

A Critique of “Moral and Character Development”

LIU Ping¹

Abstract: A critique was made in this essay about William G. Huitt’s (2004) article titled “Moral and Character Development”. The strong points of his article were discussed with his conclusion that social and cultural values influence the formation of children’s character traits, while school should play its own role as a sub-social unit to develop their characters and morality based on the cognitive, affective, conative and behavioral principles. The obvious weakness was presented by ignoring politics to be a vital factor influencing moral development. This essay aims to discuss why moral principles can be taught in school and how moral education can be practiced in classroom. It proposes what approaches are supposed to be significantly effective.

Keywords: Moral education; Character development; Behavioral principles; Cognition; Psychological approaches

1. SUMMARY

William G. Huitt is one of the worldwide renowned educational psychologists and his research field covers effectiveness of classrooms and schools, critical thinking, spiritual development and brand-new web-education. In his article “Moral and Character Development”, he classified the development of one’s character into one of the issues in the education of young people today. He defined normative view of character as morally relevant conduct or words and a complex set of one’s persistent qualities, which is distinguished from values that mean orientations or dispositions. In his opinion, character includes cognitive, affective, conative and behavioral components.

He traced scholarly focus and debate on moral development back to Aristotle and Socrates’ time. The American influential philosopher and educator, John Dewey, took moral education as core of the school task, but since the 1930’s it was ranked as the last goal of education in public schools with basic literacy development to be priority and development of pride in work as well as feeling of self-worth to be the second. Since the 1960’s the teacher’s role has lowered to be a transmitter of social and personal values. A good teacher is expected to be a skilled technician and achieves effective teaching assessed by the students’ scores on standardized tests of basic skills but without emphasis on their morality. He introduced Wynne & Walberg’s idea as his opinion that academic competence and character development are not mutually exclusive but complementary. That’s to say, education should be aimed to teaching the philosophical “why” besides the technical “how”. Fortunately, in 1987 the National School Boards Association proposed a project to the US. Department of Education, “Building Character in the

¹ Associate Professor, Master Of Educational Management, School of Foreign Languages in Zhongnan University of Economics and Law, Wuhan, 430073, China.

* Received 26 May 2009; accepted 19 August 2009

Public Schools,” designed for the goals of sharpening national awareness of the importance of character development as well as the goals of encouraging establishment and improvement of the character development programs in public elementary and secondary schools.

Huitt intends to address character development from four lenses: the definition of good character, the factors to cause or prevent it, the measurement of it and the best way to develop it. He defined the traditional character focusing on traits or values to be developed for the industrial age such as obedience to authority, work ethic and group work under supervision. However, modern education must base character promotion on such values for the information age as: honesty, integrity, individual responsibility, wisdom, justice, humility, steadfastness, dependability, etc. The major factors influencing character development, according to Campbell and Bond (1982), are heredity, early childhood experience, parental modeling, peer influence, general social environment, communication media, instructions in school and specific situations or roles. It can be clearly observed that families, communities and society, not schools alone, make much difference in one’s character development. In order to bring about appropriate measurement of one’s character, Huitt borrowed Campbell & Bond’s (1982) possible measures and Bennett’s (1993) list of cultural indicators. A cursory glance of the change about general social trends and leading cultural indicators from 1960 to 1990 can show us that GDP in the US. has increased dramatically but the nation’s character moves in the opposite direction, which suggests the obvious influence from the major social institutions on young people’s character development.

Six alternatives to dealing with moral and character education are proposed in this article. First, it can be added into the proper curriculum attractive to the students. Second, the opportunities are offered to the students to clarify and defend their own values without any recommendations or advocacy. Of course, some values or character traits may lead to social controversy, but it is in this way that educators and the public can reach the consensus about the worth of certain values which can be taught appropriately to students. Third, the students can be taught how to analyze their views after making decisions and how to put the decisions into action rationally. Fourth, Lawrence Kohlberg’s (1976) cognitively-oriented approach can be used to gravitate students to a higher level after discussing with their peers holding high-level moral values. Fifth, students can be taught a given set of values and corresponding appropriate actions. However, this inculcation approach to values clarification is only applied in an unchanging society. Undoubtedly, in the society with an accelerating change, this approach alone is not strong enough to produce desired outcomes in character development. Last, the combination of a series of approaches, such as inculcation, values education, analysis and action learning or service learning, can be applied to impact one’s volition and action.

