Varieties of Character Education and the Moral Formation of Persons

Daniel Lapsley

University of Notre Dame

Contact Information
Department of Psychology
390 Corbett Family Hall
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame IN 46556
Email: danlapsley@nd.edu
Ph: +1 574-631-1264

Abstract

One of the remarkable features of character education research over the past two decades is the extensive interdisciplinary dialogue that has taken place across the "mending wall" that divides the philosophical and empirical wings of moral psychology. How to insure empirically responsible moral philosophy and philosophically responsible moral psychology is an exciting prospect. In these remarks I propose a fourfold-fold typology to organize the many ways character education has been understood over the years. First, Best Practice mobilizes the educational psychology literatures of constructivist learning, academic press and communal organization of schools to guide the formation of Good Learners. Second, Risk Reduction Models have driven research about the best way to reduce or prevent risk behavior, sometimes considered evidence of "bad character." Third, Positive Psychology and positive youth development emphasizes character strengths and social-emotional skills. Finally, Intentional Moral-Character Education transforms the Fortified Good Learner into a Moral Self. I make the case for considering the moral self as the aim of education, discuss new ways of understanding self-identity and how it relates to *phronesis*, and conclude with a challenge to the next decade of research to seek meaningful integration between virtue psychology and character education with the educational psychology and learning science literatures on metacognition, given the metacognitive functions of phronesis.

Varieties of Character Education and the Moral Formation of Persons

Introduction

I am just delighted to be with you at Oriel College to celebrate the anniversary of the remarkable Jubilee Center; and for this invitation to speak I am just endlessly grateful and not a little humbled, to be honest.

Back in July, at the annual meeting of the Association for Moral Education held in Manchester, a meeting that was superbly organized by Kristjan Kristjansson, and where Liz Gulliford, Andrew Peterson, and Shane McLouglin gave very excellent presentations, ---there I remarked that everyone in AME and indeed in the entire field of moral-character education and moral psychology, owes a huge debt of gratitude to the indefatigable work of the Jubilee Center.

In addition to James Arthur's own important writings on character education, his founding of the Jubilee Center in 2012 has quite simply galvanized the study of character ethics, character psychology and education. These fields now include a vast interdisciplinary and international coalition of philosophers, social scientists and educators that might not have coalesced around the problematic explored by the Center were it not for its leadership, the talent it has attracted, and the enduring impact of both its scholarly products and the pedagogical resources made available to educators.

There are other useful perspectives I could mention, ---well let me mention them -- character.org's "Eleven Principles of Effective Character Education, "Marvin Berkowitz's 6 design principles he calls "PRIMED", Tom Lickona and Matt Davidson's "Smart and Good

High Schools," to name three, and there are others --- from where I stand there is no better guidepost to the contemporary **Renaissance of Character** than the *Jubilee Center Framework for Character Education in Schools*. This Framework, along with the very many policy statements, research briefs, articles and chapters and books that emanate from the Center has brought character education in from the cold and returned to education its half-forgotten language of virtue and moral formation.

Taking Stock

It is perhaps fitting at an anniversary to take stock on where we are as a field, and how we got here. So I would like to take a backward glance over where character education has been over the last few decades or so, to identify its varieties and forms, if only to illustrate by comparison the singular achievement of the Center.

As one surveys the landscape at least four possible ways of talking about character education becomes evident. One option I will call "Best Practice" as it treats character education as an outcome of good education generally, one that is grounded by empirically supported best instructional practice.

The second option is driven by "Risk Reduction Models" that includes psychosocial prevention, intervention and health promotion programs that cover a wide range of purposes. These are sometimes considered examples of character education to the extent they drive down or prevent problematic behavior that is otherwise thought to have its source in "bad character."

The third option is a large eclectic bucket of things that I am calling the Positive Psychology option. This would include the character strengths movement but many other things besides, including other so called non-cognitive variables like grit, and social-emotional learning, which some have called "positive psychology in the classroom."

The fourth option is "Intentional Moral Character Education" which is best illustrated by the work of the Jubilee Center ---it treats some conception of morality, virtue or character as the explicit target of instruction or intervention, as an independent variable, as it were, or the lever of change in a logic model.

