

Children's Perspectives on Fairness and Inclusivity in the Classroom

Elise Marie Kaufman  and Melanie Killen 

University of Maryland at College Park (USA)

Abstract. School represents an important context for children's social, moral, and identity development. Research indicates that supportive teacher-student relationships are significantly related to positive student academic achievement. Unfortunately, teacher bias as well as peer exclusion based on group identity (gender, race, ethnicity, and nationality) pervade many school contexts. The presence of these biases in the classroom is negatively related to students' academic development, especially for children who are minoritized and marginalized. Very little research has connected teacher bias and children's reasoning about bias and inequalities in the classroom context. The classroom is a complex environment in which to examine children's social and moral reasoning about bias, given teachers' position of authority which often includes power, status, and prestige. We propose that understanding both teacher bias and peer intergroup exclusion are essential for promoting more fair classrooms. This paper reviews foundational theory as well as the social reasoning developmental model as a framework for studying how children think about fairness and bias in the classroom context. We then discuss current research on children's social-cognitive and moral capacities, particularly in the contexts of societal inequality and social inclusion or exclusion. Finally, this article proposes new directions for research to promote fairness and inclusivity in schools and suggests how these new lines of research might inform school-based interventions.

Received 26 May 2022; Revised 6 October 2022; Accepted 07 October 2022

Keywords: bias, classrooms, fairness, inclusion, teachers

School represents an important context for children's social, moral, and identity development (Killen & Smetana, 2015; Nucci & Ilten-Gee, 2021). Research indicates that supportive teacher-student relationships are significantly related to positive student academic achievement (Rivas-Drake et al., 2014). While teachers care about their students and value teaching all students, unintentional (and sometimes intentional) bias occurs in the classroom (Marx & Larson, 2012; Tropp & Rucinski, 2022). When teachers display biases, students experience unfair treatment (Glock & Kovaks, 2013; Starck et al., 2020; Tenenbaum & Ruck, 2007). While teacher bias has been documented, little is known about children's perspectives about fairness and inclusivity in

the classroom. Classrooms that reflect biased teacher attitudes that are left unchecked result in an exclusive school environment for all members of the community (Dovidio et al., 2009; Glock & Kovaks, 2013). Biased expectations and prejudicial attitudes have been shown to be related to the ethnic/racial achievement gap, low self-esteem, a lack of school belonging, and low motivation to attend school in addition to mental health outcomes such as stress, anxiety, and depression (Inan-Kaya & Rubies-Davies, 2022; Okonofua et al., 2016; Peterson et al., 2016; Rivas-Drake et al., 2014).

Further, children who exclude peers in classroom contexts based on group membership, such as gender, race, ethnicity, and nationality, contribute to the display of bias, the emergence of prejudicial attitudes, and a negative climate (Killen & Rutland, 2011; Rutland & Killen, 2015). Inclusion and exclusion of peers involves a number of social-cognitive capacities including the evaluation of social inequalities, social status and hierarchies, detecting bias, awareness of status hierarchies, and decisions to trust peers (Burkholder et al., 2019;

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Elise Marie Kaufman, University of Maryland at College Park, Department of Human Development and Quantitative Methodology, 3942 Campus Drive, Suite 3304, 20742–1131 Maryland (USA).

E-mail: ekaufmal@umd.edu

Acknowledgement: We thank Ileana Enesco for helpful feedback on the manuscript and the Social and Moral Development team at the University of Maryland for feedback on the research reported in the paper.

Funding statement: The last author was supported, in part, by a grant from the National Science Foundation, BCS/DS1728918 and from the National Institutes of Health/NICHD, R01HD093698.

Conflict of interest: None.

How to cite this article:

Kaufman, E. M., & Killen, M. (2022). Children's perspectives on fairness and inclusivity in the classroom. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 25, e28. Doi:10.1017/SJP.2022.24

Yee et al., 2022). Understanding teacher and student perspectives about their social relationships and the broader social context is necessary for creating inclusive classrooms, which, in turn, contribute to healthy child development and equal opportunities for all students to reach their potential in terms of academic learning and achievement (DeCuir-Gunby & Bindra, 2022; Starck et al., 2020).

Objectives of this paper

We begin with an overview of the need for more research on children's understanding of bias in the classroom context. We then turn to a review of the foundational theory that generated current research, focusing on the development of moral concepts such as fairness and equality in childhood. We turn to more recent research focusing on the group and societal norms that influence children's evaluations of different types of inequalities, guided by the social reasoning developmental framework (Elenbaas, 2019; Rutland & Killen, 2017). Next, we discuss research on how children think about intergroup inclusion and exclusion, as well as social inequalities, with a specific focus on social inequalities in the classroom and school context. This background provides the basis for investigating children's perspectives about teacher biases in the classroom and the associated consequences for students in terms of their own intergroup behaviors, academic outcomes, and mental health outcomes. We conclude with recommendations for future research on the factors that create inclusive classrooms.

Schools are often viewed as contexts for promoting caring and fair treatment of others. Research on preservice and early career teachers finds that care for and enjoyment of students is an important motivating factor for teachers' work (Jarvis & Woodrow, 2005). However, research finds that many racial-ethnic majority teachers still struggle to relate to racial-ethnic minority students, hold stereotypes about these students, and feel unprepared to teach diverse classrooms (Marx & Larson, 2012). To examine rates of teacher implicit racial bias compared with other American adults, Starck and colleagues (2020) analyzed two Implicit Association Test (IAT) national datasets. Data from the IAT, a tool to assess social group preferences based on the speed with which one associates members of that group with positive attributes, revealed few significant differences between teacher and nonteacher adults, indicating that teachers who took the IAT (81 percent White) exhibit pro-White racial bias at about the same rate as the average American adult who took the IAT (71 percent White). Awareness of bias is the first step towards reducing negative attitudes, yet less is known about what helps teachers be aware of their own biases or

about how their students make sense of teacher bias in action.