Huitt (2004) further explains the approaches to character education from the systems model of human behavior. He pointed out that the students acquire the knowledge base, right and wrong, as well as the rational process to make moral decisions based on that knowledge, which is “cognition” component. Then they follow some given criteria related to the value system to make moral or ethical judgments, which is “affect” component. After the students achieve these two steps, they are willing to set goals and make an effort towards accomplishing them, reaching the third step “volition”. Finally these three components influence the final one: overt behavior, embodied to be personal virtues and social virtues (Huitt, 2004). Certainly behavior can also influence these three components after it is reflected on because it will be added to the knowledge base, strengthen students’ thinking skills and impact their values (Huitt, 2004). It is important to help the students make their implicit knowledge and values become explicit so as to make the overt behavior more “intentional” (Huitt, 2004). This multi-faceted view of character development emphasizes “reciprocal determinism” (Huitt, 2004), similar to Bandura’s (1989) social cognition theory, instead of stressing one component to the loss of the others.

We must acknowledge that some values are relative within a rapidly changing context and teach children to create their own views accordingly, but simultaneously we (parents, educators, religious organizations and community members) must teach them some absolutes widely accepted by commonalities, major world religions and moral philosophers because moral and character development is integral to the self-development. Any development program should be based on philosophical foundation, otherwise it is arbitrary, so educators must decide on philosophies and meta-ethical theories firstly and then develop curriculum (Watkins, 1976). Wynne’s (1989) research reports that the

harmonious relationship among faculty is vital to development of the students' character.

Huitt's three exemplary programs and the corresponding results underpinned his concept is sound. The Child Development Project (CDP) is designed to enhance children's "prosocial" behaviors and attitudes in the interrelated systems— affective, cognitive and behavioral (Watson et al., 1989). The children are supposed to learn both specific skills and the appropriate social conventions such as fairness, consideration, helpfulness and social responsibility. The results showed that enrolled students were more cooperative and more often displayed concern, support and encouragement towards one another. This program advocated that it's a powerful way to develop students' pro-social values in combination of instruction, practice and reflection. The Hyde School operated the program based on the belief that each child is gifted with a unique potential for excellence. A comprehensive curriculum for growth is designed to challenge students in intellectual, physical, spiritual and emotional areas. The results of the program are fantastic and incredibly successful in all graduating seniors accepted to accredited 4-year colleges since 1986. The City Montessori school (CMS) established four guiding principles for educating the whole child---universal values, excellence, global understanding and service. All children strive for academic excellence and trained to develop willingness to accept responsibility for the well-being of all humanity. This awareness is put into practice via "service" projects to foster dignity of labor. The results are impressive and the program is diffused in other five countries.

Huitt sums up that the sustainable power of one country depends on the human, social, political or spiritual aspects rather than economic success. It's generally thought that government and public schools ought to be neutral on defining the good life and an integrating curriculum should be composed for young people to strive for excellence in character and competencies.

2. STRENGTHS

Huitt builds his concept on many theorists' voices and utilizes them as a prism for the analysis of the notion that social and cultural values influence the formation of children's character traits, while school, as an education institution, should play its own role as a sub-social unit to develop their characters and morality based on the cognitive, affective, conative and behavioral principles (Huitt, 1996). The specific strengths are as following outline:

