

Building a Sustaining Classroom Climate for Purposeful Ethical Citizenship

Darcia Narvaez, University of Notre Dame

ABSTRACT

In an age and society where children and adolescents receive decreasing support for building good lives, best practice for fostering optimal moral character needs to be extended in the classroom beyond mastery learning and positive caring climates. A *sustaining* classroom climate provides more than a good learning environment or caring classroom. A sustaining classroom climate provides as much as possible the type of environment under which human mammals thrive. It fosters students' sense of positive purpose, as individuals and as a group, and a peaceful moral citizenship. It is characterized by collaborative leadership, community fellowship, democratic practice, and enhancement of human potential. In Triune Ethics theory terms, students learn to foster the engagement and imagination ethics while minimizing the self-centric security ethic. In sustaining classrooms, students learn skills for individual flourishing and enabling community flourishing.

Building a Sustaining Classroom Climate for Purposeful Ethical Citizenship

In the recent past, moral and character educational approaches have typically emphasized individual capacities for moral reasoning or good habits. As understanding of human nature has improved, scholars are realizing the intersubjectivity of human behavior, its groundedness in a social fabric, and the importance of both in human development. There is greater understanding of how moral behavior is shaped by context. Environments elicit particular interpretations, foster specific habits, and channel opportunities. The social fabric of an organization is often called its climate or culture. In this paper, a *sustaining* climate is proposed as the optimal culture for moral development and moral functioning. But the notion of climate is only one of several elements important for moral character development that are summarized by the integrative ethical education model.

The Place of Climate in Moral Education: The Integrative Ethical Education Model

The Integrative Ethical Education model (IEE; Narvaez, 2006; 2007; 2008) provides a comprehensive approach for fostering moral character in schools and organizations. Grounded in bioecological systems theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) and drawing on findings from neurobiology (Narvaez, 2008), anthropology (Hewlett & Lamb, 2005) and social and emotional learning (Elias et al., 2008), IEE's aim is to foster human flourishing through skill development and novice-to-expert instruction (Hogarth, 2001), positive social influences on brain and behavior, resulting in personal and group empowerment (Baxter Magolda, 2001; Scharmer, 2007). IEE tries to solve many of the issues that arise when educators take on moral character education (see Anderson, Narvaez, Endicott, Bock & Lies, 2004; Narvaez, Bock, Endicott & Lies, 2004) and presents an empirically-derived set of proposals for educators, which are briefly presented here.

The first proposal is to *establish a secure, caring relationship with the child*, ensuring the social context for learning and the mutual commitment to working together and influencing one another (Masten, 2003). Wired for emotional signaling and motivation (Greenspan & Shanker 2004; Panksepp 1998), a caring supportive teacher can foster empathy and caring behavior in students as well as motivation to learn (Wentzel, 1997).

It is known from social and motivational literatures that the classroom climate primes and promotes particular behaviors (Battistich, 2008; Solomon et al., 2002) so the second proposal is to *create a sustaining climate which is supportive of ethical behavior and excellence*. Educators can ensure that the school and classroom environments are fostering good intuitions—intuitions that promote mastery learning, prosocial relationships and citizenship development. Climates that help students meet their needs (e.g., for belonging, competence, autonomy; Deci & Ryan, 1985) also foster skills for good character and resiliency (e.g., Benson et al., 1998), thereby encouraging prosocial behavior. High support and high expectations for achievement and behavior produce the best results (Zins et al., 2004). This proposal is discussed in more detail below.

The third proposal draws on the literatures of expertise and schema development, proposing that an apprenticeship model of teaching be adopted to nurture a set of ethical skills that comprise ethical sensitivity, ethical judgment, ethical focus/motivation, and ethical implementation (Narvaez, 2009a; Narvaez & Bock, 2009; Narvaez & Endicott, 2009; Narvaez & Lies, 2009). Through four levels of instruction for expertise development (immersion in examples and opportunities, attention to facts and skills, practice procedures, integrate across contexts), students build their embodied understanding (intuitions and explicit understanding) of a skill in context. When teachers incorporate ethical skill development and practice into regular academic instruction and school activities, they promote moral capacity building, positively affecting student character development (Narvaez et al., 2004).

The fourth proposal highlights the importance of *self-authorship*, emphasizing how educators can empower student self-actualization (Baxter Magolda, 2001). Plato pointed out what has become a truism in an individualistic society: character development is a problem of the self--“deciding what to become and endeavoring to become it” (Urmson, 1988: 2). Domain-specific self-regulation and metacognitive skills can be coached (Zimmerman, Bonner, & Kovach, 2002) and are necessary for domain success (Anderson, 1989).

