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The study of the development of social reasoning requires the analysis of the complex phenomenon in social interactions.\(^1\) One of the principal ways to understand the social reasoning of children and adolescents is to study how they think, feel, and judge about critical issues in their peer relationships such as friendship, exclusion, identity, and victimization. Especially, analyses on the judgments of children and adolescents on peer exclusion, based on social-domain approach,\(^2\) have revealed multifaceted features of social and

---

moral reasoning by investigating their judgments on exclusion of peers based on race, gender, or personality in diverse situations across various countries such as Denmark, Japan, Korea, Netherlands, Switzerland, the U.K. and the U.S. Among the various types of exclusion, children and adolescents assessed peer exclusion based on race, ethnicity, or nationality as less acceptable than exclusion based on gender, personality, or group functioning, using moral justifications more frequently in the evaluation of race-based exclusion than the other types of exclusion. This present study investigated the social and moral reasoning of children and adolescents by proposing some complex situations for the exclusion of a biracial peer in South Korea.

Many empirical studies have demonstrated that “certain types of social interactions constitute coherent systems revolving around a particular social domain.” For examples, the moral domain of social reasoning is based on the concepts of welfare (harm), justice, fairness, and rights, which are neither arbitrary nor dependent on context. Conventional reasoning in social exclusion tends to appear as considerations about whether to exclude or include a certain peer for a better function of a peer group. Personal judgments consist of the preferences and choices of an individual over one’s

---


4) Killen et al., 2010; Moller & Tenenbaum, 2011; Park & Killen, 2010.


privacy, selection of friends, and individual activities in leisure time.8) Children and adolescents used these three distinct domains in systematic ways. For example, adolescents in Netherlands evaluated less negatively acts based on a personal choice (i.e., wearing a headscarf) than those considered moral issues (i.e., discriminating others by sexual orientations).9) Thus, the social domain approach is a powerful instrument for systematically delving into complicated social and relational issues, such as children’s judgments of the exclusion of biracial peers within various contexts.

In general, exclusion based on gender or race and prejudice or stigma is judged morally wrong and considered to cause harm to the excluded.10) It is, however, important to acknowledge that some types of exclusion might be necessary or inevitable in social lives. A social group may exclude individuals who do not meet the criteria for group membership, in order to make the group function according to its goals.11) For example, slow runners are excluded from a school track team. Personal relationships necessarily include some people, but they also have boundaries that exclude others.12) These types of exclusion need


to be distinguished from social exclusion based on gender or race and prejudice or stigma. Thus, exclusion is a multifaceted social phenomenon which may not always be morally condemned but approved socially or personally according to adequate evaluations of the contexts and targets of exclusion. Thus, this study investigated the judgments of Korean children and adolescents the exclusion of a biracial peer in three different contexts: personal gathering, group activity, and public facility.

**Social and Moral Development and Peer exclusion**

The research of children’s reasoning in peer exclusion provides invaluable resources for the understanding of social development. As children and adolescents use and coordinate distinct domains of social reasoning in the evaluation of peer exclusion, researchers can examine common characteristics and age, gender, and cultural differences in the developmental process of social reasoning found that older children and adolescents used more reasons based on the proper functioning of groups or personal preferences in the selection of group members or friends than did younger children. They also found that adolescents used more than younger children justifications based on fairness reasoning in the evaluation of peer exclusion while younger ones used more than adolescents empathy. However, the age-related decrease between 7th and 10th grade European American boys was found in the evaluation of exclusion based on gender in the context of friendship. They suggested that further studies would necessary to understand children’s understanding of fairness and equality in the context of peer exclusion. Thus, this study investigated how child’s
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13) Killen et al. (2002). See also Nucci, 1996; Nucci, Killen, & Smetana, 1996 for age variations in the personal domain; and, Turiel, 1983 for age variations in the conventional domain.
14) Davidson, Turiel, & Black, 1983; Smetana, 1981 for age variations in the moral domain.
reasoning changes with age in the use of concepts of welfare, fairness, and rights in the moral domain.

Along with the developmental trajectory in the moral domain, such as age-related decrease or increase of fairness reasoning, researchers should pay attention to the developmental pattern in the coordination of the moral domain with non-moral domains in order to have a broad picture of moral development. Nucci and Turiel (2009) suggested that moral reasoning develops together with the understanding of social conventional norms and concepts and realms of personal decision and choice. They found that the frequency of moral choice (i.e., giving priority to moral reasons over conventional or personal reasons) is lower among early adolescents (10 to 14 years old) than among children (7 to 8 years old) and older adolescents (16 to 17 years old). Instead of a unidirectional increase of moral choice with age, a U-shape pattern was found in moral development. This developmental pattern was revealed in the reasoning of children and adolescents on conflict situations regarding direct and indirect harm and help. When some features of conflict situations were ambiguous, younger adolescents were more likely than children and older adolescents to select a non-moral, personal choice (i.e., giving priority to a personal reason over moral reasons). This study systematically investigates age differences, both in children’s reasoning in the moral domain and in their coordination of moral reasoning with non-moral reasoning in various complex situations.

