

# Chapter 13 1

## Becoming a Moral Person – Moral 2

### Development and Moral Character Education 3

#### as a Result of Social Interactions 4

Darcia Narvaez and Daniel Lapsley 5

It is commonly assumed that humans do not begin life with moral character or virtue. 6  
Most documented societies through history considered infants to be unformed 7  
persons, not yet moral members of society, “humanity-in-becoming” who have 8  
“watery souls” (Fijian) (Sahlins 2008: 101–102). This person-becoming view 9  
fits well with human sciences today, as a child’s development is viewed as the 10  
unfolding and co-construction of a complex dynamic system. At first, the infant is 11  
co-constructed by other complex, dynamic systems—caregivers. The personality 12  
that is formed is very much dependent on this early formation, which is largely 13  
beyond the control of the individual. However, over time, the individual takes on 14  
more choices about her or his own character development within the framework of 15  
subsequent social experience and enculturation. 16

### 13.1 Early Experience<sup>1</sup> 17

As a dynamic system, initial conditions of human development matter greatly 18  
(Churchland 1998). In fact, how one begins life may be of utmost importance to the 19  
emergence of virtue (Herdt 2008). Early experience plays a key role in the develop- 20  
ment of all body and brain systems and so it necessarily has an influence on subse- 21  
quent moral functioning (Narvaez and Gleason 2013). From conception, if not before, 22  
the quality of brain and body systems are influenced by caregiver behavior, affecting 23  
such things as immune system receptors and ratios, brain transmitter quality and 24  
stress response, all of which relate to physical and mental health outcomes 25

---

<sup>1</sup>The focus here is on the first few years of life. Of course, there are other sensitive periods and other experiences that play roles in moral development. But the first years of life establish thresholds for physiological and psychological functioning that are difficult to change later.

[AU1] D. Narvaez (✉) • D. Lapsley  
Department of Psychology, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN, USA

26 long-term (Grosjean and Tsai 2007; Davis and Sandman 2010). Perinatal and post  
27 natal experience can influence the mother-child relationship by contributing to estab-  
28 lishing a positive highly-responsive relationship, or not (Bystrova et al. 2009; Klaus  
29 and Kennell 1976/1983). The nature of this early interaction affects the child's life  
30 outcome significantly (Felitti et al. 1998). For example, children with inconsistent or  
31 non-responsive caregivers may develop emotional dysregulation that becomes the  
32 foundation for further psychopathology such as depression, aggression, compromised  
33 social abilities and lifelong anxiety (Cole et al. 1994; Davidson et al. 2000; Henry and  
34 Wang 1998; Panksepp and Watt 2011; also see Schore 2013). Let's take one of hun-  
35 dreds of possible examples. When care is responsive and subverts infant stress, the  
36 child develops a good tone in the vagus nerve, which is implicated in the functioning  
37 of digestion, respiratory and cardiac systems as well as self-regulation capacities  
38 (Porges 2011). Vagal tone also influences compassionate response. Those with poor  
39 vagal development tend to be less compassionate (Eisenberg and Eggum 2002). [AU2]

40 Warm, responsive parenting is longitudinally related to the development of agreeable-  
41 ness, conscience and prosociality (Kochanska 2002), characteristics of adult moral  
42 exemplars (Walker and Frimer 2009). Thus, as others have pointed out (e.g., Tomkins  
43 1965), early experience has import for moral functioning in adulthood.

44 Triune ethics theory (TET; Narvaez 2008) describes how early experience can  
45 influence the neurobiological underpinnings of moral functioning, identifying  
46 three moral orientations that emerge from the evolved strata of the brain (MacLean  
47 1990) and that are shaped by early experience: Safety (reflexive self-protection),  
48 Engagement (relational attunement) and Imagination (reflective abstraction).  
49 Individuals can be influenced by the situation to adopt one of the ethics (e.g., Safety  
50 in threatening situations), but individuals can also develop a dispositional orienta-  
51 tion toward one or another based on experience during sensitive periods.<sup>2</sup> When an  
52 orientation is activated, it influences perception, including which rhetoric is attrac-  
53 tive and which action possibilities (affordances) are salient. For example, when one  
54 feels threatened, vision narrows toward actions that facilitate the reestablishment of  
55 a sense of safety (Rowe et al. 2007; Schmitz et al. 2009). When an individual uses  
56 an orientation to take action, trumping other values in the moment, it becomes an  
57 ethic. For the individual, acting for self-protection with aggression or withdrawal  
58 "feels" like the right and moral thing to do.