2.1 He enriches the social cognition theory by stressing one's volition to be source of personal behavior

He borrows a diagram to show the process from observation to personal and social overt behavior. In his illustration, he stresses a multi-faceted view of character development as reciprocal determinism, matching the point asserted in Bandura's (1989) social cognition theory. The social cognition theory claims one's behavior could be explained in terms of *observable* acts that could be described by "stimulus-response sequences" and "contiguity between stimulus and response determined the likelihood that learning would occur" (Crosbie-Brunett & Lewis, 1993). Also Aronfreed (1971) thinks we have many resources of moral knowledge not reflected in our actions. It is the nature and strength of "affective" components, not merely the cognitive substance of values, that permit the values to exercise control over overt behavior (Aronfreed, 1971). Huitt (2004) goes deeper in analyzing action learning and service learning about how to make "implicit" knowledge and values become "explicit" and then cause the behavior more "intentional". His theory focuses on one's volition to behave morally after building explicit values. He analyzes how children operate cognitively on their social experiences and how these cognitions then influence behavior and development. He detailed in relationship among cognition, affect, volition and behavior. His saying can be understood that one's knowledge of the environment is the basis of his values and he is willing to commit to and plan for his desired goals after thinking and selecting moral criteria. Then his plan will be on the way to fulfilling in the forms of personal behavior or social behavior just as Jones claims the mind is an "active force" that constructs one's reality, selectively

encodes information, performs behavior on the basis of values and expectations, and imposes structure on its own actions (Jones, 1989). Through feedback and reciprocity, a person's own reality is formed by the interaction of the environment and one's cognitions, so one's perception of, and attitude toward, the environment are significant influences on behavior, and a person's behavior is purposeful and motivated by a pursuit of goals. However, when one's interest conflicts with the social or collective interest, moral dilemma emerges to trouble each individual. Huitt (2004) emphasizes the importance of being self-disciplined through the interplay of self-produced and external sources of influence, including motivational standards, social and moral standards. His operant conditioning theory and social learning theory are parallel with Kohlberg's (1971) claims that in moral development one should develop competence to resolve conflicts of interests between himself and others because cognitive learning means active interaction with the environment to attain competence in dealing with it. Huitt's elaboration on approaches to character development: observation -- modeling -- consequences, is compelling to his argument that school can assist children to develop their volition and build their moral standards based on internal and external resources of influence.

2.2 He cites three examples to support his standpoint that the morality and character can be developed successfully in school education

The real case functions to be the important data to convince the readers of the views presented in the article. The first exemplary program is the most advisable to emulate in terms of moral education of young kids in the society at large, I think, because many theorists believe that children are ignorant of values, good or bad, when the principles go beyond their understanding, and they absolutely need enlightenment or guidance in learning conventional moral principles. Jarrett (1991) pointed out that primary obligation of the school is to acquaint and familiarize the child with the prevailing social norms. In this sense, adult and society make much difference in helping them accumulate moral wisdom by exposing them to prosocial models (Huitt, 2004) since children will grow up historically under the influence of specific social necessities (Durkheim, 1956). This developmental program is designed to deepen children's commitment to prosocial values such as kindness, helpfulness, personal responsibility, and respect for others when nurturing children's capacity to think skillfully and critically. From this example, we know Huitt attaches importance to social contexts' role played in moral education. Wilson (1985) underpinned Huitt's concept in the statement that "morality is inherently more social—and perhaps even conventional—than it would seem", that is to say, the social concern would seem to be a basic instinctual force for one person's need to communicate in people. However, Chazan (1985), comparing Wilson's theory with Durkheim's about social role in one's morality, found that Durkheim's starting point is assumption of society as "creator" of individuals, and society is an "ontological category", while for Wilson (1979) individuals create societies to fulfill certain needs or demands. Anyhow, Chazan (1985) summed that societies are part of morality as preconditions and contexts, but they themselves are not moral phenomena; instead, the heart of the moral process is related to autonomous moral deliberation. Huitt (2004) emphasizes that the basis of the CDP program is that children need to learn the "accumulated moral wisdom of the culture with appropriate social conventions", so Huitt's notion of sharpening morality with social conventions is reasonable in practice in schools.

2.3 Huitt takes a few effective and persuasive writing techniques in his article

Firstly, in the analysis of his proposition, more like Bandura's (1989) social cognition theory, he ranks the most complicated part for understanding to the list of bottom in order to put more words on detailed annotation, which works out the possible puzzle from the readers in the end and avoids impatience of reading the hardest from the beginning. Secondly, he presents the history of moral education in school advocated by many popular philosophers, who are authoritative in doing research on moral development in schools. John Dewey is quite influential in modern philosophical research. This way is compelling to prove the necessity and feasibility of moral education, supported by many established theorists.

