

# To educate citizens and citizen-leaders for our society: Renewing character education in universities

## *Formar ciudadanos y ciudadanos-líderes para nuestra sociedad: Renovando la educación del carácter en las universidades*

Edward BROOKS. Executive Director. Oxford Character Project, University of Oxford ([edward.brooks@geh.ox.ac.uk](mailto:edward.brooks@geh.ox.ac.uk)).

Jorge L. VILLACÍS, PhD. Assistant Professor. University of Navarra ([jvillacis.1@unav.es](mailto:jvillacis.1@unav.es)).

### Abstract:

Seventy-five years ago, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights promoted a vision of education “directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms” (United Nations, 1948, 26.2). In 2015, the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) took this further, stating in SDG 4 that “the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes required by citizens to lead productive lives, make informed decisions and assume active roles locally and globally in facing and resolving global challenges can be acquired through education for sustainable development and global citizenship education” (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 2016, p. 14). What might the adoption of

this educational mission involve for higher education? And what does it mean in a challenging global context following the COVID pandemic and the Russian invasion of Ukraine? This paper argues that the current global tumult should catalyse reflection as to the purpose and content of higher education. It focuses on the importance of education for “values and attitudes”, emphasized as an essential component of global citizenship and leadership education in the rubric of SDG 4. It proposes a return to the philosophical categories of “character” and “virtue”, arguing that the societal orientation of global universities and their aspiration “to educate the citizens and citizen-leaders for our society” (Harvard College, 2022) necessitates a renewal of theoretically rigorous, pedagogically effective, and practically relevant character education.

Revision accepted: 2022-12-04.

This is the English version of an article originally printed in Spanish in issue 284 of the **revista española de pedagogía**. For this reason, the abbreviation EV has been added to the page numbers. Please, cite this article as follows: Brooks, E., & Villacís, J. (2023). Formar ciudadanos y ciudadanos-líderes para nuestra sociedad: renovando la educación del carácter en las universidades | *To educate citizens and citizen-leaders for our society: Renewing character education in universities*. *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, 81 (284), 51-72. <https://doi.org/10.22550/REP81-1-2023-03>  
<https://revistadepedagogia.org/>

ISSN: 0034-9461 (Print), 2174-0909 (Online)

revista española de pedagogía  
year 81, n. 284, January-April 2023, 51-72



**Keywords:** character education, virtue ethics, university students, higher education.

## Resumen:

Hace setenta y cinco años la Declaración Universal de los Derechos Humanos promovió una visión de la educación «dirigida al pleno desarrollo de la personalidad humana y al fortalecimiento del respeto por los derechos humanos y las libertades fundamentales» (Naciones Unidas, 1948, 4.7). En 2015 los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible (ODS) de las Naciones Unidas llevaron este tema aún más lejos y establecieron en el ODS 4 que «los conocimientos, las habilidades, los valores y las actitudes que requieren los ciudadanos para llevar vidas productivas, tomar decisiones informadas y asumir roles activos a nivel local y global para enfrentar la resolución de desafíos globales se pueden adquirir a través de la educación para el desarrollo sostenible y la educación para la ciudadanía global» (Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura [UNESCO], 2017, p. 14). ¿Qué puede

implicar para la educación superior la adopción de esta misión educativa? ¿Y qué significa en un contexto global desafiante después de la pandemia de la COVID y la invasión rusa de Ucrania? En este artículo se argumenta que la presente conmoción global debería favorecer la reflexión sobre el propósito y el contenido de la educación superior. En el presente estudio el foco se dirige a la importancia de la educación en «valores y actitudes», enfatizada como un componente esencial de la educación para la ciudadanía global y el liderazgo de acuerdo con el ODS 4. Este artículo propone un retorno a las categorías filosóficas de «carácter» y «virtud», argumentando que la orientación social de las universidades globales y su aspiración a «educar a los ciudadanos y ciudadanos-líderes para nuestra sociedad» (Harvard College, 2022) requiere una renovación de la educación del carácter teóricamente rigurosa, pedagógicamente eficaz y prácticamente relevante.

**Descriptor:** educación del carácter, ética de la virtud, estudiantes universitarios, educación superior.

## 1. Introduction

Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) advances the ideal of education as open to all and aimed towards the holistic development of the human personality and good of society. “Everyone has the right to education” it states, adding that higher education should be “equally accessible to all on the basis of merit” (United Nations, 1948, 26.1). As for its goal, “education shall be directed to the full de-

velopment of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms” (United Nations, 1948, 26.2). In 2015 the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) took up and advanced the UDHR vision in “SDG 4, Quality Education: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all” (United Nations, 2015). Two of the accompanying targets have specific relevance for higher edu-

cation. Target 4.3 speaks of “equal access to affordable technical, vocational and higher education” (United Nations, 2015, 4.3). Target 4.7 emphasizes education’s purpose:

It is vital to give a central place to strengthening education’s contribution to the fulfilment of human rights, peace and responsible citizenship from local to global levels, gender equality, sustainable development and health. The content of such education must be relevant, with a focus on both cognitive and non-cognitive aspects of learning. The knowledge, skills, values and attitudes required by citizens to lead productive lives, make informed decisions and assume active roles locally and globally in facing and resolving global challenges can be acquired through education for sustainable development and global citizenship education. (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 2016, p. 14)

What does such global citizenship education, including the development of “values and attitudes” as well as knowledge and skills, mean for universities? How does it relate to central functions of academic research and disciplinary education? And what does it mean in a challenging global context where crises such as climate change, COVID 19, military conflict, and the rising cost of living, seem to be layered one on the other? In this paper we take universities broadly to refer to all higher education institutions. We argue that the current global tumult should catalyse reflection as to the purpose and content of higher education. In particular, we argue that the opportunity and responsibility of global universities

to advance the common good, reflected in their widely shared civic orientation, holds within it a necessary renewal of character education.

The paper will unpack this proposal in three sections: First, we consider trends in higher education amidst the changes and challenges of our late modern context, arguing that present challenges add weight to a recent focus on the social purpose of universities. Second, we turn to the aspiration of global universities themselves, identifying a widely shared mission to serve society that entails an educational focus — in line with SDG 4.7 — on the development of students’ values and attitudes as well as their knowledge and skills. Third, we argue that this focus needs to be conceptually robust, pedagogically effective, and practically relevant. We draw on the theoretical framework of Neo-Aristotelian character education (Kristjánsson, 2015) to propose a renewal of character education in universities that will help students to flourish in their lives in and beyond university and enable them to play their part as “citizens and citizen-leaders for our society” (Harvard College, 2022) into the future.

