

REVISTA

DIÁLOGO EDUCACIONAL

periodicos.pucpr.br/dialogoeducacional



Moral Education and Social Justice: Connections Between Social Domain Theory and Freirean Pedagogy

Educação moral e justiça social: articulações entre a teoria do domínio social e a pedagogia freireana

Educación moral y justicia social: articulaciones entre la teoría del dominio social y la pedagogía freireana

Diana Villac Oliva ^[a] 

São Paulo, SP, Brasil

Universidade de São Paulo – Instituto de Psicologia da Universidade de São Paulo (IPUSP)

Betânia Alves Veiga Dell'Agli ^[b] 

São João da Boa Vista, SP, Brasil

Faculdades Associadas de Ensino (UNIFAE)

Luciana Maria Caetano ^[c] 

São Paulo, SP, Brasil

Universidade de São Paulo – Instituto de Psicologia da Universidade de São Paulo (IPUSP)

How to cite: OLIVA, Diana; DELL'AGLI, Betânia; CAETANO, Luciana. Moral Education and Social Justice: Connections Between Social Domain Theory and Freirean Pedagogy. *Revista Diálogo Educacional*, v. 25, n. 86, p. 1389-1405, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.7213/1981-416X.25.086.AO01EN>

^[a] Master's and Doctorate degrees from the School Psychology and Human Development Programme at the Institute of Psychology, University of São Paulo (IPUSP), e-mail: dianavillacoliva@gmail.com

^[b] Postdoctoral degree from the Faculty of Medical Sciences, Unicamp, e-mail: betaniadellagli@gmail.com

^[c] Master's degree, PhD and Associate Professor in the School Psychology and Human Development Programme at the Institute of Psychology, University of São Paulo (IPUSP) e-mail: lmcaetano@usp.br

Abstract

This theoretical article discusses the importance of moral education as a tool for confronting social injustices, articulating the social domain theory (SDT) and Paulo Freire's critical pedagogy. First, the foundations of SDT are presented, emphasizing the organization of social knowledge into distinct domains – moral, conventional, and personal – and advocating for the active development of moral reasoning through social interactions and critical thinking. Subsequently, the convergence between SDT and Freirean pedagogy is examined, highlighting the centrality of praxis, problem-posing dialogue, and the awakening of critical consciousness in the formation of ethical subjects committed to social transformation. Transformative social and emotional learning (SEL) is also discussed as a complementary strategy to moral education for social justice, stressing the importance of creating inclusive, cooperative, and justice-oriented school environments. Based on the dialogue between these perspectives, practical suggestions are offered for schools and teachers seeking to foster the critical moral development of students. It is concluded that the integration of SDT and Freirean pedagogy strengthens emancipatory educational practices, capable of enhancing students' moral agency and social responsibility, thus contributing to the construction of more just, democratic, and dialogical societies.

Keywords: Moral education. Social domain theory. Paulo Freire. Social justice. Ethical development.

Resumo

O presente artigo, de natureza teórica, discute a importância da educação moral como instrumento de enfrentamento das injustiças sociais, articulando a teoria do domínio social (TDS) e a pedagogia crítica de Paulo Freire. Inicialmente, são apresentados os fundamentos da TDS, que propõe a organização dos conhecimentos sociais em domínios distintos – moral, convencional e pessoal – e defende o desenvolvimento da consciência moral a partir de interações sociais e raciocínio crítico. Em seguida, examina-se a convergência entre a proposta da TDS e a pedagogia freireana, destacando a centralidade da práxis, do diálogo problematizador e do despertar da consciência crítica na formação de sujeitos éticos e comprometidos com a transformação social. Discute-se também a aprendizagem socioemocional transformadora como estratégia complementar à educação moral crítica, enfatizando a criação de ambientes escolares inclusivos, cooperativos e orientados à justiça social. Com base no diálogo entre essas perspectivas, são oferecidas sugestões práticas para escolas e professores interessados em promover a formação moral crítica dos estudantes. Conclui-se que a integração entre a TDS e a pedagogia crítica de Paulo Freire fortalece práticas educativas emancipatórias, capazes de desenvolver a agência moral e a responsabilidade social dos alunos, contribuindo para a construção de sociedades mais justas, democráticas e dialógicas.

Palavras-chave: Educação moral. Teoria do domínio social. Paulo Freire. Justiça social. Formação ética.

Resumen

El presente artículo, de naturaleza teórica, analiza la importancia de la educación moral crítica como instrumento para enfrentar las injusticias sociales, articulando la Teoría del Dominio Social (TDS) y la pedagogía crítica de Paulo Freire. En primer lugar, se presentan los fundamentos de la TDS, que propone la organización del conocimiento social en distintos dominios – moral, convencional y personal – y sostiene el desarrollo activo de la conciencia moral a partir de las interacciones sociales y el razonamiento crítico. A continuación, se examina la convergencia entre la propuesta de la TDS y la pedagogía freireana, destacando la centralidad de la práxis, del diálogo problematizador y del despertar de la conciencia crítica en la formación de sujetos éticos comprometidos con la transformación social. También se discute el aprendizaje socioemocional transformador como una estrategia complementaria a la educación moral crítica, enfatizando la importancia de crear ambientes escolares inclusivos, cooperativos y orientados a la justicia social. A partir del diálogo entre estas perspectivas, se ofrecen sugerencias prácticas para escuelas y docentes interesados en promover la formación moral crítica de los estudiantes. Se concluye que la integración de la TDS y la pedagogía crítica de Paulo Freire fortalece las prácticas educativas emancipadoras, capaces de desarrollar la agencia moral y la responsabilidad social de los alumnos, contribuyendo así a la construcción de sociedades más justas, democráticas y dialógicas.

Palabras clave: Educación moral. Teoría del dominio social. Paulo Freire. Justicia social. Formación ética.

Introduction

The study of moral education often raises questions about the factors that lead individuals to show contempt for other human beings. Both objective (macrosocial) and subjective (microsocial) conditions influence individuals to either engage in or passively witness acts of barbarity without questioning or opposing them. Although objectivity and subjectivity should not be treated as dichotomous, any attempt to analyze or intervene in one necessarily affects the other in a continuous dialectical movement, as proposed by Paulo Freire in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (Freire, 1968/2021). Thus, even when the possibilities for directly transforming the macrosocial conditions that give rise to barbarity are limited, focusing on the socioemotional and moral development of human beings can enhance their capacity for reflection, resistance to extremism, and transformation of the objective conditions that perpetuate injustice and violence.