Durkheim (1973), one of the researchers on moral education, highlights the role of the school, when

compared to family influence on moral development. He says, contrary to the all too popular notion, that moral education falls chiefly within the jurisdiction of the family. The task of the school in the moral development of the child can and should be of the greatest importance (Durkheim, 1973). Thirdly, he contrasts the changing definitions of “good” and “effective” teachers to stress that people shift the emphasis on education to the technical “how” rather than on both the philosophical “why” and technical “how” (Lickona, 1991; Nucci, 1989). This highly-generalized and concise statement makes the idea clearly delivered in catching two fundamental elements of education. Fourthly, he spreads out the factors of impacting moral and character development in a rank, and a chart to illustrate his viewpoint that general social trends influence leading cultural orientation. The combination of words and chart with figures strengthens its persuasiveness. Finally, three exemplary programs are typical to prove the satisfactory outcomes of development for children’s morality and character in schools.

Although, three programs involve different perspectives for emphasis, each of them gives attention both to training specific skills and to developing characters. The first program teaches children specific social skills besides development of children’s prosocial orientations; the second program focuses on comprehensive skills cultivation such as intellectual, physical, spiritual and emotional areas in life. The series of impressive goals are hard to attain, but worthy for other schools to emulate. The third program deems four pillars as guiding principles, in which concern for global understanding is supplementary for Huitt’s attention. In his analysis he regards universal values and community service as paramount ingredients to reinforce in moral education. Of course, academic performance is relevant to development of knowledge as another dimension of educational institutions. Global understanding included in the program of City Montessori School elevates convergence on achieving world peace, as Huitt (2004) advocates modern education must promote character based on values suitable for the information age, but here foci on global understanding replenishes values for the high-tech age because world peace is being threatened by nuclear bomb, terrorism and territory’s resources plunder. It is comprehensiveness and updating that make the program receive popularity among many other countries.

3. WEAKNESSES

Huitt (2004) expounds his theory of four components developing one’s character, taking many influential factors such as society, culture, family and religion, besides schools, into consideration, and most of them are convincing, but some weaknesses can not be ignored.

3.1 He seems to deviate from the topic about “moral development” as stated in the title or seems to bypass this topic to focus on “value development”

In his proposition, value, character and moral are defined differently, but he doesn’t elaborate what moral domain covers, so he appears to detract the topic about “moral development”. There are discussion and disagreement among moral philosophers about the source of morality: “group norms or individual conscience” (Chazan, 1985). Chazan says morality is regarded as a code or ethos rooted in a collective authority by some thinkers. That’s to say, one’s moral way is in accordance with the collective norms. But disagreement is that morality refers to a modal experience of the individual and implies the ability to resolve problems rather than adherence to an external set of norms (Chazan, 1985). Therefore it’s essential for Huitt to clarify his position so that we can identify whether morality can be practically taught in schools. Because whether moral education can be operated in schools depends on the sphere morality extends, just as Chazan(1985) defines, if morality is essentially social, then moral education has the responsibility to transmit and inculcate the collective moral code; it can be taught in schools. But if morality relates to individual reflection and choice, then moral educational function would be oriented to the development of qualities indispensable for individual reflection and choice; it can’t be taught but can be learned from personal cognition. Some educators believe that character cannot be taught, for no professionals in teaching virtue exist in schools, so what schools can do is to train children in standards of conduct. Furthermore, Huitt doesn’t clarify whether value education is the same as moral education,

which leads to dubious thought: can they be exchanged in the research here?