**Biracial Children in Korea**

Currently, about 2% of the population of South Korea is not ethnically Korean, which is a result of the rapid growth in migrant workers and arranged international marriages since the 1990s. Most of these workers and spouses come from other Asian countries, such as China, Vietnam, the Philippines,

Japan, and Pakistan. The number of children aged 16 or younger from international marriages was 58,007 in 2008, accounting for 6.5% of all children in Korea (“KoreaFaces,” 2008). These recent demographic changes have brought some race-related issues, such as racial discrimination, social exclusion, human rights for migrant workers, and difficulties in communication. Some scholars and researchers in Korea have examined social and psychological issues regarding the development and welfare of biracial children from the disciplines of sociology, social welfare, clinical psychology, education policy, linguistics, and anthropology.16)

Nam and Lee (2009) found that the biracial children of multicultural families are highly distressed by economic and physical environments and show a higher rate of depression as compared to the Korean children of typical Korean families.17) Jung and Woo (2007) reported problems in the social adjustments of biracial children such as bullying and marginalization. They also developed national identity issues: 59.6% of biracial children thought of themselves as foreigners in Korea, and only 9.5% thought of themselves as Korean. In addition to these problems, some biracial children showed delays in language development and many were distressed by low academic achievement. Findings from previous studies are mainly related to the adjustment problems of biracial children and methods of intervention. Few studies have dealt with the judgments of Korean children and adolescents about their interactions with biracial peers, from a developmental psychological perspective. Therefore, along with these approaches, it is necessary to study the social thinking and moral judgments of Korean children on the exclusion of biracial peers, in order to understand and resolve issues within the social relationships of biracial children. Furthermore, biracial

16) Bae, 2006; Choi, 2009; Han, 2006; Hwang & Kim, 2008.
children have rarely studied in the field of peer relationships as the targets of peer exclusion.

*Common reasons for peer exclusion*

Previous studies have investigated what kinds of personal or social characteristics children and adolescents use to justify the exclusion of the peers. Exclusion based on personal reasons such as angry, sad, or shy traits and interpersonal issues such as lack of common interests or bullying were judged more acceptable than exclusion based on invariable individual factors such as race or matters of personal preferences such as dying hair or wearing a headscarf.\(^{19}\) On the other hand, Leets and Sunwolf (2005) directly studied the rules adolescents employ to exclude peers from social groups.\(^{20}\) The most common reason for exclusion was a perceived lack of physical or social attractiveness of a peer. The adolescents tended to promote positive images of their groups by excluding unattractive peers. Besides unattractiveness, they judged peer exclusion as legitimate behavior to punish past wrongdoings, to prevent dangerous actions of the target of exclusion that may harm insiders, to force group loyalty for all insiders, or to protect the target peer from the anticipated hostile behavior of insiders (i.e., benevolent protection). Although this study did not provide a domain distinction among the reasons or rules with which adolescents justify and permit peer exclusion, some are related to moral reasoning (e.g., preventing harm) and other more important reasons were related to the conventional and personal reasoning (e.g., maintain a positive group image and selecting an attractive friend). It is important to know whether some personal issues have positive or negative implications for the image or function of peer group. Thus, an individual characteristic in

\(^{19}\) Killen et al., 2010; Malti et al., 2012; Park et al., 2003; Park & Killen, 2010.  
\(^{20}\) Leets and Sunwolf, 2005.
social context such as unattractiveness of a peer can be used frequently for the exclusion of the peer unlike other personal characteristics with weak interpersonal implications.

Researchers in the area of social identity suggest the tendency of people to pursue positive images of their groups by maintaining a distinction between their groups and those of others, by favoring their groups, and by excluding deviant or undesirable members from their groups.\(^\text{21}\) The issue of identity goes beyond the realm of conventional reasoning, such as group functioning or image, according to some scholars. Giddens (1986; see Kaspersenn, 2000) proposed that moral status is associated with social identities.\(^\text{22}\) When a person is identified by one’s country of citizenship, his or her basic rights are secured by the nation. Unfortunately, it is not unusual for undocumented migrant workers in some countries to not have the same rights or protections as native or documented people. It is also plausible that some Korean children believe that biracial peers have same or different social identities and so include or exclude them from peer groups. The issue of how they define the identity of the biracial peer may be part of their justification for the judgments of exclusion or inclusion.

**Cultural Differences in Peer Exclusion**

Over the past few decades, some researchers have maintained a sharp distinction between Western cultures (e.g., the U.S., Canada, and European countries) and non-Western cultures (e.g., China, Korea, and Japan) by characterizing the former as individualistic and the latter as collectivistic.\(^\text{23}\)

According to them, East Asians tend to make clearer distinctions between ingroup and outgroup members than do Northern Americans. If this perspective accurately reflected realities of different cultures, then certain differences in children’s judgments of exclusion could be expected between Asians and Americans. However, many criticisms have been raised against the generalizations of collectivism for Asian populations and individualism for Western ones.\(^\text{24}\) In addition, cross-cultural studies on peer exclusion have not support the sharp distinction between Western and non-Western cultures,\(^\text{25}\) but have produced complex results that show cultural differences among Asian countries.\(^\text{26}\)

Park and Killen (2010) found that both Korean and American children shared general tendencies in the evaluation of exclusion: Peer exclusion in the friendship context was viewed more acceptable than that based on race and personal reasoning was used more for the former than for the latter.\(^\text{27}\) These cross cultural studies also found some cultural differences. For example, Korean children were much less willing to exclude a child from a peer group than were Japanese and American children. No gender differences were found only in the Korean samples.\(^\text{28}\) In order to explain these subtle differences, more studies are necessary. However, it is manifest that Korean, Japanese, and American children cannot be categorized into such two cultural groups as collectivist and individualist. A simple categorization of cultural phenomena does not contribute in the investigation of a multifaceted social phenomenon such as peer exclusion. This study examined cultural aspects of Korean


\(^{25}\) Killen, Crystal, & Watanabe, 2002; Park & Killen, 2010.

\(^{26}\) Park, Killen, Crystal, & Watanabe, 2003.

\(^{27}\) Park and Killen, 2010.

\(^{28}\) Park et al., 2003.
children and adolescents in the exclusion of a biracial peer.

The Present Study

This study was based on a unique research method in the examination of the social reasoning of children and adolescents in the hypothetical situations of exclusion. The typical research based on social-domain approach usually starts an interview with a straightforward situation of peer exclusion (e.g., a peer is excluded simply because of his/her race or gender) and then add several probing questions (e.g., What if your parents ask you to exclude or include the peer?). As previous studies already examined the peer exclusion based on race or ethnicity in straightforward situation across cultures, this study focused on the social reasoning of children and adolescents on the exclusion of a biracial peer in complex situations, which included implicitly or explicitly some other factors of the subject of judgment or the target of the exclusion than their ethnic backgrounds.

