

spanning more than two centuries, to the Harvard Graduate School of Education's Monroe C. Gutman Library.

Chall's last work, published posthumously, was *The Academic Challenge: What Really Works in the Classroom* (2000). In it, she divided American instruction into "child-centered" and "teacher-centered" approaches, suggesting that the twentieth century was dominated by the former (discovery approaches) in spite of research that supported the superiority of the latter (explicit teaching). Earlier, Helen Popp had persuaded her to coauthor a contribution to explicit teaching: a handbook for teachers, *Teaching and Assessing Phonics* (1996). The Chall-Popp Phonics program was completed after her death (2000).

Written in a climate in which many members of her own profession still disdained explications of the English writing system, the 1996 handbook is true to many of Chall's core concerns: teaching reading, particularly to at-risk children, and research-validated explicit instruction.

See also: READING, *subentries on* BEGINNING READING, COMPREHENSION, TEACHING OF.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADAMS, MARILYN JAGER, and RATH, LINDA K., eds. 2000. "Jeanne Sternlicht Chall: The Difference One Life Can Make." *Perspectives* [issue devoted to memorial tributes of Jeanne Sternlicht Chall] 26(4):1, 4.
- CHALL, JEANNE S. 1983. *Stages of Reading Development*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- CHALL, JEANNE S. 1993, 1994. "Fascination with Psychology and Teaching of Reading." *History of Reading News* 17(1):1-2; 17(2):2.
- CHALL, JEANNE S. 1996. *Learning to Read: The Great Debate* (1967). New York: McGraw Hill.
- CHALL, JEANNE S. 2000. *The Academic Achievement Challenge: What Really Works in the Classroom*. New York: Guilford.
- CHALL, JEANNE S., and POPP, HELEN. 1996. *Teaching and Assessing Phonics: A Guide for Teachers*. Cambridge, MA: Educators Publishing Service.
- RAVITCH, DIANE, et al. 2001. "A Tribute to Jeanne Chall." *American Educator* 25(1):16-23.

INTERNET RESOURCE

JEANNE CHALL READING LAB. 2002. "About Jeanne Chall." <www.gse.harvard.edu/~litlab/about_chall.html>.

E. JENNIFER MONAGHAN

CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT

When a person is said to have character, it usually implies they have distinguishing moral qualities, moral virtues, and moral reasoning abilities. Less frequently used terms include *morality*, *virtue*, and *ethics*. A moral person understands right and wrong and willfully chooses what is right; a virtuous person engages in good behavior intentionally, predictably, and habitually; an ethical person figures out what is right or good when this is not obvious. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, there appears to be a desire to reconsider earlier goals of American education by taking character building more seriously. Most people share the view that schools should be formally and strategically involved in building moral character, virtues, and ethical behavior and should work in concert with parents and the community.

Looking Back

From the beginning of written history, the importance of building moral character has been recognized by parents, educators, and concerned citizens in every culture and society. Between 1640 and 1940, educators in the United States were as concerned about moral education as academic education. Throughout this 300-year period, the dominant pedagogical method was inculcation (repetitive direct instruction combined with reinforced practice), and the goals were inspiration, commitment, and habituation. During the early 1900s the American philosopher, psychologist, and educator John Dewey and other progressive educators expanded those goals to include critical thinking and reflection about values and morals; they stressed the value of experiential learning for building character. In 1951 the National Education Association (NEA) recommended combining these traditional and progressive approaches. This was not accomplished because concerns about academic competence and teaching specific values caused character education to be put aside as a formal undertaking. Public schools abandoned the dual focus on moral character and aca-

demic success and adopted a singular focus on academics. Character education continued informally through the hidden curriculum of Western democratic values and the independent efforts of teachers.

Between 1940 and 1970 cognitive-developmental psychologists generated some renewed interest in character by identifying levels of moral reasoning and trying to accelerate moral development. The more widely adopted values clarification movement was a response to the nation's preoccupation with individual freedom and self-improvement and the nationalistic push for better science and mathematics education. A third influence was built on the work of Erik Erikson and Robert James Havighurst, who identified processes and stages of socioemotional development. Affective-developmental psychologists and moral philosophers concerned with conscience and emotion began to expand the understanding of affective moral development.

Public concern about a moral decline in society and the disintegration of families and communities led to the reemergence of character education in the 1980s. By 1995 it had become a social movement with thousands of schools and communities involved. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, proponents of traditional and progressive approaches engaged in a friendly dialogue, which energized the movement and accelerated the synthesis of ideas. Schools drew strategies from both approaches with little regard for the theoretical foundation for this synthesis. They taught and trained students using stories, moral exemplars, reinforcement, and lists of virtues as recommended by traditionalists; they provided active student experiences within caring communities through class meetings, cooperative learning, and service learning as recommended by progressives.

