Narvaez, D., Bock, T., & Endicott, L. (2003). Who should I become? Citizenship, Goodness, Human Flourishing, and Ethical Expertise. Wiel Veugelers & Fritz K. Oser (eds.), *Teaching in Moral and Democratic Education* (pp. 43-63). Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang Publishers. *Reformatted here.*

Who Should I Become? Citizenship, Goodness, Human Flourishing, and Ethical Expertise

> What is my purpose in life? What am I striving for? What do I want to be? These are questions which every individual asks himself at one time or another, sometimes calmly and meditatively, sometimes in agonizing uncertainty or despair. They are old, old questions which have been asked and answered in every century of history. Yet they are also questions which every individual must ask and answer for himself, in his own way. (Kelly, 1962, p.21)

Education, particularly moral and value education, provides guidance for answering existential questions. In the wake of the September 11th, 2001, terrorist attacks in the U.S.A., the questions seem more pressing and universal. What is the meaning of life? What kind of community should we be? How can we assist young people in seeking answers? Moral education speaks to these very questions but it is not always clear what kind of guidance it should provide. What tools, skills, and knowledge should moral and value education foster? In this paper, we discuss the rationale for the Ethical Expertise (ETHEX) framework, which has been implemented in the Minnesota Community Voices and Character Education project (Anderson, Narvaez, Bock, Endicott, & Lies, 2003; Narvaez, Endicott, Bock & Lies, in press). ETHEX seeks to provide clear guidance on what should be taught and how it should be taught.

The content of any curriculum rests on two fundamental underpinnings. First, it draws on philosophical assumptions about the purpose of schooling. What is the ideal endpoint envisioned for students? The teleological spin on what to prepare students for varies and usually includes one of the following: economic success (making a living), social justice (making a fairer society), personal development (becoming more actualized), or supporting tradition (reflecting the values of the culture). Second, a curriculum reflects assumptions about the psychological specifics of human nature and development as well as the appropriate methods to foster learning. A worthwhile approach to moral education should be explicit about these footings. We address these foundational issues in the Ethical Expertise model.

Assumptions of the Ethical Expertise Model

The ETHEX model for moral education is based on four ideals garnered from the work of diverse scholars and researchers. These are: (1) common understandings of what it means to be good; (2) conclusions from the social sciences about what helps humans thrive; (3) the consensus among leaders worldwide on the necessary characteristics of citizens in the 21st century; (4) up-to-date knowledge of how humans learn. From these four sources we draw a framework for moral education that explicitly delineates philosophical and psychological underpinnings.

Following Blasi (1990), we define goodness according to common understandings and ordinary language. According to this view, 'we know it when we see it.' The individual recognizes "(1) when the conditions for a certain meaning have or have not been fulfilled and (2) when an interpretation corresponds to his experience" (ibid, p. 62). Etzioni (1996) states: "certain concepts present themselves to us as morally compelling in and of themselves" (p. 241). We do not explain the nature of a good person precisely. Instead, we delineate the skills that a person needs to have in order to function as a moral being in the world.

ETHEX offers a framework of skills that are based on universals such as human rights (e.g., the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights), common notions of democratic citizenship, and the elements that foster human flourishing, individually and within community. The Ethical Expertise model is grounded in a psychological description of human flourishing rather than in a philosophical one. But we are not unique in this regard. Recently, philosophers have emphasized the importance of integrating psychology into a moral philosophy (Flanagan, 1996; Johnson, 1996). We agree with McKinnon's (1999) proposal for a functionalistic naturalism:

> Given their nature, humans have certain quintessentially human needs and human abilities. These [are] relevant in determining what counts as a good human life. The point of morality is to assist us in leading better human lives, so we need to understand how our nature constrains what counts as a good human life…The normative component of ethics will be seen to emerge from certain natural facts about human beings and from the ways in which these facts constrain what counts as a good human life. (p. 6)

What are human needs? What are humans able to do? What are the constraints for human achievement and morality? The philosophical and psychological foundations of a moral education theory must directly connect to the daily experience of an individual in a practical way. A practical focus requires an operationalization of optimal functioning that addresses human needs, capacities and constraints. McKinnon continues:

> Just identifying what counts as a 'fact' about human nature may seem problematic unless a particular background theory about a good human life is adopted. If the set of relevant facts about human nature is taken, not to *determine* what counts as a good human life, but at best to *constrain* it, then a looseness of fit between criteria that specify which facts of human nature are relevant and preferred stories about good human lives becomes apparent. The appeal to natural facts about human beings serves to rule out some choices of kinds of lives as non-optimal. (p. 11)

The normative claims of a moral theory ought to relate the characteristics of a good person to the characteristics of optimally-functioning individuals and communities. Individuals and communities may exist more or less optimally. When we identify the characteristics of an optimal life, we rule out choices that we know are harmful to humans (e.g., a violent upbringing) or to communities (extreme individualism).