The focus on how students think about bias in the classroom is crucial for how to intervene to create more inclusive learning environments. Research on children's social and moral development has shown that children begin evaluating unfair treatment of others as wrong as early as 3 years old (Smetana et al., 2012; Sommerville, 2022). Yet, little is known about the extent to which children view teacher biases in the classroom context as wrong or unfair. This may have to do with the perceived status of teachers at school in terms of their role as an authority, holding power and prestige in the classroom context (Laupa, 1994). Children's perceptions of teacher bias involve multiple forms of judgment including the role of authority for decision making, as well as the recognition of unfair treatment that results from group norms and social inequalities. Recently, research has examined when children view group-level social inequalities as unfair and whether they desire to rectify such disparities (Elenbaas, 2019; Mistry et al., 2021). These data are relevant for understanding how children perceive classroom bias and for creating inclusive classrooms.

Also important is the extent to which teachers are aware that children often exclude their peers based on group membership. Research has documented the factors that contribute to children's support or rejection of peer exclusion based on stereotypes and biases (Rutland & Killen, 2015). Further, children's trust in their peers as a source of knowledge and information reveals the contexts in which they may turn to their peers (instead of teachers) for social support and information (Sebastián-Enesco et al., 2020). Students who are rejected by teachers may also be more likely to be rejected by peers (Osterman, 2000). If teacher rejection occurs systemically as a manifestation of unconscious bias against certain groups, this may further intergroup peer exclusion. We propose that addressing the factors that contribute to promoting positive and inclusive classroom environments requires knowledge (a) of teacher and student attitudes toward other groups and toward bias in the classroom, (b) of children's judgments about fair and unfair treatment of others, and (c) of children's evaluations of group norms that support bias and exclusion.

Children's Critical Social-Cognitive and Moral Capacities

Children are capable of critically evaluating teachers' actions, such as when they punish the group for the misdeeds of one child (Piaget, 1932/1965) or condone acts of moral transgressions, such as inflicting harm on another person (Smetana et al., 2012). As well, children

recognize the domains of student behavior that fall within and without a teacher's legitimate authority (Guerrero et al., 2017; Smetana & Bitz, 1996; Yoo & Smetana, 2022). In general, children view moral judgments as obligations that apply across scenarios, not as a matter of consensus, nor as under authority jurisdiction (Turiel, 1983, 2002). For example, children view teachers as having jurisdiction regarding conventions in the classroom such as how the classroom desks are arranged, the appropriate attire for classroom participation, and how teachers should be addressed in the classroom. By four years of age, however, children do not believe that teachers have jurisdiction to alter moral rules in the classroom, such as whether it is okay to hit someone, take away other students' resources, or engage in deception for personal benefit (Smetana et al., 2014); these actions are viewed as wrong and unfair *even* if a teacher condones them. Extensive research has shown that children in multiple cultural contexts (by nation, urban/rural, SES, and traditional/modern) view teacher jurisdiction over conventions designed to make groups work as distinct from teacher jurisdiction over moral obligations about mutual respect, fairness, and others' welfare (Helwig et al., 2014; Wainryb & Recchia, 2014). With development, children's depth of moral reasoning becomes more nuanced and robust, as they develop an understanding of others' mental states (Lagattuta & Weller, 2014) and the role of authority (Turiel, 2015).

Children's peer relationships are crucial in this process. Piaget emphasized the role of peer interaction as a unique contribution to development, particularly for facilitating change regarding social-cognitive and moral development (Carpendale, 2000; Piaget, 1932/1965). Piaget (1932/1965) argued that peer relationships are among equals, allowing for greater cooperation and development of reciprocity, equality, and mutual respect. To Piaget (1932/1965), the "equal status" nature of peer relationships stands in contrast to adult-child interactions, which are unilateral and constraining given that adults have power, knowledge, and status. However, research over the past two decades has demonstrated that both peer and adult-child relationships are multifaceted. Peer relationships may be a context for equality as Piaget imagined, but they may also be unilateral in the case of bully-victim relationships (Rubin et al., 2007). At the same time, adult-child relations may be unilateral, but they can also be constructive, with scaffolding and positive communicative interactions (Grusec, 2019; Kuczynski & Mol, 2015).

These findings have several implications for creating inclusive classrooms. Children's conceptions of authority play a role in how children view teachers, including teachers who foster inclusive relationships as well as those who display biases. Further, with age, children are

capable of critically evaluating biased behavior from peers (Killen & Dahl, 2021). Teachers can support students who reject stereotypic expectations from peers or resist unfair treatment. For this to happen, though, both students and teacher must bring to bear an awareness of bias, their own group identity, and moral judgments about a fair classroom (see Nucci & Ilten-Gee, 2021).

Group Identity and Moral Judgment: A Theoretical Model

Just as morality naturally develops, so too does an awareness of group dynamics and the human desire to affiliate with groups (Tomasello, 2014). Social identity theory (Abrams & Rutland, 2008; Nesdale & Lawson, 2011; Verkuyten, 2013) theorizes that in-group preference develops as individuals affiliate with groups. Strengthening one's in-group affiliation can result in in-group bias which often leads to out-group distrust. Theories of social exclusion have drawn on social identity theory to explain processes of intergroup inclusion and exclusion (Abrams et al., 2004). Extensive research has found evidence of in-group preference from early childhood (Dunham et al., 2011; Kinzler & Spelke, 2011) through adolescence and adulthood (Levy et al., 2016). This natural preference does not have to become a bias against a particular out-group, but affiliation with one's in-group can become bias against an out-group in contexts that promote and perpetuate social hierarchies and inequalities. The social identity approach is consistent with current theories about anti-racism which focus on systemic racism (Kendi, 2016) in that prejudice is characterized as a systemic aspect of societies that allows groups to maintain power and privilege (Dovidio et al., 2015). Thus, understanding how children and adults morally reason through issues like bias and prejudice in the classroom requires consideration of group identity, especially in a sociocultural context that places some groups in power while subjugating others.

