



Intuition: The BYU Undergraduate Journal of Psychology

Volume 9 | Issue 1

Article 9

2012

Family Life as Context for Adolescent Moral Development

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/intuition>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

(2012) "Family Life as Context for Adolescent Moral Development," *Intuition: The BYU Undergraduate Journal of Psychology*. Vol. 9 : Iss. 1 , Article 9.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/intuition/vol9/iss1/9>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Intuition: The BYU Undergraduate Journal of Psychology* by an authorized editor of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

Family Life as Context for Adolescent Moral Development



by Ryan Woodbury

Adolescence (ages 12–19) is foundational for adulthood. Many changes occur during adolescence preparing adolescents for adult life. Some of these changes include physical changes accompanying puberty, cognitive changes, and social changes like spending less time with family and more time with peers. Adolescents' social shift away from family has raised questions on how much influence parents have on their teens. Researchers found parents have an influence on their teens, particularly on teens' moral development. Different parenting styles (Baumrind, 1966), family structures (two-parent vs. single-parent vs. adoptive-parents, etc.), and levels of family cohesiveness play roles in adolescents' moral development. This review examines research on adolescent moral development within the context of family life, specifically, analyzing results and the research implications, then directions for future research are discussed.

Family Life as Context for Adolescent Moral Development

Adolescence is a foundational developmental period that can prepare children for adulthood and society (Hart & Carlo, 2005). Teenagers (12–19 years old) are pressured from all sides, even from within, to become more adult-like. Indeed, nearly 25% of adolescents are legally considered adults (18–19 years old). Some of the influences include individual pressures like biological and cognitive development mostly due to puberty, or social pressures from family, peers, teachers, and society in general. These influences may cause “disorientation or discovery” (Psychology Today, 2011, para. 1; “Teens”, American Psychological Association, 2011, para. 1). As teens explore new developmental abilities (cognitive and physical) and do so within various social structures (family life, peer relations, and culture or society as a whole) that they may not have had or experienced as children, they begin to realize their autonomous choices require some responsibility (Daddis, 2011). As part of adolescents’ perceptions of autonomy and responsibility, parents must give up authority over certain choices. Interestingly, research has shown only personal issues (e.g., hairstyle, curfew, time spent on computer) are fought over between adolescents and parents. There are normally no disagreements between parents and teens about moral issues (Daddis, 2011; Smetana, 2000; Smetana & Asquith, 1994). Because of this continued relationship between adolescents and their families, particularly the teens parents, within the moral domain, the present paper explores research on adolescent moral development within the family, then discusses future research and how it may elucidate richer information for moral development research.

Moral Development Research History

Morality has generally been defined as having a sense of what is right or wrong (Hart & Carlo, 2005). Research on morality has grown over the past 40 years and has become a central focus in the field of psychology (Walker, 2004). Reasons for this front-and-center view include, first, the possible implications of research. To know what is moral, is to know human goodness; to know how to develop morality is to know how to develop human goodness (Williams, 1995). This point is particularly relevant to adolescence, where teens are developing autonomy and preparing for adulthood. Second, morality is more than just the making of ethical decisions in professional occupations (e.g., doctors, lawyers, etc.), but is at the heart of the human condition and all genuinely human relationships

(Walker, 2004). This second point is relevant to adolescent development because adolescents make decisions in their social world; they must follow certain laws or face consequences (e.g., schooling, driving, alcohol, etc.). Third, there has been a research shift toward the question of human agency (i.e., the ability to have and make choices) in moral judgment and action (Moretto, Walsh, & Haggard, 2011) and, therefore, the nature and meaning of morality has become a renewed topic of discussion and research. Agency and autonomy become more salient during adolescence. Research on perceived autonomy exposes differences between children and adolescents, illustrating that adolescents exhibit more autonomy and are more concerned with making (or allowed to make) self-determined choices, while children are very dependent on parents and other authorities (Daddis, 2011; Hart & Carlo, 2005; Walker, Henning, & Krettenaur, 2000). There is less dependence on parents and more autonomy. Yet, while teens may become more autonomous, they seek help from other sources to develop an identity that will propel them into adulthood (Erikson, 1966).