59 The safety ethic relies on the extrapyramidal systems, basal ganglia and lower  
60 limbic system units that function to protect the organism. These are available at  
61 birth but can be conditioned by early experience to be over or under-reactive. When  
62 children do not get what their brains and bodies evolved to expect, they develop a  
63 stress-reactive brain (Henry and Wang 1998). This leads to a more self-protective  
64 orientation to the social life and fosters a dispositional Safety Ethic for socio-moral  
65 functioning. In this case, from early "undercare" the individual loses free will,

---

<sup>2</sup>Generally speaking, sensitive periods in brain development include the first 5 years, early adoles-  
cence, early adulthood and during therapy. Although thresholds for many systems are established  
early, there is opportunity for change during these other sensitive times. It is not yet known how  
the three ethics differ in malleability during these periods.

forced by conditioning (as the brain reacts without control to situations as threatening) to rely on suboptimal emotional circuitry or even more primitive brain systems for social interaction (Narvaez 2013b). The brain/body system stays 'on alert' to some degree, keeping self-protective systems online. This activation subverts the more relaxed states that are required for positive prosocial emotions and sophisticated reasoning. Fearful vigilant states can render the Engagement and Imagination ethics mute.

According to TET, mature moral action requires control of stress reactivity and a heightening of the prosocial aspects of brain function that underlie the engagement and imagination ethics. The Engagement ethic is well developed when early care is good. Good early care matches the ancestral human mammalian milieu (AHMM; Narvaez and Gleason 2013), representative of social mammalian characteristics that emerged over 30 million years ago (extensive breastfeeding, constant touch, natural childbirth, prompt response to needs, multiple adult caregivers and extensive maternal social support, free play). The AHMM environment fosters well-functioning physiological systems (e.g., vagus nerve mentioned above) as well as prosocial systems (e.g., higher limbic system with connections to the prefrontal cortex), hormones such as those related to bonding and attachment (e.g., oxytocin), allowing the individual to reach out and attune to others (Narvaez et al. 2013b). For example, emotional intelligence, the ability to get along skillfully with others, is higher in children raised with a mutually-responsive-orientation with the primary caregiver (e.g., Kochanska 2002). The individual is able to adopt an intersubjective stance with others through "limbic resonance" (Lewis et al. 2000), leading to greater emotional engagement, self-regulation and skilled sociality (Schoore 1994).

When care is ideal, the systems underlying the imagination ethic (e.g., prefrontal cortex systems) are also well established allowing for appropriate abstraction that does not detach from emotion and typically maintains a prosocial connection (communal imagination). Under conditions of undercare or toxic behavior during sensitive periods (e.g., neglect in early childhood, binge drinking in adolescence; Bechara 2005; Lanius et al. 2010), the imagination ethic can be damaged resulting in disassociation from emotion (detached imagination). Moreover, trauma during sensitive periods can strengthen connections to the self-protective orientation (vicious imagination), adding to a self-centered moral orientation.

Recent studies in the first author's lab show that early care practices matter for moral functioning in early childhood. She and her colleagues are studying the evolved developmental niche (EDN) for young human offspring which emerged with the social mammals over 30 million years ago with slight variation among humans (extensive, on-demand breastfeeding; nearly constant touch; responsiveness to the needs of the child; multiple adult caregivers; free play; social support; and natural childbirth). The EDN components influence health and wellbeing with known physiological mechanisms (e.g., stress reactivity; neurotransmitter development; Narvaez et al. 2013a). The first author and colleagues are showing that they matter for moral development as well. Each of these practices relates to early childhood moral development (conscience, self-regulation, empathy, cooperation). For example after controlling for education, income and general responsivity, maternal

111 touch patterns at age 4 months predict fewer behavior problems at age 3 (Narvaez  
112 et al. 2013b) and a higher amount of maternal positive touch in early childhood cor-  
113 relates with empathy at age 3 in both the USA and China (Narvaez and Gleason  
114 2013). These findings suggest that practices representative of the ancestral human  
115 mammalian milieu may be important, above and beyond responsivity alone, for  
116 fostering sociomoral development.

