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This thesis examines recent calls for moral education programs in the United States to address societal violence. Character education and peace education are two approaches that have been employed towards this end, and mandated in some districts and states, including the state of Hawai‘i. The paper provides an analysis of the historical evolution of content and pedagogy of Character and Peace Education programs. Specifically, it looks at six programs and analyzes them using Frankena's (1965) schema to determine normative educational philosophies through the examination of the dispositions advocated, and suggested methodologies.

It is the hoped that this thesis will assist educators and administrators who are seeking to determine which types and elements of character and/or peace education curriculum would best serve their needs, as well as to discern what the objectives, implications and indicators of such a program would be. Although many proponents of character or peace education programs have been critical towards the other, this treatise compares and contrasts a variety of character and peace education programs finding similarities and differences among them.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Statement of the issue:

Calls for moral education to be integrated into public schools have been made from all sides of the political spectrum in the United States (Elias, 1989; Wynne & Ryan, 1993, Ryan & Bohlin, 1999; Hearing, 2000; Cummings, Tatlo, Hawkins, Steiner-Khamsi, et al., 2001). While hardly a household word, “character education” was placed high on education agendas, as illustrated in former President Clinton’s 1996 State of the Union Address: ‘I challenge all our schools to teach character education, to teach good values and good citizenship’ (as cited in Lockwood, 1997, p. 3). The 2001 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110, Sec. 5431), better known as the No Child Left Behind Act, authorizes grants for character education, along with a list of recommended “elements of character” and standards for evaluation (appendix A).

Scholarly interest in this field has renewed and the numbers of academic and popular articles related to this specific topic have multiplied over the last two decades. Much of this advocacy has arisen due to the perception of increasing outbreaks of violence in public schools, such as the 1999 student shootings at Columbine High School. This is significant considering many parents, tax-payers, political and industry leaders maintain “the primary purpose of public schools is to prepare students academically for a workplace that keeps our economy productive and competitive throughout the world,” as asserted by the Reagan-era 1983 “A Nation at Risk” report (Cuban, p. 46, 2001).

The 1990s witnessed a flurry of education leaders and advocates bemoaning the “moral decline” of the USA (Bennett 1995, Kilpatrick, 1992, Lickona, 1989, Wynne &

There were six White House congressional conferences on character education in the 1990s (Tschang, 2000). A 1995 poll reports that 9 out of 10 Americans believe that the American morality is in a state of deterioration (DeRoche & Williams, 1998)). Many interpret juvenile statistics, such as increased youth homicide, suicide, out-of-wedlock births, and declining SAT scores, as proof of declining morality and increasing “laxity” within public education and evidence demanding moral education (Wynne & Ryan, 1993). Others would extend evidence for the “spiritual decline” of the USA, to include the acceptance of abortion, venereal disease, homosexuality, and euthanasia (Heslep, 1995, p. 6). While many of these critics acknowledge the lack of direct evidence between juvenile sociopathologies and school policies, many still credit statistics of improving juvenile behavior as evidence that “pro-tradition” political candidates, judges, and
punitive school policies are reversing trends in school violence and other undesired behavior (Wynne & Ryan, 1993, p. 16). President George W. Bush specified in a speech titled “The True Goal of Education” in New Hampshire on November 2, 1999, the following executive summaries with five specific commitments (Joesephson, 2000):

1. Increase character education funding to at least $24 million per year
2. Incorporate character-building lessons into federal youth programs.
3. Establish the “American Youth Character Awards” to recognize individuals of exemplary character.
4. Expand the role of faith-based organizations and community organizations in after-school programs.
5. Increase federal funding for abstinence programs to a level at least as high as that provided for teen contraception programs.

Calls for peace education have also increased, particularly in regions torn by recent histories of violent conflict such as in former Yugoslavia, Ireland and various African states, as well as the United States. In the US where handguns proliferate, homicide is the second leading cause of death of people between the ages of fifteen and twenty-four (Forcey & Harris, 1999, p.1), with an average of eight youth killed by handgun violence and 182 arrested for violent crimes each day (Each day, 2004). More American youth have died from gunfire since 1979 than the combined total American soldiers killed in the Vietnam-US conflict, the first Gulf War and other recent US military engagements (Pont-Brown & Krumboltz, 1999). It is no surprise that some youth in the USA exhibit similar symptoms, behaviorisms and circumstances of those in war-torn regions (Van Sylck & Stern, 1999). Peace education, like character education, has been another curriculum suggested as part of a remedy for addressing systematic violence by other, although without the popularity or pervasiveness of the latter for the last two decades.
Popular debate over moral education has re-emerged at a time when public educational curriculum and purpose have been defined more by pressures to prepare students for an increasingly technological world and global economy and by pressures to prepare students to meet entrance requirements for college, than by the question of what it means to be educated. Peace and character education programs have been implemented in many public schools, and even mandated in entire school districts, such as the State of Hawai‘i Department of Education’s Character Education Regulations (Tamashiro, 1998).

However, moral education is hardly a recent phenomenon (Elias, 1989). Moral education has existed as long as there has been religious instruction. Moral education has not been exclusive to formal and informal parochial tutelage, as illustrated in ageless deliberations on the nature of virtue in classic Confucius, Lao-tze, Aristotle, and Plato, as well as the folktales of oral cultures, which often advocate specific ethical behaviors and dispositions, and illustrate the consequences of antisocial behavior. Enlightenment education philosophers, including Rousseau, Kant, Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Spencer discussed the significance of education in character formation. Durkheim, Dewey, Piaget and Theodore Sizer were some of the many that have advocated moral education grounded on scientific theories and methodology within secular public education (Sommer, 2002).

Moral education historically and internationally was often been managed within the exclusive realm of religion. Common schools inculcated values of a national identity, and later into the 20th Century, stressed vocational skills and academic curriculum reflecting core priorities of the ruling class. Some cultures emphasize moral education for “means,” such as for public participation and general ethics, whereas others focus on
“ends,” such as increased productivity (Cummings, et al., 2001, p.11). It is interesting that while the diverse nations within the Pacific rim have traditionally emphasized communitarian values, with the exception of the U.S.A. which emphasizes individualism, education leadership within all of these rim nations have switched emphases in the 21st Century.

Internationally, various nations have implemented some form of moral education, including peace education and character education, under different names. The UN General Assembly declared the year 2000 as the International Year for the Culture of Peace. UNESCO has launched numerous peace education projects, including the Teacher Education for Peace Project, while the Hague Appeal for Peace is promoting the Global Campaign for Peace Education. These international institutions have identified peace education as a means towards cultivating cultures of peace (e.g., the proliferation of conflict resolution and diversity training in post-Apartheid South Africa). Indeed, education for values is currently a very engaged topic, despite being unfamiliar or unclear to many educators, administrators, parents and students.

Character education and peace education are two popular forms of education explicit in values. But, why do some advocate peace education (e.g., UNESCO) to address issues of violence, while others advocate character education (e.g., William Bennett) to address similar social problems? If they are both educational programs claiming to nurture peaceable attitudes, values, and behavior, what are the similarities and differences, and why the differentiation in names? The latter was a prevalent question by participants at a public school teachers workshop titled “Peacemaking.

---

1 The USA withdrew from UNESCO in 1985 until recently rejoining in October, 2003
Peacekeeping, and Peacebuilding in the Classroom (June 17-18, 1999), organized by the Matsunaga Institute for Peace at the University of Hawai‘i at Manoa. In fact, a couple of participants got upset when one of the workshops that I helped facilitate centered on peace education, when they declared to be interested “only in character education.” There is a need for a systematic dialogue, comparison, and analysis on the similarities and differences between peace education and character education to help identify objectives, means, content and pedagogy.

Purpose of the Study

Hawai‘i is one of sixteen states with character education mandates and one of over 30 states to have received U.S. Department of Education character education state grants (Otten, 2000). The state of Hawai‘i Department of Education received a one million dollar grant to implement and assess various character education models at seven schools for the fiscal years 1998-2001. Pilot schools implemented one peace education and a variety of character education programs that had been suggested by the Hawai‘i DOE, but participating schools chose their own models, based on their needs, interests and geographic representation. In 1997, the Hawai‘i Board of Education implemented policy 2101 which requires all classrooms infuse character education into their curriculum and promote a core of ethical values, to be evaluated by student conduct statistics (Tamashiro,1998). At a time when moral education is being called for by diverse sectors with different political ideologies and agendas, and even mandated in some schools districts, it behooves all involved parties to analyze the different models

---

2 Former US secretary of education and character education czar, William Bennett, was named one of the “25 most influential Americans” by Time magazine (June 17, 1996)
available toward one that will suit their needs and objectives. Teachers, administrators, and parents need to know the philosophies, theories, objectives, effectiveness, motives, and political agendas (explicit and implicit) behind these various programs of peace and character education, so that they may collectively and individually decide and tailor programs that fit their needs with a clarity of purpose.

Can we assume that character education and peace education are the same or different entities? Many of the goals of both character and peace education programs claim similar objectives and values, e.g., the core values of the Character Counts! Coalition: trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring and citizenship (Kinnamon, 2000). How do character education and peace education programs differ and parallel in terms of content, process, outcomes and hidden agendas? Analyses of both are required so teachers can select and/or reevaluate programs already in use. Content and theoretical analysis of character and peace education is requisite. Prescribed (or lack thereof) pedagogy must be examined. What behavioral, affective, cognitive, and communicative skills are targeted? The language of peace and character education theoreticians must also be analyzed. What does research show on the effectiveness of peace and character education programs?

Historical analysis is also needed to identify the catalysts and contexts that educational policies and programs such as peace and character education are borne. Why has there been resurgence in moral education, particularly as a national reform movement? What has been the historical context of character and peace education? Are there any trends in their prominence and demise? What is the relationship between the current social and political currents, and today’s character education renaissance?
Charges of “social decay” are debatable (Hayward & Izumi, 1996). Some studies (Purpel, 1997) suggest that such charges are untrue, e.g. unprecedented teen pregnancies. If so, why such charges and why is moral education proposed as one remedy? Such information could possibly divulge implicit agendas, helping interested teachers, parents, leaders and agencies determine what programs they may or may not want to implement and how. Such comprehensive knowledge of the objectives and philosophies of such educational programs may aid in a more successful and effective implementation in the classroom, and ideally in other environments (e.g., home and community). Regardless of the debate on “social decay,” there is a real phenomenon of violence permeating society, and it is in the interest of the public health and safety to reduce violence in all its forms.

Methodologies

Frankena’s (1965) schema for analyzing normative philosophies of education serves as a framework for content analysis. This maintains that any educational philosophy contains statements and suggestions about the ends, principles, means, techniques, and content of an education that is desired, as well as empirical variables and assertions about human nature.

Using Frankena’s schema, six different character and peace education programs will be evaluated by: 1) the dispositions to be fostered by a given educational theory; 2) the reasons given for advocating such dispositions (e.g., philosophic positions, empirical variables, metaphysical premises); 3) any suggested methods for the furthering such ethical education objectives; and 4) reasons given for the suggested methods (e.g., normative premises, factual premises). The models were selected as representatives of
different forms, approaches and emphases of character and peace education programs.