The fifth proposal emphasizes the *restoration of the ecological network of relationships and communities that support the child’s development*. When families, neighborhoods and schools align their goals and practices for optimal child development, flourishing is more likely to result (Lerner, Dowling & Anderson, 2003).

When applied in a school setting, the Integrative Ethical Education approach uses a flexible, collaborative model where educators adapt the research-based framework of skills and novice-to-expert pedagogy to local needs and conditions. The framework is intentionally broad and inclusive so that educators have maximal flexibility in their local adaptations (see Narvaez, 2009; Narvaez & Bock, 2009; Narvaez & Endicott, 2009; Narvaez & Lies, 2009).

The Minnesota Community Voices and Character Education project especially emphasized ethical skill development and climate. Across participating schools and a comparison school, over a one-year pre-post evaluation, school climate positively influenced the development of student reported ethical focus skills: Community Bonding, Citizenship, and Ethical Goodness (each $p < .001$; Narvaez et al., 2004).

Next, we further develop proposal two, the sustaining climate. A sustaining climate builds on best practice as demonstrated in mastery learning climates and caring climates, adding the grounding in additional characteristics needed by human mammals for flourishing.

The Power of Climates

Organizational climates and cultures shape individual perceptions and social behavior (Power, Higgins & Kohlberg, 1989; Power & Higgins –D’Alessandro, 2008). Using a broad definition, the climate encompasses social structures that include the goals and aspirations of the group, overt and hidden systems, as well as the incentives and disincentives that regulate behavior. More specifically, climate has to do with how members of the group work together, treat one

another, encourage and discourage particular feelings and behaviors. Here, climate is defined as a culture of shared expectations, habitual ways of acting and responding that have been explicitly and implicitly supported initially by the leader (educator) and then enforced by the group as a whole. Climates influence multiple aspects of individual and community life, including implicit learning, and attitudes, cognitions and behaviors.

Implicit learning. Humans learn in two basic ways, with the deliberate mind through conscious effort (as in book learning), and with the implicit mind through unconscious systems that learn automatically without conscious effort (as with most of learning through life experience). Implicit learning includes the “hidden curriculum” of schools (Hasher & Zacks, 1984; Jackson, 1968; Wilson, 2003). Through the hidden curriculum, environments “educate” the implicit mind in terms of what actions are successful for getting needs met in that environment (Hogarth, 2001). The mind learns effortlessly from the recurrent patterns in the environment (Frensch, 1998; Reber, 1993). For example, from repeated social interaction with members of their cultural group, children learn how to greet someone, when to share eyegaze, what signals indicate pleasure, and so on (Hall, 1973). These habits become automatized without effort. Most of human behavior is governed by such implicit, tacit knowledge (Bargh & Chartrand, 2000; Bargh & Ferguson, 1999).

Because of the power of environments (Hogarth, 2001; Sternberg, 2001), adults who work with children have a great deal of say over what kinds of intuitions and cultural expectations children will develop because the adult designs and supervises the environment. Classroom environmental structures include the overt and hidden systems of rewards and punishment, the goals and aspirations promoted by the environment. The climate that results from the environmental structures plays a large role in how people treat one another, how the group works and makes decisions, and what feelings are allowed.

Attitudes, cognitions, behaviors. Climates influence member attitudes, cognitions and behavior in multiple ways. Attitudes like “boys will be boys” and “everyone gets bullied—you have to learn to stand up for yourself” support certain types of climates. Climates that emphasize performance (looking good) over mastery (learning) foster different attitudes towards effort and study. Climates affect what members think about, expanding or narrowing members’ imaginations, fostering or depressing emotional expression (e.g., can I say what I think?). Environments shape individual hopes and movement towards self-actualization.

Climates promote particular habits and expectancies that affect the interpretation of events, individual goals and options for action. Humans are susceptible to suggestion and imitation. This means that if they see someone else do something, they are likely to do it too. Local climates are conveyed not only by social practices but physical properties. For example, when trash is on the ground, rather than in a receptacle, people are more likely to throw trash on the ground. Situations press us to behave in certain ways—e.g. wild and crazy at a football game, quiet at a funeral, etc. The climate also can emphasize dangerous ideas such as belief in one’s superiority, vulnerability, or distrust towards another group (Eidelson & Eidelson, 2003). Climates can affect how we treat members of other groups (Zimbardo, 2007), exemplified in the abuses by soldiers at the Abu Ghraib prison during the Iraq War.

