



## From moral instruction to moral formation: Reimagining moral education for behavioural transformation in contemporary society

Amit Mishra<sup>1</sup>, Himanshu Kumar Pandey<sup>1</sup>, Shailendra Kumar<sup>1</sup>, Sanjay Sonker<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Research Scholar, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, India

<sup>2</sup> Professor, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, India

**Corresponding Author:** Himanshu Pandey

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.66856/ijmer.2026.11.3.11052>

### Abstract

This paper critically examines the paradigmatic shift from traditional moral instruction to holistic moral formation in contemporary educational discourse. Despite decades of moral education initiatives, persistent ethical failures across societal institutions reveal a fundamental disconnect between moral knowledge and moral action. Drawing on virtue ethics situated cognition theory and contemporary moral psychology, this study argues that the conventional instructional model—centered on cognitive understanding of ethical principles—has proven insufficient for cultivating the moral agency required in an increasingly complex, pluralistic society. Through synthesis of philosophical frameworks and empirical evidence, this paper proposes a reconceptualized approach to moral education that prioritizes character formation, affective development, and embodied practice over mere intellectual comprehension. The analysis demonstrates that effective moral education must integrate cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions through experiential learning, community engagement, and sustained habituation. This framework addresses critical gaps in current moral education theory and practice, offering practical implications for educational policy, curriculum development, and pedagogical innovation. The paper concludes by outlining pathways for implementation and identifying areas requiring further research, ultimately contributing to the urgent task of preparing morally competent citizens capable of navigating contemporary ethical challenges.

**Keywords:** Moral education, moral formation, character development, virtue ethics, moral agency

### Introduction

Contemporary society faces an unprecedented moral crisis. Despite universal access to education and widespread dissemination of ethical principles, we witness persistent ethical failures across all sectors of society—from corporate malfeasance and political corruption to everyday incivility and social fragmentation (Glanzer, 2018; Sandel, 2020) [48, 120]. The disconnect between moral knowledge and moral action has become increasingly apparent, raising fundamental questions about the efficacy of traditional approaches to moral education (Narvaez, 2006; Rest *et al.*, 1999) [96, 98]. High-profile corporate scandals such as Enron, Volkswagen's emissions fraud, and widespread financial misconduct leading to economic crises; systemic institutional failures in healthcare, law enforcement, and religious organizations; accelerating environmental degradation despite widespread ecological awareness; and widening social polarization amid unprecedented access to information—all point to a troubling reality: knowing what is right does not automatically translate into doing what is right (Blasi, 2004; Treviño *et al.*, 2014) [17, 141].

This paper contends that the root of this crisis lies not in a deficit of moral knowledge, but rather in the fundamental approach to moral education that has dominated Western educational systems for the past century (Arthur, 2020; Kristjánsson, 2015) [5, 75]. The prevailing paradigm, which I term *moral instruction*, operates primarily at the cognitive level, emphasizing the transmission of ethical principles, moral reasoning skills, and abstract values (Kohlberg, 1981; Lapsley & Narvaez, 2006) [71, 98]. While such instruction may enhance moral literacy and develop capacities for ethical deliberation, it has proven woefully inadequate in cultivating the kind of moral agency necessary for ethical

behavior in complex, real-world situations characterized by ambiguity, competing values, social pressure, and personal cost (Berkowitz & Bier, 2005; Walker & Frimer, 2007) [11, 148]. The assumption that ethical knowledge naturally leads to ethical action—what might be called the "cognitive fallacy" of moral education—has been empirically discredited through decades of research in moral psychology, yet continues to underpin much educational practice (Haidt, 2001; Treviño *et al.*, 2006) [52, 142].

In contrast, this paper advocates for a paradigmatic shift toward *moral formation*—a comprehensive approach that recognizes moral development as an integrative process encompassing cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions (Jubilee Centre, 2017; Narvaez & Lapsley, 2008) [67, 97]. Moral formation prioritizes the cultivation of character understood as integrated patterns of perception, emotion, judgment, and action; the development of moral dispositions that become stable features of personality; and the formation of virtuous habits through sustained practice and experiential learning in authentic moral contexts (Annas, 2011; Hursthouse, 1999) [1, 64]. Rather than treating morality as a subject to be learned through instruction, akin to mathematics or history, moral formation understands it as a way of being to be embodied and enacted through lived practice (Arthur *et al.*, 2017; Sanderse, 2012) [6, 121]. This shift from instruction to formation represents not merely a pedagogical adjustment but a fundamental reconceptualization of moral development itself.

### The Research Problem

The central problem this research addresses is threefold. First, there exists a persistent and well-documented gap between moral knowledge and moral behavior, a

phenomenon that traditional instructional approaches have systematically failed to bridge (Bebeau, 2002; Rest, 1986)<sup>[10, 114]</sup>. Individuals regularly demonstrate sophisticated capacities for moral reasoning while simultaneously engaging in ethically questionable behavior, a disconnect that reveals the inadequacy of purely cognitive approaches (Bandura, 1999; Blasi, 1980)<sup>[8, 16]</sup>. This gap manifests across professional contexts—physicians understanding bioethical principles yet violating patient autonomy, business leaders articulating corporate social responsibility while pursuing profit maximization at social cost, politicians advocating democratic values while engaging in corrupt practices—and in everyday life, where ordinary individuals espouse moral values they routinely fail to enact (Treviño *et al.*, 2006)<sup>[142]</sup>.

Second, contemporary society presents increasingly complex moral challenges that require not just abstract reasoning but practical wisdom, emotional intelligence, and moral courage (Coeckelbergh, 2020; Gardner, 2011)<sup>[27, 43]</sup>. Digital ethics and questions surrounding artificial intelligence, data privacy, and algorithmic bias; environmental challenges requiring sustained behavioral change and collective action despite diffuse responsibility; global inequality and questions of distributive justice across borders; biotechnological advances raising questions about human enhancement, genetic modification, and the boundaries of personhood; and navigating moral pluralism in multicultural democracies—all demand forms of moral competence that transcend theoretical knowledge of ethical principles (Carr & Harrison, 2015)<sup>[24]</sup>. These challenges require individuals capable of recognizing moral salience in novel situations, managing emotional responses to moral complexity, resisting social pressure and personal temptation, and sustaining moral commitment despite obstacles and setbacks (Darnell *et al.*, 2019)<sup>[31]</sup>.

Third, current educational frameworks lack a coherent theoretical model that adequately integrates the cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions necessary for genuine moral development (Nucci & Narvaez, 2008; Walker *et al.*, 2004)<sup>[17, 99]</sup>. Cognitive-developmental approaches emphasize reasoning while neglecting emotion and action; character education programs often focus on behavior while insufficiently developing critical reflection; social-emotional learning addresses affective competencies but sometimes lacks explicit moral content and purpose (Lapsley & Yeager, 2013)<sup>[80]</sup>. This fragmentation reflects deeper theoretical divisions between rationalist and sentimentalist ethics, between individual autonomy and communal formation, between universal principles and particular contexts—divisions that must be transcended in a comprehensive approach to moral formation (Kristjánsson, 2013; Narvaez, 2008)<sup>[74, 99]</sup>.

This research problem is particularly urgent given the accelerating pace of social change and the erosion of traditional moral frameworks that once provided coherent guidance (MacIntyre, 2007; Taylor, 1991)<sup>[131, 135]</sup>. In an era characterized by moral pluralism, where multiple comprehensive worldviews coexist without agreed-upon foundations; digital interconnection, which amplifies moral failures while creating new ethical challenges; rapid technological advancement that outpaces moral reflection; and institutional distrust stemming from repeated ethical failures—the need for morally competent individuals who can navigate ethical ambiguity and demonstrate practical

wisdom has never been greater (Noddings, 2002)<sup>[101]</sup>. Yet educational institutions continue to rely primarily on outdated models that emphasize cognitive acquisition over character formation, theoretical knowledge over practical wisdom, individual achievement over communal responsibility, and compliance with rules over cultivation of virtue (Lickona & Davidson, 2005; Seligman *et al.*, 2009)<sup>[85, 124]</sup>.

## Research Objectives and Significance

This paper pursues four primary objectives. First, it critically analyzes the limitations of traditional moral instruction models, identifying the theoretical assumptions—particularly rationalist and individualist assumptions—and practical shortcomings that have systematically hindered effective moral education (Campbell, 2008; Kohn, 1997)<sup>[73, 99]</sup>. This analysis draws on empirical research demonstrating the inadequacy of purely cognitive approaches while examining why such approaches have nonetheless persisted despite mounting evidence of their limitations (Narvaez, 2006)<sup>[79]</sup>.

