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This paper considers the development of the whole person from the perspective of developing capacities in nine domains: (1) temperament, personality, and self-views, (2) cognition/thinking, (3) affect/emotion, (4) conation/volition (or self-regulation), (5) physical/bodily-kinesthetic, (6) social/interpersonal; (7) spiritual/transpersonal, (8) moral character, and (9) citizenship. Basic research is considered as well as how interested adults, especially educators, can facilitate development in these areas.

Parents, educators, and concerned citizens around the world are asking questions about how best to prepare children and youth for successful adulthood in the twenty-first century. The question takes on added importance because humanity is immersed in a social and cultural environment that is changing at an accelerating rate (Kurzwiel, 2001). Simultaneously, there is exponential growth in an understanding of human capacities and the potential for human development (Damon, 2004). Though every human society has dealt with issues of preparing children and youth for adulthood, the potential benefits have never been greater for providing the proper learning experiences so that young people can flourish as adults.

While it is acknowledged that schools are not the only social institutions responsible for the education of children and youth (Huitt, 2009a), schools are where most will engage in formal, systematic learning experiences rather than the informal and sometimes conflicting learning experiences provided by the home, community, and larger society (Wikeley, Bullock, Muschamp, & Ridge, 2007). Focusing on schools as a means for preparing young people for adulthood is one of the hallmarks of developed countries (The National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). On the other hand, when positive connections are made between home, school, and community, the impact can be even more powerful (Epstein, & Sanders, 2000; Henderson, & Mapp, 2002; Roehlkepartain, Benson, & Sesma, 2003).

A new vision for educating children and youth, both formally and informally, is required if they are to become successful adults in the twenty-first century. Exactly what that means needs to be considered and plans need to be made and implemented (The Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2009; Tate, 2008). This requires the ability to think beyond the actual to the possible through the use of imagination. Liu and Noppe-Brandon (2009) make an excellent point that the use of imagination is the first step towards developing creative solutions to seemingly intractable challenges. It is then necessary to develop innovative products and services that can be used to meet those challenges.

The purpose of this paper is to provide an overview of research describing innate capacities of human beings that can be actualized through directed school-based experiences and to review the types of curricula, learning experiences, and potential accountability procedures that educators can use to do so. This information is also important to parents and community members who want to facilitate development of a broad range of knowledge, attitudes, and skills.
related to successful development (Bushaw, & Gallup, 2008; Elam, Rose, & Gallup, 1992; Gallup, 1975.) It is intended that readers will be stimulated to provide more of the types of experiences that will allow children and youth to prepare for the challenging times they will face as adults.

Identifying Capacities

The first step in the identification of potential capacities that could be developed via guided learning experiences is to investigate human capacities considered to be intelligences as these refer to an ability or aptitude for learning. A second step is then to investigate whether available research showed that the movement from capacity to competence (i.e., an actualized capacity) could be facilitated through guided learning experiences. A third step is then to investigate the most likely contexts within which individuals will use those capacities.

Perhaps the most widely accepted approach to identifying a variety of human capacities is Gardner’s (1983, 2006) work on multiple intelligences. He initially identified seven intelligences. Three of the intelligences have been labeled Symbol Analytic in that they involve making a conversion from a symbol to a higher-level mental code (i.e., linguistic—translating letters and words into knowledge and concepts; logical-mathematical—converting numbers to quantitative concepts and to think rationally and/or logically; musical—translating written musical symbols in timbre, pitch, and rhythm). Two of Gardner’s intelligences are considered Personal intelligences in that they are oriented to the person (intrapersonal—knowledge of one’s self and interperson—knowledge of others, especially their moods and motivations). Finally, two additional intelligences might be considered as Object-oriented intelligences (spatial—the ability to mentally rotate an object in space and bodily-kinesthetic—the ability to control one’s body and handle objects skillfully).

Gardner (1999) later identified an eighth intelligence which he labeled naturalist (an Object-oriented intelligence). He defined this as an ability to discern differences in one’s natural surroundings. A ninth intelligence, labeled existential (a Transpersonal intelligence) is still under consideration. It involves that ability to search for and connect with universal unknowns.

In the process of investigating other research that might confirm the concept of multiple intelligences, eight domains were identified separately by a variety of researchers: (1) temperament, personality, and self-views, (2) cognition/thinking, (3) affect/emotion, (4) conation/volition (or self-regulation), (5) physical/bodily-kinesthetic, (6) social/interpersonal; (7) spiritual/ transpersonal, and (8) moral character. Interestingly, five of these relate to terms used by the ancient Greeks to describe different aspects of a human being: body (bodily-kinesthetic), mind (cognition/thinking, affect/emotion, and conation/volition), and soul/spirit. Research also identified human capacities for social interaction, morality, and the creation of self-views. A ninth dimension, citizenship, was added as that is the role within which these capacities will be used.

There is considerable overlap between Gardner’s (1999, 2006) list of multiple intelligences and the list of intelligences identified separately by others whose research will be discussed below. For example, both lists contain bodily-kinesthetic, social/interpersonal, existential/spiritual, and self/intrapersonal. The domain of cognition/thinking is represented in Gardner’s work as a combination of linguistic and logical-mathematical intelligences. However, Gardner does not identify intelligences linked with the domains of affective/emotion,
volition/conation, and morality. Likewise, spatial, musical, and naturalistic intelligences are not considered as intelligences by other researchers.

The domains might be considered as points on a star with the self and self-views central to the image and the concept of local-global-cosmic citizenship used as the amalgamation of the adult roles in which individuals engage in the modern world (see Figure 1). This is a revision of the Becoming a Brilliant Star framework previously developed (Huitt, 2006a). It shows that the domains are developed within a multi-level sociocultural context where family, school, religious organizations, and friends, as well as the connections among them, provide the most direct influence on one’s development, but that development is also influenced by larger social and cultural forces.

**Figure 1. Becoming a Brilliant Star Framework**
The remainder of this section will briefly review capacities represented by the eight intelligences. Discussed first are different ideas regarding the development of the knowledge of one’s self or intrapersonal intelligence will be considered. This is followed by a discussion of cognition and thinking, as that is the dominant domain used for identifying the capacity to do well in school through developing academic competence. Next considered are the other two faculties of the mind, affect or emotion and conation or volition (currently discussed primarily in research on self-regulation). The domains of physical or bodily-kinesthetic intelligence, social intelligence, spiritual intelligence, and moral intelligence will then be discussed.

Self and Self-Views (Intrapersonal Intelligence)

Many researchers have demonstrated that the concepts of self and self-views are essential to the study of human behavior. Probably the most fundamental concept is that of temperament, considered an innate or inherited aspect of personality (Derryberry, & Reed, 1994; Keirsey, 1998). For example, one’s levels of excitability or irritability are considered aspects of one’s temperament as well as one’s tendency to introversion or extroversion. Temperament has been shown to be related to learning style (Oakland, & Joyce, 2004), development of competence and motivation (Rothbart, & Hwang, 2005), the type of career one prefers while a student (Oakland, Stafford, Horton, and Glutting, 2001), and the type of career one selects as an adult (Keirsey).