Many important contributions to character education occurred during the final two decades of the twentieth century. In 1992 representatives from many organizations devoted to building the civic virtue and moral character of students formed the Character Education Partnership (CEP). According to CEP's eleven principles, effective character education schools:

1. promote core ethical values as the basis of good character;
2. define character comprehensively to include thinking, feeling, and behavior;

3. promote core values intentionally and proactively through all parts of school life;
4. are caring communities;
5. give students opportunities for moral action;
6. have meaningful and challenging academic curriculums that respect learners;
7. develop students' intrinsic motivation;
8. have professionals who exemplify core values and maintain a moral community;
9. require moral leadership from educators and students;
10. recruit parents and community members as full partners;
11. evaluate school character, student character, and adults as character educators.

The Eclectic Ideal

Research and practice suggest that the most effective character education schools combine direct instruction, modeling, reinforcement, and various community-building strategies (class meetings, service learning, cooperative learning, intercultural exchange, social-skills training, and caring interpersonal support) to promote the development of moral virtues, moral reasoning, and other assets that make the will and ability to do what is right and good probable. They are concerned with all aspects of development, including social, emotional, moral, intellectual, and academic. They are child-centered without abandoning the responsibility to transmit core ethical values to youth. They endorse Robert D. Heslep's view that character education includes civic education (learning about laws, government, and citizenship), social education (learning social roles, responsibilities, and skills), prudential education (learning how to take care of oneself), cultural education (becoming historically and culturally literate), and moral education—the latter providing a context of principles that guide civic, social, prudential, and cultural education.

Good character educators are aware of the overlapping and interconnected parts of the moral person: knowledge, understanding, reasoning, autonomy, values, beliefs, standards, principles, perspective taking, conscience, empathy, emotion, virtues, intentions, will, commitment, motivation, duty, behavior, and habits. Marvin Berkowitz's 1995 model of the complete moral person includes moral values (beliefs and attitudes with an affective component),

moral behavior (intentional moral acts), moral emotion (energizing feelings), moral character (a personality characteristic), moral identity (being or trying to be moral), and meta-moral characteristics such as self-discipline. Thomas Lickona's moral feeling, thinking, and action, and Kevin Ryan's knowing, loving, and doing the good are perhaps easier to remember and use. William G. Huitt's 2000 model treats moral will or volition as a part distinguishable from moral emotion, moral thought, and moral behavior.

Thomas F. Green (1999) connects the thinking and feeling parts of the moral person by describing five voices of conscience (craft, membership, responsibility, memory, and imagination). Jerome Kagan explains how several specific moral emotions compel adherence to standards of right and wrong beginning in early childhood. Many define moral behavior in terms of specific virtues or habits of conduct from which inner parts of the moral person can be inferred. Gordon G. Vessels distinguishes between primary virtues that reflect personal integrity (e.g., kindness, courage, ability, and effort) and primary virtues that reflect social integrity (e.g., friendship, teamwork, and citizenship). He incorporates elaborations of these virtues and theoretical propositions about moral-developmental processes into behavioral objectives for various age groups.

Early Twenty-First Century

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, the time devoted to character education in many schools is decreasing due to the popular focus on academic standards, accountability, standardized testing, and whole-school reform. The well-researched whole-school reform models that include character education are not among the most popular: Basic Schools, Child Development Project (CDP), Modern Red Schoolhouse, Positive Action, Responsive Classroom, School Development Program, and Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound. In general, American society may not be ready to think in terms of preventing social problems and improving schools by implementing a curriculum that balances character education and academic instruction, and the addition of nontraditional assessment measures that document products and processes reflecting good character and character growth such as Huitt's (2001) proposed use of cumulative electronic portfolios with scanned pictures and video clips.

Trends and concerns suggest that in order for character education to become a highly valued and fully integrated feature of education once again, character educators will have to focus on reducing societal problems and address concerns about the effectiveness of academic instruction in the schools. Barring a major shift in priorities, the future of character education appears to hinge on the evaluation of its potential for reducing school violence, drug use, teen pregnancy, disrespect, and prejudice; and improving school climate, student discipline, school safety, intercultural understanding, and academic achievement. Models for this type of program evaluation research are available. Leaders in education are not likely to change course unless research results show that academic goals are achievable using a curriculum that addresses all aspects of development, thereby integrating academic and character goals, objectives, and methods.

