Perceived discrimination amongst young people in socio-economically disadvantaged communities: Parental support and community identity buffer (some) negative impacts of stigma
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There is increasing acceptance that children are not unaware of when they are targets of discrimination. However, discrimination as a consequence of socio-economic disadvantage remains understudied. The aim of this study was to examine the impact of perceived discrimination on well-being, perceptions of safety and school integration amongst children growing up within socio-economically disadvantaged communities in Limerick, Ireland. Mediation analysis was used to explore these relationships and to examine the potential role of parental support and community identity in boys and girls in the 6th to 9th year of compulsory education (N = 199). Results indicate perceived discrimination contributed to negative outcomes in terms of school integration, perceptions of safety and levels of well-being. Age and gender differences were observed which disadvantaged boys and younger children. All negative outcomes were buffered by parental support. Community identity also protected young people in terms of feelings of school integration and risk but not in terms of psychological well-being. Findings are discussed in terms of the different role of family and community supports for children negotiating negative social representations of their community.

Children growing up within disadvantaged communities are at greater risk of lower academic achievement and reduced overall well-being than those from advantaged communities (Angel & Angel, 2006). Whilst previous studies emphasize how these outcomes can be seen to be related to socio-economic status, studies focusing on ethnic minority communities reflect the influence of factors other than the economic elements (Rios, Aiken, & Zautra, 2012). Negative stereotypes and discrimination represent a potential pathway through which these outcomes can be understood (Prelow, Danoff-Burg, Swenson, & Pulgiano, 2004). Branscombe, Schmitt, and Harvey (1999) outline how these negative consequences of discrimination can be alleviated by the meaning, belonging, and support provided by identification with the stigmatized group. In practical terms, group support can provide a range of emotional, informational, and economic
resources to deal with the challenges of discrimination (Haslam, Jetten, Postmes, & Haslam, 2009). Moreover by drawing on group membership, negative social representations of community identities can be challenged, reconstructed, or refocused (Howarth, 2006). This study considered the impact of discrimination associated with membership of marginalized communities, and how it is buffered by parent support and community identity.

The impact of community stigmatization in childhood

For children, the impact of stigmatization can be particularly pronounced as it shapes their initial perception and engagement with the broader social world. A recent meta-analysis shows that perceived discrimination is felt more acutely by children (under 13 years) than by adolescent or adult samples (Schmitt, Branscombe, Postmes, & Garcia, 2014). Despite the negative potential, perceived discrimination in childhood has, until recently, received limited attention. Incorporating aspects of stigma – often operationalized as perceived discrimination – within one’s own self-concept has been shown in longitudinal studies to lead to reduced self-esteem and psychological well-being in children aged 10–12 years (Brody et al., 2006). And we know by the age of 10, 92% of children understand and are familiar with the term discrimination (Verkuyten, Kinket, & van der Wielen, 1997). The majority of children have at this age experienced at least one instance of discrimination (Simons et al., 2002).

In spite of this, stigmatized groups rarely exhibit the totality of negative outcomes when compared to dominant group members (Crocker & Major, 1989). Branscombe et al. (1999) suggest a form of protection via a rejection-identification model. This outlines how stigmatization processes in adults can lead to stronger identification with the community which in turn mediates the negative impact of discrimination by providing a sense of identity and belonging. This sense of belonging helps those affected by discrimination to interpret its meaning, thus enhancing self-esteem as well as giving access to social support and collective resources (Haslam et al., 2009). This can lead to a virtuous cycle that reinforces identification with the group, increasing psychological well-being (Schmid & Muldoon, 2015). Similarly in children, Spears Brown and Bigler (2005) highlight that disadvantaged children are most likely to report experience of discrimination and that those with strong group identities, and those whose parents’ socialization practices facilitate their identity development, can be protected.