Personality is another way of conceptualizing how an individual organizes one’s thinking, feeling, intending, and behavior. The most widely used description in modern psychology is the 5-Factor model (McCrae, & Costa, 1997). The five factors (making the acronym, OCEAN) are (1) openness (an active imagination, a preference for variety, or a display of intellectual curiosity); (2) conscientiousness (being precise and careful or thorough); (3) extroversion (a tendency to look outside the self for stimulation and pleasure); (4) agreeableness (a tendency to be pleasant and accepting in social situations); and (5) neuroticism (a tendency to experience negative emotional states.) These factors have been related to a number of outcomes including political preferences (Carney, Jost, Gosling, & Potter, 2008), tendency to use alcohol or drugs (Flory, Lynam, & Milich, 2002), one’s passion for internet activities and willingness to express one’s ‘true self’ online (Tosun, & Lajunen, 2009), becoming a ‘node’ in a social network (Liu, & Ipe, 2010), and different aspects of leadership (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002).

A different view of personality was presented by Myers (1995) using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). This approach was based on the work of Jung (1971) and proposed that people differ in terms of their preferences related to four dimensions (extrovert-introvert, sensing-intuition, feeling-thinking, and judging-perceiving.) The MBTI has been used extensively in such areas as identifying learning styles (Lawrence, 1984), career selection (Kennedy, & Kennedy, 2004), processing social information (Edwards, Lanning, & Hooker, 2002), problem solving and decision making (Huitt, 1992), and leadership styles and working in teams (Kroeger, & Thuesen, 1989).

Yet another conceptualization of personality is that of personality traits, most recently articulated by Peterson and Seligman (2004). They identified twenty-four character strengths grouped into six virtues (wisdom and knowledge [cognitive strengths]; courage [emotional strengths]; humanity [interpersonal strengths]; justice [civic strengths]; temperance [strengths protecting against excess]; and transcendence [strengths that provide meaning by connecting to something outside of one’s self].) Notice that these categories of strengths overlap considerably with the previous descriptions of capacities. Peterson and Seligman’s belief is that this list of
strengths and virtues represents universal positive traits that people use to identify their most important qualities or characteristics.

Additionally, there are a number of self-views (e.g., self-concept, self-esteem, self-efficacy) that have been explored for their relationship to school achievement and life success. These differ from other measures discussed above in that they are conceptualized as being constructed by the individual through reflection on one’s interaction with his or her environment. Initially, it was thought that measures of these constructs related to the cognitive, affective, and volitional domains respectively (Bandura, 1994; Campbell, 1990; Kernis, 2003; Marsh, & Hattie, 1996). However, later research showed that there are components of each of these domains in each of the measures (Swann, Chang-Schneider, & McClary, 2007). Swann et al. advocated that a better conceptualization of self-views would relate to the specificity of the view and its relationship to an appropriate level of generalization. For example, if a researcher wanted to predict how an individual’s self-view related to a general outcome of life success, then the appropriate predictor would be a general measure of self-concept or self-esteem. One the other hand, if one were looking for a relationship between a self-view and academic achievement, a measure of academic self-concept or self-esteem would be most appropriate. Finally, if one were trying to predict success on a specific task, then a measure of self-efficacy related to the specific task would be best. Most importantly, research over the past two decades has shown that attempting to raise a student’s general self-concept or self-esteem through involvement in non-academic tasks bears absolutely no relationship to how well one does academically (Baumeister, Campbell, Krueger, & Vohs, 2003).

Finally, there is the concept of high levels of well-being, which Seligman (2011) labels as flourishing. He modified his view that authentic happiness should be considered the ultimate goal of life (Seligman, 2002) and adapted the work of Diener (1984, 2000; Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999). His view is that there are five components of flourishing that should be considered in combination as a single desired outcome: (1) positive emotion, (2) high levels of engagement and flow, (3) positive human relationships, (4) transcendent meaning and purpose, and (5) personal accomplishment and achievement. From the perspective of the domains in the Brilliant Star framework, these represent the domains of affect/emotion, cognition/thinking, social/interpersonal, spiritual/transpersonal, and conation/volition, respectively. In fact, the Brilliant Star framework might be considered as an elaboration of the concept of flourishing as it adds the domains of self/self-views, physical/kinesthetic, moral character, and citizenship to those identified by Seligman (2011).

**Cognitive Intelligence**

While many view cognitive intelligence as inherently fixed (Jensen, 2002), other researchers have demonstrated that learning experiences can impact cognitive processing skills and, therefore, one’s ability to learn academic content. For example, Feuerstein and his colleagues (1979; Feuerstein, Rand, Hoffman, & Miller, 1980) showed that measured IQ can be increased through involvement in a two- to three-year program (titled Instrumental Enrichment) focused on modifying specific, though non-content related, cognitive processes. Ben-Hur (2000) reviewed research from seven separate studies demonstrating the effectiveness of the program. In general, students who completed the program were more organized in their thinking, more self-sufficient in their learning, and volunteered more in class.
Sternberg (1985, 1996) stated that traditional measures of intelligence, developed to identify mental capacity related to academic competence, are limited. He identified three separate, though related, categories of cognitive abilities. The first he labeled *analytic*, where the individual uses strategies such as comparing and analyzing to investigate the elements and relationships of an object or situation. The second he labeled *creative*, where the individual uses strategies such as imagining or designing to find different elements or connections to solve non-traditional problems or challenges. Sternberg labeled the third as *practical*, where the individual is using strategies to address problems or challenges as they occur in everyday contexts. Sternberg believes that one’s individual profile of successful intelligence is comprised of one’s competencies in each of these three areas. While one can have an inherited capacity for each of these types of intelligence, this is relatively less important than how these capacities are developed and used for personal success. Sternberg and his colleagues have developed specific programs and lessons that focus on the development of the skills related to the different components of successful intelligence (e.g., Sternberg, & Grigorenko, 2000; Sternberg et al., 2000; Williams, Blythe, Li, White, Sternberg, & Gardner, 1997; Williams, Markle, Brigockas, & Sternberg, 2002).

Wegener (2005) provided another rubric for considering the specific skills used in cognition and thinking. He primarily focused on Sternberg’s (1985, 1996) analytic intelligence skills such as making associations, engaging in analysis, drawing implications, and describing correlational and causal relationships. However, he also identified the intellectual skill of synthesis, which is more related to the creative aspect of intelligence described by Sternberg. In all, he described twenty-two cognitive processing skills that provide the foundation for engaging in academic tasks. Most importantly, Wegener provided samples of lessons that can be used to address each of the skills he identifies.

Costa and Kallick (2008) developed yet another alternative through a description of 16 habits of mind (see Table 1). Using the domains described in this paper, 7 of the 16 actually relate to cognition and thinking (e.g. strive for accuracy, think flexibly, and think about one’s own thinking). Eight of the others relate to affect and emotion (e.g., listen with understanding and empathy, find humor), conation and volition (e.g., manage impulsivity, persist, take responsible risks), and social (e.g., effective communication, interpersonal effectiveness). The last habit, metacognition, provides a bridge across the domains as it relates to one’s integrated thinking about capacity and competence in the other domains. In many ways, Costa and Kallick’s work integrates the research of Feuerstein, Gardner, and Sternberg discussed above, as well as the work on emotional, conative, and social intelligence discussed below. The authors not only describe the habits in detail, they also provide ways to integrate these into curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Most importantly there are excellent descriptions available on how this approach has been implemented in actual schools and districts.