The particular needs required for flourishing change with age and development, and vary to some degree across individuals and contexts. However, there is increasing agreement in the findings of developmental psychology and neuropsychology regarding the basic conditions necessary for children to develop into well-functioning adults (Masten & Coatsworth, 1998; Nelson & Luciana, 2001). One of the most vital ingredients is a responsive, loving caregiver who engages the infant socially, emotionally, and cognitively from the beginning. This involves effectively building the child's trust in the caregiver, supporting mutual recognition and regulation of the child's and caregiver's emotions, and stimulating the child's desire and potential to understand, learn, and communicate using conversation, books, and exploration of objects. Such caregiver behaviors pave the path to well-functioning adulthood by creating a healthy attachment upon which future social connections can be built, the ability to identify and regulate emotions, as well as a general sense of self-efficacy in learning and interacting with others (Sroufe, Carlson, & Shulman, 1993; Sroufe, 2002; Werner 1995). We know that neglected children, such as those raised from infancy in understaffed orphanages, function poorly in emotion regulation at both neurological and behavioral levels. They also tend to exhibit developmental delays or dysfunction in other social and cognitive domains (Gunnar, 2001; Garmezy & Rutter, 1983).

Not all children have good fortune. Many do not encounter an optimal environment. How can educators promote flourishing in the children who did not get the necessary early nurturance from a caregiver? Further, how can we help maintain a positive trajectory for those children who received adequate caregiving but are faced with additional stressors and risk factors? Resilience research attempts to determine which 'protective factors' buffer at-risk children from negative outcomes. Classic resilience studies (Werner, 1993; Rutter, 1977, 1991; Garmezy, Masten, & Tellegen, 1984) followed the developmental paths of children from places as varied as Kauai and the Isle of Wight, whose families were marked by multiple risk factors (e.g., poverty, malnutrition, low birth weights, parent alcoholism, parent mental disorder). The most powerful environmental protective factors are social connections, particularly an ongoing relationship with an adult who truly supports the child's flourishing. Some protective factors reside within the child, such as being socially skilled in communication and conflict-resolution, and the ability to establish meaningful relationships. Negative outcomes can also be buffered by having a talent or interest that is valued by elders or peers (e.g., in sports or performing arts) and believing that one's own actions can make a positive difference in one's life (Werner, 1995). The Search Institute in Minnesota has identified forty assets, internal and external, that cumulatively protect children from adverse outcomes (Scales & Leffert, 1999).

Integrating knowledge about protective and risk factors, prevention science seeks to develop models and interventions that help prevent negative outcomes. Prevention practitioners bolster protective factors and reduce risk factors for the children they encounter, though in many cases risk factors are often difficult, if not impossible, to eradicate. Working at the family, school, and community levels, they work to identify negative outcomes, to understand their developmental trajectories, and to implement prevention strategies. ETHEX is designed to engage each community in identifying social problems, understanding them within that specific context, and strategizing on which protective factors to build up to "immunize" students against risk factors.

In recent years, psychological science has learned quite a lot about human flourishing. Martin Seligman (2002) has initiated a positive psychology movement that focuses on optimal human functioning—what it is and how to foster it in persons and communities. Positive psychology identifies particular factors that are generally related to positive outcomes and mental health. Seligman (2002) observes:

> The field of positive psychology at the subjective level is about positive subjective experience: well-being and satisfaction (past); flow, joy, the sensual pleasures, and happiness (present); and constructive cognitions about the future—optimism, hope, and faith. At the individual level it is about positive personal traits---the capacity for love and vocation, courage, interpersonal skill, aesthetic sensibility, perseverance, forgiveness, originality, future-mindedness, high talent, and wisdom. At the group level it is about the civic virtues and the institutions that move individuals toward better citizenship: responsibility, nurturance, altruism, civility, moderation, tolerance and work ethic (Gillham & Seligman, 1999; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). (p.3)

Positive psychology contributes significantly to the vision of a good person. It points to the development of personal and social skills that support human relationships and human thriving. Our model includes these skills which are vital for social and psychological flourishing.