First, this research examined contextual variations and age differences in the judgments of Korean children and adolescents on exclusion. Based on previous findings, it was hypothesized that participants were more likely to endorse exclusion in the personal relationship context than in the group activity and public facility contexts as they tended to accept a possibility to exclude a peer in a personal gathering. Age differences were expected in the judgment of exclusion mainly in the personal and group contexts, not in the public context. As the vast majority in each of the three age groups was likely to reject the exclusion of a biracial peer from public facilities, no age differences were expected. This study included participants from the fourth, seventh, and tenth

29) Turiel, 1983 for further information about a interview method from social-domain approach.  
30) Gieling et al., 2010; Killen et al., 2002; Killen & Stangor, 2001; Malti et al., 2012; Moller & Tenenbaum, 2011; Park & Killen, 2010.  
31) Killen et al., 2002.
grades. Helwig(1998) suggested that a majority of Canadian ten year-olds understand the universality and non-rule contingency of rights.\textsuperscript{32} Therefore, fourth graders(\(M_{age}=9.09\)) are an age group with which to adequately study developmental changes regarding their understanding of the key moral concept of rights.

Second, age differences were investigated in the use of justification categories in order to find a developmental trend regarding children’s reasoning in the moral domain. Previous studies showed mixed results regarding age-related differences in justification categories in moral reasoning.\textsuperscript{33} Thus, it was premature, due to the inconsistency in the previous findings, to make specific hypotheses regarding age differences in the use of moral rationales. The examination of age differences in the use of moral rationales in this study would strengthen empirical underpinnings in the area of moral development.

Third, it was hypothesized that the participants who justified their judgments with moral reasons were less likely to change their judgments than were those who justified their judgments with personal and conventional reasons. Participants would more easily change their decisions based on personal reasoning than moral reasoning in conflicts with their peer group or with authority, since moral judgments, unlike judgments in the personal or conventional domain, are not heavily influenced by variations in locations, contexts, and external influences.\textsuperscript{34}

---

\textsuperscript{32} Helwig, 1998.
\textsuperscript{33} Turiel, 1983; Killen et al., 2002.
\textsuperscript{34} Turiel, 1983.
Methods

1. Participants

The sample consisted of 56 girls and 55 boys from urban schools in Seoul in South Korea. There were 19 female and 18 male fourth graders ($M = 9.09$ years, $SD = .37$, range 8.33 to 10.17 years), 16 female and 16 male seventh graders ($M = 11.92$ years, $SD = .31$, range 11.33 to 12.5 years), and 16 female and 16 male tenth graders ($M = 14.90$ years, $SD = .34$, range 13.83 to 15.42 years), respectively. Teachers at those schools recruited volunteers for this study. All participants were Korean; none of them were biracial. Their racial backgrounds were verified by their teachers. Parental permission and participant assent were received prior to interviews.

2. Procedure and design

The research assessed judgments of racial exclusion in hypothetical situations through 20-25 minute interviews. Interviews were conducted on a one-to-one basis at school. Each participant was informed that his or her interview data was anonymous and confidential. Then, scripted stories were read to the participant one by one and questions followed each story. The interviews were conducted in Korean. All interviews were audiotaped and transcribed.

The stories depicted the biracial child as half-Filipino and half-Korean, thereby implying that he or she probably had darker skin than had Korean peers. The Philippines is one of the major Asian countries from which women emigrate for international marriages in Korea. In order to make the story realistic in the public facility context where a biracial child is not admitted to a public swimming pool, this study chose a half-Filipino child who tends to be distinguishable from other Korean children by his or her
appearance. The Korean-Chinese and Korean-Japanese biracial children differ little from mainstream Korean children in appearance, while Korean-Filipino and Korean-Indonesian children differ in appearance from most Korean children. In all stories, the main character who made a judgment was a Korean child, while the target of exclusion or inclusion was a biracial child. Both of them were assumed to be peers of the same gender and grade as the participant. Gender appropriate names were used for interviews.

Each interview included three sets of stories consisting of one initial and two conflict situations in three contexts (i.e., personal relationship, group activity, public facility). The initial situations represented three prototypical events in social interactions (i.e., invitation to a birthday party, selection of a chorus member, and admission to a public pool). Then, a pair of conflict situations between the domains of social reasoning was presented in each context. A conflict situation was based on the judgment made in the initial situation. The conflict was introduced by presenting participants with an opposing judgment with reasons from domains other than the domain of the main event in the initial situation. (See Figure 1 and Appendix A for an interview procedure.)

In the personal relationship context, the initial situation involved a mainstream Korean child who was thinking about whether to invite a biracial peer to his or her birthday party. In the story, the birthday child did not like the biracial peer although he or she knew that the peer wanted to be friends with him or her. The participant was asked if it was all right for the Korean child not to invite the biracial peer (judgment). Then, the participant was asked to explain why he or she thought that it was all right or not all right to exclude the biracial peer (justification).

After the initial judgment, two conflict situations were presented to the participant. The first conflict situation entailed the introduction of information from the conventional domain that opposed the initial judgment of the
participant. If the participant had judged the exclusion of the biracial peer from the birthday party as not all right, he or she was asked to evaluate the conflict situation that was introduced by the friends of the birthday child: They said that they did not want the biracial peer to join the party because the peer was not part of their group (i.e., social pressure and tradition). Conversely, if the participant had judged exclusion of the biracial peer from the birthday party as all right, he or she was asked to evaluate the conflict situation introduced by the friends of the birthday child: They said that they wanted the biracial peer to join the party because the peer was part of their group (i.e., social pressure and tradition).

