

Wilfrid Laurier University

Scholars Commons @ Laurier

Psychology Faculty Publications

Psychology

2015

What Develops in Moral Identities? A Critical Review

Tobias Krettenauer

Wilfrid Laurier University, tkrettenauer@wlu.ca

Steven Hertz

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.wlu.ca/bpsy_faculty



Part of the [Developmental Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

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>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Psychology at Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Psychology Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

Running head: MORAL IDENTITIES

What develops in moral identities? A critical review

Tobias Krettenauer & Steven Hertz

Wilfrid Laurier University

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>

Please address correspondence to:

Dr. Tobias Krettenauer

Department of Psychology

Wilfrid Laurier University

75 University Ave W

Waterloo, ON N2L 3C5

CANADA

email: tkrettenauer@wlu.ca

Abstract

According to the standard model of moral identity development, moral identities emerge during adolescence and early adulthood. Contrary to this assumption, however, moral identity research has consistently failed to demonstrate any age-related change in this developmental period. The present paper discusses implications of this non-finding. It is argued that researchers need to broaden the scope of inquiry and include developmental aspects of the moral identity construct that have been neglected in the past. Three areas are identified where moral identity development likely occurs in adolescence and beyond: (1) context-dependent differentiation and integration of the self-importance of moral values, (2) growth in internal moral motivation and (3) unfolding of narratives of moral responsibility. It is suggested that any systematic investigation into these areas will reveal important developmental changes in moral identities and, thus, will confirm the developmental nature of the moral identity construct.

Key words: Morality, identity, development, adolescence

What develops in moral identities? A critical review

The moral identity construct has made some history in Psychology. Since being introduced in the early 1980s by Blasi (1983, 1984) it has been subject of hundreds of research articles, dissertations and book chapters. Conferences were organized around the theme (Edelstein, Nunner-Winkler, & Noam, 1993; Narvaez & Lapsley, 2009) and major review articles published (Bergman, 2002; Hardy & Carlo, 2005, 2011). In the most recent edition of the Handbook of Moral Development an entire chapter was devoted to the topic (Walker, 2014). This rise of the moral identity construct coincides with the eclipse of Kohlberg's stage model (Kohlberg, 1984). In fact, it can be seen as a response to two major limitations Kohlberg's theory has been repeatedly criticized for: First, the difficulty of predicting moral action from moral judgment within the stage model (see Walker, 2004). Second, the exclusive focus of this model on moral cognition at the expense of other important aspects of moral functioning, notably moral affect. The moral identity construct promised to bridge the gap that separates moral judgment from moral action by providing a more inclusive account of moral development, which integrates moral cognition with emotions, moral motivation and the self (cf. Hart, 2005). After more than 25 years of research in this area it seems fair to ask: Did the construct deliver what it promised?

In the past 25 years, dozens of studies were conducted to investigate the relationship between moral identity and moral behavior. Considering only those studies that independently assess moral identity and moral behavior (and do not merely take moral behavior as a marker of moral identity), Hertz and Krettenauer (2015) were able to identify 77 experimental and correlational studies that investigated a broad range of

prosocial, ethical and antisocial behaviors in relation to individuals' moral identity. The vast majority of studies reported small to moderate effects of moral identity consistent with the notion that moral identity strengthens individuals' readiness to engage in prosocial action and to abstain from antisocial or harmful behavior. Moreover, moral identity was repeatedly found to counteract situational pressures and affordances for acting immorally (e.g., Aquino, Freeman, Reed, Felps, & Lim, 2009; Brebels, De Cremer, Van Dijke, & Van Hiel, 2011). Even though the moral identity construct does not fare significantly better than other predictors of moral action (notably moral emotions; see Malti & Krettenauer, 2013), these findings overall suggest that a person's moral identity is of considerable psychological import when it comes to explaining moral behavior.

The moral identity construct has enjoyed great popularity as a predictor of actual behaviour in academic fields outside developmental psychology. By contrast, the issue of moral identity *development* has been investigated much less. When studies reported age-graded change in adolescence or early adulthood, findings typically turned out to be non-significant (for details see next section). Thus, there is little empirical support for age-graded change in a developmental period that is commonly considered crucial for moral identity formation. Correspondingly, leading advocates of the construct openly concede "a paucity of developmental research" (Lapsley & Stey, 2014, p. 97) and lack of knowledge regarding "precursors of moral identity and developmental trajectories" (Hardy & Carlo, 2011, p. 214). Evidently, the moral identity construct has not taken roots in developmental psychology so far and its initial promise to provide a vantage point

from which to build an integrative theory of moral development is far from being fulfilled.

The present paper represents an attempt to change this situation. By discussing what features of a moral identity likely undergo systematic developmental change, we hope to stimulate further investigations into the topic of moral identity development, which ultimately will help to overcome the lack of developmental knowledge lamented by scholars in moral identity research. Towards this end, we first will describe what can be considered the standard model of moral identity development, which so far has received very little empirical support. The lack of empirical evidence for age-graded change in adolescents' and young adults' moral identities is due - at least partly - to a top-down logic of research that places strong emphasis on the moral identity construct as a predictor of moral action and largely neglects its developmental features. As a consequence, common conceptualizations and measures of moral identity are not sensitive for detecting developmental changes in this construct. Whereas moral identity research has been dominated by trait-based or sociocognitive approaches, it is argued that a personological approach is most suitable for identifying areas of developmental change in moral identities. Three areas will be discussed in detail, namely context-dependent differentiation and integration of moral values, growth in internal moral motivation and the unfolding of narratives of moral responsibility. Changes in all three areas are likely to occur in adolescence and beyond, but have been largely neglected by previous moral identity research.

Moral Identity Development: The Standard Model

Guiding assumption

Moral identity has been defined as "the degree to which being a moral person is important to an individual's identity" (Hardy & Carlo, 2011, p. 212). In other words, if an individual feels that moral values such as being honest, compassionate, fair and generous are central for defining her personal identity, she has a strong moral identity. Following this definition, the goal of moral identity development is in the integration of self and morality such that self-concerns and moral concerns become unified. Researchers may employ different notions as to what this integration of self and morality exactly entails and may rely on various methodological approaches to assess it empirically. Still, in its most basic form, the idea of an integration of self and morality has been the guiding principle for much research on moral identity development, as the following examples covering three decades of moral identity research demonstrate.