A practical focus in moral education requires awareness of human limitations. Where do humans consistently fail or commit errors? One area is the evolved preference for the familiar, in particular, familiar persons. In order to contravene prejudice, individuals must learn how to deal with people who are from groups other than personal ingroups. Research that straddles the social and biological sciences has informed us a great deal about the human mechanisms that breed potential for interpersonal and intergroup conflict. Educators must consider these natural mechanisms and teach their students how to be aware of them and manage them effectively. For example, human nervous systems are designed to respond to the stimuli in the world in particular limited ways that functioned

well in a simpler context (i.e., further back in our evolutionary history). Humans quickly interpret sensory input based on previous experience and draw conclusions, making evaluations and decisions in milliseconds. While these instincts served humanity well in maintaining survival within a circumscribed environment, they tend to lead to inaccurate and often biased perceptions in a complex society. These limitations have implications for how we think about both morality and education. Humans are constrained by an information processing system that generalizes, prefers the familiar, and recoils from difference. Any moral education program must make evident these biases and nurture the means to control them.

We spent several years in consultation and collaboration with teachers and administrators on how to construct a framework that meets all these goals: to inoculate students against risk factors, to enhance optimal growth, to help students compensate for human limitations. Table 1 demonstrates one outcome of this process, a list of four processes, each with seven skills, based upon developing ethical competence. When the ETHEX framework is implemented, students learn skills they need to live a good life and to flourish.

It bears emphasizing that the good life is not lived in isolation. One does not flourish alone. ETHEX is implemented in and with a community. It is the community who establishes, and nourishes the individual's moral voice, providing a moral anchor. Hunter (2000) suggests that we find the answers to our existential questions in the particularities that we bring to a civic dialogue: 'Character outside of a lived community, the entanglements of complex social relationships, and their shared story, is impossible' (p. 227). It is in the community that students apply and hone their ethical competencies.

Citizenship education fosters skills, attitudes and knowledge in students that enable them to effectively and responsibly participate in civic life. Davidson (2000) aptly points out that in a global world it is no longer feasible to consider citizenship 'within the terms of the nation as something whose parameters are national' (p. 5). Rather, citizenship becomes a global 'public' value. Consequently, citizenship in the 21st century must be considered in terms of what it means to be a citizen in a global society, rather than in a particular nation or social group. Others suggest the need to cultivate a democratic personality (Wing-On & Sai-Wing, 2001).

The Citizenship Education Policy Study Project (Cogan, 1997) was undertaken to yield a global consensus on the demands of citizenship in the early 21st century from a global society perspective. Policy experts (n=182) from nine countries and many different fields (e.g., government, business, science, education) participated in the project. They were asked to identify the global trends that will have a significant impact in the next 25 years, and the necessary characteristics of citizens to enable them to cope with these trends. The experts identified several global trends that should be treated as priorities by policy makers. Trends to be assuaged include increased disparities among peoples, a deterioration of the environment, increased consumerism and rising government control. Trends to be encouraged include more regional alliances, fewer systematic mistreatments of marginalized groups, and the necessary adoption of environmentally-friendly methods by business and industry.

The policy experts in the Citizenship Education Policy Study Project identified the public virtues and values that a global citizen should have in the 21st century. It is anticipated that if people around the world do not develop these characteristics, there will be more wars and threats of war. The experts agreed on the following characteristics, in descending order of importance.

1. Approaches problems as member of a global society
2. Works cooperatively with others and takes responsibility for one's roles and responsibilities in society
3. Understands, accepts, and tolerates cultural differences
4. Thinks in a critical and systematic way
5. Resolves conflict in a non-violent manner
6. Adopts a way of life that protects the environment

7. Respects and defends human rights
8. Participates in public life at all levels of civic discourse
9. Makes full use of information-based technologies.

Although virtually every moral education curriculum addresses item two, the other eight items are not reliably found in moral curricula. ETHEX incorporates them all. Not surprisingly, the first eight characteristics identified by civic leaders correspond to features important to human flourishing generally.