The social reasoning developmental (SRD) model draws from social domain theory (Killen & Smetana, 2015; Turiel, 2015) and social identity theory (Rutland et al., 2010) to provide a framework to consider children's reasoning about intergroup settings, such as a diverse classroom context in which group identity is salient. Social domain theory holds that individuals consider their social world by coordinating concerns in the moral (e.g., fairness, equality, wellbeing of others), social-conventional (e.g., norms), and personal/psychological (e.g., personal preferences, autonomy) domains (Killen & Smetana, 2015). Social identity theory posits that one's group identities, such as race or gender, play a crucial role in the development of one's

self concept, affecting how one interacts in social situations (Rutland et al., 2010; Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

The SRD model integrates these two frameworks by documenting that children are often conflicted when making moral judgments in intergroup contexts in ways that are different from intragroup situations. When asked to share resources within their own group, children often draw exclusively on moral reasons. Yet, when asked to make the same decision in an intergroup context, the decision is more difficult with in-group biases, group norms, and group identity taking priority (Elenbaas, 2019; Mulvey, 2016; Rutland et al., 2015). Not only are situations involving resource allocation subject to conflicting in-group bias and fairness judgments, but most situations involving social inclusion and exclusion decisions reflect this same type of dilemma from childhood to adulthood (Levy et al., 2016), as we review in the next section. Thus, these situations require studying not only moral and conventional reasoning, but judgments and attitudes reflecting group norms, identity, and biases (Rutland et al., 2010). This model also contends that children bring their psychological knowledge to bear on their social cognition, including their interpretations and awareness of others' intentions, feelings, and mental states (Glidden et al., 2021; Rizzo & Killen, 2016). These same forms of psychological knowledge about others are likewise relevant to how children think about peer inclusion and exclusion in the classroom.

Children's Evaluations of Social Inclusion and Exclusion

While interpersonal peer rejection may occur because of an individual's personality traits, intergroup social exclusion occurs when children are rejected based on their group identity, a result of prejudice and bias. Children often justify intergroup exclusion (based on gender, race, and ethnicity) by using conventions, traditions, and group functioning reasons, for instance rejecting an out-group peer because they expect not to have much in common (Mulvey, 2016).

Research on bias in the peer context at school finds that children may also encounter and reason about intergroup social exclusion differently based on age and social identity. Cooley et al. (2019) found that White 12- to 14-year-olds tended to expect a group of same-race peers to include someone of a different race less than did White nine- to 11-year-olds. This demonstrates that by middle school, children are aware of societal racial biases and take these into account when forming their expectations about peer inclusion behavior. In the same study, Black children evaluated racial exclusion as more wrong than did their White counterparts (Cooley et al., 2019). This finding suggests that with increasing age, White children expect that their peers will be more

willing to include a same race than a different race peer when considering a friendship opportunity. Research finds that as children age, though, shared interests can prevail over group identity (such as race, ethnicity, and nationality), and children can become more capable of valuing diverse peer groups (Hitti & Killen, 2015). Through classroom discussions, teachers can scaffold this process, helping children to recognize what makes intergroup exclusion wrong and the benefits of including peers of many identities (Killen, Burkholder, D'Esterre et al., 2022).

Children's Evaluations of Societal Inequalities

Part of understanding how children think about bias in the school context is to understand how they evaluate social inequalities in general. Recognizing societal level inequalities is especially important for majority group members, contributing to perspective-taking and empathy for groups that are not majority status. By middle childhood, children gain the ability to use their moral reasoning in the context of societal inequalities, recognizing that some inequalities are unfair and need to be rectified. This reasoning gets more complex with age. Rizzo and Killen (2016) studied how five- to six-year-olds and seven- to eight-year-olds thought about resource inequalities between two groups. Children were shown two fictional towns, one with a history of having resources and one with a history of lacking resources, as well as a fictional character from each of the towns. When asked about how many resources to give each of the two characters, five- to six-year-olds considered both a rectifying (giving more to the character from the disadvantaged town) and an equal allocation of resources to each character to be fair. The seven- to eight-year-olds evaluated equal allocations of resources to both characters, which perpetuated the inequality, as less fair than allocations that rectified the inequality (Rizzo & Killen, 2016). Here, the seven- to eight-year-olds integrated their knowledge of prior inequity between groups in their judgments about the fairness of different resource allocations, while the younger children's reasoning had not developed this level of complexity, on average.

Importantly, these social inequalities are not arbitrary. While certain social groups have been given power based on identities such as race and gender, others have been systematically subjugated and disadvantaged, and the child's world is not free of these influences. As children develop their own sense of group identity, they must navigate how their identification with certain social groups intersects with their sense of morality.

Prior research has explored how children balance moral priorities with group identity through the framework of the SRD model. These studies have examined

how children understand societal biases that result in structural inequality. Children recognize systemic biases, such as those based on gender and race, and they bring to bear their own group identities. In the context of resource inequalities, when children identify with a disadvantaged group, they recognize the inequality, disapprove of it, and act to rectify it at an earlier age than when they identify with the advantaged group (Elenbaas et al., 2016; Rizzo & Killen, 2020). Likewise, Elenbaas and colleagues (2016) found that when children were shown an unequal distribution of school supplies between a school with African American children and a school with European American children, all children gave more resources to the disadvantaged groups, but younger children were more likely to give even *more* resources to their own group, displaying an in-group bias. With age, children recognized the societal inequality; older children gave more resources to the African American disadvantaged schools. European American and African American participants were equally likely to rectify the inequality between the two schools.