Lawrence Kohlberg (1984), expanding on Piaget's (1965, 1932) formal cognitive development theory, explored moral reasoning and planted theoretical seeds for a crop morality research. Due to the stage-like developmental nature of morality (Kohlberg, 1976, 1984), subsequent researchers started using longitudinal studies to explore contexts of development, as well as the possible causal influences (e.g. parenting styles, educational programs, peer relationships and social norms, community service, etc.) of moral development (Pratt, Hunsberber, Pancer, & Alisat, 2003). Researchers have explored contexts such as family life and parenting (Hardy, Padilla-Walker, & Carlo, 2008), peers (Walker et al, 2000), religion (King & Furrow, 2004), school (Covell & Howie, 2001), culture (Baek, 2002; Nasir & Kirshner, 2003), and more recently evolutionary and biological factors of morality (Casey, Getz, & Galvan, 2008; Killen & Smetana, 2007; Krebs, 2005). Due to the amount of research on adolescent moral development, there is no concise literature review of all the influences on moral development. There are, however, many specialized journals (see, e.g., *Journal of Moral Education*, *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, and *Journal of Adolescence*), books (Killen & Smetana, 2005), and book chapters (Eisenberg, Morris, McDaniel, & Spinrad, 2009; Eienberg & Murphy, 1995; Turiel, 2008; Walker & Frimer, 2011) on adolescence and moral development. This article, however, will only discuss family life as a context for adolescent moral development. Recently, the most studied context of adolescent moral development is

family life (Hart & Carlo, 2005; see also Walker, 1999; White & Matawie, 2004). *The family is a complex relational whole that differs greatly in its organization and constitution across and within cultures.* Even with the many differences evidenced in family life, researchers have focused on the universal effects of moralization from parental influence and styles, family cohesion, and family structure.

Family Life and Moral Development

Family life greatly affects child socialization, including the development of morality (see Coleman, Hardy, Albert, Raffaelli, & Crockett, 2006; Hart & Carlo, 2005; White & Matawie, 2004). The main moral influence researched within the family has been parenting style. Parental influences that have been identified include: involvement, autonomy support, and structure (Hardy, Padilla-Walker, & Carlo, 2008). These influences have been measured in terms of verbal interaction, communication quality, and ego functioning (Walker et al., 2000; Walker & Hening, 1997). Family cohesion is another important influence on which researchers have focused their efforts (Bakken & Romig, 1994; White, Howie, & Perz, 2000). Finally, family structure (i.e. single- vs. two-parents, homosexual vs. heterosexual parents, number of siblings) has also been studied in regards to its moderating effects on adolescent moral development.

Parenting

Parents play an important role in the socialization of children, yet just exactly how influential are the parents is a deeper question. Parental interaction with children differs between families as there is wide variety in how parents interact with their children. Both mothers and fathers have influences on their teens' moral development, regardless of the teens' age or gender (Hardy, Olsen, Woodbury, Funk, & Walker, in review). Discussing parental influence, Diana Baumrind and others (1966; Maccoby & Martin, 1983) suggested that there are four basic parenting styles: Authoritarian, Authoritative, Permissive, and Negligent. Authoritarian parenting is demanding and controlling. Authoritative parenting, on the other hand, provides structure and firmness, as well as autonomy for children. Permissive parents, however, are lax toward family rules and tend to provide a maximal environment for children's autonomy. The Negligent parenting style is low on autonomy support, structure, and involvement. Negligence is a "non-existent" parent and has not studied much due to the non-existent effects. These parenting styles were discovered through observational and survey studies (Baumrind, 1966), yet are now used as

quasi-variables in relation to adolescent moral development. Researchers have tried to obtain representative samples of parenting styles to compare and contrast parenting styles' influence on moral development. Yet, parenting styles cannot be randomly assigned and manipulated to different groups of teens, therefore, no causal relationship can be firmly identified between parenting styles and adolescent moral development.

