Morality and Justice

Linda J. Skitka   Christopher W. Bauman   Elizabeth Mullen

University of Illinois at   University of California,   George Washington

Chicago   Irvine   University

Morality and Justice

Morality and justice have apparent similarities. Both facilitate social interaction, coordination, and cooperation. Both can feel like external standards that somehow should carry more weight than individuals' preferences. That said, morality and justice are not synonymous. Scholars as far back as Aristotle have identified ways that morality and justice differ (see Konow, 2008). In this chapter, we review research programs from the literatures on moral development, the social psychology of justice, and the burgeoning social psychological literature on adult morality and examine how scholars have conceptualized the relation between morality and justice. We review these literatures in roughly chronological order to illustrate how theorizing and research about morality and justice has changed over time.

We find a great deal of variability in how theorists have approached links between morality and justice. Some treat them as the same construct (e.g., classic theories of moral development; Piaget, 1932/97; Kohlberg, 1981). Others view morality as one of several possible motivations for justice (e.g., Folger, 2001; Skitka, 2003). Still others argue that justice is merely one component of morality (e.g., Haidt & Joseph, 2004). The goals of this chapter are therefore to (a) review these different perspectives on morality and justice, and (b) offer constructive critiques and identify ways that these theories might inform each other. We conclude that three separate literatures converge on the basic idea that morality and justice are distinct but related constructs. However, no consensus exists regarding more specific aspects of the relation between the constructs.

Moral Development and Justice

Classic Theories of Moral Development

Justice has had a long and deep connection to theory and research on moral development, beginning with Jean Piaget's focus on the moral lives of children as revealed through games and play. He observed that children's games are dominated by concerns about fairness (Piaget, 1932/97). In early years, children are very concerned about following the rules, but they also begin to understand that rules are relatively arbitrary as they develop. Finding ways to coordinate play to facilitate group function becomes more important than the rules themselves. Piaget therefore came to view moral development as the result of interpersonal interactions through which people find solutions all will accept as fair (Piaget, 1932/97).

Kohlberg (1981) embraced and elaborated on Piaget's conclusion that moral development is rooted in justice. Kohlberg described the stages of moral development in a variety of ways, but one clear way he thought they differed was in the motivation that drives justice judgments. In Stages 1 and 2, people do little more than seek to avoid punishment and obtain rewards. Their conceptualization of justice is mainly defined by self-interest. At Stages 3 and 4, people begin to consider others' expectations for their behavior and the implications of their behavior for society as a whole. They show concern for other people and their feelings, follow rules in an effort to be seen as a good person, and feel an obligation to contribute to the group, society, or institution. At Stage 5, people define justice in terms of upholding people's basic rights, values, and the legal contracts of society. People at this stage understand social life is a social contract to abide by the laws for the good of all and to protect the rights of the individual and the group. Finally, at Stage 6, people believe that laws or social agreements are valid only if they are based on universal principles, and their justice judgments are motivated by concerns about self-condemnation rather

than social approbation. In short, people become increasingly able to take into account the perspectives of others as they progress through the stages, and the source of moral motivation shifts from outside (i.e., heteronomy) to inside the individual (i.e., autonomy).

Although Kohlberg's theory was enormously influential, it nonetheless has a host of problems. For example, people seldom give responses to moral dilemmas that can be completely encapsulated or described by any single Kohlbergian stage. The theory also has been criticized for championing a Western worldview and being culturally insensitive (e.g., Simpson, 1974; Sullivan, 1977), and sexist in both its construction and interpretation of morality (Gilligan, 1982). There also have been many critiques of the evidence that Kohlberg tried to mount in support of the notion that moral development occurs in universal ordered stages (e.g., Simpson, 1974; Sullivan, 1977).

Contemporary Theories of Moral Development

Contemporary theories of moral development have adapted some components of Kolhberg's ideas, but have dropped its most controversial aspects, including normative claims that some stages of moral development and reasoning are better or worse than others. Ties between moral development and justice operations remain, but the emphasis on justice is not as strong in contemporary theories of moral development as they were in Kohlberg's writing about the topic. Next, we review two of these contemporary theories: Moral schema and domain theory.

Moral schema theory. Moral schema theory reconceived Kohlberg's stages as cognitive schemas (Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, & Thoma, 1999a, 1999b). According to this theoretical update, people use three kinds of schemas to make socio-moral judgments: personal interest, norm maintenance, and post-conventional. The personal interest schema develops in early childhood, the norm maintenance schema develops during adolescence, and the post-conventional schema

develops in late adolescence and adulthood. Once formed, people can use any one of the schemas to guide their judgments and behavior, and theoretically can move fluidly between them as a function of how well features of situations and social relationships map onto and therefore prime the activation of one or another core schema.

When people apply the personal interest schema, they tend to focus on their own self-interests in a situation or justify the behavior of others in terms of their perceptions of others' personal interests. The norm maintenance schema focuses on (a) the needs of cooperative social systems and the group, (b) a belief that living up to these norms and standards will pay-off in the long-run, and (c) a strong duty orientation, whereby one should obey and respect authorities. Finally, the post-conventional schema primes a sense of moral obligation based on the notions that laws, roles, codes, and contracts facilitate cooperation. However, people also recognize that these standards are relatively arbitrary, and there are a variety of social arrangements that can achieve the same ends. This schema leads people more toward an orientation that duties and rights follow from the greater moral purpose behind conventions, not from the conventions themselves. Post-conventional thinking therefore focuses people on ideals, conceptions of the ultimate moral good or imperative (Rest et al., 1999a). Although moral schema theory does not explicitly reference justice or justice operations, Rest et al. (1999a, 1999b) nonetheless emphasize that their theory is fundamentally about justice: "We still agree with Kohlberg that the aim of the developmental analysis of moral judgment is the rational reconstruction of the ontogenesis of justice operations" (1999b, p. 56).

Domain theory. Domain theory was proposed as an alternative view of moral development as criticism of Kohlberg's theory began to mount. A key observation that helped launch domain theory was that people, even young children, differentiate between actions that harm innocent

people and those that break rules but do not harm anyone (Turiel, 1983; see also Nucci & Turiel, 1978; Smetana, 1981). Based on growing support for the distinction between transgressions that do versus do not harm someone, Turiel surmised that two distinct systems underlie people's judgments of social events; a system focused on morality and another on social convention.

