Integrating Moral Education into Language Education in Asia: Guidelines for Materials Writers

Saneh Thongrin

Abstract A growing body of research has identified ESL/EFL instruction as a practice that is culturally hegemonic. Perspectives from critical pedagogy and representations of learners' reality, issues in morality have rarely been integrated into ELT practices, especially in the realm of materials development where the influence of culture and learners' socio-cultural variables should be recognized. As this chapter aims to help English language teachers produce localized materials representing students' realities and thus serving their needs appropriately, it discusses some rationale for morality-oriented materials development and gives guidelines for materials writing, emphasizing the incorporation of moral education into ELT practices. With the perspectives discussed and the guidelines suggested, it is expected that the materials designed and developed will play a more important role in socializing Asian learners into moral reasoning, thereby fostering morally competent citizens for their local and global societies.

Keywords Asian learners • Cultural identities • ELT practices • Materials development • Moral education

> Teaching itself involves moral action… Teachers are moral agents, and education as a whole, and thus classroom interaction, in particular, is fundamentally and inevitably moral in nature (Buzzelli and Johnston 2001, p. 876).

1 Introduction

"ELT in Asia is the product of its relation with Western countries throughout the colonial, neocolonial, and modern era" (Sung 2012, p. 30). This statement points out problems in teaching English in Asia where students hold unique socio-cultural backgrounds (see Matsuda and Friedrich 2011; McKay and Bokhorst-Heng 2008; Sung 2012). This is because the approach called Communicative Language Teaching

S. Thongrin (✉)
Thammasat University, Klong Luang, Pathum Thani, Thailand
e-mail: sthongrin@gmail.com

H.P. Widodo et al. (eds.), *Situating Moral and Cultural Values in ELT Materials*,
English Language Education 9, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-63677-1_9

(CLT) places more emphasis on the development of students' linguistic communicative competence based on the native speaker as a model (e.g., British English, American English). English Teachers, regardless of the teaching contexts, aim to train learners with "a native speaker communicative and cultural competence" (Risager 1998, p. 244) where Western national Anglophone culture has been adopted (Saraceni 2009). Learners are expected to achieve communicative competence, and the model proposed by Canale and Swain (1980), consisting of competence in linguistics, sociolinguistics, and discourse, has been used and acknowledged in ELT. This clearly indicates that, in addition to meaning in communication, language accuracy, though contextually assessed, is still one of the primary goals of teaching. The native-speaker model has consequently received some criticisms. Byram (1997), for instance, argues that those teaching goals are far from successful and tend to "create the wrong kind of competence," and "it would imply that a learner should be linguistically schizophrenic, abandoning one language in order to blend into another linguistic environment, becoming accepted as a native speaker by other native speakers" (p. 11).

Clearly, teaching English with the aim of creating the learners who may lose their own cultural identity through the learning processes underpinned by the perfect model of the CLT approach may not be the ultimate goal, especially when English can be viewed from multiple perspectives. The problems inherent in the implementation of CLT are that learners not only have insufficient language skills but encounter problems in cultural identities in certain Anglophone contexts. "Standard native-speaker arteries of English can no longer be considered to be the only correct varieties" (Tomlinson 2005, p. 6).

This problem has also been found in materials development as materials writers still base content, levels of knowledge and language skills, and cultural aspects on linguistic uniformity and "perfect" competence of native speakers. The ELT materials distributed internationally are mainly oriented towards American and British perspectives (Ilieva 2000; Ndura 2004). These materials mostly used in non-English settings scarcely portray students' specific needs, problems, emotional ties, values, and cultural notions (Bell and Gower 1998; Garcia 2005; Jolly and Bolitho 1998; McDonough and Shaw 2003; Murayama 2000; Scollon and Scollon 1995; Sheldon 1988; Tomlinson 2003, 2005); thereby failing to reflect today's pedagogical principles.

Probably, the pedagogical principles originally created for language education in English environments may not work well for Asian learners born and raised with a different socio-cultural worldview. As such, ELT activities should be implemented on the basis of some view in critical pedagogy fostering learners' authorities, identities, and desirable characteristics, where students not only learn an additional language, but also become culturally competent learners and, as decent members of their society, hold desirable characters and critical minds.

In language education, moral education, among many, can serve as a teacher tool to enhance such students' characters and critical minds. Education may not serve their needs well unless it reinforces moral reasoning for their lives. "Education is just as meaningless outside the real world as is a fire without oxygen, or as is breath-

ing in a vacuum. The teacher's educational work, therefore, must inevitably be connected with his creative, social and life work." (Vygotsky 1977, p. 345). A Vygotskian perspective on morality emphasizes moral education as an important function in culture-oriented practices (Rogoff 1990) socially and culturally mediated by language and discourse. The knowledge and understanding of socio-cultural differences and the target community should result in more intercultural awareness (Council of Europe 2001), and ELT materials designed for non-native learners should thus help them to communicate effectively with speakers of English around the globe.

However, the implementation of moral education in ELT is far from evident. As inferred from the studies by Mangubhai (2007) and Sockett and LePage (2002), previous studies have provided little how English language teachers and materials writers have spelled out moral dimensions in language teaching and classroom materials. What appears is a political lens of critical perspectives in language teaching (See Alvarez 2007; Canagarajah 2007; Pennycook 1994; Phillipson 1992; Sharifian 2009) or ethics in teacher education (See Buzzelli and Johnston 2001; Johnson & Reiman, Johnson and Reiman 2007; Mahony 2009). Among the few studies is the study by Johnston, Juhasz et al. (1998) investigating English teachers' behavior based on the three-fold framework: class rules, morality carried in curricular substructure (e.g., shared understandings in class), and students' perceptions of their classroom practices. Unfortunately, the framework used may not well reflect morality or students' cultural ideologies. Also, this study was conducted in an Anglophone setting, so the research merits may not extend completely into Asian contexts, where students' needs and socio-cultural backgrounds are different from those in Anglophone environments.

