White Dutch and Turkish-Dutch mothers (Chapter 5). For the Turkish-Dutch mothers this result was unexpected, given that discrimination experiences based on ethnicity and religion are common among Turkish-Dutch people (Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau, 2020). Future research on colorblindness among various ethnic groups in the Netherlands is needed to exclude the possibility that recruitment methods have influenced the present results, and to explore what drives and explains this

endorsement. Together, these group differences in maternal endorsement of diversity ideologies suggest that particularly White Dutch children, whose interethnic attitudes can benefit from a multiculturalist approach the most, are less likely to be exposed to multiculturalism at home as compared to children from other ethnic backgrounds.

Although it should be noted that multiculturalism is not synonymous with anti-racism, our findings support scholars' increasing advocacy for parents (Perry, Skinner-Dorkenoo et al., 2021) and teachers (Boutte et al., 2011) to move away from colorblind approaches and towards engaging in discussions about ethnicity, race, and racism with children. White parents seem reluctant to engage in such conversations, even when asked to do so (Pahlke et al., 2012; Vittrup, 2018), although exceptions are also illustrated (Hagermann, 2017). One strategy that is suggested to increase discussions about diversity with young children is shared-book reading (Kemple et al., 2016). Colorblindness, however, prevailed in the popular children's books that were analyzed in Chapter 6, as very few references to cultural or ethnic backgrounds of characters of color were made and books thus mostly stayed clear of the topic of ethnicity, mirroring earlier results on children's literature (Winograd, 2011). These results suggest that the books do not provide openings that parents who themselves are reluctant to initiate conversations might benefit from. Moreover, in some of the books (implicit) examples of stereotypes, White supremacy, or eurocentrism were found (Chapter 6), and results on the prominence of characters were mixed: some factors suggest that White characters and characters of color played equally important roles in the books, but other factors suggest that characters of color were less prominent (Chapter 4). Intersectionality, referring to the importance to take into account the interaction between dimensions of identity such as ethnicity and gender (Crenshaw, 1989) showed to be important in the analyses of the books: most stereotypes concerned male characters of color (Chapter 6), but especially female characters of color were less prominent (Chapter 4). In addition, most stereotypes about values and settings were found for Middle Eastern cultures (Chapter 6), possibly reinforcing the large perceived cultural distance by the White dominant ethnic group (Schalk-Soekar et al., 2004) and Islamophobic attitudes in the Netherlands (Adbelkader, 2017). Taken together, these results suggest that books that Dutch children are likely to be exposed to, might unintentionally convey messages and ideologies that negatively impact readers intergroup attitudes.

Limitations and Future Directions

The studies presented in the current dissertation have some limitations. Firstly, the studies on families in the Netherlands (Chapters 2, 3, and 5) were correlational, limiting any inferences about causality. In addition, although fathers were invited to participate, and some did, numbers were too small to include them in the analyses. Therefore, this dissertation only takes into account associations between mothers and children, and potentially misses links between paternal and child attitudes. Moreover, the participating mothers were highly educated, limiting generalizability to the entire Dutch population. This was particularly true for the White Dutch mothers

(Chapters 2, 3, and 5) and the Afro-Dutch mothers (Chapters 3 and 5). Given that level of education is an important factor related to diversity ideologies (Van de Vijver et al., 2008), as well as interethnic prejudice (Carvacho et al., 2013), future research should ideally include a sample with a more representative distribution of level of education. Recruitment methods may have additionally attracted mothers with an interest in the topic of diversity in the context of children. Such self-selection might have led to an overly optimistic picture regarding maternal interethnic attitudes in the present dissertation. Moreover, although the inclusion of families of different ethnic backgrounds is definitely a strength of this dissertation, recruitment proved to be more challenging than expected. This resulted in various recruitment approaches, differing in effectiveness per ethnic group, and relatively small sample sizes for the Turkish- and Afro-Dutch families in particular, hampering power to find statistically significant effects (Chapter 3 and 5).

Limitations to the studies on popular children's books (Chapter 4 and 6) include the fact that most of the (initial) coding was done by a White researcher. Although an ethnically diverse team was occasionally consulted, the perspective of the White researcher may have influenced the work. An additional limitation to Chapter 4 specifically is that ethnicity of the characters could only broadly be categorized into White characters and characters of color, due to a common lack of detail in drawings and story lines. It therefore remains unclear to what degree specific ethnic groups in the Netherlands are (under)represented in popular children's books. In addition, the present studies did not examine the actual degree to which children are exposed to the books included in the study, what messages adult readers additionally provide, nor the direct effect that reading these books has on their interethnic attitudes or prejudice. The results do provide an initial insight in opportunities for indirect contact and messages that children may come across.

The research field could therefore benefit from longitudinal studies examining associations between parental attitudes or ideologies and child outcomes over time to further explore whether and when associations are unidirectional (Rodríguez-García & Wagner, 2009) or bidirectional (Vollebergh et al., 2001). Moreover, observational research on how parents put their attitudes (e.g., toward child interethnic contact) and diversity ideologies (such as multiculturalism and colorblindness) into practice, and how these concrete parenting practices relate to child interethnic prejudice, is needed. Innovative research methods and approaches need to be developed to examine parents' ethnic-racial socialization practices (Hughes et al., 2006), as previous research has demonstrated how difficult it can be to elicit parent-child discussions about race or ethnicity, especially in White families (Pahlke et al., 2012; Vittrup & Holden, 2011). Future work can build on examples of books and videos aimed to elicit such conversations with varying success rates (Pahlke et al., 2012; Perry et al., 2020; Vittrup & Holden, 2011). It should be explored how laboratory procedures that seem successful (Perry, Abaied et al., 2021) can be adapted to facilitate and elicit ethnic-racial socialization at home and in daily life. Another promising development is that the Observational Measure of Ethnic-Racial Socialization (OMERS) task and coding system (Yasui, 2008), was recently adapted

for school-aged children (Aguayo et al., 2021). Future work in this area can help substantiate recommendations for parent-child discussions about race and ethnicity and make them more concrete (Scott et al., 2020). In addition, to complement existing intervention research on indirect contact effects through books, which has mostly been conducted in schools and included post-reading group discussions led by researchers (e.g., Cameron et al. 2006; Cameron et al., 2007), intervention research in families is needed to examine whether similar effects can be accomplished by parents. However, parental compliance to engage in discussions about race and ethnicity with their children might hamper such studies, highlighting the need for qualitative approaches to explore reasons and motivations for specific parental ethnic-racial socialization strategies like applied by Abaied and Perry (2021).

Future studies should moreover ideally include multiple socialization agents that can impact children's learning, such as parents and media but also peers and school environments, simultaneously, in order to disentangle various influences and their interactions, as hypothesized in the ecological model of development (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). Some work with adolescents, for example, shows that peer attitudes are more important for within-person fluctuations in prejudice, but that parental attitudes are more important for between-person differences, partly because parental attitudes predicted the type of peers their children befriended (Miklikowska et al., 2019). At the same time, the effect of parental attitudes is weaker when children are in ethnically diverse classrooms (Miklikowska et al., 2019). Similar research in earlier developmental stages is needed to tailor interventions aimed to reduce prejudice. In this future work, it remains important to pay attention to the specific populations and contexts included, so that concrete and tailored suggestions can be formed.

Implications

The studies presented in this dissertation provide some initial suggestions for implications, taking into account the limitations described. Firstly, the results in this dissertation suggest that policies, programs, or interventions aimed to improve interethnic attitudes should already start at an early age, and focus on attitudes of and towards various ethnic groups. A systematic review describes interventions based on both intergroup contact and media/instruction aimed at children of 8 years and younger and their effectiveness (Aboud et al., 2012), providing a basis for intervention development. Interventions, which have mostly been researched in the U.S. (74%, Beelmann & Heinemann, 2014), should be tailored to the Dutch context, and be kept up to date and tailored to patterns emerging in society, as societal developments may play a role in shaping child prejudice against specific outgroups.

Secondly, programs promoting intergroup contact among children of various ethnic groups should closely monitor the nature of this contact and its effects, as results from the present study suggest that even interethnic friendships can have undesired effects. Results from the present study suggest that there is most room for improvement in interethnic contact in ethnic groups that predominantly identify as

Muslim. Interventions using indirect contact measures through books like procedures by Cameron et al. (2006; 2007) could therefore aim specifically at contact between a character from an underrepresented ethnic group that identifies as Muslim and characters from other ethnic backgrounds.

Thirdly, this dissertation supports the idea that multiculturalism is more beneficial for children's interethnic attitudes than colorblindness, especially in White families. Although suggestions and practical guidelines on how to engage in discussions about the topic of ethnicity or racism unquestionably need further concretization and elaboration, avoiding the topic is not recommended. In addition, materials to help parents engage in such conversations, such as books and video's (Pahlke et al., 2012; Perry et al., 2020; Vittrup & Holden, 2011), need further development to effectively overcome parents' reservations and need to be tailored to the specific context in which they are used.

Fourthly, the studies in this dissertation imply that there is room for improvement in terms of quantitative and qualitative representation of ethnic diversity and characters of color in children's books. Authors, illustrators, and publishers should take into account not only how much ethnic diversity they portray in their books, but also how culturally specific and authentic the stories are, and what ideological viewpoints and messages concerning ethnic diversity are conveyed. Diagnostic tools to evaluate representation such as proposed by Van de Rozenberg and Van Veen for school book publishers (Universiteit Leiden, 2020) could also help publishers of children's literature. Furthermore, guidelines such as provided by Derman-Sparks (2013) can be applied by publishers and authors to evaluate diversity-related messages in books. Additionally, parents can pay attention to similar criteria when selecting books and when providing extra information while reading with their child. They should be aware that books can unintentionally transfer messages that might at first not stand out.

Conclusions

Overall, this dissertation shows that interethnic prejudice is found in various forms among young children in the Netherlands. In addition, it provides an insight in the attitudes and ideologies they are exposed to through two socialization agents: parents and books. This dissertation is an important first step in examining the basis for applying prejudice reducing theories based on social learning theory to the specific multi-ethnic Dutch context. It shows that intergroup contact approaches to improve children's interethnic attitudes may face some obstacles, as parents might be more or less willing to facilitate interethnic contact with different ethnic groups, intergroup contact effects are not always positive, and ethnic diversity and thus indirect contact opportunities in popular books for young children are somewhat limited. Furthermore, it shows that multiculturalist rather than colorblind diversity approaches can benefit interethnic attitudes of children in dominant ethnic groups, but that the latter is prevailing in popular books for young children. The results from this dissertation can help move both research and the development of practical

programs on improving interethnic attitudes among children in the Netherlands forward.

References

Abaied, J. L., & Perry, S. P. (2021). Socialization of racial ideology by White parents. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000454

Abdelkader, E. (2017). A comparative analysis of European Islamophobia: France, UK, Germany, Netherlands and Sweden. *UCLA Journal of Islamic and Near Eastern Law, 16*(1), 29-63. https://doi.org/10.5070/N4161038735

Aboud, F. E., & Doyle, A. B. (1996). Parental and peer influences on children's racial attitudes. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 20*(3-4), 371-383. https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(96)00024-7

Aboud, F. E., Tredoux, C., Tropp, L. R., Brown, C. S., Niens, U., & Noor, N. M. (2012). Interventions to reduce prejudice and enhance inclusion and respect for ethnic differences in early childhood: A systematic review. *Developmental Review, 32*(4), 307-336. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2012.05.001

Adam, H., & Barratt-Pugh, C. (2020). The challenge of monoculturalism: what books are educators sharing with children and what messages do they send?. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-019-00375-7

Aguayo, L., Hernandez, I. G., Yasui, M., Estabrook, R., Anderson, E. L., Davis, M. M., Briggs-Gowan, M.J., Wakschlag, L.S., & Heard-Garris, N. (2021). Cultural socialization in childhood: Analysis of parent–child conversations with a direct observation measure. *Journal of Family Psychology, 35*(2), 138-148. https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000663

Akgündüz, A. (1993). Labour migration from Turkey to Western Europe (1960–1974): An analytical review. *Capital & Class, 17*(3), 153-194. https://doi.org/10.1177/030981689305100107

Al-Hazza, T. C., & Bucher, K. T. (2008). Building Arab Americans' cultural identity and acceptance with children's literature. *The Reading Teacher, 62*(3), 210-219. https://doi.org/10.1598/RT.62.3.3

André, S., Dronkers, J., & Fleischmann, F. (2008). The different levels of discrimination, experienced by first and second generation immigrants from different countries of origin in the different EU member-states. In *Proceecings of the RC28 Spring Meeting, Florence, Italy* (pp.15-18).