3.2 Huitt ignores politics to be a vital factor influencing moral development

He covers such elements as society, culture, religion, and family influencing one's character development, but ignores politics. Politics play a decisive role in standards of social conduct, cultural values and ethic modes. Anything, so to speak, is related to the larger frame of politics, because moral standards vary from government of aristocracy, monarchy, corruption to democracy. School is only a unit of organization in politics-based government, so the task of moral development will not be fulfilled only by schools. Durkheim (1973) demonstrated that character development is a "social not an individual process" and "social presupposition" can be given to any form of human character development, but social context is regulated by government with powerful political policies. Politics dominates all social and cultural norms which serve the ruling government to attain the pre-set general goals. The core systems steer the establishment of constitution and laws. Let's take marriage for an example, in most countries the prevailing law is one husband and one wife forming one family; that's to say, if one husband in his marriage builds another family with the other woman, he is supposed to break laws. However, in some of the regions or countries, it's not a problem at all, let alone breaking laws. In that case, responsibility varies in meaning in terms of moral principles, so how to manipulate children in moral cultivation and character development relies on abiding by laws established on the basis of political system. Ethics are closely related to political orientation in one community or certain small society, while work ethics or tenets of bearing oneself in the adult world should be fostered in early schooling period, so politics plays an essential role in formulation of acceptable social conventions to develop children's characters guided by moral tenets in schools.

3.3 Huitt reports the study by Hartshorne and his colleagues (1929) which fails in character development by in-class discussion or practicing helping activities, weakening the credibility of the approaches to moral and character development.

What's worse, he doesn't analyze the possible reasons for failure nor offer constructive suggestions or reflections on the futility of the experimental study. Any research should be put into practice and in practical operation the program or study may end with failure or ineffectiveness, but what's expected to do is analyze the deficiency or flaw in the program to figure out the remedy or improvement for the theories to be applied as advocators anticipate. However, Huitt's negligence of further contemplation on the report detracts the credibility of his approaches to moral and character development. Maybe the potential reason for failure is connected with the issue of philosophy since he expressed that any framework without philosophical foundation is arbitrary before the introduction of this unsatisfying study. Is it logical for us to think that program doesn't meet the desired outcomes just for lack of current philosophies and meta-ethical theories? If the posit is sound, then what is the solution or remedy to this problem obstructing moral development? According to Chazan (1985), there are issues in moral philosophy and issues in the philosophy of education related to the practice of moral education. He categorizes five issues in moral philosophy: the social and the individual; moral principles; reason in ethics; content and form; action. Also he generalizes two issues in philosophy of education: a conception of the morally educated person; indoctrination and moral education. As for the failure of the program mentioned here, what lessons can educators learn from it and how will they handle the specific problem to improve the program? Specifically speaking, which one of the issues generalized by Chazan, or going beyond the categories, prevents the program from succeeding? Any research must be connected with practice, so how the theories about moral education can be put into effect is what educators have been concerned with. In my humble opinion, Huitt (2004) should have specified the crux of the curriculum designing or program plan so that the followers can avoid repeating the mistakes or the errors for more efficiency in the practice of moral development.

Moreover, the controversial status and limitations of Lawrence Kohlberg's approach to moral development should be recognized. As Arbuthnot and Faust (1981) say that Kohlberg's position is "controversial", but it also has a great deal of immediate intuitive appeal for psychologist and

non-psychologists alike. Huitt (2004) adopts Lawrence Kohlberg's (1976, 1984) controversial theory based on the cognitive development theory of Jean Piaget (1932, 1962), but he doesn't go ahead for the distinction clarification between values education and character education. Short of sufficient supportive evidence for this approach weakens his standpoint conveyed in this article. In Huitt's summary, economic failure is not regarded as an element to lose a country's power, instead, character development must be seen as an organic process in education helpful in keeping sustainable power of a country, but in the body of whole article, we can't find any expression related to economy, so how can he draw this conclusion by comparing economy with moral development? It seems to be abrupt and a far-fetched comparison and undermine the purpose of his writing to some extent.

4. SO WHAT

Research on moral education has been done by many contemporary education philosophers such as John Dewey, Lawrence Kohlberg, Emile Durkheim, John Wilson and Barry Chazan. Their analysis of approaches to moral education is linked to philosophy, education and practice. This article pinpointed moral education relevant to themes in educational philosophy with practical and most telling examples in schools. Huitt (2004) confirms his belief that character development undergoes cognitive, affective, conative and behavioral phases. Based on this article, such questions are pondered over: What is moral education? Can it really be taught in schools? How is moral education taught? Who should teach moral education in classroom? What is significance of analysis of approaches to moral education?