Second, it synthesizes diverse theoretical frameworks—including virtue ethics as articulated by Aristotle and contemporary virtue ethicists (Annas, 2011; Hursthouse, 1999)<sup>[1, 64]</sup>, situated cognition theory emphasizing the contextual and social nature of learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991)<sup>[82]</sup>, social learning theory highlighting the role of modeling and practice (Bandura, 1986)<sup>[7]</sup>, and contemporary moral psychology demonstrating the primacy of intuition and emotion (Haidt, 2012)<sup>[54]</sup>—to construct a comprehensive model of moral formation that transcends the limitations of unidimensional approaches (Darnell *et al.*, 2019; Fowers, 2005)<sup>[31, 41]</sup>. This synthesis aims to integrate insights from multiple traditions while avoiding eclecticism, grounding the framework in a coherent account of moral development.

Third, it examines empirical evidence demonstrating the efficacy of formative approaches to moral education, drawing on meta-analyses of character education programs (Berkowitz *et al.*, 2017)<sup>[12]</sup>, longitudinal studies of moral exemplars (Colby & Damon, 1992; Walker & Frimer, 2015)<sup>[28, 149]</sup>, neuroscientific research on moral cognition (Greene *et al.*, 2001; Moll *et al.*, 2005)<sup>[51, 90]</sup>, and pedagogical studies of experiential learning and service learning (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Yorio & Ye, 2012)<sup>[39, 157]</sup>. This evidence base demonstrates not only what works but why it works, illuminating the mechanisms through which moral formation occurs (Durlak *et al.*, 2011)<sup>[36]</sup>.

Fourth, it proposes practical implications for curriculum design, pedagogical methods, and institutional reform, translating theoretical insights into concrete guidance for educators, policymakers, and institutional leaders (Battaly, 2016; Walker & Henning, 2004)<sup>[9, 150]</sup>. These implications address multiple levels: individual pedagogical strategies, curricular integration across disciplines, institutional culture and environment, teacher preparation and professional development, and educational policy and accountability systems (Berkowitz & Hoppe, 2009; Davidson *et al.*, 2010)<sup>[14, 33]</sup>.

The significance of this research extends across multiple domains. Theoretically, it contributes to ongoing debates in moral philosophy and educational theory by articulating a more nuanced understanding of moral development that transcends the traditional dichotomy between cognitivist

and character-based approaches, between rationalist and sentimental ethics, between individual autonomy and communal formation (Curren, 2010; Kristjánsson, 2013) <sup>[29, 74]</sup>. The framework demonstrates how apparently competing approaches can be integrated within a comprehensive account grounded in virtue ethics yet informed by contemporary psychology and neuroscience.

Practically, it offers concrete guidance for educators, policymakers, and institutional leaders seeking to cultivate genuine moral agency in educational contexts facing resource constraints, accountability pressures, and cultural diversity (Davidson *et al.*, 2010; Lickona & Davidson, 2005) <sup>[33, 85]</sup>. Rather than proposing idealistic reforms disconnected from educational realities, the framework acknowledges practical constraints while demonstrating how moral formation can enhance rather than compete with academic learning and institutional effectiveness.

Socially, it addresses the urgent need for citizens capable of ethical engagement in an increasingly complex and morally challenging world characterized by rapid technological change, environmental crisis, widening inequality, and democratic fragility (Noddings, 2012; Peterson & Seligman, 2004) <sup>[103, 108]</sup>. Democratic societies depend on citizens who possess not merely voting rights and formal freedoms but substantive capacities for ethical judgment, empathetic understanding across difference, civic responsibility, and moral courage—capacities that must be systematically cultivated through education (Colby & Damon, 1992; Walker & Frimer, 2015) <sup>[28, 149]</sup>.

By reimagining moral education as formation rather than instruction, this research seeks to contribute to the broader project of creating more just, compassionate, and sustainable societies capable of addressing the profound challenges of the 21st century (Noddings, 2012) <sup>[103]</sup>. The stakes could not be higher: the kind of society we create, the wellbeing of current and future generations, and the possibility of human flourishing in an uncertain world all depend significantly on our capacity to cultivate moral agency through education.

## Structure of the Paper

The remainder of this paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 provides a comprehensive literature review, examining the historical development of moral education from classical antiquity through contemporary approaches, critiquing dominant instructional models by identifying their theoretical assumptions and empirical limitations, and surveying alternative approaches including character education, care ethics, and social-emotional learning. Section 3 articulates the theoretical framework undergirding moral formation, drawing on virtue ethics as the philosophical foundation, situated cognition theory and embodied morality, contemporary moral psychology emphasizing intuition and emotion, and developmental considerations across the lifespan. Section 4 analyzes the three key dimensions of moral formation—cognitive (encompassing moral perception, imagination, critical reflection, and practical wisdom), affective (including empathy, moral emotions, and motivation), and behavioral (focusing on habituation, practice, and moral self-efficacy)—and examines their dynamic integration. Section 5 discusses practical implications for educational practice, including specific pedagogical strategies such as case-based learning and service learning, curricular integration across

disciplines, institutional culture and environment, and assessment approaches. Section 6 addresses potential criticisms and limitations, including concerns about indoctrination, cultural relativism and pluralism, implementation challenges, and questions of measurement and evidence. The conclusion synthesizes key arguments, identifies directions for future research, and reflects on the urgency of reimagining moral education for contemporary society.

## Literature Review

### 1. Historical Development of Moral Education

The history of moral education reveals a complex trajectory from premodern character formation to modern cognitive instruction, a shift that reflects deeper transformations in conceptions of morality, selfhood, and education (Carr, 1991<sup>[23]</sup>; MacIntyre, 1981). In classical antiquity, moral education was understood primarily as character cultivation through habituation, practice, and exemplary modeling rather than theoretical instruction (Sherman, 1989) <sup>[126]</sup>. Aristotle's conception of moral virtue as a *hexis*—a stable disposition or settled state of character acquired through repeated practice under guidance of those possessing *phronesis* (practical wisdom)—exemplified this formative approach (Aristotle, trans. 2009) <sup>[3]</sup>. For Aristotle, we become just by practicing just actions, temperate by practicing temperance, and courageous by practicing courage, much as we become skilled musicians through practicing music. Virtues thus represent integrated excellences of character encompassing characteristic patterns of reasoning, feeling, and acting developed through sustained practice in contexts providing appropriate models, feedback, and progressive challenge (Hursthouse, 1999) <sup>[64]</sup>. The medieval period maintained this emphasis on character formation and habituation, though reframed within Christian theological frameworks emphasizing spiritual formation, moral discipline, and cultivation of theological as well as cardinal virtues (MacIntyre, 1990; Pieper, 1966) <sup>[22, 109]</sup>. Medieval education integrated intellectual and moral formation, understanding both as oriented toward ultimate goods transcending individual preference. The monastic tradition particularly exemplified formative approaches, with novices learning virtue through immersion in communities of practice characterized by regular prayer, manual labor, communal life, and guidance from spiritual mentors (MacIntyre, 2007).

The transition to modernity brought a fundamental reorientation toward rationalist and individualist approaches reflecting Enlightenment confidence in reason as the foundation of morality (Taylor, 1989) <sup>[134]</sup>. The Enlightenment privileged reason over tradition, universal principles over particular practices, and individual autonomy over communal formation, profoundly influencing educational philosophy toward cognitive and principle-based approaches (Schneewind, 1998) <sup>[122]</sup>. Kant's emphasis on rational autonomy, categorical imperatives derived through pure practical reason, and moral worth residing in good will rather than consequences exemplified this shift (Kant, trans. 1996, 2002) <sup>[68, 69]</sup>. Kantian ethics led to educational models prioritizing development of rational moral agency through understanding universal principles and exercising autonomous judgment, a stark contrast to Aristotelian habituation or Christian spiritual formation.

The 19th and early 20th centuries saw diverse approaches including character education in the Victorian tradition emphasizing specific virtues and behavioral norms, progressive education drawing on Dewey's pragmatism and emphasizing democratic values and experiential learning, and values clarification treating moral development as individual construction of personal values through reflection (Dewey, 1916; Raths *et al.*, 1978) <sup>[34, 113]</sup>. However, the mid-20th century witnessed the dominance of cognitive-developmental approaches, particularly Lawrence Kohlberg's stage theory (Kohlberg, 1981, 1984) <sup>[71, 72]</sup>.