Angerer, S., Dutcher, E. G., Glätzle-Rützler, D., Lergetporer, P., & Sutter, M. (2017). Gender differences in discrimination emerge early in life: Evidence from primary school children in a bilingual city. *Economics Letters, 152*, 15-18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2016.12.031

Angerer, S., Glätzle-Rützler, D., Lergetporer, P., & Sutter, M. (2016). Cooperation and discrimination within and across language borders: Evidence from children in a bilingual city. *European Economic Review, 90*, 254-264. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2016.02.022

Annamma, S. A., Jackson, D. D., & Morrison, D. (2017). Conceptualizing color-evasiveness: Using dis/ability critical race theory to expand a color-blind racial ideology in education and society. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 20*(2), 147-162. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2016.1248837

Apfelbaum, E. P., Norton, M. I., & Sommers, S. R. (2012). Racial color blindness: Emergence, practice, and implications. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 21*(3), 205-209. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721411434980

Apfelbaum, E. P., Pauker, K., Ambady, N., Sommers, S. R., & Norton, M. I. (2008). Learning (not) to talk about race: When older children underperform in social categorization. *Developmental Psychology, 44*(5), 1513-1518. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012835

Apfelbaum, E. P., Pauker, K., Sommers, S. R., & Ambady, N. (2010). In blind pursuit of racial equality?. *Psychological Science, 21*(11), 1587-1592. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610384741

Apfelbaum, E. P., Sommers, S. R., & Norton, M. I. (2008). Seeing race and seeming racist? Evaluating strategic colorblindness in social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(4), 918-932. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0011990

Arends-Tóth, J., & Van de Vijver, F. J. (2003). Multiculturalism and acculturation: views of Dutch and Turkish–Dutch. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*(2), 249-266. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.143

Ashby, M. S., & Wittmaier, B. C. (1978). Attitude changes in children after exposure to stories about women in traditional or nontraditional occupations. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 70*(6), 945-949. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.70.6.945

Autoriteit Persoonsgegevens. (2020, July 17). Werkwijze Belastingdienst in strijd met de wet en discriminerend. https://autoriteitpersoonsgegevens.nl/nl/nieuws/werkwijze-belastingdienst-strijd-met-de-wet-en-discriminerend

Bahara, H., & Ezzerioli, N. (2019, November 15). Zo werd het pro-Zwarte Piet-protest steeds gewelddadiger. *De Volkskrant.* https://www.volkskrant.nl/nieuws-achtergrond/zo-werd-het-pro-zwarte-piet-protest-steeds-gewelddadiger~bd07c121/

Bar-Haim, Y., Ziv, T., Lamy, D., & Hodes, R. M. (2006). Nature and nurture in own-race face processing. *Psychological Science, 17*(2), 159-163. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01679.x

Barlow, F. K., Paolini, S., Pedersen, A., Hornsey, M. J., Radke, H.R.M., Harwood, J., Rubin, M., & Sibley, C. G. (2012). The contact caveat: Negative contact predicts increased prejudice more than positive contact predicts reduced prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38*(12), 1629-1643. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167212457953

Barker, J. L. (2010). Racial identification and audience in roll of thunder, hear my cry and the Watsons go to Birmingham – 1963. *Children's Literature in Education, 41*, 118-145. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10583-010-9101-4

Becker, M., McElvany, N., & Kortenbruck, M. (2010). Intrinsic and extrinsic reading motivation as predictors of reading literacy: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102*(4)*,* 773–785. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020084

Beelmann, A., & Heinemann, K. S. (2014). Preventing prejudice and improving intergroup attitudes: A meta-analysis of child and adolescent training programs. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 35*(1), 10-24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2013.11.002

Belet, M. (2018). Reducing interethnic bias through real-life and literary encounters: The interplay between face-to-face and vicarious contact in high school classrooms. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 63*, 53-67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2018.01.003

Benner, A. D., Wang, Y., Shen, Y., Boyle, A. E., Polk, R., & Cheng, Y. P. (2018). Racial/ethnic discrimination and well-being during adolescence: A meta-analytic review. *American Psychologist, 73*(7), 855–883. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000204

Berg, M., Schor, P., & Soto, I. (2014). The weight of words: Writing about race in the United States and Europe. *The American Historical Review, 119*(3), 800-808. https://doi.org/10.1093/ahr/119.3.800

Berreman, G. D. (1972). Race, caste, and other invidious distinctions in social stratification. *Race, 13*(4), 385-414. https://doi.org/10.1177/030639687201300401

Berry, J. W., & Kalin, R. (1995). Multicultural and ethnic attitudes in Canada: An overview of the 1991 national survey. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 27*(3), 301-320. https://doi.org/10.1037/0008-400X.27.3.301

Bigler, R. S., Averhart, C. J., & Liben, L. S. (2003). Race and the workforce: Occupational status, aspirations, and stereotyping among African American children. *Developmental Psychology, 39*(3), 572-580. https://doi.org/10.1037/00121649.39.3.572

Bigler, R. S., & Liben, L. S. (2007). Developmental intergroup theory: Explaining and reducing children's social stereotyping and prejudice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 16*(3), 162-166. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00496.x

Bikmen, N. (2011). Asymmetrical effects of contact between minority groups: Asian and Black students in a small college. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17*(2), 186-194. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023230

Binder, J., Zagefka, H., Brown, R., Funke, F., Kessler, T., Mummendey, A., Maquil, A., Demoulin, S. & Leyens, J.P. (2009). Does contact reduce prejudice or does prejudice reduce contact? A longitudinal test of the contact hypothesis among majority and minority groups in three European countries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*(4), 843-856. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013470

Birnbaum, H. J., Stephens, N. M., Townsend, S. S., & Hamedani, M. G. (2020). A diversity ideology intervention: Multiculturalism reduces the racial achievement gap. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 12*(5), 751-759. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550620938227

Bishop, R.S. (1990). Mirrors, windows, and sliding glass doors. *Perspectives: Choosing and Using Books for the Classroom, 6*(3), ix–xi.

Bishop, R. S. (2012). Reflections on the development of African American children's literature. *Journal of Children's Literature, 38*(2), 5-13.

Bishop, K. (2013). Making multicultural literature meaningful. *Knowledge Quest, 32*(1), 27-28.

Bista, K. (2012). Multicultural literature for children and young adults. *The Educational Forum, 76*(3), 317-325. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2012.682203

Botelho, M. J., & Rudman, M. K. (2009). *Critical multicultural analysis of children's literature*. Routledge.

Boutte, G. S., Lopez-Robertson, J., & Powers-Costello, E. (2011). Moving beyond colorblindness in early childhood classrooms. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 39*(5), 335-342. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-011-0457-x

Brondolo, E., Libretti, M., Rivera, L., & Walsemann, K. M. (2012). Racism and social capital: The implications for social and physical well-being. *Journal of Social Issues, 68*(2), 358-384. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2012.01752.x

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist, 32*(7), 513–531. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.32.7.513

Brooks, W. (2009). An author as a counter-storyteller: Applying critical race theory to a Coretta Scott King Award book. *Children's Literature in Education, 40*(1), 33-45. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10583-008-9065-9

Brown, G. K., & Langer, A. (2010). Conceptualizing and measuring ethnicity. *Oxford Development Studies, 38*(4), 411-436. https://doi.org/10.1080/13600818.2010.525629

Brown, R., Eller, A., Leeds, S., & Stace, K. (2007). Intergroup contact and intergroup attitudes: A longitudinal study. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 37*(4), 692-703. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.384

Buda, R., & Elsayed-Elkhouly, S. M. (1998). Cultural differences between Arabs and Americans: Individualism-collectivism revisited. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29*(3), 487-492. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022198293006

Byrd, C. M. (2012). The measurement of racial/ethnic identity in children: A critical review. *Journal of Black Psychology, 38*(1), 3-31. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095798410397544

Cameron, L., Rutland, A., Brown, R., & Douche, R. (2006). Changing children's intergroup attitudes toward refugees: Testing different models of extended contact. *Child Development, 77*(5), 1208-1219. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00929.x

Cameron, L., Rutland, A., & Brown, R. (2007). Promoting children's positive intergroup attitudes towards stigmatized groups: Extended contact and multiple classification skills training. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 31*(5), 454-466. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025407081474.

Cameron, L., Rutland, A., Hossain, R., & Petley, R. (2011). When and why does extended contact work? The role of high quality direct contact and group norms in the development of positive ethnic intergroup attitudes amongst children. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 14*(2), 193-206. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430210390535

Carlson, C. I., Wilson, K. D., & Hargrave, J. L. (2003). The effect of school racial composition on Hispanic intergroup relations. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 20*(2), 203-220. https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075030202005

Carol, S. (2014). The intergenerational transmission of intermarriage attitudes and intergroup friendships: The role of Turkish migrant parents. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 40*(10), 1550-1571. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2013.872557

Carvacho, H., Zick, A., Haye, A., González, R., Manzi, J., Kocik, C., & Bertl, M. (2013). On the relation between social class and prejudice: The roles of education, income, and ideological attitudes. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 43*(4), 272-285. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.1961

Castelli, L. U., Carraro, L., Tomelleri, S., & Amari, A. (2007). White children's alignment to the perceived racial attitudes of the parents: Closer to the mother than the father. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 25*(3), 353-357. https://doi.org/10.1348/026151006X159851

Castelli, L., De Dea, C., & Nesdale, D. (2008). Learning social attitudes: Children's sensitivity to the nonverbal behaviors of adult models during interracial interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*(11), 1504–1513. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167208322769

Castelli, L., Zogmaister, C., & Tomelleri, S. (2009). The transmission of racial attitudes within the family. *Developmental Psychology, 45*(2), 586-591. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014619

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (2018a). Bevolking; hoogstbehaald onderwijsniveau en onderwijsrichting.
https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/nl/dataset/82816ned/table?dl=8083

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (2018b). Kinderen van tweede generatie ouders, 1 januari 2018. https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/maatwerk/2018/47/kinderen-van-tweede-generatie-ouders-1-januari-2018

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (2019a). Bevolking op 1 januari; leeftijd, geboorteland en regio.
http://statline.cbs.nl/Statweb/publication/?DM=SLNL&PA=70648ned&D1=0&D2=a&D3=a&D4=0&D5=l&HDR=T,G3,G4&STB=G2,G1&VW=T

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (2019b). Bevolking; generatie, geslacht, leeftijd en migratieachtergrond, 1 januari.
https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/nl/dataset/37325/table?ts=1539777137624

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (2020). Verkenning bevolking 2050: Meer inwoners met een migratieachtergrond. https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2020/28/verkenning-bevolking-2050-meer-inwoners-met-een-migratieachtergrond

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (2021a). Bevolking; kerncijfers.
https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/nl/dataset/37296ned/table?ts=1616065565146

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (2021b). Bevolking; onderwijsniveau; geslacht, leeftijd en migratieachtergrond. https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/nl/dataset/82275NED/table?fromstatweb

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (n.d.). Wat is het verschil tussen een Westerse en niet-Westerse allochtoon? https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/faq/specifiek/wat-is-het-verschil-tussen-een-westerse-en-niet-westerse-allochtoon-

Chen, M., Bell, R. A., & Taylor, L. D. (2016). Narrator point of view and persuasion in health narratives: The role of protagonist-reader similarity, identification, and self-referencing. *Journal of Health Communication, 21*(8), 908-918.
https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2016.1177147

Clark, K. D., & Tate, C. (2008). Measuring racial prejudice in a multiracial world: New methods and new constructs. In M. A. Morrison & T. G. Morrison (Ed.), *The Psychology of Modern Prejudice*, (pp. 93-122). Nova Science Publishers.

Cohen, J., Weimann-Saks, D., & Mazor-Tregerman, M. (2018). Does character similarity increase idenfitication and persuasion? *Media Psychology, 21*(3), 506-528. https://doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2017.1302344

Cohen, J. S., & Woody, E. Z. (1991). Maternal involvement in children's peer relationships: The contribution of mothers' experiences, values and beliefs. Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Seattle, WA. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED338439.pdf

Cole, E. M., & Valentine, D. P. (2000). Multiethnic children portrayed in children's picture books. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 17*(4), 305-317. https://doi.org/10.1023%2FA%3A1007550124043

Cramer, P., & Anderson, G. (2003). Ethnic/racial attitudes and self-identification of Black Jamaican and White New England children. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34(*4), 395-416. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022103034004002

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 139-167.

Crenshaw, K. W. (2010). Twenty years of critical race theory: Looking back to move forward. *Connecticut Law Review, 43*(5), 1253-1354.

Dandy, J., & Pe-Pua, R. (2015). The refugee experience of social cohesion in Australia: Exploring the roles of racism, intercultural contact, and the media. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies, 13*(4), 339-357. https://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2014.974794

Davies, K., Tropp, L. R., Aron, A., Pettigrew, T. F., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Cross-group friendships and intergroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 15*(4), 332-351. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868311411103

de Bruijn, Y., Amoureus, C., Emmen, R. A. G., & Mesman, J. (2020). Interethnic prejudice against Muslims among White Dutch children. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 51*(3-4), 203-221. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022120908346

de Bruijn, Y., Emmen, R. A. G., & Mesman, J. (2021). Ethnic diversity in children's books in the Netherlands. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, *49*, 413-423. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-020-01080-2

de Hond, M. (2013): Reactie op Islam in Nederland.
http://www.pvv.nl/images/stories/Reactie_op_Islam_in_Nederland.pdf

Degner, J., & Dalege, J. (2013). The apple does not fall far from the tree, or does it? A meta-analysis of parent-child similarity in intergroup attitudes. *Psychological Bulletin, 139*(6), 1270-1340. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031436

Derman-Sparks, L. (2013). Guide for selecting anti-bias children's books. *Social Justice Books*. https://socialjusticebooks.org/guide-for-selecting-anti-bias-childrens-books/

Dhont, K., & Van Hiel, A. (2012). Intergroup contact buffers against the intergenerational transmission of authoritarianism and racial prejudice. *Journal of Research in Personality, 46*(2), 231-234. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2011.12.008

Dovidio, J. F., Eller, A., & Hewstone, M. (2011). Improving intergroup relations through direct, extended and other forms of indirect contact. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 14*(2), 147-160. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430210390555

Dovidio, J. F., Hewstone, M., Glick, P., & Esses, V. M. (2010). Prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination: Theoretical and empirical overview. In J. F. Dovidio, M. Hewstone, P. Glick, & V. M. Esses (Eds.), *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination* (pp. 3-28). Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446200919.n1

Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S. L. (2002). Implicit and explicit prejudice and interracial interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(1), 62-68. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.82.1.62

Doyle, A. B., & Aboud, F. (1995). A longitudinal study of white children's racial prejudice as a social-cognitive development. *Merril-Palmer Quarterly, 41*(2), 210-229. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23090532

Dunham, Y., Baron, A. S., & Banaji, M. R. (2007). Children and social groups: A developmental analysis of implicit consistency in Hispanic Americans. *Self and Identity, 6*(2-3), 238-255. https://doi.org/10.1080/15298860601115344

Dunham, Y., Baron, A. S., & Banaji, M. R. (2008). The development of implicit intergroup cognition. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 12*(7), 248-253. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2008.04.006

DUO Onderwijsonderzoek (2017). *De leesmotivatie van Nederlandse kinderen en jongeren*. Stichting Lezen.