117 But does early experience relate to moral functioning later in life? The first  
118 author has also been exploring how early experience (e.g., attachment) influences  
119 ethical identity and moral action in college students. She has developed measures of  
120 identity for each of the TET ethics based on Aquino and Reed's (2002) moral iden-  
121 tity measure. Research (Narvaez and Brooks, submitted) on college students is  
122 showing that proxies for early life experience (e.g., attachment) predict the person-  
123 ality traits of agreeableness and openness. These personality factors predict engage-  
124 ment and imagination identities (i.e., preferred goals for self). Engagement identity  
125 predicts action of helping the less fortunate beyond agreeableness. Those with  
126 safety identities are more dishonest and are more likely to want to impose their  
127 values on others whereas those with engagement and imagination ethic identities  
128 are more likely to live according to their core values (e.g., buy products, choose  
129 activities), than those with a safety identity, which suggests a more integrated per-  
130 sonality. Longitudinal studies must be done to verify the linkages.

### 131 **13.2 Self-co-construction from Social Experience**

132 As noted above, early life provides the environment for developing (or not) the well-  
133 functioning emotion systems and self-regulatory capacities that underlie social  
134 interactions and support the emergence of virtue. In fact, human developmental  
135 theory emphasizing the importance of early life in shaping moral personality  
136 (Kochanska 2002) matches up well with Aristotelian theory, providing insight into  
137 the development of moral personhood. Aristotle describes the nature of virtue in  
138 terms of habituation. By exercising or practicing virtue, individuals acquire virtue.  
139 One becomes virtuous through practicing virtue under the guidance of a mentor  
140 until one can mentor oneself (Urmson 1988). Aristotle's formulation fits well with [AU4]  
141 contemporary psychological theories of learning and virtue development (Bransford  
142 et al. 1999; Hogarth 2001; Narvaez 2006).

143 Although the notion of habits has been controversial within psychology, new  
144 theories provide integrative approaches that avoid these problems (see Lapsley and  
145 Narvaez 2006 for a discussion). Social cognitive accounts of moral personality  
146 interpret the dispositions of habits and virtues as social cognitive units (schemas and  
147 prototypes) that emerge from and are transformed by immersion, repeated experi-  
148 ence and guided instruction (Lapsley and Narvaez 2004). Using an apprenticeship  
149 model, Steutel and Spiecker (2004) suggest that Aristotelian habituation can best be  
150 understood as learning-by-doing that involves regular and consistent practice under  
151 the guidance of a virtuous tutor. Habits developed in this way lead to dispositional

orientations that occur automatically without reflective thought (Steutel and Spiecker 2004). Similarly, Narvaez (2005; Narvaez and Lapsley 2005) suggested that the formation of moral character reflects expertise development. According to Narvaez (2006), moral character is fostered by multiple levels of social influence including caring relationships, cultural climates, and a supportive community in a type of moral ecological context (Bronfenbrenner 1979). Within this complex set of social influences, moral character development is a matter of perfecting interactive skills (in perception, sensitivity, reasoning and judgment, focus and action). Indeed, understanding virtues as socially-mediated skills is an argument also made increasingly by virtue theorists (Jacobson 2005; Stichter 2007a, b). Coached practice of a skill leads to increasing intuitive responsiveness that permits rapid, automatic judgments and behavioral responses to relevant contingencies (Bartsch and Wright 2005; Dreyfus and Dreyfus 1991; Narvaez 2010a). The automaticity of social skills can account for the tacit qualities often associated with Aristotelian “habits”. These habits correspond to social cognitive schemas or behavioral components whose frequent activation becomes overlearned to the point of chronic automaticity (Lapsley and Hill 2008; Narvaez et al. 2006).

