Critical reflections on character education and extrinsic rewards

1. Annotated bibliography

Teaching is powerless without a foundation of good habits.

(Aristotle, 1926, p.631)

In 2012, the Central Bureau of Investigation (the UK's top lobbying business organisation) published a report, based on discussions with business leaders, teachers, school leaders and academics, which argues that through its narrow focus on academic achievement, the education system is failing the majority of children (CBI, 2012). Later that same year, the Final Report of the Riots Communities and Victims Panel (2012), published in the wake of the August 2011 UK riots, recommended new school initiatives to help children build character. There has since been a groundswell in favour of character education among policy makers and the general public, especially in England. But character education is nothing new; on the contrary, the formation of character should be seen as the perennial aim of education (Arthur, 2020).

In this essay, I will examine the relationship between character education and extrinsic rewards, via intrinsic motivation. I will begin by providing critical summaries of eight salient sources (section 1), before applying these sources (among others) to my teaching practice, using the character education framework at my current placement school as a case study (section 2).

i. *Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2021 [2011])[1]

Providing statutory guidance for school leaders, school staff, and governing bodies in England, this document from the Department for Education (DfE) defines the minimum level of practice expected of trainees to achieve qualified teacher status (QTS). Replacing the standards previously published by the former Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA, 2007), these standards were introduced in 2011 following an independent Review of Teachers' Standards, whose membership comprised leading teachers, headteachers, and other experts (DfE, 2011a, 2011b). The review drew on a range of evidence (e.g. Barber & Mourshed, 2007; NFER, 2011; OECD, 2010; Poet et al., 2010).

Some values are implicit in the standards. For example, teachers must:

---

[1] Originally published in 2011; latest update in 2021. I include the *Teachers' Standards* in the annotated bibliography because they *lack* any meaningful reference to character education, which is noteworthy in this context.

- 'demonstrate consistently the positive attitudes, value and behaviour which are expected of pupils' (p.10)
- 'maintain good relationships with pupils, exercise appropriate authority, and act decisively when necessary' (p.12)
- 'uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by […] treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect' (p.14)

Beyond these few vague statements, however, the moral and ethical role of the teacher is largely neglected (Beauchamp et al., 2015; Fullard & Watts, 2019). This is a serious shortcoming, given that teaching is inherently an ethical activity (Campbell, 2008). Though it is perhaps unsurprising. After all, the standards are published by the DfE, whose first priority is to drive economic growth (DfE, 2014), and economists prefer to sidestep issues of morality (Taylor, 2014).

Overall, echoing Arthur, Davison & Lewis (2005), the standards focus too much on what teachers *do* and not enough on what a teacher *is*.

ii.   *Character Education Fraework Guidance* (DfE, 2019)

Aimed at school leaders and teachers, this DfE document offers non-statutory guidance on character education and development for pupils.[2] Based on recommendations from an advisory group on character education, with members including headteachers and leaders of teaching trade unions, the guidance provides schools with six benchmarking questions to support reflection and the self-evaluation of current provision.

The guidance acknowledges that character is a complex concept which involves the learning and habituation of positive moral attributes known as 'virtues'. Citing a literature review for the Education Endowment Foundation and Cabinet Office (Gutman & Schoon, 2013), the guidance also observes that highly motivated children driven internally and not by extrinsic rewards show greater levels of persistence and achievement.

While the guidance begins to make up for the shortcomings of the *Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2021 [2011]), it is not without its own limitations. First, the advisory group's recommendations drew on a call for evidence, but the evidence itself is only ever alluded to throughout. Second, it fails to distinguish different types of virtues (see below). Third, it suggests that virtues are valuable *as a means*

---

[2] While the guidance itself is non-statutory, schools do have a statutory duty to promote the spiritual, moral, social, and cultural (SMSC) development of pupils, and character education contributes to this duty.

to improving educational attainment, engagement, and attendance. True though this may be (Jeynes, 2017), it misses the point of character education: virtue is its *own* reward (Kristjánsson, 2017).

Overall, the guidance is useful but superficial. Character education warrants a much deeper exploration.

iii. *The Road to Character* (Brooks, 2016)

Aimed at a general audience, Brooks' book describes what character building looks like in real life through eight biographical essays. Drawing on his experience teaching an undergraduate course on humility at Yale, Brooks distinguishes between 'résumé' virtues – 'the skills you bring to the job market and that contribute to external success' – and 'eulogy' virtues – 'the virtues that get talked about at your funeral […] that exist at the core of your being' (e.g. kindness, bravery, honesty) (p.ix).[3] Brooks reflects that while most of us agree that eulogy virtues are more important, our education systems tend to focus much more on résumé virtues: 'Most of us have clearer strategies for how to achieve career success than we do for how to develop a profound character' (p.ix).