The idea of an integration of self and morality is clearly present in Blasi's early writings (Blasi, 1988, 1995) when he describes two aspects of moral identities: (a) the centrality of moral values for the individual's self-understanding and (b) the level of their internalization or self-integration. Moral values can be more or less central in defining the content of a person's identity, as well as more or less integrated in the self-system. Once integrated, they are experienced as self-ideals a person wants to achieve rather than as social expectations one is supposed to meet. In Blasi's (1995) own words:

Values ... are integrated with one's motivational and emotional systems, are made the object of agentic processes, including responsibility; and are finally taken as a basis for the construction of one's self-concept and identity ... These themes

should not be seen as defining developmental steps, but rather, as being dialectically interrelated throughout one's life. (p. 234)

Colby and Damon (1992) elaborated on the notion of an integration of self and morality on the basis of a qualitative study of moral exemplars (i.e., people who demonstrated outstanding and sustained moral commitment over their life-course). They found that moral exemplars expressed a marked unity between self and morality such that their own personal interests and desires were identical with what they perceived as morally desirable. Moral exemplars "... seamlessly integrate their moral commitment with their personal concerns so that the fulfillment of the one implies the fulfillment of the other." (Colby & Damon, 1992, p. 300). This enables them to act with great certainty, spontaneity, and little doubt or hesitation when acting morally.

Taking a more rigorous empirical approach than Colby and Damon (1992), Frimer and Walker (2009) were able to further corroborate and expand the notion of an integration of self and morality. According Frimer and Walker's *reconciliation model* of moral identity development, human motivation entails a fundamental duality between agency and communion. Individuals normally work towards either achieving their own goals or advancing those of others. This duality is overcome either by prioritizing one motivational system over the other or by reconciling the two. Reconciliation is the integration of agency and communion such that agential desires are fulfilled through the pursuit of communal concerns. According to Frimer and Walker, reconciliation lays the foundation for sustained moral commitment that often has been considered a marker for a strong moral identity (see Hart, 2005). Furthermore, reconciliation is the hallmark of

moral maturity. As Walker (2014) puts it, "In moral maturity, agency and communion do become meaningfully integrated" (p. 513).

Timing

When does this integration of self and morality that constitutes a person's moral identity typically occur in the course of development? According to Blasi and Glodis (1995) there is a shift in identity modes from *Identity Observed* to *Management of Identity* that typically occurs sometime between middle adolescence and emerging adulthood. In the Identity Observed mode there is a split between inner feelings and thoughts that reflect one's genuine self, on the one side, and public appearance and socially guided actions, on the other. Management of Identity, by contrast, emphasizes inner standards, belief, values and goals that define one's identity "... identity consists of managing one's life and shaping oneself in order to approximate one's ideals. Commitment to these ideals, fidelity in action, and concern for self-consistency become, then, important aspects of the sense of self" (Blasi & Glodis, 1995, p. 424). Commitment, fidelity and consistency are all qualities that describe essential features of a moral identity. Thus, with changes in identity modes from *Identity Observed* to *Management of Identity*, a moral identity becomes increasingly possible. This transition normally occurs in the years of mid adolescence to emerging adulthood, according to Blasi and Glodis.

While expanding on his own research into the development of self-understanding in childhood and adolescence, distributive justice, and moral exemplars, Damon (1996) arrived at a similar conclusion. As demonstrated in research on children's self-understanding (Damon & Hart, 1988), younger children make no reference to their moral

beliefs or goals when describing themselves. This typically does not happen before adolescence. As Damon (1996) wrote:

[Children] do not think of themselves as persons who are fair or not fair ... Their moral concerns do not translate into concerns about who they are. This segregation is resolved towards the end of childhood, when in fact children do begin thinking about themselves in terms of how kind, just, and responsible they are (p. 217).

Along with this change in children's self-understanding, Damon (1996) observed greater consistency between children's beliefs and actions particularly when tempted to act selfishly or to cheat. Thus, according to Damon, early to middle adolescence appears to be crucial for the emergence of a moral identity. This does not preclude further development in later age periods. Colby and Damon (1993) described changes across the life-span as a dialectical process where moral goals lead to moral actions, which in turn strengthen pre-existing goals and commitments.

Frimer and Walker (2009) refer to the reconciliation of agency and communion as an Eriksonian crisis. Resolving this crisis becomes a critical developmental crossroad that defines the range of future developmental outcomes available to the individual. Frimer and Walker state that reconciliation is "a process that begins, at the earliest in adolescence but may occur at any later point in time. Once established, we believe integrated identity remains stable" (Frimer & Walker, 2009, p. 1671). Note, that in more recent publication, Walker and collaborators shifted away from this focus on adolescence and investigated the integration of agency and communion from childhood to old age (Walker & Frimer, in press; Dunlop, Walker and Matsuba, 2013).

The various accounts of moral identity development described above converge with regard to three major developmental assumptions. First, it is assumed that the integration of self and morality that constitutes a moral identity is not available to children. In this sense, children lack a moral identity. This does not preclude that less demanding forms of morality-self integration occur in childhood (cf. Kochanska, Koenig, Barry, Sanghang, & Yoon, 2010; Krettenauer, Campbell, & Hertz, 2013; Krettenauer, 2014). Second, self and morality become increasingly integrated in adolescence or emerging adulthood, giving rise to a moral identity. Third, once this integration is achieved it allows individuals to embark on different developmental pathways. Those who have integrated self and morality to a considerable extent, and consequently have developed a strong moral identity, will likely seek out for opportunities to put their moral commitments into action, which in turn may further strengthen their moral identity. By contrast, those with weak moral identities will embark on non-moral careers, allowing them keep their agentic desires separate from communal or other moral concerns.

Taken together, these assumptions form what could be called the standard model of moral identity development. According to this view, moral identity development consists of three phases. The first phase, childhood, is void of moral identity. It is followed by the period of identity formation (adolescence to emerging adulthood). After identities are formed, individuals embark on moral identity elaboration, which is likely a multi-directional process, where the moral identities of some individuals are further strengthened, and others' not.

The Empirical Challenge: Lack of Evidence for Developmental Change

According to the standard model, a moral identity is not present in childhood and emerges at some point in time between early adolescence and emerging adulthood. If most normally developing teenagers start to integrate moral values into their self over the adolescent years (at least to some extent), a moderate association between moral identity and age is to be expected for this age period. However, studies do not support this view.