If we move beyond early life, childhood involves additional social experiences that influence the development of the moral person. What are the developmental sources of moral habits and chronicity? Lapsley and Narvaez (2004) suggest that moral chronicity is built on the foundation of generalized event representations that comprise early socio-personal development (Thompson 1998), the “basic building blocks of cognitive development” (Nelson and Gruendel 1981: 131), internalized working models of what one can expect of social experience. So for example, children taught to pay attention to their impact on others (‘how does your sister feel after you took her toy?’, ‘how can we share the single cookie?’) learn to frame their social lives with this sort of awareness. Prototypic working models are progressively elaborated in the early conversations with caregivers who help children review, structure and consolidate memories in script-like fashion (Fivush et al. 1992).

Another type of internal working model that guides behavior is proposed by attachment theory (Bowlby 1988). This approach integrates the emotional aspects of social experiences with caregivers. Attachment has to do with implicit, ‘felt,’ experience more so than conscious explanation of experience. Triune Ethics Theory, described earlier, brings these ideas into the moral domain, emphasizing the underlying neurobiology of moral internal working models. The child internalizes emotional memories as part of the self. The topics and emotional frameworks the caregiver uses in helping children organize their lives become routine, habitual and automatic the longer they are practiced. The socio-emotional patterns in routine relationships become expectations for the social life. When the parent references norms, standards and values, they encourage the formation of chronically accessible social cognitive schemas (e.g., ‘What should you say when you receive a gift?’; Lapsley and Narvaez 2004). As the self develops, the child integrates these patterns of experience into autobiographical memory, facilitated by parental conversation, interrogation, emphasis and focus. The moral self is part of this package of

197 experience, deeply influenced by the parents and other caring relationships.  
198 Reflection on past success through the rehearsal and review of events, reactions, and  
199 so forth, is important for future moral action because the implicit understanding of  
200 certain brain systems is integrated with the more conscious conceptualization of  
201 other brain systems. Parents help children reflect and build moral representations of  
202 their lives.

203       Becoming a moral person is a lifelong enterprise. In the USA, it is much more  
204 difficult to be virtuous than in the contexts of most of human genus history (prior to  
205 agriculture) because of poor childrearing in relation to basic needs, multiple pres-  
206 sures towards vicious behavior (e.g., self-centered consumption), disregard and  
207 enslavement of animals and the natural world, violent media infused with humor  
208 (which has a greater influence on children to imitate), shifting or unclear goals, roles  
209 and duties (for detailed discussion, see Narvaez 2013a, b). To discuss the full flower  
210 of moral personality, we must move beyond early childhood, and even the college  
211 years. We must examine the nature of moral maturity (Narvaez 2010b).

### 212 **13.3 Mature Moral Functioning**

213 When we think of mature functioning, we often think of advanced moral reasoning  
214 and the ability to be impartial in making decisions. But we know now that emotions  
215 are essential for good cognition (Greenspan and Shanker 2004) and without them,  
216 decisions are often faulty (Damasio 1999). We also know that reasoning is only  
217 weakly linked to action (Thoma 1994).

218       We can take another tack in examining mature moral functioning by using the  
219 framework of expertise, which involves implicit and explicit understanding, inte-  
220 grating intuition and deliberation. Moral exemplars often exhibit the characteristics  
221 of experts. Although the knowledge and skill advantages the expert has are still  
222 being uncovered, experts are distinguished by certain characteristics. They have  
223 many more or less automated responses including perception that allow them to see  
224 patterns and opportunities that novices miss (Chase and Simon 1973; Chi et al.  
225 1988). They are better at selecting appropriate schemas and having them readily  
226 available for action (Spiro 1980). They have rehearsed action responses to high  
227 levels of automaticity (Ericsson and Smith 1991). In other words, expertise is a  
228 combination of perceptual attunement, complex understanding, motivation for  
229 excellence and effectivities that provide the capacity to take action given the affor-  
230 dances of the situation.

231       What kind of knowledge is expert knowledge? Schooling and literacy has  
232 focused us so much on reasoning and conscious thinking (in contrast to holistic,  
233 creative thinking), that we have begun to emphasize them in our childrearing prac-  
234 tices too. We often forget that most of our mind and actions proceed nonverbally  
235 without deliberation or conscious awareness and that emotions are foundational to  
236 adaptive functioning (Bargh 1989; Panksepp 1998). Intuition has become a large  
237 focus of recent psychological research, replacing a focus on conscious processing,

as psychology has come to appreciate how much implicit processes govern human action (Reber 1993). One critical facet of this research is the necessity to distinguish between naïve and well-education intuition (Narvaez 2010b). Expertise blends both deliberation and well-educated intuition together (Hogarth 2001). This is true in the case of moral functioning as well (Narvaez 2010b).