This theoretical article aims to discuss the possible articulations between Social Domain Theory (SDT) and Paulo Freire's critical pedagogy, considering their relevance to moral education for social justice. To this end, the article presents: (i) a brief overview of SDT's foundational principles, with particular attention to its moral education framework; (ii) an analysis of the relevance of Freirean critical pedagogy for advancing moral education within the SDT framework; and (iii) practical suggestions for schools and teachers committed to fostering students' critical moral development.

Through this theoretical dialogue between Paulo Freire and SDT, moral education for social justice is understood as a formative process aimed at the development of moral awareness and ethically grounded, reflective action—rooted in principles of social justice and resistance to culturally legitimized yet morally questionable norms and practices.

Accordingly, the formative horizon guiding the reflections presented in this article is based on the premise that only an education grounded in *praxis*—understood, following Freire (1968/2021), as the integration of action and critical reflection—can interrupt cycles of injustice, oppression, violence, and the normalization of barbarity.

This article therefore seeks to deepen the articulation between Social Domain Theory and Paulo Freire's critical pedagogy in the field of moral education, contributing to the strengthening of emancipatory and dialogical educational practices committed to the promotion of social justice.

Moral Education in the Traditional Perspective and Its Limitations

Moral education in schools is, for many people, a controversial topic. Traditionally, both in Brazil and in other countries, it has been conceived as the transmission of norms validated by the majority within a given culture, aiming to shape children and adolescents into well-behaved individuals who follow proper conduct and adopt good practices (Kohlberg, 1981; Nucci, 2000; Nucci; Powers, 2014). In this conception, influenced by Émile Durkheim, the child is viewed as lacking a moral framework of their own and therefore dependent on adults—parents and teachers—to learn how to behave appropriately, ensuring social belonging and contributing to the maintenance of the status quo (Nucci, 2000; Nucci; Powers, 2014).

However, when values are tied to a specific historical moment, the transmitted content tends to lose relevance over time as social, legal, and cultural contexts evolve. Moreover, “good citizens” have always coexisted with structural injustice and inequality (Kohlberg, 1981; Nucci, 2000), even during periods marked by extreme barbarity, such as World War II (Adorno, 1971/2006) and, more recently, the COVID-19 pandemic.

Lawrence Kohlberg (1981), considered the father of moral psychology, criticized this traditional view, describing it as the mere inculcation of a list of virtues—or a “bag of virtues.” He argued that this approach was limited because it failed to consider how virtues are internally structured and how individuals assign meaning to them when making integrated moral decisions. In his view, moral education based solely on the transmission of isolated virtues does not foster the formation of an internal moral identity.

Kohlberg (1981) maintained that genuine moral education must be grounded in the development of the concept of justice, which he regarded as the only true virtue. Inspired by Socratic reasoning, he understood justice not as something inherited or imposed but as something constructed through critical reflection and dialogue. His proposal aligns with Freire's perspective (Freire, 1968/2021, 1979/2016, 1979/2021), as both seek social transformation that transcends mere conformity to established norms. Rather than teaching children to be “good” according to prevailing cultural standards, moral education should help them internalize principles of justice to guide their actions in a consistent and ethical way—even in the face of potentially unjust conventions (Kohlberg, 1981).

It is not necessary to turn to major historical catastrophes to observe that, even in societies considered stable, most people fail to recognize that prevailing norms often perpetuate patterns of social injustice (Nucci, 2000). Frequently, individuals who engage in humanitarian acts also reproduce unjust or violent practices in other spheres (Freire, 1968/2021; Nucci, 2000).

For this reason, moral education in schools must go beyond promoting conformity to norms and conventions and instead foster students' critical capacity to evaluate the impact of human actions across diverse historical and cultural contexts (Kohlberg, 1981; Nucci, 2000; Nucci; Powers, 2014; Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).

Social Domain Theory: Foundations and Implications for Moral Education

This theoretical perspective, grounded in constructivist and developmental approaches (Killen; Dahl, 2016), proposes that social knowledge and the values attributed to it can be organized into three domains: the conventional, the moral, and the personal (Turiel, 1983/2003; Smetana, 2005; Smetana *et al.*, 2014). Although distinct, these domains coexist and jointly operate within the structure of social thought, manifesting in everyday judgments, actions, and choices.

Social Domain Theory (SDT) is grounded in the premise that social knowledge is heterogeneous and constructed through interactions between individuals within specific contexts (Turiel, 1983/2003, 2014). It departs from traditional perspectives by rejecting the notion that moral development consists merely of internalizing cultural norms or obeying authority. Rather, SDT conceptualizes moral development as a constructive process in which children and adolescents actively develop their understandings of justice, rights, and well-being.

Moral norms are defined as those that govern how people ought to treat one another, ensuring justice, equality, respect for fundamental rights, and collective well-being (Turiel, 1983/2003, 2012, 2014; Smetana, 2005; Killen; Dahl, 2016). These norms are neither innate nor passively transmitted; they emerge in early childhood through reciprocal and cooperative social relationships, and require personal effort, reflection, abstraction, and critical reasoning (Killen; Dahl, 2016) in a continuous developmental process.

The distinction between different domains of social knowledge, although refined by SDT, has its roots in the work of Jean Piaget and his collaborators, who distinguished, for example, physical from logical-mathematical knowledge, as well as domains such as classification, seriation, number, space, and time (Turiel, 1989/2003; Caetano, 2024). However, SDT advances beyond the Piagetian tradition by conceptualizing morality as an autonomous and independent domain (Caetano, 2024).

In addition to the moral domain, SDT delineates the conventional domain, which encompasses socially agreed-upon rules and norms for organizing groups and institutions. These are characterized by contextual relativity and reliance on authority (Smetana, 2005; Smetana *et al.*, 2014; Smetana, 2024). Examples include lining up, raising one's hand to speak, or wearing a school uniform. Another key component is the personal domain, which pertains to individual choices—such as food preferences, friendships, or clothing styles (Nucci, 2000; Smetana, 2005, 2013, 2024; Turiel, 2012). Autonomy, identity, and a sense of personal rights are strengthened as children and adolescents make decisions within this domain (Nucci; Powers, 2014).