See also: AFFECT AND EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT; AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR; MORAL DEVELOPMENT; STRESS AND DEPRESSION.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BATTISTICH, VICTOR; SOLOMON, DAVID; DONG-IL, KIM; WATSON, MARILYN; and SCHAPS, ERIC. 1995. "Schools As Communities, Poverty Levels of Student Populations, and Students' Attitudes, Motives, and Performance: A Multilevel Analysis." *American Educational Research Journal* 32:627-658.
- BATTISTICH, VICTOR; SOLOMON, DAVID; WATSON, MARILYN; SOLOMON, DANIEL; and SCHAPS, ERIC. 1989. "Effects of an Elementary School Program to Enhance Prosocial Behavior on Children's Cognitive-Social Problem-Solving Skills and Strategies." *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 10:147-169.
- BENNINGA, JACQUES S.; TRACZ, SUSAN M.; SPARKS, RICHARD; SOLOMON, DANIEL; BATTISTICH, VICTOR; DELUCCHI, KEVIN; and STANLEY, BEVERLY. 1991. "Effects of Two Contrasting School Task and Incentive Structures on Children's Social Development." *Elementary School Journal* 92:149-167.
- BERKOWITZ, MARVIN. 1995. *The Education of the Complete Moral Person*. Aberdeen, Scotland: Gordon Cook Foundation.

- BOYER, ERNEST. 1995. *The Basic School: A Community for Learning*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- COMER, JAMES. 1997. *Waiting for a Miracle: Why Schools Can't Solve Our Problems—and How We Can*. New York: Penguin Putnam, Plume.
- COMER, JAMES. 2001. "Schools That Develop Children." *American Prospect* 12(7): 30–35.
- DUNCAN, BARBARA J. 1997. "Character Education: Reclaiming the Social." *Education Theory* 47(1):119–131.
- ELAM, STANLEY; ROSE, LOWELL C.; and GALLUP, ALEC M. 1993. "The 25th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes toward the Public Schools." *Phi Delta Kappan* 75(2):137–154.
- ELLIOTT, STEPHEN N. 1995. *The Responsive Classroom Approach*. Washington, DC: District of Columbia Public Schools.
- ERIKSON, ERIK. 1961. "The Roots of Virtue." In *The Humanist Frame: The Modern Humanist Vision of Life*, ed. Julian Huxley. New York: Harper.
- ERIKSON, ERIK. 1980. *Identity and the Life Cycle*. New York: Norton.
- ETZIONI, AMITAI. 1984. *Self-Discipline, Schools, and the Business Community*. Washington, DC: National Chamber Foundation.
- GILLIGAN, CAROL. 1987. "Moral Orientation and Moral Development." In *Women and Moral Theory*, ed. Eva F. Kittay and Diana Meyers. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield.
- GINSBURG, ALAN L., and HANSON, SANDRA L. 1986. *Gaining Ground: Values and High School Success*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- GREEN, THOMAS F. 1984. "The Formation of Conscience in an Age of Technology." *American Journal of Education* 94(1):1–32.
- GREEN, THOMAS F. 1999. *Voices: The Educational Foundation of Conscience*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- HAVIGHURST, ROBERT J. 1953. *Human Development and Education*. New York: Longmans, Green.
- HAYES, B. GRANT, and HAGEDORN, W. BRYCE. 2000. "A Case for Character Education." *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development* 39(1):2–4.
- HESLEP, ROBERT D. 1995. *Moral Education for Americans*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- HINCK, SHELLY, and BRANDELL, MARY ELLEN. 1999. "Service Learning: Facilitating Academic Learning and Character Development." *NASSP Bulletin* 83(609):16–24.
- HOFFMAN, MARTIN. 1982. "Development of Prosocial Motivation: Empathy and Guilt." In *The Development of Prosocial Behavior*, ed. Nancy Eisenberg. New York: Academic Press.
- HOFFMAN, MARTIN. 1983. "Empathy, Guilt, and Social Cognition." In *The Relationship between Social and Cognitive Development*, ed. Willis Overton. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- KAGAN, JEROME. 1984. *The Nature of the Child*. New York: Basic Books.
- KOHLBERG, LAWRENCE. 1984. *The Psychology of Moral Development*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- KRAJEWSKI, BOB, and BAILEY, ELSIE. 1999. Caring with Passion: The "Core" Value. *NASSP Bulletin* 83(609):33–39.
- LEMING, JAMES S. 1997. "Research and Practice in Character Education: A Historical Perspective." In *The Construction of Children's Character*, ed. Alex Molnar. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education; distributed by the University of Chicago Press.
- LEMING, JAMES S.; HENDRICKS-SMITH, ASTRID; and ANTIS, J. 1997. "An Evaluation of the Heartwood Institutes: An Ethics Curriculum for Children." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- LICKONA, THOMAS. 1993. *Educating for Character: How Our Schools Can Teach Respect and Responsibility*. New York: Bantam Books.
- MCCLELLAND, B. EDWARD. 1992. *Schools and the Shaping of Character: Moral Education in America, 1607–Present*. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education and the Social Studies Development Center.
- RYAN, KEVIN. 1996. *Character Education: Education's Latest Fad or Oldest Mission*. Keynote address presented at the Linking School and Community through Character Education conference at Emory University, March 7, planned and sponsored by the Georgia Humanities Council.