Some of these options are not entirely antithetical or mutually exclusive and the convergence among them are worth pointing out. What is shared in common is a commitment to best practice instruction as the basis for moral-character education; an emphasis on school ethos and relationships; on the realization that good education requires something else in addition to mastering lesson plans. So, when one compares the 6 design principles of PRIMED and the 11 principles of character.org, for example, there will be notable points of convergence with each other and with some elements of the Jubilee Framework.

The four approaches differ, as we will see, on how explicit is the commitment to developing moral dispositions as the "treatment" or aim of education. As I conclude my remarks I will want to say something about the moral self as the aim of moral-character education, and the challenges of folding all of this into a teacher training and research agenda, and I will end with a prophetic suggestion for the next ten years.

Four Options for Moral-Character Education

So let's have a look at the four options for MC-education, beginning with Best Practice.

Best Practice

On this option character education is an outcome of best practice instruction. Teachers attend to the moral formation of pupils when they engage in teacher practices that maximize opportunities for student learning. Marvin Berkowitz argues, for example, that character education is just good education. This is the default stance of many schools and, indeed, there is some reason for optimism that student moral-character formation can be advanced by well-attested teacher practices. This can be illustrated in a number of ways.

For example, a generation of research has shown that effective schools have two crucial characteristics: academic press and a communitarian ethos. Academic press describes a school culture where teachers, students and administrators are motivated by achievement goals. These goals come to exert a normative authority that socializes the behavior, norms and values of a school community. The school-wide press for academic excellence involves high expectations for achievement, rigorous core curriculum, minimal tracking, and teachers who offer encouragement, constructive feedback and attention to student work. But academic press is not enough.

A communitarian ethos points to a way of organizing schools that facilitate the creation of strong emotional bonds between students and teachers and relational trust among professional staff.

Teachers take collective responsibility for student learning and see themselves as responsible for the development of the whole child and not just for their academic outcomes

Indeed, a strong sense of personal belonging strengthens students' academic tenacity, an effect that might be particularly crucial for ethno-racial minority students. Not surprisingly, students in communally-organized schools with strong academic press show a range of positive academic and behavioral outcomes that character educators might want to claim.

But is this character education? A case can be made that it is, or at least it is hard to imagine successful character education without these features. Certainly, the learning sciences emphasize the importance of communal organization of schools, social belonging, academic press and cognitive-mediational theories of learning and instruction, and these are targets of preservice teacher formation (or should be). If character education is just good education, then preservice teachers and school leaders who are trained in these matters are also learning how to direct students' behavioral outcomes towards desirable ends; and these ends will also be those associated with good character.

My confidence is saying this resides in the fact that these topics also align with principles of effective character education as promulgated by character.org. For example, Principle 6 insists that effective character education *"includes a meaningful and challenging academic curriculum that respects all learners."* It calls for differentiated instruction, the development of thinking strategies and the minimization of external rewards to sustain motivation This latter point that stresses the importance of intrinsic motivation and avoiding external motivation is also a design

principle in Berkowitz's PRIMED model. So both Principle 6 and PRIMED affirms that character education requires academic press.

Other character.org principles cover the rest of the bases. Principle 2 ("*defines character comprehensively to include thinking, feeling and doing"*) endorses the cognitive-mediational perspective of constructivist learning. Principle 3 urges a "*Uses a comprehensive, intentional, proactive and effective approach to character development"* ---but what this turns out to be after unpacking the guidebook is to encourage teachers to have high expectations, to develop a sense of community by giving students "voice-and-choice" and a chance to shape group norms. All good teachers know this.

Principle 4 ("*Creates a caring school community"*) explicitly addresses the communitarian ethos that characterizes good schools. Principle 7 ("*strives to foster students' self-motivation"*) endorses fostering intrinsic motivation to do well on academic tasks by encouraging growth and learning mindsets; and intrinsic motivation to do the right thing by building a climate of trust and respect, by encouraging autonomy, by building shared norms through class meetings and shared decision-making. One would find these themes as well in some of the PRIMED design principles. We find them in the Jubilee framework, and they are vouchsafed by research on the developmental needs of adolescents and the conditions that meet basic psychological needs.