Research on adolescents' moral identity development typically is based on a list of values, both moral and non-moral, that is presented to participants (e.g., being honest, generous, responsible, caring, fair versus being athletic, energetic, organized). Respondents are asked to rate these values according to their self-importance. A sum score is derived that reflects the self-importance of moral values (sometimes in absolute terms, sometimes relative to non-moral values). Whereas the standard model would imply a positive correlation between moral identity and adolescents' or young adults' age, this score was repeatedly found to be unrelated to age in several large-scale cross-sectional studies, as well as two longitudinal studies covering the age period of mid to late adolescence (Hardy, 2006; Hardy, Walker, Olsen, Woodbury, & Hickman, 2014; Hardy, Walker, Rackham, & Olsen, 2012; Krettenauer, 2011; Pratt, Hunsberger, & Pancer, 2003).

At this point, one may question the validity of adolescents' self-reports regarding the self-importance of moral values. However, even when the well-validated measure developed by Aquino and Reed (2002) was used, no age differences between 15- and 20-year-olds were found (Krettenauer & Casey, 2014). Similar findings were reported in studies with young adults (Gu, 2011; Matherne & Litchfield, 2012; McFerran, Aquino, &

Duffy, 2010; O'Fallon & Butterfield, 2011; Reynolds, Dang, Yam, & Leavitt, 2014). All these studies replicated the finding from the very first study on adolescent moral identity development, conducted by Arnold (1993), that did not reveal any relationship between the self-rated importance of moral virtues and adolescents' age.

Thus, moral identity as assessed by current measures typically does not evidence significant age-related increases in a developmental period that is considered crucial for moral identity formation according to the standard model. To be sure, chronological age is only a proxy for development and more longitudinal data is needed to draw definite conclusions. Still, the consistent failure of past research to document any age-related change in adolescents' and young adults' moral identities warrants further scrutiny.

Responding to the Challenge: Bringing Development to the Forefront

Considering the lack of empirical support for developmental change in moral identities, skeptics of the moral identity construct (e.g., Nucci, 2004; Proulx & Chandler, 2009) may contend that this finding is not accidental but reflects a major flaw of the concept itself. Since its inception, the moral identity construct has been discussed both as a developmental dimension and as an important dimension of individual differences (Lapsley & Hill, 2009). The lack of empirical support for age-graded change in individuals' moral identities may indicate that this construct primarily represents a dimension of individual differences that undergoes very little change in the course of development. The available data, at this point, do not refute this conclusion. Yet, in view of the general literature on the development of morality, personality, and identity, a general lack of change appears highly implausible. Young children do not have a moral identity. Moral identities emerge in the course of development. The very notion of an

identity formation is the antithesis of stability. More importantly, many individual characteristics that are assumed to be highly stable over the course of development (e.g., personality traits, aggressiveness, intelligence) undergo systematic change in the way these characteristics are expressed in everyday behavior. From this perspective, developmental change in moral identities is the default scenario. Stability is a particular instantiation of constancy in change (for a more elaborate discussion of this issue as it applies to the concept moral character, see Lerner & Schmid Callina, 2014).

With regard to moral identity development, two aspects of change need to be distinguished: Development of individual differences, and general age-related change in features defining a person's moral identity. Development of individual differences can be multidirectional and is not necessarily paralleled by general age-related trends. Thus, some moral identities become stronger over time, and others weaker, potentially yielding no general developmental trend in the way morality is integrated into the self. Conversely, a general development trend is fully compatible with little to no change in individual differences. Whereas the development of individual differences and general age-related change are two analytically distinct aspects of development, empirically they likely co-occur and interact in the course of moral identity development. Thus, individual differences are transformed as moral identities develop from less to more mature. At the same time, a general developmental trend can lead to more or less stable individual differences as the rate of development slows down for some individuals but not for others.

Evidently, the various forms of developmental change and their interactions have been largely unexplored in moral identity research so far. As described at the beginning,

researchers have been focussing mostly on moral identity as a predictor of moral behavior. In many studies investigating age-related differences was peripheral. This focus of analysis was justified by a top-down logic a research (cf. Lapsley & Stey, 2014). According to this logic, it is advisable to first identify the critical features of a mature adult moral identity that reliably predict moral behavior. Once this task has been accomplished researchers are assumed to be better equipped to track the developmental pathways that lead to the desired outcome (Walker, 2014). This logic of research certainly has its merits, however, it leaves earlier and less mature forms of moral identity largely undefined. As a consequence, the developmental processes that link less developed with more mature forms of moral identity remain elusive. Identifying a possible endpoint of development as such is not sufficient for extrapolating a developmental history. Investigations into developmental change of important features defining a person's moral identity therefore are indispensable.

Taking these various lines of argument together, it is hardly surprising that research to date has largely failed to empirically demonstrate the developmental nature of the moral identity construct. Common conceptualizations and measures may not be sensitive for important developmental changes in this construct. In order to identify these changes, researchers need to step up efforts on conceptual as well as empirical grounds. They need to clarify conceptually what features of moral identities likely undergo systematic developmental change as these features area not necessarily implied in the prediction of moral action. Based on this conceptual groundwork, researchers need to empirically investigate developmental change in moral identities more systematically than has been done in the past.

In the second half of the present paper, we undertake a first step in this direction by identifying important areas of moral identity development that have been neglected in previous research.

Areas of Developmental Change in Moral Identities

In his overview chapter, Walker (2014) distinguished three major approaches to investigating issues of moral personality, motivation, and identity: Trait-based, sociocognitive, and personological approaches. Trait-based approaches assume cross-situational consistency and temporal stability in behavioral dispositions relevant for individuals' moral conduct. Sociocognitive approaches, by contrast, stress the importance of situation-specific knowledge structures and schemas that guide self-regulation and action. Personological approaches take up the integrative framework provided by Dan McAdams (cf. McAdams & Pals, 2006) and argue that moral personality, motivation and identity needs to be studied on different layers of abstraction that are all equally important for describing the moral person. These layers address dispositional traits, characteristic adaptations, and the life-story.

Even though trait-based, sociocognitive and personological approaches do not explicitly address developmental change in moral identities, they largely differ with regard to their ability to accommodate this issue. For trait-based approaches the essence of development is in stability. Change needs to be dealt with as an aberration. For sociocognitive approaches, development results from more fundamental processes of schema formation and activation and, hence, is in itself not a topic of interest. Correspondingly, "all socio cognitive theories share a common defect, which is the absence of a developmental account of the pathways that bring individuals to adult forms

of functioning" (Lapsley & Hill, 2009, p. 203). The personological approach, by contrast, is not committed to a particular personality theory that emphasizes either stability or malleability. At the same time, it provides rich observations of personality change across the life-span (see McAdams & Olson, 2010). A personological approach to moral identity, therefore, seems to be most promising when trying to specify important areas of moral identity development that have been neglected in the past.

