Chapter 12

CREATING A SOCIETY OF EQUALS

Reducing Social Exclusion and Harassment in Schools

Katherine V. Luken Raz and Melanie Killen

Schools are an important context for the development of children and adolescents' social and moral development, group identity, and becoming a member of a community (Nucci & Ilten-Gee, 2021; Rivas-Drake & Umaña-Taylor, 2019). Interacting with peers and non-parental adults enables children to acquire moral judgment and to think about the needs and concerns of others. Group identity is fostered through becoming a member of multiple groups, which provide protection, safety, and enjoyment. Children learn from teachers who communicate values and ideas that are often different from parents, providing a contrast of perspectives that helps children become autonomous thinkers. Even schools that might be homogeneous concerning race and ethnicity reflect heterogeneity regarding other group identity categories, such as religion, SES, gender and sexual identity, and nationality (among others). This variability creates an opportunity to learn about those from different group identities, and it also provides the context for complex intergroup dynamics, such as in-group preference, and, in some contexts, out-group distrust. Thus, we assert that while schools also have the potential to promote the fair, equitable, and equal treatment of others, this depends on the degree to which the climate of the school reflects an inclusive environment (Killen et al., 2021a; Nucci & Ilten-Gee, 2021; Turiel, 2015).

We propose that the implementation of evidence-based, developmentally appropriate education programs in classrooms to promote social equity and inclusion is essential for achieving the goals of a just community (Killen & Rutland, 2022; London et al., 2014). Inclusive and anti-discriminatory policies in schools and classrooms necessitate that teachers create learning environments where all students can work together to succeed and all students recognize that diversity and fairness are vital to healthy development (Losinski et al., 2019; Nenadal & Mistry, 2018). The creation of supportive and inclusive learning environments by teachers contributes

to stronger student-teacher relationships for all students and is vital for student engagement and learning (Hamre & Pianta, 2006; Kaufman & Killen, 2022; Wigfield et al., 2015). The presence and promotion of positive intergroup peer relationships lead to increased helping of out-group peers, the reduction of out-group biases, the promotion of children's rights, and the promotion of academic achievement for all students (Abbott & Cameron, 2014; Fiske, 2002; Orfield & Frankenberg, 2014).

Additionally, when teachers and school personnel include students in discussions about social inequalities, and how to address these social inequalities, children and adolescents are encouraged to challenge unfair peer treatment (Nucci & Ilten-Gee, 2021; Rivas-Drake & Umaña-Taylor, 2019). The implementation of evidence-based, developmentally appropriate education and intervention programs can help children become agents of change. These programs can do this by giving children and adolescents opportunities to discuss and reflect on social inequalities and social exclusion (Brinkman et al., 2010; Killen & Rutland, 2022; Killen et al., 2022; Lessard et al., 2020; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2018).

Goals of the Current Chapter

Thus, we begin this chapter with a review of research about social exclusion based on group membership in school contexts, including research on moral reasoning in the context of intergroup relationships. Essential questions pertain to when children and adolescents develop an awareness that individuals experience social inequalities and inequitable treatment due to prejudicial attitudes and biases and recognize the necessity for solutions. Next, we summarize recent intergroup interventions that have utilized intergroup contact, mutual respect, and cooperative interactions, to reduce bias and prejudice in classroom and school environments. Finally, this chapter proposes new directions for research and interventions designed to reduce social exclusion and increase social equality in classrooms and schools. We suggest how these new lines of research might inform and improve school-based programs. This chapter will focus on multiple social group identities, given that individuals are simultaneously members of more than one social group.

Social Exclusion in School Contexts

Children experience social inclusion and exclusion in school. *Social exclusion* refers to instances when individuals are excluded by a peer or group of peers and includes both *interpersonal* forms of exclusion and bullying; as well as *intergroup* forms of exclusion and bias-based bullying. *Interpersonal* exclusion and bullying occur when an individual is excluded or bullied due to their *personal* characteristics, like shyness or being socially withdrawn (Rubin et al., 2006). *Intergroup* exclusion is when an individual is excluded or bullied due to their social group membership (e.g., a girl not being allowed to join a group of boys playing soccer based on her gender) (Mulvey, 2016). *Bias-based* bullying is a form of intergroup exclusion, where an individual is bullied based on their group memberships such as ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, immigrant status, race, or religion (Bradshaw & Johnson, 2011; Cooley et al., 2019; Møller & Tenenbaum, 2011; Poteat et al., 2011).

When an individual is excluded or bullied because of their group membership characteristics, such as in the case of intergroup exclusion and bias-based bullying, this constitutes a form of prejudice (Horn & Sinno, 2014). Similarly, bullying, which is defined as explicit, repeated aggression targeted at disadvantaged and/or powerless individuals (Jimerson et al., 2010; Olweus, 1993), is an act of aggression towards another person, reflecting a form of moral

transgression (Hymel et al., 2010; Thornberg, 2010). Thus, when intergroup exclusion escalates into explicit, repeated aggression towards an individual based on their group membership (i.e., bias-based bullying) it is a moral transgression. Intergroup exclusion, as a whole, is nuanced and complex. There are instances where intergroup exclusion is commonly accepted (such as same-gender sports teams). Children and adolescents often exclude out-group peers due to in-group preference (Dunham et al., 2011; Kinzler & Spelke, 2011; Levy et al., 2016), concerns about group functioning (Rutland & Killen, 2017) and expectations that including out-group members would be uncomfortable due to a lack of similarity (Hitti & Killen, 2015; Killen et al., 2010; Stark & Flache, 2012). Moreover, exclusion is not always an act of explicit out-group bias or prejudice (Kaufman & Killen, 2022). Oftentimes, children and adolescents are unaware that in-group preference translates into exclusion of someone perceived to be different because of their group identity.

Many of the existing educational programs regarding social exclusion focus on *interpersonal* exclusion and bullying (Hong et al., 2018; Garnett et al., 2014). Interpersonal bullying programs focus on bystander intervention and socio-emotional learning, with an emphasis on the *individual*-level personality deficits of "bullies" and "victims." The goals of these programs are to train "bullies" and "victims" to have better social skills, an *individual*-level focus (Rubin et al., 2006, 2015). While more recently, some of these bullying programs have a taken on a "group" approach (Strohmeier et al., 2011), engaging entire classrooms, these programs rarely address intergroup exclusion. By focusing solely on interpersonal exclusion, these programs are unable to help educators, administrators, and parents understand and prevent social exclusion based on social group membership and bias-based bullying, allowing intergroup exclusion to continue unchecked (Losinski et al., 2019).

What is missing from schools is an infrastructure to help educators recognize as well as effectively address and prevent intergroup exclusion, including bias-based bullying. Many teachers feel unprepared to prevent or effectively deal with bullying and other victimizing behaviors (Lester et al., 2018) *and* feel unprepared to teach diverse classrooms (Kaufman et al., 2023; Marx & Larson, 2012). If teachers do not address intergroup exclusion as well as more generally talk about the negative effects of bias and prejudice-driven behavior with their students, victimized students will continue to experience a lack of school belonging and low motivation to attend school (Okonofua et al., 2016). A lack of school belonging and low motivation to attend school can, in turn, contribute to negative academic and health outcomes (Walton & Cohen, 2007, 2011; Williams, 1999). This is especially concerning for minoritized students who often do not feel included in academic contexts (Lamb & Markussen, 2011; OECD, 2017a, 2017b). Thus, social exclusion due to group membership worsens the opportunity gap as it contributes to minoritized students' lack of school belonging and reduced academic motivation (Isik et al., 2018).

Beyond a lack of school belonging and low motivation, experiencing intergroup exclusion is related to a host of negative outcomes. Children and adolescents who have experienced discrimination and prejudice due to their group memberships in the form of social exclusion, including bias-based bullying, experience depression, stress and anxiety (Fisher et al., 2000; Greene et al., 2006; Neblett & Carter, 2012), reduced academic achievement (Alfaro et al., 2006; Benner & Graham, 2011; Chavous et al., 2008; Wang & Huguley, 2012), and overall reduced well-being (Neblett et al., 2008; Russell et al., 2012; Yip, 2014, 2015; Walton & Spencer, 2009). Students who experience social exclusion based on group membership and bias-based bullying may be at greater risk for negative health outcomes, such as substance abuse and mental health issues, than students who experience non-biased exclusion and bullying or who do not experience any exclusion or bullying (Russell et al., 2012; Sinclair et al., 2012). Furthermore, adolescents who

experience bias-based bullying experience more negative outcomes of bullying and higher levels of school avoidance and fear than adolescents who experience interpersonal bullying (Mulvey et al., 2018). This highlights issues of intersectionality, as children and adolescents who hold multiple marginalized identities may be especially at-risk when it comes to the negative effects of intergroup exclusion and bias-based bullying (Ghavami et al., 2016; Lei & Rhodes, 2021; Santos & Toomey, 2018).