Domain theory defines morality as conceptions of rights, fairness, and human welfare that depend on inherent features of actions (Turiel, 1983). For example, punching a stranger in the face for no reason is wrong because it hurts someone, not because it violates a law, social rule, or custom. Social conventions, in contrast, are rules that a particular group has adopted to create and maintain order within the group. Conventions are arbitrary in the sense that they depend on group norms and practices rather than intrinsic features of the actions they govern. For example, greeting someone with a handshake or by showing them the back of your hand with just your middle finger extended is only meaningful in a particular society that has established rules about those actions. Other societies have established different practices for greetings that are equivalent in terms of how they regulate interpersonal interactions (e.g., kisses on the cheek, flicking your hand under your chin); nothing about these actions in-and-of-themselves is inherently right or wrong. In sum, morals and conventions both establish permissibility or impermissibility and create social order, but conventions depend on group context whereas morals are viewed as more universal. In domain theory, as in formalist ethics, morals (a) are not based on established rules (i.e., rule contingency), (b) prohibit rules that would sanction undesirable actions (i.e., rule alterability), and (c) generalize to members of other groups and cultures (i.e., rule and act generalizability).

Supporting the notion that there is an important psychological distinction between the moral and conventional domains, people judge and punish moral transgressors more severely than

those who break conventions (Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 1998). Additionally, moral rules do not depend on authorities. Children say that hitting and stealing are wrong, even if a teacher says it is okay (Nucci & Turiel, 1978; Smetana, 1981, 1985). Similarly, children endorse obedience to moral requests (e.g., to stop fighting) made by any person, including other children, but they only endorse obedience to norms (e.g., seat assignments) from legitimate authorities (Laupa, 1994). Domain theory therefore provides a clear account of when and why people sometimes are willing to break rules to achieve what is in their view a greater good. Moral rules supersede social conventions and provide both the motivation and the rationale that attempts to change the system require.

In summary, moral developmental theory began with the core assumption that morality and justice operations were functionally the same psychological constructs. Although the emphasis on justice operations is less explicit in contemporary moral developmental theory than it was in Piaget and Kolhberg's work, these theories nonetheless continue to assume that justice and morality are either very deeply connected if not the same psychological construct. Integrating the domain theory distinction between morality and convention with social psychological theory and research on justice, however, suggests the connections are not as deep as these theorists might believe—an issue we revisit in the concluding section of this chapter.

Morality from the Perspective of Justice Theory and Research

Justice theory and research evolved almost entirely independently of theory and research in moral development. Moral development theory and research was focused on improving childhood education. Justice theory and research, in contrast, was initially motivated by a desire to understand the factors that affect satisfaction with promotion decisions and wages, and the implications of just or unjust treatment on worker productivity (e.g., Adams, 1965; Stouffer et al.,

1949). Early justice theory and research focused largely on questions of distributive justice, that is, how people believe the benefits and burdens of social cooperation should be distributed. Theories of distributive justice generally assume that people approach life as a series of negotiated exchanges, and that human relationships and interactions are best understood by applying subjective cost-benefit analyses and comparisons of alternatives. Although based on an assumption that people are rationally self-interested, these theories also propose that properly socialized persons learn that to maximize rewards in the long run, they need to understand and adhere to norms of fairness in their relationships with others (e.g., Walster et al., 1978).

In the early 1980s, justice theory and research shifted from a dominant focus on distributive justice to consider the role that procedures play in people's conceptions of fairness, with a corresponding shift in assumptions about the motives that drive people's concern with fairness. Procedural justice theorists posited that people's concern about being fairly treated is driven more by relational motives, such as needs to feel valued, respected, and included in important groups, than it is by material self-interests (e.g., Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler & Lind, 1992). Both the quality of decision-making procedures and the quality of interpersonal treatment provided by decision-making authorities, provide individuals with important information about their status and standing within a group (Blader & Tyler, 2003)[1].

---

[1] Some scholars consider interpersonal treatment a dimension of procedural justice (e.g., Blader & Tyler, 2003), others argue that interpersonal treatment from those who implement procedures is a separate construct termed interactional justice (Bies, 2005; Bies & Moag, 1986). Meta-analyses indicate that interactional justice and procedural justice are highly overlapping but nonetheless distinguishable constructs (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). For example, people tend to experience higher levels of interactional justice when decision makers provide justifications and explanations for outcomes compared to when they do not, irrespective of the decision making procedures used to generate the outcomes. Although theorists suggested from the outset that poor treatment can prompt moral outrage (Bies, 1987), the potentially unique link between moral motivation and interactional justice has only recently begun to be emphasized and articulated in detail (e.g., Spencer & Rupp, 2009).

Morality as a consideration or motivation that shapes people's justice reasoning is a relatively new development in justice theorizing and research. Some of this work connects with the historical focus of justice research on questions of distributive and procedural justice, and some of it does not, but each of these perspectives nonetheless posit that morality—and not only self interest or relational needs-- plays a role in how people think about fairness.

Moral Exclusion and the Scope of Justice

The scope of justice is defined as the boundary condition on when morality and justice are perceived as applicable concerns: Moral rules and justice considerations only theoretically apply to those psychologically included in people's scope of justice (Opotow, 1990). Moral exclusion, a related concept, refers to the entities (e.g., individuals, groups of people, or animals) that are excluded from people's scope of justice and therefore not considered as having the right to fair or moral treatment (Opotow, 1995).

Theory and research on the scope of justice has its roots in evidence that people are relatively hard wired to sort others into categories of "us" versus "them" (Deutsch, 1990). Categorizing entities in this way corresponds with a tendency to see people within one's group (and therefore scope of justice) as good, and those outside of it as less so (e.g., Tajfel et al., 1971). The consequences of moral exclusion theoretically range from mild kinds of micro-aggression (e.g., verbal or behavioral indignities; Sue et al., 2009) to much more harmful forms of exclusion, including extermination, genocide, slavery, or mass internments (e.g., DeWind, 1990; Nagata, 1990, 1993; Staub, 1990). Consistent with scope of justice predictions, people are less likely to support social policies designed to help excluded groups (Beaton & Tougas, 2001; Opotow, 1994; Singer, 1996), more likely to deny excluded groups legal procedures and rights (Boeckmann &

Tyler, 1997), and more likely to express apathy when they witness negative treatment of excluded

than included groups (Brockner, 1990; Foster & Rusbult, 1999).

Although the notion that people maintain a scope of justice has been generative, it has not

escaped constructive criticism. Among other issues, there is not agreement that justice and

morality are functional equivalents, or if instead, justice is only one aspect of morality or ethics

(Hafer & Olson, 2003). Although Opotow and others treat these concepts as relatively

interchangeable, it might be preferable to narrow the "scope of justice" term to concerns about

fairness, rather than all of morality. In addition, there is confusion about whether the scope of

justice should be conceptualized as a dichotomous (in which case targets are either in or out of the

scope) or continuous variable (in which case exclusion can range from mild to severe, Hafer &

Olson, 2003). The scope of justice concept also implies that if someone is "inside the scope," then

they get positive treatment, whereas if they are outside the scope, they do not. What this

conceptualization ignores is the possibility that entities—regardless of whether they are included

or excluded from perceivers' scope of justice—can vary in whether they are perceived as

deserving positive or negative treatment (Hafer & Olson, 2003).