SDT also identifies the prudential domain, which involves matters related to personal safety and individual well-being, such as wearing a seatbelt or adopting healthy habits (Turiel, 1983/2003, 2014; Smetana, 2013). Although distinct, the prudential domain often intersects with the personal domain due to its emphasis on self-protection.

Differentiating between these domains is essential for moral development and the construction of critical autonomy (Nucci, 2000). It enables children and adolescents to assess social norms and expectations, distinguishing those related to justice and well-being from those that are merely conventional or grounded in personal preference (Smetana *et al.*, 2014).

In school contexts, this distinction has clear practical implications. Understanding the importance of raising a hand before speaking or submitting homework on time belongs to the conventional domain, whereas recognizing that one must not harm classmates—through theft, aggression, or exclusion—belongs to the moral domain (Smetana, 2005, 2024; Smetana *et al.*, 2014; Nucci; Powers, 2014). The ability to differentiate between these domains is crucial for forming individuals capable of ethical action, even under social pressure.

Brazilian research reinforces the significance of this distinction. A study by Coelho (2022) found that although children exhibit theoretical competence in differentiating domains, conventional justifications tend to prevail, revealing the reproduction of authoritarian models based on unilateral obedience.

More broadly, multiple studies conducted in Brazil indicate that even when young children can distinguish between moral and conventional domains (Valadares, 2019), culturally accepted authoritarian interactions and one-sided respect contribute to the reproduction of authoritarian norms throughout childhood and adolescence, perpetuating systems of oppression (Caetano *et al.*, 2019; Souza, 2019; Coelho, 2022; Choi *et al.*, 2024).

These findings resonate with Paulo Freire's critiques (Freire, 1968/2021), in which he denounced the reproduction of oppressive relations in educational settings and advocated for dialogical and emancipatory practices. For Freire, the critical formation of educators is essential to break with authoritarian practices and strengthen moral autonomy.

In a complementary study, Caetano and Dell'Agli (2017) emphasized the gap between moral ideals and the actual practices of parents and teachers: although they explicitly reject blind obedience, educational practices characterized by authoritarianism and a lack of dialogue persist, hindering the translation of moral judgments into consistent actions.

These findings reinforce the need to invest in the critical formation of educators and in the implementation of school practices that foster the differentiation and coordination of social domains. In this regard, SDT offers a robust theoretical foundation for building a moral education for social justice, centered on strengthening autonomy and fostering active resistance to culturally legitimized yet morally questionable norms and practices.

Building on these reflections, the next section presents educational practices proposed by SDT theorists aimed at preparing students to become social justice-oriented citizens.

Social Domain Theory and Educational Practices for Social Justice

Nucci and Turiel (2009) highlight a significant disconnect between research in moral development psychology and moral education practices in schools. This gap stems mainly from the premature translation of psychological research into unfounded school recommendations and from the underestimation of the complex relationship between moral development and the social context. According to the authors, when establishing connections between SDT and moral education, it becomes essential to adopt a cautious and critical approach, avoiding premature applications that only perpetuate the gap between theory and practice (Nucci; Turiel, 2009).

Ilten-Gee and Nucci (2019) add that school-based moral education practices are often limited to isolated campaigns, such as anti-bullying initiatives, which, although relevant, fail to bring about lasting changes and tend to minimize the school's responsibility in shaping critically engaged citizens. Studies on social and emotional learning (SEL) support this assessment, showing that such campaigns neither transform school structures nor address the complexity of moral development (Mart *et al.*, 2017; Weissberg *et al.*, 2017; Mahoney *et al.*, 2020). Therefore, educational practices must provide students with tools to recognize social inequalities and to act toward building a more just society (Ilten-Gee; Nucci, 2019).

One of the core premises for moral development is the creation of a caring classroom environment in which emotional vulnerability is welcomed, thereby strengthening mutual trust (Nucci; Powers, 2014). The sense of community—a central element in promoting prosocial behavior—emerges from this reciprocal feeling of belonging and extends beyond the classroom to encompass the entire school and broader society. Students are expected to develop a sense of belonging to a global community in which all people are treated with fairness and respect (Nucci; Powers, 2014).

Once a climate of trust is established, transgressions can be interpreted through the lens of social domains, contributing to students' moral formation (Nucci; Powers, 2014; Ilten-Gee; Nucci, 2019). Teacher interventions should be proportional to the nature of the infraction, guiding the student toward an understanding of the violated norm. For instance, the use of derogatory nicknames calls for attention to the emotional harm caused to a peer, whereas interrupting turn-taking pertains to the domain of social conventions. It is essential for educators to distinguish between moral and conventional transgressions, assigning greater importance to the former and interpreting student choices through a developmental lens, avoiding reductionism (Nucci and Powers, 2014).

Observational studies indicate that in elementary and middle school, most transgressions involve violations of social conventions, particularly in 3rd, 4th, 7th, and 8th grades (Nucci; Powers, 2014). These ages correspond to developmental phases marked by a tendency to question norms, making such transgressions predictable.

Promoting moral education from a Social Domain Theory (SDT) perspective—that is, domain-based moral education—requires creating environments that support both the moral and personal domains. This includes providing opportunities for children to make autonomous decisions, thereby strengthening their identity and understanding of personal rights (Caetano; Dell'Agli, 2022). Social interactions—with peers and adults—play a central role in this process, fostering agency, autonomy, and rights consciousness (Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021; Caetano; Dell'Agli, 2022).

Moral education must respect children's and adolescents' reasoning abilities and their understanding of the different social domains, taking their developmental stages into account. Findings from SDT provide a foundation for educators to move beyond the mere transmission of norms and to recognize the complexity of moral and personal development (Caetano; Dell'Agli, 2022).

SDT can be integrated across subject areas such as history, geography, literature, and mathematics through critical moral analyses of these contents. The aim is to develop students' ability to think and act critically by evaluating social conventions and personal conduct based on principles of justice and collective well-being (Nucci; Powers, 2014). In this sense, schools play a strategic role in promoting justice by helping students navigate the complexity and contradictions of the social world throughout their educational journey (Nucci; Powers, 2014).

Understanding moral education through the lens of SDT also enables a deeper articulation with Freirean critical pedagogy, highlighting not only points of convergence but also Paulo Freire's conceptual contributions to the consolidation of the theory—particularly the emphasis on praxis, the critique of oppressive relations, and the promotion of moral autonomy.