The strength of this book lies in its accessibility. Brooks lets the reader see what he is seeing by using visual, concrete language; and he describes character development via stories, which people find easier to understand and remember than other types of material (Willingham, 2004). But in being concrete and accessible, the book necessarily lacks a theoretical basis.

Overall, the book succeeds in chronicling the cultivation of character.

iv. *Aristotelian Character Education* (Kristjánsson, 2017)

Targeted at theoretically minded educationists, professionals, and parents, as well as moral psychologists and philosophers, Kristjánsson's book offers a theoretical account of character education along Aristotelian lines. It introduces several relevant concepts, as follows. The ultimate aim of character education is *human flourishing*, which comprises the realisation of specifically human excellences called *virtues*. *Prototypical* virtues include courage, justice, honesty, compassion, gratitude, and humility. These are the *moral* ('eulogy') virtues, a subset of which are the *civic* virtues (e.g. citizenship, volunteering). But flourishing also requires *intellectual* virtues (e.g. curiosity, critical thinking; especially *phronesis* or good sense, a meta-virtue which serves as moral adjudicator when two virtues clash) and *performance* ('résumé') virtues (e.g. co-operative skills, resilience). Kristjánsson

---

[3] Brooks also invokes Soloveitchik's (1965) distinction between Adam 1 and Adam 2: Adam 1 is external, résumé Adam; Adam 2 is internal, eulogy Adam. Adam 1 and Adam 2 are not fully reconcilable.

stresses, however, that performance virtues derive their value only from enabling the moral virtues, which have intrinsic (non-instrumental) value; if morally unconstrained, performance virtues can be positively dangerous. For a topical example, consider the resilience and self-confidence (two performance virtues) of Vladimir Putin.

Professor Kristjánsson is the foremost academic authority on character education; most recent works defer to him, and usually to this book in particular (see e.g. Jubilee Centre, 2017; Jeynes, 2017; Watts, Fullard & Peterson, 2021). Yet still he speaks plainly and clearly, keeping technical jargon to a minimum. While the book is light on practical recommendations, the practical was never its intent.

Overall, the book provides a solid theoretical foundation on which to build any programme of character education.

v. 'Motivational aspects of moral learning and progress' (Curren, 2014)

Aimed at moral philosophers and psychologists, Curren's journal article offers potentially testable hypotheses concerning the ways in which moral upbringing and education might favour intrinsic moral motivation. Drawing on Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2012), it argues that for moral education to succeed on its own terms, it must satisfy three innate psychological needs: *relatedness* (positive social connection or belongingness), *competence* (self-efficacy), and *autonomy* (self-determination).

The article succeeds in paving the theoretical way for empirical studies on the motivational foundations of moral education; it has proven influential in the field of character education, being cited by Kristjánsson (2017) and recommended as further reading by the Jubilee Centre (2017). Still, it has two potential pitfalls. First, the connection between intrinsic motivation and the three innate psychological needs is left unspecified (the next entry will address this). Second, the argument depends entirely on Self-Determination Theory (SDT), a macro theory of human motivation and personality, which has faced some criticism. For example, behaviourists have challenged the central distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (see e.g. Flora, 1990; Carton, 1996). But SDT has survived this challenge, among others, and is today the most systematic theory of motivation available.

In sum, Curren's argument can be accepted on the assumption of SDT, which seems to be a safe assumption.

vi. 'Self-determination and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being' (Ryan & Deci, 2000)

Published in *American Psychologist*, the flagship journal of the American Psychological Association, Ryan & Deci's article explains how research guided by SDT has led to the postulation of three innate psychological needs – competence, autonomy, and relatedness – which when satisfied yield enhanced self-motivation and mental health but when thwarted lead to diminished motivation and well-being. Ryan & Deci introduce *intrinsic motivation*, which refers to doing something because it is inherently interesting. Research indicates strong links between intrinsic motivation and the needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness (thus plugging the hole in Curren's (2014) argument, above). But much of what people do is not intrinsically motivated. *Extrinsic motivation* refers to doing something because it leads to a separable outcome. SDT proposes that extrinsic motivation can vary in the degree to which it emanates from the self. Findings suggest that the internalisation of extrinsic motivation can be facilitated by supports for competence, autonomy, and relatedness. Ryan & Deci further suggest that these basic needs must be satisfied across a lifetime for someone to experience 'eudaimonia'. This is the Greek word for 'flourishing', and the ultimate aim of character education (Kristjánsson, 2017).