Perceived discrimination may have its greatest impact in childhood (Schmitt et al., 2014), because the identity resources available during this period are limited compared to those available in adolescence and adulthood (Phinney & Baldelomar, 2011). Social identity development is a key task for middle childhood, and children’s emerging identities may not be as freely harnessed as resources in the way that they may be in later life. Although social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) was formulated to account for adult group processes, latterly Nesdale (1999) has argued for its application within child cohorts. In doing so however, the potential interaction of group processes with developmental changes needs to be acknowledged. Nesdale (2000) found age had a dual influence on children’s developing cognitive ability to process and remember information on the one hand and group processes on the other. Whilst children’s ability to distinguish individual-rather than group-related traits increases in middle childhood, so too does children’s ability to recognize and process stereotypical group behaviour. As a result, concerns relating to in-group image management consistent with social identity theory become evident. Thus, there is evidence that children of lower status groups begin to
reduce their ‘liking’ and increased negative attributions towards own group at this age (Nesdale & Flesser, 2001). In short, this work demonstrates that identification with one’s group and the views of that group were intertwined and only emerge during middle childhood (age 5–8 years).

Importantly, the bulk of this research has been undertaken in relation to discrimination as a consequence of race, ethnicity, and gender (Spears Brown & Bigler, 2005). The present study, however, examined the impact of perceived discrimination as a consequence of socio-economic disadvantage. This has important implications. First, there is less evidence that community identity or belonging associated with social class can be harnessed in the same manner as racial or gender group membership (McNamara, Stevenson, & Muldoon, 2013). And second, there is evidence, even amongst adults, that the invisibility and individualization of social class may make it difficult for class-based identities to be harnessed as a collective psychological resource: Race and gender are group memberships associated with visual markers, and class is not (Jay & Muldoon, in press). This gives rise to two possibilities. The first is that children fail to perceive discrimination as a consequence of the membership of disadvantaged community. The second is that the children do perceive the discrimination but have no identity resources available to negotiate this stigma. And of course, both of these factors are likely to be related to both children age and gender. Males are more susceptible to overt negative outcomes as a consequence of perceived discrimination (Behnke, Plunkett, Sands, & Bámaca-Colbert, 2010). In disadvantaged communities, boys are seen to be more likely to be both the perpetrators and recipients of violent actions. This may result in increasing the impact of discrimination on boys when the stereotype involved is of an antisocial, aggressive, or violent nature. Similarly, perceived discrimination is felt more acutely by children (under 13 years) than by adolescent (Schmitt et al., 2014), whilst the identity resource available to deal with this experience is likely to increase as children become increasingly independent within their schools and communities (Erikson, 1995). For this reason, we hypothesize that age and gender differences in perceived discrimination will be evident that disadvantage males and our younger cohorts.

Social resources for coping with stigma in childhood

For children developing in marginal communities, the reminders of their stigmatized identity are manifold (Howarth, 2002). Aspirations and expectations of children living within marginalized communities are subject to cultural conditioning which can result in children excluding themselves from paths deemed to be inappropriate or threatening because of stereotyped beliefs (Ridge, 2006). This may limit participation in some areas whilst at the same time enhancing it in others (Howarth, 2001). Young people within disadvantaged communities may choose to withdraw from the community in order to avoid negative appraisals at the same time as engaging more with marginalized peers (Howarth, 2002). This withdrawal can result in decreased levels of perceived belonging and support at community level at the same time as increasing young people’s perceptions of risk and safety in their locality (Stafford, De Silva, Stansfeld, & Marmot, 2008). Importantly, Taylor and Shumaker (1990) underline that perceptions of safety and fear are not correlated with crime rates but rather reflect feelings of personal vulnerability. This sense of vulnerability is exacerbated by negative perceptions of neighbourhood environments (Aneshensel & Sucoff, 1996), again implicating the role of stigmatization and
discrimination in stripping individuals of the psychological and social resilience provided by their communities.

On the other hand, Stafford et al. (2008) highlight that those with lower levels of fear exhibit higher levels of social activities. Fear may restrict an individual’s inclination to leave their home and result in decreased opportunities for social connection (Whitley & Prince, 2005) whilst at the same time reducing the opportunity for antisocial behaviour. In stigmatized areas, this may mean that parents, eager to reduce the risk of children’s antisocial behaviour, may attempt to curtail young people’s activities purposefully, which may limit meaningful social ties (Ross, 2000). Taken together, these findings again allow us to hypothesize that for children growing up within stigmatized communities, that stigma and discrimination can negatively impact on children’s educational outcomes, psychological well-being, and perceptions of safety.