The Importance of Paulo Freire for Moral Education from the Perspective of Social Domain Theory

The importance of critical approaches for the development of individuals capable of resisting injustice—whether against themselves or others—is not unique to Social Domain Theory (SDT). Nucci and Ilten-Gee (2021) recognize the relevance of Paulo Freire’s critical pedagogy, identifying convergences in both goals and pedagogical strategies, particularly in the emphasis on problem-posing dialogue, the use of transactive discourse, and the encouragement of responsive engagement. For these authors, Freire’s critical pedagogy is essential for shaping moral education for social justice.

Small-group discussions using transactive discourse to address moral and social dilemmas—whether real, hypothetical, or tied to academic content—are central to moral education from the SDT perspective (Nucci *et al.*, 2015; Nucci and Ilten-Gee, 2021). For students to employ transactive discourse, teachers must teach them to engage with peers’ ideas openly, respectfully, and with a willingness to revise their own views. From the perspective of critical pedagogy, dialogical problem-posing also plays a central role in the development of critical consciousness. Freire (1968/2021) advocated for a “co-intentional” education in which power is shared between teachers and students.

Responsive engagement, in turn, refers to a kind of conversation in which all participants aim to achieve a shared understanding that is collectively accepted and legitimized (Nucci and Ilten-Gee, 2021). Rather than dismissing or rejecting divergent opinions, the goal is to create a dialogical space in which all perspectives are heard and respected. This approach fosters a collaborative atmosphere of mutual understanding, conducive to the emergence of moral transformations grounded in critical reflection and respect for others.

Freire (1968/2021, 1979/2016, 1979/2021) maintained that education should awaken students’ critical awareness of structural and systemic inequalities, enabling them to understand their oppressive circumstances not as immutable facts but as realities that can be changed. In his view, the educational process should be centered on the students themselves and their everyday experiences.

Critical of the “banking” model of education—in which the teacher deposits knowledge into the student—Freire (1968/2021) proposed a problem-posing education, in which students and teachers explore real-world issues together, using culturally relevant texts to identify elements of injustice within power relations and to develop action plans aimed at transforming them. For Freire (1968/2021), education should alter students’ perception of the world, prompting them to recognize social contradictions and organize reflective actions in response.

Praxis, as defined by Freire (1968/2021), is the inseparable integration of action and critical reflection. It is a continuous process in which individuals, upon reflecting on their concrete living conditions, organize transformative actions aimed at overcoming injustices. In the context of moral education for social justice, praxis is understood as the driving force that enables the transition from moral judgment to committed moral action.

Freire (1968/2021, 1979/2016) identified specific types of reasoning transformation, referring to them as the awakening of critical consciousness. This consciousness allows individuals to connect personal experiences with broader social issues, interpreting isolated problems as manifestations of systemic structures. Although some cognitive changes may occur spontaneously, Freire (1968/2021, 1979/2016) emphasized that the full development of critical consciousness requires proactive educational programs grounded in active investigation, ongoing reinterpretation of findings, and engagement in meaningful action.

According to Nucci and Ilten-Gee (2021), moral education for social justice must not only foster the critical awareness of students belonging to oppressed groups but also affect the moral responsibilities of those in privileged positions. In this regard, educators are tasked with contributing to the deconstruction of privilege and power relations, integrating these reflections into students’ moral reasoning. Understanding

the dynamics of social oppression enables students to “read the world” critically and organize collective actions for justice.

Nucci and Ilten-Gee (2021) also argue that both critical pedagogy and SDT-based moral education share the goal of transforming the ways in which young people perceive, understand, and act in the world. Both approaches emphasize the need to apply moral principles to the critical analysis of social norms and conventions that often perpetuate structural injustice, guiding reflective action against such injustices.

The incorporation of Freire’s (1968/2021) praxis cycle is considered essential for moral education for social justice. According to Nucci and Ilten-Gee (2021), this cycle includes the following steps: (i) identifying a problem; (ii) analyzing the problem through the lens of different social domains using transactive discourse; (iii) developing an action plan; (iv) implementing the plan; and (v) analyzing and evaluating the action based on transactive discourse and critical reflection on its impacts.

The ongoing application of the praxis cycle generates a spiral movement of learning and transformation. Each iteration deepens students’ understanding of their reality and strengthens their capacity to act more effectively and consciously, promoting both self-empowerment and the consolidation of moral agency (Freire, 1968/2021). In this sense, the praxis cycle serves as a central pedagogical tool for the emancipation and conscientization of students, fostering their engagement as active agents in building a more just and equitable society.

According to Nucci and Ilten-Gee (2021), teachers can engage students in praxis cycles through three strategies: (i) selecting a specific curriculum topic and developing a related action plan; (ii) presenting multiple scenarios and allowing students to choose one to address; or (iii) identifying a real-life situation experienced within the school or community and encouraging students to develop an action plan for concrete intervention.

Finally, Nucci and Ilten-Gee (2021) emphasize the importance of critically examining the informational assumptions embedded in the moral and social judgments present in school curricula. Informational assumptions are factual premises used in specific contexts to explain actions that might otherwise be interpreted as unjust (Nucci, 2000; Smetana, 2005; Smetana *et al.*, 2014). A typical example is the historical use of physical punishment in child-rearing: it was once socially accepted as a disciplinary strategy, but with advances in research on child development, it is now recognized as a form of violence and injustice. This shift in interpretation occurred through a revision of the informational assumptions involved. Critically reflecting on how these assumptions shape the interpretation of actions and historical events is fundamental to moral education for social justice. This perspective aligns with Freire’s (1968/2021) call for continuous critical analysis of facts and their causes, challenging dominant perceptions disseminated by mainstream media. Integrating such reflections is essential for strengthening the praxis cycle and deepening the students’ formative process.

Social Domain Theory, Critical Pedagogy, and Transformative Social and Emotional Learning

In addition to its intersection with critical pedagogy, Nucci and Ilten-Gee (2021) identify strong convergences between domain-based moral education and transformative social and emotional learning (SEL). This formative approach aligns with the struggle against injustice and oppression in social relationships, particularly in ethnic-racial contexts (Jagers *et al.*, 2019, 2021). By promoting critical inquiry into the roots of inequality and encouraging action to overcome it, transformative SEL goes beyond merely fostering responsible and participatory individuals. It aims to develop citizens committed to social justice, democratic transformation, and the construction of more equitable relationships.