The Ethical Expertise Model

The "ethical expertise model" appeals to research literatures in the cognitive and social sciences in order to defend a model of moral functioning. We integrate the findings from developmental psychology, prevention science, and positive psychology. In delineating the elemental skills of good character, ETHEX addresses *character* education. In proposing the best approach to instruction, it addresses character *education.* The purpose of ETHEX is to provide a roadmap for teachers about what character is and how to teach it. ETHEX has the following characteristics.

(1) ETHEX emphasizes the development of ethical skills rather than the learning of dispositional traits.

Whereas most character education programs rest on thin empirical evidence, ETHEX is attested by a voluminous literature and stands on time-tested research traditions in moral development research. Many character education programs tacitly endorse a trait understanding of character, a view not actually held by contemporary personality theorists. ETHEX bases its understanding of character on well-attested literatures in cognitive science. Character development is, according to this view, not a matter of developing traits of character, but rather developing a set of inter and intrapersonal skills that build proficiency towards expertise. Hence, individuals who have good moral character are more expert in the exercise of certain foundational skills, rather than being in possession of certain personality traits (we say more about skills below). Like Robert Sternberg (1998) and others, we abandon a trait approach, preferring to think of an ethical person's characteristics as an interplay of skills. Using a concrete view of ethical behavioral processes (ethical sensitivity, judgment, motivation, and action), each process is parsed into skill categories which are teachable, assessable, and can be taught in regular subjects across the curriculum. See Table 1. Rooted in firm psychological research and theory, the ETHEX model incorporates a dynamic view of ethical behavior, skills, and processes.

Table 1.Ethical Processes and Skills for Practical Reasoning and Functional Ethics

ETHICAL SENSITIVITY

ES-1: Understand Emotional Expression
ES-2: Take the Perspective of Others
ES-3: Connecting to Others
ES-4: Responding to Diversity
ES-5: Controlling Social Bias
ES-6: Interpretations Situations
ES-7: Communicate Well

ETHICAL JUDGMENT

EJ-1: Understanding Ethical Problems
EJ-2: Using Codes and Identifying Judgment Criteria
EJ-3: Reasoning Generally
EJ-4: Reasoning Ethically
EJ-5: Understand Consequences
EJ-6: Reflect on the Process and Outcome
EJ-7: Coping

ETHICAL MOTIVATION

EM-1: Respecting Others
EM-2: Cultivate Conscience
EM-3: Act Responsibly
EM-4: Help Others
EM-5: Finding Meaning in Life
EM-6: Valuing Traditions and Institutions
EM-7: Developing Ethical Identity and Integrity

ETHICAL ACTION

EA-1: Resolving Conflicts and Problems
EA-2: Assert Respectfully
EA-3: Taking Initiative as a Leader
EA-4: Planning to Implement Decisions
EA-5: Cultivate Courage
EA-6: Persevering
EA-7: Work Hard

(*2) ETHEX incorporates constructivist views of teaching and learning using structured experience in helping novices move toward expertise.*

Whereas most character education programs rely upon a "transmission model "of teaching and learning---a model that assumes that teaching is a matter of adults handing off knowledge to passive "learners"—the present model is based upon constructivist principles that guide "best practice" instruction. This view assumes that individuals are active constructors of meaning. It assumes that individuals build conceptual frameworks, both declarative and procedural, in the process of making sense of one's experience.

Alfred North Whitehead (1929) pointed out that whereas individuals learn from experience and then abstract and codify their experiences, adults focus on the codifications they have made from experience when they educate the next generation, burdening the children with inert knowledge. Yet society believes they are educated. A similar problem occurs in moral education. Labeling a complex set of behaviors with a single word (codifying multiple experiences) does not help the novice. For example, if you tell a person who is learning to be a cook to 'make a white sauce,' he or she will be at a loss on how to proceed. Likewise, if you tell a child 'be responsible,' the child will be at a loss on how to be so, regardless of how many assemblies or posters espouse its importance.