Climates influence the kind of personality traits members display but also what types of habitual dispositions they develop to begin with. Climates elicit particular behaviors from members often without their awareness. People learn from the reactions their actions elicit in an environment. You don't guess at an answer if the teacher rebukes you for it or expose your feelings if peers laugh at you for it. You raise your hand when you know the right answer because that is what pleases the teacher. We learn from what is rewarded or punished by those with power. We learn from teacher and peer discourse –what is emphasized or ignored.

Learning Climates

Several types of climates have been described and studied in educational settings. The majority of climate research in classrooms has been conducted on the *learning* climate and its relationship to achievement. The messages that students perceive teachers conveying are related to their cognitive and affective outcomes (Fraser, 1989). When students perceive teachers emphasizing high achievement and competition, students are likely to adopt a *performance* goal orientation (Urdan, Midgley & Anderman, 1998). Performance climates emphasize looking good in comparison to others and can have detrimental effects but not always (depending perhaps on whether the goal is to not look bad rather than to look good; Elliot, 1997). In contrast, when students perceive teachers emphasizing understanding, students are more likely to adopt a *mastery* goal orientation (Urden & Midgley, 2001). Mastery climates emphasize learning and understanding and bring about positive attitudes towards learning, student engagement and higher achievement (Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Elliot, 1997).

Social Climates

Positive classroom climates include caring climates which emphasize community feeling. In such classrooms, students feel greater psychological and physical safety, leading to a stronger sense of belongingness (Anderman, 2003; Ma, 2003). Positive social climates produce fewer behavioral and emotional problems and raise achievement levels (Kuperminc, Leadbeater, & Blatt, 2001; McEvoy & Welker, 2000); they increase academic achievement among urban students (Haynes & Comer, 1993) and provide a protective factor for boys and high-risk students (Haynes, 1998; Kuperminc et al., 1997). The power of the climate influences not only academic motivation but socio-moral development is as well.

Moral Climates

The relation of school climate to *moral* development was first examined by Lawrence Kohlberg and his students who began to attend to the climate of schools in the 1970s. When they constructed *just community* schools, schools-within-schools, they found that the “moral atmosphere” was key to fostering a sense of responsibility to the community and for cultivating moral reasoning in students. Moral climates emphasize fairness and care, and democratic procedures (Power, Higgins & Kohlberg, 1989). The Child Development Project in the 1980s adopted a caring, just community as a first principle for organizing classrooms (Watson et al., 1989). Caring and just were defined as classrooms where: (1) teacher-child relationships are warm, mutually-trusting and supportive; (2) every student's needs for autonomy, competence, and belonging are met; (3) students have opportunities to discuss and refine understanding about morality that they practice in the classroom; (4) teachers promote these goals with proactive and reactive techniques that support student behavior in conformance with prosocial values (Watson, 2008). Such classroom climates increase prosocial behavior (Battistich, 2008).

Characteristics of these three types of climates--mastery learning, caring and moral—are integrated into a proposal for sustaining climates. A sustaining climate is also grounded in attending to a broader array of human mammalian needs.

A Proposal For Sustaining Climates

Children today have lost much of the social scaffolding of the past that cared for and mentored children—the “village” of care by the community that fostered children’s self-regulation and other key skills for flourishing. Erosion has occurred in all the supports children had in the past other than school: community, religion, family, and culture (Brazelton & Greenspan, 2001). The social environment in the USA has become toxic for child development not only because of the loss of support across the board but also because of intrusive, negative role models (e.g., Garbarino, 1999) and the daily “monsters” of family abuse and community neglect (Canada, 1996). Whereas a positive learning climate may have been enough to motivate students 50 years ago and a caring classroom would have been enough to foster moral character 20 years ago, today much more is required as a counterweight to the negativity and toxicity in which children are immersed. It will be suggested here that children need a *sustaining* climate that meets a broad array of basic needs, fosters individual resiliency and strengthens interpersonal relations.

Basic Needs

The “environment of evolutionary adaptedness” (EEA) was proposed by Hartmann (1939/1958) then Bowlby (1973; 1988) as a way to describe what human mammalian systems require in early life. Anthropologists more recently have summarized some of the characteristics of early life found in communities resembling what is presumed to have been the EEA, small hunter-gatherer bands. In such communities, adults provide prompt responses to children’s distress, offering comfort and support as needed. Several adults share in caregiving. Children experience constant touch and holding in the first years of life and experience multi-age play groups. There is a general focus on the enjoyment of relationships. The social environment was positive, not punishing, warm and caring, not harsh and forbidding.