To achieve this goal, intervention programs must integrate five core components: identity, agency, belonging, curiosity, and collaborative problem-solving (Jagers *et al.*, 2019, 2021). According to SDT theorists, transformative SEL should be embedded into both the curriculum and classroom social

interactions, taking into account students' diverse needs and identities and contributing to the construction of a just and equitable school environment (Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).

Recent studies (Cipriano *et al.*, 2023; Wu *et al.*, 2023; Shi; Cheung, 2024) underscore the importance of critically integrating social and emotional learning with educational practices aimed at social justice. These studies highlight the need for approaches that address cultural diversity and structural inequalities in school settings.

Transformative SEL is grounded in the recognition that social and emotional learning is not value-neutral (Jagers *et al.*, 2019, 2021). SEL practices that do not adopt a transformative perspective may inadvertently reinforce dominant social norms, promoting self-regulation of behaviors that generate additional stress and suffering for students from marginalized backgrounds (Jagers *et al.*, 2019, 2021; Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021). It is therefore essential for schools and teachers to consider students' racial and ethnic identities as central aspects of the self, ensuring that students from diverse backgrounds do not experience their identities as devalued. Transformative SEL thus emphasizes the creation of a positive school climate for all, with special attention to the fair and equitable functioning of classroom dynamics and disciplinary policies (Jagers *et al.*, 2019, 2021).

Nucci and Ilten-Gee (2021) suggest that social interactions and curricular activities serve as natural contexts for transformative SEL, rather than relying on decontextualized activities that may seem artificial or detract from instructional time. According to the authors, it is not necessary to create separate courses for moral and social-emotional education; instead, transformative SEL should be implemented transversally throughout the curriculum—through teaching practices, the moral climate of the school, emotional recognition, conflict resolution based on restorative justice, and the promotion of empathy.

Up to this point, there is agreement with Nucci and Ilten-Gee (2021). However, their position diverges when it comes to excluding structured social and emotional education classes from the school curriculum. Several meta-analyses have demonstrated that universal school-based programs, when implemented directly in the curriculum, have greater impact on the development of social and emotional competencies than unstructured interventions (Durlak *et al.*, 2011, 2022; Cipriano *et al.*, 2023). Although concerns about instructional time are legitimate, they may be mitigated, as structured programs that follow the SAFE criteria—sequenced, active, focused, and explicit—also contribute to improved academic performance (CASEL, 2013, 2021; Durlak *et al.*, 2011, 2022; Weissberg *et al.*, 2017; Mahoney *et al.*, 2018; Wu *et al.*, 2023; Shi; Cheung, 2024).

It is therefore argued that strategies derived from domain-based moral education, critical pedagogy, and transformative SEL should be integrated into a specific curriculum and implemented both during the regular school schedule and in daily practice, through the development of a respectful and cooperative moral climate.

Nucci and Ilten-Gee (2021) state that five basic needs must be met in order to create a moral classroom climate: autonomy, belonging, competence, respect, and fairness. Addressing these big needs is essential for establishing an environment in which students feel valued and connected.

Within the scope of social, emotional, and moral development, the authors emphasize the importance of disciplinary strategies centered on restorative justice (Nucci and Ilten-Gee, 2021). Students must understand the impact of their choices and actions, rather than act merely to avoid punishment or obtain rewards. Restorative justice practices involve acknowledging harm, assuming responsibility, and engaging with the community. They provide a space for respectful listening and reintegration following conflict. These practices include proactive discussions on racial and gender equity and the use of restorative circles, constituting a paradigmatic shift capable of transforming school relationships and fostering moral development (Nucci and Ilten-Gee, 2021).

Although Freire (1968/2021) focused primarily on adult education, Nucci and Ilten-Gee (2021) argue that the principles of critical pedagogy and moral education in the perspective of SDT are applicable

to learners of all ages. Even children as young as three years old can engage in conversations about race, gender, and social inequality—even if they do not yet fully grasp the complexity of social systems.

Nucci *et al.* (2015) investigated the effects of integrating SDT into the moral and social development of elementary school students. The study involved 11 teachers and 254 students from urban schools in California. The teachers were trained to incorporate SDT into history lessons, addressing justice and human well-being while promoting moral reasoning. Classes included discussions on historical events and social norms—such as the Code of Hammurabi—with transactive discourse as a central component. Small-group discussions were analyzed for the use of transactive strategies, and students completed written assessments at the beginning and end of the school year. Results showed a significant increase in the use of transactive discourse and in the development of students' moral and social reasoning following teacher training in SDT.

In collaboration with fifth- and sixth-grade teachers and students, Nucci and Ilten-Gee (2021) developed guidelines for structuring classroom discussions, incorporating elements of transactive discourse and translating concepts of responsive engagement into accessible language. These guidelines were systematized into nine rules for a good discussion, presented as follows:

Nine Rules for a Good Discussion:

1. Think before you speak.
2. Listen carefully to what others have to say.
3. Do not interrupt when someone else is speaking.
4. Make use of what others have said when it is your turn to speak.
5. Only say what you truly believe.
6. Do not remain silent. Make sure to contribute to the discussion.
7. Let other people speak. Do not hog the discussion. Once you are done speaking, let other people talk before you speak again.
8. Support good ideas that other people have, even if they are different from your own.
9. Search for the best solution even if it is different from the way that you thought at first (Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021, p. 133).

According to the authors, students tend to take these rules seriously, especially from fourth grade onward. Implementation proved more effective when the guidelines were previously discussed and adapted according to each classroom's characteristics. These rules serve as a foundation for building a dialogical environment that fosters critical moral reasoning and the ability to consider multiple perspectives.

In summary, critical moral education—grounded in SDT, Paulo Freire's critical pedagogy, and transformative SEL—offers complementary and effective approaches to addressing social injustice. These frameworks converge in the construction of educational environments based on trust and mutual respect, fostering students' development of critical moral reasoning and their capacity for transformative action. Their integration offers a promising path toward emancipatory and effective educational practices capable of confronting various forms of injustice.

Based on this integration, the next section presents practical suggestions for schools and educators committed to moral education for social justice.