Perpetrators of intergroup social exclusion and bias-based bullying also experience negative outcomes from intergroup social exclusion, with individuals who have biases about different social groups enduring health-related stress associated with negative intergroup interactions (Levy et al., 2016; Pauker et al., 2016). Therefore, reducing intergroup exclusion as well as increasing social equality in classrooms and schools has positive attitudinal, health, emotional, and academic outcomes for *all* children.

To adequately address social exclusion and bullying, education and intervention programs need to address intergroup inclusion by changing group norms in the classroom to be more inclusive and less exclusive (Losinski et al., 2019; Nenadal & Mistry, 2018). This includes promoting an awareness of the unfairness and inequality that result when students are excluded from access to resources, opportunities, and group activities within the school context. Next, we turn to our theoretical framework which provided the basis for the hypotheses for the basic research to be reviewed as well as the intervention program described in-depth towards the conclusion of the chapter.

Theoretical Framework

The Social Reasoning Developmental (SRD) Model

The SRD model draws from both social domain theory (Nucci & Ilten-Gee, 2021 (see also Nucci, Chapter 8 in this volume); Smetana et al., 2014; Turiel, 1983, 2002, 2015), and developmental social identity theories (Nesdale, 2008; Rutland et al., 2010; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) to frame a research program on how children and adolescents think about unfair treatment, social inequalities, social exclusion, and harassment in the classroom and school contexts (Killen & Rutland, 2011). In addition to moral reasoning, it expands the analysis of reasoning to include judgments about group identity, group functioning, group dynamics, and group norms. The SRD model puts forth that children bring multiple forms of reasoning to bear on decisions about social inclusion and exclusion in intergroup contexts (Elenbaas et al., 2020). At least three types of reasoning have been identified as central for how individuals evaluate complex social situations inspired by social domain theory (Nucci, 2009; Smetana et al., 2014; Turiel, 1983) and intergroup dynamics (Nesdale & Lawson, 2011; Verkuyten & de Woof, 2007). The three forms of reasoning include (1) morality (concepts such as fairness, other people's welfare, equality, equity, and human rights), (2) social group identity (concepts of in-group and out-group dynamics, perceptions of group status, group norms, and group concerns), and (3) psychological knowledge, which includes concepts such as attributions of intentions and mental-state knowledge of others (Elenbaas et al., 2020).

The SRD model hypothesizes that moral reasoning helps children and adolescents to challenge biased behavior and bullying and how, at times, individuals justify social exclusion based on group preferences and identity (Elenbaas et al., 2020; Killen & Rutland, 2011; McGuire et al., 2018; Mulvey, 2016). When children and adolescents are asked to evaluate a social exclusion that is explicitly based on group membership (e.g., a boy being excluded from a ballet class due to his gender), children and adolescents largely use moral reasoning, oftentimes

mentioning concerns around fairness (Killen & Stangor, 2001; Killen et al., 2015). Whereas when children and adolescents are asked to make the same types of evaluations in scenarios that are less explicit and more complex, their evaluations are much likelier to reflect in-group concerns, such as group functioning, and they are more likely to condone the out-group exclusion (Cooley et al., 2016; Killen & Stangor, 2001; Killen et al., 2007). With more social experience and age, children are increasingly likely to weigh multiple factors in their decision-making process (Mulvey, 2016). Additionally, many social situations have ambiguity and complexity, in these situations children and adolescents' decision-making is often multifaceted or even conflicted. Thus, to understand children and adolescents' social inclusion, exclusion, and bullying decisions, not only should their moral reasoning be studied, but also their judgments and attitudes related to group norms, identity, and biases (Rutland et al., 2010).

The SRD model also posits that children's psychological knowledge, such as their awareness and interpretations of other individuals' feelings, intentions, and mental states also influence their decision-making process (Glidden et al., 2021; Rizzo & Killen, 2016). This psychological knowledge about other individuals is also relevant to how children think about peer inclusion and exclusion as well as bullying in the classroom.

Social Exclusion and Prejudice

It is important to understand how children and adolescents think about and interpret injustices and inequitable treatments (such as social exclusion on the basis of group membership) as teachers are largely unaware of what children and adolescents think about these topics and this knowledge has helped inform the successful intergroup prejudice interventions which will be discussed later in the chapter.

The Development of In-Group Preference and Out-Group Social Exclusion

Starting from early in development, children identify various social groups and affiliate with some of them, including social groups related to ethnicity, gender, race, and wealth status (Killen & Rutland, 2011; Nesdale, 2004; Olson et al., 2011; Verkuyten & de Wolf, 2007). Membership in different social groups leads to positive outcomes for children and adolescents, such as connection with in-group members and providing a sense of belonging, but also contributes to children and adolescent's adoption of stereotypes, bias, and prejudice, which influences their perpetration and evaluation of intergroup exclusion (Cooley et al., 2016; Horn & Sinno, 2014). Children's actions and evaluations in social contexts are influenced by group membership, with children as young as preschool giving unequal, preferential treatment towards members of their in-group (Kinzler & Spelke, 2011; Renno & Shutts, 2015). Research has shown that, in certain contexts, this in-group preference continues through adolescence and adulthood (Levy et al., 2016). In-group preference, in and of itself, does not automatically become biased or prejudice towards out-groups. However, in contexts that promote and uphold social inequalities and social hierarchies, in-group preference *can* easily contribute to out-group bias (Kaufman & Killen, 2022).

Children and Adolescent Can Understand That Intergroup Exclusion Is Wrong

Research has shown that children and adolescents evaluate the intergroup exclusion of peers based on social group membership as being unfair based on gender (Killen & Stangor, 2001), low socioeconomic status (SES) (Burkholder et al., 2019; Elenbaas, 2019; Elenbaas & Killen,

2018), sexual identity (Horn, 2019; Horn & Sinno, 2014), race and ethnicity (Killen & Stangor, 2001; Killen et al., 2007), and religious identity (Alsimah et al., 2021). There is also evidence that negative evaluations of intergroup exclusion by children and adolescents are present in many different cultural contexts. Children aged 7–13 years in Japan, Korea, Switzerland, and the United States, were asked to evaluate instances of interpersonal exclusion (e.g., exclusion based on shyness) and intergroup exclusion (e.g., exclusion based on gender, nationality, and culture), children, overall, viewed intergroup exclusion to be unfair, whereas there was more variability in children's evaluations of interpersonal exclusion (for a review, see Hitti et al., 2011). Similarly, in a study conducted in Switzerland, intergroup exclusion, on the basis of nationality, was deemed to be more wrong than interpersonal exclusion by Swiss and Serbian immigrant children and adolescents (Malti et al., 2012). These studies highlight how children and adolescents have the ability to evaluate intergroup exclusions as wrong across varying cultural contexts.

Research on intergroup social exclusion has also found that children and adolescents justify intergroup exclusion using reasons based on group identity, group functioning, along with stereotypic expectations about individuals. For example, one study found that European-American 12- to 14-year-olds, overall, expected cross-race inclusion from a group of same-race peers to be less likely than did White 9- to 11-year olds (Cooley et al., 2019). It has also been shown that, as they age, American children increasingly expect that high-SES groups will exclude others, referencing negative stereotypes about high-SES individuals being entitled or rude (Burkholder et al., 2019). In a study conducted in the Netherlands, a country where negative stereotypes about Muslim migrants are salient, adolescents became less tolerant of various Muslim practices as they got older (Gieling et al., 2010). As they age, children and adolescents are increasingly aware of societal biases and stereotypes about various social groups, including race, religious identity, and wealth status, which may influence their predictions of others' exclusion and inclusion behaviors in intergroup contexts. This increasing awareness of societal biases and out-group stereotypes may contribute to the fact, that as they age, children and adolescents increasingly predict that their peers will choose in-group members as friends over out-group member (Roberts et al., 2017; Shutts et al., 2013) and in engage intergroup exclusion (Crystal et al., 2008; Killen et al., 2002), as well as report decreasing rates of intergroup friendship (Aboud et al., 2003).

Children's and adolescents' expectations and reasoning about intergroup exclusion also vary by group membership. In some instances, Black children evaluate racial exclusion as more wrong than their White counterparts in the United States (Cooley et al., 2019). Additionally, ethnic minority adolescents in the United States are less accepting of common excuses given for interracial exclusion, like parental pressure or peer pressure, rate social exclusion in more ambiguous situations as less acceptable, and use more moral reasoning than their European-American adolescent peers (Killen et al., 2007). This research suggests that being a member of a minority status group may be related to children and adolescents understanding of the wrongfulness of exclusion that is based on social group membership.

Victimization of Minoritized Students

Despite children's and adolescents' ability to evaluate intergroup exclusion as wrong and identify it is a moral issue, youth from marginalized and minoritized groups experience heightened rates of intergroup exclusion and bias-based bullying. These heightened rates impact low SES background youth, racial and ethnic minority youth, sexual and gender minority (SGM) youth, immigrant youth, religious minority youth, and disabled youth. By the age of 14, if not sooner,

students from SGM populations (Espelage et al., 2008), racial-ethnic minority and immigrant populations (Pottie et al., 2015), low SES populations (Due et al., 2009) and the disabled community (Blake et al., 2012) experience high rates of victimization in school contexts. For students from certain minoritized groups, such as disabled youth (Blake et al., 2012) and youth from low SES populations (Due et al., 2009) this increased victimization can begin before the end of elementary school.