## 2. Changing higher education for a changing world

The COVID-19 pandemic and Russian invasion of Ukraine, which are the context and catalyst for this special issue of **revista española de pedagogía**, have prompted hand-wringing discussion concerning the status of the

post-war vision of globalised liberal democracy and progressive technological modernity that is encapsulated in documents such as the UDHR. The pandemic's global toll of over 6.5m reported deaths (World Health Organization, 2022), accompanied by the strict lockdown measures needed to constrain the disease and deleterious economic consequences, have been a stark reminder of the fragility of life and the importance of humanistic values and interpersonal relationships. The pandemic has presented a significant challenge to the idea that the modern world is advancing towards a technological and transhumanist utopia. More recently, Russia's brazen invasion of Ukraine demonstrates the influence of leaders, who have significant power to mobilise people and resources for good or for ill. Justified as a holy war, the invasion highlights that human values are mediated through group affiliations. In this case, the war evidences the grip of a starkly illiberal ideology that connects Russia's nuclear capability and its national religion (Adamsky, 2019). Predatory threats of nuclear conflict and the apparent disdain of Russian military commanders for international law highlights that the consensus enshrined after the Second World War in the documents and organisations of the United Nations is fragile.

These major global crises have an impact and importance that reaches across society. Here, our focus is on universities: What do these major global crises mean for higher education? Should a "renewed character education following the

pandemic and the invasion of Ukraine" — as the title for this journal edition puts it — be a priority at the university level? What might such education look like? Rather than starting with abstract principles, we will begin with universities themselves and the trends in global higher education that act as their operating context.

In *Changing higher education for a changing world* (Callender et al., 2020a), professors Claire Callender, William Locke, and Simon Marginson bring together recent work by twenty-five leading global higher education academics who have collaborated in the Centre for Global Higher Education (CGHE). Established in 2015, the CGHE is a partnership of six UK and nine international universities who have been funded to carry out research on global, national, and local higher education. Its work focuses on central issues and trends in higher education, including growing participation, funding models, student learning and digitisation, private-sector providers, graduate jobs, university partnerships, international students, governance, and the role of higher education in advancing the public good (Callender et al., 2020b). The book, which was published soon after the worldwide outbreak of COVID-19, presents perspectives and findings from the first wave of CGHE research between 2017 and 2019. It provides a valuable, research-based picture of global higher education in the period immediately before the pandemic. The editors present three framing themes and related trends: expansion, globalisation and inequality.

First, expansion: according to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2022), 40% of young people entered some form of tertiary education in 2019, most of them enrolling in degree programmes. This number has grown from 14% in 1990 with a present 1% annual growth rate meaning that by 2030 “half of all young people everywhere will enter tertiary education” (Marginson et al., 2020, p. 3). This remarkable growth around the world is not primarily driven by governmental or economic factors (see Marginson, 2016), but “accumulating social demand for opportunities” (Marginson et al., 2020, p. 5). The graduate premium that students and families are seeking is less focused on financial return than on “esteem, satisfaction, personal agency and self-respect” (Marginson et al., 2020, p. 5). Young people are enrolling in higher education with the goal of what Marginson (2014) terms “self-formation”, seeking to “manage their lives reflexively, fashioning changing identities, albeit under social circumstances largely beyond their control” (Marginson, 2014, p. 6). As recent psychological research suggests, having an intrinsic motivation (i.e., personal growth) rather than an extrinsic one (i.e., the prospect of higher future earnings) is related to higher academic performance and reduced rates of college withdrawal (Milovanska-Farrington, 2020).

Higher education doesn’t simply shape skills but values. It “provides conditions and resources for the self-formation of students and leaves a

lifelong mark on graduates” (Marginson et al., 2020, p. 5). Holding together this formative role of higher education with its scale and ongoing growth points to its importance in society. As former Harvard President, Derek Bok (2020), points out:

Colleges are the dominant institutions for teaching and nurturing young people during four critical years in which they are capable of growth not only in their intellects but in other qualities of personality and behaviour that can help them succeed and flourish after they graduate. For most of these capabilities, there is no satisfactory alternative to college for providing the necessary instruction. (2020, p. 142)

Second, globalisation: the influence, and with it the responsibility of higher education institutions extends across borders right around the world. Advances in communication technologies and cloud-based data storage have led to the development of the internet as a massive, globally accessible library of information. In relation to this data bank, the network of global universities constitutes — at its best — a space for free-thought, knowledge development, and open exchange, akin to a “world mind” (Marginson, 2020, p. 255). The connectedness and integration of societies, economies, political systems, and cultures is a prominent feature of late modernity. Universities, which “are among the most internationally active and globalized of social institutions” (Marginson et al., 2020, p. 7) both shape and are shaped by this broader global context. Universities are ranked globally



and one way they advance up the hierarchy is through global partnerships in research and teaching programmes. Students are recruited globally, with more than 5 million studying internationally each year (up from 2 million in 1999 and increasing at 6% per annum before the pandemic) (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2018). Faculty collaborate in international groups and conferences, with 22.5% of research papers in the Scopus database co-authored across national boundaries in 2018 (Marginson, 2022). However, economic forces of globalisation diminished following the 2008 financial crash, and popular political movements on both left and right have caused many governments to turn inward. Universities, especially global research universities, have faced the consequences of this new nationalism in terms of difficulties for faculty and student mobility, and disruption of funding sources. What is more, the accusation that universities are aloof and distant from local and national concerns has challenged public confidence (Hudson & Mansfield, 2020). There is pressure for universities to demonstrate that a global focus does not leave the local behind, while continuing to fulfil their wider intellectual and social responsibility.