As a result, the purpose of this chapter is to propose possible guidelines for ELT teachers and materials writers, the agents of knowledge, cultures, and virtues, to integrate moral education into teaching materials and class activities so that we can meet students' needs more effectively. In this chapter, I situate my standpoints in the theoretical views on critical pedagogy, cultural representations, and moral education. The chapter finally concludes with guidelines essential for materials writers to consider when they develop course materials or class activities appropriate for students' needs and historical backgrounds.

2 Critical Pedagogy and Course Materials

ELT Practices are politically constructed (Pennycook 1994) as they hold social and economic ideologies. The status quo attached to English education is ingrained "in the rhythms and textures of culture, consciousness, and everyday life" (Apple 1990, xi). In developing materials, we should consequently start with critical pedagogy that suggests the issues of morality to be integrated into learning materials. Three tenets inherent in critical pedagogy signify what we need to do when designing such materials: individuals' culture or lived experience to be reflected; voice through a

critical look at one's society; and society transformed toward people's equality. In Freire's (1970) view, what and how teachers teach any subject matters to students are closely related to the critical pedagogy view, and their main commitment is to help students hold "conscientization" (consciousness) and critical minds that view their education settings and connect their own problems and experiences to their society. As critical pedagogy aims to promote an informed transformation of society through a praxis related to the formation between theory and practice and between thinking and doing (Giroux 1988), teachers are expected to be the agents holding knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes that question, understand, and act for change for schools' inequities, all of which are termed as intellectually transformative, where monolithic views of dominations, what Giroux argued in his 1981work, probably need to be reconstructed:

> Emphasizing the form of classroom encounters that replicate the social relations of the workplace, they do not consider how the dominant culture is mediated in schools through textbooks, through the assumptions that teachers use to guide their work, through the meaning that students use to negotiate their classroom experiences, and through the form and content of school subjects themselves. (p. 97)

Here, learning materials, teachers' beliefs, students' negotiated meaning, and learning subject matters are the entities teachers need to consider if they are to cultivate critical, active learners. Such critical perspectives are asserted by several linguists and educators. However, when it comes to the textbooks non-native students used, Cortazzi and Jin (1999) observed that the contents of textbooks used in Venezuela, Turkey, and Saudi Arabia and in the United Sates embraced students' cultures, target cultures, and international target cultures. The third category includes the textbooks covering cultures from English speaking countries and non-English counterparts, and it is very helpful for classroom practices in a wider language education spectrum. The first two types could be of use when teachers introduce awareness to the class and provide complements for the missing elements in the texts. Students' learning benefits as a result of any single view or practice implemented, however, may be limited as there could be some missing advantages that should be derived from multifaceted practices or perspectives. More benefits should be offered by the textbooks with the content that portrays the combination of cultures, in which students learn about their own culture and others' at the same time. This is more crucial especially in ELT contexts, in which we should consider students' representations of reality and global cultures. This is because the content of materials should representi social-cultural reality of learners and their wider global society. In this case, issues in moral education can be addressed in ELT materials as there is a wide spectrum of morality issues oriented to each cultural context available for selection as the materials content. Socialized with the local and global points of view, students tend to gain more world knowledge and later on enhance more critical thinking. These will be helpful for their problem solving, especially when they encounter some difficulties in relation to their learning, living, or working. Accessing both levels of these cultural contents is also a way they not only

appreciate the beauty of their own cultural heritage, but also understand others in wider societies. They then gradually hold more awareness of cultural differences while learning at school and serving their future workplace. Accordingly, both local and global cultures integrated into ELT materials are greater cultural resources for morality content that should offer positive solutions to students learning in the globalized context.

3 Cultural Representations and Materials Writing

In addition to critical pedagogy, materials writers, when designing course materials, need to understand concepts of culture that could foster or inhibit students' learning. Culture based on Brody (2003) is defined in two levels: level one as the product of "civilization" (p. 39) and referred to as the formal institutions in a macro scale including social, political, and economic domains, and level two as the way of everyday life for people in any particular groups. When considering the fundamental concept of culture and its applications in real world practice, we see that one seems to be complementary to another, and both provide pictures of cultures at large and small scales, some of which can be implemented in textbooks designed for learners in ELT contexts. Culture is also more important when considered as part of learning elements, where it is "the site where identities are constructed, desires mobilized, and moral values shaped" (Giroux 2000, p. 132). This can take place on condition that we integrate students' historical background into the process of teaching and learning, and materials writing is an important element of such a process.

Materials and their cultural factors could be viewed through many lenses, and one on which I position this chapter is the view by Risager (2012), where the term linguaculture is referred to in her work, *Linguaculture and transnationality: The cultural dimensions of language*, in the use of first, second, and foreign language. Citing linguistic anthropologist Paul Friedrich (1989), Risager emphasizes the relationship between political economy, ideology, and language, stating that the term was originally defined as "a domain of experience that fuses and intermingles the vocabulary, many semantic aspects of grammar, and the verbal aspects of culture" (Friedrich 1989, p. 306) and changed to languaculture and then used by linguistic anthropologist Michael Agar in his 1994 work. While the term is referred to as a variation defined locally in Friedrich's way, it also expands to social groups in Agar's view:

> Language, in all its varieties, in all the ways it appears in everyday life, builds a world of meanings. When you run into different meanings, when you become aware of your own and work to build a bridge to the others, 'culture' is what you're up to. Language fills the spaces between us with sounds; culture forges the human connection through them. Culture is in language, and language is loaded with culture. (Agar 1994, p. 28).

With this relationship, investigations of languaculture learning benefit second language instruction, which also encompasses materials design and development, in which Agar suggests that L2 be replaced by second languaculture (LC2). This is sensible as languaculture can explain the connections of culture embodied in language structures, semantics, and pragmatics. More terms with similar meanings to languaculture used by various researchers, such as culture-in-language (See Crozer and Liddicoat 2000), or language-and-culture (See Byram et al. 1994), indicate social/cultural representations that play a greater role in the process of language learning in which those learners of non-English environments are engaged. With such representations, students can understand interactions between themselves and others. As Moscovici asserts:

> Social representations are systems of values, ideas and practices which enable communication to take place among the members of a community by providing them with a code for social exchange and a code for naming and classifying unambiguously the various aspects of their world and their individual and group history. Moscovici (1961, xiii, cited in Dervin 2012, p. 185)

Through such representations, we understand the worldview in various scales and can interact with the members at such levels. Since these shared representations are co-constructed (Howarth 2006), they can be unsteady and hybrid with multiple forms, where content selected has many roles to play in materials writing. This is important especially when we write the textbooks used in non-English contexts, where the cultural contents represented in those instructional materials significantly socialize learners cognitively and culturally.

