UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM | THE JUBILEE CENTRE FOR CHARACTER & VIRTUES

Locating "Leadership" in Singapore's Character and Citizenship Education

Jasmine B.-Y. Sim

This is an unpublished conference paper for the 12th Annual Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues conference at Oriel & Magdalene Colleges, Oxford University, Thursday 4th – Saturday 6th January 2024.

Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues

University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TT United Kingdom

T: +44 (0) 121 414 3602 F: +44 (0) 121 414 4875

E: jubileecentre@contacts.bham.ac.uk W: www.jubileecentre.ac.uk

Locating "Leadership" in Singapore's Character and Citizenship Education

Jasmine B.-Y. Sim
jasmine.sim@nie.edu.sg
National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
Philip H.-H. Tham
Columbia University

Abstract

There is an increasing expectation for leaders to possess virtuous character in light of the complex and ambiguous operating environment that contemporary society finds itself in. This expectation is observable in the Singaporean political context, and is reflected in the intimate connection between leadership and character in student leadership development programmes designed by *individual* educational institutions in Singapore. Though such programmes aiming to inculcate virtuous leadership anchor themselves to *national-level* policy documents published by the Ministry of Education like the Character and Citizenship Education (CCE) syllabus, there is no explicit link between character development and leadership in these documents. This paper thus attempts to pinpoint the elusive concept of "leadership" within the CCE syllabus to engender coherence between schools' curricular design and larger educational policy. We argue that "leadership" in CCE is present on two levels. One, leadership concepts are used instrumentally as part of CCE's pedagogical structure to develop virtuous character. Two, from a neo-Aristotelian virtue ethical perspective, the development of virtuous leadership can also be interpreted to be a teleological goal of the CCE curriculum. Character and leadership are therefore reflexively and dialogically developed in CCE, with leadership experiences feeding into character development and vice versa.

Introduction

Recent events such as the Covid-19 pandemic bear testament to the volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous times that we live in. Technological advancements further create avenues for previously unthinkable situations to arise. In this context, present and future leaders will inevitably face a greater multiplicity of complex moral quandaries to parse. Consequently, there is an increasing expectation that leaders possess sound morals and virtuous character to make desirable decisions in such circumstances. In the Singaporean context, such expectations perhaps most prominently emanate from the political elite, with Deputy Prime Minister Lawrence Wong precising in 2023 that character is the "first prerequisite of leadership" (Prime Minister's Officer, 2023).

This intimate connection between leadership and character can clearly be seen in (student) leadership development programmes in individual educational institutions in Singapore (see BPGHS, 2023; NUS High School, 2023). Such programmes make reference to a litany of public-facing policy and curriculum documents published by the Ministry of Education, such as the Desired Outcomes of Education, 21st Century Competencies (21CC) and the syllabus of Character and Citizenship Education (CCE) — the latest iteration of values education — to anchor their leadership programmes amongst the Ministry's wider education policy. Yet a closer inspection of this suite of Ministry documents surprisingly reveals no explicit reference to leadership. Rather, they mention only broader concepts of morality and character development (see MOE, 2022; MOE SDCD, 2014, 2021). Evidently, a more explicit bridge between the Ministry's broader aims of moral and character development, and educational institutions' specific thrusts of leadership development needs to be articulated to engender more coherence between schools' curricular design and larger educational policy.

In this vein, this paper attempts to locate the concept of "leadership" within the syllabus documents of Singapore's CCE, which acts as the primary vehicle through which institutionalised character and moral education takes place (Neoh, 2017; Sim & Tham, 2023). We argue that "leadership" in CCE can be found on two levels. One, leadership concepts serve an instrumental function, being part-and-parcel of CCE's pedagogical structure to the end of cultivating good character, resilience and social emotional wellbeing, future-readiness and active citizenship (MOE SDCD, 2021). On one hand, teachers are expected to exhibit leadership by functioning as moral educators, authorities and exemplar role models for students in loco parentis. On the other hand,

Student Leadership Development (SLD) programmes are also part of a larger toolkit of pedagogical methods under the experiential learning approach used to effectively achieve CCE's goals.

Two, the development of virtuous leadership can also be interpreted to be one teleological goal of CCE. From a neo-Aristotelian virtue ethical perspective, the CCE pedagogical toolkit encompasses both the processes of habituation and phronetic rationalisation necessary to cultivate true virtue and moral character. CCE is then overlain with school-specific leadership programmes that focus on morally-neutral performance virtues to develop values-driven, virtuous leadership. Within the framework of CCE then, character and leadership are therefore reflexively and dialogically developed, with leadership experiences feeding into character development and vice versa.

