Chapter 8

MORAL COGNITION IN ADOLESCENCE AND EMERGING ADULTHOOD

Daniel Lapsley, Emily LaPorte, and Katheryn Kelley

The study of moral cognition has a long history in developmental science. Indeed, moral stage theory was once the very model of ontogenetic development during the latter decades of the 20th century. The pioneer generation of researchers typically addressed stage-related developmental change in conceptions of justice (Kohlberg et al., 1983) and in related domains such as interpersonal (Selman, 1980), prosocial (Eisenberg et al., 2006), and social conventional (Turiel, 1983) reasoning. Although there are still abiding efforts to map stage-related change in conceptions of moral judgment (Gibbs, 2019) and prosocial reasoning (Eisenberg et al., 2014), the landscape of moral cognitive development has markedly changed (Lapsley & Carlo, 2014).

One striking trend of recent research is how porous the boundary of the moral domain has become and how extensively it is implicated across and within the entire fabric of development. Concerns about the proper boundaries of the moral domain, both in terms of what it has traditionally neglected (e.g., moral emotions, prosocial reasoning, virtues, self-identity, culture) and what it confounds (e.g., reasoning about social convention) has opened up important lines of inquiry. Morality concerns justice, fairness, and harm, on a traditional account, but this is now being investigated within the context of peer friendships and social organization, as well as in terms of complicating domain considerations. Morality also involves prosocial response to the distress and needs of others, which is seemingly unbidden by Kantian moral imperative, and this is now being examined in the context of families and culture. Moral cognition is a product of selves with personality, and thus the moral self is a target of inquiry. Furthermore, it is now apparent that moral emotions like guilt and shame and emotive capacities like empathy and sympathy are indispensable to moral judgment. As Sherman (1989) put it, "We notice through feeling what might otherwise go unheeded by a cool and detached intellect" (p. 45), and without the emotions, "we do not fully register the facts" (p. 47). Moral cognition has many facets and is interwoven within numerous components of development.

One theme of this chapter, then, is that moral cognition is implicated across and within the interleaved experiences of coming of age: how adolescents and youth form friendships, navigate peer groups, expand and reduce social boundaries, engage media, experience culture, and construct self-identity. It is implicated in family life and schools, in prosocial behavior and character, and in cognition and emotion. As Iris Murdoch (2003) put it, "Morality is and ought to be connected with the whole of our being" (p. 495), which is to insinuate morality into every corner of developmental experience. Hence, few topics within adolescent psychology are completely specified without consideration

https://doi.org/10.1037/0000298-008
APA Handbook of Adolescent and Young Adult Development, L. J. Crockett, G. Carlo, and J. E. Schulenberg (Editors)
Copyright © 2023 by the American Psychological Association. All rights reserved.

of the moral domain, and no single chapter in standard developmental textbooks can contain it.

We selected topics that illustrate the way moral considerations attach to wide swaths of development in the 2nd and 3rd decades of life and ramify in common challenges that face adolescents and emerging adults. We first consider two approaches that devolve from social cognitive domain theory to illustrate the way moral judgments play out in peer and ingroup social contexts. We next examine prosocial moral reasoning with particular emphasis on parenting and family socialization. Our final section focuses on the way moral cognition connects to self-identity, drives moral disengagement, and has implications for recent research on moral essentialism and the moral true self. We conclude with some observations about the way forward with respect to integrative lines of research.

MORAL JUDGMENT AND SOCIAL COGNITIVE DOMAINS

Over the last several decades, social domain theory has evolved to become one of the most productive research programs in developmental science (Nucci, 1981; Smetana et al., 2014; Turiel, 1983). In this view, social reasoning is structured around domains of experience. Moral judgments concern issues of harm, welfare, rights, equality, and fair allocation of resources, while societal judgments concern norms, customs, and conventions that regulate social interactions within families, peer groups, and social organizations of all kinds. The psychological domain concerns matters for which personal jurisdiction is claimed. One striking feature of this research program is that it has been extended into wide fields of application. Social cognitive domain theory has something to say about parenting and family socialization, peer inclusion and exclusion, moral education, identity and prejudice, fairness, and autonomy. It covers the vast terrain of adolescent psychology where social cognition matters, which is just about everywhere. For example, the arena of discretion that adolescents carve out as a matter of personal jurisdiction suggests a close connection between domain reasoning and psychological individuation, with implications for self-development, mental health, and well-being (Nucci et al., 2005).

Moreover, the social situations that confront adolescents and young adults are rarely uncomplicated, as they involve a mélange of moral, conventional, and personal considerations. Two recent lines of research address (a) how adolescents and emerging adults coordinate moral and nonmoral concerns when reaching moral judgments and (b) how moral judgments are implicated in the experience of peer group participation and exclusion.

Continuity and Discontinuity in Adolescent Moral Judgment

Nucci and colleagues (2017) showed that the development of moral judgment is not a simple matter of linear improvement as if climbing a staircase. In the rich context where moral issues reside, decisions must be reached in ways that require coordination of competing situational elements. In this study, children and adolescents were asked to think about the behavior of story characters who engaged in three types of moral actions (direct harm by hitting, failing to return dropped money, and helping another in distress) in situations that presented conflict with other considerations. For example, in the hitting scenario, the protagonist is deciding whether to engage in unprovoked hitting (Unconflicted), hit another in self-defense (Conflicted-Self), or hit in defense of another child (Conflicted Other). In the helping example, the protagonist sees a boy in pain after falling and considers helping by getting his parents (Unconflicted), wonders whether helping will get him cut from the team for missing a tryout (Conflicted-Self), or considers whether helping will get his brother cut from the team for missing a tryout (Conflicted-Other).

In addition to action (hitting, stealing, helping) and context (Unconflicted, Conflicted-Self, Conflicted-Other), a third complication was the nature of the target of the action: a generic "another" boy or girl, a child who was vulnerable because of age or disability, or an antagonist who had previously slapped or teased the protagonist. Participants were asked whether the protagonist should perform the act, by what rights, and under what conditions. The results showed, not surprisingly, that

children and adolescents strongly opposed unprovoked hitting and stealing and supported prosocial sharing. In straightforward prototypic situations, there are few age differences. Indeed, individuals from an early age know a moral issue when they see one, core knowledge of which might be evident in infancy (Hamlin & Wynn, 2011).

But Nucci and colleagues (2017) also showed that discontinuity was evident when moral judgment faced situational and relational complexity. Although 8-year-old children and older adolescents (16 years) came down on the side of moral judgment, the younger adolescents (10–14 years) were not so sure. According to the authors, this U-shaped pattern in judging acts and the right to engage in them reflected a greater willingness on the part of young adolescents to consider nonmoral personal choice and personal jurisdiction in making decisions. This developmental rhythm was described in terms of three levels. At Level 1 (Straightforward One-Dimensional), the moral elements of the situation—whether it involves harm and welfare, for example—unambiguously drive moral judgment at the expense of nonmoral considerations. At Level 2 (Multidimensional Uncoordinated), there is an awareness of features that induce moral ambiguity, but moral and nonmoral features are not coordinated in any systematic way, opening the door for self-interest to gain traction. At Level 3 (Multidimensional Coordinated), the moral and nonmoral elements are carefully weighed and sources of moral ambiguity are resolved by systematic coordination of multiple features of the situation.