The Functional Pluralism Model of Justice

The functional pluralism model of justice attempts to integrate moral concerns into how

people think about questions of procedural and distributive justice. According to the functional

pluralism model of justice (Skitka, 2003; Skitka, Aramovich, Lytle, & Sargis, 2009; Skitka &

Wisneski, 2012), the adaptive challenges people confront in their everyday lives require the

ability to move fluidly between different goal states or motives. For example, people have to

resolve the problems of (a) competing for scarce resources, such as wages or jobs (the economist),

(b) how to get along with others and secure their standing in important groups (the politician), and

(c) building a meaningful sense of existence (the theologian)[2]. In short, the functional pluralism model's position is that people are intuitive economists, politicians, *and* theologians. Which homunculus is piloting the ship at any given time (so to speak), depends on the current goal orientation of the actor and the salience of various situational cues that could activate one or another of these mind-sets.

The intuitive economist. People take the perspective of an intuitive economist when situations prime a materialistic mindset. According to the functional pluralism model of justice, material goals and concerns are most likely to be activated when (a) there is a possibility of material gain, (b) the relational context is defined in market terms, and (c) other goals are not particularly salient. Contexts that prime the intuitive economist therefore include negotiations for goods and services, purchases, investments, and other contexts in which the primary goal is material exchange.

When the intuitive economist, or materialistic mindset is activated, people define equitable outcomes as more fair than outcomes distributed equally or on the basis of need (e.g., Deutsch, 1985), a finding that is robust across cultures (Fiske, 1991). They also become physiologically distressed at either inequitable underpayment or overpayment, and adjust their level of effort and productivity to restore equity (see Walster et al., 1978 for a review). Although no research to our knowledge has studied the degree to which an intuitive economist mindset affects perceptions of procedural justice, there are some logical possibilities. For example, intuitive economists should be especially concerned about consistency, for example, that pricing rules or compensation guidelines are applied in the same way irrespective of who is purchasing the goods or performing

---

[2] Other mindsets or perspectives that can influence perceptions of fairness are the intuitive scientist and prosecutor (see Skitka & Wisneski, 2012 for a review).

the service. Given that voice effects on procedural fairness are explained to some degree by the instrumental benefits of process control (e.g., Lind, Kanfer, & Earley, 1990), people in an intuitive economist mindset might also be especially sensitive to opportunities for voice, but primarily for instrumental rather than non-instrumental reasons.

The intuitive politician. When situations activate an intuitive politician mindset, people are motivated to achieve and maintain a position to influence others, to accumulate the symbols, status, and prestige associated with influence and power, and seek approval from the social groups and individuals to whom they are accountable (Tetlock, 2002). Intuitive politicians' motivation is rooted in "the knowledge that one is under the evaluative scrutiny of important constituencies in one's life who control valuable resources and who have some legitimate right to inquire into the reasons behind one's opinions or decisions. This knowledge activates the goal of establishing or preserving a desired social identity vis-à-vis these constituencies" (Tetlock, 2002, p. 454).

The functional pluralism model predicts that people are more likely to take the perspective of the intuitive politician when: (a) their material needs are at least minimally satisfied, (b) their needs for belongingness, status, and inclusion are not being met or are under threat, (c) the potential for significant relational losses or gains are made especially salient, (d) the dominant goal of the social system is to maximize group harmony or solidarity, (e) people's interdependency concerns are primed, and (f) accountability demands are high (Skitka 2003; Skitka & Wisneski, 2012).

Consistent with the idea that the goals associated with the intuitive politician perspective influence people's reasoning, people care more about procedures and interpersonal treatment than material outcomes when (a) social identity needs are particularly strong, (b) perceivers are of low

rather than high status, (c) status concerns are primed, and (d) they are high rather than low in

interdependent self-construal and interdependent self-construal is activated (see Skitka &

Wisneski, 2012 for a review). In a related vein, people are more likely to accept negative or

unfavorable material outcomes when they are the result of fair rather than unfair procedures (the

"fair process effect," e.g., Folger, 1977), in part because these procedures convey information

about belongingness (e.g., De Cremer & Alberts, 2002) and respect (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler &

Lind, 1992). In short, people sacrifice material interests to serve social identity needs and goals,

when social identity needs are more salient than material ones.

Variables related to social identity also influence people's judgments of distributive

justice. For example, people primed with solidarity and group harmony goals, who are chronically

higher in communal or interpersonal orientation, or who take a group rather than an individual

level perspective, are more likely to allocate material rewards equally than equitably, and to rate

equal allocations as more fair than equitable ones. Other research indicates conceptions of fairness

vary as a function of the social role of the perceiver. For example, when one's social role as a

parent is more highly activated, one is more likely to perceive allocations based on need as fairer

than those based on equity or equality (see Skitka & Wisneski, 2012 for a review).

The intuitive theologian. People adopt an intuitive theologian mindset when they are

motivated more by concerns about morality and immorality and questions of the greater good

than by either their social standing or material self-interest. People should be more likely to use a

moral frame of reference for evaluating fairness when (a) their material and social needs are

minimally satisfied, (b) they have a moral conviction about the outcome being decided (e.g.,

whether abortion is or is not legal); (c) moral emotions are aroused, such as moral outrage, guilt

or shame; (d) there is a real or perceived threat to people's conceptions of morality (not just

normative conventions), (e) people's sense of personal moral authenticity is questioned or

undermined, or (f) people are reminded of their mortality (Skitka, 2003; Skitka, et al., 2009;

Skitka & Wisneski, 2013).

Consistent with these hypotheses, people are more likely to believe that duties and rights

follow from the greater moral purposes underlying rules, procedures, and authority dictates, than

from the rules, procedures or authorities themselves when they have a moral investment in

outcomes (Skitka, Bauman, & Lytle, 2009; see also Kohlberg, 1976). Moral beliefs are not by

definition anti-establishment or anti-authority; they just are not dependent on establishment,

convention, rules, or authorities. Instead, when people take a moral perspective, they focus more

on their ideals, and the way they believe things "ought" or "should" be done, than on a duty to

comply with authorities. When people have moral certainty about what outcome authorities and

institutions should deliver, they do not need to rely on standing perceptions of legitimacy as proxy

information to judge whether the system works—in these cases, they can simply evaluate whether

authorities get it "right." "Right" decisions indicate that authorities are appropriate and work as

they should. "Wrong" answers signal that the system is somehow broken and is not working as it

should. Consistent with these ideas, people's fairness reasoning is driven more by whether

authorities get it "right" than by whether authorities provide opportunities for voice, respect the

dignity of those involved, or otherwise enact procedural fairness when people have a moral

investment in decision outcomes (e.g., Bauman & Skitka, 2009; Skitka, 2002; Skitka & Houston,

2001; Skitka & Mullen, 2002; Skitka et al., 2009).