Third, inequality: if one critique of globalised higher education is its disconnection from local and national interests, an important corollary is its contribution to a political economy of inequality, where global cities and networked “elites” are unfairly advantaged. Global research universities, in

particular, are in a difficult position — their contribution to society relies on global collaboration to produce common goods, yet productive collaborative efforts are often exclusive, formed between small groups of similar institutions or with barriers to entry that only a few can navigate. In the sector more broadly, the opportunities universities provide for emerging adults to study abroad fosters global mobility and intercultural exchange. However, the financialization of international study, with overseas students paying higher fees in many countries, has the potential to diminish the positive effect of such mobility by limiting opportunities to those with means. There is no single course of action that can address all the challenges. What universities can do is take seriously their impact and so responsibility in relation to societies locally and globally, and act intentionally. Investing in scholarships for international students, engaging in research and teaching on dynamics of global inequality, working with other educational institutions in their vicinity, and developing intentional policies and practices of student selection, are all important levers (Marginson et al., 2020). Universities have a range of local, national and global spheres of influence but the conceptualisation of universities as having a social purpose and responsibility is increasingly prominent (Grant, 2021; The Netter Center for Community Partnerships, 2008).

These three themes of expansion, globalisation, and inequality contain within

them the rationale for a focus on character. It is important how character education is conceptualised and delivered, but if the expansion of higher education is driven less by financial motives than by social esteem and the potential for “self-formation”, character education would seem to be an important part of meeting demand. When it comes to the interrelated issues of globalisation and inequality, character education — and especially the development of civic virtues — can be understood as part of the university’s responsibility to educate citizens who will work with others to engage global challenges and advance justice in the world.

Such challenges form the backdrop of a higher education sector that, before COVID-19, was navigating minefields laid by some of the contradictory tendencies within global modernity. This contemporary socio-cultural context at once manifests a deep commitment to individual rights and social justice, alongside a lack of consensus on the nature of truth and a wide variety of beliefs and opinions (Bauman, 2011; Giddens, 1991). A positivist paradigm is confidently maintained in science and technology and yet this epistemic stance translates poorly to the moral domain, leaving ethical questions and life commitments increasingly difficult to resolve. The emerging adults that populate university campuses live amidst these tensions. Many students are passionate about social justice and yet ill-equipped to make the kind of commitments needed to advance it, preferring to keep their options open when it comes to

such matters as career, family, and political ideology (Alvarado et al., 2020; Arnett, 2015; Salvà-Mut et al., 2018). The world of post-university employment for which degree programmes are expected, by many, to be directly preparatory is likewise in flux, catalysed by the disruption of advanced digitalisation and process automation (Schwab, 2017; Susskind & Susskind, 2015). In such a world, ethical rules and utilitarian calculus offer only limited light to guide action, but character comes into its own. In particular, the virtue of practical wisdom, understood as the moral deliberation and discernment needed to balance competing tensions and make wise and ethical decisions at the most appropriate time, is invaluable. Indeed, the University of Birmingham (2022) has recently added practical wisdom to its official list of graduate attributes as a key quality of “ethical and active citizens” along with “socially responsible” and “reflective”.

The context of a rapidly changing world has spawned a futurology of higher education, advanced as a discipline by a wide range of commentators and consultants (Locke, 2020). Amongst the trends said to be driving the future are the transformation of graduate work, the changing profile and expectations of students, a reduction in government funding, deregulation and associated competition from for-profit institutions, and greatly increased use of technology in teaching and learning (Locke, 2020). Add the underlying themes of expansion, globalisation, and inequality and it is easy to lose orientation amidst the com-

plexity with waves of peril and possibility (Schwab, 2017) indistinguishable and all around.

The COVID-19 pandemic and Russian invasion of Ukraine hardly make the field of global higher education any easier to comprehend. What is more, while these challenges are still with us it is far from clear what their medium and long-term effects will be. First, when it comes to student numbers, there is insufficient data to make any conclusions on the impact of the pandemic on the global expansion of higher education. Overall student numbers in the UK have continued to grow (Bolton, 2022) but it would be unwise to extrapolate from selective national examples. Second, both crises have exacerbated tensions in relation to globalization, re-introducing division and distrust last seen in the Cold War. The impact on academic collaboration is yet to be seen and the flow of international students seems to differ by country and is difficult to estimate overall (OECD, 2021). Third, the COVID pandemic clearly accelerated the adoption of digital technologies in higher education as in other contexts. The importance of IT infrastructure and the role of educational technology providers and platforms are notable but it remains to be seen what the “new normal” for teaching and learning will look like, with little indication that digitalisation can replace face to face relationships between students and professors (OECD, 2021). Fourth, when it comes to inequality, there is evidence that the effect of the pandemic on the experience of

learners varied significantly in relation to socio-demographic and geographic factors. In a global study of 30,383 students from 62 countries (Aristovnik et al., 2020) 86.7% of respondents reported the cancellation of in-person teaching for some form of online education. However, when it came to satisfaction with online provision, students from Africa lagged significantly behind — perhaps unsurprising given only 29% of African students had functional internet access, compared with a global average of 60%. If this finding is sadly unremarkable, it does highlight the variability of higher education experiences and significant inequality of provision.

If it is too soon to draw conclusions from data in terms of the enduring impact on higher education of the pandemic and invasion of Ukraine, perhaps we can take a step back and consider these events in terms of their broader significance, allowing them to raise questions regarding the purpose of higher education in the modern world. Such reflection can take us beyond questions of short-term performance to consider the deeper question: in a world challenged by COVID-19 and under the threat of nuclear conflict, what are universities for?

One answer to the question is *science*. The COVID pandemic demonstrated the importance of technology in understanding and overcoming serious medical threats. Masks, ventilators, vaccines, and other medicines all need to be developed, tested and safe-



ly administered. In the pandemic, universities have sourced and analysed data, and in some cases contributed to the direct development of technologies needed to combat the disease. If the pandemic points to the role of universities in scientific progress, it has also drawn attention to the human dynamics of modern life. Imposed obligations of 'social distancing' and 'lockdown' as well as severe restrictions on the commemoration of life events, have raised questions about social responsibility and revealed anew the importance of close social relationships. The failure of some prominent leaders and celebration of 'ordinary heroes' has drawn attention to the need for citizens and leaders across society with virtues such as service, compassion, empathy, humility, hope, and courage. The examples that were singled out for public admiration at the height of the pandemic were groups, such as nurses, where these virtues are central to their profession, as well as leaders who evidenced such virtues in distinctive ways. New Zealand's Prime Minister, Jacinda Ardern was widely noted for her empathy; Germany's Angela Merkel for the intellectual humility she displayed when justifying policy decisions; in the UK, Queen Elizabeth's steadfast and hopeful resolve was evident as she gave a public broadcast exhorting people to endure present challenges and not give up. The role of universities in science and technology seems straightforward to grasp, but such technologies are developed and deployed within wider social structures that are built on values and upheld by

the virtuous action of citizens and leaders. What role should universities play in this latter regard?