The role of the caregiver in interpreting and providing reassurance in the face of discrimination and adversity has been shown to facilitate children’s understanding and adjustment (Garbarino, Dubrow, & Kostelny, 1991). Belsky, Putnam, and Crnic (1996) suggest that supportive family structures contribute fundamentally to support and adjustment. In particular, parents as well as the wider community may be able to insulate against the impact of discriminatory environments (Simons et al., 2002). Thus, we hypothesize that identification with community and support from family can alleviate the negative impact of discrimination, as per Branscombe et al.’s (1999) rejection-identification model. And our particular aim here then was to examine whether parent support and community identity act in the same way across late childhood and our range of outcomes to alleviate the impact of perceived discrimination in those growing up in a socially disadvantaged area.

Current study
The current study focused on marginalized communities within Limerick City in Ireland. Limerick experiences a high degree of geographically segregated socio-economic polarization (Limerick Development Board, 2001). Within marginalized areas, educational attainment, employment, and levels of health are well below national averages with high levels of violent crime and mental health issues (Hourigan, 2011). Media representations are predominantly negative and contribute to the stigmatized identity and marginalization experienced by the residents. Previous research has indicated that residents within these communities are subjected to levels of prejudice, framing communities as less caring and supportive, and less able to contribute meaningfully to society (McNamara, Muldoon, Stevenson, & Slattery, 2011). As a result, these areas are seen to retain nationwide notoriety (McNamara et al., 2013). Previous studies exploring the consequences of discrimination within these marginalized communities have focused on adult cohorts. The impact on children is less well understood.

As a result, the aims of this study were to explore the impact of children’s experiences of discrimination. This study asks two research questions. First, does support in the form of family support act as a mediator in the relationship between perceived discrimination and (1) perceptions of safety, (2) psychological well-being, and (3) school integration? Second, does support in the form of community identity act as a mediator in the relationship between perceived discrimination and (1) perceived safety, (2) psychological well-being, and (3) school integration? This study hypothesized that perceived discrimination will have a negative impact on children’s psychological well-being,
perceptions of safety, and level of school integration and that both parental support and community identification will mediate these relationships.

**Method**

**Participants**
A total of 199 children (100 girls, 94 boys, five children did not indicate their gender) from primary and secondary schools servicing marginalized communities in Limerick City were recruited to take part in this study. Children were largely sourced from three grades, the 6th–9th year of compulsory education in Ireland ($M = 10.5$, $SD = 2.2$).

**Procedure**
Children were recruited from primary and secondary schools within areas designated by government as deprived in Limerick City. Subsequent to contacting the principal of each school and obtaining consent for the study to run in each school, parental consent forms were sent home with children 1 week prior to data collection. Parental consent was therefore obtained in advance of the administration of the survey, and each child also gave their consent to participate in the study on the day. All questionnaires were administered in booklet form in normally schedule class time. The survey was administered in class groups and items were read aloud to children within the primary school system as they completed the questionnaire. Composite measures were calculated based on the average of the sum totals.

**Measures**

**Predictor variable**
*Perceived discrimination.* *Perceived discrimination* was measured using five items from the Personal Discrimination scale (Cassidy, O’Connor, Howe, & Warden, 2004). This scale is a composite of two measures (Phinney, Madden, & Santos, 1998; Verkuyten, 2001) which were designed and developed for use with children. Although perceived racial and ethnic discrimination has been measured and well documented using this measure and other measures amongst children of this age previously (Coker et al., 2009), the adaptation here to assess perceived frequency of being treated unfairly or negatively because of class background (e.g., ‘I feel like people who are not from my neighbourhood have something against me’) is ours. Previous work demonstrates, however, that disadvantaged neighbourhoods and communities are widely stigmatized and understood to be different by children and adults alike (Jay & Muldoon, in press). Reflecting the viability of the adaptation, the coefficient alpha for this sample was .75 and children reported no difficulties understanding the meaning of the items. Each item is rated on a seven-point scale from ‘almost never’ (1) to ‘very often’ (7).

**Mediating variables**
*Parental support.* *Parental support* was measured using a three-item parent relation scale (Kidscreen, 2006). The scale was developed and validated for use with children aged 8–18 years across Europe. This scale indicated the level of support as well as the quality of the interaction between the child and their parent or caregiver (e.g., ‘Have you been able
to talk to your parents when you wanted to?‘) (Ravens-Sieberer et al., 2013). Responses were measured on a Likert scale and ranged from 1 (Never) to 5 (Always). The coefficient alpha for this sample was .66.