Other basic needs, which turn out to be characteristic of the EEA, have been described by contemporary psychologists, such as autonomy to express oneself and act freely, competence, meaningful purpose, and trust in environmental supports (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Fiske, 2003; Staub, 2003). It should be pointed out that researchers often describe basic needs as individual needs. However, individuals are always embedded in relationships which form the backdrop for their expression and fulfillment. For example, autonomy occurs within a social context, as does competence. Competence is really about effectance—the ability to make valued things happen or the ability to influence others with one’s skills; so, basic needs take place in a relational context.

Climate influences how well a person can meet basic needs. One teacher writes: “We have all been in classrooms that feel tight and tense. Imagine trying to learn while worrying about pressures, limits, disapproval, and criticism” (Turkanis, 2001: 99). Such a climate is unlikely to meet needs for social belonging and autonomy and is likely to provoke resistance or rebellion. We learn how to effectively get needs met in each environment we encounter. If an environment does not provide positive ways to feel a part of the group, then negative ways will be learned. If

an environment makes false promises (the discourse does not match practice), then cynicism will prevail and a counterculture may arise.

The “developmental assets” approach provides another perspective on basic needs. Assets represent characteristics of individual students and community supports that buttress resiliency (Benson et al. 1998; Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1998). Classrooms can foster assets. For example, in a growth-oriented classroom, discipline is not punishment but is coached character development (Watson, 2008).

Moral Habitats¹

Habitats, the places where humans pass their time, vary in which values and dispositions they foster. This is a critical fact because the values one develops and expresses come from the habitats in which one spends the most time. For 99% of human history, humanity shared a common moral habitat –that of the environment of evolutionary adaptedness (EEA). In that habitat, close positive relationships were fundamental. Children received the moment-to-moment care they needed barring traumatic events. During that time, humans lived in small, nomadic bands and were largely peaceful (Fry, 2007). In the last 10,000 years or so, the common moral habitat has splintered often into inhospitable habitats for the type of moral sense that Darwin (1871/1981) described and the EEA reflects. The panoply of habitats now can be sorted according to optimality. Compared to the social habitats of our ancestors, many habitats today are cold and disheartening, promoting suboptimal or even aberrant development. Cultural narratives and religious dogma have misshaped some habitats into forms that are counter to human flourishing (e.g., those that encourage punishment and use pain for behavioral control; Prescott, 1996).

Triune ethics theory (Narvaez, 2008, 2009b) describes three basic ethical propensities that humans carry as part of their evolutionary heritage. Each propensity is rooted in evolved brain systems and can be activated by the situation or by dispositional habit. The *security* ethic is a primitive propensity for self-preservation through status, territory, rivalry and similar urges. It can be triggered by threat or be a default disposition for persons who experienced poor nurturing or trauma at a young age. If a person adopts a self-preservation orientation when solving moral problems, they are using a security ethic. The *engagement* ethic is rooted in a countervailing set of brain systems and experiences. It focuses on social connection and responsiveness to others in the moment. The *imagination* ethic uses the most recent parts of the evolved brain which includes executive and abstract reasoning functions. It allows us to envision those who are not present, make plans for the future and coordinate planned action. The imagination ethic operates usually in coordination with one of the other ethics. Optimal structuring of the brain systems involved in the engagement and imagination ethics rely on warm, responsive parenting in early life and other sensitive periods but their functioning is influenced by the climate or situation throughout life as well. Within the classroom, educators can calm the security ethic with a positive climate and use the ethic of imagination (Who should I be? What can we do for others?) to promote and emphasize the ethic of engagement (e.g., how can we show care and respect for one another?).

Emotional expression and development. The mammalian brain is wired for emotional signaling, facilitating actions that meet the needs of the organism (Panksepp, 1998). Humans use

emotional signals to determine appropriate behavior. Organizational climates or cultures convey expectations that are picked up by the individual's emotional systems. Is this a safe place to be myself? What feelings are okay to exhibit? Does the climate support excitement for learning or obedience to direction?

Climates can evoke different emotional systems. Classrooms can be set up to emphasize and activate one or more of these ethics. When climates are unsafe to the individual, they will provoke a "security ethic" in which self-safety becomes a major focus and priority for action (Narvaez, 2007; 2008). "Boot camp" classrooms (DeVries & Zan, 1994) emphasize obedience and competition, activating the security ethic. In these classrooms it pays to be self-focused and wary. When climates are caring and positive, they will evoke an "engagement ethic" in which the individual is able to feel and show concern for others. Such "community" classrooms (DeVries & Zan, 1994) are about relationships, and cultivate the engagement ethic when the joy of interpersonal relations is emphasized. Such classrooms foster empathy for others and compassionate response. "Factory" classrooms (DeVries & Zan, 1994) emphasize academics, minimizing social and emotional learning, leading to detached imagination (without engagement).