Russia's invasion of Ukraine and the threat it presents to global democracy prompts the same question from a different angle. If universities are for science, can the scientific capability of universities be legitimately mobilised to support war as it has been to overcome disease? To answer negatively, we will need to refer to values. Starting from an uncontroversial commitment to open inquiry as a central value of modern universities, we are led on to the necessary practice of such liberal virtues as justice, honesty, open-mindedness, intellectual humility, tolerance, and respect. In such inquiry, the potentially subversive question of when (if ever) nuclear weapons can legitimately be deployed, and the courage to pursue it, arises together with the knowledge of how to make them. Universities thus considered have a properly dissenting function in totalitarian states as institutions devoted to critical questioning. What role might Russia's universities play in fostering such dissent against Putin's regime? And if they should play such a role, what role ought universities outside Russia play in the peace-time development of students as citizens and leaders who will uphold rigorous open inquiry and advance free and just societies into the future? It is in raising questions such as these that the current crisis moves higher education discourse beyond economics and efficiency to ethics and character.

### 3. A mission to educate “citizens and citizen leaders to serve our society” (Harvard College)

In his famous 1930 book *Mission of the University*, José Ortega y Gasset (2010) argued that effective reform of universities must be rooted in an understanding of their purpose. For Ortega (2010), this purpose was social and entailed a focus on education that emphasized the personal enrichment of individual potential so that students would be prepared to contribute to society (Wyatt, 2020). Jonathan Grant (2021) takes up Ortega’s emphasis on the public purpose of the university, offering a historical typology that begins with the *confessional university* originating in eleventh century Bologna for the training of clerics and subsequently the moral education for the ruling class. Not until the nineteenth century was this model challenged, when Humboldt’s emphasis on research was joined to Newman’s emphasis on teaching and formation in an American model of the *multiversity* that soon came to dominate globally. The *civic university* refers to the wave of nineteenth-century, socially oriented universities, both in the USA following the 1862 establishment of ‘land grant’ universities, and in the UK where ‘redbrick’ universities were established in industrial cities. “HiEdBizUK” (Collini, 2012) is currently dominant, the term coined by Stefan Collini to refer disparagingly to what he sees as government-sponsored financialization and managerialism in the higher education sector. Grant (2021) portrays the models as

overlapping and acknowledges that the typology is crude, but the emphases of different models are observable globally. The proposal he advocates is for a new evolution of the university with a driving social purpose. He offers the University of Pennsylvania as an example, pointing to the work of Judith Rodin, University President between 1994 and 2004, to reconnect the university with the pro-social vision of its founder Benjamin Franklin. Her commitment lives on in her successor Amy Gutmann’s affirmation of Franklin’s belief that “a university is, first and foremost, a social undertaking to create a social good” (Penn Office of the President, 2022).

The prioritisation of social purpose is widely shared amongst leading universities around the world. Cortés-Sánchez (2018) used text mining to analyse 248 mission statements from the Quacquarelli Symonds 2016 ranking list of universities worldwide, finding “an overall emphasis on society and students, as stakeholders” (p. 597). Breznik and Law (2019) analysed mission statements of 250 universities worldwide, finding that “social responsibility” was one of four core dimensions. Bayrak (2020) used text mining to analyse 227 mission statements from the highest ranked universities in Asia, Africa, Europe, Latin America, and North America, according to the Times Higher Education (THE) 2017 ranking, finding that “higher education institutions in every region call attention to the importance of serving community” (p. 8).

In the Spanish context, a study covering 47 Spanish public universities found that teaching was prioritized over research and service to society in their mission statements (Arias-Coello et al., 2020). However, when examining the most common message classified under the category of service to society, researchers reported that “transfer of knowledge, culture or research results, in order to improve the economic or social development of the surrounding environment or society” appeared for 71% of the universities.

In 2022, we conducted a thematic analysis of mission statements of 17 global universities. Our aim was to probe the findings of recent widescale surveys with a specific focus on the stated educational mission(s) of a small number of global universities. We focused on the highest ranked institutions internationally on account of their global influence and function as aspirational models. Our sample was made up of the top ten universities listed in the THE 2022 ranking as well as the top university from each of Africa, Australasia, East Asia, Europe (beyond the UK), Latin America, the Middle East, and South Asia. The top universities in East Asia, Peking University and Tsinghua University were equally placed in the THE ranking so both were included in the sample. The list of institutions can be found in the appendix, below.

We located the “about” and specific “mission and vision” pages (where available) of university websites and

imported them into NVivo. For the majority of universities outside the UK and USA where the primary site was in the local language (ETH Zurich, Indian Institute of Science, Peking University, Tel Aviv University, Tsinghua University), we selected the English site. However, in the case of the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, where the relevant information had not been translated into English, we analysed content in Spanish. These pages were coded and thematically analysed by a single researcher according to the pragmatic realism paradigm of qualitative research advocated by Miles, Huberman and Saldaña (2018). We used an inductive coding method, focusing particularly on the stated mission of universities, the place of education in relation to it, and the description of that education.

We found a high degree of overlap in the emphases of university statements regarding their mission and purpose. Almost all of them describe their central function in terms of a dual core, using the standard terms of “education” and “research”. Many of the universities add a note regarding their pursuit of international excellence in these domains (terms such as “outstanding” and “world-class” are widely used). In common with the research referred to above, there is a shared prioritisation of social purpose. Every institution on the list has this emphasis, with variation only in terms of its relative placement, the extent to which its meaning is elaborated, and the specification of social purpose in terms of a specific commu-

nity. Some speak in general terms of their mission “to benefit society”, others elaborate with such emphases as the public good, the common good, societal well-being, the economy, the environment, and the natural world. The global horizon is present in each case, but the majority also highlight national and/or local communities.

