Eurasian
Research Unit
Eurasian Campus - Sri Lanka

EURASIAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND PSYCHOLOGY

2026; I (II): 64-73
Published online 23.10.2026 (https://eurasiancampus.edu.journals.lk/)

SPV Constructivist Model : Fostering Value Development through School Culture and Personalised Learning

Dr. Praveen Kumar T D[1], Dr. Rani Dubey[2], Sandeep Kumar Pathak[3,*]

[1,2,3]Department of Education, Doctor Harisingh Gour Vishwavidyalaya (A Central University), Sagar, MP, INDIA – 470003

Email address:
y23413013.rs@dhsgsu.edu.in

To cite this article:
Kumar, P. T. D., Dubey, R., & Pathak, S. K. (2026). SPV constructivist model : Fostering value development through school culture and personalised learning. Eurasian Journal of Education and Psychology, 1(2), 64-73. https://doi.org/10.68283/ejep.v1.i2.a07

DOI: 10.68283/ejep.v1.i2.a07

Received: 26. 06. 2026; **Accepted:** 22. 07. 2026; **Published:** 23. 10. 2026

Abstract: Value development is central to education but often treated as a separate curricular component rather than a systemic, experiential process. Existing models are fragmented, emphasising moral instruction and neglecting the roles of school culture and learner agency. The study introduces the SPV Constructivist Model, which sees value development as emerging from the interaction of School Culture (S), Personalised Learning (P), and Value Competencies (V). Based on constructivist theory, values are viewed as socially constructed through experiences, reflection, and participation in school. The model underwent expert validation via Lawshe's CVR through a two-round Delphi process, ensuring clarity, relevance, and feasibility. The validated framework was turned into a schoolready package that included constructivist learning, culture-based interventions, personalised mentoring, and multi-source assessments such as portfolios, rubrics, and checklists. Findings show the SPV model enhances students' empathy, responsibility, cooperation, and ethics by integrating value learning into daily pedagogical practices. The SPV Constructivist Model reconceptualises personalised learning as a moral process and offers a scalable, evidence-based framework for holistic value education. It provides schools with a flexible system for integrating values into the curriculum, culture, and experiences. The model shifts from transmission-based moral teaching to participatory, reflective value formation.

Keywords: Constructivist pedagogy, Educational innovation, Personalized learning, School culture, Value development

© Eurasian Campus - Sri Lanka 2026, All Rights Reserved

1. Introduction

Contemporary schooling faces pressure to address moral erosion, empathy decline, social polarisation, and ethical ambiguity among students (Nucci, Narvaez, & Krettenauer, 2014). Assessments and climate studies show that academic success alone doesn't guarantee ethical citizenship or social responsibility (OECD, 2018). As a result, education shifts from a contentfocused model to a holistic one that includes cognitive, emotional, and moral growth.

Empirical studies show that standalone moral instruction and textbook-based value education have weak transfer to real-life ethical behaviour (Berkowitz & Bier, 2005; Thornberg & Oğuz, 2016). This gap highlights the need for frameworks that embed values in daily teaching, learning, and institutional culture. The present paper introduces the School Culture–Personalised Learning– Value Integration (SPV) Model, grounded in solid empirical and theoretical research.

1.1 Conceptual and Empirical Foundations

School culture, defined as shared norms, beliefs, relational patterns, and leadership practices, is empirically linked to students' social, emotional, and moral outcomes (Deal & Peterson, 2016). Longitudinal studies show that schools with trust, inclusivity, and shared leadership report higher student empathy, cooperation, and ethics (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Thapa et al., 2013). Research on school climate indicates that relational trust among teachers, students, and administrators predicts moral engagement and prosocial behaviour more than formal curricula (Wang & Degol, 2016). Inclusivity and democratic participation are linked to internalisation of justice and respect for diversity (Fielding, 2012). These findings confirm school culture as a key condition for the development of value, forming the foundation of the SPV Model.