The Sustaining Climate

Sustaining classrooms offer the closest match to the EEA and meeting human needs. In such classrooms, relationships are central but thinking skills are also. Imagination is rooted in engagement. The climate is caring but also rich in positive relational discourse ("let's think about how we can help our neighbor" "what effect does x behavior have on other people's well being?"). A prosocial "imagination ethic" is fostered which allows a person to consider the needs of others and imagine possibilities for action and response. In sustaining classrooms students learn to foster the engagement and imagination ethics while minimizing the self-centered security ethic. Students learn skills for flourishing and helping others flourish.

Emotional Sensitivity: Emotional signaling, responsiveness and trust. Climates influence emotional signaling. Cold climates suppress and control emotion, encouraging obedience without protest. Warm climates offer social and emotional support to members as they meet the tasks of the day. A warm climate is a human and humane environment. Feelings are accepted. Sustaining climate shares a lot of characteristics with Rogers & Freiberg's (Rogers, 1983) person-centered classroom in which unconditional positive regard is practiced. In a person-centered classroom, leadership and rule development is shared; all students can help manage the classroom. Teachers help students with self-discipline and intrinsic motivation.

Sustaining climates offer a democratic, negotiating approach to tasks. That is, individuals have a say in what they do, what the goals are and what are good outcomes. Like their interest in the goings on, their emotions are engaged as a matter of course. The individual spirit is not alienated by coercive strategies. Instead, individuals have an effect on the course of the group activities. They have influence. Much like a good parent-child relationship, there is mutual influence and co-construction of the relationship and joint activities.

Good feeling is not enough. Habits and capacities of various kinds must be fostered. A sustaining climate is one that takes seriously the social and work habits that are established early, by the

individual and the group. Whenever things go wrong, there is relational mending through conflict resolution, forgiveness and restitution.

Moral discourse and structures, citizenship and solidarity. A sustaining classroom is democratic and open. Democratic classrooms foster student development by allowing students to have an opportunity to make suggestions for structuring the rules and practices of the classroom. Students have opportunities to discuss all sides of controversial topic (Berman, 1997). Open classrooms promote democratic values (Ehman, 1980). In a sustaining classroom climate, students are at ease enough to express their thoughts and feelings about basic issues. They are able to engage in discussions in which viewpoints conflict and develop greater social perspective taking skills. Such activities also promote moral judgment development (Reimer et al., 1988) and personal efficacy in democratic functioning: “Open-classroom climate generally is related to higher political efficacy and trust, and lower political cynicism and alienation—to more democratic attitudes” (Ehman, 1980, p. 110). Those who have extensive experience designing and creating curriculum as children learn to “own” their learning generally and feel more capable in making decisions, solving problems and thinking creatively as adolescents and adults (Turkanis, 2001) . Students who practice these skills are able to “enhance and embellish assignments, discuss requirements and expectations, seek new depth and experiences, and search for meaning and value in projects and classroom studies” (Turkanis, 2001, p. 102).

Purposeful citizenship is fostered by teachers who help students develop a sense of social responsibility (Berman, 1997). Such teachers promote peer interaction within a context that emphasizes cooperation and equality. They allow conflicts to be openly and effectively resolved. They give students a meaningful voice in controlling their environment. They enlarge young people’s perspectives by inviting them to consider the perspectives of others and the good of the group. Of course, there are different ways to be a cohesive group. You can have a democratic community but demonize the outgroup. Teachers can set up or allow climates to develop that emphasize the Security ethic (me against you, us against them), the engagement ethic (relational care), or the imagination ethic (inclusive solutions). Sustaining classrooms are globally sustainable. That is, they take multiple perspectives into account when planning, thinking of consequences and solutions.

For a successful participatory democracy, Reimer (Reimer et al., 1989) suggested that several conditions must be met. Student interest is maintained. Issues are raised clearly so that the pros and cons of concrete proposals can be discussed and this is done in a clear, flexible procedural order. Students and staff discuss issues by voicing reasons for their stands and not by attacking one another on personal grounds. Controversy and conflict are welcomed as a way to encourage cognitive and ethical growth. Moral judgment is promoted through discussions of what rules to establish, thereby building understanding of the need for agreements and commitment to following them as well as discussions of everyday dilemmas and socio-moral problems.