In summary, theories of procedural and distributive justice have emphasized materialistic

and social motivations underlying justice and ignored or dismissed the possibility that people's

conceptions of fairness might connect to underlying moral motives. Justice theory and research

has been preoccupied with which of these two motives—materialistic/egoistic motivation versus social identity and belongingness—best explains people's reasoning about procedural and distributive fairness. A working definition of justice and what it means to people, however, could just as reasonably start with morality, righteousness, virtues, and ethics rather than with self-interest, belongingness, or other non-moral motivations. The functional pluralism model of justice treats materialistic and social identity concerns as valid motivations that can contingently influence how people think about fairness (instead of framing these as competing theoretical alternatives), but it also recognizes that moral concerns sometimes shape people's fairness reasoning as well.

Fairness Theory and the Deonance Approach

Fairness theory focuses less on questions of procedural and distributive fairness, and more on people's reactions to transgressions. Fairness theory posits that justice is fundamentally about accountability and the assignment of blame in response to counter-normative outcomes and interpersonal conduct (Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, & Rupp, 2001; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998; 2001; Folger, Cropanzano, & Goldman, 2005). According to the theory, perceived fairness depends on people's answer to three central questions: (a) *Would* the situation have turned out better if things were done differently? (b) *Could* the actor have behaved differently? (c) *Should* the actor have behaved differently? That is, "would" judgments assess whether something negative occurred by considering counterfactual alternatives as reference points. "Could" judgments determine whether the actor realistically could have chosen a different course of action. "Should" judgments ascertain whether the actor violated moral or ethical standards. In short, people judge fairness by comparing aspects of events associated with accountability to counterfactual alternatives.

The "should" component of fairness theory explicitly links justice and morality. It argues that perceived transgressions of moral norms for interpersonal conduct—the product of "should" judgments—arouse deonance, a motivational state akin to reactance and dissonance (Folger, 1998, 2001). Deontic responses have at least five important attributes that distinguish them from other responses to unfairness (Folger et al., 2005). Deontic responses often involve rapid evaluations of situations that alert perceivers to injustice. Although people can and do consciously deliberate about justice, initial appraisals of unfairness can arise from automatic attribution processes that detect and categorize stimuli as negative for the perceiver. Deontic responses do not always serve individuals' self-interest and often include strong emotions, especially anger and hostility that drive behavioral responses. Furthermore, deontic responses prompt a desire for retribution. Rather than seek compensation for the losses they incurred, aggrieved persons can be motivated to restore justice through punishment or other means perceived to decrease the likelihood of future violations (e.g., Skarlicki & Rupp, 2010). However, deontic responses also include opportunities for social reconciliation, which open the door to future interactions once a situation has been satisfactorily resolved. Taken together, these aspects of the deontic approach highlight a facet of the way people experience injustice that has been absent from many theories of justice.

In summary, fairness theory attempts to integrate and organize theory and research on moral judgment with justice, and proposes the social cognitive and emotional processes that may underlie when, why, and how people judge and react to unfairness. Empirical research that formulates and tests specific hypotheses derived from fairness theory has recently gathered momentum (e.g., Umphress, Simmons, Folger, Ren, & Bobocel, 2012), but as with any relatively young theory, there are many areas of fairness theory that remain untested, unaddressed, and

underspecified. For example, fairness theory currently has only addressed negative events, that is, people's responses to perceived transgressions. Although the theory may ultimately be extended to explain people's reactions to positive events (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001), asymmetries in how people process positive and negative events are likely to complicate this effort (e.g., Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Finkenauer, & Vohs, 2001). Therefore, fairness theory provides a broad framework for understanding justice judgments in the context of transgressions that may provide increasing utility as it continues to develop.

Justice from the Perspective of Theory and Research on Adult Morality

Justice theorists are not alone in their recent interest in morality; in recent years other social psychologists have also become fascinated by morality. We turn next to how social psychologists interested in morality have made connections with psychological concerns with justice.

Moral Foundations Theory

Moral foundations theory (MFT) incorporates concerns with justice as part of a larger pluralist theory of morality. Drawing on similarities between works in anthropology (e.g., Fiske, 1992; Shweder, Much, Mahapatra, & Park, 1997), and evolutionary theories of human sociality, Haidt and colleagues proposed MFT (Haidt & Joseph, 2004, 2007; Haidt & Graham, 2007; see Graham et al., 2013 for a review) to explain variation in morality across (sub)cultures. In particular MFT argues that there is a small set of innate "foundations" upon which cultures construct their moral systems. Thus, MFT argues some aspects of morality are organized in advance of experience (Marcus, 2004), but nevertheless get revised during childhood through cultural practices and experiences. The revision process accounts for the diversity of moralities witnessed across cultures and across groups within a culture (Graham, Haidt & Nosek, 2009).

Moral foundations theory asserts that there are at least five moral foundations: (1) Harm/care, (2) Fairness/reciprocity, (3) Ingroup/loyalty, (4) Authority/respect, and (5) Purity/sanctity (Graham et al., 2013). The harm/care foundation underlies virtues of kindness, generosity and nurturance and evolved from our ability to feel the pain of others. The fairness/reciprocity foundation underlies ideas of justice, rights, equity, and autonomy and is related to the process of reciprocal altruism. The ingroup/loyalty foundation underlies the virtue of self-sacrifice for the group and values such as loyalty and patriotism; it evolved in response to our ancestors' ability to form shifting coalitions. The authority/respect foundation underlies the virtues of obedience to legitimate authorities and respect for tradition; it evolved from our history of hierarchical social interactions. Finally, the purity/sanctity foundation underlies ideas about religiosity and how the body can be desecrated by contaminants and impure activities; it evolved from disgust mechanisms that protect the body. Notably, Haidt and colleagues believe that several additional foundations may exist, including but not limited to Liberty/oppression, Efficiency/waste, and Ownership/theft (Graham et al., 2013). To date, however, empirical research on additional candidates for "foundationhood" has focused mainly on Liberty/oppression, which underlies the negative reactions people have to individuals or institutions that meddle in the lives of others (see Iyer, Koleva, Graham, Ditto, & Haidt, 2012).

The harm and fairness foundations are individualizing foundations (in which individuals are the locus of moral value, and concerns with autonomy and protecting individuals' rights are paramount), whereas ingroup, authority and purity are binding foundations (in which the group is the locus of moral value, and concerns with loyalty, duty and self-control are paramount; Graham et al., 2009). Haidt and colleagues argue that most research in moral psychology has tended to focus on the individualizing foundations, and has neglected the other foundations.