Duursma, E., Augustyn, M., & Zuckerman, B. (2008). Reading aloud to children: The evidence. *Archives of Disease in Childhood, 93*(7), 544-557. https://doi.org/10.1136/adc.2006.106336

Duursma, E. (2014). Parental bookreading practices among families in the Netherlands. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 14*(4), 435-458. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468798414523025

Eagly, A. H., & Diekman, A. B. (2005). What is the problem? Prejudice as an attitude-in-context. In J. F. Dovidio, P. Glick, L. Rudman (Eds.), *On the nature of Prejudice,* (pp. 19-35). Blackwell Publishing.

Eberl, J. M., Meltzer, C. E., Heidenreich, T., Herrero, B., Theorin, N., Lind, F., Berganza, R., Boomgaarden, H. G., Schemer, C., & Strömbäck, J. (2018). The European media discourse on immigration and its effects: A literature review. *Annals of the International Communication Association, 42*(3), 207-223. https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2018.1497452

Edmonds, C., & Killen, M. (2009). Do adolescents' perceptions of parental racial attitudes relate to their intergroup contact and cross-race relationships? *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 12*(1), 5-21. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430208098773

Eisenberg, K. N. (2002). *Gender and ethnicity stereotypes in children's books* (Doctoral dissertation). https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2443/docview/251657696?pq-origsite=primo

Ellemers, N., & Haslam, S.A. (2012). Social identity theory. In: P. van Lange, A. Kruglanski, & T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology (pp. 379-398).* Sage.

Eller, A., Abrams, D., & Gomez, A. (2012). When the direct route is blocked: The extended contact pathway to improving intergroup relations. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 36*(5), 637-646. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2012.03.005

Elturki, E., & Shaman, S. (2013). Aladdin's wonderful lamp: How are foreign folktales conveyed in Western children's literature?. *Arab World English Journal,* 1, 115-133.

Ekehammar, B., Akrami, N., & Araya, T. (2003). Gender differences in implicit prejudice. *Personality and Individual Differences, 34*(8), 1509-1523. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00132-0

Esajas, M., & de Abreu, J. (2019). The Black Archives: Exploring the politics of Black Dutch radicals. *Open Cultural Studies, 3*(1), 402-413. https://doi.org/10.1515/culture-2019-0034

Everett, J. A., Schellhaas, F. M., Earp, B. D., Ando, V., Memarzia, J., Parise, C. V., Fell, B., & Hewstone, M. (2015). Covered in stigma? The impact of differing levels of Islamic head-covering on explicit and implicit biases toward Muslim women. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 45*(2), 90-104. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12278

Farago, F., Sanders, K., & Gaias, L. (2015). Addressing race and racism in early childhood: Challenges and opportunities. *Advances in Early Education and Child Care, 19*, 29-66. https://doi.org/10.1108/S0270-402120150000019004

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*, 175-191. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146

Feddes, A. R., Noack, P., & Rutland, A. (2009). Direct and extended friendship effects on minority and majority children's interethnic attitudes: A longitudinal study. *Child Development, 80*(2), 377-390. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2009.01266.x

Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. *Second edition.* SAGE Publications.

Fish, J., & Syed, M. (2020). *Racism, discrimination, and prejudice*. In S. Hupp & J. Jewell (Eds.), Encyclopedia of Child and Adolescent Development. John Whiley & Sons, Inc. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781119171492.wecad464

Fortuin, J., Van Geel, M., Ziberna, A., & Vedder, P. (2014). Ethnic preferences in friendships and casual contacts between majority and minority children in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 41*, 57-65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2014.05.005

Frye, B., Button, L., Kelly, C., & Button, G. (2010). Preservice teachers' self-perceptions and attitudes toward culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Praxis in Multicultural Education, 5*(1), 6-22. https://doi.org/10.9741/2161-2978.1029

Ganea, P. A., Ma, J., & DeLoache, J. S. (2011). Young children's learning and transfer of biological information from picture books to real animals. *Child Development, 82*(5), 1421-1433. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01612.x

Ganea, P. A., Pickard, M. B., & DeLoache, J. S. (2008). Transfer between picture books and the real world by very young children. *Journal of Cognition and Development, 9*(1), 46-66. https://doi.org/10.1080/15248370701836592

General Bureau of Statistics (2013). *Resultaten 8ste volkstelling in Suriname (volume 1): Demografische en sociale karakteristieken en migratie*. Algemeen Bureau voor de Statistiek Suriname (GBS).

Georgiou, M., & Zaborowski, R. (2016). Media coverage of the "refugee crisis": a cross-European perspective. Council of Europe Report no. DG1(2017)03, LSE Media and Migration Project, September. LSE.

Gerritsen, A. A., Bramsen, I., Devillé, W., van Willigen, L. H., Hovens, J. E., & Van Der Ploeg, H. M. (2006). Physical and mental health of Afghan, Iranian and Somali asylum seekers and refugees living in the Netherlands. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 41*(1), 18-26. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-005-0003-5

Ghorashi, H. (2014). Racism and "the Ungrateful Other" in the Netherlands. *Thamyris /Intersecting, 27,* 101–116. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789401210096_006

Ghorashi, H. (2020). Taking racism beyond Dutch innocence. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506820978897.

Gniewosz, B., Noack, P., Wentura, D., & Funke, F. (2008). Adolescents' attitudes towards foreigners: Associations with perceptions of significant others' attitudes depending on sex and age. *Diskurs Kindheits-und Jugendforschung, 3*(3), 321-337.

Goff, P. A., Eberhardt, J. L., Williams, M. J., & Jackson, M. C. (2008). Not yet human: Implicit knowledge, historical dehumanization, and contemporary consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*(2), 292-306. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.2.292

Greenberg, J., & Arndt, J. (2012). Terror Management Theory. In: A.Kruglanski, E.T. Higgins, & P. van Lange (Eds), *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (pp. 398-415). Sage Press.

Greenhoot, A. F., Beyer, A. M., & Curtis, J. (2014). More than pretty pictures? How illustrations affect parent-child story reading and children's story recall. *Frontiers in Psychology, 5,* 738. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00738

Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review, 102*(1), 4-27. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.102.1.4

Greenwald, A. G., Nosek, B. A., & Benaji, M. R. (2003). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: I. An improved scoring algorithm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*(3), 197-216. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0087889

Griffiths, J. A., & Nesdale, D. (2006). In-group and out-group attitudes of ethnic majority and minority children. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 30*(6), 735-749. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2006.05.001

Guimond, S., Crisp, R. J., De Oliveira, P., Kamiejski, R., Kteily, N., Kuepper, B., Lalonmde, R.N., Levin, S., Pratto, F., Tougas, F., Sidanisu, J., & Zick, A. (2013). Diversity policy, social dominance, and intergroup relations: Predicting prejudice in changing social and political contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104*(6), 941-958. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032069

Hagerman, M. A. (2017). White racial socialization: Progressive fathers on raising "antiracist" children. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 79*(1), 60-74. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12325

Hamby, S. (2018, May, 22). Know thyself: How to write a reflexivity statement. *Psychology Today*. https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/the-web-violence/201805/know-thyself-how-write-reflexivity-statement

Hamilton, M. C., Anderson, D., Broaddus, M., & Young, K. (2006). Gender stereotyping and under-representation of female characters in 200 popular children's picture books: A twenty-first century update. *Sex Roles, 55*(11/12), 757-765. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9128-6

Harlin, R., & Morgan, H. (2009). Review of research: Gender, racial and ethnic misrepresentation in children's books: A comparative look. *Childhood Education, 85*(3), 187-190. https://doi.org/10.1080/00094056.2009.10521389

Harrison, L. (2001). Understanding the influence of stereotypes: Implications for the African American in sport and physical activity. *Quest, 53*(1), 97-114. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2001.10491732

Hartup, W. W., Laursen, B., Stewart, M. I., & Eastenson, A. (1988). Conflict and the friendship relations of young children. *Child Development, 59*(6), 1590-1600. https://doi.org/10.2307/1130673

Hayes, A. F. (2018). Partial, conditional, and moderated mediation: Quantification, inference, and interpretation. *Communication Monographs, 85*(1), 4–40. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2017.1352100

Hefflin, B. R., & Barksdale-Ladd, M. A. (2001). African American children's literature that helps students find themselves: Selection guidelines for grades K-3. *The Reading Teacher, 54*(8), 810-819.

Heilbron, M., Esajas, M. & de Abreau, J. (2018, December 5), Zwarte Piet is morgen weer vertrokken. Het racisme blijft. *De Correspondent.* https://decorrespondent.nl/8970/zwarte-piet-is-morgen-weer-vertrokken-het-racisme-blijft/4001198744400-de06971e

Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup bias. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 575-604. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135109

Hindriks, P., Verkuyten, M., & Coenders, M. (2014). Interminority attitudes: The roles of ethnic and national identification, contact, and multiculturalism. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 77*(1), 54-74. https://doi.org/10.1177/0190272513511469

Hofmann, W., Gawronski, B., Gschwendner, T., Le, H., & Schmitt, M. (2005). A meta-analysis on the correlation between the Implicit Association Test and explicit self-report measures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*(10), 1369-1385. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167205275613

Holmes, A. G. D. (2020). Researcher positionality-A consideration of its influence and place in qualitative research-A new researcher guide. *Shanlax International Journal of Education, 8*(4), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.34293/ education.v8i4.3232

Holoien, D. S., & Shelton, J. N. (2012). You deplete me: The cognitive costs of colorblindness on ethnic minorities. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*(2), 562-565. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.09.010

Hondius, D. (2014). Black Dutch Voices: Reports from a country that leaces racism unchallenged. In P. Essed & I. Hoving (Eds.), *Dutch Racism* (pp. 273-294). Rodopi.

Huber, L. P., Gonzalez, L. C., & Solórzano, D. G. (2018). Considerations for using Critical Race Theory and Critical Content Analysis: A research note. *Understanding and Dismantling Privilege, 8*(2), 8-26.

Hughes, D., Rodriguez, J., Smith, E. P., Johnson, D. J., Stevenson, H. C., & Spicer, P. (2006). Parents' ethnic-racial socialization practices: a review of research and directions for future study. *Developmental Psychology, 42*(5), 747-770. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.42.5.747

Hughes-Hassell, S., Barkley, H. A., & Koehler, E. (2009). Promoting equity in children's literacy instruction: Using a Critical Race Theory framework to examine transitional books. *School Library Media Research, 12*, 1-20.

Hughes-Hassell, S., & Cox, E. J. (2010). Inside board books: Representations of people of color. *The Library Quarterly, 80*(3), 211-230. https://doi.org/10.1086/652873

Huijnk, W. (2018). *De religieuze beleving van moslims in Nederland: Diversiteit en verandering in beeld.* SCP.

Huijnk, W., & Liefbroer, A. C. (2012). Family influences on intermarriage attitudes: A sibling analysis in the Netherlands. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 74*(1), 70-85. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00882.x

Ipsos Belgium (2009). Survey: *Hoe tolerant zijn Belgen ten opzichte van etnische minderheden*? Retrieved from Unia https://www.unia.be/nl/publicaties-statistieken/publicaties/tolerantie-enquete

Iwai, Y. (2013). Multicultural children's literature and teacher candidates' awareness and attitudes toward cultural diversity. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 5*(2), 185-198. https://iejee.com/index.php/IEJEE/article/view/20

Johnson, N.J., Koss, M.D., and Martinez, M. (2018). Through the sliding glass door: #EmpowerTheReader. *The Reading Teacher, 71*(5), 569-577. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1659

Johnson, H., & Gasiewicz, B. (2016). Examining displaced youth and immigrant status through critical multicultural analysis. In H. Johnson, J. Mathis, & K. G. Short (Eds.), *Critical content analysis of children's and young adult literature* (pp. 38-53). Routledge.

Judd, C. M., & Park, B. (1993). Definition and assessment of accuracy in social stereotypes. *Psychological Review, 100*(1), 109-128. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.100.1.109

Kalmijn, M. (1998). Intermarriage and homogamy: Causes, patterns, trends. *Annual Review of Sociology, 24*(1), 395-421. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.24.1.395

Kalmijn, M., & Van Tubergen, F. (2006). Ethnic intermarriage in the Netherlands: Confirmations and refutations of accepted insights. *European Journal of Population/Revue europeenne de demographie, 22*(4), 371-397. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10680-006-9105-3

Kaltenbach, S. L. (2005). *The multicultural aspects of the Caldecott and honor books* (Doctoral dissertation). https://etd.ohiolink.edu/rws_etd/document/get/bgsu1120582732/inline

Karniol, R., & Gal-Disegni, M. (2009). The impact of gender-fair versus gender-stereotyped basal readers on 1st-grade children's gender stereotypes: A natural experiment. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 23*(4), 411-420. https://doi.org/10.1080/02568540909594670

Katz, P. A. (2003). Racists or tolerant multiculturalists? How do they begin? *American Psychologist, 58*(11), 897-909. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.58.11.897

Keita, S. O. Y., Kittles, R. A., Royal, C. D., Bonney, G. E., Furbert-Harris, P., Dunston, G. M., & Rotimi, C. N. (2004). Conceptualizing human variation. *Nature Genetics, 36*(11), S17-S20. https://doi.org/10.1038/ng1455

Kelley, J. E. (2008). Power relationships in Rumpelstiltskin: A textual comparison of a traditional and a reconstructed fairy tale. *Children's Literature in Education, 39*(1), 31-41. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10583-006-9039-8

Kelly, D. J., Liu, S., Ge, L., Quinn, P. C., Slater, A. M., Lee, K., Liu, Q., & Pascalis, O. (2007). Cross-race preferences for same-race faces extend beyond the African versus Caucasian contrast in 3-month-old infants. *Infancy, 11*(1), 87-95. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/15250000709336871

Kelly, D.J., Quinn, P.C., Slater, A.M., Lee, K., Gibson, A., Smith, M., Ge, L., & Pascalis, O. (2005). Three-month-olds, but not newborns, prefer own-race faces. *Developmental Science, 8*(6), F31–F36. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2005.0434a.x

Kelly, D.J., Quinn, P.C., Slater, A.M., Lee, K., Ge, L., Pascalis, O. (2007). The other-race effect develops during infancy. Evidence of perceptual narrowing. *Psychological Science, 18*(2), 1084-1089. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.02029.x

Kemple, K. M., Lee, I. R., & Harris, M. (2016). Young children's curiosity about physical differences associated with race: Shared reading to encourage conversation. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 44*(2), 97-105. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-014-0683-0

Kendy, I.X. (2019). *How to be an antiracist*. Random House.