**Affective/Emotional Intelligence**

Lewis, Haviland-Jones, and Barrett (2008) documented the resurgence of research on emotion and reported on the pervasive influence of emotions on human thinking and behavior. Work done by Salovey and Juneer (1990), and popularized by Goleman (1995), brought this domain to the attention of the public in a manner similar to the impact of work done on cognitive intelligence by Gardner (1983) and Sternberg (1985) a decade earlier.
### Table 1. Habits of Mind

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Habit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**Cognition/</td>
<td>Gather data through all the senses</td>
<td>Use all sensory pathways: gustatory, olfactory, tactile, kinesthetic, auditory, and visual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>Strive for accuracy</td>
<td>Check facts; nurture desire for exactness, fidelity, craftsmanship, and truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question and pose problems</td>
<td>Consider what data are needed; find problems to solve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apply past knowledge to new situations</td>
<td>Access prior knowledge and transfer that knowledge to new contexts and problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Think flexibly</td>
<td>Change perspectives, generate alternatives, and consider multiple options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create, imagine, and innovate</td>
<td>Generate novel ideas, seek fluency and originality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Affect/</td>
<td>Listen with understanding and empathy</td>
<td>Connect cognitively and emotionally with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>Respond with wonderment and awe</td>
<td>Be intrigued by the world’s phenomena and beauty. Find what is awesome and mysterious in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Find humor</td>
<td>Look for whimsical, incongruous, and unexpected in life. Laugh at self when possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Conation/</td>
<td>Manage impulsivity</td>
<td>Think before acting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volition</td>
<td>Persist</td>
<td>Seeing task through to completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Take responsible risks</td>
<td>Live on the edge of one’s competencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remain open to continuous learning</td>
<td>Be proud of what one knows and humble enough to admit one doesn’t know. Resist complacency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Think and communicate with clarity and</td>
<td>Strive for accurate communication in both written and oral form; avoid overgeneralizations, distortions, deletions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>precision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Think interdependently</td>
<td>Work with and learn from others in reciprocal situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple</strong></td>
<td>Think about one’s own thinking (metacognition)</td>
<td>Become aware of own thoughts, feelings, intentions, strategies, and actions and how these affect others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Adapted from Costa and Kiiuik (2008)

Unfortunately, Goleman’s conceptualization of emotional intelligence, which included a list of twenty-five potential competences, diluted the focus on emotion as only four directly related to other researchers’ definitions (i.e., the personal competencies of emotional awareness, accurate self-assessment, and self-confidence, and the social-emotional competence of understanding others’ emotions.) Juneer and Salovey (1997) provided an update of the research on emotional intelligence, conceptualizing it as comprised of aptitudes in four categories: (1) the
ability to perceive emotion; (2) the ability to use emotion to facilitate thought; (3) the ability to understand emotions; and (4) the ability to manage emotions.

Denham (1998), in an excellent overview for educators emphasizing the actualization of emotional intelligence, chose to ignore the component of influencing thought and focused on three aspects of emotional intelligence: (1) emotional understanding (of one’s own emotions and those of others as well as the ability to relate the two); (2) emotional expression (how one uses verbal and nonverbal means to express emotion); and (3) emotional regulation (the ability to enhance or dampen one’s emotions based one’s circumstances.) Maurer, Brackett, and Plain (2004) suggested emotional understanding should be further unpacked into (a) recognizing emotions to obtain valuable information about the environment, (b) understanding how emotions influence attention, thinking, decisions, and behavior, and (c) labeling emotions to describe feelings precisely. This disagreement on a definition of emotional intelligence is only one of many issues that have yet to be resolved (Matthews, Emo, Roberts, & Zeidner, 2006; Matthews, Roberts, & Zeidner, 2004).

There are a number of authors who focused on classroom-based approaches to developing emotional competence. For example, Hyson (2003) and Saarni (1999, 2007) described activities for the early childhood level. Saarni provided an excellent review of research related to developing five emotional competencies: (1) awareness of one’s own emotions and discernment of the emotions of others; (2) the capacity for connecting empathically with others; (3) understanding the difference between internal subjective feelings and external expressional expression; (4) self-management when coping with aversive emotions; and (5) awareness of emotional communication and self-regulation in relationships. Maurer et al. (2004) described a middle school program for developing emotional literacy. Additionally, several chapters in an edited volume by Bar-On, Maree, and Elias (2007) review research that schools, parents, and community organizations can use to impact emotional development.

A related area to the development of emotional competence is the issue of subjective well-being, which includes three components. Two are affective components defining everyday happiness (positive affect and negative affect); the third is a cognitive component describing one’s overall satisfaction with one’s life (Diener, 1984; Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999). Seligman (2002) concluded that there are actually three different orientations to happiness: (1) sensual pleasure (hedonic happiness); (2) engagement (flow, using one’s character strengths in challenging situations), and (3) meaning (eudaimonic happiness). Peterson, Park, and Seligman (2005) showed that these orientations could be reliably measured. While a high score on any one of these orientations correlated well to life satisfaction, people with a high score on all three (what the researchers titled “living a full life”) showed the highest levels of life satisfaction. Perhaps more importantly, a higher level of meaning-related happiness had a larger effect size than did the other two in predicting life satisfaction.

In a related study, Park, Peterson, and Seligman (2004) found that strengths more related to the affective domain (i.e., hope, zest, gratitude, love) and the conative domain (e.g., curiosity, persistence, self-regulation) were more likely to be associated with life satisfaction than were strengths more associated with the cognitive domain (e.g., perspective/wisdom). Subsequently, Froh and his colleagues (Bono, & Froh, 2009; Froh, Miller, & Snyder, 2007; Froh, Sefick, & Emmons, 2008) found that gratitude was a significant component of life satisfaction for adolescents and could be impacted through school-based interventions.

While there are significant challenges to addressing emotional intelligence and emotional competence, including the various components of happiness, these issues continue to attract a
great deal of attention. Perhaps that is because emotional development has been tied to cognitive functioning (Isen, 2008; Lazarus, 1999), conative development (Buckley, & Saarni, 2009; Saarni, 1997), social development (Goleman, 2006), moral development (Hoffman, 2000), spiritual development (Guela, 2004), and self-views (Hamacheck, 2000). Happiness has been related to outcomes such as higher income, more satisfying and longer marriages, more friends, better physical health, and living longer (Lyubomirsky, 2007). Lyubomirsky also reported research showing that individuals who identified themselves as happier were more creative, helpful, self-confident, and showed greater self-regulation and coping abilities.