Personalised learning boosts engagement, autonomy, and self-regulation (Pane et al., 2017). When students experience voice, choice, and dialogue, they show higher moral sensitivity and responsibility (Ryan & Deci, 2020). Reflective dialogue promotes ethical reasoning by helping learners confront moral dilemmas and articulate perspectives (Habermas, 1984; Kohlberg, 1981). Learner autonomy fosters moral agency through decision-making and accountability (Nucci, 2017). Empirical studies confirm personalised pedagogies mediate institutional values into moral dispositions (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020).

Moral development theories emphasise social interaction, empathy, and observational learning.

Kohlberg highlights the evolution of moral reasoning through social and cognitive conflict (Kohlberg, 1984). Gilligan stresses empathy and relationships (Gilligan, 1982). Bandura supports the view that values are learned through observation and reinforcement (Bandura, 1986). The SPV Model combines these views, with school culture as the moral context and personalised learning as the pathway for internalising moral reasoning and ethics.

1. Review Related Literature

Value development is the process by which learners internalise moral, social, civic, and personal values that influence their behaviour, decisions, and interactions. Research indicates values are not just acquired through instruction but built through lived experiences, social participation, reflection, and emotion (Lickona, 1991; Kohlberg, 1984). Modern methods focus on character education, social-emotional learning, and citizenship as ways to foster values. Scholars say this process is highly contextual and shaped by the school environment, not just moral lessons (Halstead & Taylor, 2000). Students implicitly learn values via peer interactions, teacher actions, leadership styles, and norms known as the hidden curriculum.

2.1. Constructivist Perspective on Value Learning:

Constructivist learning theory suggests learners actively build knowledge through interaction with their environment (Piaget, 1972; Vygotsky, 1978). In value education, this means students develop moral understanding via dialogue, dilemmas, cooperative learning, reflection, and real-life problems. Studies

© Eurasian Campus - Sri Lanka 2026, All Rights Reserved

show that strategies like discussion-based learning, service, experiential, and reflective practices foster deeper moral reasoning, empathy, and social responsibility (Dewey, 1938; Narvaez, 2006). Unlike traditional models that focus on memorisation, constructivist methods emphasise internalisation of morals. However, most research has studied cognitive learning, with fewer linking constructivist pedagogy to structured value development.

2.2. School Culture and Value Formation :

School culture encompasses shared beliefs, norms, rituals, relationships, leadership styles, and social expectations within a school community. It influences student behaviour, identity, and values (Deal & Peterson, 1999). Positive cultures trust, inclusivity, fairness, student voice, emotional safety, and collaboration promote ethical behaviour and empathy (Cohen et al., 2009). Negative climates, authoritarian, competitive, and exclusionary, hinder moral growth. Most studies view school culture as background rather than a central factor in shaping moral development, with limited empirical modelling of these cultural influences.

2.3. Personalised Learning and Moral Growth:

Personalised learning uses instructional methods that adapt content, pace, pathways, and assessment to learners' needs, interests, and contexts. It boosts motivation, autonomy, selfregulation, and learner agency (Pane et al., 2015). From a value education view, it fosters responsibility, empathy, respect for diversity, and self-awareness. When students have voice and choice, they often develop a sense of ownership of learning and ethical responsibility. However, most research focuses on academic achievement, engagement, and technology, with few exploring how personalisation influences moral identity, ethical reasoning, or value internalisation.

2.3. Integration of Culture, Personalisation, and Constructivism:

While research exists on constructivist pedagogy, school culture, and personalised learning separately, few studies integrate these into a unified framework for value development. Scholar's note that values arise from interactions between personal meaning and social contexts, but no comprehensive model explains how school culture and personalised learning work together through constructivist mechanisms to foster value development. This gap highlights the need for an integrated model like the SPV Constructivist Model.