In another study, Rizzo and Killen (2020) investigated how three- to eight-year-old children evaluated individually and structurally based inequalities. Children were asked to evaluate allocations made by a hypothetical allocator who gave more resources based on merit (an individual is hard-working) or more resources based on group identity (structural gender bias). Overall, children evaluated structurally based inequalities to be more unfair and worthy of rectification than individually based inequalities. However, when given the opportunity to allocate resources themselves, most children allocated equally, which is not the most direct means for rectifying a pre-existing inequality. These findings reveal that even young children have the cognitive capacity to recognize what makes a structural inequality different from an individual inequality but do not consistently use strategies that fully rectify the inequality based on a gender bias.

The recognition of the presence of systemic bias is the first step for children applying their moral reasoning to bias, but the next is the understanding that individuals perpetuate these biases. Additionally complex moral reasoning is required when children must make sense of and respond to bias in an individual whom they may have viewed as inherently fair and just, such as a teacher or friend.

Structural Bias in the School Context

School is a social environment with salient peer and child-adult relationships in which children receive, interpret, and evaluate social information about conventional rules (e.g., norms) and moral rules (Nucci & Ilten-Gee,

2021). Teachers engage with, support, and challenge their students in many ways, but extant literature suggests that normative forms of communication can reflect biases about students' backgrounds, including group identity (İnan-Kaya & Rubie-Davies, 2022; Skinner & Meltzoff, 2019). A meta-analysis examining research on differences in teachers' behavior toward ethnic minority compared with White American students found that teachers held the highest expectations for Asian American students and held lower expectations for Latino ($d = 0.46$) and African American ($d = 0.25$) students compared with White students (Tenenbaum & Ruck, 2007). The authors also found that teacher speech toward these ethnic groups differed, with more positive and neutral speech toward White students than Latino and African American students ($d = 0.31$). Other studies use student self-reports of unjust or discriminatory treatment from a teacher and find that racial-ethnic minority students report discriminatory treatment via grading, discipline, and lack of positive feedback at higher rates than White students (Čiuladienė & Račelytė, 2016; Crystal et al., 2010).

A child's own racial identity affects not only their vulnerability to racial bias from teachers (Tenenbaum & Ruck, 2007) and peers (Greene et al., 2006) but also the likelihood that they recognize when peers may be victims of bias (Elenbaas et al., 2016). Classroom and school norms also play an important role in whether children see instances of bias as the expected status quo or whether they see bias as an injustice to which they have the power to respond. By adolescence, when children report high levels of prior unfair treatment by authorities such as teachers, they are less likely to recognize later prejudicial mistreatment of a peer (Crystal et al., 2010). Instances of teacher bias inherently involve children's moral concerns, as they think about whether their peers are being treated with equality and fairness. When witnessing bias at school, children are also engaged in the intricate social cognition of understanding others' mental states, as they might consider the intentions of the teacher as well as the emotions and experiences of peers being treated unfairly based on their identity.

As children gain an understanding of the nature of fairness and inequalities, they also must parse out the reasons for the inequalities they see at school, attempting to make sense of the roles of bias and merit. Rizzo and Killen (2020) found that children tend to approve of group inequalities when they believe the inequality is earned (one group works harder than the other), but not when they see the inequality as structural, or bias-based (one group's gender is preferred by the leader). Still, a child's sense of fairness and justice is not impervious to the influence of societal inequalities. Importantly, Pauker and colleagues (2016) argue that merit-based and bias-based perceptions of inequalities can become

conflated as children internalize stereotypes; when certain social groups are preferred over and over again with merit-based justifications, children may eventually come to assume that disadvantaged groups have somehow earned their lower status. Thus, though Rizzo and Killen (2020) show that though children have the capacity to distinguish between group inequalities that are earned or based in bias, repeated exposure to differential treatment based on stereotypes, such as from peers or teachers at school, may eventually lead to children holding these stereotypes themselves. It is for this reason that research gaining a deeper understanding of how children think about bias in the classroom is so important.

Effects of Teacher Bias on Student Intergroup Behavior

While most current research on how children evaluate bias has been in the peer context, we also know that the peer-to-peer and child-to-adult contexts are not fully independent in a young person's world, especially in the classroom. In this environment, the way a teacher treats a student is likely to influence the way that student's peers treat them, and the teacher creates norms around who is worth including and celebrating, and who is not. While many teachers work hard to create inclusive norms in their classrooms, teachers' implicit attitudes about an out-group can sometimes influence student intergroup attitudes in unintentional ways. Geerlings and colleagues (2019) examined the relationship between Dutch teacher interethnic attitudes, student perception of teachers' expressed multicultural norms (e.g., "all cultures should be respected"), and students' ethnic out-group attitudes. Classrooms in the study included Dutch majority students, Turkish-Dutch minority students, and Moroccan-Dutch minority students in fourth to sixth grades. Among the Dutch majority students, observing a teacher's positive relationship with ethnic minority students had a positive effect on ethnic out-group attitudes, but only among those who reported few instances of teachers' expressed multicultural norms. The authors posit that students may form their ethnic out-group attitudes based more on how their teachers model interaction with ethnic minority students than based on what their teachers state explicitly (Geerlings et al., 2019).

Importantly, teachers' interactions with minority students may also be better indicators of teachers' implicit attitudes than the norms teachers overtly express. Prior research has found that negative implicit teacher attitudes are more indicative of teacher behavior than explicit attitudes (Glock & Kovacs, 2013), highlighting the need for further research on how children respond to actual teacher behavior. While teachers (like most

adults) tend to report that they have few biases and care about their students (Marx & Larson, 2012), the study of the true impact of teacher bias has been hindered by a dearth of quality measures for this bias in context (DeCuir-Gunby & Bindra, 2022). Additional research with emerging tools (e.g., Teacher Race Talk Survey; Milner, 2017) is needed to capture more nuances about teacher bias, such as teacher beliefs about the role of their students' racial-ethnic identities in their education.