One challenge for addressing emotional intelligence and happiness in school is research showing that early experiences, specifically in the home between the infant/child and primary caregiver, are especially important for proper emotional development (Cooper, Masi, & Vick, 2009; Stack, Serbin, Enns, Ruttle, & Barrieau, 2010; Yap, Allen, Leve, & Katz, 2008). A second challenge is that there are relatively few classroom-based programs that focus solely on developing students’ emotional intelligence. Rather, focus on emotions is generally embedded in programs such as habits of mind (Costa, & Kallick, 2008), social-emotional learning (Zins, Payton, Weissberg, & O'Brien, 2007), conflict resolution (Bodine, & Crawford, 1999), or moral development (Narvaez, 2008b). These programs are discussed separately below.

Conative Intelligence

Central to the concept of conative intelligence is the use of personal agency or volition to make choices regarding thoughts, emotions, and behaviors related to goal-directed activities. Although conation has been an area of study in psychology since its beginning as a scientific discipline (Hilgard, 1980), research on this domain, including research on will, volition, and self-regulation, has been fraught with controversy as it highlights discussions of human agency and whether or not it actually exists (Tallon, 1997). However, over the last century, Newton’s paradigm of a closed, deterministic universe where human agency was perceived as non-existent gave way to a process ecology or adaptive systems paradigm where the universe, and especially humanity’s interaction with it, is viewed as being open and indeterministic (Ulanowicz, 2009). This has lead to a philosophical view of human capabilities that allows, even requires, conscious agency. The reappearance of an emphasis on human volition was assisted after a long absence when Wechler included a conative component in his widely-used intelligence measure (Cooper, 1997), Kolbe (1990) developed a reliable and valid measure of conation, and Goleman (1995) included conative components in his definition of emotional intelligence.

Bandura (1986, 1989, 2001) has been one of the leading researchers in the study of human agency through his investigation of self-regulation. He identified four components that provide the foundation for one’s self-regulatory capability: (1) intentionality—the ability to originate a purposeful action; (2) forethought—the ability to think about the future and to make plans; (3) self-reactiveness—the ability to monitor one’s actions and make corrections to achieve one’s goals; and (4) self-reflection—the ability to evaluate one’s purpose, values, and goals with respect to one’s plans and actions. Using Bandura’s framework, Zimmerman (1998) developed a process approach to self-regulation that included three phases: (1) forethought, including setting goals and making plans; (2) performance, including the use of volition to put plans into action; and (3) self-reflection, including relating performance to goals and taking corrective action.

Huitt and Cain (2005) took a slightly different approach by focusing on the self-motivational components of conation, including proactively establishing and maintaining one’s
goal-directed actions, energizing one’s self to action, and persevering in spite of setbacks or obstacles. Proactively establishing one’s direction includes at least four sets of skills: (1) becoming aware of human needs in general as well as one’s specific needs; (2) articulating a vision for one’s life and forming a related statement of long-term desires or aspirations; (3) setting short-term goals related to long-term aspirations; and (4) making specific plans for taking action. Strategies must then be used to put plans into action and one must persevere to bring plans to fruition. Self-directed formative evaluation throughout the process allows one to make adjustments in attainment of goals.

As educators, businesses, and governmental agencies began to address the fast pace of social change, the importance of conative or self-regulation skills related to life-long learning became increasingly apparent (McCombs, 1991). Early research showed that students who scored high in self-regulation had set personal learning goals, engaged in accurate self-monitoring, and thought strategically about their learning activities (Schunk, & Zimmerman, 1994). Summaries of research in this field showed that it is intricately linked to cognitive and affective processing (e.g., Baumeister, & Vohs, 2007; Boekaerts, Pintrich, & Zeidner, 2000). However, it is distinctive in that it focuses on proactive, goal-directed behavior.

Other research showed that conative or self-regulation skills are significantly related to academic achievement in a wide variety contexts (e.g., Eshel, & Kohavi, 2003; Joo, Bong, & Choi, 2000; Neber, & Schommer-Aikins, 2002; Pajares, & Graham, 1999) and can be modified through classroom experiences (e.g., Debowski, Wood, & Bandura, 2001; Perels, Guertler, & Schmitz, 2005; Perry, 1999; Zimmerman, 2002). Additionally, researchers found that classroom teachers could be trained to provide instruction that enhanced student’s self-regulation skills (Schunk, & Zimmerman, 1994, 1998). Zimmerman and his colleagues published a how-to manual on developing students’ self-regulation skills (Zimmerman, Bonner, & Kovach, 1996) and produced a classroom-based program that addressed these skills (Cleary, & Zimmerman, 2004; Nelson, Cleary, & Platten, 2008).

**Bodily-Kinesthetic or Physical Intelligence**

Gardner (1983) stated that bodily-kinesthetic intelligence involves the ability to use the body to complete complex and/or intricate physical tasks. Blemenfeld-Janes (2009) defined bodily-kinesthetic intelligence as an ability to be aware of one’s body in space and motion. Visser, Ashton, and Vernon (2008) showed that bodily-kinesthetic intelligence was often differentiated into two components: (1) gross motor ability (e.g., extraordinary balance and coordination), and (2) fine motor ability (e.g., dexterity). As bodily-kinesthetic intelligence is actualized into competence, there are also two categories: basic and advanced. Basic physical competence is often measured in terms of (1) cardiovascular endurance, (2) muscular strength, (3) muscular endurance, and (4) flexibility (Caldwell, & Huitt, 2004) while more advanced competencies are shown in such activities as dance, theatre, and sports (Visser et al.)

In order to use one’s bodily-kinesthetic intelligence, one needs to have a healthy body. In the developed world, approximately two-thirds of adults and one-third of children are overweight (Daniels, Jacobson, McCrindle, Eckel, & Sanner, 2009; Lewis et al., 2009). Additionally, as global abundance increases, the epidemic of obesity is spreading rapidly to developing countries (Katz, 2005). Katz summarized data from the United States National Center for Health Statistics that showed the trends now in place forecast a “shorter life expectancy for children than for their parents” (p. 62).
Nutrition and physical exercise are the two primary influences on physical development, including health and well-being (Cooper, 1999). With respect to proper eating, a major challenge is that most adults have been taught incorrect information about eating and nutrition (Willett, Skerrett, & Giovannucci, 2001). It does not help that bookstores and magazines are full of competing advice on what and how to eat (Katz, 2005). Fortunately, researchers and practitioners such as Willett et al., Ornish (2007), and Sisson (2009) are beginning to provide sound, scientifically-based recommendations on what and how much to eat. Likewise, chefs such as Ann Cooper (Cooper and Holmes, 2006) and Jamie Oliver (2009; Smith, 2008) provide guidance in how to put these ideas into practice in schools and homes.

In a meta-analysis of 21 studies, Cook-Cottone, Casey, Feeley, and Baran (2009) found that programs producing the best results in addressing obesity targeted elementary children, were whole-school oriented (did not just target overweight children), provided children with specific information and activities regarding healthy nutrition and exercise, and had a high level of parental support. This suggests that preventing weight problems is more effective than addressing problems that arise with older children and youth, that providing information and assistance to parents is as important as working with children, and that schools must target both nutrition and exercise while they have children in their care.