Instrumental role of leadership in CCE pedagogy

Teachers as virtuous leaders

Virtuous leadership refers to the "act of guiding others towards a common goal or good" towards morally good ends (González, Espinosa & Ortiz de Montellano, 2023, p3). Virtuous leaders, then, are individuals that engage in virtuous leadership, with their situationally-appropriate expressions of virtue being worthy of emulation (Hackett & Wang, 2012; Wang & Hackett, 2016). Within the context of character education — any school-instituted programme designed to influence the moral character of individuals by developing desirable traits for some positive aim (Sim & Tham, 2023) — teachers can be interpreted to be virtuous leaders as they guide students towards the morally good end of developing virtuous moral character.

To understand how teachers exemplify virtuous leadership in guiding students' character development, the means through which students' acquire virtue must first be deciphered. Students acquire virtue through three channels — character and virtue can be caught, taught and sought (Jubilee Centre, 2022). First, students can "catch" virtues from the school community of both staff and pupils through peer culture (Lickona, 1997). Second, virtue can be taught to students through direct or indirect methods, with explicit moral instruction and moral discipline being examples of the former while the prioritisation of democratic and cooperative procedures in classroom settings are examples of the latter (Arthur, 2002). Last, if appropriate educational opportunities are

provided for, “character caught and taught can develop together, leading to character sought” (Jubilee Centre, 2022, p. 8), with pupils then being intrinsically motivated to develop their own character.

Teachers, then, act as the primary vector through which virtues are “caught” by and “taught” to students within the frame of character education. Lickona (1997) places the teacher at the centre of his model of classroom character education, identifying them as the agents who animate key elements of the character education curriculum such as the imparting of moral knowledge (such as the “conscience of craft”, the notion that it is morally good to perform one’s duty well and not in a slovenly manner) and the development of skills (such as “ethical reflection”). Teachers do so by playing three roles *in loco parentis*. First, they act as effective caregivers, caring for students’ well-being and helping them to succeed at the work of school. Second, they function as moral models whom students’ can emulate and, in the process, gain virtuous traits. Last, they serve as ethical mentors giving moral instruction and guidance to students to encourage positive moral development. Importantly, these three roles of the teacher are rarely exercised separately. Rather, they are often intertwined and mutually reinforce each other. For instance, a teacher can be a moral model and source of emulation by demonstrating the virtues of compassion and justice in their caregiving capacity by looking out for students’ well-being.

In this manner, teachers are virtuous leaders in character education. Towards the goal of developing within students a virtuous character, teachers themselves exemplify the virtues “to a pronounced degree” and “serve as a lively reminder” of exemplar virtues. To Hackett and Wang (2012) and Wang and Hackett (2016), this display of situationally-appropriate expression of virtue that is worthy of emulation would already qualify teachers as virtuous leaders. But on a deeper level, teachers further guide students beyond the mere imitation or display of habituated virtue towards the development of true virtue. As opposed to habituated virtue developed through external stimuli and repeated action, true virtue requires an element of *phronesis*, i.e. the human excellence of judgement (Curren, 2016). Kristjánsson (2006; 2013; 2015) suggests that such virtue comprises affective (emotion), conative (motivational or intentional), cognitive (rational) and behavioural components. In other words, an individual’s virtuous behaviour or conduct must be undergirded by virtuous emotional impulsions, conative motivations and cognitive rationalisations to be considered a truly virtuous person. Through ethical mentoring, instruction and guidance,

teachers thus guide moral learners towards the attainment of this true virtue, fulfilling the aforementioned definition of virtuous leadership.

A recognition that values are both caught and taught is reflected in the CCE curriculum, with the 2014 and 2021 syllabi documents therefore including explicit exhortations to teachers to be role models to ensure that CCE effectively achieves its stated goals Indeed, one of the foundational philosophies of the curriculum is the fundamental role of teachers, whose "conviction and commitment to be role models influence the effectiveness of school efforts for the development of character…in our students" (MOE SDCD, 2021, p. 4). Consequently, the syllabi documents call on teachers "to be aware of the positive or negative impact they can have on young minds" and "consciously try to be good role models" (MOE SDCD, 2021, p. 18). Above and beyond role modelling, teachers are called to "create learning opportunities to shape and instil in every student the core values", bringing to mind Lickona's (1997) characterisation of the teacher as an ethical mentor guiding a students' character development.