Teacher behavior has the power to influence not only majority student bias and moral reasoning but can affect that of minority students as well. Crystal et al. (2010) examined children and adolescents' perceptions of unfair treatment by authorities and responses to unfair treatment of a peer. Students in minority racial-ethnic groups reported more unfair treatment by authorities. Also, adolescents who reported fair treatment by authority were more likely to perceive peer interracial exclusion as wrong as were adolescents who reported unfair authority treatment. This is particularly interesting in that it points to the complexity of the teacher-student power dynamic and its effect on how children relate to their peers. One might expect that, given Crystal and colleagues' (2010) finding that racially minoritized children experienced more unfair treatment by authority, these participants would thus be more likely to recognize the unfair treatment of someone else in a situation of interracial exclusion. Rather, their repeated experiences of unfair treatment may, by adolescence, have desensitized them to recognizing the unfair treatment of others, now seeing injustice as the norm. The findings suggest that if children are repeatedly subject to teacher bias, they may be less likely to recognize, name, and thus to act to prevent prejudice of others in the future. More research is needed to understand how children and adolescents think about their experiences of bias in the classroom, to inform prevention and intervention.

Effects of Bias at School on Student Achievement and Wellbeing

Experiences of prejudice and bias at school affect not only students' own intergroup behavior, but also their academic and mental health outcomes. Peterson et al. (2016) found that teachers' implicit racial biases (as measured on an IAT) predicted student performance on an end-of-year standardized test, with students in their teacher's preferred racial-ethnic group scoring higher on average than students not in this group. A longitudinal study of racial minority students throughout high school similarly found that students who reported unjust treatment in their classrooms showed lower grades on average in the next semester (Dalbert & Stoeber, 2006). Student reports of unjust and

discriminatory treatment in the classroom have also been associated with academic disengagement (Berti et al., 2010; Gasser et al., 2018).

Encountering bias at school also has consequences for students' mental health. Okonofua and colleagues (2016) review the substantial evidence that racially biased school discipline practices have harmful mental health outcomes for racial-ethnic minority students. Wong et al. (2003) followed students from ninth to twelfth grade and found student reports of racial discrimination at school were associated with lower self-esteem among minoritized students over time. Greene et al. (2006) similarly followed students identifying as Black, Latino, and Asian American and found adult discrimination at school to be associated with decreased self-esteem and increased depressive symptoms across time. This study also found that perceived peer discrimination remained stable over time, but perceived adult discrimination increased over time. This highlights that the way children recognize and reason about bias at school changes with development and may differ depending on the peer or student-teacher context. This research points to the need for further study of how children and adolescents think about adult versus peer bias at school.

Creating Inclusive and Fair Classrooms: What Comes Next

Developmental research has explored how children think about social inequalities (Burkholder et al., 2021; Elenbaas & Killen, 2016; Olson et al., 2012; Rizzo & Killen, 2016), the role of group identity in these scenarios (Elenbaas et al., 2016), and the role of group identity in peer inclusion/exclusion contexts (Cooley et al., 2019). Meanwhile, educational research has established the pervasive presence of teacher racial bias (İnan-Kaya & Rubie-Davies, 2022; Starck et al., 2020; Tenenbaum & Ruck, 2007) and the associated negative impacts of bias and discrimination at school, primarily for racial-ethnic minority students (Gasser et al., 2018; Greene et al., 2006; Peterson et al., 2016).

However, there remain important avenues of research to build our understanding of children's experience of fairness and bias in the classroom to inform interventions at both the teacher and student level. For instance, research has yet to focus on how children think about classroom inequalities that originate from teacher or peer racial bias in the classroom context. The teacher-student power dynamic is unique to and salient in the classroom, yet this context has not been used as the situational basis for developmental studies that ask children about their reasoning and judgments about bias. While prior studies of how children think about authority suggest children are aware

of this power differential as they consider the moral acceptability of a teacher's lying behavior (Peng et al., 2021) or unjust directives (Gingo, 2017), research has not yet examined how children consider teacher bias in the same way. Understanding the child's experience in this way is crucial for developing interventions to reduce bias from both teachers and peers at school and for making the classroom a more fair, equitable space.

Status hierarchies perpetuate inequalities in children's lives by benefiting or constraining access to opportunities based on youth's group identity including gender, ethnicity, race, and wealth status. In many school contexts, youth experience status hierarchies created by school authorities, as biases may lead teachers to unfairly distribute leadership roles to students based on group membership. As an example, in a recent study, U.S. youth (eight- to 14 year-olds) evaluated teachers' assignments of leadership roles across three conditions: equal (assigning both European American and Latin American students), unequal majority (assigning only European American students) and unequal minority (assigning only Latin American students). Adolescents, but not children, evaluated each context differently, viewing a teacher favoring European American students as most unacceptable, followed by unequal allocations favoring Latin American students. Adolescents viewed equal allocations between the two ethnic groups as most acceptable. Adolescents also evaluated unequal leadership allocations more negatively than did children. These findings revealed that, with age, students distinguish between high and low status groups and view ethnic bias as unfair regarding the allocation of leadership roles in school contexts (Killen, Burkholder, Brey, et al., 2022). Future interventions for teachers might address the role of status in the classroom, challenging educators to recognize potential status hierarchies in the school context and how students' group identities intersect with these hierarchies.