The claims in this article are based on 25 years of research into motivation and SDT, a theory which originated in the work of Deci and Ryan (especially Deci & Ryan, 1985). Though the article was published some time ago, since then research into SDT has only increased (see e.g. Vansteenkiste, Ryan & Soenens, 2020; Krettenauer & Curren, 2020).

Overall, the article offers some of the deepest insights available into the sources of human motivation.

vii. 'A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation' (Deci, Koestner & Ryan, 1999)

It was in the early seventies when research first revealed that rewards can undermine intrinsic motivation (Deci, 1971; Lepper, Greene, & Nisbett, 1973), which Deci (1975) interpreted in terms of rewards facilitating a more external perceived locus of causality (i.e. diminished autonomy). While the issue of rewards has been hotly debated ever since, Deci, Koestner & Ryan's meta-analysis of 128 studies confirms that all expected tangible rewards made contingent on task performance do reliably undermine intrinsic motivation.

Four meta-analyses had already attempted to evaluate the idea that rewards undermine intrinsic motivation (viz. Rummel & Feinberg, 1988; Wiersma, 1992; Tang & Hall, 1995; Eisenberger & Cameron,

1996), but each had significant methodological problems, results varied, and conclusions were controversial. Given these limitations and the importance of the issue for real-world applications, Deci, Koestner & Ryan answered the call for a more comprehensive meta-analysis. While it may now seem dated, their review continues to be cited as the leading authority on the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation (see e.g. Ojo et al., 2022; Bastanfard, Shahabipour & Amirkhani, 2022).

Overall, we can safely accept the claim that rewards undermine intrinsic motivation, which is likely because they diminish the sense of autonomy.

viii. 'Extrinsic rewards undermine altruistic tendencies in 20-month-olds' (Warneken & Tomasello, 2008)

Published in *Developmental Psychology*, Warneken & Tomasello's study investigates the influence of rewards on very young children's prosocial behaviour by comparing their tendency to help after experiencing different kinds of rewards. In response to helping an experimenter reach a pen, 36 children received either a reward (a toy cube; "For this, you get a cube."), praise ("Thank you, [child's name]; that's really nice!"), or nothing at all. When presented with further opportunities to help, only 34 children continued; 2 children stopped helping completely. Both of these children had previously received a reward. Warneken & Tomasello claim that this provides evidence for an effect in which extrinsic rewards undermine children's altruistic motivation.

While the study has proven influential in the field of character education (see e.g. Watts, Fullard & Peterson, 2021), it has one obvious limitation. The final sample consisted of 36 German children (16 girls, 20 boys) who were approximately 20 months old. Given such a small sample, Warneken & Tomasello's findings may not generalise to all young children, let alone to older children. In fact, Deci, Koestner & Ryan (1999) found that rewards tended to be more detrimental for children than college students.

That said, Warneken & Tomasello never attempt to generalise; they are more tentative, presenting their findings only as evidence that extrinsic rewards can undermine children's altruistic motivation. As such evidence, their findings may be accepted.

In sum, though some values are implicit, the *Teacher's Standards* (DfE, 2021 [2011]) largely neglect the moral role of a teacher. While the *Character Education Framework Guidance* (DfE, 2019) is a welcome step in the right direction, it fails to distinguish moral ('eulogy') virtues, which have intrinsic value, from performance ('résumé') virtues, which derive value only from enabling the moral virtues (Kristjánsson, 2017; Brooks, 2016). Essential to moral education (and thus character education) is

intrinsic motivation, which refers to doing something for its own reward; and essential to intrinsic motivation (not to mention wellbeing and even flourishing) is the satisfaction of three innate psychological needs: the needs for competence (self-efficacy), autonomy (self-determination), and relatedness (positive social connection or belongingness) (Curren, 2014; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Intrinsic motivation, however, is undermined by extrinsic rewards, which is likely because extrinsic rewards diminish autonomy (Deci, Koestner & Ryan, 1999). We might hypothesise that extrinsic rewards thereby undermine character education, the conscious process of cultivating intrinsically valuable virtues (see also Ellis & Todd, 2018; Watts, Fullard & Peterson, 2021). There is some empirical evidence for this hypothesis: extrinsic rewards were found to undermine altruism (a moral virtue) in very young children (Warneken & Tomasello, 2008).