In short, the Best Practice approach endorses a set of well-attested pedagogical strategies that are considered best practice for teachers and school leaders. Moreover, it has the added virtue, if it is a virtue, of requiring no significant alteration of pre-service teacher training (provided that

training is already of high quality). Indeed, my spouse Darcia Narvaez and I have suggested

somewhere (2008, p. 158) that the "knowledge base that supports best practice instruction is

coterminous with what is known to influence the moral formation of students."

However, the problem with the Best Practice approach, if it is a problem, is that while it

foregrounds best instructional and educational practice, it *backgrounds* intentional values

education, thereby remanding moral-character education to the hidden curriculum. Maybe this is

not a big deal if the hidden curriculum is just an example of character *being caught* rather than

taught, -- but it is a worry if what is hidden cannot be effectively cultivated or instructed; or if

this is all that moral-character education amounts to, which is certainly not the case with the

Jubilee Framework.

That said, and once again, it is difficult to see how intentional moral-character education can be

effective unless it trades on the core insights of the education sciences. Moreover, many of the

instructional practices that support academic achievement and a sense of a belonging also

mobilize the dispositional resources of children that contribute to academic tenacity and

prosocial behavior.

Hence an effective moral educator must first be an effective educator; and then come to learn the

pedagogical content knowledge specific to moral-character education. More on this later.

One more point on Best Practice: As I just noted, this is probably the default position of teacher

education programs, at least in the United States, and it is lamentable. For 8 years I chaired a

department of educational psychology in a school of education at a state university that had a

robust teacher's college, and the only place where preservice teachers learned about moral development or character education was when it was smuggled into a course on developmental or educational psychology, and usually just in the courses that I taught.

Moreover, teacher professional standards required for program accreditation and teacher licensure insisted that teachers must understand "*how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional and physical areas and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences*" (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2011, p. 8).

But one topic is omitted from the usual catalogue of core teacher knowledge. In contrast to cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional and physical areas, the language of values, character and morality is notably absent. One looks in vain for accreditation standards that compel teacher formation programs to prepare teachers to take up the moral work of teaching. Teacher licensure does not require it. The moral-character formation of children is the instructional objective that dare not speak its name. That the moral work of teaching carries on, at least to some degree, using the tools of best practice pedagogy is not nothing, but it's not all that it can be, and students deserve better.

Risk Reduction Models

This second approach ---what I am calling Risk Reduction Models--differs from Best Practice in two ways. First, it requires intentional implementation of a program or curriculum that is ostensibly non-academic. There is something else to teach in addition to the academic lesson-

plan (although it can often be integrated with the academic lesson plan). Something else is targeted other than student learning of academic subjects. Second, it evinces more explicit concern with outcomes of interest to what I will call traditional character education that was regnant a few decades ago. Let's begin on this latter point.

The traditional character education movement that was ascendant in the latter decades of the 20th-century was under the impression that morality, values and character were somehow expunged from public schools; and therefore, a case has to be made for its reintroduction. The case was made by pointing to the general rot they found in youth who are unschooled, apparently, in matters of values and character.

 A "litany of alarm" (Arthur, 2005) was rehearsed --- almost always in chapter 2 of the many books of this period --- that drew attention to troubling epidemiological trends in youth disorder, such as poor academic achievement, rising drop-out rates, the incidence of premarital sex and teen pregnancy, substance use by adolescents, bullying, victimization and violence, delinquency, suicidal behavior, even showing disrespect and using bad language Why do teenagers do these things, it was asked, why are they so dysfunctional? Because they lack moral character was the inevitable answer, and the reason they lack moral character is because it is no longer taught in school; or maybe because God and prayer were also banished.

The claim, then, was that teenagers engage in risk behavior because schools abandoned their mission to form the moral character of students.

Robert Nash, in his book "**Answering the Virtuecrats**," called this genre of writing on character the "cultural declinist" perspective. It asserted an empirical relationship between the neglect or abandonment of intentional moral instruction or character education and the rise of youth disorder and youth immorality, and the general decline of culture.