The educational mission of the universities we looked at fits clearly within their commitment to “make a contribution to”, “make a difference in” or “serve” society. The idea of education for personal success is present in some cases, but it is not nearly as prominent as the idea that education is aimed towards “cultivating global citizens who will thrive in today’s world and become tomorrow’s leaders” (Tsinghua University Education Foundation, 2022), or, to take the example that is used in the title of this paper, “the mission of Harvard College is to educate citizens and citizen-leaders for our society” (Harvard College, 2022). The personal benefit to students is generally framed in holistic terms such as “intellectual transformation” (Harvard College, 2022), “education that stimulates, challenges and fulfils” (University of Melbourne, 2022), and “transformative and socially engaged” education to “unleash students potential” (University of Cape Town, 2022). Personal benefit is subsumed under the idea of preparing citizens and leaders who will “contribute to society” (University of Oxford, 2022). The content of the education needed to meet such a goal focuses on the devel-

opment of knowledge, skills, and values. All three aspects are emphasized prominently, with knowledge and skills most prominent but also a significant emphasis on values. The language of values or ethics is explicit in over a third of cases. Specific values that universities are seeking to cultivate are service, creativity, curiosity, resilience, wisdom, and civic responsibility. Perhaps surprisingly, given its scientific and technological focus, it is the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT, 2022) that most clearly spells out its commitment to values and character development in its educational mission:

It is the purpose of the educational program to develop in each student that mastery of fundamentals, versatility of mind, motivation for learning, and intellectual discipline and self-reliance that is the best foundation for continuing professional achievement; to provide a liberal as well as professional education so that each student acquires a respect for moral values, a sense of the duties of citizenship, and the basic human understanding and knowledge required for leadership; and thereby to send forth men and women of the highest professional competence, with the breadth of learning and of character to deal constructively with the issues and opportunities of our time.

Many of the educational emphases we have noted are included in MIT’s statement. A focus on professional achievement is integrated with an emphasis on moral values, citizenship, and leadership in what is described as “a liberal as well as professional education”. The purpose is for students to develop “the high-

est professional competence” (skills), “breadth of learning” (knowledge) and “character to deal constructively with the issues and opportunities of our time” (character). Interestingly it is character that is singled out as particularly important to navigate the present context.

#### 4. A renewal of character education

We have seen that the ambition of universities to educate citizens and leaders who will serve society necessitates an emphasis on more than knowledge and skills. The importance of developing “values and attitudes” is present as a third component in SDG 4 and highlighted by many universities, which often point to specific values that they seek to help students develop. MIT focuses on “character” in its educational mission, a move we advocate here as holding significant promise.

In arguing that character development should be an intentional focus of universities, we are not presenting a new emphasis but arguing for a renewal of character education in a form that is fit for purpose in modern institutions. The expansion of universities since the mid twentieth century has been built on a vision of opening access to important knowledge and skills, and the need to grow a technically skilled and highly educated workforce for an increasingly knowledge-based global economy. It has been driven by public sector funding and student debt and focused on financial outcomes. The contribution of higher education to career prospects and na-

tional economies is important, but few argue that it constitutes the full picture of what universities should be about. In focusing on knowledge, skills and economic impact, the importance of values and character development has not been overturned so much as overlooked. It is harder to conceptualise and articulate in relation to financial benefits and perceived as difficult for modern, ideologically plural institutions to actively promote. The expansion of universities with a mission to serve society, the consensus of university mission statements and international documents like the UDHR and SDGs, and the challenges of the present global context highlight the importance of character education in universities and should spur its renewal.

It is important to note that such a proposal is not without its critics. Some argue against the possibility of character education in university years. Others oppose it on grounds of ethical permissibility, suggesting that the intentional cultivation of virtue in university students needs to be justified by a direct professional concern linked to their degree programme if it is to respect their autonomy as adults (Carr, 2017). Both objections should be resisted. Universities play a crucial role as stewards of the next generation (Bok, 2020) and have a responsibility to take appropriate steps to help students develop the character as well as the knowledge and skills they need to flourish in their lives. What is more, recent research in neuroscience and psychology supports the possibility of virtue cultivation at the life stage of emerging adulthood



(Williams, 2022). Universities are a promising context in which virtuous moral habits, such as self-control, intellectual curiosity, and care for others, can be promoted in students (Villacís et al., 2021). So long as the autonomy of students is affirmed and pedagogical strategies that support student character development as self-directed, David Carr's (2017) concern can be mitigated. What is more, virtues of character supplement the civic competencies required for living well in society and performing a leading role in social change (Naval et al., 2022).

This article proposes that a renewed emphasis on character education is needed to move higher education forward so that universities deliver on their aspiration to educate "citizens and citizen leaders to serve society". In this final section we elaborate on the nature of such character education, arguing that it should be based on a rigorous theoretical framework, a tested pedagogical approach, and a practically relevant orientation toward students' interests.

#### 4.1. Conceptual rigour

At present, many universities focus on the development of "values and attitudes" (SDG 4) under the framing of graduate attributes, 21st century skills, or higher education competencies. Such framings can be helpful in order to focus the attention of administrators and educators onto aspects of education that are not necessarily emphasized in specific disciplinary degree programmes. However, we argue that it is necessary to

move beyond generic framings to conceptualise character development in universities more robustly. This is important since it is only by way of a clear understanding of what character education is (and isn't) that it is possible to consider how it can be conducted to good effect in modern universities.

One promising theoretical and practical stream of character education has developed from the twentieth-century renewal of virtue ethics (Anscombe, 1958; MacIntyre, 2007) and selective appropriation of the philosophical and practical tradition of formation that is built on the work of Aristotle. Serious deficiencies in a number of Aristotle's positions, not least concerning race, gender, and slavery mean that Aristotle's teaching should certainly not be taken up without critique. Instead, the approach of Neo-Aristotelian character education, as defined by Kristján Kristjánsson (2015) reads Aristotle critically in order to provides a theory of character and character development that integrates the latest insights of social scientific research with contemporary moral and educational philosophy.

This approach to character education involves three aspects: an understanding of the motivational dynamism in the human person, the presence of habits as means for the potential of positive motivation to be realised in practice, and pedagogical guidelines as to how such habits can be promoted. The motivational dimension of Neo-Aristotelian character education relates to the idea that human

action is deeply motivated by the attainment of happiness or *eudaimonia*, commonly translated as *flourishing*. Flourishing is a dynamic state of human being, wherein the full potential of human life is fully realised. In a flourishing life the internal aspiration for holistic well-being and external conditions necessary to support it are achieved in a way congruent with reason and the common good (Kristjánsson, 2015).