Kiers, J., Limon, I., Schavemaker, M., Tjon A Fong, J. (2019, September 12). Waarom het Amsterdam Museum de term 'Gouden Eeuw' niet langer zal gebruiken. *De Volkskrant.* https://www.volkskrant.nl/columns-opinie/waarom-het-amsterdam-museum-de-term-gouden-eeuw-niet-langer-zal-gebruiken~b2711957/

Kiesraad (2012). Tweede Kamer 12 september 2012. https://www.verkiezingsuitslagen.nl/verkiezingen/detail/TK20120912

Kiesraad (2017). Tweede Kamer 15 maart 2017. https://www.verkiezingsuitslagen.nl/verkiezingen/detail/TK20170315

Kok, R., Van IJzendoorn, M. H., Linting, M., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., Tharner, A., LLuijk, M.P.C.M., Székely, E., Jaddoe, V.W.V., Hofman, A., Verhulst, F.C., & Tiemeier, H. (2013). Attachment insecurity predicts child active resistance to parental requests in a compliance task. *Child: Care, Health and Development, 39*(2), 277-287. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2214.2012.01374.x

Koops, J., Martinović, B., & Weesie, J. (2017). Are inter-minority contacts guided by the same mechanisms as minority–majority contacts? A comparative study of two types of inter-ethnic ties in the Netherlands. *International Migration Review, 51*(3), 701-726. https://doi.org/10.1111/imre.12247

Koss, M. D. (2015). Diversity in contemporary picturebooks: A content analysis. *Journal of Children's Literature, 41*(1), 32-42.

Koss, M. D., Martinez, M. G., & Johnson, N. J. (2017). Where are The Latinx? Diversity in Caldecott Winner and Honor Books. *Bilingual Review, 33*(5), 50-62.

Kowalski, K. (2003). The emergence of ethnic and racial attitudes in preschool-aged children. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 143*(6), 677-690. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224540309600424

Kowalski, K., & Lo, Y. F. (2001). The influence of perceptual features, ethnic labels, and sociocultural information on the development of ethnic/racial bias in young children. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology,* 32(4), 444-455. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022101032004005

Ladd, G. W., & Parke, R. D. (2021). Themes and theories revisited: Perspectives on processes in family–peer relationships. *Children, 8*(6), 507. https://doi.org/10.3390/children8060507

Larsen, N. E., Lee, K., & Ganea, P. A. (2018). Do storybooks with anthropomorphized animal characters promote prosocial behaviors in young children?. *Developmental Science, 21*(3), e12590. https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12590

Lee, E. L. (2017). *Exploring diversity representation in literature for children: A content analysis of the 2015-16 Texas Bluebonnet Award Master List* (Doctoral dissertation). https://uh-ir.tdl.org/uh-ir/bitstream/handle/10657/1882/LEE-DISSERTATION-2017.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Leslie, L. M., Bono, J. E., Kim, Y. S., & Beaver, G. R. (2020). On melting pots and salad bowls: A meta-analysis of the effects of identity-blind and identity-conscious diversity ideologies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 105*(5), 453-471. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000446

Levin, S., Van Laar, C., & Sidanius, J. (2003). The effects of ingroup and outgroup friendships on ethnic attitudes in college: A longitudinal study. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 6*(1), 76-92. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430203006001013

Levy, S. R., & Hughes, J. M. (2009). Development of racial and ethnic prejudice among children. In T. Nelson (Ed.,), *Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination* (p. 23-42). Psychology Press.

Levy, S. R., West, T. L., Bigler, R. S., Karafantis, D. M., Ramirez, L., & Velilla, E. (2005). Messages about uniqueness and similarities of people: Impact on U.S. Black and Latino Youth. *Applied Developmental Psychology, 26*(6), 714-733. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2005.08.004

Mähönen, T. A., Ihalainen, K., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2013). Specifying the contact hypothesis in a minority-minority context: A social identity perspective. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie, 221*(4), 223-231. https://doi.org/10.1027/2151-2604/a000152

Malcolm, Z. T., & Lowery, R. M. (2011). Reflections of the Caribbean in children's picture books: A critical multicultural analysis. *Multicultural Education, 19*(1), 46-50.

Maliepaard, M., & Lubbers, M. (2013). Parental religious transmission after migration: The case of Dutch Muslims. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 39*(3), 425-442. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2013.733862

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*(2), 224-253. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224

Martinović, B. (2013). The inter-ethnic contacts of immigrants and natives in the Netherlands: A two-sided perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 39*(1), 69-85. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2013.723249

McIntyre, J. (2017). *Gender and race in children's picture books: A tragedy in three studies* (Doctoral dissertation) .https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/33052849/MCINTYRE-DISSERTATION-2017.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

McNair, J. C. (2008a). The representation of authors and illustrators of color in school-based book clubs. *Language Arts, 85*(3), 193-201. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41962267

McNair, J. C. (2008b). A comparative analysis of The Brownies' Book and contemporary African American children's literature written by Patricia C. McKissack. In W. Brooks and J. McNair (Eds), *Embracing, evaluating, and examining African American children's and young adult literature* (pp. 3-29). Scarecrow.

Meeusen, C., & Dhont, K. (2015). Parent–child similarity in common and specific components of prejudice: The role of ideological attitudes and political discussion. *European Journal of Personality, 29*(6), 585-598. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2011

Meissner, C.A. & Brigham, J.C. (2001). Thirty years of investigating the own-race bias in memory for faces: A meta-analytic review. *Psychology and Public Policy Law, 7*(1), 3–35. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8971.7.1.3

Merz, E. M., Özeke-Kocabas, E., Oort, F. J., & Schuengel, C. (2009). Intergenerational family solidarity: Value differences between immigrant groups and generations. *Journal ofFamily Psychology, 23*(3), 291-300. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015819

Miklikowska, M., Bohman, A., & Titzmann, P. F. (2019). Driven by context? The interrelated effects of parents, peers, classrooms on development of prejudice among Swedish majority adolescents. *Developmental Psychology, 55*(11), 2451-2463. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000809

Milner IV, H. R. (2008). Critical race theory and interest convergence as analytic tools in teacher education policies and practices. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*(4), 332-346. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108321884

Mol, S. E., & Bus, A. G. (2011). To read or not to read: A meta-analysis of print exposure from infancy to early adulthood. *Psychological Bulletin, 137*(2), 267-296. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021890

Möller, K. J. (2016). Creating diverse classroom literature collections using Rudine Sims Bishop's conceptual metaphors and analytical frameworks as guides. *Journal of Children's Literature, 42*(2), 64-74.

Mortensen, A. (2019, 8 May). Measuring diversity in the collection. *Library Journal.* https://www.libraryjournal.com/?detailStory=Measuring-Diversity-in-the-Collection

Mounts, N. S. (2000). Parental management of adolescent peer relationships: What are its effects on friend selection. In K. A. Kerns, J. M. Contreras, & A. M. Neal-Barnett (Eds), *Family and peers: Linking two social worlds* (pp. 169 - 193). Praeger Publishers.

Munniksma, A., Flache, A., Verkuyten, M., & Veenstra, R. (2012). Parental acceptance of children's intimate ethnic outgroup relations: The role of culture, status, and family reputation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 36*(4), 575-585. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.12.012

Nesdale, D. (2004). Social identity processes and children's ethnic prejudice. In M. Bennett & F. Sani (Eds.), *The development of the social self* (p. 219–245). Psychology Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203391099_chapter_8

Nesdale, D. (2017). Children and social groups: A social identity approach. In A. Rutland, D. Nesdale, & C. S. Brown (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook of group processes in children and adolescents* (pp. 3-22). Wiley-Blackwell.

Nesdale, D., Maass, A., Durkin, K., Griffiths, J. (2005). Group norms, threat, and children's racial prejudice. *Child Development, 76*(3), 652-663. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00869.x

Neville, H. A., Lilly, R. L., Duran, G., Lee, R. M., & Browne, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of the color-blind racial attitudes scale (CoBRAS). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*(1), 59-70. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-0167.47.1.59

Neville, H. A., Awad, G. H., Brooks, J. E., Flores, M. P., & Bluemel, J. (2013). Color-blind racial ideology: Theory, training, and measurement implications in psychology. *American Psychologist, 68*(6), 455-466. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033282

Nikolajeva, M., & Scott, C. (2013). *How picturebooks work.* Routledge.

Norton, M. I., Sommers, S. R., Apfelbaum, E. P., Pura, N., & Ariely, D. (2006). Color blindness and interracial interaction: Playing the political correctness game. *Psychological Science, 17*(11), 949-953. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01810.x

NOS Jeugdjournaal (2019, November 9). Geweld bij bijeenkomst actiegroep tegen Zwarte Piet. https://jeugdjournaal.nl/artikel/2309711-geweld-bij-bijeenkomst-actiegroep-tegen-zwarte-piet.html

Nosek, B. A., Banaji, M. R., & Greenwald, A. G. (2002). Harvesting implicit group attitudes and beliefs from a demonstration web site. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 6*(1), 101-115. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.6.1.101

Nosek, B. A., Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (2005). Understanding and using the implicit association test: II. Method variables and construct validity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*(2)*,* 166–180. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271418

O'Bryan, M., Fishbein, H. D., & Ritchey, P. N. (2004). Intergenerational transmission of prejudice, sex role stereotyping, and intolerance. *Adolescence, 39*(155), 407-426.

Olson, K. R., Shutts, K., Kinzler, K. D., & Weisman, K. G. (2012). Children associate racial groups with wealth: Evidence from South Africa. *Child Development, 83*(6), 1884-1899. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01819.x

Pahlke, E., Bigler, R. S., & Suizzo, M. A. (2012). Relations between colorblind socialization and children's racial bias: Evidence from European American mothers and their preschool children. *Child Development, 83*(4), 1164-1179. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01770.x

Paradies, Y., Ben, J., Denson, N., Elias, A., Priest, N., Pieterse, A., Gupta, A., Kelaher, M., & Gee, G. (2015). Racism as a determinant of health: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PloS one, 10*(9), e0138511. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0138511

Pauker, K., Apfelbaum, E. P., & Spitzer, B. (2015). When societal norms and social identity collide: The race talk dilemma for racial minority children. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 6*(8), 887-895. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550615598379

Pauker, K., Williams, A., & Steele, J. R. (2017). The development of racial categorization in childhood. In A. Rutland, D. Nesdale, and C. S. Brown (Eds.) The Wiley handbook of group processes in children and adolescents (pp. 221-239). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118773123.ch11

Perry, S., Abaied, J. L., Skinner-Dorkenoo, A. L., & Waters, S. F. (2021). *A laboratory procedure to facilitate color conscious racial socialization methods among White parents in the U.S.* PsyArXiv. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/3w59e

Perry, S., Skinner-Dorkenoo, A. L., Abaied, J. L., Waters, S. F., & Osnaya, A. (2020). *Initial evidence that parent-child conversations about race reduce racial biases among White U.S. children.* PsyArXiv. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/3xdg8

Perry, S., Skinner-Dorkenoo, A. L., Abaied, J. L., & Waters, S. F. (2021). *Applying what evidencewe have: Support for having race conversations in White US families.* PsyArXiv. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/8dpru

Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*(2), 173-185. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167297232006

Pettigrew, T.F., & Tropp, L.R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5), 751-783. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 38*(6), 922-934. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.504

Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L. R., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advances in intergroup contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35*(3), 271-280. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.03.001

Phalet, K., & Schönpflug, U. (2001). Intergenerational transmission in Turkish immigrant families: Parental collectivism, achievement values and gender differences. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 32*(4), 489-504. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41603774

Pirchio, S., Passiatore, Y., Panno, A., Maricchiolo, F., & Carrus, G. (2018). A chip off the old Block: Parents' subtle ethnic prejudice predicts children's implicit prejudice. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*, 110. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00110

Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., & Goren, M. J. (2009). Is multiculturalism or color blindness better for minorities?. *Psychological Science, 20*(4), 444-446. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02318.x

Poarch, R., & Monk-Turner, E. (2001). Gender roles in children's literature: A review of non-award winning "easy-to-read" books. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education,16*(1), 70-76. https://doi.org/10.1080/02568540109594975

Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers, 36*(4), 717-731. https://doi.org/10.3758/bf03206553

Purdie-Vaughns, V., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., Ditlmann, R., & Crosby, J. R. (2008). Social identity contingencies: how diversity cues signal threat or safety for African Americans in mainstream institutions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*(4), 615-630. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.4.615

Quintana, S. M. (1994). A model of ethnic perspective-taking ability applied to Mexican-American children and youth. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 18*(4), 419-448. https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(94)90016-7

Quintana, S. M. (1998). Children's developmental understanding of ethnicity and race. *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 7*(1), 27-45. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-1849(98)80020-6