Consequently, any program or intervention that sought to drive down these trends by discouraging substance use or sexual activity, or by preventing violence or improving social skills or school persistence, and the like, would qualify as a moral-character education program. Similarly, anything that strengthens protective mechanisms for children exposed to psychosocial hazards would also count for moral-character education if the outcome minimizes risk behavior.

I will give an example of this in a moment, but first I want to address the question that is begged: was it ever true that morality or even character education was expunged from American schools? In their book *Moral Matters* Barbara Stengel and Alan Tom argue that moral language in fact is immanent-and-inevitable within schools just because it articulates concerns about *right relationship* and that which is *worth doing*, and these concerns are pervasive and ubiquitous in classrooms. Moral considerations are woven deeply into the fabric of the school day, from decisions about topics to select or exclude, in how groups are formed, how discipline in handled, in the demand for excellence, for honesty, and respect for truth, in the relational qualities of students and teachers, and what it means to develop.

I've adapted some of their examples to reflect characters from The Simpsons cartoon for some reason (I hope The Simpsons is on television over here!)

- "I am happy to see Bart and Milhaus are sitting quietly, ready to begin math lessons

- "Mrs Krabapple, Nelson is pulling my hair"

- "Boys and girls, this is a wonderful story about friendship, isn't it?"

- "We have a problem. A calculator has gone missing…

- "Why did the settlers treat the Indians that way?"

- "Please show respect by listening carefully"

- "Whose responsibility is it to clean up the lab?"

This is moral language, in their view, because it implicates right relationship and what is worth doing. It is inescapable, immanent and embedded in the daily life and practice of schools. It is so pervasive that one hardly notices it. It is "hidden" because it is common and in plain sight. But is *has never been absent from schools*.

Now back to my example of risk reduction models of character education.

The Social and Character Development (SACD) research program jointly initiated by the Institute for Educational Sciences, which is a Federal agency in the United States, and the Division of Violence Prevention (Centers for Disease Control) illustrates the point.

The SACD research program was an attempt to systematically evaluate seven universal school-based programs that promise to reduce or prevent aggression and violence-related youth problem behavior, improve school climate, and promote positive social development and academic outcomes. The seven programs had diverse objectives and included a wide range of strategies, including but not limited to values clarification, social skills training, and behavior management and for the sake of simplicity were called "social and character development."

Under this heading of risk reduction, I want to focus on the programs aimed at reducing

aggression and violence-related behaviors, but also reduction of other risks, too, such as

substance use and sexual activity. It strikes me that the considerations of values, morality or

virtues are irrelevant to the design of these programs. These are better understood, in my opinion,

by the risk-and-resilience literatures of developmental psychopathology. If these programs do

attempt to promote positive social development, and some of them do, the language of values

and virtues is also vanishingly rare, and this will be seen more clearly in my third Positive

Psychology option coming next.

My major point is that the nomenclature is sufficiently flexible to encompass many good causes

that have little to do with ethical conceptions of virtue, morality or values, so long as proper

outcomes are the result.

Positive Psychology Models

This brings us to "Positive Psychology Models." In addition to public health or risk reduction

models that aim to improve the resilience of children exposed to risk factors, there is also a

concern with promoting positive outcomes for all children (and not just for those at-risk).

The PYD movement really took off in the 1990s as a counter-weight to the dominant risk-and-

resilience perspective associated with developmental psychopathology. It came with a motto.

The motto of the positive youth development movement is *problem free is not fully prepared*.

Just because children and youth are not exposed to psychosocial hazards, just because they do

not carry risk factors, --- does not mean that they possess the competencies required to get on in

life. There is more work to do after issues of risk-and-protection are addressed. Diverting youth

from violence-related problems or using illegal substances or engaging in premarital sex is one thing, but building competencies is another goal entirely.

This is where (what I am calling the) positive psychology option steps in, and prominent examples include the work of the Seattle Social Development model, social-emotional learning and the character strengths approach. Let me focus on just the latter two examples: SEL and character strengths.