Of note, the CCE syllabi documents carry the implication that all teachers, not just CCE teachers, must exemplify virtuous leadership at all times, particularly when in contact with students. Specifically, the first Guiding Principle for Teaching and Learning in the 2014 CCE syllabus is that "every teacher [is] a CCE teacher" tasked to "role model and create learning opportunities" to influence character development (MOE SDCD, 2014, p. 9). To this end, the Ministry has placed an increased focus on the professional development of teachers such that "every teacher is better equipped to be a more effective teacher of CCE" (MOE, 2020). On a theoretical level, it is easily acceptable why all teachers should be held to this high standard of role model and ethical mentor. However, is it even possible for teachers to actually *be* virtuous *all* the time? Would asking mathematics teachers to constantly be on the look-out for "teachable moments" and experiential opportunities for character development in addition to marking homework, teaching classes and dealing with administration be too heavy a burden? Evidently, the question of feasibility remains moot.

Student Leadership Development (SLD) programmes as part of CCE pedagogy

Another manner through which the concept of "leadership" is used instrumentally to attain the outcomes of the CCE curriculum is through the inclusion of Student Leadership Development (SLD) programmes in the curriculum's pedagogical toolkit. Specifically, an SLD can be the appointment of a student to a leadership position such as a class monitor, a prefect or a team leader in a group project. These SLD programmes are categorised as key Student Development Experiences (SDEs), which are "learning platforms where CCE is enacted with intentionality" that include other experiences like Co-Curricular Activities (CCA) and Cohort Learning Journeys (LJs) (MOE SDCD, 2021, p. 14). Through the experience of participating in SLDs, students are expected to develop virtuous character traits such as compassion, empathy, respect and conscience of craft.

One can turn to character education philosophers to provide a solid theoretical framework to explain the importance of, and the mechanism through which experiences facilitate the development of character. Arthur (2002, p. 31) points out that there seems to be a consensus emerging in the field that virtue "must be practised and not merely taught". Rather than being solely built through "moralistic utterances" and explicit instruction, character is developed through a holistic approach encompassing the crucial processes of thinking, feeling and acting (Ryan & Lickona, 1987). By providing appropriate experiences, students are exposed to situations that elicit emotional responses, prompting them to engage in cognitive processes to think about what to do and then to act on their decision. In the process, the student is given an opportunity to practise virtuous traits that had previously been caught and taught. Further, the student also derives moral beliefs about how to act under what circumstances through ethical reflection (Curren, 2010), subsequently shaping their character. When coupled with the guidance provided by the teacher's virtuous leadership as a source of emulation and ethical tutelage, the student thus develops virtue.

In particular, neo-Aristotelian virtue ethics, a specific approach to character education that is experiencing an increase in popularity relative to other approaches of the 20th century (Walker, Roberts, & Kristjánsson, 2015), places a strong emphasis on the role of experiences in the development of virtuous character. Indeed, Aristotle himself can be interpreted to argue that character development is "primarily about *practising* right behaviour" (Arthur, 2002, p. 30, emphasis added), while contemporary proponents such as Curren (2010) highlight the importance of undergoing experiences to grasp the moral "facts" that are the starting points of ethical inquiry and moral growth.

Pupil leadership experiences are particularly effective at developing virtuous traits. A survey conducted by the Jubilee Centre (2022) surveying character education leaders bears testament to this. Participants were asked to first identify what kind of character development focused enrichment programmes their schools offered, and then evaluate their impact. Based on the survey, pupil leadership programmes were the overall most used character education enrichment activity across primary and secondary schools surveyed. Notably, these pupil leadership programmes were also perceived to be among the most impactful experiences for students' character development. In primary schools, the programme had a mean perceived impact score of 4.67 of 5, making it the second most highly rated activity after residential trips, which only scored marginally higher at 4.69. In secondary schools, it was the highest rated programme, receiving an impact score of 4.60 of 5. The Centre theorised that leadership programmes were particularly beneficial to character development since they served as avenues through which students could role model good character to their peers (p. 24).