Caldwell and Huitt (2004) reported on the results of schools spending an increased amount of time attempting to improve academic test scores—a reduction in children’s physical activity with a resulting decline in physical fitness and an increase in fitness-related illnesses. Eliminating or even reducing physical activity in schools does not acknowledge research showing that physical activity positively impacts school academic achievement (Trost, 2009). For schools who desire to promote physical competence, it can be done by connecting academic lessons to physical education activities (Huitt, 2009b), involving children and youth in dance, theatre, or sports, or through movement education (e.g., Dobbins, DeCorby, Robeson, Hussen, & Tinlis, 2009; Dobbins, Lockett, Michel, Beyers, Feldman, Vohra, & Micucci, 2001). Kogan (2004) created a movement education curriculum for elementary students; Carter, Wiecha, Peterson, Nobrega, and Gortmaker (2007) provided a similar approach for middle school students. While there can be specific advantages in having students involved in dance, theatre, sports, or movement education, the most important goal should be to have children and youth develop strong and healthy bodies so that they can use whatever bodily-kinesthetic intelligence they possess.

Social/Interpersonal Intelligence

When Aronson (2003) first published The Social Animal in 1972, he confirmed scientifically what people knew experientially: Human beings are social in their very nature. In fact, Dunbar (1998) hypothesized that the large human brain evolved primarily to adapt to an increasingly complex social environment. Albrecht (2005) and Goleman (2006) provided recent reviews of the literature on social intelligence, though they focused more on adults than children and adolescents. Nevertheless, their conceptualizations of social intelligence offer an excellent introduction to this topic.

As with other domains, there are difficulties with the definitions of social intelligence and social competence. Goleman (2006) identified two basic categories of social intelligence, each with four specific subcomponents: Social Awareness (primal empathy, attunement, empathetic accuracy, and social cognition) and Social Facility (synchrony, self-preservation,
influence, and concern). The School Social Behavior Scales (SSBS), one of the most widely used assessment instruments for students in K-12 classrooms, is actually comprised of two scales: (1) the Social Competence Scale, and (2) the Antisocial Behavior Scale (Merrell, 1993). In turn, the Social Competence Scale is comprised of three sets of skills: (1) *interpersonal skills*, (2) *self-management skills*, and (3) *academic skills*.

The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL, 2003, 2007), one of the leaders in the development of social-emotional learning (SEL), identified five teachable competencies that they believe provide a foundation for effective personal development:

1. *Self-awareness*: knowing what one is feeling and thinking; having a realistic assessment of one’s own abilities and a well-grounded sense of self-confidence;
2. *Social awareness*: understanding what others are feeling and thinking; appreciating and interacting positively with diverse groups;
3. *Self-management*: handling one’s emotions so they facilitate rather than interfere with task achievement; setting and accomplishing goals; persevering in the face of setbacks and frustrations;
4. *Relationship skills*: establishing and maintaining healthy and rewarding relationships based on clear communication, cooperation, resistance to inappropriate social pressure, negotiating solutions to conflict, and seeking help when needed; and
5. *Responsible decision making*: making choices based on an accurate consideration of all relevant factors and the likely consequences of alternative courses of action, respecting others, and taking responsibility for one's decisions.

CASEL and like-minded researchers proposed that school curricula must provide learning experiences that address students’ development in the academic, emotional, social, and moral domains (Cohen, 2006; Elias & Arnold, 2006; Zins, Weissberg, Wang, & Walberg, 2004). Notice that the five competencies listed above involved the domains of cognition/thinking (responsible decision making), affect/emotion (self-awareness and self-management—handling one’s emotions), and conation/self-regulation (self-management—setting and accomplishing goals; persevering), in addition to the social domain (social awareness, relationship skills). These researchers suggested that by developing a safe and secure environment and directly teaching the above listed social-emotional competencies, students will not only be more academically engaged, thereby learning more academic material, but also less likely to engage in risky behavior that would be detrimental to their development. Additionally, they proposed that when schools form partnerships with the families and community organizations of students they serve, the impact of the school is made even stronger (Patrikakou, & Weissberg, 2007; Zins et al., 2007).

** Spiritual Intelligence **

Huitt and Robbins (2003) summarized the views of many researchers in the area of spiritual intelligence and the development of spiritual competence by describing it as: (1) an inherent human component, (2) considered important by a vast majority of people both in the developed and developing world, and (3) extremely difficult to define and assess with any reliability and validity. There are multiple components of a definition of spirituality, including, but not limited to, the ability to connect to the sacred (Pargament, & Mahoney, 2002); the ability
to generate meaning and purpose for one’s life (Frankl, 1997, 1998); self-awareness (Zohar, & Marshall, 2000); and the ability to create deep, personal relationships with one’s self, with others, with nature, and universal unknowns (Hay, & Nye, 1998). Maslow (1971) suggested that human spirituality is an existential, transpersonal quality that is the essence of one’s humanity. However, a number of authors have questioned whether spirituality should be considered an intelligence or better thought of as an aspect of another domain of human potential such as cognition or emotion (Emmons, 2000; Gardner, 2000a; Juneer, 2000).

Notice that the definitions of each of these indicate that a potential has been actualized at an adult level, at least in a manner that allows the individual to be conscious of its expression. For those working with children and youth, the same difficulty exists with qualitative assessments of spirituality Hodge (2001). Roehlkepartain, Ebstyn, Wagener, and Benson (2006) provided an excellent review of the current literature, yet considerable work is needed to identify the developmental sequences for children and youth as they actualize their innate potential in this domain.

Palmer (1998/1999, 2003) has long advocated that spirituality should be part of a classroom teacher’s training and practice. McGreevy and Copley (1998/1999) offered a number of suggestions for doing so, including a focus on the arts, making the classrooms and school a place of beauty, taking time to ponder profound issues and questions that students want to address, and involving students in service learning projects. Kessler (2000) identified what she calls seven gateways to the soul that teachers can use as part of their classroom practice (see Table 2). Huitt and Robbins (2003) showed that each of the pathways Kessler identified has been considered important by other researchers. However, Kessler stated that if these activities are to address spiritual development, they must be dealt with in ways that are meaningful to each student. If they are dealt with in a perfunctory manner, students will not develop the deep, personal connections required for developing spiritual competence.