Though random assignment and variable manipulation may be improbable (and most likely unethical) in experimentation on adolescent moral development, there have been informative studies of the importance of parenting employing correlational designs. For example, Walker et al. (2000) and Walker & Henning (1997) measured parenting influences by inviting parent-child dyads to read and discuss how moral certain hypothetical dilemmas were thought to be (Moral Judgement Interview, MJI; Colby & Kohlberg, 1987). The discussions (verbal interactions) were coded using the Developmental Environments Coding System (DECS; Powers, 1983, 1988). Both measures proved to be reliable (MJI: $\alpha = .92$, DECS: $\alpha = .69$). DECS coded for conversational turns given by each participant, summaries of topics or conversations, and purpose of conversational turns (supportive, informative, operational, etc). The dyads were also asked to discuss a real-life dilemma involving the child and parent. The discussions of real-life or hypothetical dilemmas were randomized to avoid order effects. Again, the verbal interactions were coded using DECS. Compared to other parenting styles, the authoritative style was most influential on moral reasoning. In other words, children whose parents were authoritative, rather than authoritarian, permissive, or negligent, displayed significantly higher moral reasoning (Walker & Taylor, 1991). Walker and Henning (1997) also reported another interesting finding when they compared a child's real-life moral dilemma to a hypothetical dilemma. There seemed to be greater moral development over time with parents and children who discussed the child's real-life dilemma. When a parent and child discussed real-life dilemmas, the parents were coded to use questions for understanding and gave support to the child's reasoning, as well as offered applicable suggestions for greater moral reasoning. Nonetheless, even with significantly greater moral reasoning development via real-life dilemma discussions, many current researchers use hypothetical dilemmas in parent-child research. The reason may be hypothetical dilemmas have been standardized, and therefore are seen to be easier to code and analyze (Matsubo & Walker, 2004).

Parenting measures have normally erred in only using one parent and one child (for exceptions to this practice, see Hardy et al, in review;

Walker & Hening, 1999; Walker & Taylor, 1991; White & Matawie, 2004). Researchers often have trouble recruiting fathers. Researchers have suggested providing larger cash incentives and home interviews to recruit father participation. Cash incentives, however, may have their own recruitment biases based on socio-economic status. Home interviews are also problematic in some ways because they do not allow researchers to control for some variables in the way that a more controlled setting might. Though home interviews may be less controlled, they provide more direct access to the rich context of family life and the relationships within the home (Dollahite, 2008). Home interviews may also take one step closer to the phenomenon of interest, therefore providing higher validity for the data. Adolescent moral development research may help parents have a better idea of how to raise their children and prepare them for adulthood. Parents must keep in mind that their adolescents are autonomously engaged in creating and internalizing moral standards and therefore are agents of their own morality and moral domain.

Family Cohesion

Family cohesion is the emotional bonding that takes place between family members (Olsen et al., 1992). White (2000) and his colleagues (White et al., 2000) surveyed families' cohesion and adaptability, investigating if these constructs affected children's perception of moral authority. Family cohesiveness was measured by the Family Adaptability and Cohesiveness Scale (FACES II; Olsen et al., 1992), in which teens were asked to what extent they agreed with various statements about their family (e.g., "Our family does things together"). It was found that the greater the perceived family cohesion, the more likely it was that teens perceived their parents as moral authorities. Other studies have found that single-parent families are less cohesive and, thus, teens are more likely to not see their parents as a moral authority (Walker & Hening, 1997; Cohen, 1994). White's studies were cross-sectional and, therefore, did not provide clear evidence for any causal sources of family cohesiveness and perceived moral authority. Walker and Hening (1997), however, performed a longitudinal study and found that due to less family cohesiveness single-parent teens exhibited a clear decrease in the amount of moral authority they perceived in their parents.

While parenting styles normally only looks at one parent with one child, investigations of family cohesiveness may reveal a more holistic measure of the family. Different children may have different perspectives of each

parent, and possibly as a family unit as a whole. Parenting and family cohesion are important research topics for determining moral influences on adolescent moral development. Researchers have used self-reports and interview coding systems to measure the context of family. However, self-reports about morality, whether about prosocial or antisocial behavior, may produce socially desirable responses. To get at the heart of morality a variety of alternative methods are being used, including narratives (Matsuba & Walker, 2005) and having others (i.e. parents, siblings, peers) report on adolescent moral development (not just self-reports; Hardy et al, in review). Not only are these measures' reliability high, using these methods allows for greater breadth of investigation and more holistic results.