Because it is hard to define morality, the notion of moral growth is vague, almost to the point of unintelligibility (Carter, 1984) and moral education issues involve points of debate or dispute for which the "differentiation" between correct and incorrect often becomes "blurred" (Arbuthnot & Faust, 1981). To ask what the elements of morality are involves an inquiry into fundamental dispositions, into those mental states at the root of the moral life. To influence the child morally is not to nurture in him a particular virtue, but develop or constitute those general dispositions that adapt themselves readily to the particular circumstances (Durkheim, 1973). Should morality refer to specific ideologies or normative philosophies? Should it mean procedural characteristics implying how to confront moral problems? (Chazan, 1985). The different definition leads to diversity of analytical approaches to moral development. Huitt expresses one's character involves his actions or behaviors, but it's often defined in terms of traits such as honesty, integrity, etc.

Huitt proposes that moral principles can be delivered in schools and it is one of the primary dimensions of education. However, Chazan (1985) says some theorists argue that moral education is not a "legitimate activity of schools", and it is improper to impose a specific morality in schools sponsored by public groups and funds. Surprisingly, in recent research, education's value is challenged by Wilson in his statement "Is education a good thing?" (Wilson, 2002). He thinks there are "very serious questions about the goodness of education that have not been faced squarely, let alone answered" (p. 327). This dubious attitude toward education's value is likely to cause more negative stance on moral development in schools. Additionally, anti-moral education tradition stands in sharp contrast to Huitt's (2004) logos that moral education is one of the main tasks and responsibilities of schools. It is generally thought that people develop moral standards from a variety of influences, such as direct instruction, feedback on behaviors from significant others, and modeling of moral standards by others (Bandura, 1986; 1989; 1991). We can accustom the child to self-control and moderation before they go to school, which may be opposed to his desires and passions but meaningful guidance for conformity to pre-established rules. Kohlberg (1976) argues that the process of moral development can be described as the movement through distinct stages of awareness, like the process of intellectual or cognitive development, based on empirical studies in psychology. Although Kohlberg's six-stage approach is controversial, his idea about cognition's role in accumulation of experience is acceptable. Huitt (2004) supports his belief that moral principles can be taught in schools and the children can be trained in developing their characters.

In Huitt's (2004) article, there is no overt curriculum for moral education in schools, but in the three

exemplary programs we may find the hidden curriculum is practiced in the schools. There is wonder in recent probing questions: how moral education is practically operated in schools. Should it be about the transmission of moral ideologies or be about the development of children's abilities to deal with moral issues? What are the differences between "indoctrination" and "education"? Is education possible without "indoctrination"? Must the teacher of moral education have special skills and knowledge? What materials and process should be used in classrooms for program's reasonable accessibility? Durkheim (1973) says that moral principles should not be taught in an exclusively rote in school. To teach morality is neither to preach nor to indoctrinate; it is to explain.

Kohlberg (1976) establishes his six-stage approach based on the premise that moral principles depend on stages of judgment or moral reasoning, but is there possibility that ultimate criterion for assessing moral maturity should be a person's conduct or behavior rather than judgment or reasoning? The discrepancy between conscience and conduct reveals the importance of affective components of cognitive structure with emphasis on behavior, because it will determine the way to teaching moral principles in schools. The technique most characteristic of the moral development approach is to present a hypothetical or factual value dilemma story to be discussed in the group (Superka et al., 1976). This instructional model requires the teacher to be neutral, avoiding turning teaching into indoctrination, pupils can learn whatever by discovering through experiment, trial and error and genuine argument (Warnock, 1975). In Huitt's summary, he is also aware that the government and public schools ought to be neutral on defining the good life (Rawls, 1971). Values Clarification is advocated by some theorists on the condition that there is no consensus about contents of inculcation and the subjugation of the individual to the group in the values domain (Chazan, 1985). Huitt (2004) also takes this position in his alternatives to moral and character education, but VC is opposed to because of its being against moral conventionalism and expressing personal preferences, inclinations, or dislikes deriving from the personal experiences of the individual. Of course Huitt further emphasizes the combination of personal and conventional worth of values when disagreement appears about some values clarified by the individual. Huitt's additional explanation confirms Chazan's New VC proponents. Chazan (1985) points out that the "new VC valuing person should be able to think on various levels, think critically, think divergently, set goals, collect data, consider consequences, send clear messages, empathize and resolve conflicts" (p. 49).