Much of the research on MFT has been applied to understanding ideological disagreements between liberals and conservatives (and of late, libertarians). In particular, Haidt and colleagues have argued that liberals endorse the harm and fairness foundations more than the other foundations, whereas conservatives tend to endorse all five foundations more equally (Graham et al., 2009; Haidt & Graham, 2007); both groups equally endorse liberty (Graham et al., 2013). Thus, according to MFT, the root of some ideological disagreements rests in the fact that conservatives endorse moral principles that liberals don't recognize as moral (Haidt & Graham, 2007). MFT and moral motives theory (reviewed later in this chapter) together suggest that justice researchers may have missed an important moderator of how people judge fairness, specifically, the political orientation of the perceiver.

Although MFT has generated a lot of research in the short time since its original formulation, it has also been subject to criticism (for a review see Graham et al., 2013). In particular, MFT has been criticized for lacking conceptual clarity on what constitutes a foundation and for not providing enough evidence that moral intuitions are in fact innate (Suhler & Churchland, 2011). Some scholars reject its pluralist perspective and argue that all morality comes down to the dimension of harm (Gray et al., 2012). Others argue that only the harm and fairness dimensions are truly moral, and the other foundations represent conventional beliefs (e.g., Jost, 2009). Still others criticize MFT for missing vital elements of morality (see Janoff-Bulman's work reviewed below) or for not paying enough attention to the relational context in which concerns about morality arise (Rai & Fiske, 2011). The authors of MFT acknowledge these criticisms in their recent writings and discuss ways that MFT could address these criticisms in future research (Graham et al., 2013).

In summary, MFT argues that concerns about harm and justice (which have been the dominant focus in the literatures on moral development and the social psychology of justice) are only two foundations on which morality is built. By drawing our attention to other possible foundations of morality (e.g., authority), MFT has highlighted that justice and morality are not identical concepts because concerns about justice and harm are only part of the larger pie of morality.

Relational Models Theory and Moral Relationship Regulation

The relationship regulation approach to morality posits that people derive their standards for morality and justice from their understanding of the social relationships within specific situations (Rai & Fiske, 2011). According to this perspective, moral principles do not exist independent of the social-relational contexts in which they operate. Instead, moral concepts such as harm, equality, or purity are situationally determined as a function of the type of social relationship a given situation involves. Diversity in moral thought, feelings, and actions therefore is not the product of erroneous recognition of moral facts but a legitimate consequence of how different people interpret social situations and implement a finite set of schema about the nature of a given relationship.

Social relationships generally fit one of four basic relational models: communal sharing, authority ranking, equality matching, and market pricing (Fiske, 1991, 1992; see also Haslam, 2004). How people define fairness and morality therefore depends on the relational system. In communal sharing relationships, all people within a given group (e.g., a family) hold equivalent and undifferentiated status and can expect equal access to resources, but the same is not true for outsiders. The authority ranking model provides organization within a group by introducing asymmetry among members according to ordinal positions that indicate linear patterns of

dominance and deference. In equality matching relationships, people seek to balance their outcome relative to others' in terms of both valence and magnitude along one dimension at a time (e.g., effort). In market pricing relationships, people take into account a wide array of disparate dimensions of comparison and combine them along a common metric (often money) into a single ratio that facilitates complex comparisons and exchanges. The four basic relational models help people anticipate and coordinate behavior, evaluate interactions and exchanges, and identify transgressions.

Each relational model prescribes the basis for moral motivation and judgment that people use to derive appropriate standards of conduct given the nature of the relationship between the individuals involved (Rai & Fiske, 2011). Unity is the principal moral motive in communal sharing relationships. People in communal sharing situations are expected to take care of their own. They ought to satisfy any ingroup members' unmet needs, experience threats to individual members of the group as a threat to the group as a whole, and protect the integrity of the group from both internal and external disruptions. Hierarchy is the principal moral motive in relationships characterized by authority ranking. People expect inequality in these situations; lower ranking individuals claim fewer resources and have a duty to support and defer to higher ranking individuals. Higher ranking individuals, in contrast, claim more resources but are obligated to lead and look after lower ranking individuals.

Equality is the principal moral motive in the equality matching model. In relationships characterized by equality matching, people strive to provide equal opportunities or outcomes through processes such as turn taking, in-kind reciprocity, and lotteries in which each person has the same opportunity to be chosen. Finally, proportionality is the principal moral motive in market pricing relationships. When market pricing applies, people monitor multiple inputs and

outputs simultaneously and ensure that rewards and punishments are equitable. Taken together, the relational regulation approach integrates a wide array of perspectives, including prior research on care (e.g., Opotow, 1990), authority (e.g., Tyler & Lind, 1992), and multiple distributive justice criteria (e.g., Deutsch, 1985). By doing so, it provides a comprehensive and contingent theory of when and why moral rules and motives vary across situations and individuals.

From the perspective of relational models theory, moral conflict is largely the result of disagreement over implementation rules that specify when, how, and to whom each relational model applies (Fiske, 1991, 1992; Fiske & Tetlock, 1997). The relational models themselves are universal but abstract. Beliefs about how to operationalize the models to address specific situations and relationships vary across cultures, groups, institutions, ideologies, and individuals' familiarity with possible precedents. Consider, for example, a situation in which most people agree that the equality matching model fits. If one person does another a favor, everyone might agree that reciprocation is appropriate. In the absence of more precise implementation rules, however, it remains unclear how or when the favor should be reciprocated. Different interpretations of the ways to satisfy the requirements of a model can therefore lead to misunderstanding, disagreement, and conflict.

Disagreement over which model ought to apply to a given situation is less common than disagreement over implementation rules, but it tends to generate intense and intractable conflict that is accompanied by moral outrage (Fiske & Tetlock, 1997). Tradeoffs that are relatively easy to make when viewed through the lens of one relational model can appear inappropriate—or even ghastly and unthinkable—when viewed through the lens of another. Goods and services, for example, are bought and sold every day, and the vast majority of these transactions are acceptable because people apply the market pricing model to such exchanges. When it comes to human

organs, however, people often apply the communal sharing model, which causes them to view organ markets as taboo and morally repugnant. Somewhat similarly, friendships often operate under the equality matching model. If one couple invites another to their home for dinner, the appropriate response is to reciprocate at a later date. Offering to pay a sum that would cover the cost of dinner would be perfectly acceptable under the market pricing model (e.g., at a restaurant), but awkward and uncomfortable under the equality matching model in someone's home. In sum, relational models and the moral motives that accompany them facilitate social interactions, but conflict arises when people apply different implementation rules, or worse, a completely different model.