Like many experts, adults often forget what it is like to be a novice and believe that presenting a list of virtues is nearly as clear to the students as it is to them. Adults may find a trait list helpful because they have had a lifetime of experience building knowledge about the trait behaviors. When you mention 'honesty' to an adult, chances are that he or she recalls many personal experiences of being lied to, of lying, of the consequences of lying, of the degrees of honesty one displays based on the level of intimacy with another, of the differences between honesty and being private or polite, and so on. The label, 'honesty,' is convenient for the adult in chunking all these experiences in memory. Adults are not novices when it comes to honesty, whereas most children are. A child has had relatively few experiences, and fewer yet that are recalled when the trait 'honesty' is mentioned. Further, these experiences may not have been reflected upon, and hence may remain closed to mental scrutiny.

Advising a child to have the trait is talking at the child and likely has little effect on their skills or character development.

There are two competing notions of how people learn. The more prevalent but out-dated and mistaken notion of learning has been called the "receptive-accrual" view (Anderson, 1989). According to this view, students passively receive and store knowledge without transforming it. The teacher "pitches" the information to the student and the student "catches" it. If the student does not learn, it is the student's fault for not "catching" due to being inattentive or stupid. In contrast, the view of human learning held by those who study it is the "cognitive-mediational" perspective. According to this view, individuals have unique conceptual structures or schemas that influence what and how they perceive, understand and remember. Learning involves an active transformation of schemas during cognitive activities such as "processing material through active, selective attention; relating new information to prior knowledge and forming new knowledge" and monitoring understanding in order to know when to ask for help or that understanding is complete (Anderson, 1989).

Expertise is a dominant focus among researchers in human learning (e.g., Ericsson & Smith, 1991), in particular the view of a learner as a novice gaining expertise (e.g., Sternberg, 1998). According to this view, human learning proceeds along a continuum between novice status and expert status. Experts are different from novices in several important ways. Unlike novices, experts know what knowledge to access, which procedures to apply, how to apply them and when. According to Sternberg (1998), experts have (a) large, rich, organized networks of concepts (schemas) containing a great deal of declarative knowledge about the domain; (b) well-organized, higher interconnected units of knowledge in the domain.

The distinction between novice and expert is relevant in the moral domain as well (e.g., Narvaez, 1999). Applying the novice-to-expert orientation to our model, in every process and skill area, experts perform in a superior manner. Experts in *Ethical Sensitivity* are able to more quickly and accurately 'read' a situation and determine what role they might play. These experts are also better at generating usable solutions because of their greater understanding of the consequences of possible actions. Experts in *Ethical Judgment* are more skilled in solving complex problems, seeing the crux of a problem quickly and bringing with them many schemas for reasoning about what to do. Their information processing tools are more complex but also more efficient. Experts in *Ethical Motivation* are skilled at maintaining their focus on prioritizing the ethical ideal. Their motivation is directed by an organized structure of moral self-identity. Experts in *Ethical Action* are able to keep themselves focused and take the necessary steps to get the ethical job done. They demonstrate superior performance when completing an ethical action.

Human experience is by and large dependent on a vast network of tacit or implicit knowledge, learned inside and outside of school. Tacit knowledge forms the rich base of practical intelligence within a particular domain (Sternberg, 1998). How do educators begin to foster in students the vast network of schemas that make up a domain's practical intelligence? According to Marshall (2000), there are several levels of knowledge in a fully-developed schema, from less to more complex: identification, elaboration, planning, and execution knowledge.

Identification knowledge establishes the boundaries of the domain. Students become familiar with the essential nature of domain situations. Students learn to recognize critical elements in the dynamic context (simultaneous processing of multiple elements). Identification or pattern recognition is based on interpreting a configuration of elements. For example in moral education, one helps students distinguish between a moral dilemma like "Heinz and the drug" and a non-moral dilemma like "Heinz and his pillow". One helps students identify the features of a moral dilemma (e.g., two or more competing moral values, valid reasons for every side of the issue, etc.). The student learns to notice dilemmas where none were seen before. The student learns to take the perspective of others who see a dilemma when the student does not.

Elaboration Knowledge is declarative knowledge that enables the creation of a situation/mental model. It encompasses individual experiences and general abstractions, including sensory information. Students focus on the details of the elements in particular situations (verbal and

visual). Initially, a student needs a prototypical example with which to make comparisons. Students create mental models of a specific problem from the particular situation or from a generalized schema. The moral educator, for example, might help students elaborate on the elements of several prototypical dilemmas. For example, "Heinz and the drug" contains elements of fairness such as the pitting of property rights against human life, or interfering to save a life versus letting things take their course. "The Doctor's dilemma" involves elements of fairness like proactive euthanasia versus human life, or letting things take their course versus choosing to end things prior to extensive suffering.