Democratic citizenship is enhanced through the development of additional capacities and attitudes required for global citizenship. The policy experts in the Citizenship Education Policy Study Project (Cogan, 1997) identified the public virtues and values that a global citizen should have in the 21st century. It is anticipated that if people around the world do not develop these characteristics, there will be more wars and threats of war. The experts agreed on the following

characteristics, in descending order of importance. Each person should (a) Approach problems as member of a global society; (b) Work cooperatively with others and takes responsibility for one's roles and responsibilities in society; (c) Understand, accept, and tolerate cultural differences; (d) Think in a critical and systematic way; (e) Resolve conflict in a non-violent manner; (f) Adopt a way of life that protects the environment; (g) Respect and defend human rights; (h) Participates in public life at all levels of civic discourse; and (i) Make full use of information-based technologies. This may be a handy list for teachers to post in the classroom.

Meaningful development, enhancement of human potential and flourishing. Sustaining classrooms are about supporting flourishing. Student interests are central to the goals of the classroom. The openness of the classroom means that the heartfelt interests of students are integrated into the tasks from which they choose. As the teacher gets to know students, she co-shapes instruction with students in ways that engage and delight them. Humor and joy are not strangers to classroom life. Moreover, the educator helps students develop a sense of positive purpose through ongoing discussions of the good life. Student self-actualization is part of the classroom mission. Individuals develop their talents under the guidance and encouragement of the classroom and school community in response to community need, an Aristotelian idea (Urmson, 1988). The community is drawn into the classroom, whether for developmental support, instructional purpose, or the investigation of community needs that the students can help meet.

Conclusion

Sustaining climates pay attention to human mammalian needs. They integrate emotional signaling, democratic practice and discourse, and enhance human potential. Sustaining classrooms offer places where students are encouraged to self-actualize through the academic tasks at hand. Students learn to integrate positive purpose, citizenship and flourishing as individuals, as members of the classroom community, and as global citizens.

REFERENCES

- Anderman, L. (2003). Academic and social perceptions as predictors of change in middle school students' sense of school belonging. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 72(1), 5-22.
- Anderson, C., Narvaez, D., Bock, T., Endicott, L., & Lies, J. (2004). *Minnesota Community Voices and Character Education: Final Report and Evaluation*. Roseville, MN: Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning.
- Anderson, L. M. (1989). Learners and learning. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher* (1st ed., pp. xii, 305 p.). Oxford ; New York: Pergamon Press.
- Bargh, J.A., & Chartrand, T. (1999). The unbearable automaticity of being. *American Psychologist*, 54, 462-479.
- Bargh, J.A. & Ferguson, M.J. (2000). Beyond behaviorism: On the automaticity of higher mental processes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 925-945.
- Battistich, V.A. (2008). The Child Development Project: Creating caring school communities. In L.P. Nucci, & D. Narvaez (Eds.) *Handbook of moral and character education* (pp. 328-351). New York: Routledge.
- Baxter Magolda, M. (2001). *Making their own way: Narratives for transforming higher education to promote self-development*. New York: Stylus.
- Benson, P., Leffert, Scales, P. & Blyth, D. (1998). Beyond the “village” rhetoric: Creating healthy communities for children and adolescents. *Applied Developmental Science*, 2(3), 138-159.
- Berman, S. (1997). *Children's social consciousness and the development of social responsibility*. New York: SUNY Press.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1988) *A secure base: Parent-child attachment and healthy human development*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brazelton, T.B., & Greenspan, S. I. (2001). *The Irreducible Needs of Children: What Every Child Must Have to Grow, Learn, and Flourish*. New York: Da Capo.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Canada, G. (1996). *Fist stick knife gun: A personal history of violence in America*. New York: Beacon.
- Cogan, J. J. (1997). *Multicultural citizenship: Educational policy for the 21st century*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Darwin, C. (1871/1981). *The descent of man*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Academic Press.
- DeVries, R., & Zan, B. (1994). *Moral classrooms, moral children: Creating a constructivist atmosphere in early education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95(2), 256-273.
- Ehman, L. H. (1980) The American school in the political socialization process. *Review of Educational Research*, 50, 99 - 119.
- Eidelson, R. J., & Eidelson, J. I. (2003). Dangerous ideas: Five beliefs that propel groups toward conflict. *American Psychologist*, 58, 182-192