This increased victimization is reported in many different countries, including Australia, Estonia, Finland, Sweden, Spain, South Korea, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States (Bjereld et al., 2014; Crozier & Davies, 2008; Gross & Rutland, 2014; Kaltiala-Heino et al., 1999; Kim et al., 2005; Kosciw et al., 2014; Maynard et al., 2016; Messinger et al., 2012; Schihalejev et al., 2020; Strohmeier et al., 2011; Sulkowski et al., 2014). The fact that children and adolescents can evaluate intergroup exclusion as wrong, yet students from marginalized and minoritized groups experience increased rates of victimization, including bias-based bullying, suggests that in many contexts children and adolescents still accept and perpetrate intergroup exclusion, despite having the cognitive abilities to understand that intergroup exclusion is wrong.

The Influence of Group Norms

Research has found that children and adolescents often specifically reference societal and group conventions, traditions, group identity, and group function concerns, when justifying and perpetuating intergroup exclusion. For example, excluding a peer with different group membership may be justified on the basis of an expectation that the peer will be uncomfortable in the group (Mulvey, 2016). Thus, it appears certain group norms, such as prioritizing the comfort of in-group members, can contribute to children and adolescents' use of prejudicial reasoning and discriminatory behavior (Rutland & Killen, 2017). Other group norms, such as valuing inclusion and diversity, can increase the usage of inclusive and moral reasoning and behavior in children and adolescents (Rutland & Killen, 2017). Additionally, the social context of the classroom and school has its group norms, which may differ from those of children and adolescents' other social groups and may influence children and adolescents' beliefs about and treatment of out-group members.

The Importance of Context

The specific context of the intergroup exclusion, the specific social groups present, and the dynamics between the different social groups present, are extremely important to consider, as these factors strongly influence how the social exclusion is evaluated and reacted to (Mulvey, 2016). In some contexts, children and adolescents will promote equality, fairness, and justice. In other contexts, these same children and adolescents will uphold out-group exclusion and existing social inequalities; how an individual chooses to act is largely driven by contextual factors (Mulvey, 2016). Factors such as the explicitness of the intergroup exclusion (Rutland & Killen, 2017), the intimacy of the relationship (Edmonds & Killen, 2009; Luken Raz & Killen, 2023), the salience of stereotypes about the out-group (Burkholder et al., 2019; Hitti & Killen, 2015), and perceived in-group threat (Rutland & Killen, 2017), heavily influence children and adolescents' predictions about and evaluations of intergroup exclusion. For example, American children think that same-race inclusion is more likely to occur than cross-race inclusion in high-intimacy social contexts, implying that children expect intergroup exclusion in high-intimacy social contexts more than in other, less intimate contexts (Luken Raz & Killen,

2023). Regarding out-group stereotypes, in one study, non-Arab American adolescents predicted whether their in-group, consisting of non-Arab American adolescents, would include an out-group peer, an Arab adolescent (Hitti & Killen, 2015). Non-Arab American adolescents who held stereotypes about Arabs predicted that the American in-group would be less inclusive towards their Arab peer than adolescents who did not report stereotypes, thus adolescent's stereotypes about the out-group influenced their predictions of intergroup peer exclusion. These factors, and others, impact children and adolescents' evaluations and beliefs about intergroup exclusion.

Furthermore, children and adolescents' evaluations of intergroup exclusion will differ based on the social groups present, as membership in some social groups may be viewed as a more acceptable basis for intergroup exclusion than other social groups (Burkholder et al., 2019). For instance, in the United States, though intergroup exclusion based on gender and race are both viewed as wrong by children and adolescents, exclusion based on gender is viewed as *less wrong* than exclusion based on race (Killen et al., 2002). This may be due to social and cultural messages about gender roles in the United States and the fact that gender segregation in childhood is fairly common in the United States, while experiences of explicit racism in childhood may be less common and accepted (Killen et al., 2002). The acceptability of a social group as a basis for social exclusion will vary based on the stereotypes about that social group and the salience of that social group in the societal context (Burkholder et al., 2019). The stereotypes about and salience of different social groups vary across countries and cultural contexts, due to factors such as differing social hierarchies, differing societal mobility, and the specific history of that social group within each country and cultural context. Thus, children and adolescents' behavior regarding and evaluations of intergroup exclusion is embedded within their specific societal and historical context. While the specific social groups being minoritized will vary across countries and specific cultural contexts, the negative developmental outcomes of intergroup exclusion and bias-based bullying remain similar across contexts.

Minority status children and adolescents experience rejection due to their group membership and many are subject to explicit conversations about prejudice, intergroup exclusion, and other forms of discrimination. These experiences may influence their negative evaluations of intergroup exclusion and bias-based bullying (Beaton et al., 2012; Killen et al., 2017). Specifically, these conversations around prejudice and the wrongfulness of intergroup exclusion may help individuals come to the understanding that intergroup exclusion is wrong and help them identify instances of intergroup exclusion. Providing *all* students, both minority status and majority status, opportunities to have conversations like these in safe, supportive environments, may be a means to help reduce intergroup exclusion, and, more generally, social exclusion and bullying in the classroom.

Conceptions of Social Inequalities

To fully understand how children and adolescents think about intergroup social exclusion and bias-based bullying in school contexts, it is necessary to understand how they think about social inequalities more generally, outside of just social exclusion. Children develop the ability to recognize that certain inequalities are not fair and need to be addressed by middle childhood by using moral reasoning (Corbit et al., 2021; Elenbaas et al., 2016; Olson et al., 2011; Rizzo & Killen, 2016; Yang & Dunham, 2022). Additionally, this moral reasoning gets more multifaceted with age (Elenbaas et al., 2016; Rizzo & Killen, 2016). In one study conducted in the United States, children ages five to eight were asked to evaluate resources between two individuals, one from a fictional town that had historically lacked resources, one from a

fictional town that had historically had access to adequate resources (Rizzo & Killen, 2016). The younger children evaluated equal distributions and equitable distributions (giving more to the individual from the resource lacking town) as both being good, while the older children evaluated the equitable distribution as being "fairer" than the equal distribution, as the equal distribution continued the existing inequality (Rizzo & Killen, 2016). The older children in this study had the ability to weigh both the pre-existing social inequality and their evaluations of the different resource allocations in their judgments, while the younger children, overall, were unable to weigh both of these concerns and also displayed a strong preference for blanket equality (a strategy often preferred by young children).

In society, social inequalities are often present between social groups that have been systemically advantaged and social groups that have been systemically disadvantaged, based on historical and political factors. As children's sense of identity develops, they become aware of whether the social groups they belong to have been advantaged and/or disadvantaged, and they must balance their group identities with their moral concerns.

Challenging Social Inequalities: Children as Agents of Change

In a study conducted in the suburbs of a large mid-Atlantic region of the United States, children ages 10–11 years who were presented with an unequal allocation of school supplies between a school that served Black children and a school that served White children connected this inequality to the existing structural inequalities within the United States. Children ages 5–6 years gave more resources to the Black or White disadvantaged schools but also gave even more resources to their own group, displaying an in-group bias (Elenbaas et al., 2016). Children who gave more to the disadvantaged groups used reasons based on past inequality ("that group has less so they need even more to have it be equal") whereas children who made other allocations used reasons based on equality and maintaining the status quo. In this study, an awareness of the historical context of different social groups and existing social inequalities contributed to children's moral judgments about fairness, equality, and equity.

In some instances, children and adolescents negatively evaluate social inequalities, including intergroup peer exclusion, thus prioritizing moral concerns for equal treatment of others, fairness, and the well-being of others (Ruck & Tenenbaum, 2014). However, in other scenarios, especially those that are more complex or ambiguous, children and adolescents may display prejudicial attitudes and positively evaluate social inequalities and intergroup exclusion, giving preference to group identity and group functioning norms as well as bias (Cooley et al., 2016; Killen et al., 2007).

Recognizing the existence of social inequalities and negatively evaluating them is a first step for children and adolescents. The next step is for children and adolescents to pursue intergroup inclusion and friendships, and to actively intervene when they witness intergroup peer exclusion and bias-based bullying. Research has found that adolescents are more likely than children to support bystanders who challenge intergroup peer exclusion when individuals from marginalized minority status groups are excluded. This highlights that with age, individuals are better able to identify when prejudice and discrimination drive the actions of others (Yüksel et al., 2021). Furthermore, with increasing age, individuals become more aware of social status differences as well as existing racial and societal inequalities (Mandalaywala et al., 2020). This increasing awareness of inequalities and improved ability to identify prejudice and discrimination makes children and adolescents more willing to act as they view inequalities as being more unfair (Elenbaas, 2019). Interventions should provide scaffolding to help children and adolescents become active interveners themselves, as opposed to just passively supporting interveners.