Planning knowledge refers to the way a schema can be used to make plans, create expectations, and set up goals and subgoals. Given more than one situation in a problem, students must acquire knowledge necessary for determining which situation to examine first and how the situations are related to one another. Students learn to formulate a plan of action. Moral educators might supply opportunities for students to plan and make moral decisions, perhaps in relation to tutoring younger students, or to providing a social service in a respectful manner. Those who have repeated opportunities to plan and implement real-life moral decisions (e.g., police officers) will likely develop an expertise in the area of practice.

Whereas planning knowledge is used to determine the steps to take in solving a problem, execution knowledge allows the student to carry out the plan. It consists of algorithms or techniques to complete each step in a plan. Students learn what knowledge to apply when and why. As each step is completed, the execution knowledge is called on to address subsequent steps. For example, the experienced manager of a homeless shelter will demonstrate execution knowledge in moral sensitivity, judgment, motivation and action as he or she nightly balances one need against another within the limits of extant resources.

ETHEX articulates a set of strategies for developing expertise. The development of moral expertise is seen to proceed in four levels of activities:

Level 1: Immersion in examples and opportunities. In this initial phase, attention is drawn to the big picture and to the recognition of basic patterns in the domain. Accordingly, the teacher plunges students into multiple, engaging activities. Students learn to recognize broad patterns in the domain and begin to develop gradual awareness and recognition of elements in the domain (comprising identification knowledge).

Level 2: Attention to facts and skills. In this phase of development, knowledge is built through a focus on detail and prototypical examples. The teacher focuses the student's attention on the elemental concepts in the domain in order to build more elaborate concepts. Skills are gradually acquired through motivated, focused attention (comprising elaboration knowledge).

Level 3: Practice procedures. At this level, one sets goals, plans the steps of problem solving, and practices skills. The teacher coaches the student and allows the student to try out many skills and ideas throughout the domain to build an understanding of how skills relate and how best to solve problems in the domain. Skills are developed through practice and exploration (comprising planning knowledge).

Level 4: Integrate knowledge and procedures. At this level, one executes plans and solves problems. Deliberate practice at this level over a long period of time can lead to expertise. The student finds numerous mentors and/or seeks out information to continue building concepts and skills. There is a gradual systematic integration and application of skills and knowledge across many situations. The student learns how to take the steps in solving complex domain problems (comprising execution knowledge).

(3) EthEx emphasizes the importance of the classroom in promoting ethical development

Students' sense of classroom community are related to teacher practices such as the emphasis on prosocial values and interpersonal understanding, the use of cooperative learning, and teacher warmth and supportiveness are related to student (e.g., Solomon, Battistich, Kim & Watson, 1997). These teacher practices in turn were related to student positive interpersonal behavior and active engagement in the classroom. For each character skill, EthEx makes specific suggestions for the types of teacher practices that promote a classroom climate that promotes that skill.

(4) ETHEX empowers the student with the grave responsibility of constructing a self.

A model for character education cannot be described without including the most important contextual variable: the students. Students will have different needs and interests, levels of development and areas of skill. Yet they have in common what we all have in common. Each of us ultimately makes the decisions about who and what we will become. Our decisions shape our characters and our futures. The 'constructing expertise' model helps students develop the skills for good choices but puts the onus on their shoulders for making the final decisions about their behavior. For each skill, students are given tools for self-regulating their progress in the skill.

In CVCE, the central questions for the students are "Who should I be" and "What do I want to become?" In the words of Christine McKinnon, individuals must 'do the work necessary for constructing a character' (1999, p. 42). Humans are 'the kinds of beings who invest their lives with meaning by creating a self which identifies them as the kind of person they are and which provides a unifying link to the various facets of their lives' (p. 42). McKinnon also states that 'the person of integrity has a self-reflexive concern with the compatibility and consistency of her many different traits and interests' (p. 38). Wickedness is a sign of failing to invest in answering the questions of becoming. McKinnon describes wickedness in the following way:

> What has gone wrong is that insufficient or unsuccessful attention has been paid to the task of constructing a self, of developing a character, of cultivating the right kinds of desires and interests, and of learning to take pleasure in the pursuit…..The conceptual point remains that the functionally best kind of human life involves much critical evaluation and self-reflexive awareness and practice in the making of a self. Human lives deficient in these respects will be less than good human lives. (p. 43)