What kind of cultural content could satisfactorily serve the students' learning needs? Answers to this question can be drawn from a number of studies. Ndura (2004) and Seidlhofer (2003), for instance, revealed that learning materials in their studies contained some unsuitable content in relation to cultural/social representations. In textbooks, cultural and moral content can be transmitted to learners, where the cultural flows defined by Risager (2012) can be seen through four pathways: linguistic flows (language codes), linguacultural flows (L1-related meanings), discursive flows (meaning in general), and other cultural flows (non-language meanings such as music, culture, or behavior). With respect to the content in learning materials that could socialize learners culturally and morally, I view that these paths can be applicable to the functions of such materials. It is true that learners, during their early periods of learning a second or foreign language, tend to draw on linguaculture experiences related to their native language. Reaching the strong abilities in such a learning context, learners may still maintain linguaculture as the result of accumulated experiences derived from historical backgrounds that include the early second/foreign-language-learning periods. Here, we agree that students' L1-related experience is a significant entity for L2 learning. This view constructs what critical pedagogy offers, and vice versa—students' historical backgrounds and the instruction tailored to suit their needs should be in concert.

4 Moral Education and Materials Writing

Morality is what we use to control conduct of our life and reasons for doing so. Morality in education aims to help learners respect human differences and democracy principles. This value, also known as moral education, values education, character education, or ethics education, is connected to life or emotional skills that help learners take on their roles in society appropriately (Elias et al. 1997; Sockett and LePage 2002). Accordingly, socializing students through morality has gained more attention in the classroom setting with five approaches. First, values clarification, through non-judgmental teaching methods, encourages learners to discover their preferred values. However, this approach was found ineffective and thus not used widely in education (Oser 1986).

Second, moral education through cognitive development focuses on, as indicated by its term, the development of learners' moral reasoning, in which Lawrence Kohlberg (1963, 1975) characterized six stages of moral reasoning—rule-governed behavior, instrumentally mutual fairness, expected mutual relationships, social responsibilities, fulfilled social obligations, and ethically moral reasoning. As these stages indicate, growing in moral reasoning can occur as it moves from one stage to another, where students' cognitive growth can be supported through class activities with emphasis on moral issues. These developmental stages of morality are in accordance with psychological development of children whose behaviors can initially be controlled by regulations, and stages 2–5 represent those grown-ups whose characters of decent members are well developed. At the very last stage of morality, children are expected to hold ethical, moral reasoning, which is always needed as one of the important elements of human beings. However, some points between the stages seem questionable as it is difficult to predict moral behavior from each stage as some may reveal the same behavior although they are achieving different stages of moral development. Also, the expected moral actions and those that have been achieved may not necessarily be the same. However, these multi-stage developments have empirically been explored, and supported by the findings of longitudinal and cross-cultural research (Power et al. 1989).

Third, teachers' caring under the feminine approach could play a complementary role to the cognitive development approach. Some theorists (e.g., Gilligan 1971) viewed that research based on Kohlberg's stages of moral development was mainly conducted through boys' lens. Accordingly, Noddings (1992) proposed caring around the realm of education, ranging from caring for self and people, animals and plants, to caring for man-made objects and personal ideas. In this way, caring explains close relationships between humans and environments, and thus can be applied to learners living in a changing world very well.

Fourth, character education signifies a virtue defined as qualities of decent character, and teachers' main responsibility is consequently to build up moral society, connecting students to virtues and "habitual practice" (Lickona 1997, p. 55) that will ultimately help them to achieve their life fulfillment.

Here, we can see that moral education viewed through teachers' caring and character education approaches can be applied in ELT practices of Asian contexts, where teachers are the main agents of students' learning. With the teacher caring, some concerns for self and others, or any related environmental issues can be used as the learning content, along with the language elements that will be set as course objectives appropriate for students' age and background levels. The qualities of decent character underlined by character education also come into play as teachers visualize the characteristics of their students in the future era, so these characteristics are main factors that signify the content selected for coursebooks, materials, or lessons written. Imagine Thai, Vietnamese, or Indonesian students socialized with qualities of decent citizens while learning to master English. These students are believed to grow with not only language competence essential for their occupation, but also desirable character necessary for peaceful societies—their own home country and more global ones in their life network.

However, in educational contexts that encourage individuals' freedom of mind, this kind of content may be viewed as what that could one way or another straitjacket students and may consequently create some limited impact on students' learning outcome as a result of choice deprived during their learning process. Given this, some classroom implementations driven by moral education through these approaches may not well represent students' choice of leaning. This results in critical morality as the fifth approach to the explorations of such issues (see Brown et al. 1991; Lipe 2004; Mashishi 1999). As moral lessons with more effective use should respond to students' needs, the transmission of moral lessons should not ignore individuals' personal choice of moral matters. Mashishi (1999) views that students' morality could be developed on an amoral-to-moral spectrum of reasoning. This could be true for actual classrooms, where students' behaviors may vary depending on some related factors. As a result, morality-oriented instruction should be implemented when students are provided with choice. That said, students should choose moral matters freely from choices provided after careful considerations, and this subsequently results in their happiness and action with what they have chosen, all of which can become their life patterns. Consequently, moral education through a critical lens should consider individuals' needs and backgrounds, giving them more room for choice of learning. Here the selection with lesson content and morality should be implemented carefully. Teachers and materials writers can resort to the view by critical pedagogy—what will be selected for the learners should represent their own needs and historical backgrounds.