It is important to note, however, that the personological approach developed by McAdams relates to personality in general and does not specifically deal with the topic of moral identity. McAdams (2009) considers the life-story as foundational for a person's identity. Consequently, within this framework the identity construct seems to be restricted to individuals' narratives about their past. In contradistinction to McAdams, however, Chandler, Lalonde, Sokol, and Hallett (2003) identified not just one but two different strategies of identity construction: a narrative and an essentialist strategy. Self-continuity and identity can be achieved through the authorship of a life-story (narrative strategy), or it can be achieved by assuming immutable characteristics that define the core self (essentialist strategy). To the extent that a person adopts an essentialist strategy, traits become part of their identity. Finally, in many areas of identity development researchers emphasize the importance of future-oriented commitments and life-goals that constitute a person's identity (cf. Schwartz, Luyckx, & Vignoles, 2011). These commitments qualify as *characteristic adaptations* in McAdams' terminology.

Thus, a moral identity is by no means limited to a person's life-story but can manifest itself on all three layers of personality description as specified by McAdams: dispositional traits, characteristic adaptations, and narratives. On the broadest, most

abstract, and least contextualized level, moral identities are reflected by those moral traits individuals ascribe as important to themselves in general (e.g., being honest, caring, tolerant etc.). On an intermediate level, moral identities are represented by different motivations and goal-orientations individuals maintain in various areas of their life (e.g., being a caring parent and a fair-minded colleague). On the least abstract levels, moral identities are expressed in life stories about moral achievements and failures in people's lives. These life-stories mitigate discrepancies and inconsistencies among conflicting self-aspects (McAdams, 1993) and sustain a personal sense of moral agency (Pasupathi & Wainryb, 2010). In the following section, we will point out developmental changes on each level that can be reasonably expected, but that have not been documented in the moral identity literature so far because commonly utilized measures of the construct are insensitive to these aspects.

Self-importance of moral values: Differentiation and Integration

It is commonly assumed that traits are highly decontextualized self-descriptions that apply to all areas of life equally. At the same time, there is clear empirical evidence that individuals make context-specific adjustments in global self-descriptions, depending on what social role is assumed (Diehl & Hay, 2007). Thus, general self-descriptions (such as being talkative, considerate, responsible) can vary depending on whether a respondent sees herself in the role of a student, friend, romantic partner, child, (co)-worker etc. (Donahue, Robins, Roberts, & John, 1993). More importantly, this context-specific differentiation of self-representations marks an important developmental achievement commonly attributed to the age period of adolescence. Harter (2012) describes the construction of multiple selves as a "critical developmental task" (p. 76) of adolescence

that is attributable to cognitive growth and an increased differentiation in social role expectations. In her own studies, she found an increased differentiation in self-descriptions across various contexts (family, friends, school) between early and middle adolescence that was accompanied by an heightened awareness of conflict (Harter, Bresnick, Bouchey, & Whitesell, 1997; Harter & Monsour, 1992). This increased differentiation was followed by an integration of conflicting self-descriptions between middle and late adolescence owing to the development of higher order self-representations.

Morality is not limited to a particular social context but cuts across all areas of life (e.g., family, school, friends). It can therefore reasonably be expected that the self-importance of moral values varies across social contexts (to some extent, at least) and that this context-dependent differentiation increases in adolescence. Even though this expectation has not been investigated in the context of moral identity development, a study of adolescents' value differentiation using Schwartz' typology (e.g., Schwartz et al., 2012) supports this view. In a large-scale cross-sectional study with Israeli and German adolescents, Daniel et al. (2012) found that the value orientations of young adolescents ($M = 11.6$ years) with regard to benevolence, achievement, conformity and self-direction were less differentiated across the three social contexts of family, school and country than the value orientations of 16-year-olds. Thus, adolescents' value orientations became more differentiated between early and middle adolescence. In this study, value integration was not addressed.

In a cross-sectional interview study covering an age range from 14 to 65 years, Krettenauer, Murua, & Pandori (2015) investigated the context-dependency of

individuals' moral identities. In this study, the self-importance of moral values was assessed separately in the context of family, work/school (depending on participants' age), and community. It was found that mean level of moral identity (average across contexts) and cross-context differentiation define two distinct aspects of moral identity that were differentially related to age: Whereas mean level of moral identity was uncorrelated with age, cross-context differentiation decreased in the adult years. In other words, individuals' moral identity became more coherent over the life-span. When asked why a certain set of values was rated most important across family, work and community, older participants more often than adolescents and young adults referred to the cross-context importance of these values as a defining feature of their moral identity (e.g., "This is all about me"). For these participants centrality of moral values was not merely in the importance of certain moral values, but in the fact that these values were *consistently* important across all areas of life. This may bolster individuals' sense of moral agency, as moral actions may be more strongly experienced as emanating from the self rather than from demand characteristics of a given situation. From this perspective, the integration of context-specific moral values may strengthen individuals' moral identities.

It is important to note at this point, that differentiation and integration refers to a general principle of development (cf. Raeff, 2011) and as such is not limited to increases in cross-context coherence in the self-importance of moral values. As individuals grow older, they may become increasingly aware that morality matters to them more in some areas of their lives than in others (fragmentation) or they may realize that moral priorities change under varying circumstances (compartmentalization). While these realizations

may be at first experienced as self-contradictory and confusing, individuals may later develop strategies to integrate their contextually differentiated moral identities. They may create justifications for why morality is less important in certain areas of their lives. Or, they may identify moral traits they consider important amidst contextual variation. Thus, their moral identities may integrate stable elements along with variable elements.

Growth in internal moral motivation

The self-importance of moral values reflects an important aspect of a person's moral identity. However, it does not fully encompass the notion of an integration of self and morality that has been guiding moral identity research (see Krettenauer, 2011). A person may feel that a moral value (e.g., honesty) is important to her because she wants to avoid trouble and does not want to disappoint others. By contrast, others may feel that honesty is a self-ideal they do not want to betray. In the former case, self-importance of honesty is externally motivated, whereas in the latter case the motivation is internal to the self.

Developmental psychology has a long history of studying different forms of internal or autonomous motivation. Various models of ego and identity development proposed a general developmental trend towards higher levels of internal motivation. These models generally assume that, with development, individuals' commitments to life-goals, values and ideals are increasingly experienced as self-chosen rather than externally imposed by others (e.g. Blasi & Glodis, 1995; Loevinger, 1993; Marcia, Waterman, Matteson, Archer, & Orlofsky, 1993). Even Kohlberg's stage model of moral development suggests a decline in external motivation as adolescents move out of the

preconventional Stages 1 and 2, and standards of individual conscience become more salient at the conventional Stages 3 and 4 (see Gibbs, Basinger, Grime, & Snarey, 2007).