The second conflict situation entailed the introduction of information from the moral domain which contradicted the initial judgment of the participant. If the participant had judged the exclusion of the biracial peer from the birthday party as not all right, he or she was asked to evaluate the conflict situation introduced by the moral conviction of the birthday child: He or she came to believe that it was fair to not invite the biracial peer to the party because the peer was not a “pure” Korean (i.e., fairness and rights). Conversely, if the participant had judged the exclusion of the biracial peer from the birthday party as all right, he or she was asked to evaluate the conflict situation introduced by the moral conviction of the birthday child: He or she came to believe that it was unfair to not invite the peer to the party because the peer was a “mixed-blood” (i.e., fairness and rights).
In the group activity context and public facility context, the same structure and questions were introduced as in the personal relationship context. In the group context, the initial situation involved a “pure” Korean child leader of a boys and girls chorus who was thinking about whether to allow a biracial peer with musical talent to join a chorus that had never had a “mixed-blood” as a member. After the initial judgment of the exclusion, two conflict situations were presented to the participant. Personal (i.e., personal choice and preference) and moral (i.e., fairness and rights) reasons were introduced, respectively, to generate conflict situations. When a child decided to admit or not admit a biracial peer to a chorus, two conflicts were posed, respectively, by (1) introducing the affection or hatred of the peer by the chorus leader (i.e., personal issue), and (2) introducing the moral concerns of the chorus
leader that the selection was fair or unfair (i.e., moral issue). (See Appendix A for a complete version of the interview protocol of this study.)

In the public facility context, the initial situation involved the decision of the town council to forbid all biracial children from using public swimming pools in the town. After the initial judgment of the exclusion, two conflict situations were presented to the participant. Personal (i.e., personal choice and preference) and conventional (i.e., tradition and authority) reasons were introduced, respectively, to generate conflict situations. When a child thought it right or wrong that a town council had decided to exclude a biracial child from public pools, two conflicts were posed, respectively, by (1) introducing the information of the biracial child’s enthusiasm for swimming or the neighbors’ negative feelings toward the biracial child (i.e., personal issue), and (2) introducing the statement that a tradition or a past practice was different from his or her initial judgment (i.e., conventional issue). (See Appendix A for a complete version of the interview protocol of this study.)

In the interview, the order of contexts (personal, group, and public) varied to counterbalance any order effects. In each context, the initial situation was presented first, and two conflict situations followed. The order of the two conflict situations was counterbalanced. For example, the conflict with conventional issue and that with the moral issue were counterbalanced in the personal relationship context.

3. Domains and categories of justifications

Based on Killen et al.’s (2002) and previous researches according to domain theory, eight justification categories were selected and defined in the process of data analysis. They are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 *Justification Coding Categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Justification categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>1. <em>Fairness</em>: Appeals to upholding fairness in the decision-making process of exclusion or in the treatment of persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <em>Welfare</em>: Appeals to the psychological difficulties, physical harm, and/or social deficits of the biracial peer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. <em>Rights</em>: Appeals to the individual right for opportunities to make friends, participate in group activities, and use public facilities, or to the possession of certain rights according to the status of the biracial peer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>4. <em>Group functioning</em>: Appeals to the enhancement of group capacity, or group harmony or teamwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. <em>Social tradition</em>: Appeals to traditions of a group or society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. <em>Authority</em>: Appeals to the authority of a group leader, and the jurisdiction of the local council or government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. <em>Social influence</em>: Appeals to the influence of others on decisions and consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>8. <em>Personal choice</em>: Appeals to personal freedom or individual preferences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Coding and reliability

The data included two types of responses, judgments and justifications, for the three initial situations and three pairs of conflict situations in the three contexts. Participant's judgments of *all right to not invite, admit, or allow* were classified as “the endorsement of exclusion,” whereas those of *not all right to not invite, admit, or allow*, as “the rejection of exclusion.” The classification system of justification categories in Table 1 was used for the
coding of the reasons for judgments. One main category is coded as long as a participant clearly explains why he or she is making that judgment.

Reliability coding examined the data of judgments and justifications using 36% of the interviews. An independent rater was trained to use the coding system of this study and scored 36 samples without knowing the goals of this study. The samples were chosen evenly from the three age groups: Six boys and six girls were randomly selected from each group. Using Cohen’s kappa, agreement between the two raters on judgment was 0.99, and inter-rater agreement on justifications was 0.91.

Results

1. Variations in judgments of exclusion by context and grade

Participants judged whether it was acceptable to exclude a biracial peer in three contexts (i.e., personal relationship, group activity, public facility). In order to examine whether they differentiated the judgments of peer exclusion by context, age, and gender, a 3 x 3 x 2 (Context of exclusion: personal relationship, group activity, public facility x Grade: fourth, seventh, tenth x Gender: female, male) ANOVA (Analysis of variance) with repeated measures on the factor of context was conducted. Post-hoc analyses by Tukey’s HSD pairwise comparisons followed. Proportions of negative judgments of exclusion in initial situations are presented in Table 2.
Table 2 Proportions of Negative Judgments of Exclusion in Initial Situations (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Female (n = 19)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (n = 18)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (n = 37)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>Female (n = 16)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (n = 16)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (n = 32)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>Female (n = 16)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (n = 16)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (n = 32)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(n = 101)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PR: personal relationship context; GA: group activity context; PF: public facility context.

This analysis showed a main effect for context, $F(2, 190) = 22.50$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .44$. The proportions of negative judgments about exclusion differed significantly by context. Participants were less likely to judge exclusion as wrong in the personal relationship context (59%) than in the group activity context (83%) and public facility context (92%). A significant interaction between context and grade were also found, $F(4, 190) = 4.68$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .44$. Tenth graders were less likely to reject exclusion in the personal context.
(28%) than in the group context (75%) and the public context (95%); and seventh graders, less in the personal context (69%) than in the public context (97%). Fourth graders showed no significant differences between the contexts. In terms of age differences, tenth graders (28%) were less likely to reject exclusion in the personal context than are the fourth graders (69%) and seventh graders (78%). No gender differences were found.