Family Structure

In addition to parenting style and family cohesion, family structure has also been found to play an important role influencing adolescent moral development. The structure of the family may be seen as a moderating factor in parenting styles and family cohesion. As mentioned previously, Walker and Henning (1997) found that over time single-parent families, compared to two-parent families, decline in cohesion and that adolescents are less likely to see their parent as a clear moral authority. This result has also been seen in adoptive and divorced heterosexual-parent families (Habersaat, Tessier, Larose, Nadeau, Tarabulsky, Moss, & Pierrehumbert, 2010; Storksen, Roysamb, Holmen, & Tambs, 2006). The incidence of homosexual parents adopting children has increased in recent years and much research has tried to examine homosexual-parent families. In comparison on most outcomes, homosexual-parented adopted adolescents are not significantly different than heterosexual-parented non-adopted peers (Drexler, 2001). This interesting result may have significant legal consequences. Some scholars worry about the detrimental impact to children growing up in a homosexual home, yet most studies have found no significant differences. Due to space limitations, however, these legal, moral, methodological, and philosophical issues cannot be adequately addressed here. (For more information, the reader is encouraged to read Richard Williams' address to the National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality given November 2000).

As mentioned previously, most research done with the family has focused on parenting styles and parent-child relationships. Parent-child relationships are only half of the family dynamic. Sibling relationships make up the other half. Unfortunately, studies of siblings relationships are

not as prevalent in the literature and so there is little information regarding the precise nature of siblings effect on adolescent moral development. There have been, however, sibling studies providing a model to study siblings' effects on adolescent moral development (Tucker, Updegraff, McHale, & Crouter, 1999).

Future Research

Many of the familial context studies have shown there was positive adolescent moral development in families that provided an authoritative parenting style, moderate family cohesion, and two-parent households (Bakken & Romig, 1994; Hardy et al, 2008; Walker & Taylor, 1991). Most of these findings, however, came from correlational studies and so do not provide sufficient evidence for drawing clear causal connections. These types of studies can provide, nonetheless, some predictive power and direction for future research. Correlational studies (compared to randomized, controlled experimentation) may be the most quantitative form of experimentation on adolescent moral development within a familial context due to possible infringements on ethical standards via manipulation of variables. For example, it would not be ethical to provide certain families with authoritative sets of family rules by which they must abide by while providing other families with permissive rules. It would also not be ethical to experimentally raise some children in a single-parent household while raising other children in a homosexual-parent household. By the nature of the complex dynamics of families, there are many quasi-variables that can be studied (e.g. parenting styles, family structure, religiosity, socio-economic status, etc.) in order to better understand the effect of family life on adolescents.

The idea of examining entire families has become a more viable option to capture adolescent moral development (Walker, 1999). Looking at an entire family, though more complex (i.e, time consuming, demand on resources, small sample sizes, expectancy and Rosenthal effects, etc.), can provide a greater breadth and depth to understanding family dynamics and the families' effects on adolescents' moral development. Qualitative research, using family narratives or interviews, can provide rich amounts of data. This would create a more comprehensive family model that would help to understand the family dynamic as a whole, instead of just parent-child relationships as isolated exchanges between individuals.

Conclusion

Family life is only one context of adolescent moral development. Family life itself has not truly been studied in holistic fashion, excepting perhaps

some research on family cohesion and adaptability (Olsen et al., 1992; White et al., 2000; White, 2000). Increasingly, however, researchers are looking into family narratives as measures of adolescent moral development. This provides a breadth to family life as a dynamic, relational, and meaningful context. Future research can also include longitudinal data. Few studies have looked into adolescent moral development longitudinally; most research has been cross-sectional or cross-lagged samples. If researchers want to explore causality between any context (i.e. family life) and adolescent moral development, longitudinal experimental designs must be used. Yet, these experiments may be ethically difficult insofar as they would seem to require treating some families as experimental groups (i.e., receiving a "moral" treatment) whereas treating other families as control groups—not receiving "moral" treatment. This design may be problematic, so other possible quasi-experimental design could be used combining family life and some other context, like religious life, socioeconomic status, culture, or ethnicity. Even though all these other contexts are part of the family life context, they are normally studied separately.

One practical benefit of studying adolescent moral development within a familial context is that it can provide information on relational strategies to be used in family therapy. Not only can this research benefit therapeutic techniques, but it may also provide quality information for families wanting to promote morality within their homes. Family life can be one of the most vital developmental contexts an adolescent has. Even though teens may change constantly, a strong moral influence comes from their families, particularly their parents, and perhaps siblings. Parents may not be the only influence on teens. Peer relationships, religiosity, physiological changes, and school environments can and do effect adolescent moral development. Teens can depend on a cohesive family and authoritative parents to help them develop capacities for sophisticated moral reasoning and behavior. And parents can be a positive influence to their children, even while the children are in the dynamic adolescent years.