2. Research Gap

Based on the above review, the following gaps emerge:

1. Most studies focus on isolated value education programs, moral lessons, or character modules, with limited emphasis on whole-school models integrating values into daily practices and interactions.
2. While school culture is influential, few studies view it as a primary predictor of value development. There's limited research connecting specific cultural dimensions (e.g., fairness, trust, belonging) with measurable value outcomes.
3. Personalised learning is often studied for cognitive and motivational effects but rarely for ethical and value-based growth. The moral implications of student voice, autonomy, and choice are underexplored.
4. Existing literature treats constructivist pedagogy, school culture, and personalised learning as separate constructs, lacking integrated models explaining their combined effect on value development.
5. Most studies are cross-sectional or descriptive; longitudinal, quasi-experimental, or modeltesting studies are rare in value education.
6. Limited research exists on value development models that reflect diverse socio-cultural realities, especially in non-Western and Indian school contexts.

3. Justification for the Present Study

The study proposes the SPV Constructivist Model, combining School Culture (S), Personalised Learning (P), and Value Development (V) within a constructivist framework. It explains how values

© Eurasian Campus - Sri Lanka 2026, All Rights Reserved

develop through interactions, learner agency, and meaning-making.

3.1. Conceptual Framework and Model Description

Table 1: Conceptual Structure of the SPV Constructivist Model

Component	Dimension	Operational Definition	Key Indicators	Expected Outcomes
S – School Culture	Relational Trust	Quality of teacher–student and peer relationships is characterised by respect, care, and emotional safety	Mutual respect, peer support, teacher empathy	Empathy, respect
	Fairness & Justice	Transparent rules, restorative discipline, and ethical consistency	Equal treatment, restorative practices	Integrity, responsibility
	Student Voice	Student participation in classroom and schoollevel decision-making	Leadership roles, open forums	Agency, civic values
	Inclusion & Belonging	Sense of acceptance irrespective of gender, caste, ability, or background	Diversity acceptance, cooperative learning	Social harmony
	Ethical Leadership	Teachers and leaders as moral role models	Value-based actions	Value internalization
	Home–Community Linkage	Alignment between the school and community values practices	Service learning, parent involvement	Civic responsibility
P – Personalised Learning	Voice & Choice	Learners select tasks aligned with interests and values	Learning menus, project options	Autonomy
	Goal Setting	Personal academic + moral goals	SMART goals	Responsibility
	Mentoring	Individual guidance and reflection	Coaching sessions	Self-awareness
	Flexible Pathways	Differentiated tasks and pacing	Tiered activities	Inclusion
	Reflective Portfolios	Value-based artifacts and reflections	Journals, selfreports	Moral reasoning
V – Value Development	Moral Cognition	Understanding of values	Scenario responses	Ethical judgment
	Moral Affect	Emotional engagement with values	Empathy scales	Compassion

© Eurasian Campus - Sri Lanka 2026, All Rights Reserved

	Moral Behavior	Observable valuedriven actions	Peer reports	Responsible conduct

Table 1 shows the structure of the SPV Constructivist Model, comprising three interconnected components: School Culture, Personalised Learning, and Value Development. Each has defined dimensions, indicators, and measurement outcomes. School Culture reflects the school's ethos, focusing on trust, fairness, student voice, inclusion, ethical leadership, and community ties, shaping students' moral perceptions and norms. Personalised Learning emphasises learner agency, mentoring, flexible pathways, and reflection, promoting internalised values over superficial morals. Value Development involves observable outcomes across cognitive, affective, and behavioural areas. This model indicates that value development results from the interaction of contextual, pedagogical, and psychological factors.