- Elias, M. J., Parker, S. J., Kash, M., Weissberg, R. P., & O'Brien, M. U. (2008). Social and emotional learning, moral education and character education: A comparative analysis and a view towards convergence. In L. P. Nucci & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Handbook of moral and character education* (pp. 248-266). New York: Routledge.
- Elliot, A. (1997). Integrating the “classic” and “contemporary” approaches to achievement motivation: A hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. In M. Maehr, & P. Pintrich (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement, Vol. 10* (pp. 143–179). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Fiske, S. (2003). *Social beings*. New York: Wiley.
- Fraser, B. J. (1989). Twenty years of classroom climate work: Progress and prospect. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 21*(4), 307–327.
- Frensch, P.A. (1998). One concept, multiple meanings: On how to define the concept of implicit learning. In M. A. Stadler, & P. A. Frensch (Eds.), *Handbook of implicit learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fry, D. (2007). *Beyond war: The human potential for peace*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Garbarino, J. (1999). *Raising children in a socially toxic environment*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Greenspan, S., & Shanker, S. (2004). *The first idea*. Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press.
- Hall, E.T. (1973). *The hidden language*. New York: Anchor.
- Hasher, L., & Zacks, R.T. (1984). Automatic processing of fundamental information. *American Psychologist, 39*, 1372-1388.
- Hartmann, H. (1939/1958). *Ego psychology and the problem of adaptation* (D. Rapaport, Trans.). New York: International Universities Press.
- Haynes, N. M. (1998). Creating safe and caring school communities: Comer School Development Program schools. *Journal of Negro Education, 65*(3), 308-314.
- Haynes, N. M., & Comer, J. P. (1993). The Yale School Development Program: Process, outcomes, and policy implications. *Urban Education, 28*(2), 166-199.
- Hewlett, B., & Lamb, M. (2005). *Hunter-gatherer childhoods: evolutionary, developmental, & cultural perspectives*: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Hogarth, R. M. (2001). *Educating intuition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jackson, P. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Kuperminc, G. P., Leadbeater, B. J., & Blatt, S. J. (2001). School social climate and individual differences in vulnerability to psychopathology among middle school students. *Journal of School Psychology, 39*(2), 141-159.
- Kuperminc, G. P., Leadbeater, B. J., Emmons, C., & Blatt, S. J. (1997). Perceived school climate and difficulties in the social adjustment of middle school students. *Applied Developmental Science, 1*(2), 76-88.
- Lerner, R., Dowling, E., & Anderson, P. (2003). Positive youth development: Thriving as the basis of personhood and civil society. *Applied Developmental Science, 7*(3), 172-180.
- McEvoy, A., & Welker, R. (2000). Antisocial behavior, academic failure, and school climate: A critical review. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 8*(3), 130-140.
- Ma, X. (2003). Sense of belonging to school: Can schools make a difference? *The Journal of educational research (Washington, DC), 96*(6), 340-349.
- Masten, A. (2003). Commentary: Developmental psychopathology as a unifying context for mental health and education models, research, and practice in schools. *School Psychology Review, 32*(2), 169-174.

- Narvaez, D. (2006). Integrative ethical education. In M. Killen & J. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (pp. 703-733). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Narvaez, D. (2007). How cognitive and neurobiological sciences inform values education for creatures like us. In D. Aspin & J. Chapman (Eds.), *Values education and lifelong learning: Philosophy, policy, programmes* (pp. 127-159). Springer Press International.
- Narvaez, D. (2008). Triune ethics: The neurobiological roots of our multiple moralities. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 26, 95-119.
- Narvaez, D. (2009a). *Nurturing character in the classroom, EthEx Series, Book 4: Ethical action*. Notre Dame, IN: ACE Press.
- Narvaez, D. (2009b). Triune ethics theory and moral personality. In D. Narvaez & D.K. Lapsley (Eds.), *Moral personality, identity and character: An interdisciplinary future* (pp. 136-158). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Narvaez, D. & Bock, T. (2009). *Nurturing character in the classroom, EthEx Series, Book 2: Ethical judgment*. Notre Dame, IN: ACE Press.
- Narvaez, D., Bock, T., Endicott, L., & Lies, J. M. (2004). Minnesota's community voices and character education project. *Journal of Research in Character Education*, 2(2), 89.
- Narvaez, D., & Endicott, L. (2009). *Nurturing character in the classroom, EthEx Series, Book 1: Ethical sensitivity*. Notre Dame, IN: ACE Press.
- Narvaez, D. & Lies, J. (2009). *Nurturing character in the classroom, EthEx Series, Book 3: Ethical motivation*. Notre Dame, IN: ACE Press.
- Ozolins, J. (2007). Avoiding bad company: The importance of moral habitat and moral habits in moral education. In D. A. Aspin & J.D. Chapman (Eds.). *Values education and lifelong learning: Principles, policies, programmes* (pp. 107-126). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Panksepp, J. (1998). *Affective neuroscience: The foundations of human and animal emotions*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Power, F.C., & Higgins –D’Alessandro, A. (2008). The Just Community Approach to Moral Education and the Moral Atmosphere of the School. In L.P. Nucci, & D. Narvaez (Eds.) *Handbook of moral and character education* (pp. 230-247). New York: Routledge.
- Power, C., Higgins, A. & Kohlberg, L. (1989). *Lawrence Kohlberg's approach to moral education*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Prescott J.W. (1996). The origins of human love and violence. *Pre- and Perinatal Psychology Journal*, 10 (3), 143-188.
- Reber, A.S. (1993). *Implicit learning and tacit knowledge: An essay on the cognitive unconscious*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reimer, J., Paolitto, D.P., & Hersh, R.H. (1991). *Promoting moral growth: From Piaget to Kohlberg*, 2nd Ed. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Rogers, C.R. (1983). *Freedom to learn for the 80's*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Scharmer, C.O. (2007). *Theory U: Leading from the future as it emerges, the social technology of presencing*. Cambridge, MA: Society for Organizational Learning.
- Solomon, D., Watson, M.S., & Battistich, V.A., (2002). Teaching and school effects on moral/prosocial development. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook for research on teaching*. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.
- Staub, E. (2003). *The psychology of good and evil: Why children, adults, and groups help and harm others*. New York: Cambridge University of Press.