**Community identity.** Community identity was measured using an 8-item Collective Self-Esteem scale (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) which tapped feelings of belonging, regard and commitment to the neighbourhood. Subjective group identification has been evidenced in children as young as five (Bennett & Sani, 2008), and this widely used measure has been used previously with children (Verkuyten, 2001) and adolescents (Whitesell, Mitchell, Kaufman, & Spicer, 2006). Items were altered to refer to the community so that they read, for example, ‘I am glad to be from my neighbourhood’ and ‘Other people respect my neighbourhood’. Responses were measured on a Likert scale and ranged from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree). The coefficient alpha for this sample was .72.

**Outcome variables**

*Psychological well-being.* Psychological well-being was measured using a seven-item psychological well-being scale developed and validated for use with children aged 8–18 years across Europe (Kidscreen, 2006). This scale measured psychological well-being of the child including the positive emotions and life satisfaction as well as the absence of feelings of loneliness and sadness (e.g., ‘Have you been in a good mood in the last week?’) (Ravens-Sieberer et al., 2013). Responses were measured on a Likert scale and ranged from 1 (None of the time) to 5 (All of the time). The coefficient alpha for this sample was .72.

*Perceptions of safety.* Perceptions of safety was measured using a 10-item perception of safety scale developed and validated for use with children aged 8–14 years (Henry, 2000). This scale indicated the level of safety the participant felt in their neighbourhood and in their journeys to and from school (e.g., ‘I feel safe on my way home from school’). Responses were measured on a Likert scale and ranged from 1 (None of the time) to 3 (Always). The coefficient alpha for this sample was .86.

*School integration.* School integration was measured using a four-item school and learning scale (Kidscreen, 2006). This scale measured the child’s perception of their capacity for learning and concentration as well as their feelings and relationship towards their school and teachers (e.g., ‘Have you been happy at school?’) (Ravens-Sieberer et al., 2013). Responses were measured on a Likert scale and ranged from 1 (None of the time) to 5 (All of the time). The coefficient alpha for this sample was .70.

**Results**

**Overview of analyses**

This study explored the relationships between perceived discrimination, community identification, family support, perceptions of safety, psychological well-being, and school integration in children growing up in marginalized communities in Limerick City. Table 1
illustrates means and standard deviations and correlations between variables. Analysis of covariance was first conducted to explore gender and effects on all measured variables. A series of regression path analyses were conducted to examine whether the family- and community-level influences act as mediators in the relationship between perceived discrimination and (1) perceived safety, (2) psychological well-being, and (3) school integration. These mediation pathways were subsequently assessed using SPSS syntax PROCESS provided by Preacher and Hayes (2004) to explore the influence of age and gender as covariates.

Correlations
Inter correlations between predictor, mediator, and outcome variables are illustrated in Table 1. Pearson correlations indicated that perceived discrimination was negatively associated with community identity and family support. Family support was positively associated with community identity, whilst community identity and family support were both positively associated with well-being, perceptions of safety, and school integration. Perceived discrimination was negatively associated with all other variables (see Table 1). And age was negatively associated with perceived discrimination with younger children reporting higher perceived discrimination.

The role of gender and age
One-way analyses of variance with age entered as a covariate (ANCOVAs) were conducted to explore the differences between male and female perceptions of discrimination, community identity, family support, perceptions of safety, and psychological well-being. There was a significant association between gender and school integration, $F(1, 184) = 7.42, p = .007, \eta^2 = .04$, with boys ($M = 15.72, SD = 3.66$) reporting lower levels of school integration when compared with girls ($M = 16.71, SD = 2.80$), $t(184) = -2.72, p = .007, r = .12$. No gender differences in perceived discrimination $F(1, 175) = 0.01, p = .91, \eta^2 < .00$, community identity, $F(1, 167) = .2.40, p = .12, \eta^2 = .01$, family support, $F(1, 183) = 0.311, p = .58, \eta^2 = .002$, perceptions of safety $F(1, 180) = 1.43, p = .23, \eta^2 = .008$, or psychological well-being $F(1, 182) = .88, p = .35, \eta^2 = .005$, were evident.