Admittedly, the public-facing CCE syllabi documents do not provide much detail on SLDs, briefly mentioning them on only two occasions. One, they are listed as an important example of SDEs, which are one of the main avenues through which CCE is enacted. The syllabi documents further specify that each SDE (presumably also including SLDs) includes its own CCE Learning Outcomes, with experiences being tailored to allow for the "intentional application of values, social-emotional and civic competencies" (MOE SDCD, 2021, p. 15). Two, SLDs are also mentioned with respect to the type of character development that the CCE curriculum envisions it to foster. Specifically, through SLDs, students are meant to develop their "self-awareness and self-management" and thereby hone their inter- and intra- personal skills as they "find a sense of purpose in becoming the best versions of themselves" (MOE SDCD, 2021, p. 28). Parsing through these oblique statements, perhaps it can be surmised that SLDs and, more generally, student leadership, are only worthwhile in the context of the CCE syllabus insofar as they lead to self management skills and develop character.

Virtuous leadership as a teleological goal of CCE

Apart from serving an instrumental function as part of the pedagogical toolkit of character education, the cultivation of virtuous leadership can alternatively be interpreted to be a hidden teleological goal of CCE. Such a goal is implicit, only revealing itself when both the CCE syllabus and school-specific leadership development programme policies are read in conjunction with each other. Indeed, CCE syllabi remain silent on (virtuous) leadership development, only explicitly enumerating four goals of the curriculum: the cultivation of good character, resilience and social emotional wellbeing, future-readiness and active citizenship. Yet leadership development programmes by individual educational institutions treat the values education provided by CCE to be the basis upon which leadership is later developed. In this vein, CCE's teleological outcome is then to equip students with a sound moral compass to guide their actions and leadership competencies towards virtuous ends, or in other words, to cultivate virtuous leadership. The following section outlines in more detail how character, its education and CCE can be interpreted complementarily with leadership and its education such that a clearer link between CCE and virtuous leadership can be elucidated.

Relationship between character and leadership, and their educations

Character refers to a "pattern of thinking which leads to acts that persist through time and that characterise or define a person" across different changing circumstances. Moral character refers to the more restrictive "sub-set of personality traits that are morally evaluable and considered to provide persons with moral worth" (Kristjásson, 2013), or in other words, the "manifestation of certain personality traits called virtues that dispose one to habitual courses of action" (Lapsley & Navraez, 2006, p. 250). Character education is occupied with the development of moral character and has been defined as any school-instituted programme designed to holistically influence the moral character of individuals by developing desirable traits for some positive aim (Sim & Tham, 2023).

In the neo-Aristotelian virtue ethicist tradition, character education focuses on developing virtues in students. Virtues are complex character traits that dispose a person to feel and or act in a certain morally right way in the right circumstances towards the right people — a measured way that hits the golden mean in each case between the respective extremes of deficiency and excess (Kristjánsson, 2006). It is composed of three parts: moral knowledge, moral feeling and moral

behaviour (Lickona, 1997). In this sense, a virtuous act is an one in which the faculties of intellect, will and affection are exercised, wherein the will performs the action the intellect proposes based on an affective desire to achieve an apparently good object (Gonzalez *et al*, 2023, p. 5). According to Aristotle, this "apparently good object" is the attainment of the highest human good of eudaimonia or human flourishing, a multifaceted concept that articulates the four fundamental human purposes of achieving growth and realising potential, finding authenticity, discovering meaning and attaining excellence (Crane, 2022).

Conversely, leadership is the "act of guiding others towards a common goal" (Gonzalez *et al*, 2023, p. 3). At its root, the core components of leadership are that it is fundamentally (i) relational, ie that it is exercised between to or more people, (ii) intentional, ie that it is deliberately directed towards some goal as opposed to a spontaneous act, and (iii) an action (Bush, 2008; Hallinger, 2010; Leithwood & Riehl, 2005). This then means that leadership has a focus on outwardly observable action of leading in and of itself, though that is not to negate the cognitive component of intentionality in leadership. In viewing leadership as an outwardly observable action, leadership can be argued to be an Aristotelian techne, a practice or skill akin to carpentry in the sense that both have tangible effects on the material world, serving an instrumental purpose (Kristjánsson, 2013). Because leadership is viewed instrumentally as a tool to achieve an end, emphasis is placed on the effectiveness of leadership and the efficient conduct of a leadership task. It is thus unsurprising that leadership education has historically focused on the development of competencies (rather than virtues for example) to hone the techne of effective leadership (Gonzalez *et al*, 2023).