Additionally, an historical overview of the evolution of character and peace education, primarily within the United States of America, is provided for sociocultural and political context. A brief history of character education in the state of Hawai`i is also included, in addition to the current status of character education within Hawai`i's centralized school district.
Chapter Two

Background to the Study

*Education* in this paper refers specifically to the transmitting of knowledge, skills, traits, attitudes and feelings by the use of varying pedagogical techniques via the institution of public schools, unless indicated otherwise, as well as the institutional process through which society maintains and renews itself (Dewey, 1966). *Moral education* is used as a generic term for education explicit in values and ethics. Often overlapping, moral education has been identified as both religious and secular; religious moral education is generally founded upon on a particular traditional religious philosophy or theology, while secular moral education is generally based upon interdisciplinary social sciences, including social psychology, as well as doctrines of international endorsement (e.g., UNESCO) or cultural and religious plurality (Elias, 1989, p. vii). Because the focus of this study is within the public education sphere, the focus of moral education is secular given public schools are mandated to be secular, although as mentioned, the lines between religious and secular moral education can be ambiguous. Peace education and character education are two types of moral education pedagogy, both of which have no static definitions, but have some persistent qualities.

*Character education* lacks a universal definition and its identification has served more as a semantic vehicle to embody the aspirations of its advocates (Lockwood, 1997). Character, the subject of much philosophical contemplation by Aristotle, Confucius, St. Thomas Aquinas, Kant and the Bible among others, comes from the Greek word charassein, meaning to engrave, as in on a surface (Ryan & Bohlin, 1999; Noddings, 1997; Wynne, 1997). While character development begins in infancy, much character
develops during the impressionable schooling years of childhood and adolescence (Berkowitz, 2002). Lickona (1997, p. 46) defines character education as "the intentional, proactive effort to develop good character." He argues that "the cardinal virtues of prudence, justice, temperance, and fortitude advanced by the ancient Greeks [are] objectively good human qualities," and that a comprehensive character education would inculcate values for the complete moral character, including its cognitive, affective and behavioral components, via the "total moral life of the school" (p. 46).

The "Character Education Manifesto" drafted in 1996 and endorsed by eight state governors states that education is "inescapably a moral enterprise" and that character education is "about developing virtues" (Ryan, Bohlin and Thayer, 1996, p.1). Ryan and Bohlin (1999, pp. 5-7) describe "good character" as "knowing the good, loving the good, and doing the good;" the "good" being "a cross-cultural composite of moral imperatives and ideals that hold us together as individuals and as societies." Character education professor and developmental psychologist Marvin Berkowitz (2002, p. 48) offers a specifically generic, universal definition of character as "an individual's set of psychological characteristics that affect that person's ability and inclination to function morally." Whether viewed as primarily attitudinal, personality or behavioral, character is a complex socio-psychological concept that includes the enduring capacity to think, feel and act on ethical matters.

Lickona (1997, p. 45) argues that schools should engage in character education because: 1) good character is needed to be fully human, 2) schools are more conducive to inculcating "communities of virtue," and 3) character education is necessary for "building a moral society. He identifies such social problems as family breakdown, rampant
violence, incivility, avarice, dishonesty, abortion, drug abuse, and so forth as evidence of societal decay that could be remedied through the systematic improvement of the individual members.

The Character Education Manifesto proclaims that "the moral authority...has been invested in them [teachers, administration and staff] by the parents and the community" (Ryan, Bohlin and Thayer, 1996, p.2). Character education champions such as Edward Wynne (1997, p. 63) note that the "common ambivalence about managing environments is an important cause for many defects in contemporary formation," and that "some environments should be deliberately managed to form children's character."

Traditional character education identifies mechanisms for character construction through contemporary behaviorism methods, such as reward/punishment incentives, use of arts, ritual daily practices, living and dead role models, and designing and managing social groups (Wynne, 1997). Benninga (1997, p. 86) argues that the "more traditional approaches to character education have their roots in the fundamental writings of our Western heritage" and that "character can only come through direct training" (p. 87). Wynne (1997) identifies diligence, obedience, cooperativeness and loyalty as traits universally assumed worthy of promoting as ends unto themselves.

Character education critic Alfie Kohn (1998) identifies two meanings of character education: 1) any education outside of routine academics that endeavors to help students become ethical humans, and 2) a specific method of moral training that holds specific pedagogy, values, and assumptions about learning and nature of children and how they learn; Kohn charges that the latter, narrow interpretation is dominating conventional public education and mistaken as the broader concept. Still, the Character Education
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Manifesto maintains that “Character education is not about acquiring the right views—currently accepted attitudes about ecology, prayer in school, gender, school uniforms, politics, or ideological charged issues” (Ryan, Bohlin and Thayer, 1996, p. 1). Character education of the 1920s explicitly propagated selected culture-specific values to a diversifying society perceived as decaying. Character education of the 1990s tended to avoid language, such as values due to political and legal sensitivities, in exchange for descriptive language such as “virtues,” and “life or citizenship skills,” illustrates how character education is evolving and how difficult it is to define it (Sockett, 1997). However, the reelection of George W. Bush in 2004 was partly successful by the platform on “values” indicating a sociopolitical shift lifting the taboo and embracing the engagement of social and personal values (Pew Research, 2004). The traditional definition of character education, one identified with “behaviorism, conservatism, and religion” is evolving to supplant the term moral education evidenced by the publishing boom in character education materials (Lockwood, 1997; Kohn, 1998, p. 33 -).

It should be noted that categorizations of character, moral and values education vary within its context of ideology, geography and history, reflecting sociopolitical and educational trends. For example, what is popularly referred to as “character education” in the United States is still referred to as “moral education” in parts of Asia or “values education” in Great Britain (Berkowitz, 2002). Berkowitz generalizes “character education” as more aligned with the more traditional conservative-behaviorist school of moral education, whereas he identifies “moral education” as more in the cognitive, constructionist and progressive school and “values education” with the empirical, atheoretical and attitudinal tradition (2002, p. 44). However, the analysis of “character
education" in this paper will be of programs and theorists who explicitly identify with a
generic character education within the contemporary United States. It is worth noting that
surveys from different American character education advocates expressed different
values of preference for character education programs, reflecting notable regional
differences, e.g., New England, Mid-west, West Coast, and Hawai`i, suggesting different
provincial priorities, agendas, contexts, cultures and needs within the U.S.A. (Cummings,

Like character education, peace education lacks an universal definition, although it has evolved to embrace the positive definition of peace (Galtung, 1964); that is, peace as not simply the absence of war and other overt physical forms of violence, identified as negative peace, but additionally the presence of certain conditions, including community and life-affirming values, non-violent conflict resolution, social and ecological harmony, and international and intertribal social justice, as identified across cultures and history (Wenden, 1995). Such a definition of peace embraces “human security” rather than politically defined “national security” (Reardon, 1982, p.14). Human security requires that all basic human needs are met including the distribution of material and human resources regardless of demographic background, whereas national security is often defined by nation-state political and economic interests.

Peace education is an interdisciplinary field, containing such themes as conflict resolution, cooperation and interdependence; global awareness; and social and ecological responsibility. Reardon (1988) emphasizes the transformative nature of peace education, that is, it ultimately aims to empower agents of positive social change from prevailing non-sustainable systems and social structures. Although peace education pedagogy is not
standardized, it tends to follow a Deweyan notion of progressive education, that is, student-centered capitalizing on the interest and experiences of the student; it acknowledges that the process is inseparable and as important as the objective.

UNICEF (Fountain, 1999, p. 9) has devised a definition for peace education as:

...The process of promoting the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values needed to bring about behaviour changes that will enable children, youth and adults to prevent conflict and violence, both overt and structural; to resolve conflict peacefully; and to create the conditions conducive to peace, whether at an intrapersonal, interpersonal, intergroup, national or international level.

The Hague Appeal for Peace Youth Agenda (2000) defines peace education as:

...Teaching and learning about the values, attitudes and forms of behaviour that reflect respect for life, for human beings and their dignity, and for all human rights, the rejection of violence in all its forms and commitment to the principles of freedom, justice, solidarity, tolerance and understanding among peoples and between groups and individuals.

Forsey and Harris (1999) differentiate between peacekeeping, peacemaking and peacebuilding, which helps distinguish the subjective definitions of peace. Peacekeeping, the most prevailing form of violence prevention, tends to be authority-based “peace-through-strength” programs, such as security guards, metal detectors, expulsion and other forms of negative peace, usually resulting in social control, rather than social change. Peacemaking tends to work towards positive peace conditions, where youth are more involved and empowered, as well as the entire staff and parents of a school involved in creating a pervasive peaceful climate, such as through peer-initiated mediation. Finally, peacebuilding refers to an overarching philosophy and goal of non-violence as a way of living.

Dr. Werner Wintersteiner (2002), a member of the Global Campaign for Peace Education Advisory Committee and developer of the European Peace Education course,
identifies “three-dimensional competences.” Most peace education programs fall within at least one:

1) Content-oriented programs focused on the acquisition of knowledge and principles of non-violent means of conflict resolution and peace, including the nature and causes of violent conflict and its connection to injustice, inequality, oppression and all forms of discrimination.

2) Student-oriented programs focused on strategies and skills for non-violent conflict resolution and deescalating tension within interpersonal or group interaction, such as through dialogue, interaction, mediation, negotiation, participation, teamwork and leadership and facilitation that is democratic and transformative.

3) Community-oriented programs focused on the reorganization and creation of an ideal learning environment that exemplifies, fosters and supports the values of inclusion, peace, power sharing, individual and collective dignity, mutuality and solidarity (p. 7).

Again, differences exist in program names, language and focus, but in general, peace education programs fall within the three groups, and according to Dr. Wintersteiner, when all three conditions exist, the conditions for a “culture of peace” will have been established. Given cultural and political biases, there is at least one universally accepted assumption within peace education programs: that peaceful solutions to conflicts and the prevention of violence are desired and to be advocated (Mazer, 2002).

**Foundations of Moral Education in the USA**

Moral education has been documented as far back as ancient Chinese, Greeks and Hebrews, while evolving more secular forms during the Renaissance and Enlightenment eras (Elias, 1989). European colonizers, particularly among the Protestant and Catholic settlers, brought their tradition of moral education with them to the Western hemisphere as illustrated by the missionary efforts to christianize indigenous peoples of the Western hemisphere and educate them to embrace a Christian commonwealth, as well as their
intentions to build their own model society (McClellan, 1999). Until the mid-18th Century, mothers generally bore primary responsibility for educating offspring, with supplemental support from institutions such as school and church; although state legislative efforts to reinforce parental responsibility of the education of their children came as early as 1642 in Massachusetts, under the Old Deluder Satan Law (Urban & Wagoner, 1996, p. 47).

Education was moreover a religious enterprise, as illustrated by the staple use of the Bible and other Christian precepts as springboard textbooks with an emphasis on reason, although this varied regionally (Cummings, et al., 2001). The New England Primer, first printed 1690 and selling over 3 million copies over 150 years, employed overtly moral Protestant precepts on virtue (Nash, 1997, p. 6). Horace Webster McGuffey, grandfather of William McGuffey, wrote a document in the 18th Century titled "The Ten Commandments of Character Education" (Ryan, 1995). In British tradition, the family maintained primary responsibility for moral education of children, while slaves were indoctrinated towards subservience within the dominant cultural order. Early Puritan schools arose from fears that family-based education was not willing or able to instill the values of a "Puritan Commonwealth" (Purpel, 1997, p. 141).