To instill desirable characters in students, materials writers, when considering morality content and approaches to ELT practice, can make use of four approaches to morality—cognitive development, caring, character education, and critical morality. The first one puts more emphasis on cognition; the second, humanistic caring for self, society, and elements of living; the third, those including cognition, emotion and behavior; the fourth, students' needs and choice to be considered. In education, a large number of studies have reported results in agreement with the positive

claims of moral education in learning domains (See Nucci and Weber 1991) and three characteristics of effective moral discussion: dilemmas as a springboard, different points of view on such dilemmas, and transactive discussion or the logical arguments made by students (Damon and Killen 1982; Younnis 1880). Given this, moral education takes on many more roles in its applications. In education, students are implanted with both knowledge and morality. In foreign language education, most teachers and materials writers unfortunately adopt the monolingual English speaker model and its ideology (Seidlhofer 2001), which may not serve students' needs and socio-cultural backgrounds completely.

In fact, language acquisition and literacy can be assisted by social and cultural practices and interactions. Although having language mastery as one of the course requirements, we can address problems indicating morality as a lesson input to trigger students' interactions through class discussions, written reflections, and class presentations. Content of morality can be incorporated into language teaching. This is because moral domains are not something new or strange to education as they are similar to learning domains in that they include cognition, emotion and behavior (Walker et al. 1995). As we may recognize taxonomy of the cognitive learning domains used as general principles for education, students' knowledge can be divided into levels, from lowest to highest, where learners can recall, comprehend, apply, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate what has been learned. In the same vein, they, in thinking morally, know and understand the causes of misconduct, apply morality in action, analyze individual and collective values, synthesize related matters for problem solving, evaluate choice of solutions, and formulate moral solutions. In feeling morally, learners become aware of and react to situated morality, commit themselves to morally selected actions, accommodate their lives to other values, and maintain their moral framework while living in society. We can see that moral domains should be incorporated into language instruction in which learners, through language as a learning tool, display their pertinent characters as those with directions and goals of good lives, decide and accomplish something right, and initiate and commit themselves to acceptable deeds. These finally benefit our learners with various age levels. What is written for young leaners may carry the content related to accepted/unaccepted behavior, while those aimed at more mature learners may include higher levels of caring, ethical, critical reasoning. The concepts around any selected morality issues should be flexible, and materials can be tailored to their audience's background (e.g., ages, study levels or socio-cultural variables, types and levels of discourse, and learning objectives.

Language in and of itself should work as the most effective tool for teachers to construct students' logical and moral reasoning, where language teachers, active moral agents creating ethics-laden English instruction, can link morality to not only students' literacy, but also their desirable characters including logical, ethical reasoning. What follows, I discuss guidelines for morality content to be integrated into language education in general and materials writing in particular.

5 Moral Education Applied to Language Education

Language education plays a crucial role in students' literacy and critical thinking in that the former functions as a tool for learning and communications in their future workplaces, while the latter could influence some ways of learners' lives in terms of ethics, philosophy, and principles in which they believe while living their lives in society. In the process of students' socialization, both in language learning and in character fostering, issues or learning content in relation to moral education can be incorporated into language education in three significant ways, based on practicality suggested by some research.

5.1 Moral Education Integrated into Classroom Practice with Literacy Emphasis

Literacy is generally emphasized for students at various levels. A simple way to implement moral education in language education is through the use of reading texts or passages. One of the motivating drives for K-12 students or those in higher levels is the community of inquiry as the text-based model suggested by Lipman (1987). This model contains questions exploring whether people's views or beliefs are sensible; students read the text aloud, ask questions and make comments on related issues to create collective competence or thinking acts triggering logical mental acts. Such logical acts serve ethical reasoning, and moral education thus helps encourage students to undertake critical, ethical inquiries. This framework should be fruitful in that the students' ability gained is important and ultimately relevant to their own lives later on. Equally important, the instruction emphasizing texts or reading activities is another important gateway for learning societies. Then students' reading habit not only creates their own ability, but also strengthens their knowledge-based community.

5.2 Learners' Character Socialized through Moral Content

In addition to language competence, moral education can be implemented to foster learners' character. The aim is to cultivate decent citizens of the future beforehand. This goal can be illustrated in the projects by Heartwood (1992), William et al. (2003), and Leming (2000). The first dealt with socializing students through literacy classes; the others focused on transforming students' characteristics to their future desirable character. In Heartwood's (1992) work, the elementary schoolers of the Heartwood Institute were implanted with morality through a multicultural, literature-oriented approach with reading-aloud activities. The students were introduced to seven desirable values—hope, love, courage, loyalty, respect, honesty, and

justice—with the goals of developing a value-ethics-morals system, understanding multicultural differences through morality, serving as cultural and ethical resources, and offering directions for children's common ethical principles. The approach apparently has favourable effects on the cognitive gains in all the six levels of learners, thus helpful in ELT practices in that moral education can be incorporated into language teaching effectively. In the project by William, Yanchar, Jensen, and Lewis (William et al. 2003), the moral principles informally integrated with high schoolers reveal positive gains in terms of the students' characters, including appreciation of respect, and teachers' attempts to implant responsibility in students' learning and future lives. The values focussed, such as respect, caring, empathy, love, and social interaction, are expected to shape the students' future so that they can become mentally and morally healthy adults in society. In the same vein, Leming (2000) used introspective approaches to the learners' lives in translating morality into learners' decision-making abilities in a middle-high school curriculum. Throughout a semester, the Building Decision Skills, a collaborative program between the Institute for Global Ethics' ethical decision-making curriculum and the community service program, aimed to teach ethical-conflict reasoning and develop students' awareness of ethics, in which some decision-making practices with essential values—right and wrong, truth and loyalty, and justice and mercy—were introduced into the discussions. All the projects are motivating examples for materials writers who are to transform classroom learning into a camp for students' lives, where the students can be trained to hold their ethical character at various educational levels. With young learners, the lessons could introduce some basic concepts of morality, such as love, courage, loyalty, respect, or honesty as these characteristics are primary principles for people living in any societies. In the learners with more maturity, some complex concepts, including caring, empathy, and social concerns, can be placed with more emphasis. After all, the learners socialized through such moral reasoning can serve their community more satisfactorily.