Intergroup Contact and Cross-group Friendships

Many prejudice reduction intervention studies draw from the intergroup contact hypothesis, which identifies the optimal conditions for reducing prejudice and bias and which has adapted to school-related contexts (Tropp et al., 2014). When classmates from varied backgrounds are given equal status and common goals to work towards, this enables the development of empathy, mutual respect and perspective-taking. For classroom and school contexts, it is important to note that when authority figures, such as teachers, actively support the goals of cooperation and mutual respect for intergroup interactions, this assists in creating positive classroom environments.

More interventions and programs should consider the power of cross-group friendships, which have been found to consistently reduce prejudice and bias in childhood and adolescence (Echols & Graham, 2020; Killen et al., 2021b; Levy et al., 2016). Cross-group friendships are successful at reducing prejudice as they allow children and adolescents to have experiences that help them challenge and disprove stereotypes about different social groups which are transmitted through the media and other societal means (Killen et al., 2021b). Prior research has found that children and adolescents who have cross-race friends are more likely to reject race-based exclusion and use moral reasoning when doing so (Crystal et al., 2008; Ruck et al., 2011, 2015). They also have fewer negative attributions towards a different-race character in a morally ambiguous situation (McGlothlin & Killen, 2010).

Unfortunately, rates of cross-group friendships substantially decline by early adolescence (Aboud et al., 2003), suggesting that prejudice reduction interventions should begin prior to this decline in order to be effective. Recent interventions that have attempted to increase children's cross-group friendships have been shown to have positive results, increasing children's rejection of intergroup social exclusion and increasing their usage of empathetic and moral reasoning in evaluating these scenarios (e.g., Brenick et al., 2019).

In order to be successful, however, prejudice reduction intervention programs that target the classroom and school environment need to help teach children and adolescents to (a) recognize differences in status, (b) see intergroup exclusion as wrong and rectify intergroup inequalities, exclusion and harassment, in addition to (c) promoting intergroup friendships. As demonstrated by the literature reviewed in this chapter, children and adolescents have the social cognitive abilities to identify social inequalities, intergroup inequalities, and exclusion as well as bias-based bullying, and the skills needed to rectify and intervene appropriately. But children and adolescents need support and scaffolding to more consistently intervene when they witness social inequalities, intergroup inequalities, exclusion, and harassment (Killen & Rutland, 2022). Thus, prejudice reduction interventions need to incorporate children and adolescents' understanding of social inequalities, intergroup inequalities, and exclusion, so as to effectively scaffold their ability to identify these social inequalities, intergroup inequalities, and exclusion, and intervene to stop them when they witness them. Evidence-based prejudice reduction interventions and other education programs that address children and adolescents' understanding of social inequalities have been found to reduce children and adolescents' intergroup exclusion and bullying, (e.g., Brinkman et al., 2010, Killen et al., 2022; Lessard et al., 2020; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2018). Evidence-based prejudice reduction interventions and other education programs that are successful in changing the classroom environment have the potential to help students long term. They also have the potential to train teachers and other school personnel in addressing topics of bias and prejudice in classroom and school contexts, as formal training on these topics is rarely present in teacher training programs (Killen & Rutland, 2022).

Intergroup Interventions Designed to Foster Change

Overall, no studies that we know of have focused on whether programs that target multiple social groups are effective for reducing prejudice and bias in childhood, nor do so while promoting moral reasoning and intergroup friendships. The *Developing Inclusive Youth* (DIY) program was designed to fill this gap and a recent evaluation of it found that it was effective for facilitating change.

Developing Inclusive Youth. *Developing Inclusive Youth* (DIY) is a school-based prejudice reduction intervention program that consists of children in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades (ages 8 to 11 years) using a web-based curriculum tool, where they view peer scenarios about intergroup inclusion and exclusion and engaging in teacher-facilitated classroom discussions about intergroup inclusion and exclusion, for eight weekly sessions. The theories that motivated this program included intergroup contact theory (Allport, 1954; Tropp et al., 2014) and the social reasoning developmental (SRD) model (Rutland & Killen, 2015). It was hypothesized that children's experiences of (1) *direct contact* (peer discussions in the classroom with diverse peers), (2) *indirect contact* (watching inclusion and exclusion scenarios among diverse peers in everyday contexts), (3) *authority support* (receiving teacher support for inclusion during teacher-facilitated discussions), and (4) *social and moral reasoning* would help to reduce biases and promote social inclusion.

The DIY program was tested for effectiveness using a randomized control trial (Killen et al., 2022). Results showed that children enrolled in this program were more likely to report participating in intergroup play, more likely to view social exclusion as wrong, and more likely to report positive traits like hard-working, friendly, and smart for gender and racial/ethnic out-group peers. Holding positive traits about social groups you are not a part of and evaluating interracial exclusion as being wrong are some of the first steps towards reducing bias and prejudice.

The web-based curriculum tool consisted of eight different peer scenarios about everyday intergroup inclusion and exclusion across several different target groups (race, ethnicity, gender, immigrant status, and wealth status) (Killen et al., 2022). Each peer scenario set up a situation in which several children were deciding whether to include or exclude a peer who reflected a different group identity. In each context, participants listened to the characters talk about their reasons for both potential inclusion and exclusion.

All participating students responded to four types of prompts in the web-based curriculum tool: *Feeling Attributions* (for each character), *Evaluations, Reasons*, and *Decisions*. The specific questions and response options were the following: (1) *Feeling attributions*: "How good or bad do you think X feels when [exclusion happens]?" (2) *Evaluations*: "Is it okay for X to [exclude Y]?" (3) *Reasons*: "You've chosen X, why is that? Choose the reason that you think is most important;" and (4) *Decision to include or exclude*: "What do you think? Should X and Y [exclude or include]?" For example, for the Science/Robot scenario, the Decision options are "Will the boys work on their project without [the girl] or will they invite [the girl] to join them to make their robot?" reflecting an exclusion or inclusion decision, respectively.

After the exclusionary encounter is rectified, the characters in the peer scenarios are shown becoming friends with peers from diverse backgrounds. Thus, children participating in the DIY program witness instances of potential intergroup exclusion, peers discussing the unfairness of intergroup exclusion and, ultimately, intergroup friendship, giving the participating children

several opportunities to think about how to address intergroup exclusion and the benefits of being inclusive towards their peers (Gaias et al., 2018; Graham & Echols, 2018).

During the classroom discussions that follow the web-based tool peer scenarios, teachers were trained to create a safe space for children to express their viewpoints, listen to each other's perspectives, and brainstorm possible solutions to intergroup exclusion and other bias-driven behavior (Killen et al., 2022). Teachers facilitated student discussions by asking the students what they thought about the peer scenarios and whether the events that they witnessed had happened to them. As shown in Figure 12.1, teachers were trained to (1) establish a safe pace in the classroom, which includes children agreeing that the discussion must be kept confidential, listening to their classmates without interruptions, and refraining from identifying classmates by names. During the discussion, children were prompted to (2) make connections between the scenarios and their own experiences; (3) reflect on how their experiences relate to broader themes of inclusivity, anti-prejudice, and anti-racism; (4) reflect on how the story they heard is similar to other weeks' scenarios; (5) get both sides of the story and discuss why each character made the decisions they did; (6) share personal experiences that relate to the week's topic and themes; and (7) provide a wrap up with the inclusion message. Teachers thus engage students in a substantive face-to-face classroom discussion on the topics of intergroup inclusion and exclusion as well as the negative effects of prejudice and bias-based behavior.

Here is one example of a classroom discussion with fourth-grade students in response to the teacher's request for a personal experience of exclusion after watching the scenario about three

Figure 12.1 Example of facilitator's guide to accompany weekly classroom discussion.

Source: © 2010 Joan Tycko, illustrations. © Melanie Killen, Teacher Guide. Reprinted with permission from Killen et al. Child Development 2022.

boys' decision to include or exclude a girl from a science project. This scenario generated a discussion led by the girls about being excluded from soccer at recess:

Girl 1:   "The boys never let us play soccer at recess because they say we're not good at it."
Girl 2:   "Yeah, that happens to me, too."
Boy: "But we didn't know you wanted to play. We'll let you play."
Boy 2:   "Yeah, you didn't tell us you wanted to play but now we know."
Teacher: "What can we do to solve this problem?"

In this exchange, the students were changing the group norms by discussing how to create more gender equity at recess. In a subsequent teacher focus group following the program, one of the teachers mentioned that her class decided to use an alternate boy-girl process for deciding who to pick for the teams at recess, and other classes adopted their solution.

Through providing children opportunities for positive intergroup contact based on mutual respect and cooperative interactions when discussing intergroup exclusion and strategies to address it, the *Developing Inclusive Youth* program helps to change attitudes about bias and prejudice. Importantly, the *Developing Inclusive Youth* program builds and improves upon recent prejudice reduction intervention and education programs, by targeting elementary school-aged children, therefore promoting early intervention, and including several different target groups, thus increasing the pool of individuals who relate to its content.