Suggestions for Schools and Teachers Committed to Critical Moral Education

Suggestions Related to Teacher Preparation and Development

1. Teacher training: Provide training on the foundations of social domain theory, critical moral education, and the stages of students' cognitive, social, emotional, and moral development. This training should support the adaptation of practices to students' developmental stages, taking into account the need to adjust the curriculum and interventions according to age and individual differences (Nucci; Powers, 2014; Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).

2. Preparation for resistance to the status quo: Prepare teachers to help students identify contradictions within the social system and confront injustice, even in the face of resistance from administrators and families. This preparation includes developing skills to mediate critical discussions among children and with adults, aiming to promote social justice (Nucci, 2000; Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).

Suggestions Related to the Classroom Climate

1. Establishing a caring environment: Foster a classroom atmosphere in which emotional vulnerability is accepted and the willingness to give and receive support is encouraged, strengthening shared responsibility for collective well-being (Nucci; Powers, 2014; Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).
2. Building a sense of community: Create an inclusive classroom and school climate where all students feel a sense of belonging and shared responsibility. Address five fundamental needs: autonomy, belonging, competence, respect, and fairness (Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).
3. Recognizing students' identities: Value students' cultural, ethnic, and racial identities, acknowledging and exploring how different cultures influence the development of the moral, conventional, and personal domains (Smetana, 2013; Jagers *et al.*, 2018, 2019; Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).
4. Establishing fair and flexible school rules: Promote mutual respect through clear, fair, and adaptable rules, applying sanctions in an equitable and respectful manner (Nucci, 2000; Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).
5. Valuing social interactions: Use everyday social interactions—such as friendships and family relationships—as key contexts for moral development, encouraging reflection on moral judgments, empathy, and helping and reparative actions (Smetana, 2013; Nucci *et al.*, 2018).

Suggestions Related to Conflict Resolution and Decision-Making Strategies

1. Differentiating transgressions: Distinguish between moral and conventional transgressions, applying appropriate responses and dialogues according to the nature of the infraction (Turiel, 1983/2003; Smetana, 2013; Nucci and Powers, 2014; Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).
2. Restorative and equitable justice practices: Implement practices that promote empathy and moral responsibility, providing spaces for listening and respectful reintegration—even for children who engage in harmful behavior (Piaget, 1953/2014; Arsenio, 2014; Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).
3. Aligning moral reasoning and action: Encourage reflection on potential discrepancies between moral reasoning and action, considering external pressures, and strengthen the integration of moral values into students' sense of identity (La Taille, 2006; Conway, 2018; Turiel, 2023).
4. Discussing mistakes and moral shame: Create respectful spaces for reflecting on mistakes and experiences of moral shame, approaching them from a developmental perspective (La Taille, 2006; Oser, 2008; Killen; Dahl, 2016).
5. Considering intentions: Support students in identifying and coordinating multiple perspectives when resolving moral conflicts, taking into account intentions and contextual factors (Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).
6. Moral weighing: Guide students in weighing and prioritizing conflicting values, rules, and principles, developing ethical decision-making skills (La Taille, 2006).

Suggestions Related to Teaching Strategies

1. Integrating the praxis cycle: Incorporate Paulo Freire's praxis cycle by combining action and critical reflection in everyday school life (Freire, 1968/2021; Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).
2. Using transactive discourse and responsive engagement: Teach students to engage in open, collaborative forms of discourse grounded in respect for others' ideas and collective critical refinement (Nucci *et al.*, 2015, 2018; Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).
3. Promoting small-group discussions: Encourage small-group debates on real or hypothetical moral and social dilemmas to foster collective reflection (Nucci, 2000; Nucci *et al.*, 2015, 2018).
4. Fostering moral responsibility: Involve students in school-based moral decision-making processes, strengthening their autonomy and moral identity (Nucci, 2000; Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021; Caetano; Dell'Agli, 2022).
5. Supporting the development of the personal domain: Promote autonomous decision-making within daily school routines to foster identity development and the recognition of personal rights (Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021; Caetano; Dell'Agli, 2022).
6. Encouraging the practical application of knowledge: Support the everyday enactment of moral principles both within and beyond the school environment (Nucci, 2000; Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).
7. Developing perspective-taking skills: Teach students to identify, name, and understand their own emotions as well as those of others (Malti; Ongley, 2014).

Suggestions related to the content to be addressed

1. Integrating moral education across the curriculum: Embed critical moral education into diverse subject areas such as history, geography, literature, and mathematics (Nucci; Powers, 2014; Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).
2. Differentiating social domains: Teach students to identify and distinguish among the moral, conventional, personal, prudential, and multifaceted domains across various contexts (Turiel, 1983/2003; Nucci, 2000; Smetana, 2005; Smetana *et al.*, 2014; Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).
3. Coordinating overlapping domains: Develop students' capacity to coordinate multiple social domains in complex moral situations (Turiel, 1983/2003; Nucci, 2000; Nucci; Powers, 2014; Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).
4. Critically analyzing informational assumptions: Encourage students to examine the cultural and social assumptions embedded in historical narratives or contemporary events (Nucci, 2000; Smetana, 2005; Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).
5. Exploring themes of social justice, well-being, and rights: Address structural inequalities and foster critical consciousness by engaging with themes related to justice, dignity, and human rights (Freire, 1968/2021; Jagers *et al.*, 2018, 2019; Nucci, 2000).
6. Fostering social co-responsibility: Discuss the collective impact of individual actions and the moral obligation to confront injustice (Freire, 1968/2021, 1979/2016; Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).
7. Discussing various forms of justice: Explore concepts such as retributive and distributive justice, equality, equity, and reciprocity (Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).
8. Reflecting critically on one's own culture: Promote moral reflection on students' own cultural backgrounds and practices (Freire, 1968/2021; Nucci, 2000; Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).

9. Bringing everyday experiences into moral reflection: Incorporate students' lived experiences as central elements in moral discussions (Nucci, 2000; Nucci; Ilten-Gee, 2021).
10. Discussing negative moral dilemmas: Use fictional narratives or morally problematic scenarios to stimulate critical thinking about consequences and responsibilities (Oser, 2008; Killen; Dahl, 2016).
11. Cultivating moral sensitivity: Help students recognize implicit moral dimensions in everyday situations (Nucci, 2000; La Taille, 2006).
12. Integrating cognitive and emotional development: Promote reflection on how emotions interact with moral reasoning in real-life decision-making (Piaget, 1932/1994, 1953/2014; Damon; Colby, 2015).
13. Encouraging purpose and strengthening the moral self: Support students in discovering a sense of purpose grounded in justice, empathy, and social responsibility (Damon; Malin, 2020; Damon; Colby, 2015).