The student must see the continuum of possibilities from best to worst (e.g., where the pitfalls of human bias are, what the dangers of wickedness are). This will aid them in constructing a self as they answer in their actions day by day, 'Who should I become?' The integration of ethical skills across processes and within unique situations is a lifelong task. It is important to get children on the right track to taking interest in their characters, and to take on the project, in McKinnon's (1999) words, of 'constructing a self…of cultivating the right kinds of desires and interests, of learning to take pleasure in the pursuit' (p. 43). The self envisioned by the ETHEX model is a self under construction, prepared to actively participate in a pluralistic democracy as a global citizen.

(5) It specifies the importance of adjusting the framework to community contexts.

The ETHEX framework balances two formative components critical to its implementation: (1) top-down principles for implementation and (2) bottom-up fidelity to the needs of the community. The top-down portion is the set of guidelines for optimal functioning (28 skills) that we have put together from research findings in collaboration with public school educators. This set of guidelines includes fundamental assumptions about the purpose of schooling (to nurture effective global citizens)

and a set of skills for individuals to learn in community. The set of guidelines is presented to teachers and community members who represent the bottom-up portion of the model.

The bottom-up portion is the necessary local adaptation of the framework of skills to the community context. Each community discusses the framework in terms of specific community perspectives, needs, and diversity, adapting them according to its own common understandings of moral being. For example, 'respecting others' can be expressed in various ways, as we know from cultures around the world. The teacher is encouraged to work with the community on how to teach the skills and what to emphasize. Further, the student is encouraged to gather information about the skill from the community (parents, elders) and bring back that information to the classroom. Although the principle of respect may be the same across communities, the specific manifestation will differ by culture, religion, and so on. When this diversity is brought into the classroom by the students themselves, it provides an appropriate backdrop for dialogue about the implementation of ethical skills and for teaching respect for differences. It can also be an important demonstration of how groups may have different practices while having the same underlying value.

Universal principles and skills meet local particularities and are melded together by the community itself. Thus, optimal functioning is grounded in the specific context of the individual and his or her community. This top-down and bottom-up combination allows each community to have its mark on the set of guidelines but within certain parameters, those of optimal functioning within a pluralistic democracy and a global community.

(6) It embeds character education across the curriculum rather than being an add-on program.

When the research framework is applied in a particular context, the 'constructing ethical expertise' model is in action. Although contexts of implementation will always vary, one of the absolutes of implementation is the embedding of character education into regular instruction. This should happen in every subject area. Here are some examples of the character units our teachers have integrated into their curricula:

Examining Bias in Media and Everyday Situations (Language Arts)
Analyzing Ethical Problems in Technology Plagiarism (Technology)
Developing General Reasoning in Current Event Analysis (Social Studies)
Values and Ethical Identity in Music (Performing Arts)
Helping Others Using Accounting and Research (Math)
Overcoming Obstacles in Nature Conservation (Science)

We advocate that character education should not stand alone but be incorporated into the entire spectrum of education for students. Ethics pervades our everyday lives, and it should be the same for students in school. Regardless of the subject area or curriculum, teachers can always raise issues of ethics (sensitivity, judgment, motivation, action) in lessons.

Summary

The Community Voices and Character Education approach presents a framework for conceptualizing ethical education, incorporating ideals for global citizenship, human flourishing, human goodness, and human learning. It applies a process model of ethical behavior, incorporating current understandings of human learning and development. Although we stress a research base, we also emphasize the expression of context-specific, community values.

References

Anderson, C., Narvaez, D., Bock, T., Endicott, L., & Lies, J. (2003). *Minnesota Community Voices and Character Education: Final evaluation report*. Roseville, MN: Minnesota Department of Education.

Anderson, L.M. (1989). Learners and learning. In M.C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Beck, J. (1998). *Morality and Citizenship in Education.* London: Cassell.

Blasi, A. (1990). How should psychologists define morality? or The negative side effects of philosophy's influence on psychology. In T.E. Wren (Ed.), *The Moral domain* (pp. 38-70). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cogan, J. (1997). *Multicultural Citizenship: Educational Policy for the 21st century*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota.