Table 2. Pathways to the Soul*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Found in Other Theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Yearning for Deep Connection  | A relationship that is profoundly caring, is resonant with meaning, and involves feelings of belonging, or of being truly seen and known; can experience deep connection to themselves, to others, to nature, or to a higher power. | • Erikson (1950) — Need for Belongingness  
• Gardner (2006) — Interpersonal Intelligence (connection to others) |
| Longing for Silence and Solitude | As a respite from the tyranny of busyness and noise, silence can be a realm of reflection, of calm or fertile chaos, an avenue of stillness and rest for some, prayer or contemplation for others. | • Gardner (2006) — Intrapersonal Intelligence               |
| Search for Meaning & Purpose  | Exploration of big questions, such as  
• Why am I here?  
• Does my life have a purpose?  
• What is life for?  
• What is my destiny?  
• Is there a God? | • Gardner (2006) — Existential Intelligence                |
Table 2. Pathways to the Soul* (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Found in Other Theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunger for Joy</td>
<td>Satisfied through experiences of great simplicity, such as play, celebration, or gratitude; also describes the exaltation students feel when encountering beauty, power, grace, brilliance, love, or the sheer joy of being alive.</td>
<td>• Csikszentmihalyi (1998) — Flow in Consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Delight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Drive</td>
<td>Part of all the gateways; students feel awe and mystery whether developing a new idea, a work of art, a scientific discovery, or an entirely new lens on life.</td>
<td>• Sternberg (1985) — Creative Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urge of Transcendence</td>
<td>Desire to go beyond perceived personal limits; includes not only the mystical realm, but experiences of the extraordinary in the arts, athletics, academics, or human relations.</td>
<td>• Maslow (1971) — Transcendence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Initiation</td>
<td>Deals with rites of passage for the young—guiding adolescents to become more conscious about the irrevocable transition from childhood to adulthood.</td>
<td>• Campbell (1972) • Schlegel &amp; Barry (1980) — Initiation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Adapted from Huitt, & Robbins, (2003)

Moral Intelligence

While there are a number of definitions for moral intelligence, most of them revolve around the habits and patterns of thought, emotions, intentions, and behavior associated with issues of right and wrong, especially in a social context (Vessels, & Huitt, 2005). In the United States, the development of moral character was seen as a fundamental requirement for having a well-functioning society, especially a multicultural democracy (Myers, 2000), and was one of the primary reasons for initially promoting universal, public education (Vessels, & Huitt, 2005). A similar expectation provided the rationale for a global expansion of compulsory schooling (Benavot, & Resnik, 2007). However, with the increased emphasis on academic learning in the latter half of the twentieth century, moral and ethical education was deemphasized.

There are a wide variety of moral character development programs ranging from moral quality of the month, to the integration of moral character activities into academic lessons, to whole-school programs where instruction is focused on moral character, to service learning programs integrated into the curriculum (Vessels, & Huitt, 2005). In general, researched showed that programs work best when they are (1) school-wide, (2) include a school-family connection, (3) include an emphasis on addressing multiple components of moral character (e.g., thinking/cognition, affective/valuing, volitional/intending, and behavior described in fairly traditional ways), and (4) provide opportunities for students to demonstrate their development by providing service to others. The goal for these programs is to have students develop an identity of themselves as virtuous people and to build an extensive repertoire of experiences that supports this identity (Borba, 2002).
In my opinion, Narvaez’s (2008b) triune theory of moral development and its implementation through the Integrative Ethical Education program (Narvaez, 2006) shows great promise in providing an integrated approach to moral development. While there are certainly many commendable character education programs that are available (e.g., Battisch, 2003; Elkind, & Sweet, 2004; Lickona, Schaps, & Lewis, 2003), Narvaez’s approach not only explicitly makes reference to the neurobiological foundation of moral character, it directly addresses the underlying components related to the domains of affect/emotions (ethical sensitivity), cognition/thinking (ethical judgment), conation/volition (ethical motivation) as well as the actual display of moral behavior (ethical action), especially in service to others (service learning). It, therefore, addresses more of the various viewpoints of moral character development discussed by other researchers.

### Citizenship

Discussions regarding citizenship have received extensive attention in recent years as humanity moves rapidly into a new era of globalization (e.g., King, 2000; Isin, 2000; Peters, Britton, & Blee, 2008; Roth & Burbules, 2007). In many ways, one’s concept of citizenship is an essential element of one’s self identity. At the earliest stages of human evolution the group affiliation that provided a source of one’s identity was the family or band, then evolved into tribe, city state, and empire (McNeill & McNeill, 2003). These changes in affiliation and identity took tens of thousands, then thousands, then hundreds of years. While most had an identity at one of these levels, the concept of world citizen (derived from the Greek word kosmopolitês) had its advocates even in antiquity (Kleingeld, 2006). The beginning of globalization in the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries (McNeill, & McNeill, 2003), the rapid changes in technology, especially digital technology, in the twentieth century (Huitt, 2007), combined with an increased mobility that is expected to continue (Castles & Miller, 2003; OECD, 2008), has created a complexity of affiliation and identity seen only in isolated individuals in the past (Banks, 2007; Grimshaw & Sears, 2008; Marshall, 2009). Unfortunately, recent attempts to make sense of these changes result in contradictory views. One such example is found in the statements that the world is flat (Friedman, 2007) and the world is curved (Smick, 2008). Townsend (2009) argues that this particular contradiction results from a focus on the whole (flat) versus the differentiation of the parts (curved) and that in the postmodern world people (especially leaders) need to think and act both locally (parts) and globally (whole).

Another contradiction is the discussion of whose rights should be central to the concept of citizenship: that of the individual (Hall, Coffey, & Williamson, 1999) or that of the community (Stevenson, 2010). While there are excellent rationales provided for both, there is also an advocacy that the most important consideration is to provide a dynamic balance between the perspectives of individual autonomy and collective benefit (McIntyre-Mills, 2009), a theme adopted in the United Nations (1948) Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Pykett (2010) suggests that discussing the tensions between individual freedoms and social order is crucial to developing a sustainable view schooling and social reforms. This would seem to be especially relevant in a discussion of preparation for citizenship. At a time in history when society is in great flux, a lack of a coherent policy results in jumping back and forth between these two advocacies in a manner that is neither satisfying nor effective.
Citizenship and One’s View of Reality

One’s concept of citizenship is tied to one’s view of reality and one’s relationship to it. Scientific discoveries have been influential in this process, especially in the last 400 years. Based on work from contributors such as Copernicus, Galileo, and Kepler, in the seventeenth century Newton formulated a view of reality that guided scientific exploration for the next three hundred years and is still influential today (Ulanowicz, 2009). Using that framework, one easily comes to the idea that citizenship is rather static and singular—that is, one’s loyalties are to a singular entity (family, tribe, city, nation, etc.) and that entity is rather static in its values and structure. However, discoveries in the twentieth century by Planck, Einstein, Heisenberg, Bohr and many others are challenging the worldview proposed by Newton (Stapp, 2007). These scientific explorations provide a view of reality that includes understandings derived from work at the subatomic level based on quantum theory as well as the macro level of cosmology (Abrams & Primack, 2011; Brown, 2007; Christian, 2005).

Many scientists discuss how recent findings demand a revision of humanity’s relationship to both the microscopic and macroscopic views of reality. For example, Stapp (2007) provides a concise statement about necessity for a reformulation of beliefs about human values and behavior:

Each of us, when trying to establish values upon which to base conduct, is inevitably led to the question of one’s place in the greater whole. The linkage of this philosophical inquiry to the practical question of personal values is no mere intellectual abstraction. Martyrs in every age are vivid reminders of the fact that no influence upon human conduct, even the instinct for bodily self-preservation, is stronger than beliefs about one’s relationship to the rest of the universe and to the power that shapes it. Such beliefs form the foundation of a person’s self-image, and hence, ultimately, of personal values (pp. 4-5).