Social-emotional learning is the process of acquiring a suite of skills that allow children and youth to recognize and manage emotions, accurately process social cues, set and achieve goals, manage interpersonal relationships, and make responsible decisions. The core SEL competencies include *self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills*, and *responsible decision-making*. Building social-emotional literacy like this has been called "positive psychology in the classroom," as I noted earlier, and a 2011 meta-analysis of SEL programs showed marked success with respect to increasing prosocial behavior and academic achievement, as well as reducing conduct problems and internalizing symptoms; and advocates of SEL make a good case for considering SEL a kind of character education.

The recent interest in character strengths is another example of positive psychology in the classroom. As is well-known, Peterson and Seligman (2004) identified 24-character strengths that are assigned to one of six universal virtues (*Wisdom, Courage, Humanity, Justice, Temperance, Transcendence*). Empirical evaluations of character strengths-based interventions

are now showing up in the literature with great frequency, and research continues apace on the Values in Action assessment of these character strengths and virtues.

This is too big a topic to concern me here, except to say that while psychological research on character strengths and their assessment will grind on, there are significant philosophical reservations about positive psychology generally; and about character strengths particularly, with Kristjan Kristjansson leading the way most effectively on both counts. With respect to positive psychology, for example, its conceptualization of flourishing and wisdom falls short of the neo-Aristotelian mark; with respect to character strengths – well, some of the character strengths seem to conflict with each other, some are misclassified under the wrong general virtue; how strengths and virtues are related is under-specified; it is absent a conception of practical wisdom required to balance and adjudicate the application of virtues when they do conflict; and it is absent a notion of motivation.

I should probably mention Angela Duckworth's "grit" construct in this context if only to make another point. Grit is defined as trait-level perseverance and passion for long-term goals in spite of challenges and set back. It has also generated a boatload of research, and I mention it here just to say that it shows up on the character report card that is drawn up for each pupil in the influential and well-known KIPP network of charter schools in the United States [KIPP stands for "Knowledge is Power Program"). The KIPP character report card includes ratings for *zest, grit, two forms of self-control (school work, interpersonal), optimism, gratitude, social intelligence,* and *curiosity)*. Just like the VIA list (*wisdom, courage, humanity, justice,*

temperance, transcendence) one might have to work a little harder to find responsible alignment with virtue theory.

In addition to SEl, character strengths, and grit, I might add under this third option the very many things that Marvin Berkowitz and Melinda Bier identify as "what works" in character education They identified 12 recommended and 18 promising practices, and these included things like problem-solving, health education, social skills, life skills, citizenship education, service learning, anti-bullying, conflict resolution, peacemaking, developmental assets, and the like. But they also noted that the term character or virtue was not used to describe program intentions or objectives; very few thought of their program as involving notions of virtue, character or morality. But they were deemed instances of moral or character education all the same because "they are all school based endeavors designed to foster positive development" (Berkowitz & Bier, 2004, p. 5).

One more example: In her study of the character education practices of 350 Blue Ribbon schools, Madonna Murphy reported a wide range of practices, including self-esteem programs, general guidance counseling, drug education, citizenship training, and conflict management.
However, in only 11% of schools was there explicit mention of any program called "character education."

Well Marvin and Madonna are probably right about this. Maybe this very broad conception of character education is just fine and defensible. But in our 2006 review of character education in the *Handbook of Child Development,* Darcia and I commented that by this criterion it would be

difficult to imagine what would *not* count as character education or what would be excluded from its purview.

We argued then that if character education is all of these things, and if the success of character education is parasitic on the success of any well-designed intervention or prevention program, then the singularity of character education as a distinctive educational objective or pedagogy, with unique curricular and programmatic features, appears to vanish.

Indeed, it would seem paradoxical that the manner in which the case has been made for character education actually results in its disappearance as a distinctive educational objective in its own right. If the case is made on the basis of disturbing trends in the epidemiology of adolescent risk behavior, as do the Risk Reduction Models, then it bids one to look for the success of character education in the diminution of this behavior. But then character education becomes any program that has a positive outcome with respect to adolescent risk behavior---or any positive outcome at all, as under the Positive Psychology options. It becomes a catalogue of psychosocial intervention, promotion and prevention programs whose objectives are framed by reference to an entirely different set of theoretical literatures that make no reference to morality, virtue or character. Moreover, there is little reason to appeal to character education, or use the language of moral valuation, to understand the etiology of risk behavior, or how best to prevent or ameliorate exposure to risk or promote resilience and adjustment.