Kohlberg's influential model, building on Piaget's cognitive-developmental theory, conceptualized moral development as a universal, sequential progression through six stages of increasingly sophisticated moral reasoning: from heteronomous morality focused on punishment and obedience, through conventional morality based on social approval and law maintenance, to post-conventional principled reasoning grounded in social contract or universal ethical principles (Kohlberg, 1984) <sup>[72]</sup>. Kohlberg's model reinforced the cognitivist paradigm, positioning moral education as primarily concerned with enhancing students' capacity for moral judgment through engagement with hypothetical moral dilemmas designed to induce cognitive conflict and stimulate stage progression (Power *et al.*, 1989) <sup>[110]</sup>. The approach emphasized rational deliberation, perspective-taking, and principled reasoning while treating emotion, character, and behavior as secondary concerns.

While Kohlberg's work generated valuable insights into moral reasoning development and remains influential in moral psychology, critics have identified multiple limitations (Gilligan, 1982; Lapsley, 1996; Rest *et al.*, 1999) <sup>[46, 78, 96]</sup>. These include insufficient attention to affective and behavioral dimensions of morality, cultural bias toward Western liberal individualism, gender bias in emphasizing justice over care, the artificial nature of hypothetical dilemmas divorced from real moral experience, and crucially, the failure to account for the persistent gap between moral judgment and moral action (Blasi, 1980; Noddings, 1984) <sup>[16, 100]</sup>. Research consistently demonstrates that sophisticated moral reasoning does not reliably predict moral behavior, revealing the inadequacy of purely cognitive approaches (Rest, 1986; Walker, 2004) <sup>[17, 114]</sup>.

## 2. Critique of Traditional Moral Instruction Models

Contemporary research has identified multiple interrelated limitations of traditional moral instruction approaches that collectively explain their inadequacy in cultivating genuine moral agency. First, the *cognitive fallacy* assumes that moral knowledge—whether of principles, values, or reasoning processes—automatically translates into moral behavior, an assumption contradicted by extensive empirical evidence across contexts (Blasi, 1980; Rest, 1986; Thoma *et al.*, 2008) <sup>[16, 114, 139]</sup>. Studies in moral psychology, organizational ethics, and behavioral economics consistently demonstrate that individuals often possess sophisticated moral reasoning abilities yet fail to act accordingly when faced with real-world ethical challenges involving social pressure, personal cost, competing incentives, or moral licensing (Bandura, 1999; Treviño *et al.*, 2006) <sup>[8, 142]</sup>. This phenomenon of moral knowing-doing gap manifests across professional contexts—physicians violating bioethical principles they intellectually endorse, business leaders engaging in unethical practices while articulating corporate

values, politicians contradicting democratic principles—and in everyday failures to act on espoused moral commitments (Tenbrunsel & Smith-Crowe, 2008) <sup>[137]</sup>.

The cognitive fallacy reflects deeper assumptions about human nature as primarily rational, morality as essentially intellectual, and education as transmission of knowledge—assumptions challenged by contemporary research in moral psychology, neuroscience, and situated cognition (Haidt, 2001, 2012) <sup>[52, 54]</sup>. Moral judgment and behavior involve complex interactions among automatic intuitions, emotional responses, situational factors, identity commitments, and reflective reasoning, with cognition often serving to justify rather than generate moral decisions (Haidt & Bjorklund, 2008) <sup>[55]</sup>. Understanding why the cognitive fallacy persists despite mounting evidence requires examining institutional factors including the ease of teaching and assessing moral knowledge compared to character, the dominance of cognitive-developmental theory in moral psychology, and educational systems oriented toward measurable learning outcomes (Narvaez, 2006) <sup>[98]</sup>.

Second, instructional models tend toward *excessive abstraction*, presenting moral principles divorced from the contextual, emotional, relational, and practical complexities of actual moral experience (Noddings, 1984, 2002) <sup>[100, 101]</sup>. Hypothetical dilemmas commonly used in moral education—trolley problems, lifeboat scenarios, abstract conflicts between duty and consequence—lack the contextual richness, emotional engagement, relationship considerations, and uncertainty characteristic of real-world ethical challenges (Nussbaum, 1990; Walker & Pitts, 1998) <sup>[105, 152]</sup>. Students may develop facility in analyzing artificial dilemmas yet remain unprepared for the moral complexity of actual situations involving ambiguous facts, competing valid considerations, relationships with particular others, institutional pressures, personal stakes, and emotional turbulence (Noddings, 1984) <sup>[100]</sup>.

This decontextualization reflects the influence of Enlightenment rationalism seeking universal principles transcending particular contexts, but fails to recognize that moral competence requires not just abstract principles but practical wisdom—the capacity to perceive morally relevant features of particular situations, weigh competing considerations, and judge appropriate action (Darnell *et al.*, 2019; Kristjánsson, 2015). As Noddings (1984) <sup>[31, 75, 100]</sup> argues, abstract principles often prove inadequate guides for action in concrete situations requiring empathetic understanding, relational responsiveness, and contextual judgment. Effective moral education must engage students with contextually rich cases, authentic moral problems in their communities, and opportunities to practice moral judgment in situations approaching the complexity of actual moral life (Narvaez, 2008) <sup>[99]</sup>.

Third, traditional approaches exhibit *affective neglect*, failing to adequately address the crucial role of emotions, empathy, and moral sentiment in ethical life (Hoffman, 2000; Tangney *et al.*, 2007) <sup>[63, 131]</sup>. Contemporary moral psychology and neuroscience have decisively demonstrated that moral judgment and moral behavior are fundamentally affective processes, not merely cognitive calculations (Damasio, 1994; Greene *et al.*, 2001; Haidt, 2012) <sup>[30, 51, 54]</sup>. Neuroimaging studies reveal that brain regions associated with emotion processing—particularly the ventromedial prefrontal cortex and amygdala—are centrally involved in moral judgment, and damage to these regions produces



specific moral deficits despite intact reasoning capacity (Moll *et al.*, 2005) <sup>[90]</sup>. Individuals with emotional deficits struggle with moral judgment and behavior even when cognitive abilities remain intact, while emotional responses often guide moral decisions more powerfully than conscious deliberation (Damasio, 1994) <sup>[30]</sup>.

Haidt's (2001, 2012) <sup>[52, 54]</sup> social intuitionist model demonstrates that moral judgments typically arise from rapid automatic intuitions driven by emotion, with reasoning serving primarily to justify rather than generate these judgments. Moral emotions including empathy, compassion, guilt, shame, moral elevation, and moral disgust play essential roles in moral perception (recognizing moral salience), moral motivation (generating commitment to action), and moral behavior (sustaining action despite obstacles) (Tangney *et al.*, 2007) <sup>[133]</sup>. Research on moral exemplars demonstrates that exceptional moral commitment correlates more strongly with emotional sensitivity to moral issues and integration of moral values into identity than with sophisticated reasoning abilities (Colby & Damon, 1992; Walker & Frimer, 2007, 2015) <sup>[28, 148, 149]</sup>. Yet traditional moral instruction often treats emotion as potential distortion to be overcome through reason rather than essential dimension requiring cultivation (Kristjánsson, 2018; Narvaez *et al.*, 2006) <sup>[76, 79]</sup>.

Fourth, instructional models typically employ *individualistic frameworks* that neglect the fundamentally social and relational nature of moral development (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Vygotsky, 1978; Wenger, 1998) <sup>[82, 146, 154]</sup>. These approaches treat moral development as primarily individual cognitive construction through personal reflection, minimizing the roles of social interaction, communal practice, relational responsiveness, and participation in moral communities. However, extensive research demonstrates that moral formation occurs not primarily through solitary reflection but through engagement in social practices, relationships with moral exemplars, participation in communities embodying moral traditions, and collaborative moral problem-solving (Bandura, 1986; Rogoff, 1990) <sup>[7, 116]</sup>.

The work of MacIntyre (1981, 2007) <sup>[71, 111]</sup> and other communitarian thinkers highlights how moral understanding is embedded in narrative traditions and social practices that cannot be adequately captured by abstract instruction divorced from communal context. Moral concepts gain meaning through their roles in social practices; moral reasoning develops through participation in communities modeling appropriate deliberation; moral identity forms through relationships providing recognition and accountability; and moral action becomes possible through communities providing support, expectations, and shared commitment (Lave & Wenger, 1991) <sup>[82]</sup>. Educational approaches must therefore embed moral formation in authentic moral communities rather than treating it as individual intellectual exercise (Noddings, 2002; Wenger, 1998) <sup>[10, 154]</sup>.