5.3 Moral Education Applied to Course Materials

Some appealing application of moral education is classroom materials used in ELT practices. This is in accordance with the view by Johnson and Reiman (2007) stating that religious and cultural principles implemented in classrooms can lead to moral judgments. The complementary use of language education and culturally moral inculcation appeared in Ghaith and Shaaban (1994), Shaaban (2005) and a work of mine (Thongrin 2012), in which all researchers tried to incorporate their students' cultural background into the materials written for their classroom contexts. Despite some different frameworks, these materials shared some commonality—demonstrating a combination of language learning and moral reasoning and thus serving students' needs in each socio-cultural context —where the first two focused on morality based on Muslim teaching, and the third life lessons through the Asian culture and the Buddhist lens, such as patience with a hard life, mercy to

mankind, positive reasoning and thinking, and more. The first two showed positive results in the students' learning, and the third exhibited positive gains revealed by the teachers who implemented or adapted the materials in their practice as the material offers hands-on activities from which students can learn language and life values, encouraging both language competence and student character development.

As has been discussed, the positive values instilled in the students' lives stand on the merits of moral education. In addition to learning knowledge and skills, the applications of moral education are expected to extend classrooms' walls. In this way, responsibilities of language teachers are not limited to language teaching. What materials writers can do with this is discussed in the following section.

6 Guidelines for Morality-Oriented Materials

How we write teaching materials should to some extent consider research applications, so practices can be justified soundly. A study by Sercu *et al*. (Sercu et al. 2005), exploring teachers' thinking and perceptions, beliefs and attitudes, and knowledge and professional development all in relation to becoming intercultural foreign language teachers, provides a comprehensive picture of the intercultural concept implemented by the teachers. The data derived from the researchers in seven European countries indicate that students are rarely developed to become intercultural speakers, and teachers may not be clear about intercultural communication perspectives and their application to ELT practices. Accordingly, simply transmitting cultural knowledge to students may not be sufficient as they could not hold skills and abilities essential for quality citizens. Also, it could be implied that in such learning contexts, some higher forms of thinking, such as critical, ethical reasoning, may rarely be introduced to learners properly. Such research findings suggest that students should be socialized through lessons or materials that enhance their critical, ethical reasoning. Then, how can these expectations be spelled out in ELT practices, and especially in materials writing? The findings derived from such research in moral education indicate that materials writers need some guidelines to consider when writing course materials or learning activities, where I proposed learning objectives, teaching methods, class activities, and learning assessment.

6.1 Learning Objectives: Moral Content-Language Intergration

How can materials writers help instill moral values in Asian learners through materials development? Integrating cultural values or moral education into class activities could socialize them to become world citizens. Particularly, learning objectives and language skills as the outcomes of teaching-learning processes are set prior to

the selections of moral issues and vice versa. Integrated skills and content-based instruction are facilitative in language instruction, as the goal of language education is to create not only language learners but also learners that hold knowledge of the world and thus serve Asian communities better. Accordingly, there are two pillars in learning objectives: (a) learning contents including morality and students' cultural identities and (b) language skills.

6.1.1 Learning Contents

Regarding learning contents, some researchers (e.g., Garcia 2005; Ilieva 2000; Murayama 2000; Ndura 2004; Shin, Eslami& Chen, Shin et al. 2011) suggest that ELT textbooks' cultural content should correspond to the cultural background of the students as the audience of those texts, and that students should be taught to be open to differences in behavior, expectations, and values of other cultural groups (Cortazzi and Jin 1999; Mughan 1999; Sercu et al. 2005). We can do so with the following:

- Consider a wide range of morality to be incorporated into such values of each culture, such as self-reliance and honesty in Muslim contexts, diligence and patience for Confucius learners, moderation and gratitude in Buddhist culture, and love and respect for those in Christianity settings.
- Many shared values in relation to peace, cultural appreciation, justice, caring, empathy, and the like are of use to learners in general cultural contexts.
- Consider choice of morality associated with students' cultural identities if the aim is to foster students' identities constructed through classroom practices.

With these, morality-oriented materials could include students' socio-cultural variables more satisfactorily.

6.1.2 Language Skills

As for language skills, we should aim for students' language competence as it is primary to ELT practices. Teachers and materials writers, while planning lessons or writing instructional materials, consider an language competence indicator, which embraces learning outcomes as well as moral and cultural contents discussed earlier. We can adopt or modify the learning objectives in the texts selected by considering communicative competence as originally stated in Canale and Swain (1980), the intercultural competence model by Byram (1997) or others, the model proposed by Risager (2007), or a combination of such models or any other applicable one. While the first model may not cover moral content representing learners' socio-cultural backgrounds due to its language emphasis, the second extends language learning boundaries to include students' cultural issues. The proportion between language and content in moral education and culture can be tailored to a particular group of audience for such materials. In the model by Risager (2007), materials writers can design the learning objectives with various central elements, which I

re-classify into four main purposes. The first five elements are related to language learning: structural linguistic competence; competence and resource in poetics; semantic and pragmatic competence and resource; competence in translation and interpretation; and competence in interpreting texts or discourse and media. The second group functions in critical awareness in languages and cultures, including knowledge of languages and critical language awareness and knowledge of cultures and society and critical cultural awareness. The third serving as learning skills includes competence and resource in linguistic identities and competence in using ethnographic methods. The last element is promising for students as the world citizens—competence in transnational cooperation. For more merits associated with learners' particular backgrounds, a combination of these perspectives could be explored, however. Teaching English during the state of flux with multiple perspectives, we should widen the road for students' learning. What we emphasize should be for their learning benefits.

6.2 Teaching Methods

In actual instruction, teaching methods will be another important factor to consider. The elements of local and global moral issues in different cultures can be brought into learning materials through content-based instruction, cultural studies, literature-based instruction, and humanistic language teaching with an emphasis on skills or resources such as reading texts, journal writing, and written or oral responses to simulations. For course materials emphasizing learning content, along with language skills, content-based and task-based instructions are more appropriate as a means of conveying morality in learning tasks, containing important aspects, such as task completion comparable to real-world activities, some communication problems to solve, and task assessment in terms of learning outcomes. These task characteristics allow materials writers to use morality issues in both local and global cultures as some input or core activities that encourage learners to be involved in learning activities for expected learning outcomes. The focus or the meaning of such activities can be drawn from moral education, and materials writers or teachers decide about morality and language skill as a means and an end, and vice versa. Two important points are planning morality content as a primary meaning, and assigning the learning of morality or language communication as a means or an end of activities.