Few studies have examined moral judgement with this complexity in mind, and if the age-related pattern of moral judgment demonstrated here is nonlinear, its pattern of development is sensibly progressive and, in the authors' view, compatible with constructivist social cognitive development and with important implications for how moral education is sequenced and structured (Nucci & Turiel, 2009).

Domains of Reasoning and Peer Groups

Social cognitive domain theory also has implications for understanding how adolescents navigate peer groups, particularly with respect to issues of peer inclusion and exclusion (Hitti et al., 2014; Killen, 2007; Killen et al., 2013). As is typically the case with clear moral issues, most adolescents oppose straightforward exclusion on moral grounds of fairness and equality, but when exclusion decisions are overlaid with matters of group membership, cohesion, and solidarity, or involve personal jurisdiction about friendship and affiliation, then active coordination is required (Killen, 2007). In one study, children and adolescents rejected social exclusion as wrong on moral grounds, even in stereotypic contexts (e.g., excluding a boy from ballet), but when the decision came down to which of two children to pick for the last spot on the roster, social conventional considerations encouraged adolescents to endorse exclusion for the sake of effective group functioning (Killen & Stangor, 2001). Complex social situations also require coordination of moral and personal considerations. For example, Killen and colleagues (2004) showed that although most emerging adults thought it morally wrong to countenance exclusion in cross-race relationships, exclusion was better supported if cross-race relations required more intimate contact, in which case exclusion was judged not a moral issue but one of personal jurisdiction.

Recently a social reasoning developmental model has been proposed that integrates developmental social domain theory with social identity theory, which addresses the social psychological dimensions of group affiliation (Killen & Rutland, 2011). In one study, Hitti and colleagues (2014) investigated how group membership contributes to decisions about social exclusion and fair distribution of resources. They showed that adolescents were not willing to exclude a member who deviated from social conventional group norms (e.g., wearing an assigned shirt), but violation of egalitarian norms (e.g., allocating resources unequally when the group wanted equal distribution) was grounds for exclusion. As the authors stated, "There are contexts in which children and adolescents view exclusion as consistent with moral principles, such as when a deviant member of a group rejects norms about the equal allocation of resources" (Hitti et al., 2014, p. 464).

PROSOCIAL MORAL COGNITION

Prosocial reasoning in adolescence and emerging adulthood is also a surging topic of research interest and one that has progressively expanded into many features of adolescent and youth development, including peer and family dynamics, emotions, and psychosocial adjustment (e.g., Carlo et al., 2011; Eisenberg et al., 2006; Knight et al., 2015; Ongley & Malti, 2014; see also Chapter 34, this volume). Prosocial reasoning arises in the conflict of whether to satisfy one's own needs, wishes, and preferences or those of others when there is no formal obligation to do so. Responses to prosocial dilemmas coalesce into discrete developmental levels that show both age-related change and patterns of individual differences from childhood to early adulthood (Eisenberg et al., 2014). In early childhood, prosocial decisions are driven by self-focused hedonistic concerns, but this gives way in later childhood to decisions motivated by empathic concern for others and then to internalized prosocial norms regarding the dignity of others and the welfare of society by adolescence and emerging adulthood.

The rhythm of prosocial development moves from hedonistic egoism to concerns for the welfare of others (from self to other), but it also moves in the opposite direction, from social stereotype and approval to strongly internalized considerations where the sense of self hangs in the balance (from other to self). Moreover, the development of standard measures of prosocial reasoning (Carlo et al., 1992) and prosocial tendencies (Caprara & Pastorelli, 1993; Carlo & Randall, 2002) has facilitated the extension of these constructs into almost every area of study within adolescent development.

Prosociality is associated, for example, with positive self-esteem (Fu et al., 2017; Zuffianò et al., 2014), emotional well-being (Martin & Huebner, 2007), academic grades (Caprara et al., 2014; Carlo et al., 2018), popularity (Findley-Van Nostrand & Ojanen, 2018; Niu et al., 2016; Wolters et al., 2014), friendship quality (Poorthuis et al., 2012), and peer relationships (Markiewicz et al., 2001). Prosocial growth is associated with constructivist theory of mind in early adolescence (Weimer et al., 2017) and exposure to diversity experiences in college (Brandenberger & Bowman, 2015). It counters deviant peer affiliation (Carlo et al., 2014), dating violence, (Foshee et al., 2015), and depressive symptoms (Padilla-Walker et al., 2020) and is associated with youth purpose (Summers & Falco, 2020), adolescent generativity (Lawford et al., 2005), civic engagement (Metzger et al., 2018), positive changes in personality (Luengo Kanacri et al., 2014), and meaning in life (Van Tongeren et al., 2016).

How prosocial moral reasoning and behavioral tendencies are socialized within families during adolescence has attracted research interest (Laible, Carlo, & Padilla-Walker, 2019). The intuition that prosocial behavior is related to parental socialization of a certain kind, such as authoritative parenting style, relational qualities of warmth and sensitivity, discursive communication within the family, parental control and inductive discipline, monitoring of behavior, and the quality of solicitation and disclosure of information about activities, among other variables, is largely confirmed (Carlo et al., 2007; Hastings et al., 2007; Laible, Conover, et al., 2019; Laird & Zeringue, 2019; Mounts & Allen, 2019; Padilla-Walker et al., 2012). Sometimes the influence of parenting on prosocial outcomes is mediated partially through affective and social cognitive variables, such as sympathy, empathic concern, and perspective taking (e.g., Davis & Carlo, 2018; Shen et al., 2013; van der Graaff et al., 2018).

There is interest in tracking culture-specific variations in how families socialize prosocial dispositions (Carlo & Conejo, 2019; Carlo et al., 2018; de Guzman et al., 2019). Familism values, for example, emphasize the importance of maintaining close family relationships, providing familial emotional support, and giving priority to family responsibilities and obligations. These values might be particularly characteristic of socialization in Latinx families (Knight & Carlo, 2012).

In one study (Knight et al., 2015), a sample of young Mexican American adolescents responded to assessments of familism values (family emotional support, family obligation, family-as-referent), sociocognitive traits (perspective taking and prosocial moral reasoning), and prosocial tendencies. Six types of prosocial tendencies were assessed:

a tendency to respond in emotionally evocative situations (Emotional), when directed or requested to do so (Compliant), in emergency situations (Dire), without personal considerations (Altruistic), and when there is an audience (Public) or no audience (Anonymous). Three of these tendencies (Compliant, Emotional, Dire) were thought to be particularly linked to the family values of Mexican American socialization. The results indicated that young adolescents who strongly endorsed familism values also reported higher scores on five of the six prosocial tendencies (excepting Altruistic). Moreover, the effect of familism on prosocial tendencies was partially mediated by perspective taking, and the indirect effects were particularly strong for Compliant, Emotional, and Dire, the specific prosocial behaviors linked to Mexican American family socialization. Prosocial reasoning also partially mediated the relationship between familism and the Altruistic prosocial tendency, although most of the indirect effects of familism on prosocial tendencies went through perspective taking.