In summary, relational models theory and the moral relationship regulation approach provide a rich framework for understanding how and why morality and justice vary across situations, and it also explains when and why people sometimes moralize conflict and resist the type of tradeoffs that are necessary to resolve disagreements. The relational systems model is solidly grounded in interdisciplinary theory and empirical research about how people coordinate social relationships. However, it is presented at a level of abstraction that may make it difficult to formulate hypotheses about how the theory should apply in specific situations. Moreover, the theory allows that any given situation can simultaneously involve parts of each model, which may limit its utility or make it unfalsifiable. Therefore, greater specification of the theory is needed before it can be tested cleanly.

Moral Motives Model

Janoff-Bulman and Carnes (2013) moral motives model has been offered as an alternative to MFT and the relational models theory. Building on the scaffolding of theory and research on behavioral regulation and motivation (e.g., motives of approach and avoidance, and behavioral

activation versus inhibition; e.g., Carver & Scheier, 2008), Janoff-Bulman and Carnes argue that morality fundamentally involves behavioral regulation to facilitate an optimized social existence. In particular, proscriptive moral regulation is focused on avoiding immorality or transgressions, and is inhibitory and protection oriented. In contrast, prescriptive morality is an approach motivation oriented toward providing rather than protecting.

In addition to arguing that morality engages these two motivational systems, Janoff-Bulman and Carnes (2013) argue that these moral motivations can play out at three different levels of analysis, specifically morality of the self, the other, and the group. At the level of the self, proscriptive and prescriptive moral motivations are associated with self-restraint and moderation on the one hand, and industriousness on the other. Other directed moral motivation is interpersonally directed, and is proscriptively focused on avoiding harm, and prescriptively focused on helping and fairness. Finally, the group-based or collective oriented moral motives are concerned with social order and communal solidarity when they are proscriptively oriented (e.g., status quo maintenance), and focused on social justice and community responsibility when they are prescriptively motivated. Similar to MFT, Janoff-Bulman and Carnes (2013) argue that liberals and conservatives differ in their moral motivations. According to this model, however, ideological differences are not classified around individuating or binding foundations, but are focused instead on differences in the motivational priorities of liberals and conservatives. Political conservatives' moral motivations are more likely to be proscriptively motivated, whereas political liberals' moral motivations are prescriptively motivated.

The moral concerns identified by MFT overlap to a considerable degree with the moral motives model, with one primary exception. MFT defines fairness in individuating terms—it describes micro justice (i.e., justice from the perspective of the individual). In contrast, moral

motives theory differentiates between micro and macro justice, or justice at the level of the individual versus the collective, respectively.

Although the macro or social justice component of moral motives theory has already proven to be somewhat controversial (see Graham, 2013 for a critique), it has strong empirical grounding in research that has revealed important differences between how people think about justice for individuals versus collectives (Brickman, Folger, Goode, & Schul, 1981). Individual justice focuses on person specific variables, such as merit. Macro justice (or what Janoff-Bulman & Carnes, 2013 called social justice) instead focuses on the shape of the outcome distribution writ large, such as the distribution of annual income of a given public. Discourse about growing income inequality is a concrete example of a macro justice concern.

MFT also implies that liberals for the most part do not have a communal moral orientation. Moral motives theory challenges this idea, and argues that liberals do have communal moral concerns, they just are not captured well by the foundations of ingroup, authority, and purity, which are largely described in proscriptive terms, which appeal to conservatives. In contrast, moral motives theory proposes that liberals' communal moral motivations are prescriptively oriented around concerns about social justice and communal responsibility, and not ingroup, authority or purity.

Strengths of moral motives theory include its explicit grounding in psychological theory and research on motivation, as well as reinvigorating the important distinctions between micro and macro justice. Especially given recent public debate about issues such as income inequality, social class divisions in access to higher education, and various other macro justice topics, how people reconcile conflicts between micro and macro justice concerns will be an important area for future research.

Morality and Justice: The Same or Different Constructs?

This review highlights the considerable variability in the literature regarding how morality and justice are related. For Piaget and Kohlberg, morality and justice were viewed as essentially the same thing; more contemporary theories of moral development, however, have de-emphasized the links between morality and justice operations. Contemporary theories of morality differ from theories of justice in the kinds of connections they make between morality and justice. Moral foundations and moral motives theories, for example, posit that justice is merely one aspect among many that define the moral domain. Alternatively, recent theories of justice maintain that morality is one concern that underlies why people care about justice.

One way to help clarify the similarities and differences in the psychology of justice and morality may be to integrate the distinction domain theory makes between normative conventions and moral imperatives with justice theory and research. Specifically, it may be that people's conceptions of justice are often grounded more on conventional beliefs than moral imperatives. Consistent with this assertion, people tend to acknowledge and accept the idea that determinants of fairness can and should vary across situations, but they experience their moral beliefs and convictions as universally generalizable and objective truths (e.g., Goodwin & Darley, 2008; Morgan, Skitka, & Lytle, 2013). Moreover, researchers have identified a plethora of allocation norms and standards that are seen as differentially fair and appropriate in different contexts, relationships, or situations (e.g., Deutsch, 1985). A broad range of factors similarly shape perceptions of procedural fairness (e.g., Leventhal, 1980; Lind & Tyler, 1988) and the relative weight that people place on distributive versus procedural considerations when making fairness judgments (e.g., Brockner et al., 1998; Skitka & Mullen, 2002; Van den Bos et al., 1998). Furthermore, the claim that justice rules are more often based on normative conventions than

moral imperatives is reinforced by the degree to which definitions of justice include not only informal norms, but also a host of formalized codes and guidelines that can vary across organizational structures or communities. Homeowners' associations, for example, generate very localized versions of their covenants; workplaces vary in their pay and benefit policies, and so forth. Although all homeowners' associations and workplaces (for example) will develop their covenants and policies in ways that ensure fairness (and therefore increase compliance), there is no one just set of rules, nor do people experience these rules as universally generalizable or objective truths.

In contrast, people do not generally accept and expect that their conceptions of morality are or should be contextually contingent or situationally variable, and are offended at the very idea that morality could be relative (e.g., Darwell, 1998; Smith, 1994). Even philosophers who reject the idea of moral objectivism (e.g., Mackie, 1977) nonetheless accept that people's commitment to the idea that there are objective moral truths is central to folk metaethics (i.e., people's beliefs and assumptions about the nature of morality).

In summary, our review of the rather disjointed literature on morality and justice leads us to tentatively conclude that morality and justice are distinct, but sometimes overlapping psychological constructs. Perceptions of justice are typically more negotiable and flexible than moral beliefs. Justice judgments also are at least as likely to be driven by non-moral as moral concerns. That is, justice judgments often are made using what Rest et al. (1999a, 1999b) referred to as personal interest or norm maintenance schemas, or what Skitka and Wisneski (2012) labeled as the intuitive economist or politician mindsets. Justice only becomes moralized when it is based on post-conventional beliefs about fundamental questions of right and wrong, which unlike normative conventions, are non-negotiable, authority independent, and autonomous.