Raabe, T., & Beelmann, A. (2011). Development of ethnic, racial, and national prejudice in childhood and adolescence: A multinational meta-analysis of age differences. *Child Development, 82*, 1715–1737. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01668.x

Ramos, M., Thijssen, L., & Coenders, M. (2019). Labour market discrimination against Moroccan minorities in the Netherlands and Spain: A cross-national and cross-regional comparison. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2019.1622824

Ramsey, P. G. (1991). The salience of race in young children growing up in an all-White community. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 83*(1), 28-34. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.83.1.28

Rattan, A., & Ambady, N. (2013). Diversity ideologies and intergroup relations: An examination of colorblindness and multiculturalism. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 43*(1), 12-21. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.1892

Richards, W. S. (2013). *Jamaican children's literature: A critical multicultural analysis of text and illustration in Jamaican picturebooks for children published between 1997-2012* (Doctoral dissertation). https://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/handle/11299/165773/Richards_umn_0130E_14094.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Rodenberg, J., & Wagenaar, P. (2016). Essentializing 'Black Pete': competing narratives surrounding the Sinterklaas tradition in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Heritage Studies, 22*(9), 716-728. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2016.1193039

Rodriguez-Garcia, J. M., & Wagner, U. (2009). Learning to be prejudiced: A test of unidirectional and bidirectional models of parent-offspring socialization. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 33*(6), 516-523. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2009.08.001

Roethler, J. (1998). Reading in color: Children's book illustrations and identity formation for Black children in the United States. *African American Review, 32*(1), 95-105. https://doi.org/10.2307/3042272

Rosenthal, L., & Levy, S. R. (2010). The colorblind, multicultural, and polycultural ideological approaches to improving intergroup attitudes and relations. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 4*(1), 215-246. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-2409.2010.01022.x

Rutland, A., Cameron, L., Bennett, L., & Ferrell, J. (2005). Interracial contact and racial constancy: A multi-site study of racial intergroup bias in 3–5 year old Anglo-British children. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 26*(6), 699-713. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2005.08.005

Rutland, A., Cameron, L., Milne, A., & McGeorge, P. (2005). Social norms and self-presentation: Children's implicit and explicit intergroup attitudes. *Child Development, 76*(2), 451-466. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00856.x

Ryan, C. S., Casas, J. F., & Thompson, B. K. (2010). Interethnic ideology, intergroup perceptions, and cultural orientation. *Journal of Social Issues, 66*(1), 29-44. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2009.01631.x

Ryan, C. S., Hunt, J. S., Weible, J. A., Peterson, C. R., & Casas, J. F. (2007). Multicultural and colorblind ideology, stereotypes, and ethnocentrism among Black and White Americans. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 10*(4), 617-637. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430207084105

Salas, R. G., Lucido, F., & Canales, J. (2002). Multicultural literature: Broadening young children's experiences. In J. Cassidy and S. Garret (Eds), *Early Childhood Literacy: Programs and strategies to develop cultural, linguistic, scientific and healthcare literacy for very young children & their families* (pp. 139-150). Centre for Educational Development, Evaluation, & Research, Texas A&M University.

Salter, P. S., Adams, G., & Perez, M. J. (2018). Racism in the structure of everyday worlds: A cultural-psychological perspective. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 27*(3), 150-155. https://doi.org/10.1177/096372147724239

Schalk-Soekar, S. R., van de Vijver, F. J., & Hoogsteder, M. (2004). Attitudes toward multiculturalism of immigrants and majority members in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 28*(6), 533-550. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2007.11.001

Schiappa, E., Gregg, P. B., & Hewes, D. E. (2005). The parasocial contact hypothesis. *Communication Monographs, 72*(1), 92-115. https://doi.org/10.1080/0363775052000342544

Schoemann, A. M., Boulton, A. J., & Short, S. D. (2017). Determining power and sample size for simple and complex mediation models. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 8,* 379-386. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617715068

Scott, K. E., Shutts, K., & Devine, P. G. (2020). Parents' role in addressing children's racial bias: The case of speculation without evidence. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *15*(5), 1178-1186. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620927702

Selman, R. L., & Byrne, D. F. (1974). A structural-developmental analysis of levels of role taking in middle childhood. *Child Development, 45*(3), 803-806. https://doi.org/10.2307/1127850

Shenhav, S., Campos, B., & Goldberg, W. A. (2017). Dating out is intercultural: Experience and perceived parent disapproval by ethnicity and immigrant generation. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 34*(3), 397-422. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407516640387

Short, K. G., & Fox, D. L. (2003). The complexity of cultural authenticity in children's literature: Why the debates really matter. In F.L. Fox & K.G. Short (Eds). *Stories Matter: The Complexity of Cultural Authenticity in Children's Literature*. (pp. 3-24). National Council of Teachers of English.

Siebers, H., & Dennissen, M. H. J. (2015). Is it cultural racism? Discursive exclusion and oppression of migrants in the Netherlands. *Current Sociology, 63*(3), 470-498. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392114552504

Smith, S., Maas, I., & Tubergen, F. (2015). Parental influence on friendships between native and immigrant adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 25*(3), 580-591. https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12149

So, J. K. (2016). Opening up spaces for early critical literacy: Korean kindergarteners exploring diversity through multicultural picture books. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, *39*(2), 176-187.

Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau (2014). *Ervaren discriminatie in Nederland*. Den Haag: SCP.

Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau (2020). *Ervaren discriminatie in Nederland II*. Den Haag: SCP.

Soetenhorst, B. (2019, November 15). Hoe het Pietendebat geweldadiger werd. *Het Parool*. https://www.parool.nl/nieuws/hoe-het-pietendebat-gewelddadig-werd~be3257dc/

Solórzano, D. G. (1997). Images and words that wound: Critical race theory, racial stereotyping, and teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 5-19.

Solórzano, D. G. (1998). Critical race theory, race and gender microaggressions, and the experiences of Chicana and Chicano scholars. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 121–136. https://doi.org/10.1080/095183998236926

Stangor, C. (2016). The study of stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination within social psychology: A quick history of theory and research. In T. D. Nelson (Ed.), *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination* (p. 3–27). Psychology Press.

Stichting Collectieve Propoganda van het Nederlandse Boek. (n.d.). *CPNB Top 100 Archief*. https://www.cpnb.nl/campagnes/cpnb-top-100-2018/uitgaven at June 14, 2019

Stokes-Guinan, K. (2011). Age and skin tone as predictors of positive and negative racial attitudes in Hispanic children. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 33*(1), 3-21. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739986310389303

Sutherland, R. D. (1985). Hidden persuaders: Political ideologies in literature for children. *Children's Literature in Education, 16*(3), 143-157.

Swart, H., Hewstone, M., Christ, O., & Voci, A. (2011). Affective mediators of intergroup contact: A three-wave longitudinal study in South Africa. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(6), 1221-1238. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024450

Thomas, P. A., Krampe, E. M., & Newton, R. R. (2008). Father presence, family structure, and feelings of closeness to the father among adult African American children. *Journal of Black Studies, 38*(4), 529-546. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934705286101

Thomsen, J. P. F., & Rafiqi, A. (2017). The contact-prejudice relationship among ethnic minorities: Examining the facilitative influence of religiosity. *Social Science Quarterly, 98*(5), 1571-1586. https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12368

Thijssen, L., Lancee, B., Veit, S., & Yemane, R. (2019). Discrimination against Turkish minorities in Germany and the Netherlands: Field experimental evidence on the effect of diagnostic information on labour market outcomes. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 47*(6), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2019.1622793

Tolsma, J., Lubbers, M., & Coenders, M. (2008). Ethnic competition and opposition to ethnic intermarriage in the Netherlands: A multi-level approach. *European Sociological Review, 24*(2), 215-230. https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcm047

Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005). Relationships between intergroup contact and prejudice among minority and majority status groups. *Psychological Science, 16*(12), 951-957. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2005.01643.x

Tropp, L. R., & Prenovost, M. A. (2008). The role of intergroup contact in predicting children's interethnic attitudes: Evidence from meta-analytic and field studies. In S. R. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood* (p. 236–248). Oxford University Press.

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*(3), 369-388. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.93.3.369

Tweede Kamer (n.d.). *Kamer debatteert over institutioneel racisme in Nederland.* https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/kamer_in_het_kort/kamer-debatteert-over-institutioneel-racisme

Universiteit Leiden (2020, February, 28). *Gender and ethnic diversity assessment tool wins Synergy Award*. https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/en/news/2020/02/gender-and-ethnic-diversity-assessment-wins-nwos-synergy-award

Van Amersfoort, H., & Van Niekerk, M. (2006). Immigration as a colonial inheritance: Post-colonial immigrants in the Netherlands, 1945–2002. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 32*(3), 323-346. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691830600555210

Van Bon, S., Fiere, B., & De Wit, N. (2021). *Discriminatiecijfers in 2020*. Rotterdam/Den Haag: Art. 1, Discriminatie.nl. https://discriminatie.nl/files/202106/discriminatiecijfers-in-2020.pdf

Van den Bossche, S., & Klomberg, A. (2020). *Jeugdliteratuur door de lens van etnisch-culturele diversiteit*. Eburon.

Van de Vijver, F. J., Breugelmans, S. M., & Schalk-Soekar, S. R. (2008). Multiculturalism: Construct validity and stability. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 32*(2), 93-104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2007.11.001

Van der Noll, J., Poppe, E., & Verkuyten, M. (2010). Political tolerance and prejudice: Differential reactions toward Muslims in the Netherlands. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 32*(1), 46-56. https://doi.org/10.1080/01973530903540067

Van der Valk, I., & Törnberg, P. (2017). *Monitor moslimdiscriminatie: Derde rapportage*. IMES, Universiteit van Amsterdam.

Van Meeteren, M. M., & Van Oostendorp, L. L. (2019). Are Muslims in the Netherlands constructed as a 'suspect community'? An analysis of Dutch political discourse on terrorism in 2004-2015. *Crime, Law and Social Change, 71*(5), 525-540. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10611-018-9802-y

Van Osch, Y. M., & Breugelmans, S. M. (2012). Perceived intergroup difference as an organizing principle of intercultural attitudes and acculturation attitudes. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 43*(5), 801-821. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022111407688

Van Tubergen, F., & Maas, I. (2007). Ethnic intermarriage among immigrants in the Netherlands: An analysis of population data. *Social Science Research, 36*(3), 1065-1086. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2006.09.003

Van Zantvliet, P. I., Kalmijn, M., & Verbakel, E. (2015). Early partner choices of immigrants: The effect of preferences, opportunities and parents on dating a native. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 41*(5), 772-794. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2014.948391

Vedder, P., Wenink, E., & van Geel, M. (2016). Explaining negative outgroup attitudes between native Dutch and Muslim youth in The Netherlands using the Integrated Threat Theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 53*, 54-64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2016.05.001

Velasco González, K., Verkuyten, M., Weesie, J., & Poppe, E. (2008). Prejudice towards Muslims in the Netherlands: Testing integrated threat theory. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 47*(4), 667-685. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466608X284443

Verhoeven, L., & Vermeer, A. (2006). Sociocultural variation in literacy achievement. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 54*(2), 189-211. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8527.2006.00341.x

Verkuyten, M. (2002). Ethnic attitudes among minority and majority children: The role of ethnic identification, peer group victimization and parents. *Social Development, 11*(4), 558-570. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9507.00215

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*(1), 121-138. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.1.121

Verkuyten, M. (2007). Ethnic in-group favoritism among minority and majority groups: Testing the self-esteem hypothesis among preadolescents. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 37*(3), 486-500. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00170.x

Verkuyten, M., Hagendoorn, L., & Masson, K. (1996). The ethnic hierarchy among majority and minority youth in the Netherlands. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26*(12), 1104-1118. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1996.tb01127.x

Verkuyten, M., & Kinket, B. (2000). Social distances in a multi ethnic society: The ethnic hierarchy among Dutch preadolescents. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 36*(1), 75-85. https://doi.org/10.2307/2695882

Verkuyten, M., & Martinović, B. (2006). Understanding multicultural attitudes: The role of group status, identification, friendships, and justifying ideologies. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 30*(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.05.015

Verkuyten, M., & Martinović, B. (2016). Dual identity, in-group projection, and out-group feelings among ethnic minority groups. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 46*(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2131

Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2001). Ethnic and gender bias among Dutch and Turkish children in late childhood: The role of social context. *Infant and Child Development, 10*(4), 203-217. https://doi.org/10.1002/icd.279

Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2013). Multicultural education and inter-ethnic attitudes. *European Psychologist, 18*(3), 179-190. https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000152

Verkuyten, M., Yogeeswaran, K., Mepham, K., & Sprong, S. (2020). Interculturalism: A new diversity ideology with interrelated components of dialogue, unity, and identity flexibility. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 50*(3), 505-519. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2628

Vezzali, L., Giovannini, D., & Capozza, D. (2010). Longitudinal effects of contact on intergroup relations: The role of majority and minority group membership and intergroup emotions. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 20*(6), 462-479. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.1058

Vezzali, L., Stathi, S., & Giovannini, D. (2012). Indirect contact through book reading: Improving adolescents' attitudes and behavioral intentions toward immigrants. *Psychology in the Schools, 49*(2), 148-162. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20621

Vittrup, B. (2018). Color blind or color conscious? White American mothers' approaches to racial socialization. *Journal of Family Issues, 39*(3), 668-692. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X16676858

Vittrup, B., & Holden, G. W. (2011). Exploring the impact of educational television and parent–child discussions on children's racial attitudes. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 11*(1), 82-104. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-2415.2010.01223.x

Vollebergh, W. A., Iedema, J., & Raaijmakers, Q. A. (2001). Intergenerational transmission and the formation of cultural orientations in adolescence and young adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*(4), 1185-1198. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.01185.x

Vorauer, J. D., Gagnon, A., & Sasaki, S. J. (2009). Salient intergroup ideology and intergroup interaction. *Psychological Science, 20*(7), 838-845. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02369.x

Wagner, U. & Zick, A. (1995). The relation of formal education to ethnic prejudice: Its reliability, validity and explanation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *25*(1), 41-56. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420250105

Wang, J., Tang, X., Pang, Y., & Duan, W. (2014). Analysis on modern anomie situation of Chinese traditional festivals. *Asian Culture and History, 6*(2), 56-63. https://doi.org/10.5539/ach.v6n2p56

Weiner, M. F. (2014). The ideologically colonized metropole: Dutch racism and racist denial. *Sociology Compass, 8*(6), 731-744. https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12163

Welch, B. F. (2016). The pervasive whiteness of children's literature: Collective harms and consumer obligations. *Social Theory and Practice, 42*(2), 367-388. https://doi.org/10.5840/soctheorpract201642220

Weitzman, L. J., Eifler, D., Hokada, E., & Ross, C. (1972). Sex-role socialization in picture books for preschool children. *American Journal of Sociology, 77*(6), 1125-1150. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2776222

White, F. A., Borinca, I., Vezzali, L., Reynolds, K. J., Blomster Lyshol, J. K., Verrelli, S., & Falomir-Pichastor, J. M. (2021). Beyond direct contact: The theoretical and societal relevance of indirect contact for improving intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues, 77*(1), 132-153. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12400

Whitley Jr, B. E., & Webster, G. D. (2019). The relationships of intergroup ideologies to ethnic prejudice: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 23*(3), 207-237. https://doi.org/1d0o.i.1o1rg7/71/01.10187878/160838186887361184726134 23

Williams, J. E., Best, D. L., Boswell, D. A., Mattson, L. A., & Graves, D. J. (1975). Preschool racial attitude measure II. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 35*(1), 3-18.