Table 2: Constructivist Pedagogical Cycle Embedded in SPV Model

Phase	Description	Teacher Role	Student Role	Evidence Generated
Experience	Real-life dilemmas, stories, service tasks	Facilitator	Active participant	Observation notes
Dialogue	Group discussion and moral reasoning	Moderator	Co-constructor	Discussion logs
Reflection	Personal meaning-making	Coach	Reflector	Journals
Action	Value-based behavior	Encourager	Practitioner	Behavior records
Evidence	Portfolio compilation	Assessor	Self-evaluator	Artifacts

Table 2 shows the constructivist pedagogical cycle that implements the SPV model at the classroom level. Based on experiential and reflective learning, it emphasises the construction of values rather than their transmission. The cycle moves from experience to dialogue, reflection, action, and evidence, promoting active engagement, social meaning negotiation, and internalisation through real-world application. The teacher shifts from instructor to facilitator and mentor, while students co-construct moral understanding. Multiple evidence forms, like journals and behavioural records, enable assessment triangulation. This cycle embeds value development into everyday practice, ensuring its sustainability beyond isolated moral lessons.

Table 3: Expert Validation Protocol

Step	Purpose	Method	Output
Expert Selection	Content credibility	10–15 experts in education, psychology, values, measurement	Panel list

© Eurasian Campus - Sri Lanka 2026, All Rights Reserved

Round 1 Review	Content relevance	Delphi open-ended feedback	Revised items
Rating	Essentiality judgment	3-point scale: Essential / Useful / Not necessary	Rating matrix
CVR Computation	Content validity	Lawshe's formula: CVR = (Ne − N/2) / (N/2)	Item-wise CVR
CVI Estimation	Scale validity	I-CVI, S-CVI	Retained dimensions
Round 2 Review	Consensus	Delphi rerating	Final model

Table 3 details the expert validation protocol used to establish the content validity and robustness of the SPV Constructivist Model. A multi-step Delphi approach allows iterative refinement of constructs and indicators. Expert selection emphasises interdisciplinary representation to encompass pedagogical, psychological, and cultural views. The essentiality judgment process follows Lawshe's methodology, keeping only indispensable elements. This protocol enhances the model's scientific credibility and reduces construct ambiguity. Including CVR and CVI improves scale coherence and internal consistency. Overall, this process ensures the SPV model is not just conceptual but empirically sound.

4. Procedure for Expert Selection, Validation, and Analysis

The SPV Constructivist Model was validated through expert review to assess content, clarity, and context. Because the goal was to evaluate its theoretical and practical validity rather than statistical generalisation, purposive sampling was used. This method is common in content validation, emphasising expertise over random sampling.

Experts were selected based on clear criteria, including at least 5 years of experience in educationrelated fields, a doctoral degree or a senior position, or a strong research background. Only those willing to participate in multiple review rounds were included to ensure continuity.

Fifteen experts, including educators, psychologists, leaders, and assessment specialists, formed the validation panel, aligning with Lawshe's CVR recommendation of 8- 10 experts. This diverse group minimised bias and enabled a comprehensive evaluation of the SPV model from multiple perspectives.

The validation used a two-round Delphi technique combined with Lawshe's CVR method. The Delphi approach was chosen to facilitate structured, anonymous communication among experts, reducing bias and promoting independent judgment. In the first round, experts received a detailed description of the SPV model, its framework, constructs, dimensions, and indicators. They evaluated clarity, coherence, grounding, and relevance, and provided open feedback on redundancy, ambiguity, missing parts, and applicability.

Responses from the first round were subjected to thematic analysis. Suggestions were examined, and revisions were made by clarifying ambiguous terms, merging overlapping constructs, and refining indicators for precision. Context-specific examples improved interpretability, ensuring the model was rigorous, understandable, and practical for real schools.

The second validation round used Lawshe's three-point scale: "Essential," "Useful but not essential," and "Not necessary." Experts judged whether each construct was vital for showing how school culture and personalised learning interact. This step was key because it had

© Eurasian Campus - Sri Lanka 2026, All Rights Reserved

experts differentiate between appealing ideas and truly necessary elements for the model.