Although reasoning has often been the focus of moral psychological development and moral maturity (e.g., Rest et al. 1999), if we expand on Rest’s (Rest 1983; Narvaez and Rest 1995) component model of moral behavior, we can see that there may be other aspects to consider in terms of mature morality. The expanded model identifies five sets of processes: reasoning and judgment, sensitivity, motivation and action skills, and perception, . Because of its dominance, we start with moral reasoning.

**Moral reasoning:** For decades, research in moral development focused on the naturalistic development of moral reasoning. Moral reasoning sophistication develops with age and education. In adults, moral reasoning sophistication is related to real-life behaviors such as democratic teaching style, professional clinical behavior, attitudes towards human rights and at the same time is distinguishable from intelligence, political attitudes and religion (Rest et al. 1999; Narvaez et al. 1999a; Thoma et al. 1999, 2009). However, contrary to Piaget and Kohlberg’s suppositions, everyday experience is not sufficient to reach the highest levels of moral reasoning development. Narvaez and Gleason (2007) proposed that moral judgment retains characteristics of being both a developmental variable (which everyone develops to some degree) and a domain variable (which requires extensive, deliberate study). As such it bears resemblance to other domains. For example, virtually everyone is familiar with some aspect of music or even skilled in some fashion—as with singing, and yet musical expertise requires specific and prolonged practice beyond everyday familiarity. Sloboda (1991) contrasts the tacit musical expertise of novices, a type of receptive, recognition-based expertise, with the explicit or productive expertise of expert musicians.

These two forms also are evident in moral judgment. Moral judgment skills are in use daily for everyone and provide a base of tacit knowledge (see Narvaez and Bock 2002; Rest et al. 1999). Some are moral judgment novices (with less stimulating experience), who have fewer conceptual strategies for solving social problems, adopting simpler, more actor-centered options or ones that maintain social norms. Other lay people have receptive moral judgment expertise which enables thinking about organizing society-wide cooperation according to moral, impartial, public, reciprocal, criticizable principles (see Rest et al. 1999, for detailed discussion). Productive moral judgment expertise requires prolonged and focused experience in a particular domain, leading to for example, original contributions to philosophy or federal court opinion, or community problem solving. In short, everyday living does not usually bring about productive expertise in moral judgment. Focused deliberative experience is required such as graduate study in moral philosophy, community leadership or social activism. Moral decision making with minimal experience will be largely nonverbal and receptive expertise whereas

282 productive expertise involves theoretical or explicit knowledge that allows experts  
283 to make arguments and explain their reasoning.

284 Expertise in moral judgment may not be sufficient for establishing moral exper-  
285 tise. Why is that? It is because the “heart” may not be involved. Moral judgment can  
286 occur in an emotional vacuum. High functioning autistic individuals may receive  
287 high scores because they are superior memorizers of rules and systems, but they fail  
288 in everyday virtue, the moment-to-moment social and moral functioning that  
289 requires exquisite emotional intelligence. Such a detached morality cannot be a  
290 demonstration of moral excellence. As Aristotle pointed out, a virtuous action is one  
291 that is performed in the right way, with the right feelings and for the right reasons.  
292 Also from the studies of nominated exemplars, reasoning like a philosopher is not a  
293 necessary condition for moral exemplarity (Colby and Damon 1992). However, if  
294 one thinks of famous moral leaders like Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr., supe-  
295 rior moral reasoning was part of the package. In short, formal education and reflec-  
296 tion with regard to moral judgment is neither necessary nor sufficient to develop  
297 moral expertise, but it has the potential to be helpful.