Williams, V. K., & Deyoe, N. (2014). Diverse population, diverse collection? Youth collections in the United States. *Technical Services Quarterly, 31*(2), 97-121.

Wilton, L. S., Apfelbaum, E. P., & Good, J. J. (2019). Valuing differences and reinforcing them: Multiculturalism increases race essentialism. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 10*(5), 681-689. https://doi.org/0.1177/1948550618780728

Winograd, K. (2011). Sports biographies of African American football players: The racism of colorblindness in children's literature. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 14*(3), 331-349. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2010.519983

Wolcott, H. F. (1991). Propriospect and the acquisition of culture. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 22*(3), 251-273.

Wolsko, C., Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (2006). Considering the tower of Babel: Correlates of assimilation and multiculturalism among ethnic minority and majority groups in the United States. *Social Justice Research, 19*(3), 277-306. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-006-0014-8

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*(4), 635-654. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.4.635

Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*(1), 73-90.

Yao, Z., & Enright, R. (2020). The influence of moral stories on kindergarteners' sharing behaviour. *Early Child Development and Care, 190*(6), 891-901. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2018.1499098

Yasui, M. (2008). *Observed ethnic-racial socialization and early adolescent adjustment* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon

Yoo-Lee, E., Fowler, L., Adkins, D., Kim, K. S., & Davis, H. N. (2014). Evaluating cultural authenticity in multicultural picture books: A collaborative analysis for diversity education. *The Library Quarterly, 84*(3), 324-347.

Zick, A., Pettigrew, T. F., & Wagner, U. (2008). Ethnic prejudice and discrimination in Europe. *Journal of Societal Issues, 64*(2), 233-251. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.00559.x

Ziller, C. (2015). Ethnic diversity, economic and cultural contexts, and social trust: cross-sectional and longitudinal evidence from European regions, 2002–2010. *Social Forces, 93*(3), 1211-1240. https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sou088

Zwirs, B., Burger, H., Schulpen, T., Vermulst, A. A., HiraSing, R. A., & Buitelaar, J. (2011). Teacher ratings of children's behavior problems and functional impairment across gender and ethnicity: Construct equivalence of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 42*(3), 466-481. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022110362752













Supplementary Material

Supplementary material Chapter 4 A

Book List

Nr	Title	Author(s)	Illustrator(s)
1	Aadje Piraatje	Marjet Huiberts	Sieb Posthuma
2*	Agent en boef	Tjibbe Veldkamp	Kees de Boer
3*	Alle dieren drijven	Gideon Samsom	Annemarie van Haeringen
4	Als iedereen slaapt	Komako Sakai	Komako Sakai
5*	Angèle de Verschrikkelijke	Tine Mortier	Bert Dombrecht
6	Anton kan toveren	Ole Konnecke	Ole Konnecke
7*	Baby'tje in mama's buik	Bette Westera	Jan Jutte
8	Bas en Daan graven een gat	Mac Barnett	Jon Klassen
9*	Beste Bregje Boentjes	Mathilde Stein	Chuck Groenink
10	Beu	Kaat Vrancken	Noelle Smit
11*	Bij ons in de straat	Koos Meinderts	Annette Fienieg
12*	Boer Boris series	Ted van Lieshout	Philip Hopman
	Boer Boris gaat naar zee	Ted van Lieshout	Philip Hopman
	Boer Boris in de sneeuw	Ted van Lieshout	Philip Hopman
13	Buurman leest een boek	Koen van Biesen	Koen van Biesen
14	Circusnacht		Mattias de Leeuw
15*	Coco of het kleine zwarte jurkje	Annemarie van Haeringen	Annemarie van Haeringen
16	De kleine walvis	Benji Davies	Benji Davies
17	De poepfabriek	Marianne Busser & Ron Schröder	Ivan & Ilia
18*	De tuinman van de nacht	The Fan Brothers	The Fan Brothers
19	Dino's bestaan niet	Mark Janssen	Mark Janssen
20*	Dit is voor jou	Sanne te Loo	Sanne te Loo
21	Een huis voor Harry	Leo Timmers	Leo Timmers
22*	Een vijver vol inkt	Annie M. G. Schmidt	Sieb Posthuma
23	En toen De Stijl	Joost Swarte	Joost Swarte
24	En?	Kitty Crowther	Kitty Crowther
25	Garmanns straat	Stian Hole	Stian Hole
26*	Hallo	Fleur van der Weel	Edward van de Vendel
27*	Handje?	Tjibbe Veldkamp	Wouter Tulp
28*	Heb jij misschien olifant gezien?	David Barrow	David Barrow
29*	Held op sokken	Bette Westera	Thé Tjong-Khing
30	Het boeboek	Imme Dros	Harrie Geelen
31	Het hondje dat Nino niet had	Edward van de Vendel	Anton van Hertbruggen
32*	Het lammetje dat een varken is	Pim Lammers	Milja Praagman
33*	Het land van de grote woordfabriek	Agnès de Lestrade	Valeria Docampo
34*	Het leukste abc ter wereld	Tom Schamp	Tom Schamp

Supplementary material Chapter 4 A

Continued

Nr	Title	Author(s)	Illustrator(s)
35	Hoe het varken aan zijn krulstaart kwam	Gerda Dendooven	Gerda Dendooven
36	Hoe je een wollige mammoet moet wassen	Michelle Robinson	Kate Hindley
37	Huisbeestenboel		Loes Riphagen
38	Ik ben bij de dinosaurussen geweest	Edward van de Vendel	Floor de Goede
39*	Jan toorop - Het lied van de tijd	Kitty Crowther	Kitty Crowther
40	Juffrouw van Zanten en de zeven rovers	Mathilde Stein	Dorine de Vos
41*	Kersenhemel	Jef Aerts	Sanne te Loo
42	Kietel nooit een krokodil	Bette Westera	Thé Tjong-Khing
43	Kleine man en god	Kitty Crowther	Kitty Crowther
44	Kleine nachtverhalen	Kitty Crowther	Kitty Crowther
45*	Kom uit die kraan	Tjibbe Veldkamp	Alice Hoogstad
46	Lieve kleine rolf	Nadia Shireen	Nadia Shireen
47*	Lisa & Jimmy series	Vivian den Hollander	Dagmar Stam
	Dappere dierenredders	Vivian den Hollander	Dagmar Stam
	Klieder, klodder, klaar!	Vivian den Hollander	Dagmar Stam
	Naar oma en opa Pannenkoek	Vivian den Hollander	Dagmar Stam
	Slagroom op je snoet	Vivian den Hollander	Dagmar Stam
	Vriendjes van overall	Vivian den Hollander	Dagmar Stam
48	Meneer Kandinsky was een schilder	Daan Remmerts de Vries	Daan Remmerts de Vries
49	Mijn opa is een boom	Kim Crabeels	Ingrid Godon
50*	Nog 100 nachtjes slapen	Milja Praagman	Milja Praagman
51*	Nooit denk ik aan niets	Monique en Hans Hagen	Charlotte Dematons
52*	Omdat ik je zo graag zie	Milja Praagman	Milja Praagman
53	Prinses Pernilla en de reddende ridders	Mathilde Stein	Dorine de Vos
54*	Seizoenen	Blexbolex	Blexbolex
55	Soms laat ik je even achter	Daan Remmerts de Vries	Daan Remmerts de Vries
56	Spin op sokken	Ted van Lieshout	Sieb Posthuma
57	Tangramkat	Maranke Rinck	Martijn van der Linden
58	Tijs en de eenhoorn	Imme Dros	Harrie Geelen

Supplementary material Chapter 4 A

Continued

Nr	Title	Author(s)	Illustrator(s)
59	Van wie is die staart?	Joukje Akveld	Martijn van der Linden
60*	Verliefd	Stefan Boonen	Jan van Lierde
61	Voor papa	Daan Remmerts de Vries	Marije Tolman
62	Waarom lig jij in mijn bed?	Joke van Leeuwen	Joke van Leeuwen
63*	Wat zou jij doen?	Guido van Genechten	Guido van Genechten
64	We hebben er een geitje bij!	Marjet Huiberts	Iris Deppe

Note. Nr = book number, * a character of color was coded in the book.

Supplementary material Chapter 4 B

Coding Variables

1. General Information

Variable	Description
Book number	Number of book on booklist
Year of publication	Year of publication of first edition
Publisher	(1) C. de Vries-Brouwers, (2) Clavis (3) CPNB, (4) Davidsfonds, (5) De Eenhoorn, (6) De Fontein, (7) Gottmer, (8) Hoogland & Van Klaveren, (9) Lannoo,(10) Lemniscaat, (11) Leopold, (12) Luitingh-Sijthoff, (13) Marmer, (14) Moon, (15) Querido, (16) Van Halewyck, (17) Van Holkema & Warendorf, (18) Stichting Collectieve Propaganda van het Nederlandse boek
Nr Pages	Number of pages in the book
Nr Pictures	Number of pictures in the book
Word count	Number of words in the book
Story line	Short description of the (most important) story line in the book
Label	(1) being different, (2) animals, (3) every day, (4) emotions, (5) family, (6) holidays/parties, (7) behavior, (8) learning, (9) body, (10) music, (11) nature, (12) on the road, (13) fairytales, (14) TV-characters, (15) friends, (16) poetry, (17) informative

2. Authors and Illustrators

Variable	Description
Nr Authors[a]	Number of authors
Ethnicity Author1[a,b]	(1) White, (2) Of color, (3) unknown
If Non-White Ethnicity Author1[a,b]	Specification of ethnicity
Gender Author 1[a,b]	(1) male, (2) female, (3) unknown

Note. [a] Variables for illustrators were identical to the variables for authors. [b] Variables for the second author were identical to the variables for the first author.

3. Characters

Variable	Description
Character Name	(1) yes, (0) no
If Character Name	Specification of name
Explicit Mention Ethnicity/Nationality	(1) yes, (0) no
If Explicit Mention Ethnicity/Nationality	Specification of mention ethnicity/nationality
Ethnic Appearance	(1) White, (2) Of color, (3) unclear
If Non-White Ethnic Appearance	Specification of ethnic appearance
Gender Character	(1) male, (2) female, (3) unknown
Age Group Character	(1) child, (2) teenager, (3) adult, (4) senior adult, (5) unknown
Role Character	(1) main, (2) supportive, (3) background
If Supporting or Background	Specify role in the story
Location	Summary of the locations the character is shown at
Representation Pages	Number of pages on which character is shown
Representation Pictures	Number of pictures on which character is shown
Representation Cover	(1) yes, (0) no
Textual Description	All adjectives and adverbs used to describe the character

Supplementary material Chapter 6

Book List

Nr	Title	Author(s)	Illustrator(s)	[Original title] or *loose translation*
1	Alle dieren drijven	Gideon Samsom	Annemarie van Haeringen	*All animals float*
2	Baby'tje in mama's buik	Bette Westera	Jan Jutte	*Baby in mom's belly*
3	Beste Bregje Boentjes	Mathilde Stein	Chuck Groenink	*Dear Bregje Boentjes*
4	Bij ons in de straat	Koos Meinderts	Annette Fienieg	*In our street*
5	De tuinman van de nacht	The Fan Brothers	The Fan Brothers	[The night gardener]
6	Dit is voor jou	Sanne te Loo	Sanne te Loo	*This is for you*
7	Handje?	Tjibbe Veldkamp	Wouter Tulp	*Hand?*
8	Heb jij misschien olifant gezien?	David Barrow	David Barrow	[Have you seen elephant?]
9	Held op sokken	Bette Westera	Thé Tjong-Khing	*Hero on socks*
10	Jan toorop - Het lied van de tijd	Kitty Crowther	Kitty Crowther	*Jan Toorop – song of time*
11	Kersenhemel	Jef Aerts	Sanne te Loo	*Cherry sky*
12	Omdat ik je zo graag zie	Milja Praagman	Milja Praagman	*Because I like you so much*
13	Dappere dierenredders	Vivian den Hollander	Dagmar Stam	*Brave animal rescuers*
14	Klieder, klodder, klaar!	Vivian den Hollander	Dagmar Stam	*Making a mess, ready!*
15	Naar oma en opa Pannenkoek	Vivian den Hollander	Dagmar Stam	*Going to grandma and grandpa Pancake*
16	Slagroom op je snoet	Vivian den Hollander	Dagmar Stam	*Whipped cream on your face*
17	Vriendjes van overal	Vivian den Hollander	Dagmar Stam	*Friends from everywhere*
18	Verliefd	Stefan Boonen	Jan van Lierde	*In love*