The Content Validity Ratio (CVR) for each construct was determined using Lawshe's formula: CVR = (Ne – N/2) / (N/2), where Ne is the number of experts who classified the item as essential, and N is the total number of experts. CVR values range from −1 to +1, with higher positive scores indicating stronger expert consensus. These CVR values were then compared with the critical thresholds suggested for a panel of fifteen experts. Constructs that met or exceeded the threshold were kept, those slightly below were revised, and those well below were considered for removal.

In addition to CVR, the Content Validity Index (CVI) was calculated to assess the model's overall coherence. The Item-Level CVI (I-CVI) indicates the proportion of experts who found an item relevant, whereas the Scale-Level CVI (S-CVI) is the average of all I-CVI scores. Together, these indices offer a comprehensive assessment of the SPV model's representativeness and conceptual consistency.

Validation decisions combined quantitative results, such as CVR and CVI, with expert qualitative feedback. Constructs with borderline CVR weren't dismissed if deemed important by experts; instead, they were revised for clarity and relevance. This mixed-method approach ensured statistical validity and contextual accuracy.

The validation process led to a refined SPV Constructivist Model with clearly defined constructs, more robust operational definitions, and better alignment with classroom realities. Redundant and ambiguous elements were removed or restructured to avoid construct inflation. This careful, expert-led validation guarantees that the SPV model is not only conceptually sound but also empirically justified, educationally meaningful, and practically feasible.

Table 4: Lawshe's Content Validity Ratio (CVR) Format

Item No.	Construct	Ne (Essential)	N (Total Experts)	CVR	Decision
1	Student Voice	12	15	0.60	Retain
2	Reflective Journaling	14	15	0.87	Retain
3	Service Learning	9	15	0.20	Revise

Table 4 details how to establish content validity for each SPV model construct. It calculates CVR for each item, keeping only expert-endorsed components. Decision rules (retain, revise, discard) ensure transparency and prevent construct inflation, confirming each dimension's relevance. CVR decisions enhance the psychometric quality of the instruments for educational research and school use.

Table 5: Instruments Developed Under SPV Model

Tool Name	Purpose	Respondents	Domains	Scale Type
School Culture for Values Index (SCVI)	Measure culture	Students, teachers	Trust, fairness, inclusion	Likert 5point
Personalised Learning for Values Rubric (PLVR)	Classroom observation	Teachers	Voice, mentoring, choice	4-point rubric
Value Portfolio (VDP)	Behavioral evidence	Students	Reflection, action	Artifactbased
SPV Fidelity Checklist	Implementation check	Coordinators	Cycles, mentoring, rituals	Yes/No

Table 5 illustrates tools for the SPV Constructivist Model across levels: institutional (SCVI), classroom (PLVR), student (VDP), and system (SPV Fidelity Checklist). This multi-instrument approach addresses single-source measurement issues by combining self-reports, teacher observations, and artefact-based evidence, enabling triangulation and increasing reliability. It shifts assessment from abstract values to

© Eurasian Campus - Sri Lanka 2026, All Rights Reserved

observable moral actions through behavioural and reflective evidence.

Table 6: 12-Week SPV School Implementation Plan

Phase	Weeks	Activities	Stake holders	Outputs
Orientation	1–2	Training, baseline assessment	Teachers, students	Pretest data
Classroom Cycles	3–8	Weekly constructivist value cycles	Teachers, mentors	Portfolios
Culture Activation	9–10	Assemblies, peer mediation	Student leaders	Culture evidence
Evaluation	11–12	Posttest, exhibition	All	Impact report

Table 6 presents a phased, time-bound plan for implementing the SPV model in schools. It progressively builds capacity, reduces resistance, and maintains fidelity. The orientation phase establishes clarity and baseline data; the classroom cycle embeds values into daily learning; the culture activation extends these into rituals and peer practices; and the evaluation phase ensures accountability and refinement. This framework makes the SPV model scalable and adaptable across various educational settings.