298 Reasoning and judgment are often studied as if they are intellectual capacities.  
299 Logical analysis about the right thing to do detaches one from the present situation  
300 and works mostly in offline situations, when one is not in the middle of being emo-  
301 tionally focused on completing goals. However, moral experts keep an emotional  
302 focus as they apply automatized reasoning and judgment when involved in domain  
303 problem solving. For example, Monroe (1994) notes that rescuers of Jews in World  
304 War II made statements like, ‘what else could I do—they were human beings in  
305 need’ whereas non-rescuers were more likely to say things like ‘what could I do—I  
306 was one person against the Nazis.’ The habitually prosocial individuals acted spon-  
307 taneously. Moral behavior involves perception, interpretation, motivation and action  
308 skills as well as judgment. These can all be integrated into classroom academic  
309 instruction, using a novice-to-expert pedagogy (Narvaez 2006, 2009; Narvaez and  
310 Bock 2009; Narvaez and Endicott 2009; Narvaez and Lies 2009).

311 **Moral sensitivity:** Moral sensitivity involves noticing the needs of others, having  
312 empathy for them, and generally noticing the need for moral action. These aspects  
313 of sensitivity depend largely on social emotions and right-brain capacities: seeing  
314 the big picture; linking the situation to prosocial emotions; determining one’s poten-  
315 tial role (Schore 1994; McGilchrist 2009). Sensitivity also includes interpretive  
316 capacities or the ability to foresee the consequences of particular courses of action  
317 or inaction in terms of concrete outcomes and reactions from others. For example,  
318 professional education programs that sensitize students to their moral responsibili-  
319 ties to patients and clients demonstrate increased awareness of issues, options and  
320 consequences (Rest and Narvaez 1994). But moral functioning also includes moti-  
321 vation, caring about the outcomes.

322 **Moral Motivation or Focus:** The third component of motivation or focus has a  
323 habitual component but also a ‘here-and-now’ component. Motivation, identity and  
324 personality are central characteristics of those who take moral action for others  
325 (Lapsley and Narvaez 2004; Narvaez and Lapsley 2009). For example,



agreeableness and conscientiousness are both characteristic of exemplars (Walker and Frimer 2009). Those with explicit moral identity goals are more likely to spontaneously process social information with moral categories. For example, Narvaez and Lapsley (Narvaez et al. 2006) used a primacy-of-output measure of moral identity where the initial response to a question (e.g., name characteristics of people you like) indicates a chronically used category for social information processing. Those with higher or lower moral identity were compared on two tasks. In one task, participants read sentences about a person in a role (e.g., “The plumber always meets his obligations and keeps his word”) and were later primed to remember the sentences with a word either representing the role (“pipes”) or the disposition (“responsible”). Half the sentences represented non-virtuous dispositions. Those with higher scores on moral identity were more likely to make a spontaneous trait inference when primed with dispositional cues than with role cues.

In their second study (Narvaez et al. 2006), participants read stories about characters who did or did not help. Those with moral identities (moral chronics) were quicker responding to probes that represented negative evaluations of story characters who did not help when requested (e.g., “selfish”). These studies showed that chronic moral identity affects social information processing.

In terms of ‘here-and-now,’ mature moral actors have greater sensitivity to prioritizing moral action at any given moment. But they understand that they may miss opportunities, just as a person helping one homeless person may miss the opportunity to help another. Mature moral actors develop habits that facilitate their moral actions. Habituated empathic concern is one such habit and can entail structured practices such as automatic bank account deductions to the food bank. Mature moral actors realize that when the time comes they may be otherwise distracted and build in safeguards for moral action (Trout 2009).

**Moral Action:** The last component comprises implementation and follow-through on a selected moral action. It requires extensive practice but is deeply linked to the other components. Perception of possible actions is an aspect of sensitivity to the situation in terms of affordances. Perception is shaped by experience and influences which stimuli reach higher order centers (Neisser 1976). Perception and action judgments are integrated into effectivities matching personal capacity built from extensive domain-relevant experience, to the possible actions (affordances) in the situation (Feltovich et al. 1997; Shaw et al. 1982). Along with concern for others, moral exemplars display more effectivities for particular actions, agency or self-efficacy in their domain that distinguishes them from others (Frimer and Walker 2009; Monroe 1994; Walker and Frimer 2009).