Note. Nr = book number













Appendices

Nederlandse Samenvatting (Summary in Dutch)

Kinderen kunnen al op heel jonge leeftijd verschillen zien tussen mensen met verschillende etnische achtergronden (Kelly et al., 2005; Kelly, Liu et al., 2007), en zijn dus niet 'kleurenblind' als het gaat om het zien van etniciteit. Later ontwikkelen kinderen ook verschillende attitudes jegens mensen met verschillende etnische achtergronden, wat kan resulteren in vooroordelen (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011). De term vooroordeel (*prejudice*) wordt wisselend gedefinieerd. Sommige wetenschappers gebruiken de term om zowel positievere attitudes ten opzichte van de ingroup dan de outgroup (*ingroup favoritism*) als negatieve attitudes richting de outgroup (*outgroup derogation*) te beschrijven (Hewstone et al., 2002). Anderen scharen alleen deze negatieve attitudes onder vooroordelen (Nesdale, 2004). Vooroordelen ten opzichte van gemarginaliseerde etnische groepen zijn het sterkst wanneer kinderen tussen de vijf en zeven jaar oud zijn (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011). Om deze vooroordelen te kunnen verminderen of voorkomen, is het van belang om goed in beeld te brengen hoe vooroordelen bij kinderen zich manifesteren. Hoewel hier steeds meer onderzoek naar wordt gedaan, is het onderzoek in Nederland nog beperkt. Verschillen in cultuur, geschiedenis, en populatie beperken de generaliseerbaarheid van eerder onderzoek in andere nationale contexten, zoals de Verenigde Staten (V.S.), naar de Nederlandse context (Zick et al., 2008). Aangezien mensen uit gemarginaliseerde etnische groepen ook in Nederland discriminatie ervaren (Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau, 2020), is onderzoek in deze specifieke nationale context nodig. Daarnaast is het van belang om aandacht te besteden aan factoren die mogelijk bijdragen aan de ontwikkeling van vooroordelen, of deze ontwikkeling juist tegengaan. Eén van de overkoepelende theorieën die wordt toegepast om de ontwikkeling van vooroordelen te verklaren is de sociaal leren theorie, gericht op de rol van anderen van wie kinderen leren (Levy & Hughes, 2009). Twee belangrijke bronnen van socialisatie voor kinderen zijn ouders en media, waaronder kinderboeken. In dit proefschrift is getracht inzicht te bieden in de vooroordelen op basis van etniciteit van kinderen in Nederland, en de attitudes en ideologieën waar zij via hun ouders en via kinderboeken aan kunnen worden blootgesteld.

Interetnische Vooroordelen in Nederland

In Hoofdstuk 2 is beschreven hoe de attitudes van 140 witte Nederlandse kinderen tussen de 6 en 8 jaar oud zijn onderzocht door middel van een *social preference* taak. De kinderen kregen foto's te zien van kinderen met een verschillend etnisch voorkomen (witte kinderen, zwarte kinderen, en kinderen met een Midden-Oosters voorkomen). Aan de deelnemende kinderen werd gevraagd naast wie ze (niet) wilden zitten, met wie ze (niet) wilden spelen, en wie ze wilden uitnodigen op hun verjaardagsfeestje. In reactie op de positief geformuleerde vragen werden de witte kinderen op de foto's het vaakst gekozen, en werden de zwarte kinderen vaker gekozen dan de kinderen met een Midden-Oosters voorkomen. In reactie op de negatief geformuleerde vragen werden de witte kinderen minder vaak gekozen dan de andere kinderen. Dit verschil in attitudes (het meest positief over witte kinderen,

dan over de zwarte kinderen en dan over de kinderen met een Midden-Oosters voorkomen) is in lijn met onderzoek naar gewenste sociale afstand onder oudere witte Nederlandse kinderen (Verkuyten & Kinket, 2000). De *social preference* taak is herhaald in een groep witte Nederlandse kinderen tussen de 6 en 10 jaar oud, waarbij, zoals beschreven in Hoofdstuk 3, andere resultaten zijn gevonden: in reactie op de negatief geformuleerde vragen werden zwarte kinderen vaker gekozen dan kinderen met een Midden-Oosters voorkomen. Mogelijk kan dit verschil verklaard worden door de verschillende tijdsperiodes waarin de kinderen bevraagd zijn (april-mei 2016 versus april 2018-januari 2020), of door verschillen in de gebruikte foto's (wel versus geen hoofddoek voor de meisjes met een Midden-Oosters voorkomen). De resultaten laten in ieder geval zien dat witte kinderen in Nederland op deze leeftijd vooroordelen hebben, zowel in de vorm van *ingroup favoritism* als in de vorm van *outgroup derogation*, en sluiten daarmee aan bij onderzoek onder witte kinderen in de V.S. (Katz, 2003; Ramsey, 1991).

Direct Interetnisch Contact

Er zijn verschillende theorieën over de ontwikkeling van vooroordelen die zich baseren op de overkoepelende sociaal leren theorie. Twee van deze theoretische lijnen vormen de basis voor dit proefschrift. Ten eerste is dit de *intergroup contact theory*, die stelt dat interetnisch contact vooroordelen kan verminderen (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). In veel eerder onderzoek is het negatieve verband tussen interetnisch contact en vooroordelen bevestigd (Pettigrew et al., 2011), ook voor kinderen (Tropp & Prenovost, 2008). Dit verband wordt grotendeels verklaard door een afname in ervaren dreiging en angst voor een andere groep, en door een toename in empathie en vaardigheden om het perspectief van een ander in te zien (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). Voor jonge kinderen kunnen ouders bepalend zijn voor de mate waarin zij interetnisch contact ervaren. Ouders kunnen verschillende rollen hebben waarin zij de sociale relaties van hun kinderen kunnen beïnvloeden (Ladd & Parke, 2021). Mogelijk faciliteren of beperken ouders (onbewust) het interetnische contact van hun kinderen op basis van hun eigen attitudes, wat vervolgens invloed kan hebben op de vooroordelen van hun kinderen. Het is daarom belangrijk om de attitudes van ouders over interetnisch contact hun kinderen in beeld te hebben.

In Hoofdstuk 3 zijn om deze reden de attitudes van moeders met verschillende achtergronden (wit Nederlands, Turks-Nederlands en Afro-Nederlands) ten opzichte van interetnische relaties van hun kinderen beschreven. Moeders rapporteerden in hoeverre ze er een probleem mee zouden hebben als hun kind een relatie (dat wil zeggen: vriendschap, daten, trouwen, kinderen krijgen) zou hebben met iemand met een andere etnische achtergrond (zwart, Islamitisch, Nederlands/Westers). Moeders' attitudes over interetnisch contact van hun kinderen waren relatief positief. Wel werd een aantal groepsverschillen gevonden: Turks-Nederlandse moeders waren minder positief over interetnische relaties van hun kind dan witte Nederlandse en Afro-Nederlandse moeders. Deze moeders waren daarentegen minder positief over interetnische relaties van hun kind met iemand met een Islamitische achtergrond dan met de andere etnische outgroup. Deze resultaten suggereren dat Turkse-

Nederlanders en mensen die zich identificeren als Moslim een hoger risico lopen om niet deel te nemen aan interetnisch contact. Dit is in lijn met eerder onderzoek waaruit bleek dat Turkse-Nederlanders minder vaak betrokken zijn in interetnisch contact dan mensen uit andere gemarginaliseerde etnische groepen in Nederland (Martinović, 2013; Koops et al., 2017).

De relatie tussen moeders' attitudes over interetnisch contact van hun kinderen en de vooroordelen van hun kinderen is verder onderzocht, en de resultaten zijn beschreven in Hoofdstuk 2 en 3. In de studie beschreven in Hoofdstuk 2, waarin alleen witte moeder-kind paren werden onderzocht en gevraagd werd naar de attitudes over relaties van kinderen met iemand 'met een niet-Nederlandse achtergrond', werd wel een relatie gevonden: kinderen van moeders die helemaal geen problemen hadden met interetnisch contact van hun kinderen lieten minder uitsluiting zien van kinderen met een Midden-Oosters voorkomen. In de studie beschreven in Hoofdstuk 3, waarin witte Nederlandse, Turks-Nederlandse en Afro-Nederlands moeder-kind paren werden onderzocht en gevraagd werd naar moeders' attitudes ten opzichte van interetnisch contact van hun kind met specifieke etnische achtergronden, werden geen verbanden gevonden. Deze resultaten suggereren dat verbanden tussen attitudes van ouders en kinderen sterker zijn wanneer meer algemene vormen van attitudes en ideologieën van ouders worden gemeten. Eerder onderzoek heeft al aangetoond dat dit het geval is wanneer zowel van ouder als kind algemenere vormen van attitudes worden gemeten (Meeusen & Dhont, 2015). Verder werd in de studie beschreven in Hoofdstuk 3 geen steun gevonden voor het idee dat ouders de mate van interetnisch contact van hun kinderen baseren op hun attitudes ten opzichte van interetnisch contact: er was geen verband tussen hun attitudes en het gerapporteerde interetnische contact van hun kinderen. Ook voor het *intergroup contact* effect werd geen steun gevonden. De resultaten laten met betrekking tot het verband tussen interetnisch contact en vooroordelen van kinderen een complex plaatje zien. Er was geen verband tussen deze constructen voor witte Nederlandse en Turks-Nederlandse kinderen, en het verband voor de Afro-Nederlandse kinderen was omgekeerd dan verwacht: meer contact met witte vrienden was gerelateerd aan meer vooroordelen over witte kinderen. Deze resultaten staan in contrast met eerder onderzoek naar het *intergroup contact* effect onder kinderen (Tropp & Prenovost, 2008), en impliceren dat meer onderzoek naar deze mogelijke ongewenste effecten nodig is.

Indirect Interetnisch Contact

Naast direct contact beschrijft eerder onderzoek dat ook indirecte vormen van interetnisch contact kunnen bijdragen aan het verminderen van vooroordelen. De *extended contact* hypothese stelt bijvoorbeeld dat het zien van voorbeelden van een positieve relatie tussen een ingroup en een outgroup member gerelateerd is aan minder vooroordelen (Wright et al., 1997). Eerder onderzoek heeft aangetoond dat zowel voorbeelden in het echte leven als fictieve voorbeelden zoals in boeken dergelijke effecten kunnen hebben bij kinderen (e.g., Cameron et al., 2006; Turner et al., 2007). Ook *vicarious contact* in boeken, waarbij er sprake is van een positieve

interactie maar niet per definitie van een relatie, is gerelateerd aan minder vooroordelen (Vezzali et al., 2012). Nog een stapje verder is de *parasocial contact* hypothese, die stelt dat alleen al blootstelling aan een positief voorbeeld van iemand met een andere etniciteit in de media, ongeacht of er sprake is van interetnische interactie, gerelateerd is aan minder vooroordelen (Schiappa et al., 2005). Boeken hebben de potentie om deze vormen van indirect interetnisch contact voor kinderen te bewerkstelligen, maar de etnische diversiteit en representatie onder personages is hiervoor van groot belang.

In Hoofdstuk 4 is daarom een studie beschreven naar de representatie van personages van kleur in populaire kinderboeken. Boeken die tussen 2009 en 2018 een prijs hadden gewonnen of in de toplijsten van verkochte en uitgeleende boeken stonden, die gericht waren op kinderen van 6 jaar of jonger, en die menselijke personages bevatten werden geselecteerd. In totaal zijn 64 boeken en 2053 personages gecodeerd, en is de representatie vergeleken met populatieschattingen op basis van data van het Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. Deze vergelijkingen lieten een ondervertegenwoordiging van personages van kleur zien. Ook werden enkele factoren die bijdragen aan het belang van een personage in het boek onderzocht, en vergeleken voor witte personages en personages van kleur. Op sommige factoren werden geen verschillen gevonden, wat suggereert dat witte personages en personages van kleur een even belangrijke rol in het verhaal spelen. Op andere factoren werden echter wel verschillen gevonden: de vrouwelijke personages van kleur waren relatief vaak achtergrondpersonages, en hoofdpersonen van kleur hadden minder vaak een naam dan witte hoofdpersonen. Deze resultaten tonen aan dat intersectionaliteit, aandacht voor verschillende dimensies van iemands identiteit en de kruising daartussen (Crenshaw, 1989), belangrijk is bij het onderzoeken van representatie en diversiteitsvraagstukken. Daarnaast sluiten de resultaten aan bij onderzoek in andere landen waar een ondervertegenwoordiging van personages van kleur werd gevonden (Koss, 2015; Koss et al., 2017), en laten ze zien dat er wat betreft etnische diversiteit en representatie ook in Nederland nog ruimte is voor verbetering.