Having provided critical summaries of eight salient sources, I will now apply these sources (among others) to my teaching practice, using the character education framework at my current placement school as a case study.[4]

2. Critical reflections

The character education framework at my school is encapsulated in a single word: 'PRIDE'. The Curriculum Intent states:

> PRIDE […] lies at the heart of all we do. It articulates our values and that shapes the learning, behaviour and experiences of our students. PRIDE helps students develop the ability to self-regulate and do 'the right thing at the right time in the right way'. Created in collaboration with students, parents and staff, […] PRIDE […] is designed to encourage the development of character, leadership skills, fundamental British values and behaviours for learning that help our students thrive throughout their 7 Year Journey and as members of a global society once they leave us.

I will begin by considering the PRIDE virtues themselves (i), before assessing how they are promoted (ii). These initial reflections will highlight some issues with PRIDE as a character education framework. I will then offer a possible diagnosis for these issues (iii), before finally considering the implications for my future practice as a teacher (iv).

---

[4] For the sake of brevity and continued anonymity, I will henceforth refer to my current placement school as simply 'my school', though of course it is not mine.

i.   The PRIDE virtues

'PRIDE' is an acronym for five virtues, namely, Proactive, Responsible, Inquisitive, Determined, and Engaged. What type of virtues are these? I will consider each in turn, within the context of my school's PRIDE statements (see Appendix).[5]

A student is Proactive if she pushes herself to be the best she can be, seeks help, listens to advice, and reflects on how she can improve her learning and character. Proactive thus seems to be a performance virtue: it enables students to learn effectively.

A student is Responsible if he is aware of how his actions can impact others and the environment, makes positive choices, and can be trusted to help others. Responsible thus seems to be a moral virtue: specifically, a civic virtue, as it concerns our moral effect on society (Kristjánsson, 2017).

A student is Inquisitive if she demonstrates a passion for learning, respects other viewpoints, and challenges stereotypical thinking. Inquisitive thus seems to be an intellectual virtue, akin to curiosity, but guided by the moral virtues of respect and courage (viz. the courage required to challenge stereotypical thinking).

A student is Determined if he never gives up, sees challenges as opportunities, and believes that no barrier can stop him from achieving his goals. Determined is certainly a performance virtue, but to what end? The 'goals' are unspecified and morally unconstrained.

A student is Engaged if she seizes opportunities that align with her future ambitions and is eager to leave school with skills, personal qualities and experiences that will help build a brighter future for herself, her family, and her community. Engaged seems to be another performance virtue, but again the end is unspecified; there are no moral constraints on her 'ambitions'.

Overall, while one moral virtue is stated explicitly (Responsible) and two others are implied (respect and courage), the PRIDE virtues are predominantly performance virtues with the aim of facilitating learning. Indeed, at a recent strategic planning meeting, the headteacher referred to PRIDE as a 'learner and character framework'. The learner is evident, but character seems like an afterthought.[6] There is a lack of explicit moral virtues (e.g. justice, honesty, compassion, gratitude, humility). If not subservient to moral virtues, performance virtues have no value; worse still, they are potentially dangerous (think again of the determination of Vladimir Putin) (Kristjánsson, 2017).

---

[5] To distinguish their use within the context of my school, each of the PRIDE virtues will be capitalised.
[6] I have heard that the 'PRIDE' acronym predates the current character education framework at my school; it is a remnant of an earlier learner framework. The PRIDE virtues were apparently chosen in part because they fitted the extant acronym. This may partly explain why character seems like an afterthought.

At the same meeting, I mentioned this issue to a senior leader. Her response was twofold. First, she said that the moral virtues are subsumed under the Responsible virtue. For example, a Responsible student would not be Determined to do something unscrupulous. But virtues are concerned with potential spheres of human experience (Kristjánsson, 2017). These spheres are largely separate; they do not readily reduce to one another. Even if they did, it is far from obvious. In all other parts of the curriculum, teachers take great care to explain all relevant concepts. Why not here in character education? If moral virtues are relevant, which they are, they should be stated explicitly, not subsumed and assumed.