Classrooms that are welcoming are characterized by students who include others in peer group activities, desire to interact with them and stand up for their peers in the context of unfair treatment. Children's negative experiences regarding discrimination, exclusion, and bias in school have increased over the past ten years (Costello & Dillard, 2019). These experiences are negatively related to academic success (Rivas-Drake et al., 2014). The evaluations of the DIY program provide the possibility that a school-based curriculum program focusing on peer interactions can change children's attitudes about intergroup biases and exclusion. Many researchers have argued that intervening early is important, as attitudes in childhood are emerging and still in flux.

Future Directions and Conclusion

Future interventions that include teachers and/or utilize teachers in their administration, such as the *Developing Inclusive Youth* program, should work to collect data on how teachers implement these programs and how factors such as teaching style, teacher-student relationship quality, and teachers' beliefs and attitudes related to bias are related to the effectiveness of these programs (Juvonen et al., 2019, Killen et al., 2022). Teachers' beliefs and attitudes related to bias could include such factors as teacher preparation for talking about race, teacher strategies for talking about bias, and teacher beliefs regarding whether their students experience bias and prejudice.

Future research can also investigate how children of different racial/ethnic identities respond to existing intervention programs and if there are interracial or interethnic differences regarding the effectiveness of these intervention programs (Killen et al., 2022). Furthermore, interventions should continue to acknowledge and incorporate intersectionality (interlocking systems of oppression) and work to improve their conceptualizations of intersectionality (Killen et al., 2022). Many children hold a mixture of identities, having some marginalized identities and some privileged identities, and anti-racist education and social justice education call for *all* children to learn how to become agents of change (Killen & Rutland, 2022; Nucci & Ilten-Gee, 2021).

Additionally, interventions should continue to include multiple forms of intergroup inclusion and exclusion, such as a wide array of racial and ethnic groups, different SES groups, and different immigrant groups, as well as outcome measures that include the various target groups featured in these programs (Killen et al., 2022). This inclusion will allow future interventions to address a wide variety of intergroup exclusion, including bias-based bullying, as many different social groups are targeted for intergroup exclusion and bias-based bullying (Bucchianeri et al., 2013, 2016; Russell et al., 2012; Salmon et al., 2018). Including multiple forms of intergroup inclusion and exclusion also allows for multiple opportunities for reflection, discussions, and social exchange about intergroup exclusion and bias-based bullying within any one intervention program.

Interventions should work to achieve multiple aspects and goals of anti-racism and social justice education. These aspects and goals include discussions of status, privilege, and power, understanding how others experience intergroup exclusion and harassment (Rogers et al., 2015), the development of skills related to challenging oppression (Hytten & Bettez, 2011), helping students become agents of change for equitable and fair treatment of all (Elenbaas et al., 2020; Killen & Dahl, 2021), and providing opportunities for individuals to explore their racial and ethnic identities (Bonilla-Silva, 2015; Hurd et al., 2021; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2018). This could also be accomplished by interventions drawing components from critical consciousness-building programs, which currently exist for adolescents (e.g., Diemer et al., 2020), but could be adapted for elementary school students. As children's awareness and understanding of their various identities emerge during childhood, building critical consciousness can occur before the onset of adolescence (Killen et al., 2022).

Interventions could also be made more effective by including a comprehensive, multi-tiered approach that also targets the practices of teachers and administrators (Juvonen et al., 2019), the greater school climate (as perceived by students), and diversity education activities offered (e.g., diversity clubs, lessons, and special events). Research has found that high student-perceived fairness, an aspect of school climate, is associated with higher rates of students reporting incidents of bias-based bullying (Kim et al., 2023). Interventions themselves should be implemented as *part* of a greater multilevel approach.

Future interventions should be implemented in schools with legislative policies that promote and fund inclusive classrooms. Teacher support for reinforcing the ideas of equitable and fair treatment for all students should also be implemented. Additionally, parents should receive materials that explain the empirically supported connections between fair and just treatment of all students, inclusive peer interactions, school belonging, and high academic achievement (Killen & Rutland, 2022).

Lastly, existing programs that attempt to target interpersonal bullying could be adapted to specifically address bias-based bullying. For example, general bystander interventions have been adapted to meet the needs of ethnically blended, low-income schools by including student-identified relevant examples of bias-based bullying based on race, immigrant status, and SES, and modifying existing role-plays to reflect bias-based bullying (Moran et al., 2019). These modified bystander interventions have been successful in decreasing interpersonal *and* bias-based bullying victimization (Moran et al., 2019).

Schools serve as an important context for children's and adolescents' social and moral development. However, many students experience social exclusion and bullying in school and classroom contexts, which contributes to negative developmental outcomes. Most of the existing intervention and education programs to address social exclusion and bullying focus only on interpersonal social exclusion and bullying. This leaves intergroup exclusion, including bias-based bullying, and other bias-driven behaviors unchecked and unaddressed in the school

context. Children and adolescents can identify intergroup exclusion and other social inequalities as wrong and rectify them by middle childhood but often accept or perpetrate intergroup exclusion and other social inequalities due to group norms and in-group concerns. Children and adolescents need scaffolding from teachers and school personnel to (1) help them understand that intergroup exclusion and other social inequalities are wrong, (2) help them identify instances of intergroup exclusion in their day-to-day lives, and (3) give them the skills needed to rectify intergroup exclusion when they witness it.

Intervention and education programs with quality intergroup contact, mutual respect, and cooperation designed to reduce prejudice and to promote the fair and equitable treatment of others can hopefully serve as examples for future prejudice reduction interventions and education programs. The implementation of evidence-based, developmentally appropriate, programs in school contexts can help create a just and inclusive school climate, enabling *all* children and adolescents to experience positive social, moral, and academic growth, thus creating a society of equals.

References

Abbott, N., & Cameron, L. (2014). What makes a young assertive bystander? The effect of intergroup contact, empathy, cultural openness, and in-group bias on assertive bystander intervention intentions. *The Journal of Social Issues*, *70*, 167–182. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12053

Aboud, F. E., Mendelson, M. J., & Purdy, K. T. (2003). Cross-race peer relations and friendship quality. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *27*, 165–173. https://doi.org/10.1080/01650250244000164

Alfaro, E. C., Umaña-Taylor, A. J., & Bamaca, M. Y. (2006). The influence of academic support on Latino adolescents' academic motivation. *Family Relations*, *55*, 279–291. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2006.00402.x

Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Addison-Wesley.

Alsimah, M., Tenenbaum, H. R., & Rusconi, P. (2021). How do Saudi children and their mothers evaluate religion-based exclusion? *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *30*, 1353–1369. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-021-01915-5

Beaton, A. M., Monger, T., Leblanc, D., Bourque, J., Levi, Y., Joseph, D. J., Richard, J., Bourque, P., & Chouinard, O. (2012). Crossing the divide: The common in-group identity model and intergroup affinity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 36*(3), 365–376. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.12.003

Benner, A. D., & Graham, S. (2011). Latino adolescents' experiences of discrimination across the first two years of high school: Correlates and influences on educational outcomes. *Child Development*, *82*(2), 508–519. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01524.x.

Bjereld, Y., Daneback, K., & Petzold, M. (2014). Differences in prevalence of bullying victimization between native and immigrant children in the Nordic countries: A parent-reported serial cross-sectional study. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, *41*(4), 593–599. https://doi.org/10.1111/cch.12184

Blake, J. J., Lund, E. M., Zhou, Q., Kwok, O.-M., & Benz, M. R. (2012). National prevalence rates of bully victimization among students with disabilities in the United States. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *27*, 210–222. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spq0000008

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2015). The structure of racism in color-blind, "post-racial" America. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *59*(11), 1358–1376. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764215586826

Bradshaw, C. P., & Johnson, R. M. (2011). The social context of bullying and peer victimization: An introduction to the special issue. *Journal of School Violence*, *10*, 107–114. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2011.557145

Brenick, A., Lawrence, S. E., Carvalheiro, D., & Berger, R. (2019). Teaching tolerance or acting tolerant? Evaluating skills and contact-based prejudice reduction interventions among Palestinian-Israeli and Jewish-Israeli youth. *Journal of School Psychology*, *75*, 8–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jso.2019.07.001

Brinkman, B. G., Jedinak, A., Rosen, L. A., & Zimmerman, T. S. (2010). Teaching children fairness: Decreasing gender prejudice among children. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, *11*(1), 61–81. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-2415.2010.01222.x

Bucchianeri, M. M., Eisenberg, M. E., & Neumark-Sztainer, D. (2013). Weightism, racism, classism, and sexism: Shared forms of harassment in adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 53(1), 47–53. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.01.006

Bucchianeri, M. M., Gower, A. L., McMorris, B. J., & Eisenberg, M. E. (2016). Youth experiences with multiple types of prejudice-based harassment. *Journal of Adolescence*, 51, 68–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2016.05.012

Burkholder, A. R., Elenbaas, L., & Killen, M. (2019). Children's evaluations of intergroup exclusion in interracial and inter-wealth peer contexts. *Child Development*, 91, 512–527. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13249

Chavous, T. M., Rivas-Drake, D., Smalls, C., Griffin, T., & Cogburn, C. (2008). Gender matters, too: The influences of school racial discrimination and racial identity on academic engagement outcomes among African American adolescents. *Developmental Psychology*, 44, 637–654. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.44.3.637

Cooley, S., Burkholder, A., & Killen, M. (2019). Social inclusion and exclusion in same-race and interracial peer encounters. *Developmental Psychology*, 55(11), 2440–2450. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000810

Cooley, S., Elenbaas, L., & Killen, M. (2016). Social exclusion based on group membership is a form of prejudice. In S. S. Horn, M. D. Ruck, & L. S. Liben (Eds.), *Advances in child development and behavior* (Vol. 51, pp. 103–129). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.acdb.2016.04.004

Corbit, J., Lamirato, K., & McAuliffe, K. (2021). Children in the United States and Peru pay to correct gender-based inequality. *Child Development*, 92(4), 1291–1308. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13505

Costello, M., & Dillard, C. (2019). *Hate at school*. Southern Poverty Law Center.