5. Research Gaps Addressed by SPV Model

The SPV Constructivist Model fills gaps in existing literature by offering a comprehensive, learner-centred framework that integrates school culture and constructivist pedagogy to reconceptualise value development as systemic. This enhances its relevance and necessity for modern education research.

6. Findings

The present study aimed to conceptualise, validate, and operationalise the SPV Constructivist Model for fostering value development through school culture and personalised learning. The findings are organised under four major themes.

1. Expert validation with the Lawshe CVR method showed strong agreement on the core constructs of the SPV model. Dimensions like relational trust, student voice, inclusion, mentoring, reflective practices, and moral behaviour had CVR values above the threshold, supporting their inclusion. This indicates that the SPV components are theoretically sound, relevant, and pedagogically meaningful.
2. Pilot implementation showed the SPV model is feasible within existing school structures. Teachers found constructivist cycles (experience–dialogue–reflection–action–evidence) compatible with routines. School leaders noted that culture-focused strategies such as student-led assemblies, restorative circles, and mentoring could be implemented without major infrastructure changes.
3. Analysis of portfolio evidence, teacher observations, and student reflections indicated enhancements in students' empathy, responsibility, cooperation, and self-regulation. Unlike conventional value education methods that rely on declarative moral knowledge, the SPV model enabled students to demonstrate their values through tangible behaviours and reflective stories.
4. The integration of school culture, personalised learning, and constructivist pedagogy fostered systemic coherence. Instead of isolated interventions, the SPV model aligned institutional practices, classroom strategies, and learner experiences towards a shared values development agenda.

7. Discussion

This study supports the idea that value development is socially constructed, context-dependent, and experience-mediated. The SPV Constructivist Model emphasises that school culture and personalised learning are key for moral internalisation, beyond just curriculum. Values are best fostered through daily practices, relationships, and student agency, aligning with constructivist views of meaning-making through experience. The model redefines personalised learning as a moral process in which student voice, choice, and mentoring promote responsibility, empathy, and ethics, thereby broadening the scope of research. Using multiple evidence sources, such as portfolios, observations, and reflections, improves

© Eurasian Campus - Sri Lanka 2026, All Rights Reserved

methodological rigour and validity by reducing reliance on self-reports. Overall, it shifts value education from a subject to a systemic, relational, and experiential process.

8. Limitations

Despite its strengths, the current study has limitations. First, validation primarily relied on expert judgment, which, while systematic, can be biased. Including a diverse panel with policymakers and parents could improve validity. Second, the pilot was limited in duration; value development is longitudinal, and short-term interventions may not capture the true depth of moral internalisation. Third, the study was conducted in a few school settings; cultural and socioeconomic factors may affect applicability elsewhere. Fourth, while the SPV model includes behavioural evidence, some value dimensions, such as moral identity and internal ethical conflict, are hard to measure objectively. Fifth, the quasi-experimental design limits causal certainty compared to randomised trials.

9. Further Scope for Modification and Extension

The SPV Constructivist Model is a flexible framework with multiple future development paths:

1. Tailoring to specific socio-cultural contexts like rural, multilingual, tribal, or inclusive settings with context-sensitive indicators.
2. Incorporating digital portfolios, AI-supported mentoring, and analytics dashboards for personalisation, monitoring, and scalability.
3. Conducting long-term studies over multiple academic years to assess the sustainability of value internalisation and identity.
4. Integrating parents, community leaders, and organizations into the value ecosystem to create moral learning communities.
5. Adapting the model for teacher training, accreditation, and policy integration.
6. Using CFA, SEM, and IRT to improve the statistical robustness of instruments.

10. Conclusion

The study proposed and validated the SPV Constructivist Model as a framework for promoting value development through the interaction of school culture and personalised learning. Based on constructivist principles, it sees value education as a systemic, relational, and experiential process embedded in daily school life, integrating school culture, personalised learning, and moral competencies for a comprehensive approach to ethical and character education.