And now we come to the fourth option:

Intentional Moral-Character Education

What if character education is defined not expansively but narrowly; and not in terms of outcomes but in terms of *treatment,* what would that look like? In addition to commitments to

instructional best practice and academic press, in addition to teacher practices that support social belonging and character strengths and social-emotional skills, Intentional Moral-Character Education would be infused with the language of moral valuation. It would have an explicit theory of action whose objective is to influence the moral formation of children.

Remember the motto of positive youth development ---*problem free is not fully prepared* --that motto would have to be amended under Intentional MC Education. In our 2006 Handbook chapter Darcia and I thought we would do the honors of amending the motto so we proposed the following: "*problem free is not fully prepared ---but fully prepared is not morally adept."* See what we did there? Well no one else did either! We were hoping it would catch on ---*it didn't* ---but we still stand by its implication that there is still more work to do by way of moral formation after reducing risk behavior, developing competencies, social-emotional skills, and building character strengths.

In fact, we all want children and adolescents to be learned (Best Practice), free of significant problems (Risk Reduction), with both muscular character strengths and a suite of social-emotional skills (Positive Psychology).

But we also want them to have a moral compass, to be conversant with ethical issues and most of all to become a person of a certain kind, a person who *cares about morality* as a second-order desire, who appeals to morality to bring order to the priorities of one's life. The caring about morality theme is central to the notion of moral self-identity which has been an abiding interest of mine.

Philosopher and Templeton Prize winner Charles Taylor (1989, p. 112) argued, for example, that "being a self is inseparable from existing in a space of moral issues." On this view identity is the product of strong evaluation; it is defined by reference to things that have significance for us. Strong evaluators---those with a strong sense of moral identity, in my view --- make discriminations about what is worthy or unworthy, higher or lower, better or worse; and these discriminations are made against a "horizon of significance" that frames and constitutes who we are as persons. "To know who I am," Taylor (1989) writes, "is a species of knowing where I stand (p. 27).

He continues: *My identity is defined by the commitments and identifications which provide the frame or horizon within which I can try to determine from case to case what is good or valuable, or what ought to be done or what I endorse or oppose" (p. 27).* The importance of commitments and identifications and the horizon of significance imply that moral self-identity is not strictly a *personal* achievement but requires settings and contexts that canalize, evoke or inspire an orientation towards morality. Moral formation is as much about the selection of right contexts as it is the development of personal virtue

My own writings over the years has tried to translate these insights about moral self-identity into psychological constructs, particularly with respect to dispositional features of moral personality. Social-cognitive theories of personality have been most congenial to this end. On one version moral personality is best understood in terms of the chronic accessibility of morally-relevant schemas for construing social events.

A moral person, on this account, is one for whom moral constructs are chronically accessible and easily activated by contextual primes. If having a moral identity is just when moral notions are central, important and essential to one's self-understanding, as Augusto Blasi famously argued, then notions that are central, important and essential should also be those that are chronically accessible for appraising the social landscape. Highly accessible moral schemas provide a dispositional readiness to discern the moral dimensions of experience, as well as to underwrite the discriminative facility in selecting situationally-appropriate behavior. After all, what we see in the social landscape depends on *who we are*.

If there is something to this, the crucial question then becomes: how can we educate children and adolescents such that moral self-identity is the probable outcome; in such a way that children and adolescents become strong evaluators in the Charles Taylor sense, so that it becomes something recognizably *characterological*, something essential, important, and central to self-understanding, so that when they look out into the social landscape its moral dimensions are not invisible, not opaque, not ignored. Again, what we see *depends on who we are*. It depends on our character. For the Intentional Moral-Character option the moral self is the aim of education

I think the Jubilee Center Framework has a lot to teach us in this regard. It affirms that the language of values, morality, and virtue would have to be heard in classrooms; appeals to moral principles would have to be extracted from lessons. Schools would have to stand explicitly for core values, to articulate and defend them and to animate them in all things in the life of the school.