Second, she said that PRIDE is to be understood in conjunction with the 7 Year Journey (7YJ). According to the Curriculum Intent, 'a cohesive 7YJ motivates students to become aspirant and self-regulated with a clear vision for their future' and 'students develop PRIDE through their 7YJ'. The 7YJ is mapped out in detail in a separate document. Throughout the 'character development' strand, many other virtues are mentioned, but only one is moral: in Year 7, students are encouraged to become *empathetic* learners. But even here, empathy (a moral virtue) is subservient to learning; character is again subservient to learner. While character education may improve educational attainment (Jeynes, 2017), the point of character education is to develop moral virtues, which are their *own* reward (Kristjánsson, 2017).[7]

Among the myriad performance virtues in the 7YJ, another notion keeps arising: students are often encouraged to become *independent*. It is worth stressing that, while there may be some merit to being an independent learner, independence per se is *not* a virtue. On the contrary, independence is antagonistic to *relatedness* (positive social connection or belongingness), which is one of the three innate psychological needs essential to intrinsic motivation and moral education (Curren, 2014; Deci & Ryan, 2000). Another is the need for *autonomy* (self-determination). Research has found a more positive relation between autonomy and collectivist attitudes than between autonomy and individualistic attitudes (Kim, Butzel & Ryan, 1998) and shown positive links between relatedness to parents and autonomy in teenagers (Ryan, Stiller & Lynch, 1994). In terms of character, as Brooks (2016) explains, character is engraved during the struggle against our own weakness, and no one can achieve self-mastery on their own; rather, we wage our struggles in conjunction with others waging theirs, and the boundaries between us become indistinct.

---

[7] The Curriculum Intent states that 'students engage and reflect upon what they have read including texts which promote diversity and empathy'. Here, empathy seems to be an end in itself, rather than a means to an end.

ii. How is PRIDE promoted?[8]

PRIDE is promoted predominantly via PRIDE points: for exemplifying the PRIDE virtues, students are awarded PRIDE points, which they spend in the reward shops on sweets, chocolate, stationery, footballs, etc. Within the context of my school, PRIDE points are essentially money. Indeed, one senior teacher describes them as 'a currency for buying good behaviour'. PRIDE points thus qualify as an extrinsic reward.

Extrinsic rewards undermine intrinsic motivation (Deci, Koestner & Ryan, 1999). Suppose a student exemplifies Inquisitiveness (a PRIDE virtue) by asking an insightful question and is awarded a PRIDE point (a common scenario). The PRIDE point, qua extrinsic reward, is likely to undermine her intrinsic motivation for exemplifying Inquisitiveness: she will be less likely to ask insightful questions because she finds them inherently interesting and more likely because they lead to a separable outcome, namely, the award of PRIDE points. This is likely because the reward has shifted her from a more internal to external perceived locus of causality (Ryan & Deci, 2000): her reason for asking insightful questions emanates less from within herself and more from outside. In other words, the PRIDE point has diminished her sense of autonomy (self-determination), which is essential for intrinsic motivation (ibid.) and moral education (Curren, 2014). Just as a toy cube undermined altruism in very young children (Warneken & Tomasello, 2008), so too do PRIDE points undermine the PRIDE virtues.

It is also worth discussing this effect in terms of self-regulation, which is mentioned no less than ten times in the School Development Plan (a 12-page document). A person is said to be self-regulated when they take responsibility for motivating themselves, that is, when they *internalise* their reasons for behaving in a particular way (Deci, Koestner & Ryan, 1999). A PRIDE point, however, is an external reason: it comes from outside the self. PRIDE points thus undermine self-regulation.

In sum, while teachers see PRIDE as a means to learning, students see it as a means to earning rewards (viz. PRIDE points). This is an inadequate basis for a programme of character education, where virtues are supposed to have intrinsic (non-instrumental) value.[9] I will now attempt to offer a possible diagnosis.

---

[8] This question accords with one of the benchmarking questions in the DfE's (2019) *Character Education Framework Guidance*, namely: 'How well do we promote a range of positive character traits [i.e. virtues] among pupils?' (ibid., p.5).

[9] I stress *character* education because PRIDE may suffice as a learner framework. But that is not my current concern.

iii. Possible diagnosis

I would first like to stress that, despite the critical nature of these reflections, I think my school is amazing. It is an inner-city school operating in a highly challenging social context, helping disadvantaged students increase their life chances. This is their ultimate guiding principle; indeed, the maxim and motto of my school's trust is 'Building Brighter Futures'. In service of this ultimate principle, my school has three ancillary principles: 'Students First', 'It's about learning', and 'No Barriers'. I think the third principle is especially relevant when considering the development of PRIDE as a character education framework.