Apart from demonstrating the role of familism in underwriting culturally supportive prosocial behaviors, this study is of interest for another reason. The sociocognitive variables, perspective taking and prosocial moral reasoning, appeared to be differentially associated with prosocial behavior. Familism was associated with Altruistic behavior through prosocial moral reasoning, but prosocial moral reasoning did not mediate the link between familism and any other prosocial tendency—that was left to perspective taking. Insofar as the summit of prosocial reasoning entails a strongly internalized commitment to prosociality, then clearly such a commitment is not required for a wide range of prosocial behaviors other than altruism. As the authors put it, "The lack of relations between prosocial moral reasoning and other forms of prosocial behaviors is consistent with prior research, suggesting that engaging in those other forms of helping often does not require strong internalized, moral principled judgments" (Knight et al., 2015, p. 725). Instead, some forms of helping appear to be facilitated by advances in social cognitive skills and knowledge of social norms. In the next section we take up another social cognitive construct, moral self-identity, which does entail a strong internalization of morality and close identification with self-identity.

MORAL COGNITION AND THE MORAL SELF

In this section, we examine three conceptually similar literatures: moral self-identity, moral disengagement, and moral true self. The first two constructs have sources in social cognitive theories and are mirror images of each other in the sense that moral action and inaction have implications for self-approbation or censure. Moreover, although moral identity and moral disengagement can reflect individual differences, they also reflect developmental processes. In contrast, belief in the moral true self is situated within the cognitive essentialism literature, which makes fewer developmental assumptions.

Moral Self-Identity

How individuals come to extend prosocial help to others is foundational to the prosocial moral cognition literature, as we have seen. But what are the limits of prosocial benevolence? What if the other is not a member of one's ingroup, coming from another tribe, political party, ideological perspective, ethnoracial identification, or religious confession? If prosocial behavior is driven mostly by stereotypic and conventional norms, then it is by no means certain that prosocial tendencies could induce one to reach across the aisle to extend a helping hand to the "other."

Moral foundations theory holds that the poles of loyalty/betrayal, authority/subversion, and purity/degradation constitute the *binding foundations* that are instrumental in holding people together as groups and communities (Graham et al., 2009) but could have a dark side if they encourage ingroups to exclude outgroups or to derogate them (or worse). Indeed, across three studies, Smith et al. (2014) showed that individuals who strongly endorse binding foundations showed more willingness to support torture of outgroup members or to withhold help from them. Yet this dark side of the binding foundations was attenuated by a strong sense of

moral identity. Individuals with pronounced moral identity are more likely to include outgroup members into an expansive circle of moral regard (Reed & Aquino, 2003) and are more likely to engage in prosocial behavior.

Evidence like this has elevated moral identity to one of the most important topics of research in moral psychology. Moral identity describes the centrality of morality to one's self-concept (Hardy & Carlo, 2005). It emerged in moral development research as a way to conceptualize the source of motivation that moves moral judgment all the way to action. There is often a disjunction between knowing the right thing to do and actually doing it; indeed, the correlation between moral judgment and moral behavior is often modest (Blasi, 1980). Yet moral self-identity bridges the gap. One is more likely to follow through on what moral duty requires, on this account, if morality is essential, central, and important for self-understanding, that is, if one's sense of selfhood is at stake in every moral decision (Aquino & Reed, 2002; Blasi, 1984). Of course individuals have many identities, morality among them, and so the resources of social cognitive theory have been utilized to understand the conditions of activation and the availability and accessibility of moral identity, including the situational factors that prime it (Aquino et al., 2009; Lapsley & Narvaez, 2004).

Moral identity is a strong and pervasive predictor of a wide range of morally significant behavior (Hertz & Krettanauer, 2016; Lapsley & Hardy, 2017). It plays a significant role in conceptions of moral character and virtue (Cohen & Morse, 2014; Lapsley, 2016; Nucci, 2019), and its developmental features have attracted much interest (Kingsford et al., 2018; Krettenauer & Hertz, 2015). For example, Krettenauer and colleagues have shown that moral identity shows mean level increases across the life course, emerging strongly in adolescence and early adulthood and shifting to internal sources of moral motivation by middle age (Krettenauer & Victor, 2017; Krettenauer et al., 2016). As Krettenauer et al. (2016) put it, "As individuals grow older, they assign greater self-importance to those values they consider essential for defining a highly moral person" (p. 981).

The self-importance of moral values is also related to generativity concerns in emerging adulthood. Frensch et al. (2007) showed, for example, that adolescents who chose "fairness" and "kindness" as values most important to themselves at age 16 and age 20 were more likely to report higher scores on a generativity composite index at age 20 than adolescents who chose nonmoral values, such as "ambitious," "hardworking," and "independent." Similarly, Pratt and colleagues (2009) reported evidence that moral identity themes in adolescent turning point narratives at age 16 (and at age 20) were robust predictors of generative concerns (as measured by the Loyola Generativity Scale) and generative story themes at age 24. Narrative moral identity ratings from stories told at age 16 were also a strong predictor of youth involvement in the community at ages 20 and 24. According to Pratt and colleagues (2009), narrative moral identity development appears to reflect "a motivational commitment to moral values and action ('moral steadfastness') that may be gradually translated into a story of the self's moral life" (p. 311). And the narrative story of the moral self may be foundational to meeting the developmental challenge of generativity in early adulthood and beyond.

Moral identity is also studied in contexts typical of the adolescent experience. For example, moral identity counters bullying (Pozzoli et al., 2016) and antisocial behavior (Kavussanu et al., 2015). In one study, moral disengagement and deviant peer affiliation predicted the perpetration of bullying, but these relationships were moderated by moral identity (Wang et al., 2020). Moral identity moderates the link between trait anger and cyberbullying (Wang et al., 2017) and between exposure to violent video games and bullying and cyberbullying (Teng et al., 2020). Bullying is also the target of moral disengagement research.

Moral Disengagement

Moral disengagement is a rapidly growing topic of study within the moral domain, with Bandura's social cognitive theory of human agency providing the main terms of reference (Bandura et al., 1996). If the self's commitment to moral identity encourages moral behavior, its recourse to moral

disengagement strategies provides a shield against self-censure when behavior violates moral standards. According to Bandura (1999), three general strategies are possible: (a) One can justify the reprehensible event so that it is not viewed as immoral, (b) one can minimize or distort the consequences of immoral conduct so that its consequences are not deemed serious after all, or (c) one can shift the attribution of blame to victims. Some specific strategies include reconstruing an immoral act in terms of some larger worthy purpose, sanitizing it with euphemistic language, or comparing it advantageously against something even worse. Displacing and diffusing responsibility, disregarding or disbelieving negative consequences, and blaming victims also serve the purpose of moral disengagement.

Research with adolescents mostly addresses the relationship between moral disengagement and peer aggression. A recent meta-analysis showed that moral disengagement is a significant predictor of aggressive behavior, with larger effect sizes evident among adolescents than children (Gini et al., 2014). The tendency to disengage moral self-sanctions is particularly evident among bullies (Gini, 2006; Perren & Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger, 2012). Of course, bullying episodes are rarely enacted without an audience, and so research is also directed toward the role of peer dynamics in the context of moral disengagement. This research shows that bystander-defenders are less likely to use moral disengagement strategies (Thornberg & Jungert, 2013) and that defenders are also more likely to report distress if they do not intervene as opposed to passive bystanders (Gini et al., 2018), suggesting that defenders may have stronger moral identity. On the other hand, pro-bully bystanders tend to morally disengage through diffusion of responsibility, victim-blaming, and distortion of consequences (Bjärehed et al., 2020).