6.3 Class Activities

To instill desirable moral values in students, we need class activities that encourage classroom interactions or collaborative learning, such as class discussion and question responses, outdoor investigations and writing projects, simulations and role

plays, brainstorming and community service projects, problem-solution exercises, and any exercises supporting critical reasoning. The cooperative learning that require students to fill language gaps also suits the nature of morality, which needs students to argue and seek ways for problem solving, and teachers are the key agents mediating any conflicting views. Then, materials writers, when designing materials with certain levels of control, can resort to Crookes and Chaudron's (1991) taxonomy of three-group techniques on the basis of levels of control.

- With those controlled techniques and applied to the morality-language integration, we can use warm-up through mimes, songs and play, reading aloud, content explanation, role-play demonstration, and dialogue/narrative presentation. These activities can be used at an early phase of instruction.
- As students are familiar with learning objectives, they can be introduced to those semi-controlled techniques. We may consider some practical activities, such as questions-answers, brainstorming, storytelling, cued narrative/dialogue, information transfer, and information exchange. These techniques are also helpful for characters constructed as students could be socialized through class interactions.
- We may challenge students using the techniques open to their creativity and response, such as problem solving and simulation, interviews and discussion, drama and role play, and composition and a propos. These are appropriate for learners in higher levels as they are mature enough to create spontaneous ideas for class activities and explore their interest while staying on task.

While teaching, teachers should bear in mind that one of the principles of instruction with morality-based content is to encourage both sides of arguments and respect students' voice. Together, the goals of lessons, possible input derived from morality or cultural content, teaching approaches and methods, roles of teachers and students, and possible learning assessment connect language mastery with morality and a learner character.

6.4 Learning Assessment

Assessment itself is a hard discipline and often problematic for teachers. In specialized materials with a combination of morality and language learning, materials writers need to help teachers assess students' learning outcomes decently and fairly. Through morality and language learning, students are normally taught to study, analyze, evaluate, and generalize what they have learned based on learning domains. Given this, the nature of learning assessment should reflect the nature of moral education integrated into language instruction so as to facilitate the students' learning process. At a macro level, the materials writers first of all need to understand three pairs of assessment constructs: informal-formal, formative-summative, and process-product (Brown 2001). The materials aiming to foster students to become decent world citizens through morality content and to become linguistically fluent

communicators are quite problematic in terms of assessment validity. For this reason, we need to prioritize the proportion of formal and informal assessment. The former may in the first place be lower than the latter that encourages students' learning processes, where their on-going improvement can be facilitated through the teacher's coaching, feedback, and consultation. The same applies to formative and summative assessment needing certain proportion with the former greater than the latter.

Then, what types of assessments are appropriate for learning tasks with morality-language integration? Traditional assessment? Alternative Assessment? These questions draw materials writers' and teachers' attention to specific types of assessments at a micro level. Morality-based lessons differ from general language ones in that the former are a combination of morality and language learning and thus constitutes the contents, critical thinking, ethical reasoning, and creativity as central to the lessons. With this in mind, materials writers should integrate the perspectives of alternative assessment (Thongrin 2012) by considering students' performance as a main entity of their learning outcomes. As such, interactive performance, performance-based assessment (when students are involved in hands-on projects), opened-ended problems, collaborative learning (e.g., project work or experiments), or learning portfolios should be taken into account. Teachers, through this kind of assessment, can observe how students learn, what kind of problems they encounter, how they feel while dealing with such problems, and what they have learned in each teaching/learning task. Such reflective questions encourage students' learning engagements as learning processes rather than final products. This means that we need to tailor assessment criteria that allocate students' knowledge and creative thinking, participation and interaction, learning involvement and responsibility in relation to the morality or values laden in such lessons, and the notion of language mastery proportionately.

To foster student autonomy, learning involvement and motivation, some of which influence students' learning, materials writers may integrate another form of alternative assessments, self-assessment, and peer assessment. In the assessment process, students are coached to evaluate themselves and peers, using some of these guiding questions:

- What have we/I learned in terms of the world, morality, and language?
- What benefits have we/I gained from the lesson?
- What caused us/me some feeling of discomfort?
- What could have helped us/me improve our/my knowledge and language skills more?

However, as learners may not feel familiar with this kind of assessment, the materials writers may incorporate this assessment type as a supplement to other types of assessment, so students are taught to liberate themselves gradually.

What I found helpful and practical is students' learning journals. In a study of mine (Thongrin 2009), I found that students could become more reflective and reveal their learning autonomy through learning journals, where they can reflect on what they have learned, not confining themselves with language and content but

going beyond these, and finally having critical minds toward themselves and their society. To use journals systematically, we may apply what Brown (2001, p. 418) suggests:

- Specify to students what the purpose of the journal is.
- Give clear directions to students on how to get started. Sometimes an abbreviated model journal helps.
- Give guidelines on length of each entry and any other format expectations.
- Collect journals on pre-announced dates and return them promptly.
- Be clear on the principal purpose of the journal and make sure [our] feedback speaks to that purpose.
- Help students to process [our] feedback, and show them how to respond to [our] responses.

The same guidelines with some adjustments can be used with leaning portfolios that show students' work and progress in learning topics. This type of assessment focuses on students' learning accomplishment, so students are guided in how to evaluate acceptable works to be included in the portfolios. Through their portfolios, students' learning improvement, and any character or cultural identities constructed could be observed or inferred. This kind of assessment is appropriate when we assess students' learning process, attitudes, and their characteristics constructed over time. To help students show their work systematically, we may provide some checklists that reflect learning objectives so what is taught and what is assessed are reciprocally echoed.