According to Aristotle, the cultivation of virtuous character is central to human flourishing. Virtues of character are rational and emotional dispositions to action. They can be parsed into moral virtues, which relate to living well, and intellectual virtues, which relate to thinking well (Kristjánsson, 2015). These habits of heart and mind have been studied thoroughly since the ancient world. In the last two decades, virtues have also been objects of scientific scrutiny in psychological research (Peterson & Seligman, 2004; Wright et al., 2021). Current efforts to study and promote virtues at the school and higher education levels have classified these habits into four groups (Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues & Oxford Character Project, 2020): intellectual virtues, such as curiosity and intellectual humility, which relate to the “pursuit of knowledge, truth and understanding” (p. 6); civic virtues, such as civility and service, which refer to “the engagement of students in their local, national and global contexts” (p. 6); moral virtues, such as honesty, courage, compassion, and justice, which concern the development of “an ethical awareness in academic work and wider universi-

ty life” (p. 6) animated by a commitment to the common good; lastly, performance strengths are traits such as determination and confidence, whose function is “enabling intellectual, moral and civic virtues” (p. 6). Crowning these virtues is *phronesis* or practical wisdom (Schwartz & Sharpe, 2010), which is understood as the integrative virtue of good judgment and serves to facilitate the application of virtues in practice in order to do “the right thing at the right time” (Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues & Oxford CharProject, 2020, p. 6)

## 4.2. Pedagogical efficacy

A conceptual understanding of character education can only serve its purpose if it can be applied in higher education. There is a need for effective teaching methods, supported by evidence, that can be applied in cohorts of emerging adults in university contexts.

Recent multidisciplinary research suggests the potential of seven strategies for cultivating virtues of character at the higher education level (Brant et al., 2022; Lamb et al., 2021). The seven strategies are:

- 1) habituation through practice; 2) reflection on personal experience; 3) engagement with virtuous exemplars; 4) dialogue that increases virtue literacy; 5) awareness of situational variables; 6) moral reminders and 7) friendships of mutual accountability. (Lamb et al., 2021, p. 82)

These methods have been recently applied in both curricular classes (Lamb et al., 2022) and extra-curricular character

and leadership programmes for university students (Brant et al., 2020; Brooks et al., 2019; Lamb et al., 2021). In these programmes, particular practices of habituation are encouraged through individual exercises and tasks (e.g., keeping a gratitude journal). Reflection on personal experience is motivated by group discussions and reflective exercises. The use of biographies, narrative texts, and readings are central techniques to favour the engagement with moral exemplars. Virtue literacy is enhanced through dialogues with visiting speakers, mentor meetings, and small group discussions. Knowledge about situational variables enable participants to reflect on their own tendencies and occupational hazards that can undermine their practice of virtues. Lastly, by forming a community of virtuous practice, these programmes provide students with regular moral reminders and can provide fertile contexts for students to establish friendships focused on character development and contribution to the common good.

In addition to educational programmes, institutional and personal actions can be implemented by university leaders and faculty members to promote character in students. As Derek Bok (2020) states, institutional initiatives can encompass courses of moral reasoning, enforcing rules against plagiarism and cheating in honour codes, ensuring that rules on students' behaviours on campus are clearly worded and adequately explained to them, and adhering to high ethical standards in leaders' administration. By effectively implementing these

actions, university students are thought to develop conscientiousness traits and improve moral reasoning and moral behaviour. Nevertheless, institutional efforts can be ineffective if universities do not count on faculty who are committed to the ongoing cultivation of their own character since they are "the individuals in the best position to influence students" (Bok, 2020, p. 76). Although more research is needed to understand the nature of this influence, the role of faculty members and other well-chosen mentors as moral exemplars can play an important part in the cultivation of virtue in the university (Lamb et al., 2021).

#### 4.3. Practical relevance

It is possible to have a great theory and excellent pedagogy, but if students do not become involved, it is not possible to educate character in universities. In order to connect the theory and pedagogical practice to life experience, we need to effectively engage the questions students are asking, the challenges they face, and the ambitions they hold.

Character education initiatives at the university must meet students where they are, not only where faculty or university leaders want them to be. An example of this approach is the connection of character development to student aspirations when it comes to leadership development and social impact. Such an approach has been applied since 2014 at the University of Oxford, where the Oxford Character Project has pioneered character and leadership education, delivering programmes at Oxford as well

as in partnership with the Europaeum group of European universities, the London School of Economics, and the University of Hong Kong (Brant et al., 2020; Lamb et al., 2021). This interdisciplinary initiative at the University of Oxford is focused on the development of character and responsible leadership in postgraduate students. Connecting with students' interests in leadership and their desire to make a difference when it comes to pressing social and environmental issues, the Oxford Character Project aims to help students develop as ethical and effective leaders who can successfully navigate complexity and uncertainty to further the good of society.

Today, intentional character development is a minority report in higher education. However, there are early signs that a renewal may be underway. The aspiration expressed by universities in their mission statements can provide a constructive starting point, and there are a growing number of character education initiatives in universities around the world. In the USA, Wake Forest University has a prominent Program for Leadership and Character, delivering curricular and extra-curricular programmes and training faculty to integrate character education into classes across the university. In Spain, the recently-founded Civic Humanism Center of the Universidad de Navarra offers a character-focused leadership programme for students in conjunction with research exploring the benefits of liberal education for character development and professional practice. Spanish residential colleges, called *Colegios Mayores*, have

also become a focus for character education, advanced by the “University Communities for Character Development” project (Dabdoub et al., 2022). Created with the first universities in Spain and France, these organizations aim to provide not only a place of residence to university students but also an environment of academic preparation and character development (Suárez, 1966). In these institutions, students from different years live alongside faculty in communities that emphasize the development of character as an important aim of education.

## 5. Conclusion

Both aspects of the educational vision of the UDHR, its commitment to education that is open to all and aims to develop people and society, were renewed in 2015 by the United Nations in SDG 4 (Quality Education), which asserts that “it is vital to give a central place to strengthening education’s contribution to the fulfilment of human rights, peace and responsible citizenship from local to global levels, gender equality, sustainable development and health” (UNESCO, 2016, p. 14). This locates education at the heart of the UN’s global agenda, driving progress across all 17 SDGs. The emphasis of SDG 4 is on “cognitive and non-cognitive aspects of learning” in an education that helps students to acquire “the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes required by citizens to lead productive lives, make informed decisions and assume active roles locally and globally in facing and resolving global challenges” (UNESCO, 2016, p.