Davidson, A. (2000). Fractured Identities: Citizenship in a Global World. In E. Vasta (Ed.), *Citizenship, Community, and Democracy* (pp. 3-21).

Ericsson, K. A., & Smith, J. (1991). *Toward a general theory of expertise*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Etzioni, A. (1996). *The new golden rule.* New York: Basic Books.

Flanagan, O. (1996). Ethics naturalized : Ethics as human ecology. In L. May, M. Friedman, and A. Clark (Eds.), *Minds and Morals* (pp. 19-43). Cambridge, MA: Bradford Books.

Garmezy, N., Masten, A.S., & Tellegen, A. (1984). The study of stress and competence in children: A building block for developmental psychopathology. *Child Development, 55(1),* 97-111.

Garmezy, N., & Rutter, M. (1983). *Stress, coping, and development in children*. Baltimore, MD,: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gunnar, M. (2001). Effects of early deprivation: Findings from orphanage-reared infants and children. In Nelson, C.A., & Luciana, M. (Eds), *Handbook of developmental cognitive neuroscience*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Hunter, J.D. (2000). *The death of character : moral education in an age without good or evil.* New York: Basic Books.

Hunter, J.D. (1994). *Before the shooting begins : searching for democracy in America's culture war.* New York: Free Press.

Johnson, M. L. (1996). How moral psychology changes moral theory. In L. May, M. Friedman, and A. Clark (Eds.), *Minds and Morals* (pp. 45-68). Cambridge, MA: Bradford Books.

Kelly, E.C. (1962).The fully functioning self. In *Perceiving, behaving, becoming.* Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA.

Masten, A.S., & Coatsworth, J.D. (1998). The development of competence in favorable and unfavorable environments: Lessons from research on successful children. *American Psychologist, 53(2*), 205-220.

McKinnon, C. (1999). *Character, virtue theories, and the vices.* Toronto: Broadview Press.

Narvaez, D. (1999). Using discourse processing methods to study moral thinking. *Educational Psychology Review, 11* (4), 377-394.

Narvaez, D. with Endicott, L., Bock, T., & Lies, J. (in press). *Foundations of character in the middle school: Developing and nurturing the ethical student.* Chapel Hill, NC: Character Development Publishing.

Nelson, C.A., & Luciana, M. (2001). *Handbook of developmental cognitive neuroscience.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Rutter, M. (1977). Isle of Wight studies, 1964-1974. *Annual Progress in Child Psychiatry & Child Development*, 359-392.

Rutter, M. (1991). Isle of Wight revisited: Twenty-five years of child psychiatric epidemiology. In S. Chess and M.E. Hertzig (Eds.), *Annual progress in child psychiatry and child development* (pp. 131-179). Philadelphia, PA: Brunner/Mazel, Inc.

Scales, P.C., & Leffert, N. (1999). *Developmental assets: A synthesis of the scientific research on adolescent development.* Minneapolis, MN: Search Institute.

Seligman, M. & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive Psychology: An Introduction. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 5-14.

Sroufe, L. A., Carlson, E., & Shulman, S. (1993). Individuals in relationships: Development from infancy through adolescence. In D.C. Funder & R.D. Parke (Eds.), *Studying lives through time: Personality and development. APA science volume* (pp. 315-342). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Sroufe, L. A. (2002). From infant attachment to promotion of adolescent autonomy: Prospective, longitudinal data on the role of parents in development. In J.G Borkowski & S.L. Ramey (Eds.), *Parenting and the child's world: Influences on academic, intellectual, and social-emotional development. Monographs in parenting* (pp. 187-202). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.

Sternberg, R. (1998). Abilities and expertise. *Educational Researcher, April*, 10-37.

Werner, E.E. (1993). Risk, resilience, and recovery: Perspectives from the Kauai Longitudinal Study. *Development & Psychopathology, 5(4),* 503-515.

Werner, E.E. (1995). Resilience in development. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 4(3),* 81-85.

Whitehead, A.N. (1929). *The aims of education and other essays.* New York: Macmillan.

Wing-on, L. & Sai-wing, L. (2001). Institutional Constraints on Promoting Civic Education in Hong Kong Secondary School: Insights from International Educational Achievement Data. In L.J. Limage (Ed.), *Democratizing Education and Educating Democratic Citizens: International and Historical Perspectives* (pp. 267-290). London: Routledge Falmer.