Alternatively, a combination of assessment can be used. Any self-reflective assessment that learners integrate into their learning journals and/or project-work papers as the product of their learning can be evaluated through self-assessment and peer assessment or teacher-student assessment. In this way, the students' learning process and product are well reflected. Accordingly, assessments of students' learning derived from morality-integrated materials should be flexible, so the students' language skills, moral knowledge, and ethical reasoning are fairly assessed.

7 Conclusion

Research in language education suggests that materials should carry students' representations of reality regardless of any learning contexts. As language learning is not values-free, how we write learning materials certainly influences learners' language mastery as well as their life skills and cultural identities. The functions of materials are pedagogically varied. Materials are teachers, learning kits, and identity-socializing resources. As we can see, materials do their jobs beyond what we may imagine. The same is true for ELT materials writers as we can do our jobs beyond the learners' language knowledge and skills. Language learners do not simply learn language; they are expected to take on many more roles in addition to their orthodox one. Learners in Asian countries should be encouraged to become decent

citizens of societies where language and culture, differences and respect, and morality and identities can be harmoniously complementary. To access such pathways, materials writers need to take into account some perspectives in terms of cultural representations, critical pedagogy, and moral education. As a result, textbooks, course materials, or lessons designed and developed with cultural contents—both local and global—are believed to enhance students' knowledge far beyond their immediate necessities.

With the guidelines the chapter has provided, ELT practices, through materials development, can take on this role, creating strong learners of desirable character—academically and ethically, and bringing Asian communities into a peacefully globalized world. Given that the guidelines are flexible for each purpose of the materials developed, materials writers can tailor any of the discussed points to suit the needs of their materials audience, which will vary from one socio-cultural context to another. Now, we accept that language teachers are one of the principal agents of learners' knowledge and morality, which could influence their lives later on. Here what Lawrence Kohlberg said a long time ago may be worth attention:

> Why are decisions based on universal principles of justice better decisions? Because they are decisions on which all moral people could agree.... Truly moral or just resolutions of conflicts require principles which are, or can be, universally applicable. (Kohlberg 1970, p. 1)

If this statement is true and recognized, then materials writers and teachers like us have many things to do.

Acknowledgements I would like to extend my gratitude to the reviewers for their insightful feedback and constructive comments. My chapter has also benefited from comments by Dr. Thomas Hoy to whom I am indebted.

References

Agar, M. (1994). *Language shock: Understanding the culture of conversation*. New York: William Marrow.

Alvarez, I. (2007). Foreign language education at the crossroads: Whose model of competence? *Language Culture and Curriculum, 20*, 126–139.

Apple, M. (1990). Series editor's introduction. In J. Willinsky (Ed.), *The new literacy: Reflecting reading and writing in the schools* (pp. ix–xiv). New York: Routledge.

Bell, J., & Gower, R. (1998). Writing course materials for the world: A great compromise. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 116–129). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brody, J. (2003). A linguistic anthropological perspective on language and culture in the second language curriculum. In D. Lange & R. M. Page (Eds.), *Culture as the core: Perspectives on culture in second language education* (pp. 37–52). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Brown, L. M., Depold, E., Tappan, M., & Gilligan, C. (1991). Reading narratives of conflict and choice for self and moral voices. A relational method. In W. M. Kurtiness & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development*, *Volume 2: Research* (pp. 25–61). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Buzzelli, C., & Johnston, B. (2001). Authority, power, and morality in classroom discourse. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 873–884.
Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Byram, M., et al. (1994). *Teaching-and-learning language-and-culture*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Canagarajah, A. S. (2007). Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*, 923–939.
Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*, 1–47.
Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1999). Cultural mirrors: Materials and methods in the EFL classroom. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 196–219). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for language: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge University Press. Online at http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/source/framework_en.pdf
Crookes, G., & Chaudron, C. (1991). Guidelines for classroom language teaching. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as second or foreign language* (2nd ed., pp. 56–66). New York: Newbury House.
Crozer, C., & Liddicoat, A. J. (2000). Teaching culture as an integrated part of language. In A. J. Liddicoat & C. Crozer (Eds.), *Teaching language, teaching culture* (pp. 1–18). Applied Linguistics Association of Australia, Melbourne: Language Australia.
Damon, W., & Killen, M. (1982). Peer interaction and the process of change in children's moral reasoning. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 28*, 347–367.
Dervin, F. (2012). Cultural identity, representation and othering. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 181–194). New York: Routledge.
Elias, M., Zins, J. E., Weissberg, R. P., Frey, K. S., Greenberg, M. T., Haynes, N. M., & Kassler, R. (Eds.). (1997). *Promoting social and emotional learning: A guide for educators*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: The Continuum Publishers.
Friedrich, P. (1989). Language, ideology, and political economy. *American Anthropologist, 91*, 295–312.
Garcia, M. (2005). International and intercultural issues in English teaching textbooks: The case of Spain. *Intercultural Education, 16*(1), 57–68.
Ghaith, G., & Shaaban, K. (1994). Peace education in the ESL/EFL classroom: A framework for curriculum and instruction. *TESL Reporter, 27*(2), 55–62.
Gilligan, C. (1971). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Giroux, H. (1981). *Ideology, culture and the process of schooling*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Giroux, H. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
Giroux, H. (2000). *Impure acts: The practical politics of cultural studies*. New York: Routledge.
Heartwood Institute. (1992). *An ethics curriculum for children*. Pittsburgh: The Heartwood Institute.
Howarth, A. (2006). Social representation is not a quiet thing: Exploring the critical potential of social representations theory. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 45*(1), 65–86.
Ilieva, R. (2000). Exploring culture in texts designed for use in adults ESL classrooms. *TESL Canada Journal*, 17(2), 50–63. Online at http://www.tesl.ca/Secondary_Navigation/TESL_Canada_Journal.htm
Johnson, L. E., & Reiman, A. J. (2007). Beginning teacher disposition: Examining the moral/ethical domain. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*, 676–687.
Johnston, B., Juhasz, A., Marken, J., & Ruiz, B. R. (1998). The ESL teacher as a moral agent. *Research in the Teaching of English, 32*(2), 161–181.