Furthermore, findings from educational research have revealed common manifestations of teacher racial bias, such as differential expectations, grading, discipline, and speech directed at students based on their ethnic or racial identity (Čiuladienė & Račelytė, 2016; Tenenbaum & Ruck, 2007). These findings can now be used to inform research protocols and stimuli in developmental science focused on both children and teachers. In addition, research should also explore the factors that enable teachers to address bias in the classroom through strategies such as discussing issues of race and discrimination openly with students. One such ongoing study of teacher perspectives uses new measures to gain a more nuanced picture of how teachers think about the role of their students' social identities in their education (Teacher Race Talk Survey; Milner, 2017) and how teachers think about the malleability of prejudice itself

(Theories of Prejudice Scale; Carr et al., 2012), potentially revealing important teacher beliefs and perceptions that prior measures of teacher bias have failed to capture (DeCuir-Gunby & Bindra, 2022; Glock & Kovacs, 2013) (see Kaufman et al., 2022). Theory of prejudice, or having the mindset that prejudice is more malleable, has been associated with a greater willingness to discuss race and have interracial interactions (Carr et al., 2012). Thus, further study of these measures among teachers can inform interventions that might address teacher and student beliefs about prejudice as a tool to build a willingness to engage on issues of bias in the classroom.

We propose that research needs to pay particular attention to elementary and middle school aged children, as much of the current research on student-reported experiences of teacher bias and discrimination focuses on high school students (Crystal et al., 2010; Greene et al., 2006; Wong et al., 2003), leaving more to learn about when and how awareness of classroom racial bias emerges in childhood. Similarly, much of the current literature on outcomes of teacher bias focuses on these outcomes for racial-ethnic minority students (Greene et al., 2006; Wong et al., 2003). While it is crucial to identify these negative outcomes for minoritized students so that policy and interventions can aim to mitigate such consequences, research must also examine how White and other majority group students process bias in the classroom, especially in light of research showing that teacher behaviors toward minority students affect majority student ethnic out-group attitudes (Geerlings et al., 2019).

Importantly, Killen and Rutland (2022) note that creating inclusive classrooms is not only a research issue but is also a policy issue affected by socio-historical trends and events. Advancements in addressing prejudice in the classroom have been hindered by disruptions to schooling from the COVID-19 pandemic and by the rise of politically polarized discourse around educating children about structural racial inequality. Hindrances like these make the need for evidence-based interventions and educational policies for creating inclusive classrooms that much more urgent. To inform such policy, further developmental research is needed to understand how children perceive teacher bias, how teachers perceive their own bias, and how teachers perceive their students' intergroup behavior.

Conclusions

Children's concepts of fairness and equality develop in an environment laden with the social hierarchies of the surrounding culture, and children must navigate moral decision making and group identity concerns in this milieu. We discussed the social reasoning

developmental model as a robust paradigm which aids in understanding the intersection of moral reasoning, group identity, and social norms. Recent research on how children think about moral issues such as social inclusion and resource allocation in intergroup peer contexts reveals novel findings about how children navigate multiple considerations in everyday settings.

We propose that in the classroom, children's group identities and moral concerns may particularly come into conflict in the context of teacher or peer bias. The classroom is a crucial context for moral development which research has yet to fully explore, especially for understanding how children think about intergroup inequalities caused by an authority figure. Current research on teacher bias, its effects on student intergroup behavior, and associated outcomes for minoritized students reflects the integration of concerns about morality (fair treatment of others) as well as group norms and group identity. Knowledge about how children identify bias in the classroom and how they think about rectifying or addressing such biases informs interventions and policies to support the creation of inclusive and fair classrooms.

References

- Abrams, D., Hogg, M. A., & Marques, J. M. (Eds.). (2004). *The social psychology of inclusion and exclusion*. Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203496176>
- Abrams, D., & Rutland, A. (2008). The development of subjective group dynamics. In S. R. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup relations and attitudes in childhood through adulthood* (pp. 47–65). Oxford University Press.
- Berti, C., Molinari, L., & Speltini, G. (2010). Classroom justice and psychological engagement: Students' and teachers' representations. *Social Psychology of Education, 13*(4), 541–556. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-010-9128-9>
- Burkholder, A. R., D'Esther, A. P., & Killen, M. (2019). Intergroup relationships, context, and prejudice in childhood. In H. Fitzgerald, D. Johnson, D. Qin, F. Villarruel, & J. Norton (Eds.), *Handbook of children and prejudice: Integrating research, practice and policy*. (pp. 115–130). Springer Press. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-12228-7_6
- Burkholder, A. R., Elenbaas, L., & Killen, M. (2021). Giving priority to race or wealth in peer group contexts involving social inclusion. *Developmental Psychology, 57*(5), 651–661. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0001178>
- Carpendale, J. I. M. (2000). Kohlberg and Piaget on stages and moral reasoning. *Developmental Review, 20*(2), 181–205. <https://doi.org/10.1006/drev.1999.0500>
- Carr, P. B., Dweck, C. S., & Pauker, K. (2012). "Prejudiced" behavior without prejudice? Beliefs about the malleability of prejudice affect interracial interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103*(3), 452–471. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028849>
- Čiuladienė, G., & Račelytė, D. (2016). Perceived unfairness in teacher-student conflict situations: Students' point of view.