Finally, traditional approaches demonstrate *behavioral disconnection*, failing to provide adequate opportunities for moral practice and habituation essential for developing stable dispositions (Lickona, 1991; Ryan & Bohlin, 1999) <sup>[84, 118]</sup>. Virtue ethicists from Aristotle onward have recognized that moral excellence develops through repeated action, not mere contemplation or abstract reasoning (Annas, 2011; Hursthouse, 1999) <sup>[1, 64]</sup>. Virtues are acquired

through practice in much the way complex skills are mastered—through repeated engagement providing progressive challenge, feedback, and refinement under guidance of skilled practitioners (Annas, 2011; Stichter, 2007) <sup>[1, 131]</sup>. Yet traditional moral instruction provides minimal opportunities for such practice, treating moral education as primarily theoretical enterprise (Sanderse, 2012) <sup>[103]</sup>.

### 3. Alternative Approaches: Character Education, Care Ethics, and SEL

In response to the limitations of cognitive-instructional models, alternative approaches have emerged emphasizing character formation, relational ethics, and affective development. The character education movement, drawing on Aristotelian virtue ethics and 19th-century moral education traditions, focuses on cultivating specific virtues—honesty, courage, compassion, integrity, perseverance, respect—through modeling, deliberate practice, and institutional culture intentionally structured to support character development (Berkowitz & Bier, 2005; Lickona, 1991; Ryan & Bohlin, 1999) <sup>[11, 84, 118]</sup>. Proponents argue that character education addresses the behavioral dimension neglected by purely cognitive approaches, providing structured opportunities for habituation and moral practice essential for virtue development (Arthur, 2003; Davidson *et al.*, 2007) <sup>[4, 131]</sup>.

Contemporary character education has evolved significantly from earlier forms, incorporating research in moral psychology and developmental science (Berkowitz *et al.*, 2017) <sup>[12]</sup>. Programs emphasize not merely behavioral compliance but understanding rationales for virtues, developing moral reasoning alongside practice, creating school cultures supporting character, engaging families and communities, and integrating character development across curriculum (Lickona & Davidson, 2005; Narvaez, 2006) <sup>[79, 85]</sup>. Meta-analyses demonstrate moderate to strong positive effects on various outcomes including prosocial behavior, ethical values, academic achievement, and reduced problem behaviors, with effect sizes varying by program quality and implementation (Berkowitz & Bier, 2005; Berkowitz *et al.*, 2017) <sup>[11, 12]</sup>.

However, character education has faced persistent criticisms warranting careful consideration (Kohn, 1997; Purpel & Ryan, 1976) <sup>[73, 112]</sup>. Critics argue that some programs amount to indoctrination, imposing particular cultural values without fostering critical thinking or respecting moral autonomy (Levinson, 1999) <sup>[83]</sup>. Questions arise about whose virtues get privileged in pluralistic societies and whether universal virtue lists adequately respect cultural diversity (Lockwood, 1997) <sup>[86]</sup>. Some critics contend that character education reduces to behavioral conditioning emphasizing compliance over authentic moral agency, potentially producing moral heteronomy rather than autonomy (Kohn, 1997) <sup>[73]</sup>. These criticisms, while sometimes caricaturing character education, identify genuine tensions requiring thoughtful navigation.

Defenders have responded by articulating more nuanced approaches integrating character formation with critical reflection, democratic values, and respect for diversity (Berkowitz & Hoppe, 2009; Lickona & Davidson, 2005) <sup>[14, 85]</sup>. They distinguish between core virtues necessary for any community—honesty, responsibility, respect—and particular value commitments legitimately varying across

worldviews. They emphasize that proper character education cultivates capacities for autonomous moral judgment alongside virtuous dispositions, develops critical thinking about inherited values, and prepares students for thoughtful engagement with moral diversity (Arthur, 2020; Kristjánsson, 2015) <sup>[5, 75]</sup>. Research suggests that well-designed programs can enhance rather than undermine autonomy by providing the character foundations necessary for independent moral agency (Berkowitz *et al.*, 2017) <sup>[12]</sup>.

Care ethics, developed by Gilligan (1982), Noddings (1984, 2002) <sup>[46, 100, 101]</sup>, and others in response to perceived limitations of justice-focused approaches, offers another alternative emphasizing relational responsiveness, empathy, contextual sensitivity, and ethics of care (Held, 2006; Slote, 2007) <sup>[62, 127]</sup>. This approach challenges both abstract principlism and individualistic frameworks, positioning moral development within webs of relationships and emphasizing attentiveness to particular others in their concrete circumstances (Tronto, 1993) <sup>[143]</sup>. Care ethics highlights dimensions of moral life—empathy, compassion, relational responsibility, nurturing, emotional attunement—often marginalized in traditional moral philosophy dominated by rights, duties, and universal principles (Gilligan & Wiggins, 1987; Noddings, 2012) <sup>[47, 103]</sup>.

For moral education, care ethics emphasizes cultivating capacities for empathetic understanding, maintaining caring relationships, responding to particular needs, and developing relational competencies (Noddings, 1984, 2002) <sup>[100, 101]</sup>. Noddings proposes education organized around themes of care—caring for self, intimate others, strangers, the natural world, ideas—providing students opportunities to develop caring capacities through authentic caring relationships and practice (Noddings, 2012) <sup>[103]</sup>. This approach treats the teacher-student relationship itself as morally formative, with teachers modeling care and students learning to care through being cared for and practicing care for others (Noddings, 1984) <sup>[100]</sup>.

However, critics have questioned whether care ethics provides adequate resources for addressing issues of justice, rights, and large-scale social problems requiring principled responses beyond particular relationships (Card, 1990; Friedman, 1993) <sup>[22, 42]</sup>. Concerns arise about potential parochialism limiting moral concern to those with whom we have relationships, insufficient attention to structural injustice requiring systemic change beyond individual caring, and risks of exploitation in unequal caring relationships lacking justice frameworks (Okin, 1989) <sup>[107]</sup>. Defenders respond that care ethics need not reject justice but reconfigures its meaning within relational context, and that principled approaches lacking relational grounding prove inadequate for moral life (Held, 2006; Slote, 2007) <sup>[62, 127]</sup>. The productive path forward may integrate care and justice, recognizing both relational and principled dimensions of morality (Nussbaum, 1999) <sup>[106]</sup>.

Social-emotional learning (SEL) represents another important development, integrating emotional intelligence, self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making (CASEL, 2020; Elias *et al.*, 1997) <sup>[25, 38]</sup>. SEL programs recognize affective foundations of moral and social development, providing systematic approaches to cultivating emotional competencies often neglected in traditional academic curricula (Zins *et al.*, 2004) <sup>[159]</sup>. Comprehensive SEL programs include explicit instruction

in emotional literacy, structured opportunities for practicing social skills, classroom climates supporting emotional safety, and integration across academic subjects (Durlak *et al.*, 2011) <sup>[36]</sup>. Extensive research demonstrates significant positive outcomes from well-designed SEL programs, including improved academic performance, enhanced peer relationships, reduced behavioral problems, better emotional regulation, and increased prosocial behavior, with effects sustained over time and generalizing across contexts (Durlak *et al.*, 2011; Taylor *et al.*, 2017) <sup>[36, 136]</sup>.

## Theoretical Framework: Toward Integrative Moral Formation

This section articulates a comprehensive theoretical framework for moral formation that synthesizes insights from virtue ethics, situated cognition theory, moral psychology, and developmental science. The framework conceptualizes moral formation as an integrative process encompassing three interdependent dimensions: cognitive (moral understanding and reasoning), affective (moral sentiment and motivation), and behavioral (moral practice and habituation) (Narvaez & Lapsley, 2008; Rest *et al.*, 1999) <sup>[96, 99]</sup>. Effective moral education must address all three dimensions in their dynamic interaction rather than privileging one at the expense of others (Berkowitz & Grych, 2000; Walker *et al.*, 2004) <sup>[13, 147]</sup>. This integrative approach transcends both purely cognitive models neglecting emotion and behavior and purely behavioral approaches insufficiently developing understanding and critical reflection.

### 1. Virtue Ethics as Foundational Framework

Aristotelian virtue ethics provides the philosophical foundation for moral formation by conceptualizing moral excellence as a stable disposition (*hexis*) acquired through habituation and practice (Aristotle, trans. 2009; Hursthouse, 1999) <sup>[3, 64]</sup>. Unlike rule-based deontological ethics focusing on right action determined by duties or consequentialist theories emphasizing outcomes, virtue ethics centers on moral character—the kind of person one becomes through sustained moral practice and formation (Annas, 2011; Foot, 1978) <sup>[1, 40]</sup>. Virtues are not merely behavioral tendencies or dispositions to act in certain ways, but integrated excellences encompassing appropriate reasoning (knowing what virtue requires in particular circumstances), feeling (experiencing appropriate emotions), and action (reliably doing what virtue requires) (Hursthouse, 1999; Sherman, 1989) <sup>[64, 126]</sup>.