Future theory and research will need to further develop and refine the ways in which morality and justice are similar and different. Important to this refinement will be (a) careful definition of terms, (b) deciding whether justice and morality describe judgments, behaviors, attitudes, motives, treatment, or outcomes (or all of the above), and (c) exploring the ways in which perspective may matter, that is, whether one is the recipient or target, a third party perceiver, or the allocator or actor of justice and morality.

Conclusion

In summary, theories of moral development, morality, and justice evolved independently but have converged on the idea that justice and morality are inherently linked yet separate constructs. The relation between justice and morality is almost assuredly conditional; sometimes there is a high degree of overlap between justice and morality, but there are aspects of morality that have nothing to do with justice and aspects of justice that have nothing to do with morality. That said, little research has directly examined this space. Future research aimed at doing so has the opportunity to have a big impact because it may inform multiple literatures.

Author Note

All authors contributed equally to the preparation of this chapter. Correspondence should be

addressed to Linda J. Skitka at lskitka@uic.edu.

References

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.

Bauman, C. W., & Skitka, L. J. (2009). Moral conflict and procedural justice: Moral mandates as constraints to voice effects. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 61,* 40 – 49.

Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Bad is stronger than good. *Review of General Psychology, 5*, 323–370.

Beaton, A. M., & Tougas, F. (2001). Reactions to affirmative action: Group membership and social justice. *Social Justice Research, 14,* 1042-1054.

Bies, R. J. (1987). The predicament of injustice: The management of moral outrage. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 9, pp. 289-319). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (pp. 43-55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Blader, S. & Tyler, T. R. (2003). A four-component model of procedural justice: Defining the meaning of a fair process. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* 747-758.

Boeckmann, R. J. & Tyler, T. R. (1997). Commonsense justice and inclusion within the moral community: When do people receive procedural justice from others? *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 3,* 362-380.

Brickman, P., Folger, R., Goode, E., & Schul, Y. (1981). Microjustice and macrojustice. In M. J. Lerner & S. C. Lerner (Eds.), *The justice motive in social behavior* (pp. 173 – 202). New York, NY: Plenum.

Brockner, J. (1990). Scope of justice in the workplace: How survivors react to co-worker lay-offs. *Journal of Social Issues, 46.* 95-106.

Brown, D. (1991). *Human universals*, McGraw-Hill.

Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1998). *On the self-regulation of behavior*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process, 86*, 278-324.

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analysis of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 425-445.

Cropanzano, R., Byrne, Z. S., Bobocel, D. R., & Rupp, D. E. (2001). Self-enhancement biases, laboratory experiments, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, and the increasingly crowded world of organizational justice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58*, 260-272.

De Cremer, D., & Alberts, H. J. (2004). When procedural fairness does not influence how positive I feel: The effects of voice and leader selection as a function of belongingness need. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *34*(3), 333-344.

Darwell, S. (1998). *Philosophical ethics*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Deutsch, M. (1985). *Distributive justice*. Binghamton, NY: Vail-Ballou Press.

Fiske, A. P. (1991). *Structures of social life: The four elementary forms of human relations: Communal sharing, authority ranking, equality matching, market pricing*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Fiske, A. P. (1992). The four elementary forms of sociality: Framework for a unified theory of social relations. *Psychological Review, 99*, 689–723.

Fiske, A. P., & Tetlock, P. E. (1997). Taboo trade-offs: reactions to transactions that transgress the spheres of justice. *Political psychology*, *18*, 255-297.

Folger, R. (1977). Distributive and procedural justice: Combined impact of "voice" and improvement of experienced inequity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*, 108–119.

Folger, R. (1998). Fairness as a moral virtue. In M. Schminke (Ed.), *Managerial ethics: Moral management of people and processes* (pp. 13-34). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Folger, R. (2001). Fairness as deonance. In S. W. Gilliland, D. D. Steiner, & D. P. Skarlicki (Eds.), *Research in social issues in management* (Vol. 1, pp. 3-33). New York, NY: Information Age.

Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (2001). Fairness theory: Justice as accountability. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 1-55). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Folger, R., Cropanzano, R., & Goldman, B. (2005). Justice, accountability, and moral sentiment: The deontic response to "foul play" at work. In J. Greenberg & J. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 215-245). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

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,* 443-550.

Graham, J. (2013). Mapping the moral maps: From alternate taxonomies to competing

   predictions. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 17,* 237 -241.

Graham, J., Haidt, J., Koleva, S., Motyl, M., Iyer, R., Wojcik, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2013). Moral

   foundations theory: The pragmatic validity of moral pluralism. *Advances in Experimental*

   Social Psychology, 47, 55–130.

Graham, J., Haidt, J. & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and Conservatives rely on different sets of

   moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*, 1029-1046.

Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the moral

   domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101,* 366-385.

Gray, K., Young, L., Waytz, A. (2012). Mind perception is the essence of morality. *Psychological*

   Inquiry, 23, 101-124.

Hafer, C. L., & Olson, J. M. (2003). An analysis of empirical research on the scope of justice.

   Personality and Social Psychology Review, 7, 311 – 323.

Haidt, J., & Joseph, C. (2004). Intuitive ethics: How innately prepared intuitions generate

   culturally variable virtues. *Daedalus, 133,* 55-66.

Haidt, J., & Joseph, C. (2007). The moral mind: How 5 sets of innate intuitions guide the

   development of many culture-specific virtues, and perhaps even modules. In P. Carruthers,

   S. Laurence & S. Stich (Eds.), *The Innate Mind, Vol. 3* (pp. 367-391). New York: Oxford.

Haidt, J., & Graham, J. (2007). When morality opposes justice: Conservatives have moral

   intuitions that liberals may not recognize. *Social Justice Research, 20,* 98-116.

Iyer, R., Koleva, S., Graham, J., Ditto, P., & Haidt, J. (2012) Understanding libertarian morality:

   The psychological dispositions of self-identified libertarians, PLoS ONE, 7(8): e42366.

   doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0042366

Janoff-Bulman, R. & Carnes, N. C. (2013). Surveying the moral landscape. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 17,* 237 – 241.

Jost, J. T. (2009). Group morality and ideology: left and right, right and wrong. Paper presented to the Society for Personality and Social Psychology annual conference, Tampa, FL.

Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive developmental approach. In T. Lickona (Ed.), *Moral development and behavior: Theory, research and social issues.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice.* San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Konow, J. (2008). Distributive justice. In M.A. Genovese and L.C. Han (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of American government and civics*. New York: Facts-on-File.

Laupa, M. (1994). Who's in charge? Preschool children's concepts of authority. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 9*, 1-17.

Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. White (Eds.) *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research (pp. 27 – 55).* New York: Plenum.