Additionally, philosophers have been hard at work in creating a set of organizing principles for this new paradigm (Laszlo, 1996; Ulanowicz, 2009). Most importantly in terms of a discussion of citizenship, Schacker (2001) describes how the phases in the movement from a medieval worldview to the mechanistic, reductionistic worldview are now being repeated in the movement to the organismic, holistic, complex adaptive systems worldview—(1) early enlightenment, (2) conservative backlash, (3) intensive phase, and (4) transformational phase. While the concepts of the new paradigm are being used regularly in guiding individual and organizational development and, in turn, concepts of citizenship (Beck & Cowan, 1996; Snyder, Acker-Hocevar, & Snyder, 2008; Wheatley, 2006), it is rather easy to identify elements of a conservative backlash to a more fixed and static view of society and citizenship (Turner, 1990; or as an internet search using the phrase “conservative backlash” will show). Thus, it is apparent that while the moving target of scientific understanding presents a challenge to the discussion, it is a critical element that needs to be included.

Abrams and Primack (2011) take up the challenge of this reformulation and advocate the conceptualization of a cosmic society and cosmic citizenship as an important next step in the sociocultural evolution. Extending Townsend’s (2009) thinking, this would require an advocacy of thinking and acting on the local, global, and cosmic levels. But exactly what would that
mean? Dowd (2008) suggests, at a minimum, it means comprehending that the simple act of breathing (taking in oxygen and nitrogen that originated when a red giant star collapsed billions of years ago) connects every human being to the cosmos. It also means that every human being on the planet is a direct result of a physical-chemical-biological evolutionary process that is at least 13.7 billion years old and continuing. The bodies of human beings are related not only to each other, not only to every physical entity on the planet, but also every type of physical object in the cosmos.

Most importantly, Stapp (2007) and others (e.g., Combs, 2002; Schwartz & Begley, 2002) describe how recent insights generated through quantum theory provide an understanding of humanity’s potential for influencing this evolutionary process, especially in its behavioral, psychological, and sociocultural aspects. This is an especially important theme in the discussion of citizenship. Not only are the relationships nested (i.e., individual within local community within state within nation within international region within world), but there is a reciprocal (i.e., back-and-forth) relationship at all levels. When individuals change (whether intentionally or unintentionally), it influences change at higher levels of organization that, in turn, influences individual change. To the extent those changes allow one to better thrive and flourish, and are prosocial in that they do the same for others, the context within which one lives becomes more capable of even further positive growth and development. When these are done intentionally, one is making a purposeful and meaningful contribution to individual and community development. Thus, one’s concept of citizenship has the potential to impact every higher levels of context within which the individual is developing.

In addition to significant increases in scientific knowledge and the major paradigm used to organize those data, there have been attempts in recent years to reconcile these new understanding with interpretations of religious teachings (Dowd, 2008; Green & Palmer, 2005; Lewis-Williams, 2010; Polkinghorn, 1998; Wilber 2007). While there are detractors who proclaim there is no need for a reconciliation of science and religion as science is the only reasonable alternative (Dawkins, 2006; Harris, 2005; Hitchens, 2009), and there are substantial disagreements among those involved in this discussion (Green & Palmer, 2005), the discussion continues unabated. At this point it would seem that any discussion about the source of knowledge related to views of citizenship would need to include representatives from all of these groups.

**Educating for Citizenship**

Fortunately, there are many efforts to provide education and schooling focused on preparation of children and youth for their roles as citizens that can be examined as part of this discussion. Diaz, Massialas, and Xanthopoulos (1999) propose that citizenship education should help students to develop thoughtful and clarified identifications with their cultural communities and their nation-states. It should also help students to develop clarified global identifications and deep understandings of their roles in the world community. One of the best known approaches is the curriculum developed by Oxfam GB (2006). In addition to identifying specific knowledge, dispositions, and skills necessary for global citizenship for the entire K-12 system, Oxfam also provides activities and resources for addressing these in the classroom (see http://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/).

No consensus has developed as to the focus and target of citizenship education. In addition to working with classroom teachers, Cordry and Wilson (2004) advocate working with
the family as parents are the first teachers of children. On the other hand, Woolley (2008) believes it is critical to influence student teachers as they are the future of the schooling profession. Townsend (2009) advocates starting with school leadership, as they are influential in setting the schooling agenda. Karlberg (2008) advocates that the community should be the focus of the effort to define citizenship as that is the context within which discussion about the elements of identity takes place while Doherty (2000) believes the focus should be on efforts to connect families and communities.

Summary and Conclusions

Having just read a somewhat brief overview of research relating to the process of actualizing capacities and preparing for citizenship, a parent or educator might ask the question: “What are we supposed to do?” In my opinion the more fundamental question is: “What goals or desired outcomes do we have for our children and youth?” I agree with such authors as Park (2003) who believe a wider variety of outcomes must be explicitly stated (Huitt, 1995, 1997, 2004, 2006a, 2007). The aspirations adults have for young people can be summarized in four categories: to become good, smart, healthy, and socio-culturally well-integrated. In my opinion, this is the essence of what Seligman (2011) refers to as flourishing. I believe parents and educators also want young people to be prepared to provide service to others, recognizing that doing good is just as important as doing well (Coplin 2000). In his advocacy for the development of wisdom as a primary goal of one’s life, Sternberg (2004) said something quite similar:

Wisdom is the use of one's intelligence and experience as mediated by values toward the achievement of a common good through a balance among (1) intrapersonal, (2) interpersonal, and (3) extrapersonal interests, over the (1) short and (2) long terms, to achieve a balance among (1) adaptation to existing environments, (2) shaping of existing environments, and (3) selection of new environments (p. 164).

As educators consider the appropriate role for schools in the development of children and youth, approaches to curricula, classroom practice, and assessment instruments and methods can be summarized in terms of four major categories. The first is an “Academics and/or Technical Skills Only” category which considers the school as the place for the development of knowledge and skills related to academic disciplines (e.g., Hirsch, 1996) or vocational/technical skills (e.g., Losh, 2000). Educators and parents who adopt this approach are quite comfortable with only using standardized tests of basic skills or standardized protocols for technical/vocational skills as ways to measure school success. Huitt, Huitt, Monetti, and Hummel (2009) provided an overview of research that can provide a framework for action for educators with a basic academic skills perspective. Gemici and Rojewski (2007) and Lewis (2008) report on similar efforts in the area of vocational-technical skills development. The appropriateness of any school-based activities related to the development of capacities discussed in the present paper would be judged in terms of the influence they might have on the improvement of academic test scores or demonstrations of vocational-technical skills. While educators with this perspective might agree that the development of additional capacities and preparation for citizenship is important, they would leave that to parents and religious or other community organizations.
A second category might be labeled “Academics/Technical Skills Plus”. Educators adopting this approach hypothesize that academic success can be developed through instruction directly focused on the desired academic knowledge and skills, but additional gains can be obtained through addressing cognitive processing skills with the goal of developing disciplined minds (Gardner, 2000b). The programs developed by Feuerstein et al. (1980), Sternberg and his colleagues (Sternberg, 1996; Sternberg et al., 2000; Sternberg, & Grigorenko, 2000), or Wegener (2005) are examples of programs developed within this approach. Each provides specific recommendations, including materials and teacher training, that address the cognitive processing skills used in learning academic content. Again, the development of capacities in additional domains, including citizenship and adult roles, would be left to others.