Perpetration and defense also depend on peer and friendship networks. Caravita and colleagues (2014) showed that moral disengagement tended to rise over the course of 1 year from late childhood to early adolescence, but this change also depended upon friends' moral disengagement. Given the fact that moral disengagement also tended to decline over this period among children, the authors concluded that "the influence of peers in changing moral disengagement becomes more relevant in early adolescence compared to late childhood" (Caravita et al., 2014, p. 204), which is consistent with the increased salience of peer groups in adolescence. Moreover, the role of friends in changing moral disengagement also holds for defenders. In a related study, Sijtsema and colleagues (2014) showed that in early adolescence, individuals selected peers who were similar in bullying (indicating a selection effect) as friends and, over time, engaged in more bullying (a socialization effect). But this effect was strongest in youth who also reported elevated moral disengagement. The selection and socialization effects were also evident for young adolescents who were defenders. Young adolescents selected as friends those who were similar in victim-defense, and this similarity increased over time.

Not enough is known about propensity to moral disengagement, how it comes about, and under what conditions is it activated. Both moral identity and moral disengagement reference the moral self, perhaps from opposite directions: The same moral self that enacts prosocial-moral action out of identity motivation also self-protects with disengagement. But it is not known the extent to which—if at all—they trade on the same developmental or experiential factors.

Two studies have examined the possible precursors to moral disengagement. Fontaine and colleagues (2014) showed that peer rejection at age 14 predicted moral disengagement at age 16 to 18, which in turn predicted criminal misbehavior in emerging adulthood (age 18–20). As they put it, "The individual who is peer rejected and socially disfavored may, as a result of viewing the world as unfair and unjust, develop criminogenic judgment and decision-making strategies (moral disengagement) that facilitate his or her pursuit of antisocial goals" (Fontaine et al., 2014, p. 1).

A second study (Hyde et al., 2010) investigated the contribution of early rejecting parenting and neighborhood impoverishment as variables conducive to downstream moral disengagement and antisocial behavior. Rejecting parenting within the first 2 years of life, neighborhood impoverishment at age 6 to 10, and parental and child reports of

empathy predicted adolescents' report of moral disengagement at age 15. But empathy emerged as the most robust predictor of moral disengagement, in fact mediating the link between early risk factors and moral disengagement. As one possible path, the authors suggested that "youth with adverse experiences with parents may develop low levels of empathy towards others during the transition to adolescence and, when combined with neighborhood risk, be primed to develop a cognitively and affectively disengaged stance towards society and others" (Hyde et al., 2010, p. 206). Other research has targeted lack of empathy as part of the affective component of moral disengagement, and future research will undoubtedly continue to investigate the interplay of sociomoral emotions and moral cognition.

The Moral True Self

A rather different take on the moral self has emerged from the psychological essentialism literature. *Essentialism* is a pervasive conceptual bias whereby natural and social categories are understood as being constituted by a deep, immutable essence, rooted in biology and not apparent on the surface, that gives all members of the category its nature (Gelman, 2004; Newman & Knobe, 2019). Essentialist beliefs emerge between 4 and 6 years of age and are generally pervasive across adolescence and adulthood with respect to a wide variety of social categories, including race, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, mental illness, and personality (e.g., Haslam et al., 2000, 2004; Rhodes et al., 2018; Sutherland & Cimpian, 2019).

Although children hold more essentialist beliefs than adults (Heiphetz, 2019), the tendency to essentialize social categories does not appear to be strongly developmental. Yet psychological essentialism has important implications for understanding moral cognition in adolescence and emerging adulthood. For example, essentialist beliefs predict bias against outgroups and intergroup conflict (Chen & Ratliff, 2018; Diesendruck & Menahem, 2015; Smyth et al., 2017). Essentialism works against prosocial gestures and empathy for the other side (Heiphetz, 2019; O'Driscoll et al., 2021) and predicts support for a wide range of boundary-enhancing political initiatives. For example, Roberts and colleagues (2017) showed that belief in gender essentialism predicted support for legislation that restricts access to bathrooms on the basis of one's biological sex.

Individuals also hold essentialist beliefs about the existence of a *true self* that lurks deep within and reflects our true nature quite apart from surface manifestations (Newman et al., 2015; Strohminger et al., 2017). This true nature is unmistakably moral (De Freitas et al., 2017; Newman et al., 2014, 2015; Strohminger & Nichols, 2014). Morality is thought to be so deeply constitutive of one's very identity as a person that to remove moral traits is to compromise it. Good character constitutes the true self to such an extent that young adults predict dramatic identity change would result if character changed for the worse than for the better (Heiphetz et al., 2017). Indeed, behavior change in the direction of immorality is thought to be movement away from the moral true self, but change from bad to good behavior is thought to reveal it (De Freitas et al., 2018). This perhaps explains why individuals caught doing something nefarious, vile, or illegal so often declare that such regrettable behavior does not reflect the "real me" and is not who they really are.

Essentialist belief in a moral true self has two other interesting features (De Freitas et al., 2018). It is not restricted to belief in the moral essence of one's own true self, for example, but applies to the true selves of others as well, including members of outgroups. In addition, some types of issues are more essential than others for grounding self-identity. Retreating from widely shared, consensual moral beliefs is thought to yield greater identity change than changing beliefs of controversial moral status or changing beliefs that reflect mere preferences (Heiphetz et al., 2017).

These features of moral essentialist beliefs about self and identity pose interesting questions for theoretical perspectives that treat moral self-identity as a developmental achievement or as a dimension of individual differences. It would seem that everyone believes the self to be moral in fundamental ways. Indeed, in the essentialist view, morality is the very thing that underwrites continuity in personality and so is constitutive of identity (Heiphetz et al., 2017).

Hence, on its face it looks like there is deep theoretical tension between moral self-identity, which is a developmental achievement, and the moral true self, which is not.

One way out is a compelling proposal by Krettenauer (2019) that moral identity really masks two independent goal orientations: moral identity aspiration and moral identity preservation. The aspirational feature of moral identity is characterized by a motivation to reach or instantiate a self-ideal that is oriented toward morality. It is this aspect of moral identity that is studied as a dispositional or developmental construct, as reflected in research on prosocial behavior, volunteerism, moral exemplarity, and so on. The preservation goal of moral identity, on the other hand, is to maintain a view of the self as essentially good and moral, a goal that aligns with characteristics of the moral true self. To conceptualize moral identity in terms of two goals is a highly promising way to bridge the moral identity and moral true self literatures, but it also is relevant for understanding the place of moral disengagement strategies in the dynamics of the moral self. The tendency to avoid self-censure by resorting to these strategies is reflective of the moral-identity-as-preservation goal orientation. These are clearly promising lines of research for the future.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS: INTEGRATIVE POSSIBILITIES

One theme of this chapter is simply that moral cognition is a pervasive feature of adolescence and emerging adulthood. A second theme is that moral psychology is alive with productive research programs. We examined manifestations of moral cognition in prominent lines of research in the moral domain, including various approaches to moral judgment, social cognitive domain theory, prosocial moral cognition, and research on moral identity, moral disengagement, and the essentialist moral self. These research programs are not standing still but are expanding into far reaches of the adolescent experience so that topics such as peer group dynamics, friendship, family life, bullying, self-identity, emotions, and use of media, among others, are now properly situated in the moral domain, and as a result, it is now difficult to tell the developmental story in these areas without reference to moral capacities.