Among many approaches to moral education, Bandura (1977) advocates self-efficacy in program of moral education that self-efficacy is achieved from history of one's achievement in a particular area, from observations of others' successes and failures, from the persuasion of others, and from one's own physiological state (such as emotional arousal, nervousness, or anxiety) while performing a behavior. Social comparison of one's own performance to that of others, especially peers or siblings, also serves as a strong source of self-efficacy. In addition, schools are considered a strong source of self-efficacy. This is an important consideration in today's society where schools are based on the evaluation of students by comparing individual performance to the group's performance. For those students who lag behind or have trouble with academics, this type of evaluation can result in severe deficiencies in self-efficacy (Rosenholtz & Rosenholtz, 1981). Moral education is long-lasting not for a certain period in one's life, so moral education techniques and guidelines should not be applied as if one were an automation. They must be supplemented with one's own knowledge and critical awareness (Arbuthnot & Faust, 1981). Social perspective taking-in levels are proposed by Selman (1975) that such levels as cognitive, cultural, peer, mutual, and interaction perspective learning are considered to put theories into practice. It goes without saying that approaches to moral education require to be carried out for proof of their validity and its theories need to be verified as well. So the urgent need in further research on moral education is the specific and feasible application to daily life of the children concerned.

Who should be the educators of moral education in schools? Can each teacher be qualified for that task? Must they be trained before teaching principles to Children? Is it necessary to designate particularly chosen staff to be teachers for moral education and character development? If yes, must a specially designed curriculum be offered by schools? Now that it is a kind of education in school, should there be a test or some evaluation system to examine the outcomes of learning? What is the standard for that evaluation? Does it depend on whether one breaks the school rules and regulations or achieves high score in written test about moral principles as the traditional test system? In the complex society, what happens depends upon the individual's motives and emotions, but all behaviors are supposed to conform

to conventional norms, to conduct one's self morally, not guided by "egocentric strength" (Kohlberg, 1976). Cooperation is a symbol for solution to conflicts between one's personal interests and collective ones, so developing children to co-operate in group discussion about any problem is not only an asset for promoting sociability and learning in the classroom and can also be claimed to be fundamental to future adult associations, particular in business (Bottery, 1990). Therefore, much work needs doing to explore as many alternatives as possible to apply the research to practice, just as Chazan (1985) states that we should conclude the analysis of moral education by examining its particular conception of and suggestions for the practical pedagogic domain.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A sincere gratitude is to be delivered to Professor and Dr. Michael Kompf, at Brock University, Canada, who is well-known for his researches on psychology, adult self-development and teacher education.

REFERENCES

- Arbuthnot, J. B., & Faust, D. (1981). *Teaching Moral Reasoning: Theory and Practice*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Aronfreed, J. (1971). Some problems for a theory of the acquisition of conscience. In C. M. Beck, B. S. Crittenden, & E. V. Sullivan (Eds.), *Moral Education: Interdisciplinary Approaches*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.) *Annals of Child Development*. (Vol. 6, pp.1-60). Greenwich, CT: Jai Press.
- Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of moral thought and action. In W. M. Kurtines and J. L. Gerwitz (Eds.), *Handbook of Moral Behavior and Development*. (Vol. 1, pp. 45-103). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bennett, W. (1993). Is our culture in decline? *Education Week*, 12 (28). 32.
- Bottery, M. (1990). *The Morality of the School: The Theory and Practice of Values in Education*. London: Artillery House.
- Campbell, V., & Bond, R. (1982). Evaluation of a character education curriculum. In D. McClelland (Ed.), *Education for Values*. New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Carter, R. E. (1984). *Dimensions of Moral Education*. Toronto, Buffalo & London: University of Toronto Press.
- Chazan, B. (1985). *Contemporary Approaches to Moral Education: Analyzing Alternative Theories*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Crosbie-Brunett, M. & Lewis, E. A. (1993). Theoretical contributions from social and cognitive behavioral psychology. In P. G. Boss, W. J. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. R. Schumm, & S. K. Streinmetz (Eds.), *Sourcebook of Family Theories and Methods: A Contextual Approach*. Plenum Press: New York.
- Durkheim, E. (1956). *Education and Sociology*. Trans. S.D. Fox, New York: Free Press.