Following the American Revolution, many Northern statesmen advocated the need for a public education that would promote "republican values" of a national consciousness and allegiance to the new country (Urban & Wagoner, 1996, pp. 71-3). Benjamin Rush, and Noah Webster upheld the premise that public schools were required to mold national and personal character, shifting from an evangelical character education to one of a constructed national consciousness (Ryan et al, 2002). The moral component
of education had been valued as integral to the formation of democratic society (Elias, 1989). “Deliberate intervention in the behavior and character of students is a central if not dominating theme in the history of public schooling in the United States”; establishment leaders believed school systems with a common curriculum were the solution to concerns of maintaining “national solidarity, social stability, and cultural purity” (Purpel, 1997, p. 141).

However, there was no post-revolution, national consensus on the education of children; it was largely split between religious revivalists who distrusted the state in teaching values and a population tempered by Enlightenment secularism that increased in relation to socioeconomic security (McClellan, 1999). Horace Mann spearheaded the movement for a public education that included Christian-based moral education without sectarian dictate to address the threat of class uprising and increasing disciplinary problems of violence and war in the 19th Century (Urban & Wagoner, 1996, p. 96-). Disputes arose over which bible to use as a source, which propelled William McGuffey’s moralistic McGuffey Readers as a depository of proverbial aphorisms and Protestant influenced “‘natural virtues’ of honesty, hard work, thriftiness, kindness, patriotism, and courage” (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993). The passage of the Morill Act in 1862 required public schools in new territories and a declining presence of religiosity in favor of “civil morality” based on worker ethics, discipline, cleanliness and public participation (Cummings, et al., 2001, p. 93).

Two views came out of the 19th Century on moral education: moral education as inseparable from religion, and moral education as a means towards societal cohesion in a society of immigrants, as advocated by William T. Harris, the first United States
Commissioner of Education (Elias, 1989). Professor Aline M. Stomfay-Stitz (1993) traces peace education back to the early 1800s through the efforts of peace societies. Often influenced by the progressivism of Emerson and Thoreau or by their spiritual conviction, they addressed issues such as antislavery, women's rights, prison reform, or temperance, often through circulated pamphlets and publications. Indeed, the formation of public schools in the United States was not intended to be value-free, as suggested by one Milwaukee school board member in 1890: "The schools are not established for the purpose of teaching scholars how to make a living but to teach them how to live" (as cited in Cuban, p. 48).

The explosion of immigration, as well as the omnipresence of the poor and ethnic minorities, advanced the contested establishment of public schools towards a "majoritarian" consciousness (Urban & Wagoner, 1996, p. 59). Despite the split from parochial education, public education was commensurate in moral training, in its mission to create a diligent workforce and amenable citizenry of virtue, led by a cadre of women teachers, the presumed authority on moral practice (McClellan, 1999). Textbooks were infused with Protestant rectitude and McGuffeyesque citizenship, that became "repositories of truth," while the selected values of good character were absolute with no room for interpretation (Urban & Wagoner, 1996, p. 83-4). An 1888 report of the Committee on Moral Education of the National Council of Education, Harris (as cited in Elias, 1989, p. 24-5) encapsulates 19th Century character education:

A whole family of virtues are taught the student and taught him so thoroughly that they become fixed in character...obedience, punctuality, regularity, silence, and industry. Moral education must begin in merely mechanical obedience and develop gradually out of this stage toward that of individual responsibility.

Public education changed with 20th Century modernity. The increased
application of social sciences, particularly psychology, in the classroom advanced a child-centered pedagogy, as illustrated by the Child Study Movement (Elias, 1989). This was furthered by the progressive educational philosophies of John Dewey, such as the notions that learning takes place in the context of one's experience and cooperative learning. Dewey's bottom-up, child-centered pedagogy and applied democracy contrasted from the conventional dominating top-down, authority-centered pedagogy, although he was not in complete disagreement with some traditional theories (Ryan, et al., 2002). However, the growing complexity of modernity and economy demanded an emphasis on academic and vocational skills. Moral education was forced to compete with scientific and practical training within an increasingly packed curriculum.

Furthermore, the criticisms that plagued Dewey in the 20th Century, such as a perceived permissiveness of student behaviors, continue into the 21st from those who see such child-centered pedagogy as moral relativism and academically undermining (Beninga, 1997).

With these changes, three basic philosophies on moral education emanated: 1) in reaction to perceived societal laxity and increased personal freedoms associated with modernity, traditional character education, that is, the explicit inculcation of the conventional traits of good character, was advocated as central to public education. 2) The progressive education movement would produce an approach to moral education that dismissed the espousal of prescribed moralistic tenets, and promoted a more student-centered, critical approach to moral education. 3) Parochial schools maintained that any moral education could not be separated from religious doctrine (McClellan, 1999, p. 48).
"Always more programmatic than theoretical, the character education movement built not so much on a thorough and coherent analysis of social change as on a vague sense that modern society presented new challenges to important values and required a strong effort to preserve character" (McClellan, 1999, p. 49). The rise of Sunday school, and then public schools in the 19th Century, exemplifies the public concerns that the home was inadequate, and that institutions were required to facilitate education, moral and otherwise, particularly those of the poor, immigrants and ethnic minorities (Urban & Wagoner, 1996). With its emphasis on tradition, obedience, patriotism, moralistic stories, and religious denotation, character education dominated moral education in American schools for the 19th Century, and the first half of the 20th Century (Noddings, 1997).

Most character education proponents were interested in preparing youth within a modern republic with a sense of assimilated Calvinist values for social and vocational proficiency. The curriculum-producing Character Education League was such a group. With the rise of modernity, diversity, secularism and prosperity for some, codes of conduct were a popular form of instilling prescribed values of obedience, as illustrated by the rise of numerous youth organizations, such as the Boy Scouts and Campfire Girls, which featured gender-based moral training, such as values of group competition or domestication. Such codes, one of the fundamental differences from progressive pedagogy, were basically lists of law-like tenets, such as the "Children's Morality Code...ten laws of right living" published by the Character Education Association, established in 1911 (McClellan, 1999, p. 50). Hutchins (1917) was among other
traditional character education advocates that criticized progressive education and argued for content-specific encoding of virtues, a reaction that would be revisited up through the present. 130 character education think tanks were implemented in 1926 alone (Territory of Hawai‘i, 1930).

The exhaustive 1928 study on deceit by Hugh Harthstone and Mark A. May found such highly didactic moral education ineffective and even harmful, and discredited traditional character education for decades, and continues to do so for contemporary critics (Hartshorne & May, 1928/1975). Despite the inconclusiveness of research around character education, its proponents are emphatic that it is necessary to remedy a perceived “youth disorder” (Wynne, 1997, p. 75). Regardless, countless testimonies praising character education and numerous public policies implementing such programs assure character education will continue to proliferate.

Some past and contemporary character educators have also argued for character education based on recommendations from industry (Territory, 1930). A report by Berliner and Biddle compiled by personnel directors of major industries which concluded “if schools are truly to serve the needs of business, it appears they should concentrate on skill training and more on the values that students need when they enter the workplace,” is used as one argument by professor Jacques Benninga for character education (as cited in Molnar, 1997, p. 78).

**Progressive Approaches to Moral Education**

With foundations in science and aspirations for a humane democratic society with justice, progressive education challenged traditional character education, not just for
ineffectiveness, but also for the need of critical moral evaluation skills that could maneuver within context. This change in pedagogy was reflected in the 1932 report of the Character Education Committee of the National Education Association's Department of Superintendence:

"Relativity must replace absolutism in the realm of morals as well as in the spheres of physics and biology. This of course does not involve the denial of the principle of continuity in human affairs. Nor does it mean that each generation must repudiate the system of values of its predecessors. It does mean, however, that no such system is permanent; that it will have to change and grow in response to experience" (as cited in McClellan, 1999, p. 56).

The aspirations of progressive moral educators were open-minded life-long learners who could analyze and understand the modern social world, calculate consequences of actions, utilize democratic decision making processes, and make moral judgments and creative solutions to problems. There was more emphasis on sociopolitical issues of public concern than on the emphasis on personal matters, and pedagogy emphasized social studies and problem-solving exercises capitalizing on student experiences, rather than classical literature as did the traditional character educators. It was also this era in which education for global citizenship or internationalism, as opposed to insular nationalistic citizenship, was advocated, and would evolve into global education in the 1970s and 1980s (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993). Influenced by the education philosophies of John Dewey, progressive educators emphasized the importance of intrinsic motivation over extrinsic behaviorist programming; the effectiveness of behaviorism continues to be questioned within research despite its pervasiveness (Fabes, et al., 1989; Grusec, Joan, 1991). Critics of traditional character education charged that the values exhorted were mere dictates of
"middle class respectability" rooted in 19th Century conventions advocating nationalist assimilation over values of diversity or critical thinking skills (McClellan, 1999, p. 55).

Critics of progressive education contended that students were left vulnerable to peer pressure and circumstances, without any adult authority (Urban & Wagoner, 1996). Furthermore, the ambiguity of progressive moral education such as specific content or programmatic markers, left educators without concrete guidance and was extremely difficult to evaluate. While many schools converted traditional character education programs to more a progressive approach particularly in the 1930s, most schools did not entirely replace virtue-centered programs, offering a progressive curriculum without a theory of moral development as a mere alternative to the prevalent hidden curriculum of conventional moralism. Moreover, moral education, the inculcation of particular values, as evidenced by its cyclical history, has always been dependent on the political and economic prerogatives of the government, which regulates and helps fund the institution of public schools.

Modern challenges to moral education

Education which advocated peace throughout much of the 20th Century was deemed "un-American," "communist," and sympathetic to perceived enemies of the state, often incriminating such educators and stymieing peace education; in some cases, peace education curriculum or content was replaced with less critical "citizenship" curriculum (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993). Such scrutiny of peace oriented curriculum is illustrated in the National Defense Act of 1920, which introduced military training in public education: "Pacifist propaganda...is intended to create a spirit of disloyalty by
forming groups who pledge not to fight for their country” (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993, p.118). This cultural sensitivity and stigma about education for peace continues in the contemporary USA, particularly in politically-charged times by varying significant societal institutions.

The debate between traditional character education and progressive models softened during the 1940s and 1950s, as wars, including the Cold War, fostered nationalism and a sense of urgency in the face of perceived enemies. The place of moral education began to diminish with the emphasis on competitive SAT scores, the rise of high-technology industries, political and economic competition with command-market economies, the shift in societal attitude of attributing success to skill, rather than character per se, and the continued societal attitude that the moral realm was personal and should be kept at home and/or church (McClellan, 1999). Advocacy of critical thinking, to include the questioning of US moral authority in an ideological war exemplified by the House Un-American Activities Committee, was subject to Communist witch-hunts making any affiliation with peace hazardous. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 in reaction to the Soviet launching of Sputnik encapsulated the cause of public education for national political interests (Urban & Wagoner, 1996). Moral education diminished as the general curriculum thickened with academic requirements. Education which explored issues of ecology, the interrelationship of nations, conflict resolution, tolerance, and so forth often did so under the guise of world affairs to minimize political scrutiny (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993).

The 1960s and 1970s witnessed a growing civil libertarian attitude towards moral education. There were more court cases disputing school practices between the years
1969 and 1978 than within the previous fifty years (as cited in McClellan, 1999, p. 76). Religion in the public classroom continued to be eradicated through the courts. It was replaced by the exaltation of positivism with its primacy of objectivity and neutrality, which purged language explicit in moralism from the classrooms (Purpel, 1997). The fear of litigation, and bureaucracy began an era discouraging schools from partaking in potentially controversial education programs, including the addressing of important social issues of the day. Contemporary surveys find in general, Americans associate morality with religion, and that values can and preferably should be taught within the family (Cummings, Tattos, Hawkins, Steiner-Khamsi, et al., 2001).