- SCHAEFFER, ESTHER F. 1998. "Character Crisis and the Classroom." *Thrust for Educational Leadership* 28(1):14–17.
- SCOTT, CHARLES L. 1992. "Shaping Character." *American School Board Journal* 179(12):28–30.
- SIMON, SIDNEY B.; HOWE, LELAND W.; and KIRSCHENBAUM, HOWARD. 1972. *Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students*. New York: Hart.
- SOLOMON, DANIEL; SCHAPS, ERIC; WATSON, MARILYN; and BATTISTICH, VICTOR. 1992. "Creating Caring School and Classroom Communities for All Students." In *Restructuring for Caring and Effective Education: An Administrative Guide to Creating Heterogeneous Schools*, ed. Richard A. Villa, Jacqueline S. Thousand, William Stainback, and Susan Stainback. Baltimore: Brookes.
- VESSELS, GORDON G. 1998. *Character and Community Development: A School Planning and Teacher Training Handbook*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- WILLIAMS, MARY. 2000. "Models of Character Education: Perspectives and Developmental Issues." *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development* 39:32–41.

INTERNET RESOURCES

- DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES CENTER. 2002. "Child Development Project." <www.devestu.org>.
- EXPEDITIONARY LEARNING OUTWARD BOUND. 2002. <www.elob.org>.
- GALLUP ORGANIZATION. 2001. "Gallup Poll Topics: Education." <www.gallup.com/poll/indicators/indeeducation.asp>.
- HUITT, WILLIAM G. 2000. "Moral and Character Development." *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. <<http://chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/col/morchr/morchr.html>>.
- HUITT, WILLIAM G. 2001. "Becoming a Brilliant Star: Thought for the Day Activity." *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. <<http://chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/brilstar/BrilStarThought.html>>.
- LICKONA, THOMAS; SCHAPS, ERIC; and LEWIS, CATHERINE. 2000. *Eleven Principles of Effective Character Education*. Washington, DC: Character Education Partnership. <www.character.org/principles/index.cgi>.

- MODERN RED SCHOOLHOUSE INSTITUTE. 2002. <www.mrsh.org>.
- NORTHEAST FOUNDATION FOR CHILDREN. 2002. "Responsive Classroom." <www.responsiveclassroom.org>.
- POSITIVE ACTION. 2002. <www.positiveaction.net>.
- SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM. 2001. <<http://info.med.yale.edu/comer>>.

WILLIAM G. HUITT
GORDON G. VESSELS

CHARTERS, W. W. (1875–1952)

Professor and director of the Bureau of Educational Research at Ohio State University, Werrett Wallace Charters contributed to the fields of curriculum development and audiovisual technology. Born in Hartford, Ontario (Canada), Charters earned his A.B. in 1898 from McMaster University, a teaching diploma from the Ontario Normal College in 1899, a B.Pd. from the University of Toronto, and his M.Ph. and Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, respectively in 1903 and 1904. After a three-year career in Canadian public schools as a teacher and principal, Charters spent the remainder of his career in the United States. Before joining Ohio State University in 1928, Charters served as a faculty member and/or dean at six institutions: the State Normal School in Winona, Minnesota, the University of Missouri, the University of Illinois, the Carnegie Institute for Technology, the University of Pittsburgh, and the University of Chicago. In 1923 Charters was awarded an honorary doctorate from McMaster University.

In his earliest scholarship, Charters attempted to develop what he called a "functional" theory of instruction derived from the ideas of the Progressive educator John Dewey (who, despite having discouraged Charters from pursuing doctoral study, had served as his doctoral adviser). In his first book, *Methods of Teaching*, Charters maintained that the function of school subject matter was "to satisfy needs and solve problems" faced by society (pp. 3, 31). A school's program of curriculum and instruction would put into practice this conception of subject matter by introducing subject matter when it addressed an actual or potential student need, enabling students to perceive its function. Charters dis-