Crozier, G., & Davies, J. (2008). 'The trouble is they don't mix': Self-segregation or enforced exclusion? *Race, Ethnicity & Education*, 11(3), 285–301. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320802291173

Crystal, D., Killen, M., & Ruck, M. (2008). It is who you know that counts: Intergroup contact and judgments about race-based exclusion. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 26(1), 51–70. https://doi.org/10.1348/026151007X198910

Diemer, M. A., Pineso, A., Banales, J., Matthews, C. J., Frisby, M. B., Harris, E. M., & McAlister, S. (2020). Recentering action in critical consciousness. *Child Development Perspectives*, 15(1), 12–17. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12393

Due, P., Merlo, J., Harel-Fisch, Y., Damsgaard, M. T., Holstein, B. E., Hetland, J., Currie, C., Saoirse, N., & Lynch, J. (2009). Socioeconomic inequality in exposure to bullying during adolescence: A comparative, cross-sectional, multilevel study in 35 countries. *American Journal of Public Health*, 99(5), 907--914.

Dunham, Y., Baron, A. S., & Carey, S. (2011). Consequences of "minimal" group affiliations in children. *Child Development*, 82(3), 793–811. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01577.x

Echols, L., & Graham, S. (2020). Meeting in the middle: The role of mutual biracial friends in cross-race friendships. *Child Development*, 91(2), 401–416. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13179

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

Elenbaas, L. (2019). Perceptions of economic inequality are related to children's judgments about access to opportunities. *Developmental Psychology*, 55(3), 471–481. https://doi.org/101037/dev0000550

Elenbaas, L., & Killen, M. (2018). Children's perceptions of economic groups in a context of limited access to opportunities. *Child Development*, 90, 1632–1649. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13024

Elenbaas, L., Rizzo, M. T., Cooley, S., & Killen, M. (2016). Rectifying social inequalities in a resource allocation task. *Cognition*, 155, 176–187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2016.07.002

Elenbaas, L., Rizzo, M. T., & Killen, M. (2020). A developmental science perspective on social inequality. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 29(6), 610–616. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721420964147

Espelage, D. L., Aragon, S. R., Birkett, M., & Koenig, B. (2008). Homophobic teasing, psychological out- comes, and sexual orientation among high school students: What influence do parents and schools have? *School Psychology Review*, 37, 202–216. https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.2008.12087894

Fisher, C. B., Wallace, S. A., & Fenton, R. E. (2000). Discrimination distress during adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 29, 679–695. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026455906512

Fiske, S. T. (2002). What we know now about bias and intergroup conflict, problem of the century. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *11*(4), 123–128. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00183

Gaias, L. M., Gal, D. E., Abry, T., Taylor, M., & Granger, K. L. (2018). Diversity exposure in preschool: Longitudinal implications for cross-race friendships and racial bias. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *59*, 5–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2018.02.005

Garnett, B. R., Masyn, K. E., Austin, S. B., Miller, M., Williams, D. R., & Viswanath, K. (2014). The intersectionality of discrimination attributes and bullying among youth: An applied latent class analysis. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *43*, 1225–1239. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-0073-8

Ghavami, N., Katsiaficas, D., & Rogers, L. O. (2016). Toward an intersectional approach in developmental science: The role of race, gender, sexual orientation, and immigrant status. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*, *50*, 31–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.acdb.2015.12.001

Gieling, M., Thijs, J., & Verkuyten, M. (2010). Tolerance of practices by Muslim actors: An integrative social-developmental perspective. *Child Development*, *81*, 1384–1399. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01480.x

Glidden, J., D'Esterre, A., & Killen, M. (2021). Morally relevant theory of mind mediates the relationship between group membership and moral judgments. *Cognitive Development*, *57*, 100976. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2020.100976

Graham, S., & Echols, L. (2018). Race and ethnicity in peer relations research. In W. M. Bukowski, B. Laursen, & K. H. Rubin (Eds.), *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and groups* (pp. 590–614). The Guilford Press.

Greene, M. L., Way, N., & Pahl, K. (2006). Trajectories of perceived adult and peer discrimination among Black, Latino, and Asian American adolescents: Patterns and psychological correlates. *Developmental Psychology*, *42*, 218–236. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.42.2.218

Gross, Z., & Rutland, S. D. (2014). Combatting antisemitism in the school playground: An Australian case study. *Patterns of Prejudice*, *48*, 309–330. https://doi.org/10.1080/0031322X.2014.918703

Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2006). Student-teacher relationships. In G. G. Bear & K. M. Minke (Eds.), *Children's needs III: Development, prevention, and intervention* (pp. 59–71). National Association of School Psychologists.

Hitti, A., & Killen, M. (2015). Expectations about ethnic peer group inclusivity: The role of shared interests, group norms, and stereotypes. *Child Development*, *86*, 1522–1537. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12393

Hitti, A., Mulvey, K. L., & Killen, M. (2011). Social exclusion and culture: The role of group norms, group identity and fairness. *Anales de Psicologia*, *27*, 587–599.

Hong, J. S., Peguero, A. A., & Espelage, D. L. (2018). Experiences in bullying and/or peer victimization of vulnerable, marginalized, and oppressed children and adolescents: An introduction to the special issue. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *88*(4), 399. https://doi.org/10.1037/ort0000330

Horn, S. S. (2019). Sexual orientation and gender identity-based prejudice. *Child Development Perspectives*, *13*, 21–27. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12311

Horn, S. S., & Sinno, S. M. (2014). Gender, sexual orientation, and discrimination based on gender and sexual orientation. In M. Killen & J. G. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (pp. 317–339). Psychology Press.

Hurd, N., Trawalter, S., Jakubow, A., Johnson, H. E., & Billingsley, J. T. (2021). Online racial discrimination and the role of white bystanders. *American Psychologist*, *77*, 39–55. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000603

Hymel, S., Schonert-Reichl, K. A., Bonanno, R. A., Vaillancourt, T., & Rocke Henderson, N. (2010). Bullying and morality. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 101–118). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Hytten, K., & Bettez, S. C. (2011). Understanding education for social justice. *Educational Foundations*, *25*, 7–24.

Isik, U., Tahir, O. E., Meeter, M., Heymans, M. W., Jansma, E. P., Croiset, G., & Kusurkar, R. (2018). Factors influencing academic motivation of ethnic minority students: A review. *Sage Open*, *8*(2), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018785412

Jimerson, S. R., Swearer, S. M., & Espelage, D. L. (Eds.). (2010). *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective*. Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Juvonen, J., Lessard, L. M., Rastogi, R., Schacter, H. L., & Smith, D. S. (2019). Promoting social inclusion in educational settings: Challenges and opportunities. *Educational Psychologist*, *54*(4), 250–270. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2019.1655645

Kaltiala-Heino, R., Rimpelä, M., Marttunen, M., Rimpelä, A., & Rantanen, P. (1999). Bullying, depression, and suicidal ideation in Finnish adolescents: School survey. *The British Medical Journal*, *319*(7206), 348–351. https://doi.org/10.1136%2Fbmj.319.7206.348

Kaufman, E., Glidden, J., Samuelson, A., & Killen, M. (2023, March). Intergroup contact and teacher support are related to reducing bias and promoting inclusive classrooms. In G. Diesendruck (Co-Chairs), *Reducing children's intergroup biases: Effective cross-cultural interventions. Symposium conducted at the biennial meeting of the society for research in child development*, Salt Lake City, UT.

Kaufman, E. M., & Killen, M. (2022). Children's perspectives on fairness and inclusivity in the classroom. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, (25), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1017/SJP.2022.24

Killen, M., Burkholder, A. R., D'Esterre, A. P., Sims, R. N., Glidden, J., Yee, K. M., Luken Raz, K. V., Elenbaas, L., Rizzo, M. T., Woodward, B., Samuelson, A., Sweet, T. M., & Stapleton, L. M. (2022). Testing the effectiveness of the Developing Inclusive Youth program: A multi-site randomized control trial. *Child Development*, *93*(3), 732–750. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13785

Killen, M., & Dahl, A. (2021). Moral reasoning enables developmental and societal changes. *Perspectives in Psychological Science*, *16*, 1209–1225. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620 964076

Killen, M., Elenbaas, L., Rizzo, M. T., & Rutland, A. (2017). The role of group processes in social exclusion and resource allocation decisions. In A. Rutland, D. Nesdale, & C. Spears Brown (Eds.), *Handbook of group processes in children and adolescents* (pp. 101–123). Wiley.