**Moral Perception:** Moral perception initiates the processes that lead to moral action: What does the individual notice or not notice? However, moral perception is influenced by other components. For example, those with more sophisticated moral judgment skills (as measured by the Defining Issues Test), are better at noticing and recalling sophisticated moral reasoning in stories (Narvaez 1998, 1999, 2001; Narvaez and Gleason 2007). They are better at discerning the intended moral theme in a story (Narvaez et al. 1999b). Similarly, those with moral identities are more

370 aware of moral violations and moral behavior in story characters (Narvaez et al.  
371 2006). Triune Ethics Theory suggests that moral perception shifts depending on the  
372 mindset that is active. In a recent study, the first author's lab finds that those with  
373 high engagement ethical identities see the photo of a crying baby as closer to them  
374 than those with low engagement identities, suggesting that identity affects visual  
375 perception (Narvaez et al. 2011).

376 Mature moral expertise is found ultimately in the integration of component skills  
377 (perception/sensitivity-judgment-focus-action links). In a way we are moving with  
378 a trend among psychologists and philosophers to view virtue and moral personality  
379 as sets of implicit skills. Along with moral developmental psychologists (Narvaez  
380 and Lapsley 2005), moral philosophers recently have been shifting to a view of  
381 moral virtue as comprised of skills that can be honed to high levels of expertise  
382 (Annas 2011; Zagzebski 2006). How does this expertise develop?

### 383 13.4 Expertise Development Through Relational Coaching 384 and Community Immersion

385 How do individuals become experts? Through guided immersion in informative  
386 environments ("kind" environments, Hogarth 2001). Their training is focused and  
387 extensive, taking about 10 years or 10,000 h of practice (Chase and Simon 1973).  
388 Expertise development can be sped up with a mentor who points out the pitfalls of  
389 particular actions and the benefits of others, a benefit not available to a novice who  
390 is testing out actions and problem solving alone. The mentor helps to coordinate  
391 deliberative understanding with intuition development. When experts with formal  
392 training are learning to solve problems in their domain, they usually do so in the  
393 context of explicit theory and explanation. Thus, early on they are able to explain  
394 the actions they take. Gradually, however, with practice and experience, their decision  
395 making processes become more automatic as well. In fact, most experts become  
396 unable to explain their decision making processes (e.g., Kihlstrom et al. 1996).

397 It must be pointed out that *moral* expertise is socially grounded and has its roots  
398 in early experience. With a skills focus, we resurrect a view that has been marginal-  
399 ized in contemporary developmental science, that the primary parental influence on  
400 morality begins in early life—in the welcoming physiology of the mother, the experi-  
401 ence of relationship with caregivers, and in the developing implicit understandings of  
402 the meaning and effect of emotions, relationships and reciprocity. Unlike other forms  
403 of expertise, moral functioning is intended for the social life so for optimal develop-  
404 ment it requires immersion early and often in the social life of the community where  
405 virtue is applied. Unlike engineering or medical diagnosis, the moral expert must  
406 have well-functioning social skills that underlie moral capacities. For example, in  
407 older normal children, it is apparent that reflective thinking is grounded in "lived  
408 emotional experience." Those with more adaptive emotional intersubjectivity with  
409 caregivers in early life are better able to think out problems, and demonstrate greater  
410 social skills, moral reasoning, and intelligence (Greenspan and Shanker 2004: 233).

### 13.5 Mature Moral Functioning Day to Day

411

Higher order deliberation is always situated in the interface of person and context. 412  
 John Dewey offers fresh insight into the nature of ethical functioning as imagination 413  
 (1930/1984). He “replaces obsolete notions of perspective-free rationality” and 414  
 “sedimented moral criteria” with “flexible, rule-sensitive situational inquiry” which 415  
 includes “moral perceptiveness, creativity, expressiveness, and skill” (Dewey, quoted 416  
 by Fesmire 2003: 5). Instead of the “traditional assumption that reasonings and 417  
 actions can be measured by an ahistorical standard,” the pragmatists William James 418  
 and Dewey emphasized “reason’s ineliminatively temporal, aesthetic, evolving, 419  
 embodied, practical, and contextual character;” “rejecting both foundationalism and 420  
 subjectivism, the classical pragmatists transferred the burdens of reflective life to 421  
 situated, emotionally engaged intelligence” (Fesmire 2003: 52). 422