Here, a distinction must be drawn between competencies that support the techne of leadership and moral virtues that undergird virtuous character. Moral virtue places an emphasis on intention and orientation towards "the good". Conversely, competency education somewhat overlooks intention, focusing instead on the efficient conduct of specific tasks from a mechanistic viewpoint (Gonzalez *et al*., 2023). Competencies are more in line with what Lickona and Davidson (2005) call performance "virtues" — morally neutral mechanisms to move individuals towards particular (moral/immoral ends). Indeed, the Jubilee Centre (2022) classifies "leadership" as a performance "virtue" rather than a moral one. Similarly, the core competencies targeted in the popular Leadership Challenge Model (Koue & Posner, 2012) focus on competencies such as being inspirational to followers ("Inspire a Shared Vision") and fostering collaboration and trust

("Enable Others to Act") rather than any exhortation to lead towards a morally good end. All this is not to say that leadership and competency education place absolutely no weightage on intention, but rather that the "motivational component of a virtue defines it more than its external effectiveness, whereas the opposite is true for competencies or practical skills" (Zagzebski, 1996).

The concept of virtuous leadership has been used to bridge the gap between character, with its emphasis on virtue and intention, and leadership, with its focus on competencies and effectiveness. Virtuous leadership, as alluded to in the earlier discussion on the leadership role of teachers as moral models, refers to the "act of guiding others towards a common goal or good" and, more specifically, leadership as exercised and oriented towards morally good ends (Gonzalez, 2023), inspiring others to emulate the virtuous leader. In this sense, virtuous leadership requires both virtue and competencies, necessitating the agent to act in a way that is both morally and technically good. Virtuous leadership, then, might be better understood as a personal competency — a "dynamic set of knowledge (knowing), abilities or skills (knowing how to do), attitudes and values (knowing how to be) that, internalised and embodied in our actions, behaviours, or ways of doing things, take us on the path of our own maturity, excellence, fullness and happiness" (Crespí, 2019, p. 98). Characterising virtuous leadership as such thus links the concept of intrapersonal and interpersonal generic competencies with a moral component that is oriented towards the virtuous ends and the flourishing of an individual (Gonzalez, 2023). In this frame, virtues give vigour and meaning to leadership competencies, while leadership education must lead to reflection and the seeking of a moral good rather than building up competence in different performance "virtues".

Situating "leadership" in the CCE syllabus

Although no reference to leadership as a goal is explicitly made in the CCE syllabi documents of 2014 and 2021, the hidden relationship between character education and leadership development in the Singapore context seems to hew closely to the "virtuous leadership" model, wherein good leadership is that which is oriented towards morally good ends, and virtuous character is supposed to animate leadership competencies. Accordingly, virtuous character nurtured through CCE is the basis upon which leadership programmes that introduce morally-neutral performance "virtues" are later overlain. Note, however, that we do not characterise Singaporean school-based leadership programmes as programmes that only teach morally-neutral competencies. Such programmes do indeed retain a strong focus on values and virtues. We merely

draw attention to the fact that leadership competencies are first introduced to students in leadership programmes while virtues have already been cultivated in students from the CCE curriculum.

The relationship between CCE and leadership is perhaps most clearly distilled in the leadership development programme policy of St Hilda's Secondary School, a government-run secondary school in Singapore. The policy states that "baseline training is provided for all pupils, by the level, through CCE lessons that focus on values-driven leadership as well as to equip them with the necessary social emotional competencies to lead others" (St Hilda's Secondary School, 2023). From this "baseline training", the school then adds its leadership development programme based on the Leadership Challenge Model that focuses on cultivating leadership competencies, as previously elaborated.

Bukit Panjang Government High School (BPGHS), a government autonomous secondary school, takes a similar view, noting that "leadership is values-driven" and that "CCE plays an integral role in fulfilling the school's mission to nurture our students to be future leaders who have the strength of character and are willing to lead and serve" (BPGHS, 2023). On top of this foundation, the school then develops its Student Leadership Development Framework is based on three components: (i) self leadership, the awareness of one's own strengths and rootedness in sound values; (ii) team leadership, the ability to work collaboratively; and (iii) thought leadership, the ability to envision a future, inspire and mobilise others.

The NUS High School of Math and Sciences, a specialised independent high school, sees the link between character education through CCE and leadership development in the same light, albeit less explicitly. It classifies CCE lessons as an activity leading to the development of a "Leading Self" that has "sound character as a foundation". It is from this basis that the student progresses along his leadership journey by "Shaping Futures" and "making a difference to the community" in various leadership positions such as the Students' Council.