Diversiteitsideologieën

De tweede theoretische lijn in dit proefschrift betreft diversiteitsideologieën: opvattingen over hoe het beste kan worden omgegaan met diversiteit en demografische verschillen (Rattan & Ambady, 2013). Twee bekende ideologieën zijn kleurenblindheid en multiculturalisme. Kleurenblindheid refereert naar het idee dat vooroordelen voortkomen uit het leggen van nadruk op sociale categorieën en verschillen zoals etniciteit, en dat het niet benoemen van dergelijke categorieën en verschillen bias zal voorkomen (Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). In de literatuur worden twee domeinen van kleurenblindheid beschreven: het ontkennen van etnische verschillen, en het ontkennen van ongelijkheid en discriminatie op grond van etniciteit (Neville et al., 2013). Deze laatste vorm wordt op zichzelf ook als een vorm van racisme beschouwd (Neville et al., 2013). Multiculturalisme is gebaseerd op het idee dat rekening moet worden gehouden met etnische verschillen, en dat deze verschillen

gewaardeerd moeten worden (Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). Volgens deze ideologie komen vooroordelen voort uit een gebrek aan kennis en waardering voor andere etnische of culturele groepen. Hoewel uit meta-onderzoek blijkt dat beide ideologieën gerelateerd zijn aan minder vooroordelen bij volwassenen, heeft multiculturalisme een sterker effect dan kleurenblindheid (Leslie et al., 2020; Whitley & Webster, 2019). Er is echter minder bekend over het effect van deze diversiteitsideologieën op de attitudes van kinderen. Eén manier waarop kinderen kunnen worden blootgesteld aan deze ideologieën is via hun ouders.

In Hoofdstuk 5 is beschreven in welke mate moeders met verschillende achtergronden (wit Nederlands, Turks-Nederlands en Afro-Nederlands) de kleurenblinde en multiculturalistische ideologie aanhangen. Uit deze studie bleek dat de Afro-Nederlandse moeders de kleurenblinde ideologie minder sterk aanhingen dan de andere moeders. Daarnaast hingen de witte Nederlandse moeders multiculturalisme minder sterk aan. Dit is in lijn met eerder onderzoek in de Nederlandse context (Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2003), en met patronen in dominante en gemarginaliseerde etnische groepen in andere landen (Ryan et al., 2010; Wolsko et al., 2006). De resultaten in Hoofdstuk 5 suggereren verder dat, in lijn met onderzoek onder volwassenen, multiculturalisme een positiever effect heeft op de vooroordelen van kinderen dan kleurenblindheid. Multiculturalisme van moeder was immers gerelateerd aan minder kind vooroordelen, terwijl kleurenblindheid van moeders gerelateerd was aan meer vooroordelen. Wel bleken de relaties te verschillen tussen de etnische groepen: de relatie van multiculturalisme kwam vooral naar voren in de witte gezinnen en de relatie van kleurenblindheid kwam vooral naar voren in de Turks-Nederlandse gezinnen. De resultaten uit dit hoofdstuk komen overeen met eerder onderzoek waarin onder schoolkinderen positievere effecten werden gevonden van een multiculturalistische ideologie op school dan van een kleurenblinde ideologie (Apfelbaum et al., 2010), en waarin werd gevonden dat het bespreken van etniciteit of ras (dus geen kleurenblinde aanpak) een positief effect had op de interetnische attitudes van kinderen (Perry et al., 2020; Vittrup & Holden, 2011).

Kinderen kunnen ook worden blootgesteld aan dergelijke ideologieën via andere socialisatie bronnen, zoals boeken. In Hoofdstuk 6 zijn de resultaten gerapporteerd van een kwalitatieve analyse van een subset van de populaire kinderboeken uit de eerder beschreven selectie. Deze subset bestaat uit boeken met een hoofdpersoon of ondersteunend personage van kleur en een doorlopende verhaallijn. In deze kwalitatieve analyse is aandacht besteed aan de mate waarin en manier waarop in de boeken aandacht werd besteed aan de etnische of culturele achtergrond van de personages van kleur, de mate waarin stereotypen voorkwamen, de machtsverhouding tussen personages, en de manier waarop relevante ideologieën zoals kleurenblindheid naar voren kwamen. In enkele boeken werden (subtiele) stereotypen en vormen van witte superioriteit en eurocentrisme gevonden. In het merendeel van de boeken werd een vorm van kleurenblindheid vastgesteld: er werd weinig aandacht besteed aan de culturele of etnische achtergrond van personages. Hoewel met name witte ouders huiverig lijken om het gesprek over etnische

diversiteit aan te gaan met hun kind (Pahlke et al., 2012; Vittrup, 2018), en het samen lezen van boeken wordt gezien als een goede manier om dit gesprek te initiëren (Kemple et al., 2016), lijken hier dus nog relatief weinig aanknopingspunten voor te zijn in de populaire Nederlandse kinderliteratuur.

Conclusie

In dit proefschrift wordt beschreven hoe ook bij jonge kinderen in Nederland al vooroordelen op basis van etniciteit worden gevonden. Daarnaast geeft het proefschrift inzicht in de attitudes en ideologieën waar kinderen mogelijk aan worden blootgesteld via twee socialisatie bronnen: ouders en kinderboeken. De resultaten in dit proefschrift zijn een belangrijke eerste stap in het onderzoeken van het fundament om strategieën om vooroordelen te verminderen of voorkomen gebaseerd op de sociaal leren theorie toe te passen in de specifieke Nederlandse context. Het laat zien dat bij een benadering gebaseerd op intergroup contact verschillende obstakels kunnen worden ervaren: ouders staan in verschillende mate open voor direct interetnisch contact van hun kind met verschillende etnische groepen, direct interetnisch contact kan mogelijk ook negatieve effecten hebben, en de mate van etnische diversiteit in kinderboeken en daarmee de mogelijkheid om op die manier indirect interetnisch contact te bewerkstelligen lijkt beperkt. Verder impliceren de resultaten uit dit proefschrift dat een multiculturalistische diversiteitsbenadering positievere effecten kan hebben op de interetnische attitudes van kinderen, met name voor witte kinderen, dan een kleurenblinde diversiteitsbenadering. Deze kleurenblinde benadering is echter overheersend in populaire kinderboeken. De resultaten beschreven in dit proefschrift kunnen gebruikt worden om zowel onderzoek als programma's in de praktijk gericht op het verbeteren van interetnische relaties onder kinderen in Nederland vorm te geven en vooruit te helpen.

Dankwoord (Acknowledgements)

Er zijn veel mensen om te bedanken voor hun bijdrage aan de totstandkoming van dit proefschrift. Als eerste wil ik alle gezinnen bedanken die hebben meegedaan, en alle studenten en assistenten die hebben meegeholpen om dit project te laten slagen. De dataverzameling en verwerking had zonder jullie niet succesvol kunnen worden afgerond. Datzelfde geldt natuurlijk voor mijn directe collega's: Daudi, Fadime, en Yiran. Het was fijn om samen met jullie dit traject door te gaan, en ik heb heel veel van jullie geleerd. Ook mijn ERC-collega's wil ik graag noemen: bedankt voor alle borrels en gezelligheid. Antoinette, onze belafspraken zorgden niet alleen voor structuur toen de wereld op zijn kop stond, maar waren ook een zekerheidje dat de dag goed zou beginnen. Essentieel voor dit proefschrift zijn ook mijn (co)promotoren Judi en Rosanneke. Ik wil jullie beiden ontzettend bedanken voor jullie begeleiding en de ruimte en mogelijkheden die jullie hebben geboden om mijn eigen weg te gaan. Jullie vertrouwen in mij was een enorme steun in de rug. Rosanneke, ik kon me geen betere en fijnere dagelijks begeleider wensen.

Ik heb het geluk om buiten werk terug te kunnen vallen op lieve vrienden en familie, die mij steunen en afleiding en gezelligheid bieden - wat mij betreft essentieel tijdens een promotietraject. Friends, hoewel we allemaal andere paden zijn gaan bewandelen voel ik me bij jullie nog altijd thuis. Divina, lieve ploeg, al ligt het sportieve teamwerk ver achter ons, ik weet dat ik op jullie kan blijven bouwen. Lieve papa, mama, en Sven, bedankt dat jullie er altijd voor mij zullen zijn. Pap en mam, bedankt voor alle mogelijkheden die jullie mij hebben geboden om mij te ontwikkelen tot wie ik ben. Ik denk dat ik nooit te oud ga zijn om te vragen naar jullie wijze adviezen – ook als ik vervolgens eigenwijs blijf en ze naast me neer leg. De levensles om altijd je best te blijven doen heeft toch maar mooi een proefschrift opgeleverd! Last but certainly not least gaat mijn dank natuurlijk uit naar jou, liefste Jochem. You are my rock. Bedankt voor al je steun en liefde. Bedankt voor al je pogingen om te proberen te begrijpen waar ik mee bezig ben, en voor je enorme overtuiging van mijn kunnen.

Curriculum Vitae

Ymke de Bruijn werd geboren op 2 april 1994 in Dordrecht. In 2012 haalde ze haar gymnasiumdiploma cum laude aan het Stedelijk Dalton Lyceum in Dordrecht. Daarna begon ze aan een bachelor Pedagogische Wetenschappen aan de Universiteit Leiden, die ze in 2015 afrondde (specialisatie orthopedagogiek). Aansluitend startte ze de Research Master Developmental Psychopathology in Education and Child Studies aan de Universiteit Leiden, waarvan ze in 2017 cum laude haar diploma behaalde. Als onderdeel van haar master deed Ymke onderzoekservaring op binnen het Stumass project. Haar scriptie leidde naar een publicatie over empathie, alexithymie, en executief functioneren in hoog-functionerende studenten met een autisme spectrum stoornis. Tijdens haar master deed Ymke daarnaast onderzoekservaring op als onderzoeksassistent bij het project Vaders in Beeld, als stagiaire bij het Verwey-Jonker instituut, en als juniorconsultant bij UniPartners Leiden. Ook werkte ze tijdens haar master als onderwijsassistent, waarvoor ze eerstejaars studenten Pedagogische Wetenschappen begeleidde in tutorgroepen, en deed ze vrijwilligerswerk voor de VoorleesExpress. Aan het eind van haar master kreeg Ymke het Ina van Berckelaer-Onnes stipendium toegewezen, waarmee ze deelnam aan de summer school Auditory and Cognitive Neuroscience aan de Universiteit van Helsinki.

Na afronding van haar master startte Ymke in september 2017 als promovenda bij het Leiden University College op het project *The parenting origin of prejudice*, een onderzoek gericht op de ontwikkeling van vooroordelen bij kinderen en de rol die ouders daarin spelen. Een deel van de resultaten van dit project staat beschreven in dit proefschrift. Daarnaast werkte Ymke aan een project gericht op diversiteit in kinderboeken, waarvan de resultaten ook in dit proefschrift zijn opgenomen, en aan een onderzoek naar collectievorming van schoolbibliotheken in samenwerking met Stichting Lezen. Gedurende het grootste deel van haar promotietraject is ze tevens werkzaam geweest als docent bij het instituut Pedagogische Wetenschappen, en heeft zij hoorcolleges, werkgroepen, en individuele begeleiding verzorgd voor diverse bachelor en (research) master vakken. In juli 2020 behaalde ze de basis kwalificatie onderwijs. Van september 2020 tot en met februari 2021 heeft Ymke haar promotietraject tijdelijk onderbroken, om als junior beleidsmedewerker te werken bij het Nationaal Regieorgaan Onderwijsonderzoek. Na afronding van haar promotietraject zal Ymke haar werkzaamheden binnen het project *The parenting origin of prejudice* voortzetten als postdoctoraal onderzoeker.

List of Publications and Presentations

Publications

de Bruijn, Y., Emmen, R. A. G., & Mesman, J. (in press). Maternal attitudes toward child interethnic relations in the Netherlands: Facilitating intergroup contact effects? *Social Development*.

de Bruijn, Y., Emmen, R. A. G., & Mesman, J. (2021). What do we read to our children? Messages concerning ethnic diversity in popular children's books in the Netherlands. *SN Social Sciences, 1,* 206. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-021-00221-7

de Bruijn, Y., Emmen, R. A. G., & Mesman, J. (2021). Ethnic diversity in children's books in the Netherlands. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, *49*, 413-423. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-020-01080-2

de Bruijn, Y., Amoureus, C., Emmen, R. A. G., & Mesman, J. (2020). Interethnic prejudice against Muslims among White Dutch children. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 51*(3-4), 203-221. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022120908346

Ziermans, T., **de Bruijn, Y.**, Dijkhuis, R., Staal, W., & Swaab, H. (2019). Impairments in cognitive empathy and alexithymia occur independently of executive functioning in college students with autism. *Autism, 23*(6), 1519-1530. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361318817716

Work in progress

de Bruijn, Y., Emmen, R. A. G., & Mesman, J. (2021). Navigating diversity: Maternal ideologies and associations with child interethnic prejudice in the Netherlands. *Manuscript submitted for publication*.

Mesman, J., **de Bruijn, Y.**, Pektas, F., Van Veen, P. D., & Emmen, R. A. G. (2021). Maternal color-consciousness is related to more positive and less negative attitudes towards ethnic-racial outgroups in children in White Dutch families. *Manuscript submitted for publication*.

Yang, Y., Emmen, R. A. G., **de Bruijn, Y.**, & Mesman, J. (2021). Mom, who are they? White prevalence and White preference in children's books in China. *Manuscript submitted for publication.*

Presentations

de Bruijn, Y., Emmen, R. A. G., & Mesman, J. (2021, 27-31 July). *Maternal attitudes toward child interethnic relations in the Netherlands: Facilitating intergroup contact effects?*. (Poster session). International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology Congress 2020+, online.

de Bruijn, Y., Emmen, R. A. G., & Mesman, J. (2020, May 4-6). *Maternal objection to child interethnic relations in three ethnic groups in the Netherlands.* (Poster session). Society for Research in Child Development Special Topic Meeting: Construction of the 'Other': Development, Consequences, and Applied Implications of Prejudice and Discrimination, Puerto Rico, United States (Conference cancelled).

de Bruijn, Y., Emmen, R.A.G., & Mesman, J. (2019, November 21-22). *Ethnic diversity in Dutch children's books*. (Poster session). VNOP-CAS Research Days, Utrecht, the Netherlands.

de Bruijn, Y., Emmen, R.A.G., Amoureus, C., & Mesman, J. (2018, July 1-5). *Ingroup favoritism and outgroup rejection in White Dutch children*. (Rapid paper presentation). International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology Congress, Guelph, Canada.