There are welcome signs of possible theoretical integration. We noted Krettenauer's (2019) fruitful suggestion on how to reconcile the moral identity and moral true self literatures. These constructs hold special relevance for understanding certain developmental challenges of adolescence and young adulthood, such as a heightened peer orientation and felt need for friendship and community. Diesendruck (2021) argued, for example, that the development of group or social essentialism is motivated by the affiliative need to belong. Essentialist tendencies that carve out social boundaries are a way to establish a community of "us" who can be trusted to meet relational needs and provide social knowledge that helps one get along and get ahead. As Diesendruck (2021) concluded, "Rather than ensuring distancing from potential foes, essentialism may result from the yearning for potential friends" (p. 79).

Along similar lines, Heiphetz and colleagues (2017) documented the importance of social relationships in coordinating judgments about moral belief type and identity change. Across three studies, participants judged that changes to widely shared moral beliefs (vs. controversial moral beliefs or preferences) would result in more change in identity, but this relationship was mediated by judgments about how changes in moral beliefs would change relationships with the community. Accordingly the "community hypothesis may have been especially powerful . . . because individuals derive aspects of their personal identity from their communities" (Heiphetz et al., 2017, p. 759). Yet how moral belief type and identity change covary with typical developmental changes in peer orientation, group affiliation, and patterns of friendship across adolescence and young adulthood is a wide-open empirical question.

An additional intriguing possibility connects these constructs, along with social domain theory, with the notion of moral agency articulated by Pasupathi and Wainryb (2010). Moral agency addresses the experience of intentional moral failure, of what happens next when one visits harm

on another with full knowledge that it was wrong to do so. What narrative do we tell of ourselves? How do we come to grips with the sort of person we claim ourselves to be? According to Pasupathi and Wainryb (2010), narrating instances of intentional harm-doing requires us to submit negative moral experience to self-reflection, which has implications for prospective action guidance and self-determination.

The moral agency construct occupies crucial theoretical space among the constructs considered in this review. According to Pasupathi and Wainryb (2010), domain theory does not help us understand how individuals make sense of the moral complexity that attends harm-doing other than to urge the coordination of moral and nonmoral considerations. Hence, moral agency works in the psychological space posterior to domain coordination. Moreover, postjudgment deliberation about harmful behavior could just as well induce moral disengagement and patterns of justifications that have lasting and detrimental effects on moral identity development. How to understand self-identity, domain coordination, and the temptation to moral disengagement within the context of narrative construction of moral agency is an exciting prospect for integrative research moving forward, and one of particular relevance to adolescence and emerging adulthood. As McAdams (2015) has argued, the "self-as-author" is the dominant theme of personality development during emerging adulthood, given the felt need of individuals at this stage to construct a coherent autobiographical narrative to make sense of their lives.

Narrative approaches also revealed linkages between adolescent moral identity and generativity in emerging adulthood. Both constructs may trade on the same formative developmental experiences, such as parenting support and community involvement, that also underwrite prosocial tendencies. As yet there is only a nascent understanding of how these constructs covary over the course of adolescent and youth development. To what extent, for example, can generative caring be considered part of the prosocial domain? Lawford and colleagues (2005) argued that "generativity may be a developing element in the domain of prosocial moral concern in later adolescence" (p. 261). The interplay of prosocial constructs (e.g., reasoning, dispositions, behavioral tendencies), narrative moral identity, and generativity in adolescence and early adulthood will be a productive line of future research.

Here is another example of a productive line of future research: Moral identity research shows that individuals with strong moral identity tend to have a wider circle of moral regard than individuals with a weaker sense of moral identity (Reed & Aquino, 2003). Similarly, moral identity moderates the relationship between binding moral foundations and derogation of outgroups, and as such, it serves to minimize the boundary between "us" and "them" (Roberts et al., 2017). Yet the tendency to essentialize social categories often enhances boundaries and encourages intergroup bias and conflict. We need to better understand the relationship between moral identity and the essentialist true self in this regard.

A recent study offers a promising way forward. De Freitas and Cikara (2018) showed that encouraging individuals to think about the individual true self of outgroup members actually reduced intergroup bias. Perhaps moral essentialism trumps gender or race essentialism; whether moral identity has comparative advantages to this end would be an illuminating line of research. One wonders, too, about the implications of this research for social developmental reasoning and domain theory that is also concerned with issues of social boundaries, prejudice, and peer exclusion. Is it possible, for example, to mitigate the social boundaries erected by conventional and personal elements by consideration of the moral true selves of outgroup members?

Recent research by Rottman and colleagues (2021) also qualifies the reach of the moral true self with respect to how willing we are to include others in the category of moral persons. In support of what they call the moral stringency hypothesis, they showed that individuals are willing to exclude others from membership in moral categories if they deviate from moral values. Apparently, the moral true self does not guide perception of others in all cases, and indeed, there is an expectation that others exhibit perfection to gain admittance to highly valued moral categories. Of course, this is

hardly the standard we hold for ourselves, and as the authors pointed out, further research is needed on the stability of moral perception of others and on the work of forgiveness and redemptive processes. We suspect that narrative approaches to moral agency might profitably consider the interplay of these processes with the true self and moral stringency hypothesis.

These do not, of course, exhaust the integrative possibilities posed by this robust literature. Future research will also situate moral cognition within broader conceptions of cognitive functioning, with significant contributions from neuroscience and deeper appreciation of the interplay between cognition and emotion, personality, and character. There is much to do, and the topics reviewed here will be the leading edge of progressive lines of research for the foreseeable future.

REFERENCES

Aquino, K., Freeman, D., Reed, A., Felps, W., & Lim, V. K. (2009). Testing a social-cognitive model of moral behavior: The interactive influence of situations and moral identity centrality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *97*(1), 123–141. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015406

Aquino, K., & Reed, A., II. (2002). The self-importance of moral identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*(6), 1423–1440. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.6.1423

Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *3*(3), 193–209. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0303_3

Bandura, A., Barbarenelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Mechanisms of moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *71*(2), 364–374. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.2.364

Bjärehed, M., Thornberg, R., & Gianluca, G. (2020). Mechanisms of moral disengagement and their associations with indirect bullying, direct bullying, and pro-aggressive bystander behavior. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *40*(1), 28–55. https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431618824745

Blasi, A. (1980). Bridging moral cognition and moral action: A critical review of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, *88*(1), 1–45. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.88.1.1

Blasi, A. (1984). Moral identity: Its role in moral functioning. In W. Kurtines & J. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Morality, moral behavior, and moral development* (pp. 128–139). Wiley.