Based on these statements, it can be clearly surmised that, at least to educational institutions, CCE provides the basic moral framework upon which leadership competencies are then overlain to produce values-driven, virtuous leadership. In this vein, CCE's teleological outcome is then to equip students with a sound moral compass to guide their actions and leadership competencies towards virtuous ends, or in other words, to cultivate virtuous leadership. While such a conclusion can easily be drawn from a survey of school-based leadership development programmes, the 2014 and 2021 CCE syllabi documents remain silent on the link between

character and leadership, creating a sense of disjointedness between the Ministry's larger education policy and individual schools' interests. Perhaps the adoption of the language of virtuous leadership and personal competencies could be considered to make a more apparent link between CCE and leadership development in the CCE syllabi.

Implications and concluding remarks

In the Singapore context, as we have shown above, character and leadership are reflexively and dialogically developed within students, though this relationship between the two is not made particularly explicit in the CCE curriculum. Basic leadership experiences, termed SLDs, are an integral part of CCE's pedagogical toolkit, with empirical evidence proving that pupil leadership programmes are one of the most effective methods of developing character within students. The firm foundation of virtuous character cultivated by CCE is then complemented with the morally neutral performance "virtues" of leadership competencies taught to students in school-specific leadership programmes to develop virtuous leadership. These leadership experiences further reinforce positive character trait development, once again serving CCE's goal of cultivating good character. This reflexive redevelopment of character and leadership within the context of CCE and leadership programmes is mediated under the guidance of the teacher as the virtuous leader who guides the student through character and leadership development.

Bearing the interconnectedness of character education embodied in the CCE curriculum and leadership education, one might be remiss not to ask what, then, is the utility of separating the two curricula. To this, we hold that there is still value in separating the curricula for two reasons. One, the content and focus of CCE and leadership development programmes are distinct. CCE, and character education more generally, focuses on virtues and morality, whereas leadership education emphasises competencies (though that is not to say that leadership education as a whole is morally neutral). Zagzabski (1996) puts it best when he posits that the "motivational component of a virtue defines it more than its external effectiveness, whereas the opposite is true for competencies". Two, there is a teleological reason for separating the two curricula. While CCE aims to develop all students into moral people with good character, it is debatable as to whether the Ministry aims to mould all students into leaders. In other words, while CCE is a curriculum that is meant to be taught to all students, formalised leadership programmes independently conceptualised and implemented by educational institutions are targeted towards selected groups

of students who have been identified with leadership potential. After all, if everyone is a leader, who follows?

Yet, just because the two curricula should be taught separately does not mean that they need to be completely *autonomous* from each other. Links between the curriculum and syllabi of CCE and school-specific leadership programmes should be present to ensure that character and leadership development are coherent with each other. In other words, cases wherein CCE classes teach compassion, justice and respect while leadership programmes focus on overly calculative and pragmatic leadership should be avoided. On the side of schools, the connection to the CCE curriculum is already present, with school websites touting the CCE curriculum as the basis of their leadership programmes. However, the connection between character and leadership development remains undefined in the public-facing CCE documents published by the Ministry. Perhaps explicit reference to the concept of virtuous or values-driven leadership can be made to bridge the gap between the two concepts and make evident the connection between the two concepts. Otherwise, we run the real risk of students' character and leadership being developed in silos, disjointed from each other.

References

Arthur, J. (2002). *Education with character: The moral economy of schooling.* London: Routledge.

Bukit Panjang Government High School (BPGHS) (2023). Student Leadership Development. In *CCE*. Retrieved June 28, 2023, from https://www.bpghs.moe.edu.sg/cce/student-leadership-development/.

Bush, T. (2008) *Leadership and management development in education.* SAGE Publications.

Crane, B. (2022). Eudaimonia in Crisis: How Ethical Purpose Finding Transforms Crisis. *Humanistic Management Journal* 7, 391-416.

Crespí, P. (2019). La necesidad de una formación en competencias personales transversales en la universidad. *Diseño y evaluación de un programa de formación*. Fundación Universitaria Española.

Curren, R. (2010). Aristotle's educational politics and the Aristotelian renaissance in philosophy of education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 36(5), 534-559.

Curren, R. (2016). Aristotelian versus virtue ethical character education. *Journal of Moral Education* 45(4), 516-526.