The validation process confirmed the model's robustness and relevance, ensuring each dimension has pedagogical and psychological significance. Its focus on multi-source evidence through portfolios, behavioural indicators, and observations addresses concerns in value education research, which often depends on self-reports. This enhances the model's credibility and applicability.

The SPV framework redefines personalised learning as a moral and social process, emphasising student voice, agency, mentoring, and reflection to promote values like responsibility, empathy, and integrity. It treats school culture as central, highlighting trust, fairness, inclusion, and ethical leadership as key to shaping students' moral identities.

The SPV model offers schools a ready-to-use structure that aligns value education with routines, leadership, and pedagogy. Its phased approach, fidelity tools, and adaptable indicators suit various educational contexts. It bridges theory and practice, providing a replicable, context-sensitive solution to challenges in moral and civic education.

The SPV Constructivist Model shifts value education from moral transmission to participatory, context-based moral learning. Embedding values in learners' experiences and school culture, it aims to develop ethically grounded, socially responsible citizens. Future research can refine and expand this framework to enhance holistic, humane education.

© Eurasian Campus - Sri Lanka 2026, All Rights Reserved

11. Acknowledgements:
We are grateful and thankful to all the faculty members and research scholars of Department of Education, Doctor Harisingh Gour Vishwavidyalaya (A Central University), Sagar, Madhya Pradesh, India.

References

Alam, M. (2024). Integrating value education for holistic development: Insights from NEP 2020. ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts. Retrieved from:https://www.granthaalayahpublication.org/Arts-

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action. Prentice Hall.

Berkowitz, M. W., & Bier, M. C. (2005). What works in character education. Character Education Partnership.

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). Trust in schools. Russell Sage Foundation.

Chand, S. P. (2023). Constructivism in education: Exploring the contributions of Piaget, Vygotsky, and Bruner. International Journal of Science and Research(IJSR).https://www.researchgate.net/publication/378071316_Constructivism_in_Education_Exploring_the_Contributions_of_Piaget_Vygotsky_and_Bruner

Constructivism Learning Theory. (2025, March 31). Simply Psychology. Retrieved from https://www.simplypsychology.org/constructivism.html

Darling-Hammond, L., et al. (2020). Preparing teachers for deeper learning. Harvard Education Press.

Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (2016). Shaping school culture. Jossey-Bass.

Eisenberg, N., Spinrad, T. L., & Knafo-Noam, A. (2015). Prosocial development.

Fielding, M. (2012). Leadership, radical student engagement and the necessity for personcentred education. International Journal of Leadership in Education, 15(1), 3–20.

Fullan, M. (2014). The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact. Jossey-Bass.

Gamage, K. A. A. (2021). The role of personal values in learning approaches and outcomes. Frontiers in Psychology. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8301052/

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice. Harvard University Press.

Habermas, J. (1984). The theory of communicative action. Beacon Press.

Handbook of Child Psychology, 6, 610–656.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2009). An educational psychology success story. Educational Researcher, 38(5), 365–379. Journal/ShodhKosh/article/download/3081/2809/18909

Kohlberg, L. (1981). The philosophy of moral development. Harper & Row.

Mötteli, C., Grob, U., Pauli, C., & Reusser, K. (2023). The influence of personalized learning on the development of learning enjoyment. International Journal of Educational Research Open. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2023.100271

Nucci, L. (2017). Character education in schools. Cambridge University Press.

OECD. (2018). Social and emotional skills for student success. OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2019). OECD Learning Compass 2030. OECD Publishing.

Pane, J. F., et al. (2017). Informing progress: Insights on personalized learning. RAND Corporation.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination theory. Guilford Press.

Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. (2013). A review of school climate research. Review of Educational Research, 83(3), 357–385.

Thornberg, R. (2008). The lack of professional knowledge in values education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 24(7), 1791–1798.

© Eurasian Campus - Sri Lanka 2026, All Rights Reserved