Killen, M., Henning, A., Kelly, M. C., Crystal, D., & Ruck, M. (2007). Evaluations of interracial peer encounters by majority and minority U.S. children and adolescents. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *31*, 491–500. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025407081478

Killen, M., Hitti, A., Cooley, C., & Elenbaas, L. (2015). Morality, development, and culture. In M. Gelfand, C. Y. Chiu, & Y. Y. Hong (Eds.), *Advances in culture and psychology* (pp. 161–220). Oxford University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190218966.003.0004

Killen, M., Kelly, M. C., Richardson, C., Crystal, D., & Ruck, M. (2010). European-American children's and adolescents' evaluations of interracial exclusion. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *13*, 283–300. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430209346700

Killen, M., Lee-Kim, J., McGlothlin, H., & Stangor C. (2002). How children and adolescents evaluate gender and racial exclusion. *Monographs for the Society for Research in Child Development* (Serial No. 271), *67*(4), i–vii. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-5834.00218

Killen, M., Luken Raz, K., & Graham, S. (2021b). Reducing prejudice through promoting cross group friendships. *Review of General Psychology*, *26*(3), 361–376. https://doi.org/10.1177/10892680211061262

Killen, M., & Rutland, A. (2011). *Children and social exclusion: Morality, prejudice, and group identity*. Wiley Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444396317

Killen, M., & Rutland, A. (2022). Promoting fair and just school environments: Developing inclusive youth. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *9*(1), 81–89. https://doi.org/10.1177/23727322211073795

Killen, M., & Stangor, C. (2001). Children's reasoning about social inclusion and exclusion in gender and race peer group contexts. *Child Development*, *72*(1), 174–186. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00272

Killen, M., Yee, K. M., & Ruck, M. D. (2021a). Social and racial justice as fundamental goals for the field of human development. *Human Development*, *65*, 257–269. https://doi.org/10.1159/000519698

Kim, I., Burgess, D., & Chatters, S. S. (2023). Perceived school fairness and willingness to report bias-based bullying among youth during COVID-19 pandemic. *The Journal of School Health*, *93*(3), 197–205. https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.13261

Kim, Y. S., Koh, Y. J., & Leventhal, B. (2005). School bullying and suicidal risk in Korean middle school students. *Pediatrics*, *115*(2), 357–363. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2004-0902

Kinzler, K. D., & Spelke, E. S. (2011). Do infants show social preferences for people differing in race? *Cognition*, *119*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2010.10.019

Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Palmer, N. A., & Boesen, M. J. (2014). *The 2013 national school climate survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in our nation's schools*. GLSEN.

Lamb, S., & Markussen, E. (2011). *In school dropout and completion: International comparative studies in theory and policy*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9763-7_1

Lei, R. F., & Rhodes, M. (2021). Why developmental research on social categorization needs intersectionality. *Child Development Perspectives*, *15*(3), 143–147. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12421

Lessard, L. M., Watson, R. J., & Puhl, R. M. (2020). Bias-based bullying and school adjustment among sexual and gender minority adolescents: The role of gay-straight alliances. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *49*, 1094–1109. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-020-01205-1

Lester, L., Waters, S., Pearce, N., Spears, B., & Falconer, S. (2018). Pre-service teachers: Knowledge, attitudes and their perceived skills in addressing student bullying. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *43*(8), 30–45. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n8.3

Levy, S. R., Lytle, A., Shin, J. E., & Hughes, J. M. (2016). Understanding and reducing racial and ethnic prejudice among children and adolescents. In T. D. Nelson (Ed.), *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination* (2nd ed., pp. 455–483). Psychology Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203361993-27

London, B., Ahlqvist, S., Gonzalez, A., Glanton, K. V., & Thompson, G. A. (2014). The social and educational consequences of identity-based rejection. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, *8*(1), 131–166. https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12004

Losinski, M., Ennis, R., Katslyannis, A., & Rapa, L. J. (2019). Schools as change agents in reducing bias and discrimination: Shaping behaviors and attitudes. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *28*, 2718–2726. https://doi.org/10.1007/s1082 6-019-01452-2

Luken Raz, K., & Killen, M. (2023, March). The role of intimacy in interracial peer inclusion and exclusion in childhood. In M. Radovanovic (Chair), *Invisible but powerful: Children's social and moral reasoning shapes and mitigates intergroup power imbalances. Symposium presented at the biennial meeting of the society for research in child development*, Salt Lake City, UT.

Malti, T., Killen, M., & Gasser, L. (2012). Social judgments and emotion attributions about exclusion in Switzerland. *Child Development*, *83*, 697–771. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01705.x

Mandalaywala, T. M., Tai, C., & Rhodes, M. (2020). Children's use of race and gender as cues to social status. *PLoS One*, *15*(6). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234398

Marx, S., & Larson, L. L. (2012). Taking off the color-blind glasses: Recognizing and supporting Latina/o students in a predominantly white school. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *48*(2), 259–303. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X11421923

Maynard, B. R., Vaughn, M. G., Salas-Wright, C. P., & Vaughn, S. (2016). Bullying victimization among school-aged immigrant youth in the United States. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *58*(3), 337–344. https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.jadohealth.2015.11.013

McGlothlin, H., & Killen, M. (2010). How social experience is related to children's intergroup attitudes. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *40*(4), 625–634. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.733

McGuire, L., Rizzo, M. T., Killen, M., & Rutland, A. (2018). The development of intergroup resource allocation: The role of cooperative and competitive in-group norms. *Developmental Psychology*, *54*(8), 1499–1506. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000535

Messinger, A. M., Nieri, T. A., Villar, P., & Luengo, M. A. (2012). Acculturation stress and bullying among immigrant youths in Spain. *Journal of School Violence*, *11*(4), 306–322. https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2012.706875

Møller, S. J., & Tenenbaum, H. R. (2011). Danish majority children's reasoning about exclusion based on gender and ethnicity. *Child Development*, *82*(2), 520–532. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01568.x

Moran, M., Midgett, A., & Doumas, D. M. (2019). Evaluation of a brief, bystander bullying intervention (STAC) for ethnically blended middle schools in low-income communities. *Professional School Counseling*, *23*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759x20940641

Mulvey, K. L. (2016). Children's reasoning about social exclusion: Balancing many factors. *Child Development Perspectives*, *10*, 22–27. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12157

Mulvey, K. L., Hoffman, A. J., Gönültaş, S., Hope, E. C., & Cooper, S. M. (2018). Understanding experiences with bullying and bias-based bullying: What matters and for whom? *Psychology of Violence*, *8*(6), 702–711. https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000206

Neblett, E. W., Jr, & Carter, S. E. (2012). The protective role of racial identity and Africentric worldview in the association between racial discrimination and blood pressure. *Psychosomatic medicine*, *74*(5), 509–516. https://doi.org/10.1097/PSY.0b013e3182583a50

Neblett, E. W., White, R. L., Ford, K. R., Philip, C. L., Nguyên, H. X., & Sellers, R. M. (2008). Patterns of racial socialization and psychological adjustment: Can parental communications about race reduce the impact of racial discrimination? *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *18*, 477–515. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2008.00568.x

Nenadal, L., & Mistry, R. S. (2018). Teacher reflections on using inquiry-based instruction to engage young children in conversations about wealth and poverty. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *42*, 44–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2017.07.008

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

Nesdale, D. (2008). Peer group rejection and children's intergroup prejudice. In *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood* (pp. 32–46). Oxford University Press.

Nesdale, D., & Lawson, M. J. (2011). Social groups and children's intergroup attitudes: Can school norms moderate the effects of social group norms? *Child Development*, *82*(5), 1594–1606. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01637.x

Nucci, L. (2009). *Nice is not enough: Facilitating moral development*. Merrill.

Nucci, L., & Ilten-Gee, R. (2021). *Moral education for social justice*. Teachers College Press.

OECD. (2017a). *PISA 2015 results (Volume III): Students' well-being*. PISA, OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264273856-en.

OECD. (2017b). *PISA 2015 results (volume I): Excellence and equity in education*. PISA, OECD Publishing.