- Polish Journal of Applied Psychology*, 14, 49–66. <https://doi.org/10.1515/pjap-2015-0049>
- Cooley, S., Burkholder, A. R., & 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>
- Crystal, D. S., Killen, M., & Ruck, M. D. (2010). Fair treatment by authorities is related to children's and adolescents' evaluations of interracial exclusion. *Applied Developmental Science*, 14(3), 125–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2010.493067>
- Dalbert, C., & Stoerber, J. (2006). The personal belief in a just world and domain-specific beliefs about justice at school and in the family: A longitudinal study with adolescents. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 30(3), 200–207. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025406063638>
- DeCuir-Gunby, J. T., & Bindra, V. G. (2022). How does teacher bias influence students?: An introduction to the special issue on teachers' implicit attitudes, instructional practices, and student outcomes. *Learning and Instruction*, 78, Article 101523. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2021.101523>
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Saguy, T. (2015). Color-blindness and commonality: Included but invisible? *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(11), 1518–1538. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764215580591>
- Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., Smoak, N., & Gaertner, S. L. (2009). The nature of contemporary racial prejudice: Insight from implicit and explicit measures of attitudes. In R. E. Petty, R. H. Fazio, & P. Briñol Turnes (Eds.), *Attitudes: Insights from the new implicit measures* (pp. 165–192).
- 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>
- 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/10.1037/dev0000550>
- Elenbaas, L., & Killen, M. (2016). Children rectify inequalities for disadvantaged groups. *Developmental Psychology*, 52(8), 1318–1329. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000154>
- 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>
- Gasser, L., Grütter, J., Buholzer, A., & Wettstein, A. (2018). Emotionally supportive classroom interactions and students' perceptions of their teachers as caring and just. *Learning and Instruction*, 54, 82–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2017.08.003>
- Geerlings, J., Thijs, J., & Verkuyten, M. (2019). Preaching and practicing multicultural education: Predicting students' outgroup attitudes from perceived teacher norms and perceived teacher–classmate relations. *Journal of School Psychology*, 75, 89–103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2019.07.003>
- Gingo, M. (2017). Children's reasoning about deception and defiance as ways of resisting parents' and teachers' directives. *Developmental Psychology*, 53(9), 1643–1655. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000350>
- Glidden, J., D'Estre, A., & Killen, M. (2021). Morally-relevant theory of mind mediates the relationship between group membership and moral judgments. *Cognitive Development*, 57, Article 100976. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2020.100976>
- Glock, S., & Kovacs, C. (2013). Educational psychology: Using insights from implicit attitude measures. *Educational Psychology Review*, 25(4), 503–522. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-013-9241-3>
- 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(2), 218–236. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.42.2.218>
- Grusec, J. E. (2019). *Principles of effective parenting: How socialization works*. Guilford Press.
- Guerrero, S., Cascado, C., Sausa, M., & Enesco, I. (2017). My teacher is wrong: Preschoolers' opposition to non-conventional statements. *Early Child Research Quarterly*, 39, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2016.11.001>
- Helwig, C. C., To, S., Wang, Q., Liu, C., & Yang, S. (2014). Judgments and reasoning about parental discipline involving induction and psychological control in China and Canada. *Child Development*, 85(3), 1150–1167. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12183>
- 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. <http://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12393>
- Inan-Kaya, G., & Rubie-Davies, C. M. (2022). Teacher classroom interactions and behaviours: Indications of bias. *Learning and Instruction*, 78, Article 101516. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2021.101516>
- Jarvis, J., & Woodrow, D. (2005). Reasons for choosing a teacher training course. *Research in Education*, 73(1), 29–35. <https://doi.org/10.7227/RIE.73.3>
- Kaufman, E., Glidden, J., Yee, K. M., Sims, R. N., Burkholder, A. R., Luken Raz, K., Samuelson, A., Rumberger, J., & Killen, M. (2022). *Teaching inclusive youth: Evaluating teacher beliefs about diverse classrooms* [Unpublished manuscript]. Department of Human Development and Quantitative Methodology, University of Maryland College Park.
- Kendi, I. X. (2016). *Stamped from the beginning: The definitive history of racist ideas in America*. Bold Type Group.
- Killen, M., Burkholder, A. R., Brey, E., Cooper, D., & Pauker, K. (2022). *Detecting ethnic and gender bias in the classroom: Children's and adolescents' awareness of status hierarchies* [Unpublished manuscript]. Department of Human Development and Quantitative Methodology, University of Maryland College Park.
- Killen, M., Burkholder, A. R., D'Estre, 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, 732–750.