Central to Aristotle's account is *phronesis* (practical wisdom)—the intellectual virtue enabling appropriate application of general moral principles to particular situations through sound judgment sensitive to contextual features (Aristotle, trans. 2009; Nussbaum, 1990) <sup>[3, 105]</sup>. *Phronesis* differs from theoretical knowledge (*sophia*) and technical skill (*techne*), representing capacity for moral discernment in particular situations where competing considerations must be balanced, contextual factors weighed, and appropriate mean between extremes identified (Dunne, 1993) <sup>[35]</sup>. Crucially, *phronesis* cannot be taught through abstract instruction but develops through experience, reflective practice, and guidance from those possessing greater wisdom (Kristjánsson, 2015; Sanderse, 2012) <sup>[75, 121]</sup>.

Contemporary virtue ethicists have developed Aristotle's insights in ways particularly relevant to moral education. Hursthouse's (1999) <sup>[64]</sup> account of virtue as involving characteristic patterns of reasoning, feeling, and acting emphasizes the integrated nature of moral character irreducible to any single dimension. Annas's (2011) <sup>[1]</sup> skill model of virtue highlights the developmental process through which moral excellence is acquired, comparing it to acquisition of complex skills through practice, feedback, and progressive refinement under guidance of skilled practitioners. This model provides a pedagogically useful framework for understanding moral formation as analogous to mastering piano, carpentry, or surgery—requiring extensive practice, good models, appropriate feedback, and gradual development from novice through competent to expert practitioner (Russell, 2009; Stichter, 2007) <sup>[117, 131]</sup>.

## 2. Situated Cognition and Embodied Morality

Situated cognition theory challenges traditional cognitivist assumptions by demonstrating that thinking, learning, and knowing are fundamentally embedded in physical, social, and cultural contexts rather than occurring as abstract mental processes divorced from embodied engagement with the world (Brown *et al.*, 1989; Lave & Wenger, 1991) <sup>[20, 82]</sup>. Knowledge is not primarily propositional information stored in individual minds but practical capacity developed through participation in communities of practice and engagement with authentic tasks in meaningful contexts (Lave, 1988; Wenger, 1998) <sup>[81, 154]</sup>. Learning occurs not primarily through transmission of information but through legitimate peripheral participation in communities where newcomers gradually acquire the knowledge, skills, and identity of practitioners (Lave & Wenger, 1991) <sup>[82]</sup>.

Applied to moral development, situated cognition theory suggests that moral understanding cannot be adequately developed through abstract, decontextualized instruction but requires engagement in authentic moral practices within meaningful social contexts (Narvaez, 2008; Wenger, 1998) <sup>[99, 154]</sup>. Moral knowledge is not primarily theoretical knowledge of principles transmitted through instruction but practical knowledge—knowing how to perceive morally relevant features, judge appropriate responses, and act effectively—acquired through participation in moral communities and practices (Rogoff, 1990) <sup>[116]</sup>. Moral competence develops through apprenticeship-style learning where novices engage in authentic moral practices under guidance of more experienced practitioners, gradually acquiring moral perception, judgment, and skill (Lave & Wenger, 1991) <sup>[82]</sup>.

Research in embodied cognition extends this insight by demonstrating that moral cognition is grounded in bodily experience and sensorimotor processes rather than occurring as purely abstract mental processing (Johnson, 1993; Lakoff & Johnson, 1999) <sup>[166, 77]</sup>. Moral concepts are structured through metaphorical mappings from physical domains—purity/contamination, balance, containment, verticality—reflecting our embodied nature as physical beings engaging with material world (Gibbs, 2005; Haidt & Joseph, 2004) <sup>[45, 57]</sup>. These embodied foundations shape moral intuitions and reasoning in ways often unrecognized but nonetheless powerful. This embodied dimension of morality has important implications for moral education, suggesting that moral formation should engage the whole person—body, emotion, and mind—through physically active, emotionally

engaging, socially embedded experiences rather than treating morality as purely intellectual exercise (Shapiro, 2011; Varela, 1999) <sup>[125, 145]</sup>.

## The Three Dimensions of Moral Formation and Their Integration

Building on the theoretical framework articulated above, this section analyzes three essential dimensions of moral formation—cognitive, affective, and behavioral—and their dynamic integration. While these dimensions can be analytically distinguished for purposes of analysis, they are not genuinely separable in lived moral experience, and effective moral formation requires their simultaneous development and integration (Narvaez & Lapsley, 2008; Rest *et al.*, 1999) <sup>[96, 97]</sup>. The separation here is heuristic, serving to clarify distinct aspects of a unified developmental process that in practice must be addressed holistically.

### 1. The Cognitive Dimension

The cognitive dimension encompasses moral perception, moral imagination, critical reflection, and practical wisdom. *Moral perception*—the capacity to recognize morally salient features of situations—is foundational yet often neglected (Murdoch, 1970) <sup>[91]</sup>. Moral failures frequently stem not from defective reasoning about recognized moral issues but from failure to perceive moral dimensions in the first place. Developing moral perception requires cultivating attentiveness, expanding moral sensitivities, and learning to see situations through moral lenses (Blum, 1991) <sup>[19]</sup>. *Moral imagination* enables envisioning alternatives, understanding diverse perspectives, and considering consequences (Nussbaum, 1990) <sup>[105]</sup>. *Critical reflection* involves examining moral intuitions and inherited values (Noddings, 2002) <sup>[101]</sup>. *Practical wisdom* represents integration of these capacities in sound judgment sensitive to contextual particulars (Kristjánsson, 2015) <sup>[75]</sup>.

### 2. The Affective Dimension

The affective dimension encompasses empathy, moral emotions, and motivation. Empathy represents foundational moral capacity enabling understanding of others' perspectives and feelings (Hoffman, 2000) <sup>[63]</sup>. Moral emotions—guilt, shame, compassion, moral elevation—provide immediate guidance and sustained motivation (Tangney *et al.*, 2007) <sup>[133]</sup>. However, empathy has limitations including bias toward similar others and potential for empathetic distress, requiring complementary moral commitments (Bloom, 2016) <sup>[18]</sup>. Moral elevation—positive emotion experienced when witnessing moral beauty—inspires similar behavior and strengthens commitment (Haidt, 2003) <sup>[53]</sup>. Motivation involves developing sustained commitment to moral values and capacity to act on moral judgments despite competing incentives (Ryan & Deci, 2000) <sup>[119]</sup>.

### 3. The Behavioral Dimension

The behavioral dimension focuses on habituation, practice, and moral self-efficacy. Moral virtues are acquired through repeated practice that gradually transforms conscious effortful behavior into automatic ingrained patterns, creating neural pathways facilitating consistent ethical action (Annas, 2011; Wood & Neal, 2007) <sup>[1, 156]</sup>. However, moral habituation differs from mere conditioning by involving understanding rationales and developing appropriate

emotional responses alongside behavioral patterns (Hursthouse, 1999) <sup>[64]</sup>. Practice should be graduated and scaffolded, progressing from simple behaviors in supportive contexts to complex challenges requiring greater judgment and courage (Berkowitz & Bier, 2005) <sup>[11]</sup>. Moral self-efficacy—confidence in capacity to act morally—correlates strongly with actual moral behavior and develops through successful moral action, peer modeling, and supportive feedback (Bandura, 1999) <sup>[8]</sup>.

#### 4. Integration of Dimensions

Effective moral formation requires dynamic integration of all three dimensions. Integration occurs through pedagogical approaches engaging students holistically: case-based learning simultaneously develops reasoning, emotional response, and behavioral judgment; service learning integrates understanding of social issues, empathetic connection, and helping practice; literary engagement cultivates imagination, empathy, and consideration of action (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Narvaez, 2008) <sup>[39, 93]</sup>. Reflective practice—systematic reflection connecting action, emotion, and understanding—facilitates integration by helping students make sense of moral experiences, examine emotional responses, consider alternatives, and build coherent moral understanding (Schön, 1983) <sup>[123]</sup>.

#### Implications for Educational Practice

The theoretical framework generates specific implications for educational practice at multiple levels: pedagogical strategies, curricular integration, institutional culture, and assessment approaches. These recommendations are grounded in both theoretical coherence and empirical evidence while acknowledging practical constraints facing educational institutions (Berkowitz & Hoppe, 2009; Davidson *et al.*, 2010) <sup>[14, 33]</sup>.