González, J. L., Espinosa, V. F., & Ortiz de Montellano, S. (2023). A virtue-based model of leadership education. *Journal of Moral Education*. DOI: 10.1080/03057240.2023.2218058.

Hackett, R. D., & Wang, G. (2012). Virtues and leadership: An integrating conceptual framework founded in Aristotelian and Confucian perspectives on virtues. *Management Decision*, 50(5), 868 - 899.

Hallinger, P. (2010). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125-142.

Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues (2022). The Jubilee Centre character framework for character education in schools (3rd Ed.). Retrieved from The Jubilee Centre Framework for Character Education in Schools - 2022.

Kouze, J. M, & Posner, B. (2012). *The Leadership Challenge: How to make extraordinary things happen in organisations*. John Wiley & Sons.

Kristjánsson, K. (2006). Emulation and the use of role models in moral education. *Journal of Moral Education*, 25(1). DOI: 10.1080/03057240500495278.

Kristjánsson, K. (2013). Ten Myths About Character, Virtue and Virtue Education – Plus Three Well-Founded Misgivings, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 61(3), 269-287.
Kristjánsson, K. (2015) *Aristotelian character education*. London: Routledge.
Lapsley, D. K., & Narvaez, D. (2006). Character Education. In K. A. Renninger, I. E. Sigel, W. Damon, & R. M. Lerner (eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Child psychology in practice* (John Wiley & Sons), 248-296.
Leithwood, K. A., & Riehl, C. (2005)> What do we already know about educational leadership? In W. A. Firestone & C. Riehl (Eds.), *A new agenda for research in educational leadership* (pp. 12-27). Teachers College Press.
Lickona, T. (1997). The Teacher's Role in Character Education. *Journal of Education*, 179(2). DOI: 10.1177/00220574971790020.
Lickona, T. & Davidson, M. (2005) *Smart and good high schools* (Cortland, NY, Center for the 4th and 5th Rs).
Ministry of Education (2014). 2014 Syllabus, Character and Citizenship Education, Secondary. Retrieved from https://www.moe.gov.sg/-/media/files/programmes/2014-character-citizenship-education-secondary.pdf.
Ministry of Education (2021). 2021 Syllabus, Character and Citizenship Education, Secondary. Retrieved from https://www.moe.gov.sg/-/media/files/secondary/syllabuses/cce/2021-character-and-citizenship-education-syllabus-secondary.pdf.
Ministry of Education (2022). 21st Century Competencies. In *Education in Sg*. Retrieved June 28, 2023, from https://www.moe.gov.sg/education-in-sg/21st-century-competencies.
Ministry of Education (2022). Desired Outcomes of Education. In *Education in Sg*. Retrieved June 28, 2023, from https://www.moe.gov.sg/education-in-sg/desired-outcomes.
Neoh, J. Y. (2017). Neoliberal Education? Comparing Character and Citizenship Education in Singapore and Civic and Citizenship Education in Australia. *Journal of Social Science Education*, 16(3), 29-39.
NUS High School of Math and Science (2023). Student Leadership Programme. In *Student Development*. Retrieved June 28, 2023, from https://www.nushigh.edu.sg/studying-at-nus-high/student-development/student-leadership-programme/.
Prime Minister's Office (2023). DPM Lawrence Wong at the Launch of the LKY Centennial Fund and SG Young Leaders' Programme. In *Newsroom*. Retrieved June 28, 2023, from

https://www.pmo.gov.sg/Newsroom/DPM-Lawrence-Wong-at-the-Launch-of-the-LKY-Centennial-Fund-and-SG-Young-Leaders-Programme.
Ryan, K. & Lickona, T. (1987) Character education: the challenge and the model. In K. Ryan and G.F. McLean (Eds), *Character development in schools and beyond*. New York: Praeger.
Sim, J. B. Y., & Tham P. H. H. (2023) Demystifying character education for the Singapore context. *Journal of Moral Education*. DOI: 10.1080/03057240.2023.2260957.
Wang, G., & Hackett, R. D. (2016). Conceptualization and measurement of virtuous leadership: Doing well by doing good. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 137(2), 321-345.
Walker, D. I., Roberts, M. P, & Kristjánsson, K. (2015). Towards a new era of character education in theory and in practice. *Educational Review*, 67(1), 79-96.
Zagzebski, L. T. (1996). *Virtues of the mind: An inquiry into the nature of virtue and the ethical foundations of knowledge*. Cambridge University Press.