- <https://srcd.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/cdev.13785>
- Killen, M., & Dahl, A.** (2021). Moral reasoning enables developmental and societal changes. *Perspectives in Psychological Science*, 16(6), 1209–1225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620964076>
- Killen, M., & Rutland, A.** (2011). *Children and social exclusion: Morality, prejudice, and group identity*. Wiley/Blackwell Publishers. <http://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/10.1177/237273222111073795>
- Killen, M., & Smetana, J. G.** (2015). Origins and development of morality. In *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science: Volume 3. Socioemotional Processes* (7th Ed., pp. 701–749). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118963418.childpsy317>
- 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>
- Kuczynski, L., & De Mol, J.** (2015). Dialectical models of socialization. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science. Vol. 1: Theory and method* (pp. 1–46). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118963418.childpsy109>
- Lagattuta, K. H., & Weller, D.** (2014). Interrelations between theory of mind and morality. In M. Killen & J. G. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (2nd Ed., pp. 385–407). Psychology Press.
- Laupa, M.** (1994). “Who’s in charge?” Preschool children’s concepts of authority. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 9(1), 1–17. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0885-2006\(94\)90026-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0885-2006(94)90026-4)
- 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. Nelson (Ed.), *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination* (2nd Ed., pp. 455–483). Psychology Press.
- 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>
- Milner, H. R., IV.** (2017). Race, talk, opportunity gaps, and curriculum shifts in (teacher) education. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, 66(1), 73–94. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2381336917718804>
- Mistry, R. S., Elenbaas, L., Griffin, K. M., Nenadal, L., & Yassine, A.** (2021). Advancing developmental intergroup perspectives on social class. *Child Development Perspectives*, 15(4), 213–219. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12431>
- Mulvey, K. L.** (2016). Children’s reasoning about social exclusion: Balancing many factors. *Child Development Perspectives*, 10(1), 22–27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12157>
- 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., & Ilten-Gee, R.** (2021). *Moral education for social justice*. Teachers College Press.
- 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/10.1177/17456916166635592>
- Olson, K. R., Shutts, K., Kinzler, K. D., & Weisman, K. G.** (2012). Children associate racial groups with wealth: Evidence from South Africa. *Child Development*, 83, 1884–1899. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01819.x>
- Osterman, K. F.** (2000). Students’ need for belonging in the school community. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(3), 323–367. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543070003323>
- Pauker, K., Xu, Y., Williams, A., & Biddle, A. M.** (2016). Race essentialism and social contextual differences in children’s racial stereotyping. *Child Development*, 87(5), 1409–1422. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12592>
- Peng, Q., Jiao, Y., Zhang, J., Liu, T., & Zhou, S.** (2021). It’s hard for children to accept a teacher’s lies: Implications of authority on children’s evaluation of lies. *Cognitive Development*, 60, Article 101093. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2021.101093>
- Peterson, E. R., Rubie-Davies, C., Osborne, D., & Sibley, C.** (2016). Teachers’ explicit expectations and implicit prejudiced attitudes to educational achievement: Relations with student achievement and the ethnic achievement gap. *Learning and Instruction*, 42, 123–140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2016.01.010>
- Piaget, J.** (1965). *The moral judgment of the child*. The Free Press. (Original work published 1932).
- Rivas-Drake, D., Syed, M., Umaña-Taylor, A., Markstrom, C., French, S., Schwartz, S. J., Lee, R., & Ethnic and Racial Identity in the 21st Century Study Group.** (2014). Feeling good, happy, and proud: A meta-analysis of positive ethnic-racial affect and adjustment. *Child Development*, 85(1), 77–102. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12175>
- 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>
- Rizzo, M. T., & Killen, M.** (2020). Children’s evaluations of individually and structurally based inequalities: The role of status. *Developmental Psychology*, 56(12), 2223–2235. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0001118>
- Rubin, K. H., Bukowski, W. M., & Parker, J. G.** (2007). Peer interactions, relationships, and groups. In W. Damon, R. M. Lerner, & N. Eisenberg, *Handbook of child psychology. Volume III: Social, emotional, and personality development* (6th Ed., pp. 571–645). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <http://doi.org/10.1002/9780470147658.chpsy0310>
- 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. <http://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*, 5(3), 279–291. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691610369468>
- Rutland, A., Hitti, A., Mulvey, K. L., Abrams, D., & Killen, M. (2015). When does the in-group like the out-group? Bias among children as a function of group norms. *Psychological Science*, 26, 834–842. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615572758>
- Sebastián-Enesco, C., Guerrero, S., & Enesco, I. (2020). What makes children defy their peers? Chinese and Spanish preschoolers' decisions to trust (or not) peer consensus. *Social Development*, 29, 494–508. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sode.12416>
- Skinner, A. L., & Meltzoff, A. N. (2019). Childhood experiences and intergroup biases among children. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 13(1), 211–240. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12054>
- Smetana, J. G., & Bitz, B. (1996). Adolescents' conceptions of teachers' authority and their relations to rule violations in school. *Child Development*, 67(3), 1153–1172. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1996.tb01788.x>
- Smetana, J. G., Jambon, M., & Ball, C. (2014). The social domain approach to children's moral and social judgments. In M. Killen & J. G. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (2nd Ed., pp. 23–45). Psychology Press.
- Smetana, J. G., Rote, W. M., Jambon, M., Tasopoulos-Chan, M., Villalobos, M., & Comer, J. (2012). Developmental changes and individual differences in young children's moral judgments. *Child Development*, 83(2), 683–696. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01714.x>
- Sommerville, J. A. (2022). Developing an early awareness of fairness. In M. Killen & J. G. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (3rd Ed., pp. 153–167). Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group. <http://doi.org/10.4324/9781003047247-13>
- Starck, J. G., Riddle, T., Sinclair, S., & Warikoo, N. (2020). Teachers are people too: Examining the racial bias of teachers compared to other American adults. *Educational Researcher*, 49(4), 273–284. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X20912758>
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Hall Publishers.
- Tenenbaum, H. R., & Ruck, M. D. (2007). Are teachers' expectations different for racial minority than for European American students? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(2), 253–273. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.2.253>
- Tomasello, M. (2014). The ultra-social animal. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 44(3), 187–194. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2015>
- Tropp, L. R., & Rucinski, C. L. (2022). How implicit racial bias and concern about appearing racist shape K–12 teachers' race talk with students. *Social Psychology of Education*, 25, 697–717. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-022-09715-5>
- Turiel, E. (1983). *The development of social knowledge: Morality and convention*. Cambridge University Press.
- Turiel, E. (2002). *The culture of morality*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511613500>
- 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>
- Verkuyten, M. (2013). *Identity and cultural diversity*. Routledge Press. <http://doi.org/10.4324/9780203710142>
- Wainryb, C., & Recchia, H. E. (2014). Parent-child conversations as contexts for moral development: Why conversations, and why conversations with parents? In C. Wainryb & H. Recchia (Eds.), *Talking about right and wrong: Parent-child conversations as contexts for moral development* (pp. 3–18). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139207072.002>
- Wong, C. A., Eccles, J. S., & Sameroff, A. (2003). The influence of ethnic discrimination and ethnic identification on African American adolescents' school and socioemotional adjustment. *Journal of Personality*, 71(6), 1197–1232. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.7106012>
- Yee, K. M., Glidden, J., & Killen, M. (2022). Group norms influence children's expectations about status based on wealth and popularity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 816205. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.816205>
- Yoo, H. N., & Smetana, J. G. (2022). Distinctions between moral and conventional judgments from early to middle childhood: A meta-analysis of social domain theory research. *Developmental Psychology*, 58(5), 874–889. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0001330>