##### 1. Pedagogical Strategies

Effective strategies include: (1) Case-based moral deliberation using contextually rich situations engaging reasoning, affective response, and practical judgment (Narvaez, 2008) <sup>[93]</sup>; (2) Service learning providing authentic moral practice addressing real social needs with structured reflection connecting experience to broader understanding (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Yorio & Ye, 2012) <sup>[39, 157]</sup>; (3) Narrative engagement through literature and film cultivating moral imagination and empathy (Carr & Harrison, 2015; Nussbaum, 1990) <sup>[24, 105]</sup>; (4) Moral exemplar study examining lives demonstrating exceptional moral commitment (Colby & Damon, 1992; Walker & Frimer, 2015) <sup>[28, 149]</sup>; (5) Collaborative moral practice through group projects, peer mediation, and community building developing relational virtues (Noddings, 2002) <sup>[101]</sup>.

##### 2. Curricular Integration and Institutional Culture

Moral formation should be integrated throughout curriculum rather than confined to separate ethics courses. Every discipline offers opportunities through discipline-specific ethical issues, moral dimensions of subject matter, and intellectual virtues (Berkowitz *et al.*, 2017) <sup>[12]</sup>. Institutional culture must support moral development through relational climate emphasizing care and respect, restorative disciplinary practices, leadership modeling moral commitment, and peer culture supporting rather than undermining moral development (Lickona & Davidson,

2005) <sup>[85]</sup>. Students need regular opportunities for authentic responsibility through student governance, peer mediation, community service expectations, and meaningful decision-making (Noddings, 2012) <sup>[103]</sup>.

#### 3. Assessment Approaches

Assessment should employ multiple methods addressing different dimensions: observational assessment of behavior in natural contexts, reflective portfolios documenting moral experiences and learning, structured interviews exploring reasoning and motivation, and peer and self-assessment cultivating metacognitive awareness (Berkowitz & Bier, 2005) <sup>[11]</sup>. Assessment should be primarily formative rather than summative, supporting ongoing development rather than just measuring outcomes, with feedback that is specific, constructive, and growth-focused (Narvaez, 2008) <sup>[93]</sup>.

#### Addressing Potential Criticisms and Limitations

The moral formation framework faces several potential criticisms warranting serious consideration. Regarding indoctrination concerns, the framework distinguishes itself through emphasis on critical reflection alongside habituation, exposure to diverse perspectives, prioritization of general moral capacities over specific ideological commitments, and focus on enabling authentic moral agency (Berkowitz & Hoppe, 2009; Kristjánsson, 2015) <sup>[14, 75]</sup>. The alternative—refusing moral formation—is neither possible nor desirable, as educational institutions inevitably shape character through their practices. Regarding cultural relativism and pluralism, the framework distinguishes between core moral capacities necessary for ethical agency in any tradition and specific value commitments that legitimately vary (Noddings, 2012) <sup>[103]</sup>. Implementation challenges are substantial but reflect limitations of current educational systems rather than inherent problems with moral formation. Measurement challenges are real, yet substantial evidence supports efficacy of formative approaches, and the stakes demand action based on best available evidence while conducting research to improve practice (Durlak *et al.*, 2011; Berkowitz *et al.*, 2017) <sup>[12, 36]</sup>.

#### Conclusion

This paper has argued for fundamental reconceptualization of moral education from instruction to formation, from cognitive transmission to integrative development, from theoretical abstraction to embodied practice. The persistent gap between moral knowledge and moral action, the inadequacy of purely cognitive approaches, and complex ethical challenges facing contemporary society all demand this paradigmatic shift (Blasi, 2004; Narvaez, 2006) <sup>[17, 79]</sup>. The framework of moral formation articulated here offers a more comprehensive and empirically grounded approach integrating cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions through experiential learning, authentic practice, and participation in moral communities (Narvaez & Lapsley, 2008; Walker & Frimer, 2007) <sup>[99, 148]</sup>. Implementation requires changes across multiple levels: pedagogical strategies emphasizing experiential learning, curricular integration across disciplines, institutional cultures supporting moral development, and assessment approaches capturing complexity of moral character (Berkowitz & Hoppe, 2009; Lickona & Davidson, 2005) <sup>[14, 85]</sup>. These changes face significant obstacles but are



nonetheless necessary and achievable given the stakes involved (Davidson *et al.*, 2010) <sup>[33]</sup>.

Future research directions include: longitudinal studies examining long-term impacts, research investigating mechanisms of moral development, cross-cultural research illuminating how principles apply across diverse contexts, and implementation research examining how to support necessary systemic changes (Hardy & Carlo, 2011; Walker & Henning, 2004) <sup>[59, 150]</sup>. Theoretical questions warrant further exploration regarding balance between stable character and moral flexibility, universal principles versus cultural particularity, moral courage alongside collaborative problem-solving, and engagement with digital ethics (Coeckelbergh, 2020; Kristjánsson, 2015) <sup>[27, 75]</sup>.

The urgency of reimagining moral education cannot be overstated. We face existential challenges—climate change, technological disruption, inequality, democratic erosion—requiring not just technical solutions but fundamental moral transformation (Sandel, 2020) <sup>[120]</sup>. We need citizens capable of ethical engagement with complexity, willing to sacrifice short-term interests for sustainability, able to build inclusive communities across difference, and committed to justice and compassion (Noddings, 2012) <sup>[103]</sup>. Such citizens are not born but formed through sustained education cultivating character alongside intellect, virtue alongside knowledge, and moral agency alongside academic achievement (Arthur, 2020) <sup>[5]</sup>.

The shift from moral instruction to moral formation represents more than pedagogical innovation; it reflects deeper understanding of human moral nature and social flourishing. We develop not primarily through abstract instruction but through participation in practices, relationships with exemplars, emotional engagement with moral reality, and sustained cultivation of virtue (Annas, 2011; Hursthouse, 1999) <sup>[1, 64]</sup>. Educational approaches recognizing and working with rather than against this reality hold greater promise for cultivating moral agents our world desperately needs. The framework proposed offers no easy solutions, as moral formation is difficult, requiring sustained effort, adequate resources, institutional commitment, and cultural support. Yet the alternative—continuing with inadequate approaches while society's ethical fabric frays—is unacceptable. We must embrace the challenge of comprehensive moral formation because the stakes demand nothing less. The kind of society we create, the wellbeing of current and future generations, and the possibility of human flourishing depend on our willingness to reimagine and recommit to the moral formation of persons capable of building a more just, compassionate, and sustainable future (Walker & Frimer, 2015) <sup>[149]</sup>.

## References

1. Annas J. *Intelligent virtue*. Oxford University Press, 2011. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199228782.001.0001>
2. Aquino K, Reed A II. The self-importance of moral identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,2002;83(6):1423–1440. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.6.1423>
3. Aristotle. *Nicomachean ethics* (R. Crisp, Trans.). Cambridge University Press, 2009. (Original work published ca. 350 BCE)
4. Arthur J. *Education with character: The moral economy of schooling*. RoutledgeFalmer, 2003.
5. Arthur J. *The formation of character in education: From Aristotle to the 21st century*. Routledge, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429295393>
6. Arthur J, Kristjánsson K, Harrison T, Sanderse W, Wright D. *Teaching character and virtue in schools*. Routledge, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315695006>
7. Bandura A. *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall, 1986.
8. Bandura A. Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*,1999;3(3):193–209. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0303\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0303_3)
9. Battaly H. Developing virtue and rehabilitating vice: Worries about self-cultivation and self-reform. *Journal of Moral Education*,2016;45(2):207–222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2016.1167027>
10. Bebeau MJ. The defining issues test and the four component model. *Journal of Moral Education*,2002;31(3):271–295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305724022000008115>
11. Berkowitz MW, Bier MC. *What works in character education*. Character Education Partnership, 2005.
12. Berkowitz MW, Bier MC, McCauley B. Toward a science of character education. *Journal of Character Education*,2017;13(1):33–51.
13. Berkowitz MW, Grych JH. Early character development and education. *Early Education and Development*,2000;11(1):55–72. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15566935eed1101\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15566935eed1101_4)
14. Berkowitz MW, Hoppe MA. Character education and gifted children. *High Ability Studies*,2009;20(2):131–142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13598130903358493>
15. Blakemore SJ, Choudhury S. Development of the adolescent brain. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*,2006;47(3–4):296–312. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2006.01611.x>
16. Blasi A. Bridging moral cognition and moral action. *Psychological Bulletin*,1980;88(1):1–45. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.88.1.1>
17. Blasi A. Moral functioning: Moral understanding and personality. In: Lapsley DK, Narvaez D (Eds.). *Moral development, self, and identity*. Lawrence Erlbaum, 2004, 335–347.
18. Bloom P. *Against empathy: The case for rational compassion*. Ecco Press, 2016.
19. Blum LA. Moral perception and particularity. *Ethics*,1991;101(4):701–725. <https://doi.org/10.1086/293339>
20. Brown JS, Collins A, Duguid P. *Situated cognition and the culture of learning*. Educational Researcher,1989;18(1):32–42. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X018001032>
21. Campbell E. The ethics of teaching as a moral profession. *Curriculum Inquiry*,2008;38(4):357–385. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2008.00414.x>
22. Card C. Gender and moral luck. In: Flanagan O, Rorty AO (Eds.). *Identity, character, and morality*. MIT Press, 1990, 197–216.
23. Carr D. *Educating the virtues*. Routledge, 1991.
24. Carr D, Harrison T. *Educating character through stories*. Imprint Academic, 2015.
25. CASEL. *CASEL's SEL framework*. Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning, 2020. <https://casel.org/fundamentals-of-sel/>