Brandenberger, J., & Bowman, N. A. (2015). Prosocial growth during college: Results of a national study. *Journal of Moral Education*, *44*(3), 328–345. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2015.1048792

Caprara, G. V., Luengo Kanacri, B. P., Gerbino, M., Zuffianò, A., Alessandri, G., & Bridglall, B. (2014). Positive effects of promoting prosocial behavior in early adolescence: Evidence from a school-based intervention. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *38*(4), 386–396. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025414531464

Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1993). Early emotional instability, prosocial behavior, and aggression: Some methodological aspects. *European Journal of Personality*, *7*(1), 19–36. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2410070103

Caravita, S. C. S., Sijtsema, J. J., Rambaran, A. J., & Gini, G. (2014). Peer influence on moral disengagement in late childhood and early adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *43*(2), 193–207. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-9953-1

Carlo, G., & Conejo, L. D. (2019). Traditional and culture-specific parenting of prosociality in US Latino/as. In D. Laible, G. Carlo, & L. Padilla-Walker (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of parenting and moral development* (pp. 247–268). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190638696.013.15

Carlo, G., Eisenberg, N., & Knight, G. P. (1992). An objective measure of adolescents' prosocial moral reasoning. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *2*(4), 331–349. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327795jra0204_3

Carlo, G., McGinley, M., Hayes, R., Batenhorst, C., & Wilkinson, J. (2007). Parenting styles or practices? Parenting, sympathy, and prosocial behaviors among adolescents. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, *168*(2), 147–176. https://doi.org/10.3200/GNTP.168.2.147-176

Carlo, G., Mestre, M. V., McGinley, M. M., Tur-Porcar, A., Samper, P., & Opal, D. (2014). The protective role of prosocial behaviors on antisocial behaviors: The mediating effects of deviant peer affiliation. *Journal of Adolescence*, *37*(4), 359–366. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2014.02.009

Carlo, G., Mestre, M. V., Samper, P., Tur, A., & Armenta, B. E. (2011). The longitudinal relations among dimensions of parenting styles, sympathy, prosocial moral reasoning, and prosocial behaviors. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *35*(2), 116–124. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025410375921

Carlo, G., & Randall, B. A. (2002). The development of a measure of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *31*(1), 31–44. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014033032440

Carlo, G., White, R. M. B., Streit, C., Knight, G. P., & Zeiders, K. H. (2018). Longitudinal relations among parenting styles, prosocial behaviors, and academic outcomes in U.S. Mexican adolescents. *Child Development*, *89*(2), 577–592. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12761

Chen, J. M., & Ratliff, K. A. (2018). Psychological essentialism predicts intergroup bias. *Social Cognition*, *36*(3), 301–323. https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2018.36.3.301

Cohen, T. R., & Morse, L. (2014). Moral character: What it is and what it does. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *34*, 43–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2014.08.003

Davis, A. N., & Carlo, G. (2018). The roles of parenting practices, sociocognitive/emotive traits, and prosocial behaviors in low-income adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, *62*, 140–150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2017.11.011

De Freitas, J., & Cikara, M. (2018). Deep down my enemy is good: Thinking about the true self reduces intergroup bias. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *74*, 307–316. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.10.006

De Freitas, J., Cikara, M., Grossmann, I., & Schlegel, R. (2017). Origins of the belief in good true selves. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *21*(9), 634–636. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2017.05.009

De Freitas, J., Cikara, M., Grossmann, I., & Schlegel, R. (2018). Moral goodness is the essence of personal identity. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *22*(9), 739–740. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2018.05.006

de Guzman, M. R. T., Landoy, B. V. N., Garcia, A. S., & Padasas, I. O. (2019). Parenting and the prosocial behaviors of children: Across cultures. In D. Laible, G. Carlo, & L. Padilla-Walker (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of parenting and moral development* (pp. 163–178). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190638696.013.11

Diesendruck, G. (2021). A motivational perspective on the development of social essentialism. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *30*(1), 76–81. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721420980724

Diesendruck, G., & Menahem, R. (2015). Essentialism promotes children's inter-ethnic bias. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *6*, 1180. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01180

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., & Spinrad, T. L. (2006). Prosocial development. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Series Eds.), & N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social emotional and personality development* (6th ed., pp. 646–718). Wiley & Sons. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470147658.chpsy0311

Eisenberg, N., Hofer, C., Sulik, M. J., & Liew, J. (2014). The development of prosocial moral reasoning and a prosocial orientation in young adulthood: Concurrent and longitudinal correlates. *Developmental Psychology*, *50*(1), 58–70. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032990

Findley-Van Nostrand, D., & Ojanen, T. (2018). Forms of prosocial behaviors are differentially linked to social goals and peer status in adolescents. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, *179*(6), 329–342. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221325.2018.1518894

Fontaine, R. G., Fida, R., Paciello, M., Tisak, M. S., & Caprara, G. V. (2014). The mediating role of moral disengagement in the developmental course from peer rejection in adolescence to crime in early adulthood. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *20*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2012.719622

Foshee, V. A., Reyes, L. M., Tharmp, A. T., Chang, L.-Y., Ennett, S. T., Simon, T. R. Latzman, N. E. & Suchindran, C. (2015). Shared longitudinal predictors of physical peer and dating violence. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *56*(1), 106–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.08.003

Frensch, K. M., Pratt, M. W., & Norris, J. E. (2007). Foundations of generativity: Personal and family correlates of emerging adults' generative life-story themes. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *41*(1), 45–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2006.01.005

Fu, X., Padilla-Walker, L.M. & Brown, M.N. (2017). Longitudinal relations between adolescents' self-esteem and prosocial belonging toward strangers, friends, and family. *Journal of Adolescence*, *57*, 90–98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2017.04.002

Gelman, S. A. (2004). Psychological essentialism in children. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *8*(9), 404–409. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2004.07.001

Gibbs, J. C. (2019). *Moral development and reality: Beyond the theories of Kohlberg, Hoffman, and Haidt* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190878214.001.0001

Gini, G. (2006). Social cognition and moral cognition in bullying: What's wrong? *Aggressive Behavior*, *32*(6), 528–539. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20153

Gini, G., Marino, C., Pozzoli, T., & Holt, M. (2018). Associations between peer victimization, perceived teacher unfairness, and adolescents' adjustment and well-being. *Journal of School Psychology*, *67*, 56–68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2017.09.005

Gini, G., Pozzoli, T., & Hymel, S. (2014). Moral disengagement among children and youth: A meta-analytic review of links to aggressive behavior. *Aggressive Behavior*, *40*(1), 56–68. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21502

Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *96*(5), 1029–1046. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015141

Hamlin, J. K., & Wynn, K. (2011). Young infants prefer prosocial to antisocial others. *Cognitive Development*, *26*(1), 30–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2010.09.001

Hardy, S. A., & Carlo, G. (2005). Identity as a source of moral motivation. *Human Development*, *48*(4), 232–256. https://doi.org/10.1159/000086859

Haslam, N., Bastian, B., & Bissett, M. (2004). Essentialist beliefs about personality and their implications. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *30*(12), 1661–1673. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271182

Haslam, N., Rothschild, L., & Ernst, D. (2000). Essentialist beliefs about social categories. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *39*(1), 113–127. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466600164363

Hastings, P. D., Utendale, W. T., & Sullivan, C. (2007). The socialization of prosocial development. In J. Grusec & P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization: Theory and research* (pp. 638–664). Guilford Press.