References

- American Psychological Association. (2011). Teens. In A. E. Kazdin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Psychology*. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/topics/teens/index.aspx>
- Baek, H. (2002). A comparative study of moral development of Korean and British children. *Journal of Moral Education, 31*(4), 373–391. doi:10.1080/0305724022000029626
- Bakken, L., & Romig, C. (1994). The relationship of perceived family dynamics to adolescents' principle moral reasoning. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 9*(4), 442–457. doi:10.1177/074355489494004
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative and parental control on child behavior. *Child Behavior, 37*(4), 887–907.
- Casey, B. J., Getz, S., & Galvan, A. (2011). The adolescent brain. *Developmental Review, 28*, 62–77. doi: 10.1016/j.dr.2007.08.003
- Cohen, O. (1994). Family functioning: Cohesion and adaptability of divorced fathers and mothers in raising their children. *Family Therapy, 21*, 35–45.
- Colby, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1987). *The measurement of moral judgment (Vols. 1–2)*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Covell, K., & Howe, R. B. (2001). Moral education through the 3 Rs: Rights, respect, and responsibility. *Journal of Moral Education, 30*(1), 29–41. doi:10.1080/03057240120033794
- Daddis, C. (2011). Desire for increased autonomy and adolescents' perception of peer autonomy: "Everyone else can; Why can't I?". *Child Development, 82*(4), 1310–1326. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01587.x
- Dollahite, D. C., & Thatcher, J. Y. (2008). Talking about religion: How highly religious youth and parents discuss their faith. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 23*(5), 611–641. doi: 10.1177/0743558408322141
- Drexler, P. F. (2001). Moral reasoning in sons of lesbian and heterosexual families: The Oedipal period of development. *Gender & Psychoanalysis, 6*(1), 19–51.
- Duriez, B., & Soenens, B. (2005). Religiosity, moral attitudes and moral competence: A critical investigation of religiosity-morality relation. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 30*(1), 76–83. doi:10.1177/0165025406062127
- Eisenberg, N., Morris, A. S., McDaniel, B., & Spinrad, T. L. (2009). Moral cognitions and prosocial responding in adolescence. In R. M. Lerner and L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology: Individual Bases of Adolescent Development, (3rd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 229–265)*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

- Eisenberg, N., & Murphy, B. (1995). Parenting and children's moral development. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of Parenting: Applied and Practical Parenting (Vol. 4, pp. 227-257)*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Erikson, E. (1966). Eight stages of man. *International Journal of Psychiatry*, 2(3), 281-300.
- Habersaat, S., Tessier, R., Larose, S., Nadeau, L., Tarabulsy, G., Moss, E., & Pierrehumbert, E. (2010). Adoption, adolescence and behavior problems: Which risk factors? *Annales Medico-Psychologiques*, 168, 343-349. doi: 10.1016/j.amp.2009.03.02
- Hardy, S. A., Olsen, J. A., Woodbury, R. D., Funk, R. J., & Walker, L. J. (in review) Parenting, gender, and positive adolescent development. *Journal of Family Psychology*.
- Hardy, S. A., Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Carlo, G. (2008). Parenting dimensions and adolescents' internalisation of moral values. *Journal of Moral Education*, 37(2), 205-223.
- Hart, D., & Carlo, G. (2005). Moral development in adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescent*, 32(3), 223-233.
- Killen, M., & Smetana, J. (Eds.) (2005). *Handbook of moral development*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Killen, M., & Smetana, J. (2007). The biology of morality: Human development and moral neuroscience. *Human Development*, 50, 241-243. doi:10.1159/000106413
- King, P. E., & Furrow, J. L. (2004). Religion as a resource for positive youth development: Religion, social capital, and moral outcomes. *Developmental Psychology*, 40(5), 703-713.
- Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stage and moralization: The cognitive-developmental approach. In T. Lickona (Ed.), *Moral Development and Behavior* (pp. 31-53). New York, NY: Reinhart, & Winston.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The psychology of moral development: The nature and validity of moral stages*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
- Krebs, D. (2005). The evolution of morality. In D. Buss (Ed.), *The Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology* (pp. 747-775). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. Mussen and E. M. Hetherington (Eds.), *Handbook of Child Psychology: Socialization, Personality, and Social Development (4th ed., Vol. 4, pp. 1-101)*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