26. Casey BJ, Jones RM, Hare TA. The adolescent brain. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 2008;1124(1):111–126. <https://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1440.010>
27. Coeckelbergh M. AI ethics. MIT Press, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/12549.001.0001>
28. Colby A, Damon W. Some do care: Contemporary lives of moral commitment. Free Press, 1992.
29. Curren R. Aristotle's educational politics. *Oxford Review of Education*, 2010;36(5):543–559. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2010.514434>
30. Damasio AR. Descartes' error: Emotion, reason, and the human brain. Putnam, 1994.
31. Darnell C, Gulliford L, Kristjánsson K, Paris P. Phronesis and the knowledge-action gap. *Human Development*, 2019;62(3):101–129. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000496136>
32. Davidson M, Lickona T, Khmelkov V. Smart & good schools. In: Nucci LP, Narvaez D (Eds.). *Handbook of moral and character education*. Routledge, 2007, 370–390.
33. Davidson M, Lickona T, Khmelkov V. A new common purpose for character education. In: Lovat T, Toomey R (Eds.). *International research handbook on values education*. Springer, 2010, 99–113. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-8675-4\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-8675-4_7)
34. Dewey J. *Democracy and education*. Macmillan, 1916.
35. Dunne J. *Back to the rough ground: Practical judgment and the lure of technique*. University of Notre Dame Press, 1993.
36. Durlak JA, Weissberg RP, Dymnicki AB, Taylor RD, Schellinger KB. The impact of enhancing students' SEL. *Child Development*, 2011;82(1):405–432. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x>
37. Eisenberg N, Fabes RA, Spinrad TL. Prosocial development. In: Eisenberg N (Ed.). *Handbook of child psychology* (6th ed., Vol. 3). Wiley, 2006, 646–718.
38. Elias MJ, Zins JE, Weissberg RP, et al. *Promoting social and emotional learning*. ASCD, 1997.
39. Eyler J, Giles DE Jr. *Where's the learning in service-learning?* Jossey-Bass, 1999.
40. Foot P. *Virtues and vices*. University of California Press, 1978.
41. Fowers BJ. *Virtue and psychology*. APA, 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10929-000>
42. Friedman M. *What are friends for?* Cornell University Press, 1993.
43. Gardner H. *Creating minds*. Basic Books, 2011.
44. Gibbs JC. *Moral development and reality* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press, 2014.
45. Gibbs RW Jr. *Embodiment and cognitive science*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
46. Gilligan C. *In a different voice*. Harvard University Press, 1982.
47. Gilligan C, Wiggins G. The origins of morality. In: Kagan J, Lamb S (Eds.). *The emergence of morality*. University of Chicago Press, 1987, 277–305.
48. Glazer PL. *The outrageous idea of Christian scholarship*. Oxford University Press, 2018.
49. Graham J, Haidt J, Koleva S, et al. Moral foundations theory. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2013;47:55–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-407236-7.00002-4>
50. Graham J, Nosek BA, Haidt J, Iyer R, Koleva S, Ditto PH. Mapping the moral domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2011;101(2):366–385. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021847>
51. Greene JD, Sommerville RB, Nystrom LE, Darley JM, Cohen JD. An fMRI investigation of emotional engagement in moral judgment. *Science*, 2001;293(5537):2105–2108. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1062872>
52. Haidt J. The emotional dog and its rational tail. *Psychological Review*, 2001;108(4):814–834. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.108.4.814>
53. Haidt J. Elevation and the positive psychology of morality. In: Keyes CLM, Haidt J (Eds.). *Flourishing*. APA, 2003, 275–289. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10594-012>
54. Haidt J. *The righteous mind*. Pantheon Books, 2012.
55. Haidt J, Bjorklund F. Social intuitionists answer six questions. In: Sinnott-Armstrong W (Ed.). *Moral psychology* (Vol. 2). MIT Press, 2008, 181–217.
56. Haidt J, Graham J. When morality opposes justice. *Social Justice Research*, 2007;20(1):98–116. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-007-0034-z>
57. Haidt J, Joseph C. Intuitive ethics: How innately prepared intuitions generate culturally variable virtues. *Daedalus*, 2004;133(4):55–66. <https://doi.org/10.1162/0011526042365555>
58. Hardy SA, Carlo G. Identity as a source of moral motivation. *Human Development*, 2005;48(4):232–256. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000086859>
59. Hardy SA, Carlo G. Moral identity. In: Schwartz SJ et al. (Eds.). *Handbook of identity theory and research*. Springer, 2011, 495–513. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-7988-9\\_19](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-7988-9_19)
60. Hardy SA, Walker LJ, Olsen JA, Woodbury RD, Hickman JR. Adolescent naturalistic conceptions of moral maturity. *Social Development*, 2013;23(1):136–155. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sode.12031>
61. Hart D. The development of moral identity. In: Carlo G, Edwards CP (Eds.). *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (Vol. 51). University of Nebraska Press, 2005, 165–196.
62. Held V. *The ethics of care*. Oxford University Press, 2006. <https://doi.org/10.1093/0195180992.001.0001>
63. Hoffman ML. *Empathy and moral development*. Cambridge University Press, 2000. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511805851>
64. Hursthouse R. *On virtue ethics*. Oxford University Press, 1999.
65. Jacoby B. *Service-learning essentials*. Jossey-Bass, 2015.
66. Johnson M. *Moral imagination*. University of Chicago Press, 1993.
67. Jubilee Centre. *A framework for character education in schools*. University of Birmingham, 2017.
68. Kant I. *Practical philosophy* (M. J. Gregor, Trans.). Cambridge University Press, 1996. (Original work published 1785)
69. Kant I. *Groundwork for the metaphysics of morals* (A. W. Wood, Trans.). Yale University Press, 2002. (Original work published 1785)
70. Killen M, Smetana JG (Eds.). *Handbook of moral development* (2nd ed.). Psychology Press, 2015.