Table 1. Correlations, means, and standard deviations of study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Parental support</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>23**</td>
<td>45**</td>
<td>39**</td>
<td>31**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community identity</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>22**</td>
<td>40**</td>
<td>33**</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Well-being</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perceived safety</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. School integration</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Age</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean | 10.53 | 13.46 | 24.57 | 29.31 | 27.48 | 16.18 | 10.44 |

SD  | 3.87  | 2.33  | 4.67  | 4.72  | 3.38  | 3.32  | 2.25  |


Note. **p < .01 level (two-tailed); *p < .05 level (two-tailed).
Age was significantly related to levels of community identity, $F(1, 167) = 4.62, p = .03, \eta^2 = .03$, school integration, $F(1, 184) = 10.20, p = .002, \eta^2 = .05$, and levels of perceived discrimination, $F(1, 175) = 6.69, p = .01, \eta^2 = .04$, with younger children indicating higher levels of school integration ($r = -.13$) and perceived discrimination ($r = -.23$).

**Parental support as a mediator of perceived discrimination**

Perceived discrimination predicted perceptions of safety, $\beta = -.39, t(172) = 6.54, p < .001$ in this variable, $R^2 = .20, F(1, 172) = 42.73, p < .001$; school integration, $\beta = -.15, \ t(176) = -2.39, p = .02$, accounting for $3\%$ of the variance $R^2 = .03, F(1, 176) = 5.72, p = .02$; and psychological well-being, $\beta = -.40, t(174) = -4.61, p < .001$, accounting for $11\%$ of the variance $R^2 = .11, F(1, 174) = 21.29, p < .001$. Discrimination was also negatively associated with parental support, $\beta = -.15, t(175) = -3.34, p < .001$, accounting for $6\%$ of its variance, $R^2 = .06, F(1, 175) = 11.16, p < .001$. The relationships between parental support and perceptions of safety ($\beta = .43, p < .001$), school integration ($\beta = .40, p < .001$), and psychological well-being ($\beta = .79, p < .001$) remained significant when perceptions of discrimination were controlled for (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Furthermore, the relationship between perceived discrimination and perceptions of safety ($\beta = -.33, p < .001$), psychological well-being ($\beta = -.29, p < .001$), and school integration ($\beta = -.09, p = .14$) were weaker when parental support was controlled for (see Figure 1). A Sobel test confirmed that community support was a significant mediator of the relationship between perceived discrimination and perceptions of safety ($z = -2.69; p = .01$), school integration ($z = -2.52; p = .01$), and psychological well-being ($z = -2.90; p < .001$).

Age and gender were entered as covariates in the mediation model using PROCESS (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). Results indicate that using 20,000 resampling iterations, there was a significant indirect association between perceived discrimination, through parental support accounting for $32\%$ of the variance, $R^2 = .32, F(4, 160) = 18.99, p < .001$, and perceptions of safety $\beta = -.06, BCa CI (−.13, −.02)$. Similarly, $23\%$ of the variance, $R^2 = .23, F(4, 164) = 12.82, p < .001$, in well-being $\beta = -.10, BCa CI (−.20, −.03)$, and $24\%$ of the variance, $R^2 = .24, F(4, 165) = 6.79, p < .001$, in school integration $\beta = -.05, BCa CI (−.10, −.01)$, was accounted for by the indirect relationship between perceived discrimination through parental support and these two outcomes. Age and gender remained significant within the overall models. The negative indirect relationship between perceived discrimination and well-being, $\beta = -.35, BCa CI (−.65, −.05)$, and school integration, $\beta = -.48, BCa CI (−.67, −.29)$ was stronger for younger participants (see Table 2). Gender was significant within the overall model for school integration $\beta = -.93, BCa CI (0.12, 1.75)$, indicating that the association between perceived discrimination and school integration was stronger for male participants (see Table 3).