2. Variations in justifications for judgments of exclusion by context and grade

Participants used justification categories (i.e., fairness, welfare, rights, group functioning, tradition, authority, social influence, personal choice) to ground their judgments about exclusion of a biracial peer in the personal relationship, group activity, and public facility contexts. Analyses of all eight categories employing 3 x 3 x 2 (Context of exclusion: personal, group, public x Grade: fourth, seventh, tenth x Gender: female, male) ANOVAs with repeated measures on the factor of context examined how context, age, and gender independently and interactively affect the social reasoning of children for the judgments of exclusion. Post-hoc analyses by Tukey’s HSD pairwise comparisons followed. The proportions of the categories of justifications are presented in Table 3.

In examining the fairness category for the judgments of exclusion, a main effect for grade was found, $F(2, 95) = 12.58, p < .001, \eta^2 = .58$. Tenth graders (30%) used it more frequently than did fourth graders (7%) and seventh graders (7%). In addition, a significant interaction effect between context and grade was found, $F(4, 190) = 5.64, p < .001, \eta^2 = .58$. In the public context, tenth graders (69%) were more likely than seventh graders (41%) and fourth graders (19%) to use fairness reasoning; and, seventh graders used it more than did fourth graders. In the group activity context, tenth graders (22%) used it more than did fourth graders (3%). As an example of fairness reasoning in the group activity context, a tenth grade
female said, “It is fair to allow the biracial peer to join the choir. It is not wise to keep the outdated tradition [...] now our society and world are changing. It is wrong to follow that kind of tradition.” Participants who used fairness reasoning tended to reject customary practices that stand against the ideas of equality and justice and accepted authority only when leaders made fair and reasonable judgments. No gender differences were found.

In the use of welfare category for the judgments of exclusion, no significant age differences were found. As an example of welfare reasoning in the personal relationship context, a seventh grade male said, “It is not all right not to invite Po (i.e., biracial) to the birthday party [...] if he is not invited, he will be disappointed. Negative emotions such as hatred will bother him. Min (i.e., Korean) should respect Po’s desire to become a friend with him.” Many participants who used welfare reasoning concerned about the psychological difficulties that a biracial peer would experience due to exclusion.

In the use of rights category for the judgments of exclusion, a main effect for grade was found, $F(2, 95) = 11.97, p < .001, \eta^2 = .45$. Fourth graders (46%) and seventh graders (43%) used it more than did tenth graders (16%). This tendency was consistent in the personal and public contexts. No age differences were found in the group context. As an example of rights reasoning in the personal relationship context, a fourth grade female said, “Su (i.e., biracial) should be invited, because she is also one of her friends . . . Min (i.e., Korean) should not disregard her because her parent is Filipino.” Many fourth graders viewed the biracial peer as a friend of the Korean child in the story because they were peers and living in the same town or in Korea. Because of the commonalities of age and living place, the biracial peer was considered as a friend with a right to be invited to the birthday party. This kind of rights reasoning appeared less in the justifications of tenth graders. No gender differences were found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>PF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral Domain</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventional Domain</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Domain</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* PR: personal relationship context; GA: group activity context; PF: public facility context. Each domain represents the total of its categories. In each context, the sum of three domains and the sum of eight categories are 100%, respectively.
In the use of the group functioning category for the judgments of exclusion, no age differences were found. Group functioning was the most common reason for both rejection and endorsement of exclusion in the group activity context. Other rationales in the conventional domain were used limitedly. As an example of group functioning reasoning to reject the exclusion of a biracial peer in the group activity context, a seventh grade female said, “She should be allowed to join the chorus. Even though there is the tradition that all members should be Koreans, it is better to include her because she is talented in music. She will make the chorus better.” Those who used the group functioning reasoning to include the biracial peer emphasized his or her musical talent as contributing to the development of the chorus. As an example of group functioning reasoning to endorse the judgment of exclusion, a female in the seventh grade said, “We should sing a song when we are pleasant and cheerful. Unless we sing joyfully, we are not happy. Then, the audience would not be satisfied. So it is not necessary to accept someone who can cause trouble in the group.” She thought the group harmony among the members of a chorus was more important for the achievement of the goals of that specific group activity than were individual talents.

In the use of personal choice category, a significant interaction effect between context and grade was found, $F(4, 190) = 4.60, p < .01, \eta^2 = .54$. Tenth graders (53%) were more likely than fourth graders (22%) and seventh graders (28%) to use personal choice reasoning in the personal context. As an example of personal choice reasoning in the personal relationship context, a tenth grade male said, “It is better not to invite him. Min (i.e., Korean) does not like him. There is no reason to invite anybody he does not like to his birthday party. It would be the same even if he was not biracial, but Korean.” Older participants tended to value more personal preferences in the
birthday party situation than did younger ones. Many of them tried to make it clear that they condoned the exclusion of the biracial peer not because of his or her racial background but because of the personal preference of the birthday person. No gender differences were found.