Lind, E. A., Kanfer, R., & Earley, P. C. (1990). Voice, control, and procedural justice: Instrumental and noninstrumental concerns in fairness judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*, 952.

Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural fairness.* New York, NY: Plenum.

Mackie, J. L., 1977, *Ethics: Inventing Right and Wrong*, New York: Penguin.

Marcus, G. (2004). *The birth of the mind.* New York: Basic.

Morgan, G. S., Skitka, L. J., & Lytle, B. L. (2013). Universally and objectively true:

Psychological foundations of moral conviction. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Nichols, S. & Folds-Bennett, T. (2003). Are children moral objectivists? Children's judgments

about moral and response-dependent properties. *Cognition, 90,* B23 – B32.

Nucci, L. P., & Turiel, E. (1978). Social interactions and the development of social concepts in

pre-school children. *Child Development, 49*, 400–407.

Opotow, S. (1990). Moral exclusion and injustice. *Journal of Social Issues, 46*, 1–20.

Opotow, S. (1994). Predicting protection: Scope of justice and the natural world. *Journal of

Social Issues, 50,* 49 – 63.

Piaget, J. (1932/1997). *The moral judgment of the child*. New York: Free Press.

Rai, T. S., & Fiske, A. P. (2011). Moral psychology is relationship regulation: Moral motives for

unity, hierarchy, equality, and proportionality. *Psychological Review, 118*, 57-75.

Rest, J., Narvaez, D., Bebeau, M. J., & Thoma, S. J. (1999a). A neo-Kohlbergian approach: The

DIT and schema theory. *Educational Psychology Review, 11,* 291 -324.

Rest, J. R., Narvaez, D., Bebeau, M. J., & Thoma, S. J. (1999b). *Postconventional moral thinking.

A neo-Kohlbergian approach.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Shweder, R. A., Much, N. C., Mahapatra, M., & Park, L. (1997). The "big three" of morality

(autonomy, community, and divinity), and the "big three" explanations of suffering. In A.

Brandt & P. Rozin (Eds.), *Morality and health* (pp. 119-169). New York: Routledge.

Simpson, E. L. (1974). Moral development research: A case of scientific cultural bias. *Human

Development, 17,* 81 – 106.

Skarlicki, D. & Rupp, D. (2010). Dual processing and organizational justice: The role of rational versus experiential processing in third-party reactions to workplace mistreatment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 944-952.

Skitka, L. J. (2003). Of different minds: An accessible identity model of justice reasoning. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 7,* 286-297.

Skitka, L. J., Aramovich, N., Lytle, B. L., & Sargis, E. (2009). Knitting together an elephant: An integrative approach to understanding the psychology of justice reasoning. In D. R. Bobocel, A. C. Kay, M. P. Zanna, & J. M. Olson (Eds.)*, The psychology of justice and legitimacy: The Ontario symposium, Vol. 11* (pp. 1 – 26). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Skitka, L. J., Bauman, C. W., & Lytle, B. L. (2009). The limits of legitimacy: Moral and religious convictions as constraints on deference to authority. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97,* 567 - 578.

Skitka, L. J. & Mullen, E. (2002). Understanding judgments of fairness in a real-world political context: A test of the value protection model of justice reasoning. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28,* 1419-1429.

Skitka, L. J. & Wisneski, D. (2012). Justice theory and research: A social functionalist perspective. In J. Suls & H. Tennen (Eds.), *The Handbook of Psychology 2nd Ed.* (pp. 420 – 428)*,* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Smetana, J. G. (1981). Preschool children's conceptions of moral and social rules. *Child Development, 52,* 1333-1336.

Smetana, J. G. (1984). Toddlers' social interactions regarding moral and conventional transgressions. *Child Development,* 1767-1776.

Smetana, J. G. (2006). Social-cognitive domain theory: Consistencies and variations in children's

      moral and social judgments. *Handbook of moral development*, 119-153.

Smith, M. (1994). *The moral problem.* Oxford: Blackwell. *CedarEthics Online.* Paper 36.

      http://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/cedar_ethics_online/36/ Retrieved May 17, 2013.

Spencer, S., & Rupp, D. E. (2009). Angry, guilty, and conflicted: Injustice toward coworkers

      heightens emotional labor through cognitive and emotional mechanisms. *Journal of*

      Applied Psychology, 94, 429-444.

Staub, E. (1990). Moral exclusion, personal goal theory, and extreme destructiveness. *Journal of*

      Social Issues, 46, 47 – 64.

Stouffer, S. A., Suchman, E. A., DeVinney, L. C., Star, S. A., & Williams, R. M., Jr. (1949). The

      American soldier: Adjustment during army life (Vol.1). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University

      Press.

Sue, D., Bucceri, J., Lin, A.I., Nadal, K.L., & Torino, G.C. (2009). Racial microaggressions and

      the Asian American Experience. *Asian American Journal of Psychology, 1*, 88-101.

Suhler, C. L., & Churchland, P. (2011). Can innate, modular "foundations" explain morality?

      Challenges for Haidt's moral foundations theory. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 23,*

      2103-2116.

Sullivan, E. V. (1977). *Kohlberg's structuralism: A critical appraisal.* Toronto: Ontario Institute

      for Studies in Education.

Tajfel, H., Billig, M. G., Bundy, R. P., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup

      behaviour. *European journal of social psychology*, *1*, 149-178.Tetlock, P. E. (2002).

      Social functionalist frameworks for judgment and choice: Intuitive politicians,

      theologians, and prosecutors. *Psychological Review, 109,* 451 – 471.

Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975*). Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ:

Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Turiel, E. (1978). Social regulations and domains of social concepts. In W. Damon (Ed.), *New*

directions for child development. (Vol. 1., pp. 45–74). New York: Gardner.

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

UK: Cambridge University Press.

Turiel, E. (1998). The development of morality. *Handbook of child psychology*. Hoboken, NJ:

Wiley.

Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. In M. P. Zanna

(Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 25*, 115–191. San Diego, CA:

Academic Press.

Umphress E. E., Simmons, A. L., Folger, R., Ren, R., and Bobocel, R. (2012). Observer reactions

to interpersonal injustice: The role of perpetrator intent and victim perception. *Journal of*

Organizational Behavior, 34, 327-349.

van den Bos, K., Wilke, H. A. M., Lind, E. A., & Vermunt, R. (1998). Evaluating outcomes by

means of the fair process effect: Evidence for different processes in fairness and

satisfaction judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1493-1503.

Walster, E., Walster, G. W., Berscheid, E., & Austin, W. (1978). *Equity: Theory and research*.

Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Waytz, A., Gray, K., Epley, N. & Wegner, D. M. (2010). Causes and consequences of mind

perception. *Trends in Cognitive Science, 14*, 383-388.