71. Kohlberg L. Essays on moral development: Vol. 1. The philosophy of moral development. Harper & Row, 1981.
72. Kohlberg L. Essays on moral development: Vol. 2. The psychology of moral development. Harper & Row, 1984.
73. Kohn A. How not to teach values: A critical look at character education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1997;78(6):428–439.
74. Kristjánsson K. Virtues and vices in positive psychology. Cambridge University Press, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139177818>
75. Kristjánsson K. Aristotelian character education. Routledge, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315797021>
76. Kristjánsson K. Virtuous emotions. Oxford University Press, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190655570.001.0001>
77. Lakoff G, Johnson M. Philosophy in the flesh. Basic Books, 1999.
78. Lapsley DK. Moral psychology. Westview Press, 1996.
79. Lapsley DK, Narvaez D. Character education. In: Damon W, Lerner RM (Eds.). *Handbook of child psychology* (6th ed., Vol. 4). Wiley, 2006, 248–296.
80. Lapsley D, Yeager D. Moral-character education. In: Weiner IB et al. (Eds.). *Handbook of psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 7). Wiley, 2013, 117–146.
81. Lave J. Cognition in practice. Cambridge University Press, 1988. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511609268>
82. Lave J, Wenger E. Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge University Press, 1991. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815355>
83. Levinson M. The demands of liberal education. Oxford University Press, 1999.
84. Lickona T. Educating for character. Bantam Books, 1991.
85. Lickona T, Davidson M. Smart & good high schools. Center for the 4th and 5th Rs, 2005.
86. Lockwood AL. Character education: Controversy and consensus. Corwin Press, 1997.
87. MacIntyre A. After virtue (2nd ed.). University of Notre Dame Press, 1981.
88. MacIntyre A. Three rival versions of moral enquiry. University of Notre Dame Press, 1990.
89. MacIntyre A. After virtue (3rd ed.). University of Notre Dame Press, 2007.
90. Moll J, Zahn R, de Oliveira-Souza R, Krueger F, Grafman J. The neural basis of human moral cognition. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 2005;6(10):799–809. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn1768>
91. Murdoch I. The sovereignty of good. Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.
92. Narvaez D. Integrative ethical education. In: Killen M, Smetana JG (Eds.). *Handbook of moral development*. Lawrence Erlbaum, 2006, 703–733.
93. Narvaez D. Triune ethics: The neurobiological roots of our multiple moralities. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 2008;26(1):95–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2007.07.008>
94. Narvaez D. The emotional foundations of high moral intelligence. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 2010, (129), 77–94. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cd.276>
95. Narvaez D. Neurobiology and the development of human morality. Norton, 2014.
96. Narvaez D, Getz I, Rest JR, Thoma SJ. Individual moral judgment and cultural ideologies. *Developmental Psychology*, 1999;35(2):478–488. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.35.2.478>
97. Narvaez D, Lapsley DK. Teaching moral character: Two strategies for teacher education. *The Teacher Educator*, 2008;43(2):156–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730701838983>
98. Narvaez D, Lapsley DK, Hagele S, Lasky B. Moral chronicity and social information processing. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 2006;87(3):261–270. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa8703\\_04](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa8703_04)
99. Narvaez D, Vaydich JL. Moral development and behaviour under the spotlight of the neurobiological sciences. *Journal of Moral Education*, 2008;37(3):289–312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240802227478>
100. Noddings N. Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education. University of California Press, 1984.
101. Noddings N. Educating moral people. Teachers College Press, 2002.
102. Noddings N. Is teaching a practice? *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 2003;37(2):241–251. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.00323>
103. Noddings N. The caring relation in teaching. *Oxford Review of Education*, 2012;38(6):771–781. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2012.745047>
104. Nucci LP, Narvaez D (Eds.). *Handbook of moral and character education*. Routledge, 2008.
105. Nussbaum MC. Love's knowledge. Oxford University Press, 1990.
106. Nussbaum MC. Sex and social justice. Oxford University Press, 1999.
107. Okin SM. Justice, gender, and the family. Basic Books, 1989.
108. Peterson C, Seligman MEP. Character strengths and virtues. Oxford University Press, 2004.
109. Pieper J. The four cardinal virtues. University of Notre Dame Press, 1966.
110. Power FC, Higgins A, Kohlberg L. Lawrence Kohlberg's approach to moral education. Columbia University Press, 1989.
111. Prinz JJ. The emotional construction of morals. Oxford University Press, 2007.
112. Purpel D, Ryan K (Eds.). *Moral education: It comes with the territory*. McCutchan, 1976.
113. Rath LE, Harmin M, Simon SB. Values and teaching (2nd ed.). Merrill, 1978.
114. Rest JR. Moral development: Advances in research and theory. Praeger, 1986.
115. Rest J, Narvaez D, Bebeau MJ, Thoma SJ. Postconventional moral thinking: A neo-Kohlbergian approach. Lawrence Erlbaum, 1999.
116. Rogoff B. Apprenticeship in thinking. Oxford University Press, 1990.
117. Russell DC. Practical intelligence and the virtues. Oxford University Press, 2009. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199561094.001.0001>
118. Ryan K, Bohlin KE. Building character in schools. Jossey-Bass, 1999.



119. Ryan RM, Deci EL. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation. *American Psychologist*, 2000;55(1):68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>
120. Sandel MJ. The tyranny of merit. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2020.
121. Sanderse W. Character education: A neo-Aristotelian approach. <sup>1</sup>Doctoral dissertation, Radboud University Nijmegen]. Repository Radboud University, 2012. <http://hdl.handle.net/2066/93662>
122. Schneewind JB. The invention of autonomy. Cambridge University Press, 1998. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511818288>
123. Schön DA. The reflective practitioner. Basic Books, 1983.
124. Seligman MEP, Ernst RM, Gillham J, Reivich K, Linkins M. Positive education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 2009;35(3):293–311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980902934563>
125. Shapiro L. Embodied cognition. Routledge, 2011.
126. Sherman N. The fabric of character. Clarendon Press, 1989.
127. Slote M. The ethics of care and empathy. Routledge, 2007. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203945735>
128. Smetana JG. Social-cognitive domain theory. In: Killen M, Smetana JG (Eds.). *Handbook of moral development*. Lawrence Erlbaum, 2006, 119–153.
129. Steinberg L. A social neuroscience perspective on adolescent risk-taking. *Developmental Review*, 2008;28(1):78–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2007.08.002>
130. Steinberg L. Age of opportunity. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2014.
131. Stichter M. Ethical expertise: The skill model of virtue. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 2007;10(2):183–194. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10677-006-9054-3>
132. Straughan R. Can we teach children to be good? George Allen & Unwin, 1982.
133. Tangney JP, Stuewig J, Mashek DJ. Moral emotions and moral behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 2007;58:345–372. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070145>
134. Taylor C. Sources of the self. Harvard University Press, 1989.
135. Taylor C. The ethics of authenticity. Harvard University Press, 1991.
136. Taylor RD, Oberle E, Durlak JA, Weissberg RP. Promoting positive youth development through school-based SEL interventions. *Child Development*, 2017;88(4):1156–1171. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12864>
137. Tenbrunsel AE, Smith-Crowe K. Ethical decision making. *Academy of Management Annals*, 2008;2(1):545–607. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520802211677>
138. Thoma SJ, Rest JR, Davison ML. Describing and testing a moderator of the moral judgment and action relationship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1991;61(4):659–669. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.61.4.659>
139. Thoma S, Narvaez D, Rest J, Derryberry P. Does moral judgment development reduce to political ideology? *Educational Psychology Review*, 2008;11(4):337–349.
140. Tracy JL, Robins RW. Putting the self into self-conscious emotions. *Psychological Inquiry*, 2004;15(2):103–125. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli1502\\_01](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli1502_01)
141. Treviño LK, den Nieuwenboer NA, Kish-Gephart JJ. (Un)ethical behavior in organizations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 2014;65:635–660. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143745>
142. Treviño LK, Weaver GR, Reynolds SJ. Behavioral ethics in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 2006;32(6):951–990. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206306294258>
143. Tronto JC. Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care. Routledge, 1993.
144. Turiel E. The development of social knowledge. Cambridge University Press, 1983.
145. Varela FJ. Ethical know-how. Stanford University Press, 1999.
146. Vygotsky LS. Mind in society. Harvard University Press, 1978.
147. Walker LJ. Gus in the gap: Bridging the judgment-action gap in moral functioning. In: Lapsley DK, Narvaez D (Eds.). *Moral development, self, and identity*. Lawrence Erlbaum, 2004, 1–20.
148. Walker LJ, Frimer JA. Moral personality of brave and caring exemplars. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2007;93(5):845–860. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.93.5.845>
149. Walker LJ, Frimer JA. The science of moral development. In: Mikulincer M, Shaver PR, Borgida E, Bargh JA (Eds.). *APA handbook of personality and social psychology: Vol. 1. Attitudes and social cognition*. APA, 2015, 585–612. <https://doi.org/10.1037/14341-018>
150. Walker LJ, Henning KH. Parent/peer context for children's moral reasoning development. *Child Development*, 2004;75(3):781–792. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2004.00707.x>
151. Walker LJ, Hennig KH, Krettenauer T. Parent and peer contexts for children's moral reasoning development. *Child Development*, 2000;71(4):1033–1048. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00207>
152. Walker LJ, Pitts RC. Naturalistic conceptions of moral maturity. *Developmental Psychology*, 1998;34(3):403–419. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.34.3.403>
153. Walker LJ, Pitts RC, Hennig KH, Matsuba MK. Reasoning about morality and real-life moral problems. In: Killen M, Hart D (Eds.). *Morality in everyday life*. Cambridge University Press, 1995, 371–407.
154. Wenger E. Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity. Cambridge University Press, 1998. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803932>
155. Wigelsworth M, Lendrum A, Oldfield J, et al. The impact of trial stage, developer involvement and international transferability on universal social and emotional learning programme outcomes. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 2016;46(3):347–376. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2016.1195791>
156. Wood W, Neal DT. A new look at habits and the habit-goal interface. *Psychological Review*, 2007;114(4):843–863. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.114.4.843>
157. Yorlío PL, Ye F. A meta-analysis on the effects of service-learning on the social, personal, and cognitive



- outcomes of learning. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 2012;11(1):9–27. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2010.0072>
158. Youniss J, Yates M. *Community service and social responsibility in youth*. University of Chicago Press, 1997. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226921716.001.0001>
159. Zins JE, Weissberg RP, Wang MC, Walberg HJ (Eds.). *Building academic success on social and emotional learning*. Teachers College Press, 2004.