Conclusion

This theoretical article examined the importance of Paulo Freire's critical pedagogy for moral education from the perspective of social domain theory, analyzing how articulating these approaches can enhance educational practices committed to critical moral development. To this end, a brief overview of the foundations of SDT was presented, with emphasis on its moral education branch, along with a discussion of the relevance of Freirean contributions in strengthening the theory's critical perspective.

In addition to the theoretical analysis, practical suggestions were provided for schools and teachers interested in promoting students' critical moral development, with the aim of supporting emancipatory and dialogical educational practices oriented toward the promotion of social justice.

The integration of SDT and critical pedagogy, from a constructivist and dialogical standpoint, is shown to be fundamental to the creation of school environments that support students' academic, social, emotional, and moral development—fostering their capacity for critical reflection, resistance to extremism, and ethical commitment to transformative action.

Thus, it is reaffirmed that critical moral education is an essential tool in the formation of individuals capable of acting ethically and autonomously, and of actively participating in the construction of more just, democratic, and pluralistic societies.

References

- ADORNO, T. W. *Educação e emancipação*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Paz e Terra, 2006.
- ARSENIO, W. F. Moral emotion attributions and aggression. In: KILLEN, M.; SMETANA, J. G. (Orgs.). *Handbook of moral development*. 2. ed. Nova York, NY: Psychology Press, 2014. p. 235-255.
- CAETANO, L. M.; DELL'AGLI, B. A. V. Concepções educativas morais de professores. *Arquivos Brasileiros de Psicologia*, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, v. 69, p. 167-182, 2017. Disponível em: http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1809-52672017000300012&lng=pt&tlng=pt.
- CAETANO, L. M.; DELL'AGLI, B. A. V. Domínio moral e domínio pessoal: Contribuições para a educação. *Cenários da Práxis Pedagógica*, v. 1, p. 39-51, 2022. doi:10.48848/935539.

- CAETANO, L. M. Teorias da moralidade em discussão. In: CAETANO, L. M.; SMETANA, J. G. *Desenvolvimento moral da criança e teoria do domínio social*. São Paulo, SP: Ideias & Letras, 2024. p. 23-104.
- CAETANO, L. M.; SOUZA, J. M.; SILVA, C. O.; CHOI, P. Y. C. Concepções educativas morais de crianças e adolescentes: Diálogo entre teoria do juízo moral de Piaget e teoria do domínio social de Turiel. *Educação & Pesquisa*, São Paulo, v. 45, e193129, 2019. doi:10.1590/S1678-4634201945193129.
- CASEL. *CASEL guide: Effective social and emotional learning programs – preschool and elementary school edition*. Chicago, IL: CASEL - Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning, 2013. Disponível em: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED581699.pdf>.
- CASEL. *The CASEL guide to schoolwide social and emotional learning*. Chicago, IL: CASEL - Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning, 2021. Disponível em: <https://schoolguide.casel.org/>.
- CHOI, P. Y. C.; GALHARDO, P. B.; DELL'AGLI, B. A. V.; SOUZA, M. T. C. C.; CAETANO, L. M. Admiração nos julgamentos dos adolescentes sobre situações que envolvem o machucar. *Revista Caderno Pedagógico*, v. 21, n. 5, p. 1-24, 2024. doi:10.54033/cadpedv21n5-119.
- CIPRIANO, C. *et al.* The state of evidence for social and emotional learning: A contemporary meta-analysis of universal school-based SEL interventions. *Child Development*, v. 00, p. 1-24, 2023. doi:10.1111/cdev.13968.
- COELHO, T. S. F. *Julgamentos das crianças sobre quebras de normatividade na escola*. 2022. 141 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Psicologia Escolar e do Desenvolvimento Humano) — Instituto de Psicologia, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2022. Disponível em: https://www.teses.usp.br/teses/disponiveis/47/47131/tde-16112022-184009/publico/coelho_me.pdf.
- CONWAY, P. The core of morality is the moral self. In: GRAY, K.; GRAHAM, J. (Orgs.). *Atlas of moral psychology*. Nova York, NY: The Guilford Press, 2018. p. 149-164.
- DAMON, W.; COLBY, A. *The power of ideals: The real story of moral choice*. Nova York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- DURLAK, J. A.; MAHONEY, J. L.; BOYLE, A. E. What we know, and what we need to find out about universal, school-based social and emotional learning programs for children and adolescents: A review of meta-analyses and directions for future research. *Psychological Bulletin*, v. 148, n. 11-12, p. 765-782, 2022. doi:10.1037/bul0000383.
- DURLAK, J. A. *et al.* The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development*, v. 82, n. 1, p. 405-432, 2011. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x.
- FREIRE, P. *Conscientização*. São Paulo, SP: Cortez, 2016.
- FREIRE, P. *Educação e mudança*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Paz e Terra, 2021.
- FREIRE, P. *Pedagogia do oprimido*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Paz e Terra, 2021.