While these models tend to view a high level of internal motivation as an endpoint of development, in that once achieved it is maintained across a broad range of domains, Self-Determination Theory considers it a flexible attribute that is more context-dependent (for an overview see Ryan & Deci, 2008). According to Self-Determination Theory, individuals' motivation to act can be described along a continuum defined by the poles of extrinsic versus intrinsic motivation. Extrinsically motivated actions are instrumental to achieving standards set by others, whereas intrinsic motivation is inherent in the activity freely chosen by the individual. Intrinsic motivation is limited to activities that are inherently gratifying and pleasurable. Actions that are based on the desire to meet social expectations or cultural norms can hardly be intrinsic in this sense. However, individuals are able to integrate these expectations to varying degrees, which leads to different levels of self-regulation along the continuum that is defined by the polarity of extrinsic versus intrinsic motivation. These levels are labelled *introjected*, *identified* and *integrated* motivation (Ryan, 1993). On the introjected level, compliance with social expectations becomes independent of external contingencies. Yet, norms and rules are subjectively experienced as social expectations one is supposed to follow, rather than as standards one wants to meet. This transformation of "shoulds" into "wants" takes place once individuals develop identified and integrated motivations. On the identified level, individuals express a basic personal agreement with a norm or societal expectation, whereas on the integrated level norms are experienced as self-ideals one wants to achieve.

Ryan, Kuhl and Deci (1997) propose a general organismic tendency to progressively rely on internal modes of motivation or self-regulation at the expense of external regulation. At the same time, actual development of internal motivation depends on environmental factors that support internal self-regulation (Grolnick, Deci, & Ryan, 1997; Grolnick & Raftery-Helmer, 2014). The various modes of self-regulation are assumed to co-exist dynamically in relation to the social environment. Internal motivation may decline over time due to the prevalence of extrinsic contingencies in a particular social context (e.g., school or workplace), but might increase in other contexts (e.g., Renaud-Dubé, Taylor, Lokes, Koestner, & Guay, 2010). Because of this context-dependency, the various modes of self-regulation - as described by Self-Determination Theory - do not represent general behavioural dispositions but reflect characteristic adaptations to a particular social context.

It is important to note that the four different forms of extrinsic motivation (external, introjected, identified and integrated) are not stages of development (Deci & Ryan, 2014). That is, individuals do not have to move sequentially through each form of motivation in order to achieve the most integrated form. Moreover, individuals may be motivated simultaneously by all four types of motivation, even when performing the same activity. Self-Determination Theory assumes that an integrated motivation typically does not emerge until late adolescence (Deci & Ryan, 2014). Age-related increases in internal forms of motivation over the life-span have been reported repeatedly with regard to personal goals (Sheldon, Houser-Marko, & Kasser, 2006; Sheldon & Kasser, 2001), but also in the context of fulfilling social role obligations (Sheldon, Kasser, Houser-Marko, Jones, & Turban, 2005).

There is very little empirical research that investigates the different forms of modes of motivation as described in Self-Determination Theory within the context of morality. In a cross-sectional sample of 15- to 17-year old adolescents, Hardy, Padilla-Walker, and Carlo (2008) reported a positive correlation of $r = .16$ between age and an overall autonomy index that reflected the degree to which adolescents prefer internal modes of moral motivation (identified and integrated), relative to external modes (external and introjected). However, this positive correlation was mostly driven by an age-related decrease in introjected motivation and not attributable to an age-related increase in identified or integrated motivation. Similar findings were obtained by Krettenauer (2011) in a longitudinal study of 13- to 19-year old adolescents. In this study, it was found that external motivation (extrinsic and introjected) decreased over a 1-year time interval, whereas internal motivation (identified and integrated) did not evidence any significant change. These findings may indicate that development of moral motivation is characterized by a decline of external motivation so that the relative (but not absolute) importance of internal moral motivation increases with age. Such a trend would be consistent with the findings reported by Sheldon and colleagues (2006) with regard to social role obligations.

Unfolding narratives of moral responsibility

Moral identities inevitably include future-oriented life-plans and goals. Otherwise, moral identities could hardly function as a predictor of sustained moral commitments. However, moral identities are not limited to this proactive function. As Erikson (1959) noted, identities provide a sense of continuity over time as they integrate past experiences with future-oriented life plans and goals. This integrative function of identities is

particularly stressed in research on narratives (McLean & Pasupathi, 2012). By narrating a life story individuals manage to connect past, present and future; they create a sense of unity across varying social role contexts and situations. Life stories may be either "big" or "small" (Bamberg, 2007). They may reflect autobiographical accounts of formative life-experiences generated in a self-reflective process and directed to an imaginary audience, or they may occur as interactive dialogues between conversational partners negotiating the meaning of an everyday event.

There is strong empirical evidence that life-stories ("big" and "small") develop in adolescence and beyond. Life-stories become temporarily, causally, and thematically more coherent in adolescence (Habermas & Bluck, 2000; Habermas & de Silveira, 2008). Whereas children have no difficulties telling stories about their lives, it is not before adolescence that these stories become imbued with an articulate sense of self. As adolescents grow older, they more frequently make explicit connections between past experiences and their current self (Habermas & Paha, 2001). These self-event connections take different forms (see Pasupathi, Mansour, & Brubaker, 2007): Past events may provide confirming evidence for stable traits or they may point at previously hidden personality characteristic that had been revealed by the event. Alternatively, events may have caused personality change by providing a learning experience or by transforming one's self-view beyond the specific event recalled. The tendency to gain these more general insights from past events describes an important development trend in adolescents' small stories about hurting and helping others (Recchia, Wainryb, Bourne, & Pasupathi, 2014). Adolescents may also dismiss the self-relevance of a past event by actively discounting it. Even then, self and event are connected by negation.

While these trends have been reported repeatedly, it is an open question as to how they jointly apply to moral identity development, and the fact that people typically are able to recall events that both confirm and disconfirm their identity. Proulx and Chandler (2009) demonstrated that 16- to 18-year-olds, more often than 13- to 15-year-olds, articulate a multiplist self-view when facing conflicting memories about past moral and immoral behavior. They proposed a general developmental trend toward increasing multiplicity and context dependency in adolescents' self-views that makes it possible to narrate one's good behaviors as internally motivated and one's bad behaviors as externally provoked. Contrary to Proulx and Chandler's account, Krettenauer and Mosleh (2013) found that adults more often than adolescents made a connection between past immoral behavior and their current self. Moreover, adults explicitly acknowledged the conflictual nature of past moral and immoral behaviors more often than adolescents. Thus, adopting a multiplist narrative about one's (im)moral past may be the predominate strategy in adolescence, but likely does not define the endpoint of moral identity development.