Within this climate of perceived amorality, other pedagogies for addressing ethical development evolved: values-clarification, cognitive developmentalism, and a feminist approach towards an ethic of caring. All of these approaches rejected the virtue-centered pedagogy of traditional moral education in favor of respecting intrinsic motivation, cognitive reasoning, individual and cultural choice and diversity. While proponents of moral reasoning via cognitive methods use stories like traditional character educators, the stories tend to be philosophical fiction to apply critical thinking exercises upon (Noddings, 1997). Among the many criticisms of modern forms of moral development include its perceived moral relativism, its potentially controversial content that may violate traditional community standards, its emphasis on choice rather than consensus, and its lack of absolutism in values, as well as sensationalized classroom experiences which have outraged parents and policy makers (Benniga, 1997).

Values-clarification emphasized pedagogy free from indoctrination and judgment, and refrained from dictating values per se, but rather engaged students to clarify their
values via group discussion or individual writing on Platonic questions involving situational scenarios. Values-clarification has been criticized as encouraging moral relativism or not being as value-free as proclaimed. While values-clarification is for the most part passé, it continues to be denounced in favor of traditional character education and associated with progressive education in general, based on the mixed experience of values-clarification and some of its abuses.

Harvard psychologist, Lawrence A. Kohlberg is most commonly associated with cognitive developmentalism. Kohlberg theorized that moral growth universally existed in progressive stages, and through the cognitive conflict arising through student debates over difficult ethical dilemmas, the cognitive dissonance would challenge students to higher-level moral reasoning. Critics charged that the emphasis on cognitive development only would produce students who could rationalize almost anything and not be motivated to apply moral reasoning into action. Kohlberg, despite denouncing relativism and values clarification, continues to be associated with values clarification by conservative camps advocating traditional character education (Kohn, 1998). Eventually, Kohlberg concluded the limits of his theory, and renounced his earlier position and concluded “moral education must be partly ‘indoctrinative’”(as cited in Sommers, 2002, p. 32).

A feminist approach to moral education incorporated affective learning, as theorized by Carol Gilligan, a colleague of Kohlberg, in a three-stage growth of caring (McClellan, 1999). First, the self as a means of survival is criticized as selfish, when it is at the expense of others. Next, responsibility and maternal care within relationships is emphasized. Lastly, an emphasis on interconnectedness in relationships is made, in
which a self-chosen principle of care is ideally implemented. A feminist definition of peace would embrace a positive peace, to include the absence of structural violence, particularly the disproportionate amount of all forms of violence against women and girls, as well as an equitable distribution of power and resources (Brocke-Utne, 1985). The primary difference between traditional character education and care theory is the emphasis and valuing of relationships. Traditional character education tends to be principle-based, consequential and/or utilitarian with a focus on the inculcation of virtue within the individual-agent, whereas care ethics is relationship-based nurturing the embodiment of ethical interdependence. While both character education and care ethics value reason, care ethics emphasizes situational and relational critical thinking over principles, reflecting research observing moral behavior tends to be motivated by the needs of the cared-for, rather than principle alone (Nodding, 2002). International peace educator and researcher Birgit Brocke-Utne (1985) observes the vast majority of violence throughout place and history is perpetrated by men, and that male-dominance reflects structural violence within most social institutions, e.g., traditional classroom processes, hierarchies, and competition that perpetuate violence-producing inequalities; her research observes that almost universally boys are socialized for some form of aggressive, violent behaviors that are more influential than any biological factors, and all the more reason for education for, rather than about, nonviolence that directly challenges socialized violence.

Four primary themes evolved within peace education during the Nuclear Age and the 1960s, later to be refined during the 1970s: 1) nonviolence, 2) global education, 3) world order education, and 4) conflict resolution (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993). Nonviolence education evolved from the theory and practice of such practitioners as Mahatma Gandhi
and Martin Luther King, Jr., as a precursor to the notion of positive peace. Global education strives to provide an international perspective into the classroom, as a means to understanding different sociocultural, political, economic, and environmental systems, and the need for international cooperation and understanding. World order education was more prominent in higher education, incorporating strategies of transition from the current international system to one addressing various goals of demilitarization, and social and economic justice; the former two forms of education were actively promoted by UNESCO. Conflict resolution education is an interdisciplinary field to provide practical skills to resolving differences from the interpersonal to the international, and has been implemented either exclusively or within the context of a comprehensive school moral education program. Never a pervasive part of American education, peace education in the 1960s reflected the turbulence of the times: the Cold War, nuclear issues, and disenfranchised groups, as exemplified by the empowering but short-lived Mississippi Freedom Schools in 1964 (Perlstein, 1990). The international community on peace education, e.g., Peace Research Education and Development (COPRED), International Peace Research Association, Peace Education Network, as well as international education programs under the auspices of the UN begin to also grow at this time.

After the social unrest and political violence of the 1960s, peace education became more recognized as a highly regarded pedagogy in the 1970s, illustrated in the growth of conferences and academic journals on the subject. Examples of a growing recognition of the need for a globally-oriented education addressing the study of nuclear weapons and conflict resolution include the U.S. Office of Education 1968 Statement on
Needs and Priorities in International Education and UNESCO's 1974 Recommendation on Education for International Understanding, Cooperation, and Peace and Education Concerning Human rights and Fundamental freedoms (Reardon, 1988). The NEA advocated a global education program around planetary interdependence in 1976 (Stomfay Stitz, 1993.). This period also saw a growth of conflict resolution programs in numerous schools, sometimes in conjunction with peace education programs, which would proliferate in the 1980s. Education on human rights multiplied, as exemplified by the works of Brazilian educator Paulo Freire, and feminist scholarship advanced the emphasis on positive peace, as advocated by peace educator Betty Reardon. While some curricula has been developed by special advocacy groups, such as Educators for Social Responsibility, Professor Reardon feels that many peace-oriented textbooks are of inferior quality (Bjerstedt, 1988). Internationally, peace education advocacy continued to swell, particularly in regions of historical conflict such as Palestine/Israel, South Africa and former Yugoslavia. However within the USA, peace education began to dwindle into the 21st Century, surpassed by the character education movement.

The Character Education Revival

While the process-centered approaches of the 1960s and 1970s have their place in historical educational discourse, the bulk of moral education in the 1980s and 1990s of public education has been the virtue-centered approach, although there are attempts to distinguish it from the traditional curriculum of the past. While this movement has not disregarded the processes of valuing and moral reasoning, it places more emphasis on content than process. As indicated in the introduction of this thesis, the virtue-centered
approach to moral education has been advocated from the White House to school boards throughout the USA. Some traditional character education advocates liken progressive moral education such as values clarification as well-intended but ineffective education trends, similar to debates over the best methodologies for teaching literacy or mathematics, but result in "moral illiteracy" and are in fact to blame for trends in perceived societal immorality (Kilpatrick, 1992). However, other character education advocates have incorporated elements of progressive education methodology into traditional values character education.

The primary proponents of the current character education restoration comes from two camps: marginal sponsors who have championed their character education programs directly to schools and teachers, rather than through mainstream educational institutions, and elite advocates of virtue-centered character education from powerful education leaders, think tanks and universities (McClellan, 1999). An example of the former is the largely privately-funded American Institute of Character Education, which produced their Character Education Curriculum first in the mid-1960s organized around a "Freedom's Code" distributed to as many as eighteen-thousand classrooms in forty-four states, despite critics challenging its effectiveness. Advocates for traditional character education decry the emphasis on process as stressed by progressive moral educators, rather than content (Kilpatrick, 1992). Traditionalists argue that concrete, binary moralism is the structure and concreteness needed by youth, rather than ambiguity and relativity that is confusing and stunts the morality of younger generations.

As illustrated in the introduction, numerous political and education leaders have criticized public schools for a perceived amorality, and link it to the perceived rise in
social pathologies. For example, educators gathered in 1994 at the Aspen Summit
Conference on Character Education, which resulted in the core “Six Pillars of Character,”
which listed: caring, citizenship, civic virtue, justice and fairness, respect, responsibility
and trustworthiness (Benninga, 1997, p. 87). Citing and praising a traditional character
education program in Clovis Unified School District in central California, Benninga
points out that while comparative studies on the Clovis students showed inconclusive
results, he states (p. 90) “What is significant is that a school that emphasizes traditional
programs of academic achievement and character education seems to foster unanimity of
purpose between its students, parents, teachers and community.” The “unanimity” that
Benninga (p. 95) surmises includes that schools rely on extrinsic control “to graduate into
society students who are accomplished academically and who demonstrate the habits and
character traits that lead to productive citizenship.” Over 70% of American public
respondents in Gallup and Phi Kappa Delta polls in the mid-1990s felt schools should
teach morals, and that a common set a values, such as honesty or patriotism, could be
agreed upon (cited in DeRoche & Williams, 1998, p. 4-5).

The October 1987 stock market crash sparked a renewed partnership between the
private and public sectors, as industry demanded an education that would prepare
students to compete in a global marketplace; towards this end, policies such as vouchers,
standards, testing, and general privatization entered the American education lexicon
(DeRoche & Williams, 1998). Despite the continued and growing general vocational,
utilitarian view of public education, peace education themes of the 1980s expanded and
overlapped from the 1970s. Examples include: the expansion of global education,
conflict resolution or peacemaking skills, increased involvement of state- and
community-mandated peace education school programs, including religious organizations' participation. For illustration, more than forty states had passed course mandates for global or international education with wide acceptance (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993). In addition, other innovative developments emerged, such as the growth of grassroots, community programs and global communications via technology, and in the USA, the founding of the United States Institute of Peace, dedicated to peace and conflict resolution (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993). With the increasing diversity among students, more schools have incorporated multicultural education, particularly in urban centers, which encourages at minimum a tolerance of human multiplicity.

Aside from any form of moral education, education in communication skills became increasingly emphasized within the field of language arts in the 1980s and 1990s. The political atmosphere of the 1980s was dominantly conservative, so many progressive educators pragmatically advocated conflict resolution/peacemaking programs, which grew exponentially throughout these decades throughout various school districts nationally (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993). Tenets of peace education have been integrated into preexisting communication and humanities classes, as peace education theory advocates student application of peacemaking principles into their lives, not moralizing lectures. This continued throughout the 1990s, as communication skills and cooperative learning gained wide acceptance and application in public education. Cooperative learning has gained popularity in contrast to the traditional American emphasis on competition, encouraging students to create win/win solutions, some based on the research of David and Roger Johnson (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993), although there is also the opinion by many that "romantic" student-centered education without "old-fashioned moral education" has
socialized tragedies, such as the 1999 Columbine High School massacre (Sommers, 2002, pp. 35-37). The prevalence of multicultural education and nonviolent conflict resolution principles in public schools throughout the USA, demonstrates some common elements of peace education employed in classrooms, without the description or intention as “peace education.” However, how and why multicultural education and conflict resolution programs are being employed may determine whether they are congruent or conflicting with peace education principles.