A third category might be labeled “Partial Holistic”. Educators adopting this approach recognize the importance of the knowledge and skills associated with achievement in the academic disciplines, but believe the research on developing competencies in additional domains warrants that school resources be devoted to actualizing potential in at least one domain in addition to the cognitive domain. The habits of mind (Costa and Kallick, 2008), SEL (e.g., CASEL, 2003, 2007), or moral character (e.g., Narvaez, 2006, 2007, 2008a, 2008b) programs will likely meet the goals of such educators. The advantage of these approaches is that they simultaneously focus on actualizing cognitive, emotional, conative, and social intelligences as defined in this paper. CASEL’s and Narvaez’s approaches have the added bonus of focusing on developing moral intelligence. The programs focused on emotional development (e.g., Deham (1998), Saarni, 2007), subjective well-being (e.g., Park et al., 2004), self-regulation (e.g., Debrowski et al., 2001; Zimmerman, 2002), movement education (e.g., Dobbins et al, 2001, 2009), and spiritual development (Kessler, 2000) can also be considered as belonging within this category. By identifying more capacities that are under the influence of schools, educators acknowledge that there is more to developing citizens that can function in a democracy than merely providing children and youth with academic knowledge and cognitive skills.

The fourth category might be labeled “Holistic” in that educators adopting this perspective focus on actualizing a majority of the capacities described in this paper. Examples of such programs can be found in Reggio Emilia (e.g., Caldwell, 1997; Kinney, & Wharton, 2008), Montessori (e.g., Cossentino, 2009; Hainstock, 1997), Waldorf (see http://www.whywaldorfworks.org/), the International Primary Curriculum (see http://www.internationalprimarycurriculum.com/), and the three International Baccalaureate programs (see http://www.ibo.org/). Additionally, the Asset Development framework advocated by the Search Institute (Benson, Galbraith, & Espeland, 1994; Lerner, & Benson, 2003; Roehlkepartain et al., 2003) fits well within this perspective. Each of these programs has a different focus or emphasis, yet they separate themselves from others by implementing a whole-school, integrated approach to holistic development of children or youth and include preparation for citizenship in a democracy as a focus of their work.

Table 3 provides a brief of overview of the types of school-based curricula and programs that might be found in each category.

**Getting Started**

In a review of research related to improving scores on standardized tests of basic skill, Huit et al. (2009) recommended that the first step was the formation and development of high functioning faculty teams using the work of Losada (2008a & b) as a basic component of
developing a learning organization (Senge, 1990). The same first step applies to using the research outlined in this paper. A major difference would be that the teams must first consider, with guidance from the administration, the possibility of revisiting the worldview, vision, and mission statements of the school. If these statements of the school are congruent with an “Academics and/or Technical Skills Only” approach to schooling, leading to a coherence among academic goals, curriculum, instructional practices, and traditional assessments, then the teams would begin by reviewing the research synthesized by Hattie (2009) and summarized by Huitt et al. or the research on improving vocational/technical skills instruction.

However, if there is a desire to begin addressing the capacities identified in this paper, it might best be coordinated at the district level. If it does not seem possible to adopt one of the holistic programs discussed above, it might be best to adopt one of the Habits of Mind, SEL, or moral character programs discussed previously. Alternatively, a district might selectively focus on actualizing different capacities at different grade levels. For example, the PreK through second grades might focus on integrating emotional and physical/kinesthetic competencies with academic competence and helping students to make explicit their physical and academic self-views. At the upper elementary (grades three through five), teachers might focus on additionally integrating the development of cognitive processing skills and continue to emphasize their students’ academic and physical/kinesthetic self-views. At the middle school level, teachers might focus on integrating social and conative/volitional/self-regulation competencies with academic work. Social self-views would be integrated with previously held academic and physical self-views. Finally, at the high school level, teachers could focus on integrating the development of moral and spiritual competencies into either the academic or vocational/technical curriculum, and help students integrate different aspects of their personalities and self-views.

Table 3. Categories of Curricula and Approaches to Schooling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academics and/or Technical Skills Only</td>
<td>Academic Knowledge and/or Technical Skills</td>
<td>Most state- or nationally-mandated curricula focused on reading/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies; vocational-technical curricula focus on specific job-related skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics and/or Technical Skills Plus</td>
<td>Academics Knowledge and/or Technical Skills plus Cognitive Processing Skills</td>
<td>Instrumental Enrichment, Sternberg’s Analytic, Creative, and Practical Intelligence, Wegner’s Process Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Holistic</td>
<td>Academics and Cognitive Processing plus at least one additional focus</td>
<td>Habits of Mind, Emotional Development, Moral Character, Social Emotional Learning, Subjective Well-Being, Self-Regulation, Movement Education, Pathways to the Soul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic</td>
<td>Academics plus a majority of the Brilliant Star domains</td>
<td>Reggio Emilia, Waldorf, International Primary Curriculum, International Baccalaureate (PYP, MYP, DP), Search Institute’s External and Internal Asset Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that actualizing cognitive intelligence accounts for at best a third of the variance related to adult life success (Gardner, 1995; Goleman, 1998; Sternberg, Wagner, Williams, &
Horvath, 1995), schools need to provide leadership in developing the whole person if they are to accept their responsibilities for preparing children and youth for successful adulthood. However, there are legitimate reasons why parents would want a school to adopt less than a holistic approach, especially if they believe competencies in the other domains are adequately addressed through home and community activities. Ideally, schools would not only provide directed learning experiences that match the desired outcomes parents have for their children and youth, but would also coordinate with families and community to provide a holistic education to all young people. That is, if all children and youth are to be provided an excellent education, they need to develop capacities, acquire virtues, and provide service as they prepare to be good, smart, happy, and healthy adults regardless of whether or not these are addressed directly in a school’s curriculum. It is also necessary to revisit the school curriculum and classroom practices on a regular basis as young people live in a rapidly changing physical and sociocultural environment that is recognized as increasingly global in scope.

The idea of having different school curricula and programs available to students on demand might sound utopian, but this is the foundation of the school choice (Huitt, 2006b) and school self-management (Caldwell, 2004) movements that are rapidly gaining wider acceptance. In a fast-paced, quickly-changing global environment educators, parents, and concerned members of the community must work together to provide the resources children and youth need as they develop towards adulthood (Benson et al., 1994; Coleman, 1988; Lerner, & Benson, 2003). This will only happen if parents and the community agree substantially with the worldview, vision, mission, and curricula as well as the instructional and assessment practices of the school. The task is difficult, but doable, and one that the world’s children and youth desperately need for the adults in their lives to accomplish.

References


Fail, H., Thompson, J., & Walker, G.


Kroeger, O., & Thuesen, J. (1989). *Type talk: The 16 personality types that determine how we live, love, and work.* New York: Dell.