Recently, Dunlop and Walker (2013) argued that narrative forms of identity construction may be far less common than generally assumed. Therefore, scholars may be mistaken in claiming that the creation of a life-story is essential for identity development. In light of this critique it is important to note that in the context of moral identity development life-stories appear to be indispensable. By telling stories about past moral achievements and failures while connecting them with their current self, individuals self-reflectively and/or discursively define the scope of their moral responsibilities (cf. Tappan, 1991; 2010). They define which types of action, situations, and life

circumstances are charged with moral responsibilities and what falls outside this zone. Blasi (1983) argued that judgments of responsibility are essential to bridge the gap between moral judgment and action. From a developmental perspective, it appears that responsibility is not an isolated judgment but the unfolding of “small” and “big” stories of assuming moral responsibility for certain actions and denying it for others. These developing narratives of responsibility are essential to bring dispositional moral traits and internal moral motivations to bear for moral action.

Conclusion

When discussing the lack of empirical evidence for age-graded change in adolescents’ and young adults’ moral identities, it was argued that scholars need to broaden the scope of inquiry and include developmental aspects of the construct that may have been previously neglected. By adopting a personological approach to moral identity, we identified three areas of developmental change in moral identities that have not been at the forefront of moral identity research so far. It was argued that moral identity development likely proceeds as (1) context-dependent differentiation and integration of the self-importance of moral values, (2) as growth in internal moral motivation, and (3) as the unfolding of narratives of moral responsibility. These three aspects of moral identity development represent three distinct layers of personality description widely used in personality research (traits, characteristic adaptations, narratives). We expect that any systematic investigation into one of these aspects will reveal developmental change in moral identities, confirming the developmental nature of the moral identity construct. Furthermore, the three areas likely influence each other reciprocally in the course of development, and form a dynamically interrelated developmental system. In line with this

view, Krettenauer (2011) found that the centrality of moral values positively predicted growth in internal moral motivation over time. Moreover, internal moral motivation was found to be associated with individuals' narratives about past moral and immoral actions (Krettenauer & Mosleh, 2013). A detailed description of how these three areas intersect in moral identity development is beyond the scope of the present paper and awaits future research.

It is important to note, at this point, that development in all three areas is by no means restricted to adolescence or emerging adulthood. From the perspective adopted in this paper, moral identities emerge in adolescence and mature in adulthood. In other words, adolescence is considered the first step into developing an adult moral identity (cf. Moshman, 2005). Moreover, we identified three areas of moral identity development where developmental change most likely occurs. This was by no means meant to imply that moral identity development is limited to these three areas.

Recently, Lerner and Schmid Callina (2014) presented a relational developmental systems model of moral character, arguing that moral character is not a fixed personality trait (or a combination thereof) that predicts moral conduct over extended periods of time and independently of context. As noted by Mascolo (2014) in his commentary to Lerner and Schmid Callina, from a developmental systems view, moral character refers to particular psychological processes within a certain type of moral identity, where an individual "identifies with a sociocultural system of moral values that have their origins outside of the self, which are thereupon internally appropriated, transformed and made one's own" (p. 351). While the present study did not explicitly employ a developmental systems view, it fully endorses the notion that moral identities (similar to moral

character) are anything but static and immutable entities, but develop as individuals engage in meaningful relationships with social and cultural systems.

References

- Aquino, K., & Freeman, D. (2009). Moral identity in business situations: A social-cognitive framework for understanding moral functioning. In D. Narvaez & D. K. Lapsley (Eds.), *Personality, identity, and character* (pp. 375–395). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aquino, K., Freeman, D., Reed, A., Felps, W., & Lim, V. K. G. (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), 123–41.
<http://doi.org/10.1037/a0015406>
- Aquino, K., & Reed, A. (2002). The self-importance of moral identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 1423–1440.
- Arnold, M. L. (1993). *The place of morality in the adolescent self*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge.
- Bamberg, M. (2007). Stories: Big or small - Why do we care? In M. Bamberg (Ed.), *Narratives - State of the Art* (pp. 165–174). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bergman, R. (2002). Why be moral? A conceptual model from developmental psychology. *Human Development, 45*, 104–124.
- Blasi, A. (1983). Moral cognition and moral action: A theoretical perspective. *Developmental Review, 3*, 178–210.
- Blasi, A. (1984). Moral identity: Its role in moral functioning. In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Morality, moral behavior, and moral development* (pp. 128–139). New York: Wiley.

- Blasi, A. (1988). Identity and the development of the self. In D. K. Lapsley & F. C. Power (Eds.), *Self, ego, and identity* (pp. 226–242). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Blasi, A. (1995). Moral understanding and the moral personality: The process of moral integration. In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Moral development: An introduction* (pp. 229–253). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Blasi, A., & Glodis, K. (1995). The development of identity. A critical analysis from the perspective of the self as subject. *Developmental Review, 15*, 404–433.
- Brebels, L., De Cremer, D., Van Dijke, M., & Van Hiel, A. (2011). Fairness as Social Responsibility: A Moral Self-regulation Account of Procedural Justice Enactment. *British Journal of Management, 22*(Suppl 1), S47–S58.
<http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2010.00715.x>
- Chandler, M. J., Lalonde, C. E., Sokol, B. W., & Hallett, D. (2003). Personal persistence, identity development, and suicide: a study of Native and Non-native North American adolescents. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 68*(2).
- Colby, A., & Damon, W. (1992). *Some do care. Contemporary lives of moral commitment*. New York: Free Press.
- Colby, A., & Damon, W. (1993). Die Integration des Selbst und der Moral in der Entwicklung moralischen Engagements. In W. Edelstein, G. Nunner-Winkler, & G. Noam (Eds.), *Moral und Person* (pp. 203–231). Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.
- Damon, W. (1996). The lifelong transformation of moral goals through social influence. In P. B. Baltes & U. M. Staudinger (Eds.), *Interactive minds* (pp. 198–220). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Damon, W., & Hart, D. (1988). *Self-understanding in childhood and adolescence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Daniel, E., Schiefer, D., Möllering, A., Benish-Weisman, M., Boehnke, K., & Knafo, A. (2012). Value differentiation in adolescence: the role of age and cultural complexity. *Child Development, 83*(1), 322–36. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01694.x>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2014). The importance of autonomy for development and well-being. In B. W. Sokol, F. M. Grouzet, & U. Müller (Eds.), *Self-regulation and autonomy* (pp. 19–46). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Diehl, M., & Hay, E. L. (2007). Contextualized self-representations in adulthood. *Journal of Personality, 75*(6), 1255–83. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2007.00475.x>
- Donahue, E. M., Robins, R. W., Roberts, B. W., & John, O. P. (1993). The divided self: Concurrent and longitudinal effects of psychological adjustment and social roles on self-concept differentiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*(5), 834–846. <http://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.64.5.834>
- Dunlop, W. L., & Walker, L. J. (2013). The life story: Its development and relation to narration and personal identity. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 37*(3), 235–247. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0165025413479475>
- Dunlop, W. L., Walker, L. J., & Matsuba, M. K. (2013). The development of moral motivation across the adult lifespan. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 10*(2), 285–300. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2012.746205>
- Edelstein, W., Nunner-Winkler, G., & Noam, G. (1993). *Moral und Person*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.