3. Conflict situations: change between initial and conflict judgments

In the conflict situations, results regarding a general tendency and effects of age and gender in judgments and justifications for judgments generally confirmed the findings of initial situations. For example, an age-related decrease in the use of rights reasoning was found in the conflict situations of the personal context as they were found in the initial situation of the same context (see Hwang, 2011). Thus, this section focused on analyses of the change between initial and conflict judgments. After their initial judgments, participants were presented with conflicting opinions from other domains which did not correspond with the domain of the main event of the context. It was investigated whether the domains of justifications for initial judgments were associated with the change of judgment. The proportions of change of judgments between initial and conflict situations are presented along with the domains of justifications for the initial judgments in Table 4.
Table 4 Proportions of Change in Conflict Situation (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Moral</th>
<th>Conventional</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PR-C</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21/61)</td>
<td>(4/6)</td>
<td>(23/34)</td>
<td>(48/101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>48***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18/61)</td>
<td>(3/6)</td>
<td>(27/34)</td>
<td>(48/101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-P</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9/38)</td>
<td>(27/62)</td>
<td>(0/1)</td>
<td>(36/101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9/38)</td>
<td>(22/62)</td>
<td>(0/1)</td>
<td>(31/101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF-P</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(35/93)</td>
<td>(5/8)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(40/101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF-C</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22/93)</td>
<td>(6/8)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(28/101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(114/384)</td>
<td>(67/152)</td>
<td>(50/70)</td>
<td>(231/606)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It was hypothesized that the participants who justified the initial judgment with moral reasons would be less likely than those with conventional or personal reasons to change their judgments. Using one-way ANOVA and Bonferroni post-hoc comparisons, it was examined how the domains of justifications influenced the change of judgment. In the personal relationship context (PR), the differences between the three domains of justifications were statistically significant in the change of judgment for both conventional conflict situation (PR-C), $F(2, 98) = 5.74, p < .01, \eta^2 = .06$; and moral conflict situation (PR-M), $F(2, 98) = 13.50, p < .001, \eta^2 = .22$. In both situations, the judgments justified with moral reasons were less likely to change in conflict situations than were
those with the personal reason. Thirty four percent (PR-C) and 30% (PR-M) of the participants who used moral reasons in the initial situations changed their judgments, whereas 68% (PR-C) and 79% (PR-M) of the participants who used personal reasons changed their judgments. In the conventional conflict situation of the public facility context (PF-C), the difference between the moral domain and conventional domain of justifications were statistically significant in the change of judgment, $F(2, 98) = 5.37, p < .01, \eta^2 = .08$. The judgments justified with moral reasons (24%) were less likely to change in conflict situations than were those with conventional reasons (75%).

As an example of those who did not change the judgments, a fourth grade male said in the initial situation of the personal relationship context, “Po (i.e., biracial) will be hurt if he is not invited. It is not acceptable not to invite Po even if he does not like him.” He rejected exclusion with welfare reasoning. When he was presented with the information that the friends of the birthday boy did not want the biracial peer to be there (i.e., the conventional conflict situation of the personal relationship context), he did not change his judgment, saying, “It is still better to invite Po to the party . . . they will come to know Po better and become friends as they get along together.” He continued to reject exclusion by appealing to the rights of the biracial peer to have an opportunity to get along with peers.

Discussion

Children and adolescents in Korea face new social issues such as racial exclusion, discrimination, and cross-race friendships due to an increase in the number of biracial children. In order to understand the nature of racial problems, it is necessary to know how Korean children and adolescents think and judge social issues in various relationships with their biracial peers. The findings from this study suggest that the social reasoning of children and
adolescents on the exclusion of a biracial peer is multifaceted and systematic. In general, participants negatively judged the exclusion of the biracial peer mainly with concerns about the welfare and rights of the biracial peer and to enhance the fairness of social interactions and decision-making processes. Some participants, however, did not judge exclusion as morally wrong in some situations. Especially, adolescents were more likely to think that the personal relationship context may legitimately permit the exclusion of some peers due to the nature of the personal gathering or relationship.

The initial situation of the personal relationship context includes the information that a birthday boy or girl does not like a biracial peer. Many participants, especially tenth graders, endorsed exclusion in this context, evaluating the choice of guests at a birthday party as a personal prerogative. Previous studies have also found that children and adolescents also consider choosing friends as a personal matter.36) They understood that some personal relationships necessarily included some and excluded others.37) The participants in this study who endorsed exclusion neither intended to harm the biracial peer and violate his or her basic rights, nor made the decision based on racial prejudice or negative stereotypes. Thus, their judgments of exclusion in the personal relationship context should not be considered racial or moral exclusion.38)

Regarding developmental changes in the use of moral rationales, the results of this study reveal that older participants were more likely than younger ones to use fairness reasoning in the public and group contexts, whereas

37) Abrams et al., 2005.
younger participants were more likely than older ones to use rights reasoning in the public and personal contexts. In the public facility context, both an age-related increase of fairness reasoning and an age-related decrease of rights reasoning were found. Tenth graders were likely to point to the wrongfulness or unfairness of the decision-making process of the town council to exclude biracial children from swimming pools, whereas fourth graders were likely to argue that a biracial child possess the same rights as him or her because the biracial child was a peer of the same age or town and/or a person with the same nationality or humanity.

Statistically significant associations between rights reasoning and age were seldom found in previous studies. On the other hand, the relationship between fairness reasoning and age was not found to be consistent in the previous studies. According to Killen et al., fairness reasoning increased with age in the school context. However, they also found that seventh graders used fairness more than tenth graders in other contexts. Unlike these results, no situations showed an age-related decrease of fairness reasoning in this study.

Fourth graders used rights reasoning in all three contexts of this study, while tenth graders used fairness reasoning mainly in the public and group contexts. It is important to view that the justifications of the fourth graders tended to be a universal claim for the human rights of biracial children across situations. Because of the rights of biracial children, they should be treated equally. According to Dworkin (1993), “Individual rights offer the only possibility of genuine community in which all individuals participate as equals.” Therefore, it is crucial for children to acknowledge the possession of rights first to construct systematic reasoning for equal opportunities of

biracial peers. Then, they may develop more sophisticated ways of moral reasoning which enable them to differentiate and coordinate various aspects of moral issues according to concrete situations and procedures.