The debate between character education and peace education remains an ongoing, academic debate over process, effectiveness and content. Kohn’s (1993) central argument is that the more extrinsic an approach to teaching, whether through overt indoctrination or through affective and material awards, the more likely the learner will lose interest in whatever it is they had to do to receive that approval or award. Much of the character education literature reviewed in this study charges progressive moral education as one of the blames for perceived social decay.

In general, 19th Century character education focused on the individual, whereas 20th Century character education began to embrace the importance of group dynamics, such as teamwork, similar to progressive pedagogy (Ryan, et. al., 2003). Lickona (1988) is an example of a character education advocate who also draws from psychology, influenced by Piaget, Erikson and Kohlberg. Drawing from curriculum and social scientific research, Berkowitz (2002) concludes that 1) modeling desired behavior, 2) treatment of students, 3) clear expectations, 4) opportunities to apply pro-social behaviors, and 4) opportunities to reason, deliberate and ponder over moral issues provides the most effective character education. This is indicative of the hybrid direction
and influences between traditional and progressive moral education pedagogy towards the 21st Century in some character and peace education programs.

It is also difficult to determine the effectiveness of peace and character education programs given the conflicting conclusions and unclear criteria of what exactly constitutes “effective.” Furthermore, longitudinal studies are inadequate and would be quite a daunting task. While many evaluations consist of qualitative surveys from teachers and administrators remarking on the general improved social climate within the schools after implementing moral education programs, much of the literature reviewed in this thesis, particularly under the guise of character education claimed conclusive popular results based on the marked reduction of behavioral and disciplinary problems.

J. S. Lemming (1993a & 1993b) conducted some of the more comprehensive analyses of moral education program effectiveness. Some of Lemming’s conclusions included: 1) didactic methodology alone (e.g., lecturing, codes, pledges, etc.) is unlikely to have substantial or enduring influence; 2) reason alone will unlikely translate into virtuous behavior; 3) character develops within a social environment which embodies the values it preaches; 4) behaviors will not necessarily change as a result of moral dilemma exercises; 5) cooperative learning environments may inculcate prosocial behaviors; 6) limited, but significant prosocial changes in student character can develop in a class environment with clear standards, mutual respect and collective governance; 7) unambiguous communication and support by community and peers yields encouraging outcomes; and 8) clear, fairly-enforced rules in an orderly, just environment within a partnership of students, school and community contribute to positive character advancement. Lemming found a more informal, progressive school atmosphere and class 35
climate, and teacher personality, role and relationship with students were rated as the most substantial qualities in nurturing character.

**Brief History of Moral Education in Hawai`i Public Education**

The history of moral education in Hawai`i's public education system follows the trends of moral education in US public education despite its Polynesian indigenous roots. The first Christian mission in the Kingdom of Hawai`i was established in 1819, which would be one of many institutions imposing foreign value systems. Subsequent waves of immigrant workers came to Hawai`i in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the face of a mass indigenous demise through Western diseases and displacement. American missionaries proselytized their cultural orientation and values, while industry demanded an Americanized docile, productive workforce from the myriad of cultures; elites perpetuated racial hierarchies to their advantages (Kent, 1993; Benham and Heck, 1994). The influence of the missionaries continues to influence the religiosity of Hawai`i's diverse population into the 21st Century (Shapiro, 2005).

In an 1850 report, Minister of Education Richard Armstrong praised manual labor and music in “moulding character” and cited indolence as “one of the great master evils” of the “Hawaiian race,” threatening American progress (as cited in Territory, 1930, p. 18). The same report exclaimed the importance of moral education in the common schools, and in a 1855 report states: “It is here he learns perhaps his first lessons of subordination and subjection to law, which are as necessary to prepare him in after life to be a law abiding citizen and a good subject of his sovereign, as a knowledge of the rudiments of learning” (p. 19). As James D. Anderson (1988, p. 1) notes, both American
overt and hidden curriculum differentiated and tracked students for “democratic
citizenship” and “second-class citizenship,” which were reflected in Hawai‘i through
“English Standard Schools” for Anglo-Americans and manual labor and vocational
training for others. “The conversion to a ‘common identity’ in Hawai‘i relied on a
standard menu of nationalist symbols and curriculum...American textbooks, the standard
nationalist rituals (flying the American flag, saying the Pledge of Allegiance, and singing
the national anthem)” (Steiner-Khamsi, et. al, 2001). Compulsory education assured the
enculturation of non-whites to devalue native and home cultural values, such as the
primacy of the community, for American values, such as individualism and competition
(Benham and Heck, 1998). Character education was essentially Americanization.
The 1930 publication by the territorial Hawai‘i Department of Public Education
“Character Education” exemplifies early American character education, as well as the
foundations of some contemporary character education programs and philosophies. A
morality code of given values, after collusion with industry leaders such as sugar
plantation industrialists, was one of the results of the 1930 character education report:
leadership, cooperation, loyalty, accuracy, initiative, love, health, effort and labor
(Territory, 1930). Like many contemporary character education advocates, character
education was heralded as the solution to “social disintegration” such as crime,
delinquency, disrespect to authority, and general “moral turpitude” due to the lack of
individual character and American enculturation (Territory of Hawai‘i, 1930, p.9). The
common schools infused biblical-based character education, gender tracking, and
emphasized industrial training to instill “habits of industry, a respect for labor, a desire
for wages, and a willingness to work” (Territory, 1930, p. 23). Dr. Romanzo Adams (as
cited in Territory, 1930, p. 33-) of the University of Hawai‘i explained the task of character education of integrating homeland cultures and “Americanization:” “Since the old country culture of an immigrant is merely an obstacle, the less of it is better”. Later generations of immigrant workers gained access to education leadership towards the goal of economic well being of their offspring (Kent, 1993). Exclusion of *kanaka maoli*, the indigenous Hawaiians, from educational leadership has been one constant throughout the history of Hawai‘i (Steiner-Khamsi et al., 2001).

Following education trends of progressivism, a committee of community members produced a guide to values after a three-year project for the Territory of Hawai‘i in 1949 (Department of Public Instruction, 1949). This guide focusing on process served as a guide for the following twenty years. A theme of democratic valuing prevailed, encouraging respect for diversity and differences, with unity on common values. The manual differentiated between democratic and authoritarian schools, encouraging the former and discouraging the latter. It drew from a plurality of religious influences, including different Christian and Buddhist sects. It drew from psychology, elaborating the importance of a healthy self, as well as competency in making healthy choices and harmonizing needs with social sensitivity. Like its predecessors and successors, it claimed character education as one remedy for the “disintegration of Western Civilization” (Department of Public Instruction, 1949).

With the advancement of social sciences and their impact on public policy, moral education in Hawai‘i shifted to the values clarification model in the 1970s (Office of Instructional Services, 1973). A committee ranging from students and educators to legislators and religious leaders, created a curriculum guide, which focused on helping
the individual discover what constitutes “good,” not by establishing what is “good” or “bad,” but by exploring what individuals and historical groups have concluded is “good,” and moreover, though endowing the individual to use ethical questioning towards the end of adopting values to guide one’s actions. The emphasis was on process and the individual.

The Hawai‘i Department of Education released a report in 1989 suggesting a return towards a more traditional character education model, adopting Regulations 2100.4, promulgating: “The times we are currently in and the forecasted changes facing our young people demand that our schools take leadership in instilling and reinforcing those values which have served to preserve our society” (Character Education, 1989, p.2). Review on value orientation within the Hawai‘i Department of Education concluded the importance of integrating moral education within existing curriculum across disciplines, as opposed to adding it on, and align moral education within instructional programs. The focus was on measurable outcomes via the use of performance standards, sequencing, approved instructional material and integrated curriculum. For example, performance statements and general learner outcomes were identified across grades.

The Hawai‘i Department of Education adopted Character Education Regulations 2101.1 in September 1997 (Appendix X). It mandated that all schools proactively integrate age-specific comprehensive formal and informal character education, character building experiences and opportunities to apply respect and responsibility throughout all grade levels. The US grants stipulated that progress was to be conveyed in teacher-parent conferences and report cards as stipulated by given core ethical values and standards of conduct, which are to be held by both students and staff, with the collaboration of
families and community members. Values derive from the following curricula: Punahou Character Education (Value-a-month), Character Counts (Six pillars of Character) and Good Character videos. Literature is derived from the Heartwood Curriculum and role models from the Giraffe Program Service Learning and Wise Skills (community service). Seven schools from different districts with different models were chosen as pilot projects for partnerships in character education throughout the state of Hawai‘i, for the years 1998-2001 (Appendix B).

Based primarily on measurement of increases and decline of behavioral disruptions and qualitative surveys by students and staff, the Evaluation Office of Curriculum Research & Development Group concluded that there was an overall improvement of student behavior despite research showing the contrary, in the second of three evaluation reports (Brandon & Higa, 2000). This was based on Brandon and Higa’s interpretation of results showing the contrary, and although they also concluded that the success of a program was relational to the positive attitude of the program by staff, they also surmised that the report was inconclusive due to inconsistencies of between information gathered from participating schools and “control group” schools.

According to Jean Nakasato (telephone conversation, June 8, 2005), student support program manager for the Hawai‘i Department of Education, this character education policy mandate is going to be removed and placed under the category of civic education as a policy of state. It will no longer be a board policy, but a up to each school.

The 21st Century in Hawai‘i has brought a surge in charter schools, twenty-seven at the time of writing, with much mixed praise and controversy (Hawai‘i Charter, 2003). While most of the charter schools are based on unifying themes, such as technology or
interdependence, over half of the charter schools are founded upon indigenous Hawaiian values. It remains to be seen what the long-term effects of a formal Hawaiian moral education might be; although, the short-term yield has shown “encouraging” results from a Hawaiian values education in comparison with standard public schools, although this varied from school to school and only measures academics (DePledge, 2004).
Chapter 3

Selected Peace and Character Education Program Reviews

The following programs and curriculum were selected for this study for their content and orientation. Character and peace education programs differ from each other, so a diversity of approaches was sought. Looking at different programs will help identify similarities and differences between character and peace education programs, as well as differences between each other, towards a better understanding of character and peace education. Frankena's (1965) schema for analyzing normative philosophies of education is used as a framework for content analysis by examining: 1) the dispositions to be fostered, 2) rationale for such dispositions, 3) suggested methodologies and 4) rationales for the suggested methodologies.

The first program represents a more traditional character education approach, as defined by its traditional pedagogy, conservative orientation and self-identified affiliation with “tradition.” There is an emphasis on dictating behavior through discipline and traditional authority in which diverse learners and individuals embrace a “universal” set of values. Wynne and Ryan are frequently referenced in other character education literature.

Dispositions to be fostered:

Reclaiming Our Schools (ROS) maintains that the transmission of values, high academic expectations, and discipline, and ‘traditional’ moral values as part of the multi-facet mission of public education, stressing the importance of educators and parents as agents for instilling the moral priorities of youth, referred as “the Great Tradition” (Ch. 2). The authors maintain that students must take responsibility for their learning, their accomplishments and shortcomings, and the effectiveness of the school, particularly as they mature.

Wynne and Ryan conclude that the teaching of Greco-Roman and Judeo-Christian ethics is practical and consistent with the majority of the US population 3, and suggest the following values: prudence, justice, temperance, fortitude, faith, hope, charity, and duty (p. 140-1). In the Western Platonic tradition of “knowing the good,” ROS upholds the examination of “heroes and villains” in literature and social studies towards applying those values through some form of service (p.148-162).