**Community identification as a mediator of perceived discrimination**

As the relationship between perceived discrimination and the outcome variables had already been demonstrated, we began this analysis by demonstrating that discrimination was also negatively associated with community identification, $\beta = -.30, t (161) = -3.33, p < .001$, accounting for $7\%$ of the variance, $R^2 = .07, F (1, 161) = 11.13, p < .001$. And our results indicated that the relationships between
community identity and perceptions of safety ($\beta = .22, p < .001$) and school integration ($\beta = .22, p < .001$), although not psychological well-being ($\beta = .15, p = .06$), remained significant when perceptions of discrimination were controlled (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Furthermore, the relationship between perceived discrimination and perceptions of safety ($\beta = -32, p < .001$), and school integration ($\beta = -09, p = .20$) were weaker when community identity was controlled (see Figure 2). A Sobel test confirmed that community identification was a significant mediator of the relationship between perceived discrimination and perceptions of safety ($z = -2.64; p = .01$), and school integration ($z = -2.31; p = .02$).

Age and gender were subsequently entered as covariates in a mediation model. Using 20,000 resampling iterations, there was a significant indirect relationship between
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**Figure 1.** Perceived discrimination, parental support, and perceptions of safety and school integration in the overall sample. (a) Indicates the direct pathway; (b) Indicates the indirect pathway. **$p < .01$ level (two-tailed); *$p < .05$ level (two-tailed).**

### Table 2. Well-being coefficient table for family support mediation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>24.83</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>&lt;.001 (18.89, 30.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family support</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>&lt;.001 (0.48, 1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-3.22</td>
<td>.002 (-0.46, -0.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-2.32</td>
<td>.02 (-0.65, -0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.35 (-0.67, 1.89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
perceived discrimination and perceptions of safety $\beta = -0.07$, BCa CI ($-0.14$, $-0.0$), accounting for 31% of the variance $R^2 = .31$, $F(4, 148) = 16.85$, $p < .001$, and school integration $\beta = -0.05$, BCa CI ($-0.11$, $-0.01$), accounting for 16% of the variance $R^2 = .16$, $F(4, 151) = 7.33$, $p < .001$, through community identity. Results did not support the hypothesis that community identity mediated the relationship between discrimination and well-being $\beta = -0.02$, BCa CI ($-0.10$, $0.03$), as zero fell between the upper and lower confidence intervals. Age remained significant, $\beta = -0.36$, BCa CI ($-0.59$, $-0.13$), within the overall model for school integration indicating that the indirect association with perceived discrimination was stronger amongst younger participants. And gender remained significant, $\beta = -1.13$, BCa CI ($0.14$, $2.12$), within the overall model also for school integration indicating that the association with perceived discrimination was greater for male participants (see Table 4).
In line with the first hypothesis, perceived discrimination is negatively associated with self-reported levels of well-being, school integration, and perceptions of safety. This supports previous research that highlights the negative relationship between discrimination and mental health (Fischer & Holz, 2007) and underachievement in educational contexts (Major & O’Brien, 2005) and increased feelings of threat in response to perceived discrimination (McCoy & Major, 2003). Results also support the hypothesis that parental support is a significant buffer in the relationship between perceived discrimination and perceptions of safety, school integration, and psychological well-being, again supporting previous research that highlights parental and family support as buffers of the negative relationship with social stresses (Juang & Alvarez, 2010). Of course, children rely on their parents for economic and emotional support. Family support was also positively associated with community identity and negatively associated with perceptions of discrimination. Lack of family support may indicate an increased vulnerability to perceptions of discrimination whilst at the same time undermine the ability to integrate within the community and develop an associated sense of belonging and identification. Results also indicate partial support for the hypothesis that community identification buffers, or suppresses, the impact of perceived discrimination.

A number of interesting relationships also emerged related to both gender and age. First, the suggestion that children do not perceive discrimination as a consequence of membership of a socially disadvantaged community is not supported. In fact, younger children were more likely to perceive discrimination than their older counterparts. This finding resonates with research with minority and disadvantaged groups which have repeatedly revealed that children rather than being unaware and immune to the contexts in which they live are in fact very sensitive to group-based inequity (Abrams & Killen, 2014). Further, the relationship between perceived discrimination and well-being, perceptions of safety, and school integration was stronger in our younger participants. This leads us to suggest that younger children not only perceive the discrimination but have fewer resources available to negotiate this stigma. In Howarth’s terms, younger participants are less able to resist and reconstruct negative depictions of their areas. Practitioners should be aware that young children are particularly sensitive to the impact of this stereotyping and should work to actively undermine it.