Jolly, D., & Bolitho, R. (1998). A framework for materials writing. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 90–115). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kohlberg, L. (1963). The development of children's orientations toward a moral order: I. Sequence in the development of moral thought. *Human Development, 6*, 11–33.
Kohlberg, L. (1970). *Moral education for a society in moral transition*. Online at http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_197510_kohlberg.pdf
Kohlberg, L. (1975). The cognitive developmental approach to moral education. *Phi Delta Kappa, 56*, 670–677.
Leming, J. S. (2000). Tell me a story: An evaluation of a literature-based character educational program. *Journal of Moral Education, 29*, 413–427.
Lickona, T. (1997). Educating for character: A comprehensive approach. In A. Molnar (Ed.), *The construction of children's character* (pp. 45–62). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Lipe, D. (2004). *A critical analysis of values clarification*. Online at http://www.apologeticspress.org/rr/reprints/critical-analysis-of-values-cla.pdf
Lipman, M. (1987). Ethical reasoning and the craft of moral practice. *Journal of Moral Education, 16*, 139–147.
Mahony, P. (2009). Should 'ought' be taught? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*, 983–989.
Mangubhai, F. (2007). The moral and ethical dimensions of language teaching. *Australian Journal of Education, 51*, 178–189.
Mashishi, N. G. (1999). *A critical analysis of the values clarification approach regarding moral values in the South African school context*. Online at http://hdl.handle.net/10210/7384
Matsuda, A., & Friedrich, P. (2011). English as an international language: A curriculum blueprint. *World Englishes, 30*, 332–344.
McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (2003). *Materials and methods in ELT: A teacher's guide*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
McKay, S. L., & Bokhorst-Heng, W. D. (2008). *International English and its sociolinguistic contexts: Toward a socially sensitive EIL pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.
Moscovici, S. (1961). *La Psychanalyse, son image, son public*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de rance.
Mughan, T. (1999). Intercultural competence for language students in higher education. *Language Learning Journal, 20*, 59–65.
Murayama, Y. (2000). *The promotion of intercultural understanding in English language teaching: An analysis of textbooks and teacher training courses for upper secondary schools in Japan*. Unpublished MA thesis, the University of York.
Ndura, E. (2004). ESL and cultural bias: An analysis of elementary through high school textbooks in the western United States of America. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 17*(2), 143–153.
Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Nucci, L., & Weber, E. (1991). The domain approach to values education: From theory to practice. In W. Kurtines & J. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development, Applications* (Vol. 3, pp. 251–266). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Oser, F. (1986). Moral education and values education: The discourse perspective. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 917–941). New York: Macmillan.
Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. Essex: ongman.
Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Power, C. F., Higgins, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1989). *Lawrence Kohlberg's approach to moral education*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Risager, K. (1998). Language teaching and the process of European integration. In M. Byram & M. Flemming (Eds.), *Language learning in intercultural perspective: Approaches through drama and ethnography* (pp. 242–254). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Risager, K. (2007). *Language and culture pedagogy: From a national to a transnational paradigm*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Risager, K. (2012). Linguaculture and transnationality: The cultural dimensions of language. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 101–115). Routledge: New York.
Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Saraceni, M. (2009). Relocating English: Toward a new paradigm for English in the world. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 9*, 175–186.
Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (1995). *Intercultural communication*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*, 133–158.
Seidlhofer, B. (2003). *A concept of international English and related issues: From 'real English' to 'realistic English*.' Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Online at http://coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/source/seidlhoferen.pdf
Sercu, L., Bandura, E., Castro, P., Davcheva, L., Laskaridou, C., Lundgren, U., Mendez Garcia, M., & Ryan, P. (2005). *Foreign language teachers and intercultural competence: An international investigation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Shaaban, K. (2005). A proposed framework for incorporating moral education into the ESL/EFL classroom. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 18*, 201–217.
Sharifian, F. (2009). *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Sheldon, L. E. (1988). Evaluation of ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT Journal, 42*, 237–246.
Shin, J., Eslami, Z. R., & Chen, W. C. (2011). Presentation of local and international culture in current international English-language teaching textbooks. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 24*, 253–268.
Sockett, H., & LePage, P. (2002). The missing language of the classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 18*, 159–171.
Sung, K. (2012). Critical practices in ASIA: A project of possibilities in the era of world Englishes. In Sung & R. Pederson (Eds.), *Critical ELT practices in Asia: Key issues, practices, and possibilities* (pp. 23–54). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
Thongrin, S. (2009). Collaboration for liberation: Using TIMET to enhance EFL Student's writing skills. *Journal of English Studies, 4*, 31–94.
Thongrin, S. (2012). EFL writing instruction. In A. Wiriyajitra (Ed.), *Looking back, looking forward: English instruction* (pp. 139–177). Bangkok: DK today.
Tomlinson, B. (2003). Developing principled frameworks for materials development. In *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 107–129). Longman: Continuum.
Tomlinson, B. (2005). The future for ELT materials in Asia. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 2*, 5–13. Online at http://eflt.nus.edu.sg/v2n22005/tomlinson.htm.
Vygotsky, L. S. (1977). The history of the development of higher mental functions. In *The collected works of L. S. Vyskotsky* (Vol. 4). New York: Plenum.
Walker, L. J., Pitts, R. C., Hennig, K. H., & Matsuba, M. K. (1995). Reasoning about morality and real-life moral problems. In M. Killen & D. Hart (Eds.), *Morality in everyday life developmental perspectives* (pp. 371–407). New York: Cambridge University Press.
William, D., Yanchar, S., Jensen, L., & Lewis, C. (2003). Character education in a public high school: A multi-year inquiry into unified studies. *Journal of Moral Education, 32*(1), 3–33.
Younnis, J. (1880). *Parents and peers in social development*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Saneh Thongrin a faculty member of Thammasat University, Thailand, has published research articles on critical pedagogy and ESL/EFL writing instruction, language, culture and identity, writing for publication, and World Englishes. Saneh gives talks as a featured Asian guest scholar at international conferences. She also reviews ESL/EFL classroom materials for international publishers. Her scholarly work was awarded by the National Research Council of Thailand (2011, 2012). Nominated for the Distinguished Teacher Award, Thammasat University, she was Honorary Teacher in humanities (2013).