ROS implores diligence by both students and teachers, including importance of modeling morality (Ch. 6). An entire chapter is dedicated to teaching discipline and punishment that must be taught and enforced according to ROS; in fact, rules serve as teaching points of character (Ch. 4). The classroom must maintain a shared moral environment, or ethos (97-103). Emphasis on self-esteem breeds narcissism and impedes impetus for continual improvement; the inculcation of diligence is emphasized (p. 103-6).

---

3 ROS maintains that teachers and schools can teach such culturally specific values to the degree the school boards and communities allow, provided religious grounds are not the basis of their moralizing (p. 28).
Rationale for such dispositions:

Wynne and Ryan cite an assortment of youth conduct statistics and attitudinal surveys they conclude that many of today's youth are anti-social, self-destructive and/or narcissistic, and require corrective action and education. They explain that most of Western history has entailed the inculcation of "proper habits," and what they propose is merely a return to that tradition from the derailment by trendy progressive education theories and unrealistic expectations by anti-trait psychology (p. 52-4). ROS maintains that character revolves around fixed conduct that must be identified; therefore, opportunities of application via a variety of school or community service should abound.

Suggested methods:

Wynne and Ryan list very specific guidelines to instill the habituation of character and academic excellence: 1) Specify learning objectives; 2) provide opportunities to take in those learning objectives; 3) align learning prerogatives with developmental levels and adjust accordingly; 4) institute strong motivators; 5) measure student level of learning via formal and informal methods; 6) examine the outcomes of these measurements to discern improvement or decline; 7) reward achievement and admonish failure and 8) examine the overall process (1-7), change as needed, and recommence instruction (Ch.3).

Wynne and Ryan use competitive sports as an instructive metaphor for "profound learning" (p. 46-49). ROS lists the following suggestions towards that end: 1) intensify incentives, such as public praise or other conspicuous awards or membership; 2) boost opportunities of high-status, high-pressure schools or programs; 3) boost the power and status of teachers in terms of prestige and ability to expel students as needed; 4) boost
punishments for inadequate performance, effort and disobedience via public humiliation, temporary banishment, exclusion from desirable activities, transfer to more repressive programs, and so forth; 5) boost the role of ceremonial assemblies, pledges and various conspicuous displays of incentives; 6) use grouping identities (e.g., team activities, uniforms, etc.) to exploit competitive pressuring; 7) intensify learning demands; 8) clarify expectations and goals for character education, discipline and academics; 9) encourage standardization of school-wide learning goals; 10) increase the variety of learning demands on students, thus increasing the areas that students can excel in; 11) provide inducements to expedite graduation for students who do not want to be in school; and 12) put emphasis on pride rather than fun to stress accomplishment and effort (p. 47-8).

Fostering community through partnerships, symbolic gatherings, rites, and boundaries to instill spirit, and reinforce values and common goals of a group is essential; as in the classroom, some benign hierarchy is needed to manage cooperation and coordination (Ch. 8). Similarly, the organizational structure of the school demands strong leadership with loyalty by employees to legitimate authority towards the enforcement of accountability (Ch. 9). Teacher performance can be maintained through the use of rewards and sanctions.

**Rationales for suggested methods:**

Wynne and Ryan believe that profound learning is inherently repulsive, that is, change is challenging and discomforting, therefore inducement is requisite; they challenge the primacy of student enjoyment in the learning process, and see it as potentially counterproductive (p.38-43). Towards that strategy of intensifying learning,
ROS lists the following factors: 1) the amount of exposure to influences over time; 2) the prestige or power of the teacher as seen by the students; 3) the use of punishments and rewards; 4) the creativity and vision of the instructor; 5) the proximity and intensity of physical space between teacher and taught; 6) the consistency of an environment; 7) the demands on body management or change; and 8) the willingness of the learner to invest in learning, all these factors determine the success or failure of the educational process (p. 39-40).

ROS upholds the authority and control of the teacher in the classroom, and the importance of serving as a role model; similarly, principals must act as managers, consulting with teachers and parents, but maintain the authority to make command decisions of the institution (p. 3). ROS questions whether education can ever truly be intrinsically motivated, thereby implying a utilitarian perspective of human nature (p. 22-3). ROS explains an inextricable link between religion and values, and bemoans the difficulty to teach values within the legislated separation of church and state, despite its citing of public polls which suggests most Americans are religious and Christian, and attributes the spread of secular values as inconsistent and prejudiced against the majority of its citizens (p. 25-28). Wynne and Ryan consider egalitarianism in the schools as a causal factor of overall scholastic decline (p.66-8). They claim that transformational education programs rarely work unless they hold very specific conditions, such as ethnic isolation or volition to be changed (p.49-51).

ROS cites respect for Western tradition and historical prominence as its own justification to maintain and preserve such legacy, and on the direction of public education, that “protradition criticisms generally represent the most coherent and relevant
body of reform proposals” (p.4-5). ROS rejects Rousseauian notions of social forces corrupting an otherwise pro-social human nature, and embraces a Burkeian perspective of an inherently dark human nature that requires shaping by societal standards, and justifies the maintaining of traditional institutions and privilege (p.4-5). ROS credits declines in various student criminal or self-destructive activity to a return to and affirmation of “traditional values,” through all institutions of the USA, including political and judicial (p. 15-17). Conversely, ROS notes declines in all-around student progress due to progressive education, including increasing student choice and decision-making, historical revisionism, de-emphasizing patriotism, “moral relativism,” and making “classrooms more ‘democratic’” among several problems in education (p.16-17). ROS does address the affective in the closing chapter by differentiating between sentiment and sentimentality; the former refers to legitimate feelings inevitable in humanity and to be considered, whereas the latter refers to an excessive emphasis on emotions over reason, denying a historical dark nature of humans disregarded by romanticism (Ch. 11).

The next program is by character education authority Thomas Lickona. Frequently cited, Lickona represents an amalgamation of traditional character education and contemporary methodology and values. Director of Center for the 4th and 5th Rs, Lickona is a leader in the character education movement and teaches courses on character education, discipline and at Summer Institute in Character Education.

Dispositions to be fostered

Lickona, a developmental psychologist and educator, differentiates between universal and non-universal values, advocating the former which he claims transcend cultural differences, such as values enshrined within United Nation documents, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (p.37). Lickona declares the centrality of religion for many embracing moral values and its significance within institutions of the USA, as well as agreed moral values across religions (p. 37-43). Educating for Character (EFC) is founded on what it concludes are the two central “natural moral laws” of respect and responsibility, as well as honesty, fairness, tolerance, prudence, self-discipline, helpfulness, compassion, cooperation, courage, and other democratic values that he considers “the basics” (p.43-47).

Rationale for such dispositions

Lickona notes youth crime statistics and polls, popular media culture, contemporary materialism and attitudes towards sex, drug use and attitudes towards authority and others, as evidence for the need of character education (Ch. 1). He also mentions poverty as contributing to “deficiencies in moral values,” although there are no other references to poverty in his book (p.4). Lickona credits the increased place of the sciences in education theory, particularly psychology and the influence of values clarification and Kohlberg’s ‘moral dilemma discussions,’ as well as social movements in the 1960s and 1970s with the rise of “ethical illiteracy” (p. 7-12).

Lickona believes that the values listed are founded on a common ethical ground that bridges sectarian and cultural norms, evidenced by the widespread, broad-based
support for such programs (Ch. 1). He also believes that democratic values and processes are essential for a pluralistic democracy, as well as for the health and safety of the youth and society as a whole from destructive behaviors. This professor of education concludes that education is inherently value-laden, therefore it is a responsibility to institutions of education to address value education and civilization demands it.

*Suggested Methodologies:*

Prof. Lickona champions a comprehensive approach to character education involving a partnership between the classroom, the school as a whole, parents, and the larger community. He stresses the importance of upholding a moral culture within each of these components (Ch. 17). Strategies within the classroom include cooperative learning, values integrated into larger curriculum, classroom democracy, teaching conflict resolution and conscience of craft, and encouraging moral reflection and discipline (Ch. 4). The teacher serves as care giver, model and mentor (Ch. 5). Outside of the classroom, the entire school should maintain a moral culture through the leadership of administration and school government with opportunities for school and community service. Parents and other community institutions should be recruited as partners in moral education. EFC cites classroom and school examples of each component via various programs throughout the U.S.A. Lickona sees the inclusion of so-called controversial issues as a vital opportunity to exercise critical and ethical thinking skills that can be framed within a cooperative approach (Ch. 14). His work does not include example lesson plans per se, but anecdotes and examples from schools across the USA.
Rationales for such methodologies

Dr. Lickona sees a relationship between moral knowing, moral feeling and moral action as interrelated components of good character (Ch. 4). Moral knowing includes perspective taking, decision-making, self-knowledge and moral awareness and reasoning. Moral feeling includes empathy, conscience, humility, “loving the good,” self-esteem and control (p. 53). Moral action includes ethical competence, will and habit (p.68).

EFC prescribes a blend of traditional character education with veneration for moral authority, with elements of social science, such as self-understanding, group learning, and cognitive stages and domain that guide diverse activities requiring application and analysis. While Lickona criticizes what he calls the moral relativism of relativistic thinking derived from positivism and personalism, he does support the values clarification questioning process as long as the teacher consciously guides the process and moreover, the values that the student espouse “worthwhile,” applying critical thinking and moral reflection (p.230-239).

The third character education program reviewed differs in its administrator orientation. The emphasis in this guide is a comprehensive “how” to start and evaluate a character education program, and less detail on “what” to teach. It does not advocate a specific list of values, as much as mentioning numerous lists adopted by different state legislatures and other school programs, and encouraging that any list be acceptable to the school community.

Disposition to be fostered:

DeRoche and Williams differentiate character education from civic education, the former focusing on personal characteristics, the latter focusing on public responsibilities. Educating Hearts and Minds (EHM) pragmatically declares the values that can be reached by consensus within a community are the values to be taught, although it refers to values that have been legislated by states as examples of core values, as well as sample lists from various character education programs, such as the Heartwood Ethics Curriculum values list: courage, loyalty, justice, respect, hope, honesty and love (p. 22). Another set of dispositions offered come from the American Association of School Administrators suggestions from 1988: 1) understanding and applying honesty and “the Golden Rule;” 2) work ethic; 3) respecting diversity; 4) teamwork; 5) self-responsibility; 6) respect for others and authority; 7) commitment to personal, family and community life; 8) U.S. patriotism and responsibilities of democracy; 9) civil dispute resolution; 10) respect for educators; and 11) life-long goals and learning (p. 22-23).

Rationale for such dispositions:

For DeRoche and Williams, forming character is the purpose of schools, along with academic development. EHM begins by condemning an inventory of behaviors and attitudes by contemporary youth and society ranging from dysfunctional families and sexual activities, rampant criminal activity, to “music with distasteful lyrics” and “sex
and violence" in popular media, to the questioning of authority by youth (p. 2-3). Additionally, EHM points out the increasing community diversity and immigration demands American enculturation, and that the surge of change throughout society, whether technical, economic or the shrinking of communities into individualism demands structure and moral order. EHM deduces that the youth are being taught these behaviors and attitudes, demanding a re-examination of what is being taught in schools and communities and a duty of schools to not be “moral bystanders” (p.5). EHM concludes, “We do not need scientific surveys to tell us what our own eyes and ears are revealing. History shows that when Americans have problems with their children and youth, they look to the schools for solutions” (p.12).