Effective schools of character are those that are infused with a clear moral purpose that is out in the open, not hidden but transparent in the practice of teaching and learning, in the way relational trust, social belonging and a sense of community is cultivated, in the disciplinary practices of the school and the way it reaches out to families and communities. Effective schools give students an opportunity to engage in moral action and opportunities to reflect upon it. The character.org principles also take this up.

When you have a chance, I would direct you to page 12 of the Jubilee Center Framework that both summarizes the themes I have just mentioned but also provides a crucial insight on the way forward: It reads:

A key feature of school communities that nurture good character is that educators understand that pupils' experience of belonging, personal growth, and self-determination is foundational to the development of good character and commitment to learning.

This is a compression of many important insights, but I want to underscore the reference to self-determination and the importance of the experience of belonging.

Indeed, self-determination theory provides a useful framework for understanding how the moral work of classrooms can motivate students to construct a moral self with a deep commitment to moral values. And here I'd make four points:

First, whether targeted values are internalized or not hinges on the quality of relationships between teacher and students, between tutor and protégé. Everybody knows this. Nothing much sticks without the experience of trust, connection and belonging in a caring classroom.

Second, SDT research has also shown that internalization of values in most likely in autonomy-supportive classrooms where basic psychological needs are met. Indeed, it is in classrooms like this where students feel the strongest sense of belonging

Third, when teachers frame learning objectives with a rationale that refers to intrinsic goals, students are more likely to internalize the goal and show more self-determination in pursuit of it, particularly in autonomy-supporting (versus controlling) classrooms (Vansteenkiste, Lens, & Deci, 2006). Intrinsic goals are satisfying in their own right and include such things as contributions to the community, health, and personal growth. Framing student learning activities in terms of such goals leads to deeper conceptual learning and better persistence on academic tasks (Vansteenkiste et al., 2006). The implication is clear: framing moral considerations in terms of long-term intrinsic goals might also pay off with respect to moral internalization as well

Fourth, and similarly, one of Darcia's study showed that when teachers framed classroom events in terms of the needs of the community, helping others, classroom identity, and peer solidarity, students responded with greater commitment to citizenship, ethical knowledge, moral self-regulation and moral locus of control. Another study, by David Yeager and colleagues, showed that framing student learning activities in terms of self-transcendent purpose (e.g., service to the community, an ethical ideal, social justice) increases academic self-regulation more than appeals to self-oriented motives (Yeager et al., 2014).

I've mentioned "teachers" a few times already, and I would like to bring my remarks to a close with a few observations about the moral work of teaching and what it requires for teacher formation

Challenges for Teaching and Learning

Intentional moral-character education will place demands upon teacher (and principal) education Philosopher David Carr once argued that we do our student teachers in education programs "no great favours by proceeding as though education and learning to teach are matters only of the mastery of certain pedagogical skills, knacks or strategies apt for the successful transmission of value-neutral knowledge or information" (p. 11).

Teachers struggle with moral-character education just because the value questions immanent to teaching are not systematically addressed in their professional formation. Carr (1991) contends that when teacher education programs do not require "sensible reflection upon the moral character of human life and experience, the nature of values and the ethical aspects of the educationalist's role" then the resulting intellectual vacuum leaves teachers vulnerable to faddism; it leaves them ill-prepared to make transparent the immanence-and-inevitability of fundamental value questions that attend education, teaching and learning.

I agree with David on this. Teacher education programs should require "sensible reflection on the moral character of human life and the ethical dimensions of teaching and the nature of values --- that go beyond, I might add, the current thin emphasis in licensing standards on legal issues around student confidentiality, providing for students with exceptionalities, mandated reporting and the like. This aligns with Intentional Moral-Character education and the expectation that the language of moral valuation will attach to the fabric of the school day.

Yet on this point we have a problem in the United States, where explicit use of the words "moral," "ethical" "morality," and "values" in the context of K-12 education will sometimes

generate an allergic backlash ---even the words "social emotional learning" is suspect in some quarters ---such is the polarizing world we live in now. It probably explains why the language of morality and values is omitted from accreditation standards of teacher formation programs and teacher licensure standards. This is a challenge, certainly, but it is not insurmountable.