Pragmatist ethics like Dewey’s rejects rigid abstractions and emphasizes flexible 423  
 responses to “the ordinary life-experiences of inherently social, embodied, and his- 424  
 torically situated beings” who face hourly encounters “too unique” for classification 425  
 by a sedimented rule or principle or intuition (although they can offer some guid- 426  
 ance); “situations do not come in duplicates” (Fesmire 2003: 59; see Dewey 427  
 1922/2000: 167–168). Generalizations, whether applied in medicine or the ethical 428  
 life, are quackery and they gag intelligence (Dewey 1929/1984: 221). “If morality 429  
 were reducible to following rules or codes, high-functioning autism would be the 430  
 moral ideal” (Fesmire 2003: 72). Mental operations involving conceptual systems, 431  
 inference, meaning and language rely on a cognitive unconscious developed from 432  
 an embodied mind’s sensorimotor experience (Lakoff and Johnson 1999). In fact, 433  
 companionship, responsive care in early life leads to greater intelligence, imagina- 434  
 tion and moral capacities (Greenspan and Shanker 2004). 435

On a day to day level, the work of moral functioning is to coordinate reasoning, 436  
 facts, intuitions, reflection on past success, current goals, affordances (and multiple 437  
 other aspects that impinge on our behavior) in the situation. Deliberative reasoning 438  
 and intuition work hand in hand. The trick is to know when to trust intuition and 439  
 when to deliberate. Both systems are goal driven but it is impossible to deliberate on 440  
 many actions/decisions so one must make sure that intuitions are appropriate. Well- 441  
 educated intuitions that develop from experience emerge from complex and sophis- 442  
 ticated understanding whereas naïve intuitions that arise with no experience can 443  
 often be misleading (Hogarth 2001). Misapplied intuitions are context-specific prin- 444  
 ciples that are over-generalized to apply in other situations (Baron 1998). Intuition 445  
 is not precise but approximate, so its errors are usually slight. On the other hand, 446  
 although the deliberative system can be more precise, its errors are huge and damag- 447  
 ing (Hogarth 2001). Further, deliberating on intuitive process can result in less opti- 448  
 mal performance (Beilcock and Carr 2001). 449

Intuition and reasoning are both susceptible to “truthiness” (it feels right so it 450  
 must be right) and require deliberative supervision of their accuracy within an open 451  
 context (Narvaez 2010a). To counteract truthiness, Hogarth (2001) recommends 452  
 that individuals take an hypothesis-testing approach—test, verify, get peer review. 453

454 Generally, an expert deliberator is able to attend to the first impression and then  
455 confirm it with deliberative steps of examination to verify intuition.

### 456 **13.6 Conclusion**

457 Generally speaking, childrearing practices have extensive and deep effects on the  
458 psychological and biological foundations in the child's body and brain (Narvaez  
459 et al. 2013b). These occur in large part from experience during sensitive periods and  
460 affect moral capacities (Narvaez 2008, 2013b). Thus, caregivers, usually parents,  
461 have a great deal of influence on moral development. Over the life course, moral  
462 knowledge shifts from tacit to explicit (moral judgment expertise) yet at the same  
463 time moral expertise generally becomes more automatic (spontaneous action).  
464 Individuals have a say in who they become by selecting environments and activities  
465 that foster particular intuitions and expectancies. Greater capacities in moral sensi-  
466 tivity, judgment, motivation and action increase with focused practice, whether  
467 through post-baccalaureate education or community-based experience. Imagination  
468 when combined with moral engagement represents humanity's highest moral  
469 capacities.

# Author Queries

Chapter No.: 13      0002028885

Queries	Details Required	Author's Response
AU1	Please confirm and provide email address for the corresponding author.	
AU2	The citation Eisenberg and Eggum (2002) is not provided in the reference list. Please check.	
AU3	In foot note 2 the sentence starting "It is not yet known..." please check for the occurrence of "ethis."	
AU4	The citations Urmson (1999), Bronfenbrenner (1970), Narvaez (1999b) have been changed to Urmson (1988), Bronfenbrenner (1979), Narvaez (1999) as per the reference list. Please check if appropriate.	

Uncorrected Proof