It is likely that school leaders first asked: What challenges do our students face? To name but a few: disadvantage, bias, discrimination, disability, prejudice, inequality, stereotypical thinking, all of which are discussed in the Curriculum Intent and other school documents. Having identified the challenges, the next question would be: Which virtues would help our students overcome these challenges? The answer: PRIDE. Indeed, it is easy to see how the PRIDE virtues would help a student overcome these challenges in pursuit of a brighter future. But one fundamental question seems to have been overlooked, at least nowhere is it addressed explicitly: What makes a future brighter? This is the ultimate philosophical question for educators: To what end are we educating our students? (see Siegel, 2009).

The ultimate goal of most, if not all forms of character education is the *flourishing* of the moral learner (Kristjánsson, 2017). A flourishing future is a bright future, even the brightest future. The School Development Plan seems to acknowledge this when explaining the 'No Barriers' principle in terms of enabling students to 'flourish as well-rounded individuals'. The PRIDE virtues were thus conceived as a means to securing such a future. But, and this point is crucial, the link between virtues and flourishing is *constitutive*: flourishing is not the aim of virtues, but rather the *ongoing realisation* of virtues, specifically, the moral virtues (e.g. courage, justice, honesty, compassion, gratitude, humility) (Kristjánsson, 2017). Indeed, research with Swiss schoolchildren has shown how specific virtues (e.g. gratitude) are relevant for satisfaction with school experience and can be predictive of global life satisfaction (Weber & Ruch, 2012).

The problem with PRIDE, then, seems to be that virtues, character, and flourishing were conceived as separate things, when in fact they are one and the same thing: to realise the moral virtues *is* to have good character, and to have steadfastly good character *is* to flourish. So, if the ultimate aim of education at my school is to build brighter futures, then PRIDE should promote more moral virtues, and not with a points-based reward system, but in a way that supports autonomy and enhances intrinsic motivation.

iv. Looking forward

I will of course continue to promote the PRIDE virtues, as I acknowledge that they were conceived in good faith to enable students to overcome a certain set of challenges. But within my classroom I will also promote more moral virtues. In fact, I have already seen this done to incredible effect. I had been struggling to control the behaviour of my Year 7s, a class which my Head of Department acknowledges as one of the most challenging in the school. My Subject Mentor recommended that I observe them with a different teacher, Miss C. In Miss C's classroom, three moral virtues reigned supreme: kindness, honesty, and respect. Whenever a student misbehaved, she would explain how their behaviour fell short of these virtues. Miss C was essentially administering her own local programme of character education. This may explain (at least in part) the difference in behaviour between her lessons and mine.

And, finally, how could I promote moral virtues in a way that enhances intrinsic motivation? I must provide supports for the three innate psychological needs (Ryan & Deci, 2000): for relatedness, I must ensure that students know I care about them (Ryan, Stiller & Lynch, 1994); for competence, I must ensure that students understand the reasons behind my expectations (Vallerand, 1997); and for autonomy, I must encourage (but not pressure) students to adopt these reasons as their own (Kuhl & Fuhrmann, 1998). Do all this, and I may yet prove a worthy guide for my students on the long road to character.

References

Aristotle (1926). *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library 73. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Arthur, J. (2020). *The Formation of Character in Education: From Aristotle to the 21st Century*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Arthur, J., Davison, J. & Lewis, M. (2005). *Professional Values and Practice: Achieving the Standards for QTS*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Barber, M. & Mourshed, M. (2007). *How the World's Best Performing School Systems Come Out On Top*. [online] London: McKinsey & Company. Available at: https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/education/our-insights/how-the-worlds-best-performing-school-systems-come-out-on-top [Accessed 10 Apr. 2022].

Bastanfard, A., Shahabipour, M. & Amirkhani, D. (2022). Crowdsourcing of labelling image objects: An online gamification application for data collection. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.

Beauchamp, G., Clarke, L., Hulme, M. & Murray, J. (2015). Teacher education in the United Kingdom post devolution: Convergences and divergences. *Oxford Review of Education*, 41(2), pp.154–170.

Brooks, D. (2016). *The Road to Character*. London: Penguin.

Campbell, E. (2008). The Ethics of Teaching as a Moral Profession. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 38(4), pp.357–385.

Carton, J.S. (1996). The differential effects of tangible rewards and praise on intrinsic motivation: A comparison of cognitive evaluation theory and operant theory. *The Behavior Analyst*, 19(2), pp.237–255.

Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) (2012). *First Steps*. [online] Available at: https://www.toomuchtoosoon.org/uploads/2/0/3/8/20381265/first_steps_end_of_year_report. pdf [Accessed 19 Apr. 2022].

Curren, R. (2014). Motivational aspects of moral learning and progress. *Journal of Moral Education*, 43(4), pp.484–499.

Deci, E.L. (1971). Effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 18(1), pp.105–115.

Deci, E.L. (1975). *Intrinsic Motivation*. New York: Plenum.

Deci, E.L., Koestner, R. & Ryan, R.M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(6), pp.627–668.

Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*. New York: Plenum.

Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M. (2012). Motivation, personality, and development within embedded social contexts: An overview of self-determination theory. In: R.M. Ryan, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Human Motivation*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp.85–107.

Department for Education (DfE) (2011a). *First Report of the Independent Review of Teachers' Standards QTS and Core Standards*. [online] Available at:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data
/file/175433/first_report_of_the_review_of_teachers_standards.pdf [Accessed 10 Apr. 2022].

Department for Education (DfE) (2011b). *Second Report of the Independent Review of Teachers'
Standards*. [online] Available at:
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data
/file/546707/DFE-00168-2011.pdf [Accessed 10 Apr. 2022].

Department for Education (DfE) (2014). *About us*. [online] GOV.UK. Available at:
https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-education/about [Accessed 10
Apr. 2022].

Department for Education (DfE) (2019). *Character Education: Framework Guidance*. [online]
Available at:
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data
/file/904333/Character_Education_Framework_Guidance.pdf [Accessed 10 Apr. 2022].

Department for Education (DfE) (2021 [2011]). *Teachers' Standards: Guidance for School leaders,
School Staff and Governing Bodies*. [online] Available at:
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data
/file/1040274/Teachers__Standards_Dec_2021.pdf [Accessed 10 Apr. 2022].

Eisenberger, R. & Cameron, J. (1996). Detrimental effects of reward: Reality or myth? *American
Psychologist*, 51(11), pp.1153–1166.

Ellis, S. & Tod, J. (2018). *Behaviour for Learning: Promoting Positive Relationships in the Classroom*.
2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Flora, S.R. (1990). Undermining intrinsic interest from the standpoint of a behaviorist. *The
Psychological Record*, 40(3), pp.323–346.

Fullard, M. & Watts, P.M. (2019). Practical wisdom in teaching through the promotion of critical
reflection during ITE. In: M.A. Peters, ed., *Encyclopedia of Teacher Education*. Singapore:
Springer.

Gutman, L.M. & Schoon, I. (2013). *The impact of non-cognitive skills on outcomes for young people*.
Institute of Education.

Jeynes, W.H. (2017). A meta-analysis on the relationship between character education and student achievement and behavioral outcomes. *Education and Urban Society*, 51(1), pp.33–71.

Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues (2017). *A Framework for Character Education in Schools*. [online] Birmingham: University of Birmingham. Available at: https://www.jubileecentre.ac.uk/userfiles/jubileecentre/pdf/character-education/Framework%20for%20Character%20Education.pdf [Accessed 10 Apr. 2022].

Kim, Y., Butzel, J. & Ryan, R.M. (1998). Interdependence and well-being: A function of culture and relatedness needs. *The International Society for the Study of Personal Relationships*, Saratoga Spring, NY, June.

Krettenauer, T. & Curren, R. (2020). Self-determination theory, morality, and education: Introduction to special issue. *Journal of Moral Education*, 49(3), pp.275–281.

Kristjánsson, K. (2017). *Aristotelian Character Education*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Kuhl, J. & Fuhrmann, A. (1998). Decomposing self-regulation and self-control. In: J. Heckhausen and C. Dweck, eds., *Motivation and Self-Regulation across the Life Span*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp.15–49.

Lepper, M.R., Greene, D. & Nisbett, R.E. (1973). Undermining children's intrinsic interest with extrinsic reward: A test of the 'overjustification' hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 28(1), pp.129–137.

Lepper, M.R., Sagotsky, G., Dafoe, J.L. & Greene, D. (1982). Consequences of superfluous social constraints: Effects on young children's social inferences and subsequent intrinsic interest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42(1), pp.51–65.

National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) (2011). *Children and Young People's Views of Education Policy*. [online] Available at: https://www.nfer.ac.uk/children-and-young-peoples-views-of-education-policy/ [Accessed 10 Apr. 2022].