I am optimistic because most parents want to raise children to become persons of a certain kind, persons who are possession of dispositions that are desirable and praiseworthy, whose personalities are imbued with a strong ethical compass. In situations of radical choice, we hope that our children do the right thing for the right reason, even when faced with strong inclinations to do otherwise. Parents want this for their children, and expect schools to mobilize the learning environment so that the virtues of character that make living well the life that is good for one to live is a realistic educational expectation. I hope my optimism is not misplaced.

Summary and Conclusion

I am ready to summarize the main points and to bring these remarks to a conclusion. I have presented four varieties of character education as possible responses to the challenge of preparing teachers and school leaders. Best Practice mobilizes the educational psychology literatures of effective learning, academic press and communal organization of schools to guide the formation of **Good Learners.**

The second option wants to limit the exposure of good learners to psychosocial hazards and reduce risk behavior. The third option builds competencies and fortifies the good learner with social-emotional skills and character strengths, both options, in their own way, seek to **fortify good learners**

Finally, the fourth option, Intentional Moral-Character Education, transforms the **Fortified Good Learner** into a **Moral Self.**

These options are moments in the moral formation of students and the moral work of teaching. The challenge for the educational sciences, and for schools of education, is to connect the bolts so that these options are a seamless weave in the training of teachers and school leaders.

But moral-character education requires pedagogical content knowledge in its own right, like any other instructional objective. And this objective is catalyzed when fortified best practice is yoked to intentional commitment to morality, virtues and values.

Fortunately, we have the Jubilee Character Framework as a formidable playbook for the way forward. At the risk of giving you more homework, I want to draw your attention to the Playbook's conceptualization of character in terms of moral, civic, and intellectual, virtues that are required to live well the life that is good for one to live as a good neighbor, a good citizen and educated person, and also the performance virtues, character strengths, really, that helps keep our eyes on the prize. The distinctions drawn here give clearer guidance about how to target virtues for instruction, and makes concrete and explicit just what it means to teach the whole child.

I am involved in Templeton-funded projects back at Notre Dame that want to better understand the role of intellectual virtues in the practice of science and in science education, and one thing

that seems clear so far is that the phronetic the work of virtues, of all virtues, intellectual and otherwise, is deeply metacognitive in nature. Metacognition is knowledge about and regulation of one's cognitive processes, and when Aristotle writes that practical wisdom, when it guides the deployment of virtues, is always *"with reference to the right objects, towards the right people, with the right motive, and in the right ways,"* he is affirming the metacognitive basis of practice wisdom.

To put it in the parlance of educational and cognitive psychology, the application of any virtue is always a matter of metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive control processes. With respect to metacognitive knowledge, it is *declarative* (knowing *that*), it is procedural (know *how)*, and it is *conditional* (knowing *when* or under *what conditions*)---these are practically Aristotle's own examples --- *with reference to the right objects, towards the right people, with the right motive, and in the right ways*; and it is also a matter of metacognitive control processes: planning, monitoring, and evaluation.

This is how metacognition is conceptualized and studied in the educational psychology and learning sciences; and there is a significant literature on its role in cognitive regulation, in memory, in learning of all kinds; and a literature too, on how to train and improve it in classroom learning.

So if we can agree that the practical wisdom of virtue is metacognitive in this way: –then this opens up new insights on how to teach the virtues. It provides new insights on the pedagogical

content knowledge proper to character education, and insights firmly anchored to a well-attested empirical foundation.

So let me end on a prophetic note: The next big advance in character education will be driven by research and practice that integrates virtue psychology and virtue education with the metacognition literatures of educational psychology and cognitive development.

And I am confident that over the next ten years, the Jubilee Center for Character and Virtues will be leading the way with field-expanding insights on this integration -- just as it has led the way for the past 10 years.

The work of the Center has made a huge difference. It has not only moved the field, it has helped create it --- and everyone associated with the Center can surely look back on what you have accomplished with justifiable pride.

So my sincere congratulations on this 10 year anniversary, and in the words of my favorite poet, W.H. Auden, I wish the Jubilee Center "calm seas, auspicious gales" for the way forward.
I am deeply grateful for the invitation to speak with you on this occasion, and for your attention this afternoon.