Tenth graders dominantly used fairness reasoning only in the public context. They did not use it significantly more than other moral reasons in the group context, and did not use it at all in the personal context. Unlike the younger children, they differentiated moral rationales by context. For instance, tenth graders were probably aware of the rights of biracial peers for equal opportunity as well as the unfairness of the decision of the town council in the public context. However, they tended to view the fairness of the decision or the decision-making process as more salient than other reasons in order to provide a specific justification relevant to the case of the regulation of the town council on the admission of biracial peers to public swimming pools. Basically, this result reflects the age difference of social reasoning that adolescents have a broader spectrum of social reasons as well as a higher ability to adapt a finely classified reason to a specific situation than do children.41)

In conflict situations when judgments from different domains were presented at the same time, it was found that the domains of justifications for initial judgments were associated with the change of judgments. Those who justified their judgments with moral reasons (i.e., fairness, welfare, and rights) were less likely to change in conflict situations than those with personal reasons (i.e., personal choice) in the personal relationship context, and those with conventional reasons (i.e., group function, authority, tradition, and social influence) in the conventional conflict situation of the public facility context. In moral reasoning, children and adolescents seriously considered the

consequences of their judgments, independent of the influence of some local customs or non-moral authority dictates.\textsuperscript{42}) In the evaluation of exclusion, moral justifications, unlike personal or conventional ones, were not much influenced by variations in situational contexts and other external conditions. When the participants made judgments with moral rationales, they also reviewed competing personal or conventional considerations. These sorts of conventional or personal reasons did not outweigh moral considerations for those who did not change their moral judgments in this study. Thus, these results revealed that moral justifications tend to take priority over other justifications in various situations.

These findings, however, do not support the presence of a fixed hierarchy between domains of social reasoning or a fixed attitude or disposition toward exclusion that determines the judgments of children and adolescents.\textsuperscript{43}) For instance, more than 35\% of those who had rejected the exclusion of the biracial peer from public swimming pools with moral reasons endorsed the exclusion when they were presented with the information that nobody wanted to swim with the biracial peer. In this situation, the priority between moral and non-moral reasons was often modified when some new features were introduced. When the participants viewed opposing judgments from the personal or conventional domain more salient than the initial moral reason, they did not prioritize moral reasons over other reasons. Therefore, it is necessary to emphasize that children and adolescents do not apply a fixed hierarchy between moral and non-moral reasons to automatically judge the inclusion or exclusion of peers in different contexts, while acknowledging a tendency for moral reasons to be prioritized over non-moral reasons. An individual child or adolescent is cognizant of the salience and importance of

\textsuperscript{42}) Turiel, 1983; Smetana, 2006.
\textsuperscript{43}) Turiel, 2006.
various features of a situation, and is able to weigh, prioritize, and coordinate different domains of social reasoning to make his or her own judgment.\textsuperscript{44)}

According to Nucci and Turiel (2009), early adolescents are less likely to give priority to moral reasons over conventional or personal reasons than are children and older adolescents.\textsuperscript{45)} The pattern of developmental trajectory regarding moral choice shows a complex U-shape (i.e., high in the early and later periods, and low in the middle), not a linear line of increase or decrease of moral choice with age. The decrease of moral choice or the increase of personal choice between the fourth graders ($M = 9.09$) and the tenth graders ($M = 14.90$) in the results of this study is similar to the lower part of the U-shaped pattern that Nucci and Turiel (2009) found. The findings in the coordination of the moral domain with non-moral domains, together with the results in the use of moral rationales, make it possible to construct a broad framework for the research of moral development.

In sum, first, the complex features of judgments on peer exclusion were found among children and adolescents in Korea as Killen et al. (2002) found in North America. The participants generally judged that the exclusion of a biracial peer across diverse situations was not acceptable. Tenth graders, however, were likely to judge the exclusion of a biracial peer legitimate in the personal context.

Second, analyses of justification categories for judgments of exclusion revealed an age-related increase of fairness reasoning and an age-related decrease of rights reasoning in some contexts. In the use of welfare reasoning, no age differences were found. These findings would be more conducive to understanding the developmental patterns of moral reasoning.

\textsuperscript{44)} Turiel, 1983, 2008.  
\textsuperscript{45)} Nucci, L., & Turiel, E., “Capturing the complexity of moral development and education”, \textit{Mind, Brain, and Education}, 3(2009), 151–159.
when a substantial theoretical framework regarding the relationships between fairness, welfare, and rights was available.

Third, the judgments with moral reasons were more consistent in conflict situations than those with personal reasons or with conventional reasons. This finding supports the priority of moral reasoning over non-moral reasoning. However, the priority of personal preference over moral considerations was found in the judgments of tenth graders in the personal context. These variations reflect different ways in which children and adolescents reason about varying degrees of importance of original and additional considerations.46)

Fourth, future research could systematically examine how a child’s own experiences, such as being bullied or cross-racial friendships, affect his or her judgments of exclusion. Some participants explained the rationale for judgments with their reflections on experiences with biracial children and of peer victimization. By studying exclusion in connection with positive and negative experiences, future research may present a systematic understanding of the structures of thoughts that result in or prevent harmful actions of children in peer relationships.
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Appendix A

Interview protocol: stories and questions

Personal relationship context

Min lives in Manse-dong. Po, who is half-Korean and half-Filipino, lives next door. Min is going to celebrate his birthday with his friends. Min knows that Po wants to get along with him. However, Min does not like Po.

Q1: Do you think it is all right/not all right for Min to not invite Po to his birthday party? (Judgment) Why do you think it is all right/not all right? (Justification)

For a judgment of all right,

Q2: Conflict with conventional domain: What if Min’s friends say that they want Po to join the party because he has been part of their group? Do you think it is all right/not all right for Min to not invite Po, then? (Judgment) Why? (Justification)

Q3: Conflict with moral domain: What if Min comes to believe that it is unfair not to invite Po to the party because he is a mixed-blood? Do you think it is all right/not all right for Min to not invite Po, then? (Judgment) Why? (Justification)

For a judgment of not all right,

Q2: Conflict with conventional domain: What if Min’s friends say that they don’t want Po to join the party because he has not been part of their group? Do you think it is all right/not all right for Min to not invite Po, then? (Judgment) Why? (Justification)

Q3: Conflict with moral domain: What if Min comes to believe that it is fair not to invite Po to the party because he is not a pure Korean? Do you
think it is all right/not all right for Min to not invite Po, then?
(Judgment) Why? (Justification)