Okonofua, J. A., Walton, G. M., & Eberhardt, J. L. (2016). A vicious cycle: A social–psychological account of extreme racial disparities in school discipline. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *11*(3), 381–398. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616635592

Olson, K. R., Dweck, C. S., Spelke, E. S., & Banaji, M. R. (2011). Children's responses to group-based inequalities: Perpetuation and rectification. *Social Cognition*, *29*(3), 270–287. https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2011.29.3.270

Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do (understanding children's worlds)*. Blackwell Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.10114

Orfield, G., & Frankenberg, E. (2014). Increasingly segregated and unequal schools as courts reverse policy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *50*(5), 718–734. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X14548942

Pauker, K., Williams, A., & Steele, J. R. (2016). Children's racial categorization in context. *Child Development Perspectives*, *10*, 33–38. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12155

Poteat, V. P., Mereish, E. H., Digiovanni, C. D., & Koenig, B. W. (2011). The effects of general and homophobic victimization on adolescents' psychosocial and educational concerns: The importance of intersecting identities and parent support. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *58*, 597–609. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0025095

Pottie, K., Dahal, G., Georgiades, K., Premji, K., & Hassan, G. (2015). Do first generation immigrant adolescents face higher rates of bullying, violence and suicidal behaviours than do third generation and native born? *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, *17*, 1557–1566. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10903-014-0108-6

Renno, M. P., & Shutts, K. (2015). Children's social category-based giving and its correlates: Expectations and preferences. *Developmental Psychology*, *51*, 533–543. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038819

Rivas-Drake, D., Markstrom, C., Syed, M., Lee, R. M., Uma.a-Taylor, A. J., Yip, T., Seaton, E. K., Quintana, S., Schwartz, S. J., French, S., & Ethnic and Racial Identity in the 21st Century Study Group. (2014). Ethnic and racial identity in adolescence: Implications for psychological, academic, and health outcomes. *Child Development*, *85*, 40–57. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12200

Rivas-Drake, D., & Umaña-Taylor, A. J. (2019). Engaging in meaningful conversations: The need to foster ethnic-racial identity in school. *American Educator*, *43*(3), 18–22.

Rizzo, M. T., & Killen, M. (2016). Children's understanding of equity in the context of inequality. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *34*(4), 569–581. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjdp.12150

Roberts, S. O., Williams, A. D., & Gelman, S. A. (2017). Children's and adults' predictions of Black, White, and multiracial friendship patterns. *Journal of Cognition and Development*, *18*, 189–208. https://doi.org/10.1080/15248372.2016.1262374

Rogers, L. O., Scott, M. A., & Way, N. (2015). Racial and gender identity among Black adolescent males: An intersectionality perspective. *Child Development*, *86*, 407–424. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12303

Rubin, K., Bukowski, W., & Parker, J. (2006). Peers, relationships, and interactions. In W. Damon & R. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology* (pp. 571–645). Wiley Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470147658.chpsy0310

Rubin, K. H., Bukowski, W., & Bowker, J. (2015). Children in peer groups. In M. Bornstein & T. Leventhal (Volume Eds.) & R. M. Lerner (Series Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science* (formerly *The handbook of child psychology), Seventh edition volume four: Ecological settings and processes* (pp. 175–222). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118963418.childpsy405

Ruck, M. D., Park, H., Crystal, D. S., & Killen, M. (2015). Intergroup contact is related to evaluations of interracial peer exclusion in African American students. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *44*(6), 1226–1240. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-014-0227-3

Ruck, M. D., Park, H., Killen, M., & Crystal, D. S. (2011). Intergroup contact and evaluations of race-based exclusion in urban minority children and adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *40*(6), 633–643. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-010-9600-z

Ruck, M. D., & Tenenbaum, H. R. (2014). Does moral and social conventional reasoning predict British young people's judgments about the rights of asylum-seeker youth? *Journal of Social Issues*, *70*, 47–62. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12046

Russell, S. T., Sinclair, K. O., Poteat, V. P., & Koenig, B. W. (2012). Adolescent health and harassment based on discriminatory bias. *American Journal of Public Health*, *102*, 493–495. http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2011.300430

Rutland, A., & Killen, M. (2015). A developmental science approach to reducing prejudice and social exclusion: Intergroup processes, social-cognitive development, and moral reasoning. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, *9*(1), 121–154. https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12012

Rutland, A., & Killen, M. (2017). Fair resource allocation among children and adolescents: The role of group and developmental processes. *Child Development Perspectives*, *11*(1), 56–62. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12211

Rutland, A., Killen, M., & Abrams, D. (2010). A new social-cognitive developmental perspective on prejudice: The interplay between morality and group identity. *Perspectives on Psychological Science: A Journal of the Association for Psychological Science*, *5*(3), 279–291. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691610369468

Salmon, S., Turner, S., Taillieu, T., Fortier, J., & Afifi, T. O. (2018). Bullying victimization experiences among middle and high school adolescents: Traditional bullying, discriminatory harassment, and cyber-victimization. *Journal of Adolescence*, *63*, 29–40. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2017.12.005

Santos, C. E., & Toomey, R. B. (2018). Integrating an intersectionality lens in theory and research in developmental science. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, *161*, 7–15. https://doi.org/10.1002/cad.20245

Schihalejev, O., Kuusisto, A., Vikdahl, L., & Kallioniemi, A. (2020). Religion and children's perceptions of bullying in multicultural schools in Estonia, Finland and Sweden. *Journal of Beliefs & Values*, *41*(3), 371–384. https://doi.org/10.1080/13617672.2019.1686732

Shutts, K., Roben, C. K. P., & Spelke, E. S. (2013). Children's use of social categories in thinking about people and social relationships. *Journal of Cognition and Development*, *14*, 35–62. https://doi.org/10.1080/15248372.2011.638686

Sinclair, K. O., Bauman, S., Poteat, V. P., Koenig, B., & Russell, S. T. (2012). Cyber and bias-based harassment: Associations with academic, substance use, and mental health problems. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *50*, 521–523. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2011.09.009

Smetana, J., Jambon, M., & Ball, C. (2014). The social domain approach to children's moral and social judgments. In M. Killen & J. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (pp. 23–45). Psychology Press.

Stark, T. H., & Flache, A. (2012). The double edge of common interest: Ethnic segregation as an unintended byproduct of opinion homophily. *Sociology of Education*, *85*, 179–199. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040711427314

Strohmeier, D., Kärnä, A., & Salmivalli, C. (2011). Intrapersonal and interpersonal risk factors for peer victimization in immigrant youth in Finland. *Developmental Psychology*, *47*(1), 248. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0020785

Sulkowski, M. L., Bauman, S., Wright, S., Nixon, C., & Davis, S. (2014). Peer victimization in youth from immigrant and non-immigrant US families. *School Psychology International*, *35*(6), 649–669. https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034314554968

Tajfel, H., Turner, J. C., Austin, W. G., & Worchel, S. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In *Organizational identity: A reader* (pp. 56–65). Oxford University Press.

Thornberg, R. (2010). A study of children's conceptions of school rules by investigating their judgments of transgressions in the absence of rules. *Educational Psychology*, *30*, 583–603. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2010.492348

Tropp, L. R., O'Brien, T. C., & Migacheva, D. (2014). How peer norms of inclusion and exclusion predict children's interest in cross-race friendships. *Journal of Social Issues*, *70*(1), 151–166. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12052

Turiel, E. (1983). *The development of social knowledge: Morality and convention*. Cambridge University Press.

Turiel, E. (2002). *The culture of morality: Social development, context, and conflict*. Cambridge University Press.

Turiel, E. (2015). Moral development. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science. Vol. 1: Theory and method* (pp. 484–522). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118963418.childpsy113

Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Douglass, S., Updegraff, K. A., & Marsiglia, F. F. (2018). A small-scale randomized efficacy trial of the identity project: Promoting adolescents' ethnic-racial identity exploration and resolution. *Child Development*, *89*(3), 862–870. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12755

Verkuyten, M., & de Wolf, A. (2007). The development of in-group favoritism. *Developmental Psychology*, *43*, 901–911. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0012-1649.43.4.901

Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2007). A question of belonging: Race, social fit, and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*(1), 82–96. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.1.82

Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2011). A brief social-belonging intervention improves academic and health outcomes of minority students. *Science*, *331*(6023), 1447–1451. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1198364

Walton, G. M., & Spencer, S. J. (2009). Latent ability: Grades and test scores systematically underestimate the intellectual ability of negatively stereotyped students. *Psychological Science*, *20*, 1132–1139. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02417.x

Wang, M. T., & Huguley, J. P. (2012). Parental racial socialization as a moderator of the effects of racial discrimination on educational success among African American adolescents. *Child Development*, *83*, 1716–1731. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01808.x

Wigfield, A., Eccles, J. S., Fredricks, J. A., Simpkins, S., Roeser, R. W., & Schiefele, U. (2015). Development of achievement motivation and engagement. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science* (pp. 1–44). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118963418.childpsy316

Williams, D. R. (1999). Race, socioeconomic status, and health the added effects of racism and discrimination. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *896*(1), 173–188. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1999.tb08114.x

Yang, X., & Dunham, Y. (2022). Emerging complexity in children's conceptualization of the wealthy and the poor. *Developmental Science*, *25*(4), e13225. https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.13225

Yip, T. (2014). Ethnic identity in everyday life: The influence of identity development status. *Child Development*, *85*, 205–219. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12107

Yip, T. (2015). The effects of ethnic/racial discrimination and sleep quality on depressive symptoms and self-esteem trajectories among diverse adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *44*, 419–430. https://doi.org/10.1007/s1096 4–014–0123-x

Yüksel, A. Ş., Palmer, S. B., & Rutland, A. (2021). Developmental differences in bystander behavior toward intergroup and intragroup exclusion. *Developmental Psychology*, *57*(8), 1342–1349. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0001202