14). While universities widely affirm this vision in their own mission statements, the intentional development of values and attitudes trails behind the development of knowledge and skills. A renewal of character education in uni-

versities, in line with the renewal of virtue ethics and character development in the theory and practice of education more widely, has the potential to fill this gap in the development of students as global citizens.

## Appendix

TABLE 1. List of universities included in the present study.

THE 2022 ranking	Institution	Country
1	Oxford	UK
2	California Institute of Technology	USA
2=	Harvard	USA
4	Stanford	USA
5=	Cambridge	UK
5=	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	USA
7	Princeton	USA
8	University of California, Berkeley	USA
9	Yale	USA
10	University of Chicago	USA
15	ETH Zurich	Switzerland
16=	Peking University	China
16=	Tsinghua University	China
33	University of Melbourne	Australia
183=	University of Cape Town	South Africa
201-250	Indian Institute of Science	India
301-350	Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile	Chile
401-500	Tel Aviv University	Israel

Source: Based on the Times Higher Education World University Rankings 2022..



## Acknowledgments

We thank Dr. José Antonio Ibáñez-Martín and Dr. Francisco Esteban Bara for the opportunity to present a preliminary version of this manuscript at the International Conference “Hacia una educación renovadora del carácter (Towards a character renewal education)”, hosted by the Universidad Internacional de La Rioja and the Universidad de Navarra. Work on this article by Dr. Edward Brooks was supported by a grant from the John Templeton Foundation (grant number 61413). The work of Dr. Jorge Villacís was supported by the Education, Citizenship and the Character Research Group of the Universidad de Navarra. The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the John Templeton Foundation.

## References

- Adamsky, D. (2019). *Russian Nuclear Orthodoxy: Religion, Politics, and Strategy*. Stanford University Press.
- Alvarado, A., Conde, B., Novella, R., & Repetto, A. (2020). NEETs in Latin America and the Caribbean: Skills, aspirations, and information. *Journal of International Development*, 32 (8), 1273-1307. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.3503>
- Anscombe, G. E. M. (1958). Modern moral philosophy. *Philosophy*, 33 (124), 1-19.
- Arias-Coello, A., Simon-Martin, J., & Gonzalo Sanchez-Molero, J. L. (2020). Mission statements in Spanish universities. *Studies in Higher Education*, 45 (2), 299-311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2018.1512569>
- Aristovnik, A., Keržič, D., Ravšelj, D., Tomaževič, N., & Umek, L. (2020). Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on life of higher education students: A global perspective. *Sustainability*, 12 (20), 8438. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12208438>
- Arnett, J. (2015). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties*. Oxford University Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2011). From pilgrim to tourist – or a short history of identity. In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 18-36). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Bayrak, T. (2020). A content analysis of top-ranked universities' mission statements from five global regions. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 72 (102130). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2019.102130>
- Bok, D. (2020). *Higher expectations*. Princeton University Press.
- Bolton, P. (2022). *Higher education student numbers*. <https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/35257/1/CBP-7857.pdf>
- Brant, J., Brooks, E., & Lamb, M. (2022). *Cultivating virtue in the university*. Oxford University Press.
- Brant, J., Lamb, M., Burdett, E., & Brooks, E. (2020). Cultivating virtue in postgraduates: An empirical study of the Oxford Global Leadership Initiative. *Journal of Moral Education*, 49 (4), 415-435. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2019.1682977>
- Breznik, K., & Law, K. M. Y. (2019). What do mission statements reveal about the values of top universities in the world? *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 27 (5), 1362-1375. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-08-2018-1522>
- Brooks, E., Brant, J., & Lamb, M. (2019). How can universities cultivate leaders of character? Insights from a leadership and character development program at the University of Oxford. *International Journal of Ethics Education*, 4 (2), 167-182. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40889-019-00075-x>
- Callender, C., Locke, W., & Marginson, S. (2020a). *Changing higher education for a changing world*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Callender, C., Locke, W., & Marginson, S. (2020b). Preface. In C. Callender, W. Locke, & S. Marginson (Eds.), *Changing higher education for a changing world*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Carr, D. (2017). Virtue and character in higher education. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 65 (1), 109-124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2016.1224806>