- Frimer, J. A., & Walker, L. J. (2009). Reconciling the self and morality: An empirical model of moral centrality development. *Developmental Psychology, 45*, 1669–1681.
- Gibbs, J. C., Basinger, K. S., Grime, R. L., & Snarey, J. R. (2007). Moral judgment development across cultures: Revisiting Kohlberg's universality claims. *Developmental Review, 27*(4), 443–500. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2007.04.001>
- Grolnick, W. S., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1997). Internalization within the family: The Self-Determination Theory perspective. In J. E. Grusec & L. Kuczynski (Eds.), *Parenting and children's internalization of values* (pp. 135–161). New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Grolnick, W. S., & Raftery-Helmer, J. N. (2014). Facilitating autonomy in the family: Supporting intrinsic motivation and self-regulation. In B. W. Sokol, F. Grouzet, & U. Müller (Eds.), *Self-regulation and autonomy* (pp. 141–164). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gu, J. (2011). *Toward a general model of moral regulation: How fluctuations in general integrity influence moral behavior*. University of Toronto.
- Habermas, T., & Bluck, S. (2000). Getting a life: The emergence of the life story in adolescence. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*(5), 748–769. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.5.748>
- Habermas, T., & de Silveira, C. (2008). The development of global coherence in life narratives across adolescence: temporal, causal, and thematic aspects. *Developmental Psychology, 44*(3), 707–21. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.44.3.707>

- Habermas, T., & Paha, C. (2001). The Development of Coherence in Adolescents' Life Narratives. *Narrative Inquiry, 11*(1), 35–54. <http://doi.org/10.1075/ni.11.1.02hab>
- Hardy, S. (2006). Identity, Reasoning, and Emotion: An Empirical Comparison of Three Sources of Moral Motivation. *Motivation and Emotion, 30*(3), 205–213. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-006-9034-9>
- Hardy, S., & Carlo, G. (2005). Identity as a source of moral motivation. *Human Development, 48*, 232–256.
- Hardy, S., & Carlo, G. (2011). Moral Identity: What is it, how does it develop, and is it linked to moral action? *Child Development Perspectives, 5*, 212–218.
- Hardy, S., Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Carlo, G. (2008). Parenting dimensions and adolescents' internalization of moral values. *Journal of Moral Education, 37*, 205–223.
- Hardy, S., Walker, L. J., Olsen, J., Woodbury, R. D., & Hickman, J. R. (2014). Moral identity as moral ideal self: links to adolescent outcomes. *Developmental Psychology, 50*(1), 45–57. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0033598>
- Hardy, S., Walker, L. J., Rackham, D. D., & Olsen, J. A. (2012). Religiosity and adolescent empathy and aggression: The mediating role of moral identity. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality, 4*(3), 237–248. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0027566>
- Hart, D. (2005). The development of moral identity. In G. Carlo & C. P. Edwards (Eds.), *Moral motivation through the life span* (pp. 165–196). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

- Harter, S. (2012). *The construction of the self: A developmental perspective*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Harter, S., Bresnick, S., Bouchev, H., & Whitesell, N. R. (1997). The development of multiple role-related selves during adolescence. *Development and Psychopathology*, 9(04), 835–853. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579497001466>
- Harter, S., & Monsour, A. (1992). Developmental analysis of conflict caused by opposing self-attributes in the adolescent self-portrait. *Developmental Psychology*, 28, 251–260.
- Hertz, S., & Krettenauer, T. (2014). *Moral identity as a predictor of moral action. A meta-analysis*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Kochanska, G., Koenig, J. L., Barry, R. A., Sanghang, K., & Yoon, J. E. (2010). Children's conscience during toddler and preschool years, moral self, and a competent, adaptive developmental trajectory. *Developmental Psychology*, 46, 1320–1332.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The psychology of moral development. The nature and validity of moral stages*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Krettenauer, T. (2011). The dual moral self: moral centrality and internal moral motivation. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 172(4), 309–28. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00221325.2010.538451>
- Krettenauer, T. (2014). Revisiting the moral self construct: Developmental perspectives on moral selfhood. In B. W. Sokol, U. Müller, & F. Grouzet (Eds.), *Self-regulation and autonomy* (pp. 115–140). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Krettenauer, T., Campbell, S., & Hertz, S. (2013). Moral emotions and the development of the moral self in childhood. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 10*(2), 159–173. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2012.762750>
- Krettenauer, T., & Mosleh, M. (2013). Remembering Your (Im)Moral Past: Autobiographical Reasoning and Moral Identity Development. *Identity, 13*(2), 140–158. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15283488.2013.776497>
- Krettenauer, T., Murua, L., & Pandori, J. (2015, March). *Moral identity development trends towards coherence*. Poster presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Philadelphia.
- Lapsley, D. K., & Hill, P. L. (2009). The development of moral personality. In D. Narvaez & D. K. Lapsley (Eds.), *Personality, identity, and character* (pp. 185–213). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lapsley, D. K., & Stey, P. C. (2014). Moral self-identity as the aim of education. In L. Nucci, D. Narvaez, & T. Krettenauer (Eds.), *Handbook of Moral and Character Education* (pp. 84–100). New York: Routledge.
- Lerner, R. M., & Schmid Callina, K. (2014). The Study of Character Development: Towards Tests of a Relational Developmental Systems Model. *Human Development, 57*(6), 322–346. <http://doi.org/10.1159/000368784>
- Loevinger, J. (1993). Conformity and conscientiousness: One factor or two stages? In D. C. Funder, R. D. Parke, C. Tomlinson-Keasy, & K. Widaman (Eds.), *Studying lives through time* (pp. 189–205). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Malti, T., & Krettenauer, T. (2013). The Relation of Moral Emotion Attributions to Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior: A Meta-Analysis. *Child Development, 84*(2), 397–412.
- Marcia, J. E., Waterman, A. S., Matteson, D. R., Archer, S. L., & Orlofsky, J. L. (1993). *Ego identity. A handbook for psychological research*. New York: Springer.
- Mascolo, M. F. (2014). Toward a Relational-Developmental Model of Character Development - Commentary on Lerner and Schmid Callina. *Human Development, 57*(6), 347–353. <http://doi.org/10.1159/000368989>
- Matherne, C. F., & Litchfield, S. R. (2012). Investigating the relationship between affective commitment and unethical pro-organizational behaviors: The role of moral identity. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics, 9*, 35–47.
- McAdams, D. P. (1993). *The stories we live by*. New York: Guilford Press.
- McAdams, D. P. (2009). The moral personality. In D. Narvaez & D. K. Lapsley (Eds.), *Personality, identity, and character* (pp. 11–29). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McAdams, D. P., & Olson, B. D. (2010). Personality development: continuity and change over the life course. *Annual Review of Psychology, 61*(5), 517–42. <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100507>
- McAdams, D. P., & Pals, J. L. (2006). A new Big Five: fundamental principles for an integrative science of personality. *The American Psychologist, 61*(3), 204–217. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.61.3.204>
- McFerran, B., Aquino, K., & Duffy, M. (2010). How Personality and Moral Identity Relate to Individuals' Ethical Ideology. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 20*, 35–56.