Heiphetz, L. (2019). Moral essentialism and generosity among children and adults. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *148*(12), 2077–2090. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000587

Heiphetz, L., Strohminger, N., & Young, L. L. (2017). The role of moral beliefs, memories, and preferences in representations of identity. *Cognitive Science*, *41*(3), 744–767. https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12354

Hertz, S. G., & Krettenauer, T. (2016). Does moral identity effectively predict moral behavior? A meta-analysis. *Review of General Psychology*, *20*(2), 129–140. https://doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000062

Hitti, A., Mulvey, K. L., Rutland, A., Abrams, D., & Killen, M. (2014). When is it okay to exclude a member of the ingroup? Children's and adolescents' social reasoning. *Social Development*, *23*(3), 451–469. https://doi.org/10.1111/sode.12047

Hyde, L. W., Shaw, D. S., & Moilanen, K. L. (2010). Developmental precursors of moral disengagement and the role of moral disengagement in the development of antisocial behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *38*(2), 197–209. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-009-9358-5

Kavussanu, M., Stangor, N. & Ring, C. (2015). The effects of moral identity on moral emotion and antisocial behavior in sport. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance*, *4*, 258–279. https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000040

Killen, M. (2007). Children's social and moral reasoning about exclusion. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *16*(1), 32–36. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00470.x

Killen, M., Abrams, D., Mulvey, K.L., & Hitti, A. (2013) Development of intra- and intergroup judgments in the context of moral and social-conventional norms. *Child Development, 84*, 1063-1083. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12011

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

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

Killen, M., Stangor, C., Price, B. S., Horn, S., & Sechrist, G. B. (2004). Social reasoning about racial exclusion in intimate and nonintimate relationships. *Youth & Society*, *35*(3), 293–322. https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X03257669

Kingsford, J. M., Hawes, D. J., & de Rosnay, M. (2018). The moral self and moral identity: Developmental questions and conceptual challenges. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *36*(4), 652–666. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjdp.12260

Knight, G. P., & Carlo, G. (2012). Prosocial development among Mexican American youth. *Child Development Perspectives*, *6*(3), 258–263. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-8606.2012.00233.x

Knight, G. P., Carlo, G., Basilio, C. D., & Jacobson, R. P. (2015). Familism values, perspective taking, and prosocial moral reasoning: Predicting prosocial tendencies among Mexican American adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *25*(4), 717–727. https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12164

Kohlberg, L., Levine, C., & Hewer, A. (1983). Moral stages: A current formulation and a response to critics. In J. A. Meacham (Ed.), *Contributions to human development* (Vol. 10). Karger.

Krettenauer, T. (2019). *Moral identity as a dual goal-orientation* [Paper presentation]. Association for Moral Education 45th Annual Meeting, Seattle, WA, United States.

Krettenauer, T., & Hertz, S. (2015). What develops in moral identities? A critical review. *Human Development*, *58*(3), 137–153. https://doi.org/10.1159/000433502

Krettenauer, T., Murua, L. A., & Jia, F. (2016). Age-related differences in moral identity across adulthood. *Developmental Psychology*, *52*(6), 972–984. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000127

Krettenauer, T., & Victor, R. (2017). Why be moral? Moral identity motivation and age. *Developmental Psychology*, *53*(8), 1589–1596. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000353

Laible, D. J., Carlo, G., & Padilla-Walker, L. M. (Eds.). (2019). *Oxford handbook of parenting and moral development*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190638696.001.0001

Laible, D. J., Conover, O., Lewis, M. E., Karabuta, E., Van Norden, C., Stat, W., Carlo, G., & Cruz, A. (2019). The quality of mother–daughter disclosure: Links with predictors and adolescents' sociomoral outcomes. *Social Development*, *28*(4), 782–801. https://doi.org/10.1111/sode.12378

Laird, R. D., & Zeringue, M. M. (2019). Parental knowledge and child disclosure as they related to prosocial and antisocial behaviors. In D. Laible, G. Carlo, & L. Padilla-Walker (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of parenting and moral development* (pp. 147–162). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190638696.013.22

Lapsley, D. (2016). Moral self-identity and the social-cognitive theory of virtue. In L. Annas, D. Narvaez, & N. Snow (Eds.), *Advances in virtue development* (pp. 34–68). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190271466.003.0003

Lapsley, D., & Carlo, G. (2014). Moral development at the crossroads: New trends and possible futures. *Developmental Psychology*, *50*(1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035225

Lapsley, D., & Hardy, S. (2017). Identity formation and moral development in emerging adulthood. In L. Padilla-Walker & L. Nelson (Eds.), *Flourishing in the third decade of life* (pp. 14–44). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190260637.003.0002

Lapsley, D., & Narvaez, D. (2004). A social-cognitive view of moral character. In D. Lapsley & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Moral development: Self and identity* (pp. 201–224). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410610256-13

Lawford, H., Pratt, M. W., Hunsberger, B., & Pancer, S. M. (2005). Adolescent generativity: A longitudinal study of two possible contexts for learning concern for future generations. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *15*(3), 261–273. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2005.00096.x

Luengo Kanacri, B. P., Pastorelli, C., Eisenberg, N., Zuffianò, A., Castellani, V., & Caprara, G. V. (2014). Trajectories of prosocial behavior from adolescence to early adulthood: Associations with personality change. *Journal of Adolescence*, *37*(5), 701–713. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2014.03.013

Markiewicz, D., Doyle, A. B., & Brendgen, M. (2001). The quality of adolescents' friendships: Associations with mothers' interpersonal relationships, attachments to parents and friends, and prosocial behaviors. *Journal of Adolescence*, *24*(4), 429–445. https://doi.org/10.1006/jado.2001.0374

Martin, K. M., & Huebner, E. S. (2007). Peer victimization and prosocial experiences and emotional well-being of middle school students. *Psychology in the Schools*, *44*(2), 199–208. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20216

McAdams, D. P. (2015). *The art and science of personality development*. Guilford Press.

Metzger, A., Alvis, L. M., Oosterhoff, B., Babskie, E., Syvertsen, A., & Wray-Lake, L. (2018). The intersection of emotional and sociocognitive competencies with civic engagement in middle childhood and adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *47*(8), 1663–1683. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-018-0842-5

Mounts, N. S., & Allen, C. (2019). Parenting styles and practices: Traditional approaches and their application to multiple types of moral behavior. In D. J. Laible, G. Carlo, & L. M. Padilla-Walker (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of parenting and moral development* (pp. 41–56). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190638696.013.10

Murdoch, I. (2003). *Metaphysics as a guide to morals*. Vintage.

Newman, G. E., Bloom, P., & Knobe, J. (2014). Value judgments and the true self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *40*(2), 203–216. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167213508791

Newman, G. E., De Freitas, J., & Knobe, J. (2015). Beliefs about the true self explain asymmetries based on moral judgment. *Cognitive Science*, *39*(1), 96–125. https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12134

Newman, G. E., & Knobe, J. (2019). The essence of essentialism. *Mind & Language*, *34*(5), 585–605. https://doi.org/10.1111/mila.12226

Niu, L., Jin, S., Li, L., & French, D. C. (2016). Popularity and social preference in Chinese adolescents: Associations with social and behavioral adjustment. *Social Development*, *25*(4), 828–845. https://doi.org/10.1111/sode.12172

Nucci, L. (1981). Conceptions of personal issues: A domain distinct from moral or societal concepts. *Child Development*, *52*(1), 114–121. https://doi.org/10.2307/1129220

Nucci, L. (2019). Character: A developmental system. *Child Development Perspectives*, *13*(2), 73–78. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12313

Nucci, L., Hasebe, Y., & Linds-Dyer, M. T. (2005). Adolescent psychological well-being and parental control of the personal. In J. Smetana (Ed.), *Changing boundaries of parental authority during adolescence*