Group activity context

Min is the head of a boys and girls chorus, which is the oldest in his town. Po, who is half-Korean and half-Filipino, sings very well and wants to join the chorus. This chorus has never had a mixed-blood as a member. Most members think this is a tradition.
Q1: Do you think it is all right/not all right for Min to not allow Po to join the chorus? (Judgment) Why do you think it is all right/not all right?
(Justification)

For a judgment of all right,

Q2: Conflict with personal domain: What if Min likes Po very much? Do you think it is all right/not all right for Min to not allow Po to join the chorus, then? (Judgment) Why? (Justification)
Q3: Conflict with moral domain: What if Min comes to believe that it is unfair not to allow Po because he is a mixed-blood? Do you think it is all right/not all right for Min to not allow Po to join the chorus, then?
(Judgment) Why? (Justification)

For a judgment of not all right,

Q2: Conflict with personal domain: What if Min dislikes Po very much? Do you think it is all right/not all right for Min to not allow Po to join the chorus, then? (Judgment) Why? (Justification)
Q3: Conflict with moral domain: What if Min comes to believe that it is fair not to allow Po because he is not a pure Korean? Do you think it is all
right/not all right for Min to not allow Po to join the chorus, then?
(Judgment) Why? (Justification)

Public facility context

Po is half-Korean and half-Filipino. He lives in Manse-dong. The town council makes a decision that all children of mixed-blood cannot use public swimming pools in the town.
Q1: Do you think it is all right/not all right for Po not to be allowed to go to swimming pool? (Judgment) Why do you think it is all right/not all right? (Justification)

For a judgment of all right.

Q2: Conflict with personal domain: What if Po likes swimming a lot? Do you think it is all right/not all right for Po not to be allowed, then? (Judgment) Why? (Justification)
Q3: Conflict with conventional domain: What if all swimming pools in the town have admitted children of mixed blood before? Do you think it is all right/not all right for Po not to be allowed, then? (Judgment) Why? (Justification)

For a judgment of not all right.

Q2: Conflict with personal domain: What if nobody likes to swim together with Po? Do you think it is all right/not all right for Po not to be allowed, then? (Judgment) Why? (Justification)
Q3: Conflict with conventional domain: What if it has been a tradition of the town that only pure Koreans can swim together? Do you think it is all right/not all right for Po not to be allowed, then? (Judgment) Why? (Justification)
韩国 어린이와 청소년의 다문화 가정 또래의
배제 상황에 대한 판단

황정연 S.J.

한국의 어린이와 청소년이 다문화 가정 자녀인 또래가 개인 관계, 단체 활동, 공공장소 이용 등에서 배제 되는 경우에 어떤 사회적 도덕적 사유와 판단을 하는지 연구하였다. 초등학교 4학년 37명(평균 연령 9.09)과 중학교 1학년 32명(평균 연령 11.92), 고등학교 1학년 32명(평균 연령 14.90)을 개별 면접해서 자료를 수집하고 연구 분석하였다. 보편적으로 연령이 높은 참가자들이 연령이 낮은 참가자 들 보다 생일 파티와 같은 개인적인 모임에서는 다문화 가정 또래를 배제하는 것이 가능하다고 판단하였다. 그러나 소년 소녀 합창단과 같은 단체 활동이나 수영장 출입과 같은 공공장소 사용의 상황에서는 절대적 다수의 참가자들이 다문화 가정 또래를 배제해서는 안 된다고 판단하였다.

판단의 근거 분석 과정에서 다문화 가정 또래의 “권리”를 보장해야 한다는 주장이 연령이 낮은 참가자들 사이에서 상대적으로 높은 반도로 제기되는 경향을 발견하였다. 반면에 “원활한 단체 활동”을 위해서 다문화 가정 또래를 배제 하거나 포함 시켜야 한다는 주장은 기존 연구와 달리 참가자들 사이에서 연령에 따른 반도의 차이를 보이지 않았다. 더불어 기존 연구 결과와 동일하게 연령이 높은 참가자들이 “공평성”과 “개인적 선호”를 판단 근거로 자주 사용하는 경향을 발견하였다. 나아가 초기 단순 상황에서 내린 판단의 근거가 이 판단과 갈등을 일으키는 후속 상황에 대한 판단에 어떤 영향을 주는지 연구 하였다. 초기 판단이 도덕적인 사유에 기초한 경우에 관습이나 개인적 선호에 근거
한 경우보다 후속 갈등 상황에서 초기 판단을 변경하지 않는 경향을 보였다. 이러한 연구 결과들은 다문화 가정 자녀들의 사회 통합 방안 연구에 실질적인 도움을 주리라 예상한다.

주제어: 판단, 배제, 혼혈, 한국, 영역접근법, 도덕적 발달
Judgments on Exclusion of a Biracial Peer in Korea

Jeong Yeon Hwang

This study investigated the exclusion of a biracial peer of Korean children and adolescents in the fourth grade ($n=37$, $M_{age}=9.09$), seventh grade ($n=32$, $M_{age}=11.92$), and tenth grade ($n=32$, $M_{age}=14.90$), focusing on their social and moral reasoning. In general, excluding a biracial peer from a group activity (i.e., a boys and girls chorus) or a public facility (i.e., a public swimming pool) was viewed less acceptable than excluding a biracial peer from a personal gathering (i.e., a birthday party). Participants tended to prioritize the domain of moral reasoning over the personal domain or the conventional domain of social reasoning in the judgments of exclusion across various complex situations. Tenth graders, however, tended to permit the peer exclusion in the personal relationship context as they judged it with personal rationales, not with moral rationales. Regarding analyses of justification categories for judgments of exclusion, an age-related increase of fairness reasoning was found in the public facility context and group activity context, whereas an age-related decrease of rights reasoning was found in the public facility context and personal relationship context.

**Key Words**: judgments, exclusion, biracial, Korea, domain approach, moral development
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