- Sternberg, R. J. (2001). Why schools should teach for wisdom: The balance theory of wisdom in educational settings. *Educational Psychologist*, 36, 227-245.
- Turkanis, C.G. (2001). Creating curriculum with children. In B. Rogoff, C.G. Turkanis, L. Bartlett (Eds.), *Learning together: Children and adults in a school community* (pp. 91-102). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Urduan, T., & Midgley, C. (2001). Academic self-handicapping: What we know, what more there is to learn. *Educational Psychology Review*, 13(2), 115-138.
- Urduan, T., Midgley, C., & Anderman, E.A. (1998). The role of classroom goal structure in students' use of self-handicapping. *American Educational Research Journal*, 35(1), 101-122.
- Urmson, J. O. (1988). *Aristotle's ethics*. Oxford, OX, UK; New York, NY, USA: Basil Blackwell.
- Wang, M.C., Haertel, G.D., & Walberg, H.J. (1998). Building educational resilience. *Phi Beta Kappa Fastbacks*, 430, 7-61.
- Watson, M. (2008). Developmental discipline and moral education. In L.P. Nucci, & D. Narvaez (Eds.) *Handbook of moral and character education* (pp. 175-203). New York: Routledge.
- Watson, M., Solomon, D., Battistich, V. Schaps, E., & Solomon, J. (1989). The Child Development Project: Combining traditional and developmental approaches to values education. In L. P. Nucci (Ed.), *Moral development and character education: A dialogue*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Wentzel, K. R. (1997). Student motivation in middle school: The role of perceived pedagogical caring. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89(3), 411-419.
- Wilson, T.D. (2003). *Strangers to ourselves: Discovering the adaptive unconscious*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Zimbardo, P. (2007). *The Lucifer effect: Understanding how good people turn evil*. New York: Random House.
- Zimmerman, B. J., Bonner, S., & Kovach, R. (2002). *Developing self-regulated learners: Beyond achievement to self-efficacy*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Zins, J.E., Bloodworth, M.R., Weissberg, R.P., & Walberg, H.J. (2004). The scientific base linking social and emotional learning to school success. In J.E. Zins, R.P. Weissberg, M.C. Wang, & H.J. Walberg (Eds.), *Building academic success: Social and emotional learning* (pp. 3-22). New York: Teachers College Press.

Footnote

1 I adopt the term “moral habitat” from John Ozolins (2007), although I define it differently

TABLE 1. Examples of Things that Climates Influence

Primary and secondary desires (e.g., performance vs mastery goals)

Positive emotions (e.g., awe, compassion) or negative emotions (e.g., status striving, competition, contempt)

Social habits

Work habits

Learning habits

Routine Preferences

Topics for Imagination

Episodic and autobiographical memory

Relationship quality and emphasis

Individual and group focus, efforts, goals

Table

Comparison of Mastery Learning, Caring, and Sustaining Climates

Mastery Learning	Caring Climate	Sustaining Climate
Climate	Who are we as a community?	(characteristics in addition to
How do we learn?		those of mastery & caring)
		Who should we be?

<p>Student-focused Mastery focused Intrinsic rewards Students self regulate Activities maintain student interest Deep thinking encouraged Clear flexible procedures</p>	<p>Management is a form of guidance Shared responsibility for classroom tasks Peer interaction encouraged Students have voice in meaningful decisions Encourage sensitivity to needs and perspectives of others Conflicts handled openly with just and caring procedures</p>	<p>Democratic practices Individual purpose and self-actualization are central to goals of education Positive group purpose Enhancement of human potential Broad ethical skills supported Leadership development Global awareness emphasized High-profile parenting encouraged Partnerships with local community</p>
---	---	---