Equally, our finding suggests that community identity does not mediate the relationship between discrimination on the basis of this same community membership and psychological well-being. This is contrary to the predictions of the well-established rejection-identification model and an important finding we believe. We attribute this to the identity under consideration. Unlike boundaries of race and gender, categories such as class are viewed as permeable – upward social mobility is at least a theoretical possibility. And of course, childhood is a time of opportunity. So disengaging from a negative

**Table 4.** School integration total coefficient table for community identity mediation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>6.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community identity</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>−0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>−1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>−0.36</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>−3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
community identity and associated class stigma may allow young people to engage with educational opportunities and eschew any perceived discrimination. Stigmatized identities associated with class, unlike gender and racial identities, can be denied (Jay & Muldoon, in press) and so young people from marginalized communities can disengage from their community identity to avoid feelings of stigma or discrimination. In contrast to a process of rejection-identification associated with impermeable racial and gender group boundaries, perceptions of discrimination are not associated with increased identification. This means that the usual collective psychological resources available as a consequence of their subordinate or ‘rejected’ identity position cannot be harnessed by children experiencing discrimination as a consequence of socio-economic deprivation making this form of discrimination particularly difficult to tackle at a school, community, and policy level.

Spears Brown and Bigler (2005) highlight that social group membership and in particular being a member of a less powerful social group are associated with higher levels of perceived discrimination. Counter-intuitively perhaps, then the effects of perceived discrimination on our outcomes were stronger in boys. Clearly, masculinity is associated with greater power in Ireland as elsewhere across the Western World, so our findings point to the importance of negative social representations of men and boys in poor communities that disadvantage boys. For all children developing in marginal and stigmatized communities, there are constant reminders and reflections of stigmatized identities; however, this is particularly the case for boys. Hourigan’s (2011) study of Limerick demonstrated that poor young men are very aware that their identity carries the (heavily classed) ‘scumbag’ stigma. And this stigmatization and stereotyping particularly of young poor males from disadvantaged neighbourhood’s has been demonstrated across a range of regional settings (Hollingworth & Williams, 2009; Jones, 2012; McCulloch, Stewart, & Lovegreen, 2006; Nayak, 2006), suggesting that this process is one that is generalizable beyond the current setting. This is likely to present particular challenges for practitioners supporting boys in terms of both well-being and educational outcomes.

Whilst discrimination can have a direct negative effect on individuals from marginalized communities, representations of community can be built up through a constant interaction between dominant representations and representations created at home and within the community (Howarth, 2006). By invoking support from family and community resources, children can be exposed to alternative representations of their community, outside dominant discourse. Through these alternative representations, negative attributes can be challenged and rejected (Howarth, 2002). It is interesting to note that community identification promoted decreased perceptions of risk and increased school integration. Poor marginalized community members are often seen as high risk for early school leaving. Here however, what we see is those children who are most identified with their community – a community where school failure and early school leaving is indeed a risk – are paradoxically those that are most likely to feel integrated within their schools. This loyalty to community then would appear to be helpful in keeping children at secondary school. But this strong sense of community identity has also been found to undermine feelings of identity compatibility in higher education contexts (Jetten, Iyer, Tsivrikos, & Young, 2008), contexts which retain their elite status amongst young people from severely disadvantaged backgrounds (Jay & Muldoon, in press). Future research and practice should consider ways in which community identities could be harnessed to support student from disadvantaged communities in their transition to third-level education amongst.
Taken together, the results indicate perceived discrimination can be understood to be associated with negative outcomes in school integration, perceptions of safety, and levels of well-being amongst economically deprived children. A potential limitation to the current study is the use of self-report questionnaires in a single-phase data collection. This only allows for examination of perceptions of individuals at one given time point and prevents causal understanding. However, direction of the effects in the current study is consistent with previous findings (Branscombe et al., 1999). That said, Bandura (1977) argues that the ethos in class and at school provides a source of collective efficacy, and as a result, school integration can be viewed as a source of social and psychological support and resilience rather than simply an outcome. Future research in this area would undoubtedly benefit from a longitudinal design. Despite these limitations, findings in the current study add to prior research. The current study enhances our understanding by providing evidence of children’s sensitivity to socio-economic or class-based discrimination and emphasizing how different forms of support contribute and protect against its negative implications. This can inform the creation of supportive environments for children developing within marginalized communities.
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