Suggested methodologies:

DeRoche and Williams propose a character education that is begins in the family and perpetuates in school and community, via study, practice and modeling. EHM provides a comprehensive framework for character education programs that consists of a integration of: vision, standards (for school, school district and community), expectations, criteria, leadership, resources, training, partnerships and assessment (Ch. 2).

EHM gives much detail on organizational structure and function for character education, including leadership, character education committees, community councils, school-district committees and school-site committees (p. 45-55). It includes what it describes as “the 11 C’s” [sic] of implementation standards principles: 1) caring; 2) collaboration; 3) commitment; 4) courage; 5) change; 6) connections; 7) coherence; 8) consensus; 9) communication; 10) culture and 11) critical (p. 35-45). A character
education council would ideally consist of a partnership among: school personnel, instructors and mentors, family outreach centers, activities and events, media, curriculum and co-curriculum, law enforcement and judicial groups, business, health and social organizations, faith community, parent organizations, feeder schools, a character education evaluation committee and coordination by partnership action team (Ch. 4).

EHM includes an extensive overview for comprehensive evaluation, including basically two models of evaluation: one that lists a rubric of program vision objectives and applications, teacher implementation, staff and student responsibilities, assessment and overall school environment, and a second which is essentially an inventory of student problematic or pro-social behavior (Ch. 5). Although the overview of different character education programs contained a mix of evaluation methods, there is a propensity towards evaluation based on reduced student behavioral problems (Ch. 6).

*Rationales for suggested methods:*

DeRoche and Williams review an extensive list of different character education programs, including school district programs, character education organization programs (e.g., Heartwood Program), intervention programs (e.g., Resolving Conflict Creatively Program), and the expert testimony of Lemming, which is listed in the analysis section.

The following program was selected for its relational approach to peace education. While the program does not self-identify itself as “peace education,” its process, objectives and emphasis on non-violence and compassion embrace fundamental tenets of peacemaking and peace building through instilling an ethic of caring, and empowering students with the communication skills to resolve conflict and nurture
relationships. It is transformative in its objective of transforming classical classroom arrangements and hierarchies, as well as transcending dualistic dichotomies towards win-win models of conflict resolution.


**Dispositions to be fostered:**

The *Compassionate Classroom* (CC) focuses on the capacity of individuals to nurture enriched human connections where: 1) people are empathetic to what each is feeling and needing, 2) people are aware of their interdependence, thus value the importance for all parties to have their needs filled, and 3) people intrinsically take care of themselves and each other in non-coercive ways. As the title suggests, core values and skills inculcated are compassion and empathy for others and self. Additionally, the CC empowers youth by accentuating their agency to make choices in their thoughts, listening, speaking and actions, (p. 53-8) and fill needs, as way to prevent, reduce and resolve conflicts. The CC inculcates a pro-social environment by nurturing partnership-based relationships, including student-student, student-teacher and so forth.

According to the Hart and Hudson, it is not enough to focus on the dispositions desired for the students, but equally if not more important to consider the values conveyed implicitly and explicitly by school as a whole. The relationships addressed in the CC include: the self, teacher-student, student-student, and student-learning, that is, the
awareness and addressing of one's learning needs and skills. Non-violent communication serves as a model of speaking and listening where those involved in conflict can express their observations, needs, feelings and requests without judging or fear of being judged, towards the collaboration of a win-win outcome rather than a divisive dispute of blaming (Rosenberg, 2003). The CC cultivates emotional intelligence through the exploration and understanding of feelings. The CC educates to recognize and respect universal human needs, such as needs of autonomy, celebration, integrity, interdependence, physical sustenance, play and spiritual communion.

**Rationale for such dispositions:**

In CC, the dispositions of the students cannot be separate or different from the disposition of the classroom, teacher or school. Therefore, to nurture students who are peaceful and cooperative, so must the school experience and environment, and assure their emotional, as well as physical, safety (Ch.1). The focus of CC is on relationships, rather than the abstract notion of “the individual,” as the individual is largely a product of their social environment, therefore the cultivating of the social environment will cultivate the disposition of the individual student.

Five premises of CC include: 1) people are naturally givers, 2) people can give and receive most needs for others, 3) to meet needs, people can be more conscientious of how we think, listen, speak and act, 4) people can learn new ways to meet needs, and 5) by focusing on needs, conflict can be better prevented, reduced and resolved (Ch. 3). The CC identifies some of the roots of conflict in the very language used that has been shaped by dualistic, “dominator” cultures based on win/lose competition; the CC advocates
relearning language that is based on human giving and receiving nature that seeks win-win outcomes (Rosenberg, 2003).

**Suggested methods:**

CC stresses student-centered education and securing the "emotional safety and trust," as well as the physical (p. 17-20). Frequent teacher and student evaluations are suggested to evaluate the learning process. Towards the empowerment of students, the maintaining of student forums, such councils, class discussions, dyads, role-play, "empathy buddies and third-siders" is recommended (p.31). CC also recommends the "interplay of feelings and needs" into existing curriculum, particularly in social, physical and language sciences to instill the under appreciated values of feelings and needs within the evolution of humankind (p.35).

Activities abound in the CC, which include exercises that recognize the social nature of humans and the universality of giving, caring, needing, and feeling. The concepts are easily translatable to younger ages through finger puppets and other activities suggested, and to older students via role-playing, group discussions, personal reflections, and so forth. There are skill-building games and activities addressing observation, feelings, needs, listening, anger and effective communication (115-172).

**Rationales for suggested methods:**

The CC is based on the work of clinical psychologist and international peacemaking trainer Marshall Rosenberg's (2003) theory of nonviolent communication,

---

4 "Empath on Duty" is a rotating student position where volunteers to listen to students in need of someone to listen to them. "Third-siders" are volunteer student mediators that facilitate empathy between parties.
which is based on the premise that conflict is the result of frustrated needs; therefore, if both parties are able to effectively and functionally able to share their observations, feelings, needs and requests without judgment or antagonism, then win-win collaboration may be possible in a way that affirms the relationship and the dignity of all parties, including the needs of students and teachers. Instead of being motivated by punishment, reward, obligation and other extrinsic forces, the actor is motivated by the intrinsic desire to feel the needs of self and others. When students observes respect from a teacher, they will reciprocate respect to authority, particularly if respect is mutually earned, not demanded, and if there is awareness of and real capacity to make choices in decision making, including their behavior.

The CC acknowledges and nurtures the affective or emotional intelligence that is often overlooked in institutions that historically emphasize cognitive development (Goleman, 1995). Nonviolent communication does not use behaviorist strategies to manipulate or dictate behavior, but rather establishes relationships based on empathy and honesty that eventually fulfill everyone's needs.

The next program was selected as a general peace education, balancing skill-building in conflict resolution and general peace education curriculum and themes. As the title suggests, it focuses on elements of peacemaking, to include peer-initiated mediation as a strategy by individuals to work towards the conditions of positive peace.

Dispositions to be fostered:

This Peacemaking curriculum has detailed performance expectations and indicators including: honing effective communication skills, developing a positive sense of self, cultivate decision-making and problem-resolving skills, develop self-sufficiency in and a passion for lifelong learning, improve physical and emotional health, nurture responsibility to self and others, inculcate cooperative and leadership skills, develop a global and ecological consciousness.

Emphasis is placed on building conflict resolution skills and awareness. The Peacemaking curriculum includes testing to knowledge of types and causes of conflict and conflict resolution, native Hawaiian-based mediation, negotiation, anger management, as well as general communication skills and stoppers. The peace education unit explores tolerance and the many manifestations of intolerance, as well as in-depth examination of nonviolent social change.

Rationale for such dispositions:

This Peacemaking curriculum was originally designed to train a core of peer mediators to implement student-based, positive conflict resolution for the school. Secondly, because the overall school curriculum has been almost entirely content-based and focused, this curriculum was intended to address the affective needs and skills of an age group normally going through much change and conflicts. In addition to its conflict resolution core, the goals are to cultivate positive self-esteem, improve communication, inculcate problem-resolving strategies, diminish school violence and improve the overall
campus environment. The combination of conflict resolution skills and peace education instills the skills required to manage inevitable conflict, and the philosophy and feelings that encourage such a functional way of living.

Suggested Methods:

The curriculum is written in lesson plan format, with activities that incorporate role-playing, group dialogue, rap sessions amongst students, critical thinking and feeling, simulations to encourage thinking on their feet, empathy, and development on moral, social, academic and spiritual areas. The activities serve as suggestions, encouraging teacher to use or modify activities as needed and to expand through guest speakers, other materials, suggested audiovisuals and activities, and field trips suggested by students. Resources are included, including local agencies that can provide guest speakers on relevant class content.

The course suggests conflict awareness and communication skills the first quarter, negotiation and mediation training, and anger mediation training the second quarter, and peace education throughout the remaining semester, covering a range of topics such as tolerance, stereotypes, discrimination, and various peace heroes and heroines, covered through research, journaling, class presentations, self-grading and exams. Personal inventories are included to reflect on self-esteem, self-efficacy, conflict attitudes and conflict management style, as well as pre- and post-test for conflict resolution.

Rationales for suggested methods:

The Peacemaking curriculum suggests starting with building a safe space and
community, as well as personal goals and communication skills the first quarter as a foundation for the rest of the course. Moving into mediation training the second offers an opportunity to apply knowledge and skills learned in the first, including ho'oponopono, an indigenous Hawaiian model of conflict resolution and negotiation that includes relational and affective issues, to draw from local, community traditions. The third quarter explores issues of tolerance, prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination through personal reflection in journals to class discussions to service projects, to connect the personal to the local to the global. Extensive study of peacemakers, such as Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., offer examples of what can and has been accomplished through non-violence. Peacemaking I & II incorporates the cognitive and the affective, as well as the relational towards a balanced whole learning.

The final program for review was selected as a comprehensive peace education that addresses violence in all its forms, including institutional violence not excluding social hierarchy in education systems. It goes beyond the peacekeeping model and aims to empower students of this program for peacemaking and peacebuilding. It is transformative in aim by encouraging students as agents of positive social change, from the individual to the global.


---

⁵ This review focuses on Vol. 1. Vol. 2 addresses "Global Dimensions" of the same themes, where it explores topics such as global interdependence, US foreign policy, the military, war and alternatives, and world hunger and poverty. Vol. 3 covers "Religious Dimensions" of the same theme. This volume was separated from the others to allow appropriate use of the other volumes within secular institutions, yet
Dispositions to be fostered:

The comprehensive curriculum of Education for Peace and Justice (EPJ) is designed to empower students as active participants towards a realized democracy towards as the title suggests- educating for positive intrapersonal, interpersonal and international peace and social justice. The emphasis of EPJ is on relationships of all forms and empowering students as agents of positive change at all levels, as well as the well-being and solidarity and service of all people, including respect for the dignity and self-determination of all people.

Cognitive goals include the awareness of: a positive sense of self, peace and justice issues, how social change occurs, manipulation and propaganda and the nature of consequences in relation to human action and inaction. Affective goals include: being moved by advocates of justice or survivors of injustice, and a sense of being supported within a community. Behavioral goals include actions: of direct service addressing situational or institutional injustice, that focus on local and national or international levels that can be done within the school or home, or involve lifestyle changes.