- Matsubo, M. K., & Walker, L. J. (2004). Extraordinary moral commitment: Young adults involved in social organizations. *Journal of Personality, 72*(2), 413–436.
- Matsubo, M. K., & Walker, L. J. (2005). Young adult moral exemplars: The making of self through stories. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 15*(3), 275–297.
- Moretto, G., Walsh, E., & Haggard, P. (2011). Experience of agency and sense of responsibility. *Consciousness and Cognition, 20*, 1847–1854. doi:10.1016/j.concog.2011.08.014
- Nasir, N. S., & Kirshner, B. (2003). The cultural construction of moral and civic identities. *Applied Developmental Science, 7*(3), 138–147.
- Olson, D. H., McCubbin, H. I., Barnes, H., Larsen, A., Muxen, M., & Wilson, M. (1992). *Family inventories: Inventories used in a national survey of families (Rev. ed.)*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Piaget, J. (1965). *The moral judgment of the child*. New York, NY: Free Press (Original work published 1932).
- Powers, S. I. (1983). *Family interaction and parental moral development as a context for adolescent moral development: A study of patient and non-patient adolescents*. Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 3753B. (University Microfilms No. 83-08,501)
- Powers, S. I. (1988). Moral judgement development within the family. *Journal of Moral Education, 17*, 209–219
- Pratt, M. W., Hunsberber, B., Pancer, S. M., & Alisat, S. (2003). A longitudinal analysis of personal values socialization: Correlates of a moral self-ideal in late adolescence. *Social Development, 12*(4), 563–585.
- Psychology Today. (2011). Adolescence. Retrieved from <http://www.psychologytoday.com/basics/adolescence>
- Rest, J., & Narvaez, D. (1995). The four components of acting morally. In W. Kurtines & J. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Moral development: An introduction* (pp. 385–400). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Smetana, J. G. (2000). Middle-class African American adolescents' and parents' conceptions of parental authority and parenting practices: A longitudinal investigation. *Child Development, 71*, 1672–1686. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00257
- Smetana, J. G., & Asquith, P. (1994). Adolescents' and parents' conceptions of parental authority and adolescent autonomy. *Child Development, 65*, 1147–1162. doi:10.2307/1131311.

- Storksén, I., Roysamb, E., Holmen, T. L., & Tambs, K. (2006). Adolescent adjustment and well-being: Effects of parental divorce and distress. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 47*, 75–84.
- Tucker, C. J., Updegraff, K. A., McHale, S. M., & Crouter, A. C. (1999). Older siblings as socializers of younger siblings' empathy. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 19*, 176–198. doi: 10.1177/027243169901900200.
- Turiel, E. (2011). The development of morality. In W. Damon and R. M. Lerner (Eds.) *Child and Adolescent Development: An Advanced Course* (pp. 473–514). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Walker, L. J. (1999). The family context for moral development. *Journal of Moral Education, 28*(3), 261–264.
- Walker, L. J., & Frimer, J. A. (2011). The science of moral development. In M. K. Underwood and L. H. Rosen (Eds.) *Social Development: Relationships in Infancy, Childhood, and Adolescence* (pp. 235–262). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Walker, L. J., & Hening, K. H. (1997). Parent/child relationships in single-parent families. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 29*(1), 63–75.
- Walker, L. J., & Hening, K. H. (1999). Parenting styles and the development of moral reasoning. *Journal of Moral Education, 28*(3), 359–374.
- Walker, L. J., Hening, K. H., & Krettenaur, T. (2000). Parent and peer context for children's moral reasoning development. *Child Development, 71*(4), 1033–1044.
- Walker, L. J., & Taylor, (1991). Family interactions and the development of moral reasoning. *Child Development, 62*, 264–283.
- White, F. A., & Matawie, K. M. (2004). Parental morality and family processes as predictors of adolescent morality. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 13*(2), 219–233.
- White, F. A., Howie, P., & Perz, J. (2000). Predictors of moral theory in two contrasting adolescent samples. *Ethics & Behavior, 10*(3), 199–214.
- Williams, B. (1995). Ethics. In A. C. Grayling (Ed.), *Philosophy: A guide through the subject* (pp. 546–582). New York, NY: Oxford University press.
- Williams, R. N. (Nov. 2000). The effect on children of the sexual orientation of parents: What the research doesn't say. Invited address to the National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality, Honolulu, HI.