- Collini, S. (2012). *What are universities for?* Penguin.
- Cortés Sánchez, J. D. (2018). Mission statements of universities worldwide: Text mining and visualization. *Intangible Capital*, 14 (4), 584. <https://doi.org/10.3926/ic.1258>
- Dabdoub, J. P., Salaverria, A. R., Berkowitz, M. W., & Naval, C. (2022, January 6). Leveraging Colegios Mayores for character development [Paper presentation]. *The 10th Annual Jubilee Center for Character and Virtues Conference. Integrating research on character and virtues: 10 years of impact*. Oriel College, University of Oxford, United Kingdom. [https://www.university-communities.org/\\_files/ugd/7500e2\\_7a889fd111394659aaa65f7337c3564b.pdf](https://www.university-communities.org/_files/ugd/7500e2_7a889fd111394659aaa65f7337c3564b.pdf)
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford University Press.
- Grant, J. (2021). *The new power university*. Pearson Education.
- Harvard College. (2022). *Mission, vision, & history*. <https://college.harvard.edu/about/mission-vision-history>
- Hudson, L., & Mansfield, I. (2020). *Universities at the crossroads: How higher education leadership must act to regain the trust of their staff, their communities and the whole nation*. Policy Exchange.
- Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues, & Oxford Character Project. (2020). *Character education in universities. A framework for flourishing*. <https://oxfordcharacter.org/assets/images/general-uploads/Character-Education-in-Universities.pdf>
- Kristjánsson, K. (2015). *Aristotelian character education*. Routledge.
- Lamb, M., Brant, J., & Brooks, E. (2021). How is virtue cultivated? Seven strategies for Post-graduate Character Development. *Journal of Character Education*, 17 (1), 81-108.
- Lamb, M., Dykhuis, E. M., Mendonça, S. E., & Jayawickreme, E. (2022). Commencing character: A case study of character development in college. *Journal of Moral Education*, 51 (2), 238-260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2021.1953451>
- Locke, W. (2020). Visions of higher education futures: The shape of things to come? In C. Callender, W. Locke, & S. Marginson (Eds.), *Changing higher education for a changing world*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- MacIntyre, A. (2007). *After virtue: A study in moral theory*. Duckworth.
- Marginson, S. (2014). Student self-formation in international education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 18 (1), 6-22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315313513036>
- Marginson, S. (2016). High participation systems of higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 87 (2), 243-271. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2016.11777401>
- Marginson, S. (2020). Public and common goods: Key concepts in mapping the contributions of higher education. In C. Callender, W. Locke, & S. Marginson (Eds.), *Changing higher education for a changing world*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Marginson, S. (2022). What drives global science? The four competing narratives. *Studies in Higher Education*, 47 (8), 1566-1584. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2021.1942822>
- Marginson, S., Callender, C., & Locke, W. (2020). Higher education in fast moving times: Larger, steeper, more global and more contested. In C. Callender, W. Locke, & S. Marginson (Eds.), *Changing higher education for a changing world*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (2022). *Mission and objectives*. <https://policies.mit.edu/policies-procedures/10-institute/11-mission-and-objectives>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2018). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. SAGE Publications.
- Milovanska-Farrington, S. (2020). Reasons to attend college, academic success, and post-college plans. *Education Economics*, 28 (5), 526-547. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09645292.2020.1801597>
- Naciones Unidas (1948). *Declaración Universal de los Derechos Humanos*. [https://www.un.org/es/documents/udhr/UDHR\\_booklet\\_SP\\_web.pdf](https://www.un.org/es/documents/udhr/UDHR_booklet_SP_web.pdf)
- Naval, C., Villacís, J. L., & Ibarrola-García, S. (2022). The transversality of civic learning as the basis for development in the university. *Education Sciences*, 12 (4), 240. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12040240>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2018). *Education at a glance 2018*. OECD Publishing.

- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2021). *The state of higher education one year into the COVID-19 pandemic*. OECD Publishing.
- Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la C. y la C. (2017). *Desglosar el Objetivo de Desarrollo Sostenible 4: Educación 2030 Guía*. [https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000246300\\_spa](https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000246300_spa)
- Ortega y Gasset, J. (2010). *Mission of the university*. Routledge.
- Penn Office of the President (2022). *Impact*. <https://gutmann-archived.president.upenn.edu/penn-compact/impact>
- Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification*. American Psychological Association & Oxford University Press.
- Salvà-Mut, F., Tugores-Ques, M., & Quintana-Murci, E. (2018). NEETs in Spain: an analysis in a context of economic crisis. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 37 (2), 168-183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2017.1382016>
- Schwab, K. (2017). *The fourth industrial revolution*. Crown Business.
- Schwartz, B., & Sharpe, K. (2010). *Practical wisdom: The right way to do the right thing*. Penguin Publishing Group.
- Suárez, F. (1966). *Teoría del Colegio Mayor [Theory of the residential colleges]*. Colegio Mayor Diego de Covarrubias (Aguirre Campano).
- Susskind, R. E., & Susskind, D. (2015). *The future of the professions: How technology will transform the work of human experts*. Oxford University Press.
- The Netter Center for Community Partnerships (2008). *Anchor institutions toolkit: A guide for neighborhood revitalization*. University of Pennsylvania.
- Tsinghua University Education Foundation (2022). *Tsinghua - The Chinese university for global leadership*. [http://www.tuef.tsinghua.edu.cn/info/picnew\\_eng/3798](http://www.tuef.tsinghua.edu.cn/info/picnew_eng/3798)
- United Nations (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>
- United Nations (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. <https://sdgs.un.org/sites/default/files/publications/21252030%20Agenda%20for%20Sustainable%20Development%20web.pdf>
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2016). *Unpacking sustainable development goal 4: Education 2030 Guide*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000246300>
- United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (2022). *Higher education*. <https://www.unesco.org/en/education/higher-education>
- University of Birmingham (2022). *UoB and beyond: Your graduate attributes*. <https://intranet.birmingham.ac.uk/as/employability/careers/graduate-attributes/uob-and-beyond-your-graduate-attributes.aspx>
- University of Cape Town (2022). *Vision 2030*. <https://uct.ac.za/transformation/vision-2030>
- University of Melbourne (2022). *Our vision*. <https://about.unimelb.edu.au/vision>
- University of Oxford (2022). *Vision*. <https://www.ox.ac.uk/about/organisation/strategic-plan-2018-24>
- Villacis, J. L., de la Fuente, J., & Naval, C. (2021). Good character at college: The combined role of second-order character strength factors and phronesis motivation in undergraduate academic outcomes. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18 (16), 8263. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18168263>
- Williams, B. A. (2022). Developing virtue in emerging adults. In J. Brant, E. Brooks, & M. Lamb (Eds.), *Cultivating virtue in the university* (pp. 57-80). Oxford University Press.
- World Health Organization (2022). *WHO Coronavirus dashboard*. <https://covid19.who.int/>
- Wright, J. C., Warren, M. T., & Snow, N. E. (2021). *Understanding virtue: Theory and measurement*. Oxford University Press.
- Wyatt, J. (2020). José Ortega y Gasset (1883-1955): The university's social mission: To enrich individual potential. In R. Barnett & A. Fulford (Eds.), *Philosophers on the University: Reconsidering higher education* (pp. 95-105). Springer.

## Authors' biographies

**Edward Brooks** is the Executive Director of the Oxford Character Project.

His research lies at the intersection of virtue ethics, character and leadership development. Particular interests include the virtue of hope, the relationship between character and culture in commercial organisations, leadership for human flourishing, and exemplarist moral theory.



<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9171-7661>

**Jorge L. Villacís** holds a PhD in Education and Psychology from the Universidad de Navarra and is an Assistant

Professor at the same institution. He is part of the Research Group on Citizenship and Character (GIECC) at the Universidad de Navarra. He has conducted a research stay at St. Antony's College, University of Oxford and completed a Visiting Research Fellowship at the Oxford Character Project. His research interests and publications are oriented towards the development of character strengths in the university context.



<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0871-250X>