(pp. 17–30). Jossey-Bass. https://doi.org/10.1002/cd.125

Nucci, L., & Turiel, E. (2009). Capturing the complexity of moral development and education. *Mind, Brain, and Education*, *3*(3), 151–159. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-228X.2009.01065.x

Nucci, L., Turiel, E., & Roded, A. D. (2017). Continuities and discontinuities in the development of moral judgment. *Human Development*, *60*(6), 279–341. https://doi.org/10.1159/000484067

O'Driscoll, D. Taylor, & Dautel, J. B. (2021). Essentialist beliefs affect children's outgroup empathy, attitudes and prosocial behaviours in a setting of intergroup conflict. *International Journal of Psychology*, *56*(1), 151–156. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12679

Ongley, S. F., & Malti, T. (2014). The role of moral emotions in the development of children's sharing behavior. *Developmental Psychology*, *50*(4), 1148–1159. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035191

Padilla-Walker, L. M., Carlo, G., Christensen, K. J., & Yorgasaon, J. B. (2012). Bidirectional relations between authoritative parenting and adolescents' prosocial behaviors. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *22*(3), 400–408. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2012.00807.x

Padilla-Walker, L. M., Millett, M. A., & Memmott-Elison, M. K. (2020). Can helping others strengthen teens? Character strengths as mediators between prosocial behavior and adolescents' internalizing symptoms. *Journal of Adolescence, 79,* 70-80. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2020.01.001

Pasupathi, M., & Wainryb, C. (2010). Developing moral agency through narrative. *Human Development*, *53*(2), 55–80. https://doi.org/10.1159/000288208

Perren, S., & Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger, E. (2012). Cyberbullying and traditional bullying in adolescence: Differential roles of moral disengagement, moral emotions, and moral values. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *9*(2), 195–209. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2011.643168

Poorthuis, A. M. G., Thomaes, S., Denissen, J. J. A., van Aken, M. A. G., & Orobio de Castro, B. (2012). Prosocial tendencies predict friendship quality, but not for popular children. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *112*(4), 378–388. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2012.04.002

Pozzoli, T., Gini, G., & Thornberg, R. (2016). Bullying and defending behavior: The role of explicit and implicit moral cognition. *Journal of School Psychology*, *59*, 67–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2016.09.005

Pratt, M. W., Arnold, M. L., & Lawford, H. (2009). Growing toward care: A narrative approach to prosocial moral identity and generativity of personality in emerging adulthood. In D. Narvaez & D. K. Lapsley (Eds.), *Personality, identity, and character: Explorations in moral psychology* (pp. 295–315). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511627125.014

Reed, A., II, & Aquino, K. F. (2003). Moral identity and the expanding circle of moral regard toward out-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*(6), 1270–1286. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.6.1270

Rhodes, M., Leslie, S.-J., Saunders, K., Dunham, Y., & Cimpian, A. (2018). How does social essentialism affect the development of inter-group relations? *Developmental Science*, *21*(1), e12509. https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12509

Roberts, S. O., Ho, A. K., Rhodes, M., & Gelman, S. A. (2017). Making boundaries great again: Essentialism and support for boundary-enhancing initiatives. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *43*(12), 1643–1658. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167217724801

Rottman, J., Foster-Handson, E., Bellersen, S., & Kroll, N. (2021). *The stringency of moral kinds* [Paper presentation]. Society of Philosophy and Psychology 47th Annual Meeting.

Selman, R. L. (1980). *The growth of interpersonal understanding*. Academic Press.

Shen, Y.-L., Carlo, G., & Knight, G. P. (2013). Relations between parental discipline, empathy-related traits and prosocial moral reasoning: A multi-cultural examination. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *33*(7), 994–1021. https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431613479670

Sherman, N. (1989). *The fabric of character: Aristotle's theory of virtue*. Clarendon Press.

Sijtsema, J. J., Rambaran, J. A., Caravita, S. C. S., & Gini, G. (2014). Friendship selection and influence in bullying and defending: Effects of moral disengagement. *Developmental Psychology*, *50*(8), 2093–2104. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037145

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). Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203581957.ch2

Smith, I. H., Aquino, K., Koleva, S. & Graham, J. (2014). The moral ties that bind . . . even to out-groups: The interactive effect of moral identity and the binding moral foundations. *Psychological Science*, *25*(8), 1554–4562. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614534450

Smyth, K., Feeney, A., Eidson, R. C., & Coley, J. D. (2017). Development of essentialist thinking about religion categories in Northern Ireland (and the United States). *Developmental Psychology*, *53*(3), 475–496. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000253

Strohminger, N., Knobe, J., & Newman, G. (2017). The true self: A psychological concept distinct from the self. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *12*(4), 551–560. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616689495

Strohminger, N., & Nichols, S. (2014). The essential moral self. *Cognition*, *131*(1), 159–171. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2013.12.005

Summers, J. J., & Falco, L. D. (2020). The development and validation of a new measure of adolescent purpose. *Journal of Experimental Education*, *88*(1), 47–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.2019.1575178

Sutherland, S. L., & Cimpian, A. (2019). Developmental evidence for a link between the inherence bias in explanation and psychological essentialism. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *177*, 265–281. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2018.06.002

Teng, Z., Nie, Q., Zhu, Z., & Guo, C. (2020). Violent video game exposure and (cyber) bullying perpetration among Chinese youth: The moderating role of trait anger and moral identity. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *104*, 106193. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.106193

Thornberg, R., & Jungert, T. (2013). Bystander behavior in bullying situations: Basic moral sensitivity, moral disengagement and defender self-efficacy. *Journal of Adolescence*, *36*(3), 475–483. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2013.02.003

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

van der Graaff, J., Carlo, G., Crocetti, E., Koot, H. M., & Branje, S. (2018). Prosocial behavior in adolescence: Gender differences in development and links with empathy. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *47*(5), 1086–1099. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-017-0786-1

Van Tongeren, D. R., Green, J. D., Davis, D. E., Hook, J. N., & Hulsey, T. L. (2016). Prosociality enhances meaning in life. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, *11*(3), 225–236. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2015.1048814

Wang, X., Yang, J., Wang, P., Zhang, Y., Li, B., Xie, X., & Lei, L. (2020). Deviant peer affiliation and bullying perpetration in adolescents: The mediating role of moral disengagement and the moderating role of moral identity. *Journal of Psychology*, *154*(3), 199–213. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2019.1696733

Wang, X., Yang, L., Yang, J., Wang, P., & Lei, L. (2017). Trait anger and cyberbullying among young adults: A moderated mediation model of moral disengagement and moral identity. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *73*, 519–526. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.03.073

Weimer, A., Dowds, S. J. P., Fabricius, W., Schwanenflugel, P. J., & Suh, G. W. (2017). Development of constructivist theory of mind from middle childhood to early adolescence and its relation to social cognition and behavior. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *154*, 28–45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2016.10.002

Wolters, N., Knoors, H., Cilessen, A. H. N., & Verhoeven, L. (2014). Behavioral, personality, and communicative predictors of acceptance and popularity in early adolescence. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *34*(5), 585–605. https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431613510403

Zuffianò, A., Alessandri, G., Luengo Kanacri, B. P., Miloni, M., Ceravolo, R., & Caprara, G. V. (2014). The relation between prosociality and self-esteem from middle-adolescence to young adulthood. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *63*, 24–29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.01.041