- ILTEN-GEE, R.; NUCCI, L. From peer discourse to critical moral perspectives: Teaching for engaged reasoning. *Precollege Philosophy and Public Practice*, v. 1, p. 58–74, 2019. doi:10.5840/p4201810242.
- JAGERS, R. J.; RIVAS-DRAKE, D.; BOROWSKI, T. Equity and social-emotional learning: A cultural analysis. CASEL Assessment Work Group Brief, Special Issues Series, 2018. Disponível em: <https://measuringsel.casel.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Frameworks-Equity.pdf>.
- JAGERS, R. J.; RIVAS-DRAKE, D.; WILLIAMS, B. Transformative social and emotional learning (SEL): Toward SEL in service of educational equity and excellence. *Educational Psychologist*, v. 54, n. 3, p. 162–184, 2019. doi:10.1080/00461520.2019.1623032.
- KILLEN, M.; DAHL, A. Moral judgment: Reflective, interactive, spontaneous, challenging, and always evolving. In: GRAY, K.; GRAHAM, J. (Orgs.). *Atlas of moral psychology*. Nova York, NY: Guilford, 2016. p. 20–30.
- KOHLBERG, L. *Essays on moral development: The philosophy of moral development*. v. 1. São Francisco, CA: Harper & Row, 1981.
- LA TAILLE, Y. *Moral e ética: Dimensões intelectuais e afetivas*. Porto Alegre, RS: Artmed, 2006.
- MAHONEY, J. L. et al. Systemic social and emotional learning: Promoting educational success for all preschool to high school students. *American Psychologist*, 2020. doi:10.1037/amp0000701.
- MALTI, T.; ONGLEY, S. F. The development of moral emotions and moral reasoning. In: KILLEN, M.; SMETANA, J. G. (Orgs.). *Handbook of moral development*. 2. ed. Nova York, NY: Psychology Press, 2014. p. 163–183.
- MART, A. K.; WEISSBERG, R. P.; KENDZIORA, K. Systemic support for SEL in schools districts. In: DURLAK, J. A. et al. (Orgs.). *Handbook of social and emotional learning: Research and practice*. Nova York, NY: Guilford, 2017. p. 482–499.
- NUCCI, L.; ILTEN-GEE, R. *Moral education for social justice*. Nova York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University, 2021.
- NUCCI, L. Psicologia moral e educação: para além de crianças “boazinhas”. *Educação e Pesquisa*, v. 26, n. 2, p. 71–89, 2000. doi:10.1590/S1517-97022000000200006.
- NUCCI, L.; TURIEL, E. Capturing the complexity of moral development and education August. *Mind Brain and Education*, v. 3, n. 3, p. 151–159, 2009. doi:10.1111/j.1751-228X.2009.01065.x.
- NUCCI, L.; POWERS, D. W. Social cognitive domain theory and moral education. In: NUCCI, L.; NARVAEZ, D.; KRETTENAUER, T. (Orgs.). *Handbook of moral and character education*. Nova York, NY: Routledge, 2014. p. 121–139.
- NUCCI, L.; CREANE, M. W.; POWERS, D. W. Integrating moral and social development within middle school social studies: A social cognitive domain approach. *Journal of Moral Education*, v. 44, n. 4, p. 479–496, 2015. doi:10.1080/03057240.2015.1087391.

NUCCI, L.; TURIEL, E.; RODED, A. D. Continuities and discontinuities in the development of moral judgments. *Human Development*, v. 60, n. 5, p. 279-341, 2018. doi:10.1159/000484067.

OSER, F. Negative morality and the goals of moral education. In: NUCCI, L. (Org.). *Conflict, contradiction and contrarian elements in moral development and education*. Manwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2008. p. 129-153.

PIAGET, J. *O juízo moral na criança*. São Paulo, SP: Summus, 1994.

PIAGET, J. *Relações entre a afetividade e a inteligência no desenvolvimento mental da criança*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Wak Editora, 2014.

SHI, J.; CHEUNG, A. C. K. Effective components of social emotional learning programs: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, v. 53, n. 4, p. 755-771, 2024. doi:10.1007/s10964-024-01942-7.

SMETANA, J. G. Desenvolvimento moral: a perspectiva da teoria do domínio social. In: CAETANO, L. M.; SMETANA, J. G. *Desenvolvimento moral da criança e teoria do domínio social*. São Paulo, SP: Ideias & Letras, 2024. p. 105-194.

SMETANA, J.; JAMBON, M.; BALL, C. The social domain approach to children's moral and social judgments. In: KILLEN, M.; SMETANA, J. (Orgs.). *Handbook of moral development*. 2. ed. Nova York, NY: Psychology Press, 2014. p. 23-45.

SMETANA, J. G. Moral development: The social domain theory view. In: ZELAZO, P. D. (Org.). *The Oxford handbook of developmental psychology*. Vol. 1: Body and mind. Nova York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2013. p. 832-863.

SMETANA, J. G. Social-cognitive domain theory: Consistencies and variations in children's moral and social judgments. In: KILLEN, M.; SMETANA, J. G. (Orgs.). *Handbook of moral development*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2005. p. 119-153.

SOUZA, J. M. *Julgamento de adolescentes sobre exclusão homofóbica na perspectiva da Teoria do Domínio Social*. 2019. 207 f. Tese (Doutorado em Psicologia Escolar e do Desenvolvimento Humano) — Instituto de Psicologia, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2019. Disponível em: <https://www.teses.usp.br>.

TURIEL, E. Moral judgments and actions: Development and processes of coordination. In: KILLEN, M.; SMETANA, J. G. (Orgs.). *Handbook of moral development*. 3. ed. Nova York, NY: Routledge, 2023. p. 3-18.

TURIEL, E. Moral reasoning, cultural practices, and social inequalities. *Innovación Educativa*, v. 12, p. 17-32, 2012. Disponível em: <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=179425449002>.

TURIEL, E. Morality: Epistemology, development, and social opposition. In: KILLEN, M.; SMETANA, J. G. (Orgs.). *Handbook of moral development*. 2. ed. Nova York, NY: Psychology Press, 2014. p. 3-22.

TURIEL, E. *The development of social knowledge: Morality and convention*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

VALADARES, D. *Os julgamentos morais de crianças pequenas (02 a 05 anos): Contribuições da teoria do domínio social*. 2019. 140 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Psicologia Escolar e do Desenvolvimento Humano) — Instituto de Psicologia, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2019. Disponível em: <https://www.teses.usp.br>.

WEISSBERG, R. P.; A., D. J.; DOMITROVICH, C. E.; GULLOTTA, T. P. Social and emotional learning: Past, present, and future. In: DURLAK, J. A.; DOMITROVICH, C. E.; WEISSBERG, R. P.; GULLOTTA, T. P. (Orgs.). *Handbook of social and emotional learning: Research and practice*. Nova York, NY: Guilford, 2017. p. 3-19.

WU, Z.; BROWN, L.; KIM, H. Y.; YOSHIKAWA, H.; ABER, J. L. Measuring the dosage of brief and skill-targeted social-emotional learning (SEL) activities in humanitarian settings. *Frontiers in Psychology*, v. 13, e973184, 2023. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2022.973184.

RECEBIDO: 20/04/2025

RECEIVED: 04/20/2025

APROVADO: 30/06/2025

APPROVED: 06/30/2025

Editor in charge: Alboni Marisa Dudeque Pianovski Vieira