Ojo, A.O., Alias, M., Dorasamy, M., Sarwar, A. & Ojo, O.T. (2022). Moderating effects of opportunity on the cognitive and motivational factors of internet engagement. *International Journal of Technology and Human Interaction*, 18(1), pp.1–17.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2010). *PISA 2009 Results: What Students Know and Can Do: Student Performance in Reading, Mathematics and Science (Volume*

I). [online] Available at: https://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisaproducts/48852548.pdf [Accessed 10 Apr. 2022].

Poet, H., Rudd, P. & Kelly, J. (2010). *Survey of Teachers 2010: Support to improve teaching practice*. [online] Available at: https://www.nfer.ac.uk/media/2195/styz01.pdf [Accessed 10 Apr. 2022].

Riots Communities and Victims' Panel (2012). *The Final Report of the Riots Communities and Victims' Panel*. [online] Available at: https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20121003195935/http://riotspanel.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Riots-Panel-Final-Report1.pdf [Accessed 19 Apr. 2022].

Rummel, A. and Feinberg, R. (1988). Cognitive evaluation theory: A meta-analytic review of the literature. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 16(2), pp.147–164.

Ryan, R.M. & Deci, E.L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), pp.68–78.

Ryan, R.M., Stiller, J.D. & Lynch, J.H. (1994). Representations of relationships to teachers, parents, and friends as predictors of academic motivation and self-esteem. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 14(2), pp.226–249.

Seldon, A. (2014). Character in schools. In: *Mind the Gap: Collected essays on the development of character, non-cognitive skills, mindfulness and well-being*. London: SSAT, pp.15–17.

Siegel, H. (2009). *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Education*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Soloveitchik, J.B. (1965). The lonely man of faith. *Tradition*, 7(2).

Tang, S.-H. and Hall, V.C. (1995). The overjustification effect: A meta-analysis. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 9(5), pp.365–404.

Taylor, T. (2014). Economics and morality. *Finance & Development*, [online] 51(2). Available at: https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2014/06/taylor.htm [Accessed 12 Apr. 2022].

Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA) (2007). *Professional Standards for Teachers*. [online] Available at: https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20111218081624/http:/tda.gov.uk/teacher/

developing-career/professional-standards-guidance/~/media/resources/teacher/professional-standards/standards_a4.pdf [Accessed 10 Apr. 2022].

Vallerand, R.J. (1997). Toward a hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In: M.P. Zanna, ed., *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, pp.271–360.

Vansteenkiste, M., Ryan, R.M. & Soenens, B. (2020). Basic psychological need theory: Advancements, critical themes, and future directions. *Motivation and Emotion*, 44(1).

Warneken, F. & Tomasello, M. (2008). Extrinsic rewards undermine altruistic tendencies in 20-month-olds. *Developmental Psychology*, 44(6), pp.1785–8.

Watts, P., Fullard, M. & Peterson, A. (2021). *Understanding Character Education: Approaches, Applications, and Issues*. London: Open University Press, McGraw-Hill Education.

Weber, M. & Ruch, W. (2012). The role of a good character in 12-year-old school children: Do character strengths matter in the classroom? *Child Indicators Research*, 5(2), pp.317–334.

Wiersma, U.J. (1992). The effects of extrinsic rewards in intrinsic motivation: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 65(2), pp.101–114.

Willingham, D.T. (2004). Ask the cognitive scientist: The privileged status of story. *American Educator*, [online] 28(2), pp.43–45. Available at: https://www.aft.org/periodical/american-educator/summer-2004/ask-cognitive-scientist [Accessed 12 Apr. 2022].

Appendix

PRIDE is about 'Doing the right thing, at the right time, in the right way'...

I am **PROACTIVE** and push myself to be the best I can be. I seek help when I need it, listen to advice and reflect on how I can improve my learning and character.

I am **RESPONSIBLE** and aware of how my actions can impact others and the environment around me. I choose to make positive choices and can be trusted to help others.

I am **INQUISITIVE** and demonstrate a passion for learning through the conversations I have, the things I read and the questions I ask. My curiosity helps me respect other viewpoints and challenge stereotypical thinking.

I am **DETERMINED** and never give up. I see every challenge as an opportunity and believe that no barrier can stop me from achieving my goals, in the short term and throughout life.

I am **ENGAGED** in all aspects of school life and seize opportunities that align with my future ambitions. I am eager to leave school with a range of skills, personal qualities and experiences that will help me build a brighter future for me, my family and my community.