- McLean, K. C., & Pasupathi, M. (2012). Processes of identity development: Where I am and how I got there. *Identity, 12*, 8–28.
- Moshman, D. (2005). *Adolescent psychological development. Rationality, morality, and identity*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Narvaez, D., & Lapsley, D. K. (2009). Personality, identity, and character. *Explorations in Moral Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nucci, L. (2004). Reflections on the moral self construct. In D. K. Lapsley & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Moral development, self, and identity* (pp. 111–132). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- O’Fallon, M. J., & Butterfield, K. D. (2011). Moral Differentiation: Exploring Boundaries of the “Monkey See, Monkey Do” Perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics, 102*(3), 379–399. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0820-2>
- Pasupathi, M., Mansour, E., & Brubaker, J. R. (2007). Developing a Life Story: Constructing Relations between Self and Experience in Autobiographical Narratives. *Human Development, 50*(2-3), 85–110.
<http://doi.org/10.1159/000100939>
- Pasupathi, M., & Wainryb, C. (2010). Developing Moral Agency through Narrative. *Human Development, 53*(2), 55–80. <http://doi.org/10.1159/000288208>
- Proulx, T., & Chandler, M. J. (2009). Jekyll and Hyde and Me: Age-Graded Differences in Conceptions of Self-Unity. *Human Development, 52*(5), 261–286.
<http://doi.org/10.1159/000233259>
- Raeff, C. (2011). Distinguishing between development and change: Reviving organismic-developmental theory. *Human Development, 54*(1), 4–33.
<http://doi.org/10.1159/000324334>

- Recchia, H. E., Wainryb, C., Bourne, S., & Pasupathi, M. (2014). The construction of moral agency in mother-child conversations about helping and hurting across childhood and adolescence. *Developmental Psychology, 50*(1), 34–44.
<http://doi.org/10.1037/a0033492>
- Renaud-Dubé, A., Taylor, G., Lokes, N., Koestner, R., & Guay, F. (2010). Adolescents' motivation toward the environment: Age-related trends and correlates. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement, 42*(3), 194–199. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0018596>
- Reynolds, S. J., Dang, C. T., Yam, K. C., & Leavitt, K. (2014). The role of moral knowledge in everyday immorality: What does it matter if I know what is right? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 123*(2), 124–137.
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2013.10.008>
- Ryan, R. M. (1993). Agency and organization: Intrinsic motivation, autonomy, and the self in psychological development. In J. Jacobs (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation (Vol. 40)* (pp. 1–56). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2008). Self-Determination Theory and the role of basic psychological needs in personality and the organization of behavior. In P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality* (pp. 654–678). New York: Guilford.
- Ryan, R. M., Kuhl, J., & Deci, E. L. (1997). Nature and autonomy: an organizational view of social and neurobiological aspects of self-regulation in behavior and development. *Development and Psychopathology, 9*, 701–728.

- Schwartz, S. H., Cieciuch, J., Vecchione, M., Davidov, E., Fischer, R., Beierlein, C., ... Konty, M. (2012). Refining the theory of basic individual values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103*(4), 663–88.
<http://doi.org/10.1037/a0029393>
- Schwartz, S. J. , Luyckx, K. , & Vignoles, V. L. (Eds.) (2011). *Handbook of identity theory and research*. New York: Springer Science+Business Media.
- Sheldon, K. M., Houser-Marko, L., & Kasser, T. (2006). Does autonomy increase with age? Comparing the goal motivations of college students and their parents. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40*(2), 168–178. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2004.10.004>
- Sheldon, K. M., & Kasser, T. (2001). Getting older, getting better? Personal strivings and psychological maturity across the life span. *Developmental Psychology, 37*, 491–501.
- Sheldon, K. M., Kasser, T., Houser-Marko, L., Jones, T., & Turban, D. (2005). Doing one's duty: Chronological age, felt autonomy, and subjective well-being. *European Journal of Personality, 19*(2), 97–115. <http://doi.org/10.1002/per.535>
- Tappan, M. B. (1991). Narrative, authorship, and the development of moral authority. Narrative and Storytelling Implications for Understanding Moral Development, *New Directions for Child Development, 54*, 5–26.
- Tappan, M. B. (2010). Telling moral stories: From agency to authorship - Commentary on Pasupathi and Wainryb. *Human Development, 53*, 81-86.
- Walker, L. J. (2004). Gus in the gap: Bridging the judgment-action gap in moral functioning. In D. K. Lapsley & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Moral development, self, and identity* (pp. 1–20). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Walker, L. J. (2014). Moral personality, motivation, and identity. In M. Killen & J. G. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (pp. 497–519). New York:

Psychology Press.

Walker , L. J. , & Frimer, J. A. (in press). Developmental trajectories of agency and communion in moral motivation. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*.