- Durkheim, E. (1973). *Moral Education: A Study in the Theory and Application of the Sociology of Education*. Trans. Everett K. Wilson & Herman Schnurer. New York: Free Press.
- Hartshorne, H., & May, M. (1929). *Studies in the Nature of Character. Vol 2. Studies in Self-control*. New York: Macmillan.
- Huitt, W. (1996). Systems model of human behavior. *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. Retrieved Dec. 1996, from <http://chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/materials/sysmdlhb.html>.
- Huitt, W. (2004). Moral and Character Development. In R. Ferguson (Ed.), *Character Is Who You Are*. From <http://chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/col/morchr/morchr.html>.
- Jarrett, J. L. (1991). *The Teaching of Values: Caring and Appreciation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Jones, J. W. (1989). Personality and epistemology: Cognitive social learning theory as a philosophy of science. In P. Hefner & K.E. Peters (Eds.), *Zygon*, 24(1):23-38. London: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kohlberg, L. (1971). From is to ought. In T. Mischel (Ed.), *Cognitive Development*. New York: Academic Press
- Kohlberg, L. (1976). The cognitive-developmental approach to moral education. In D. Purpel & K. Ryan (Eds.), *Moral Education...It Comes With The Territory*. California: McCutchan.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The Psychology of Moral Development*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Lickona, T. (1991). Does character education make a difference? Salt Lake City: Utah State Office of Education. Retrieved Dec. 1996, from http://www.usoe.k12.ut.us/curr/char_ed/resource/diff.html
- Nucci, L. (1989). Challenging conventional wisdom about morality: The domain approach to values education. In L. Nucci (Ed.), *Moral Development and Character Education: A Dialogue* (pp.183-203). Berkley, CA: McCutchan.
- Piaget, J. (1932, 1962). *The Moral Judgment of the Child*. New York: Collier.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rosenholtz, S. J., & Rosenholtz, S. H. (1981). Classroom organization and the perception of ability. *Sociology of Education* (54:132-140). London: Routledge.
- Selman, R. L. (1975). A developmental approach to interpersonal and moral awareness in young children: Some theoretical and educational implications of levels of social perspective taking. In J. Meyer; B. Burnham & J. Cholvat. (Eds.), *Values Education*. Oakville: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Superka, D. P., Ahrens, C., Hedstrom, J. E., Ford, L. J., & Johnson, P. L. (1976). *Values Education Sourcebook: Conceptual Approaches, Materials Analysis, and an Annotated Bibliography*. Colorado: Social Science Education Consortium.
- Warnock, M. (1975). The neutral teacher. In T. Monica (Ed.), *Progress and Problems in Moral Education*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Watkins, J. (1976). Forming a value curriculum: Two philosophical issues to consider. In D. Purpel & K. Ryan (Eds.), *Moral Education....It Comes With the Territory*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Watson, M., Solomon, D., Battistich, V., Schaps, E., & Solomon, J. (1989). The child development project: Combining traditional and developmental approaches to values education. In L. Nucci (Ed.), *Moral Development and Character Education: A Dialogue* (pp. 19-36). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Wilson, J. (1979). *Preface to the Philosophy of Education*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

- Wilson, J. (1985). Practical Methods of Moral Education. In B. Chazan (Ed.), *Contemporary Approaches to Moral Education: Analyzing Alternative Theories*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wilson, J. (2002). Is education a good thing? In A. James, & C. Paul (Eds.), *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 50 (3), 327–338. London: Blackwell Publishing.
- Wynne, E. (1989). Transmitting traditional values in contemporary schools. In L. Nucci (Ed.), *Moral Development and Character Education: A Dialogue* (pp. 19-36). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.