In addition to the qualities they espouse, they address qualities that must be challenged including: “militarism, racism, sexism, corporate profits at people’s expense, and callous disregard for those malnourished, ill-housed, lacking health care and miseducated” (p. i). This is extended to ageism, consumerism, handicapism and all other forms of institutional violence, including political, economic, social and educational. An entire chapter is devoted to mutual education, which includes an examination of institutional violence in schools, the values of cooperation and competition, and mutual

reveals the religious underpinnings and component of this particular curriculum, albeit quite different from other interpretations of conservative American Christianity.
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respect and responsibility to others and self, the latter encouraging autonomy over blind obedience and submission (Ch. 3). There is also a chapter devoted to a philosophical and critical examination of US laws, including its relationship with lower economic classes, prisons, and capital punishment (Ch. 4), as well as the nature and dynamics of poverty in the USA (Ch. 5). The chapter on multicultural education includes activities to inventory preconceptions and stereotypes of different cultures, enrich knowledge about diverse cultures and nurture attitudinal change towards different cultures, towards the goal of increasing of awareness, respect and sensitivity among varied cultural and racial groups (Ch. 11).

**Rationale for such dispositions:**

The Institute for Peace and Justice concludes, as did many of the revolutionary founders of the USA\(^6\), that democracy requires citizens discerning, recognizing, analyzing, questioning and challenging all social phenomena and institutions around them. Because the authors embrace of positive definition of peace as the presence and conditions for justice and actualized democracy, it follows that education must empower its citizens to remedy the multitudes of institutional violence and injustice, since they also conclude that no education can be neutral in practice. The overall aspiration of EPJ is "informed, compassionate and courageous agents of change" (p.5). It follows then that to be effective citizens within a democracy that students need to be able to examine all of its institutions, including education, military, criminal justice system, media, class and multiracial society, and traditional forms of discrimination that impede the realization of

---

\(^6\) Although many "founding fathers" believed in the inclusion of their particular interpretation of Christianity to be a bedrock and inseparable from moral education (Errant, n.d.)
equality, freedom and justice.

Suggested methodologies:

The manual instructs teachers to take students where they are at, allowing a safe place for differing views, such as rethinking what it means to be a "patriot," while challenging, not indoctrinating, students by encouraging to articulate their own positions. It also suggests avoiding students feel overwhelmed by service projects by a variety of suggestions based on supporting students where they are (p. 9). EPJ includes directives and additional resources for teachers regarding the age level of students, acknowledging the importance of tailoring lessons to appropriate levels of cognitive and affective development (p.4-). EPJ stresses process and modeling, including the inclusion of students in decision-making processes and a prevailing cooperative model of education, within and outside of the classroom. A variety of worksheets are included, largely student inventories of cultural misperceptions and knowledge.

EPJ devotes an entire chapter to conflict resolution, as an essential part of an overt implementation of the value of non-violence, including a framework to analyze conflicts and responses to conflict, perspective-taking, the use of non-violence in the face of conflict, and educational case studies of non-violent labor struggles (Ch. 1). The manual includes an in-depth analysis of the cycle of violence and institutional violence, so that the roots of violence, rather than just the symptoms, can be addressed (Ch. 2). Guidelines towards the learning of myriad cultures include: avoiding exoticism and essentialism, providing positive role models, embracing diversity, and using primary sources/speakers and student/community resources when possible with multiple perspectives (Ch. 10).
Rationales for suggested methodologies:

EPJ model of learning follows: from the cognitive (e.g., awareness, critical thinking skills) to the affective (e.g., caring, sense of connection) to the behavioral (e.g., taking some form of action towards the realization of peace and justice). EPJ demands that the very school must be a place of peace and justice, if it is to be espoused (Ch. 3). Similarly, it is not enough to teach about peace and justice, but to apply the values by taking some form of action towards peace and justice.
Chapter Four

Analysis

After reviewing a variety of literature and programs on character and peace education, it is easy to see why defining either is difficult. Notions of character and peace are subjective. For some, character is abstract qualities and principles to inspire and guide our humanity, whereas for others, character is specific behavior and habits. For some, peace is the presence of order and national/local security requiring armed and militarized ‘peacekeeping,’ whereas for others, peace is the presence of justice, demanding the elimination of structural violence in all its forms and human security, requiring the basic necessities of life for all peoples via ‘peacemaking.’

What is clear is there are many different programs with similar names or objectives that have different or even conflicting methodologies (e.g., Wynne & Ryan vs. Lickona). Similarly, there are programs with quite different names that share similar objectives, such as reducing general violence. This is not an anomaly. John Locke, Noah Webster, and John Dewey all envisioned public schools as a moral enterprise. However, they would likely have quite different pedagogical philosophies, objectives and criteria for measuring effectiveness.

It is also difficult to determine the effectiveness of peace and character education programs given the conflicting conclusions and unclear criteria of what exactly constitutes “effective.” Some programs emphasize moral education as having specific ends, whereas others emphasize moral education, as an on-going process. Furthermore, longitudinal studies are inadequate and quite a challenging endeavor. While many evaluations consisted of qualitative surveys from teachers and administrators remarking
on the general improved social climate within the schools after implementing moral education programs, much of the literature reviewed in this thesis, particularly under the guise of character education, claimed conclusive and popular results based on the marked reduction of student behavioral and attitudinal disciplinary problems. Given the pervasiveness of this method of validating character education programs, one wonders if character education programs are really being implemented to control student behavior and disruption, or if this is merely an indicator of improved character? For example, comprehensive conflict resolution programs can be implemented to transform school climate and attitudes and skills towards resolving conflict constructively, or they can be hastily implemented as a “quick-fix solution” or a mere means to control disorderly youth (Pont-Brown & Krumboltz, 1999, p. 40).

Is there a hidden curriculum in character and peace education? While the goals for most are rather explicit, the motivation, perspectives, cultural bias, and philosophies behind the goals are not. This may therefore be difficult to discern. What is useful from this historical and program survey is the importance of knowing what the true intentions are in choosing to implement a character or peace education program in their class or school. Is it to empower students or to reinforce administrator or teacher agendas or control? Given that education is inherently political and on no account neutral (Colby, 1999), it may be argued that moral education that does not acknowledge or address the empowerment of learners reveals a concealing and complicity of preexisting power. It may also be argued that an empowered teacher can empower students. If so, how and when does this transference of power become realized, if at all? Considering most of the character education programs justify the need for such programs based on statistics on
juvenile misbehavior and attitudes, it seems it as if it is a fear or need to control youth that motivates such programs, whereas most of the peace education programs underscore the intensity of violence that youth and society at large are subjected to and the need to empower them with the skills to transform this violence.

Following the historical evolution of public education, and more specifically peace and character education programs, can help clarify motivating factors and intentions behind implementing moral education programs. There are at least four major themes that have occurred in US public education history: 1) education as a means to maintain a specified cultural/religious purity or unity; 2) education as a means of instilling a specified nation-state identity; 3) education as a means of filling specified needs of industry; and 4) education as a means of transferring knowledge and empowering citizens as participants in a democracy, and as conscientious life-long learners. All four have political agendas, although only the latter tradition seeks to share and distribute power, and all the themes can and have been integrated with other themes within public education, including programs such as Hawaiian charter schools.

Given the momentous role politics and social movements have played in the shaping of public education throughout history, it would be naïve and negligent to overlook or dismiss the role of current politics and social movements in contemporary moral education efforts. What are some current influential variables, and the place of the four major themes in US public education mentioned earlier?

One of the most influential, current cultural movements in the US is the ultra-conservative Christian resurgence (Cooperman & Edsall, 2004). The religious right has become very politically active and the constitutional separation between state and church
has become more obscure, this movement is credited with concentrating their particular values from local levels, up to the national, such as the 2004 presidential election or the exclusively Christian Presidential Prayer Team. Just as Calvinist Puritans were a major force for the emphasis on moral education in colonial America, it may be no coincidence that the issue of values and character education has resurfaced back in popular dialog, media and policy including education in the 21st Century (Purpel, 1999). Cultural emphasis on individual responsibility in character building over relational and shared responsibility parallels the sectarian doctrine of personal salvation. The Puritan ethic, critique and fear of secular society in colonial North America has evolved into the 21st Century, although the collusion may manifest more culturally and epistemologically than through overt doctrine (Yu, 2004). For example, the Puritan witch hunts against ‘suspect women’ may parallel the contemporary debate over abortion, in that they are both struggles over the control of women bodies, as well as serving as platforms to discuss or dictate appropriate behavior and values.

With the increasing cultural diversity and immigration within the contemporary USA, there is also a cultural movement to affirm a generic “American” identity, which is essentially a European-American founded one (Duke, 2004). A reaction to multicultural education and ethnic pride, as well as other social changes ranging from gender equity to sexual orientation, there is a “cultural war” being waged as unfolding equality distributes power to the historically disenfranchised from the ethnically and/or economically privileged (Lampman, 2004). Given the array of issues impacting millions of Americans, such as inadequate health care or the increasing class divide and financial security, the issues that often get political and media limelight, such as homosexuality and abortion,
reflect a particular set of religious and cultural values and priorities. It would be remiss to think these culture wars are not taking place within the schools, particularly within programs that engage specifically with cultural values, such as moral education.

The 21st Century has ushered in the US as the sole superpower, at a time of unprecedented globalization, and exercising that power in its proclaimed ‘war on terror.’ As with all wars, the nation-state has a vested interest in maintaining a unified citizenry willing to sacrifice public monies and lives for a national security, as defined by those in power (National Commission, 2004). The reprisals against US global domination via the September 11, 2001 attacks on an economic icon, the World Trade Center and a military icon, the Pentagon, have propagated a renewed state patriotism that is propagated by most institutions, especially the public schools (Walsh, 2001). While the character education movement precedes the 9/11 retaliations, it parallels the conservative political upheaval around the 1980s, leading up to the neo-conservative assent to the White House through the George W. Bush administration (Purpel, 1999), which has radically impacted public schools via the “No Child Left Behind” Act, which includes a character education provision (Public Law 107-110, Sec. 5431).

To what degree does the contemporary character education movement parallel US foreign and domestic policy culturally? As the sole superpower, the US has demonstrated its willingness for unilateral international intervention and warfare, under the rhetoric of universal values such as “freedom,” “democracy,” “tolerance,” and “rule of law” (“Focus,” 2001). Similarly, many character education advocates insist on a “universality” of values that purportedly transcends nationalities, religious orientation, cultures and so forth, while trivializing or excluding other issues of class, race, gender,
culture and so forth. The values that do get selected often reflect not only the values of the dominant polity and social groups, but also the process of instilling those values. Yu (2004), a professor of education in New York originally from the Peoples’ Republic of China details the uncanny similarities between the rhetoric and behaviorism of the Maoist Cultural Revolution and the American Character Education Movement. Parallels have been made with the former Soviet education as well. These totalitarian societies espoused moral superiority analogous to popular American belief as outgoing World Bank president James Wolfensohn proclaimed, “America is the moral leader of the world” (Inskeep, 2005). Just as some character education programs emphasize ends over the process of instilling desired values, the USA has been criticized by allies and foes alike for its process of instilling its rhetorical values of ‘freedom,’ ‘justice,’ and ‘democracy’ through armed invasion, economic enticement or sanction, influencing or hand-picking foreign leaders, and other forms of aggression and unilateralism that has been debated as undermining the goals of peace and security (“Poll,” 2005).

Looking at character education programs throughout the USA, there is a pattern of partnerships with business and industry, partners that often sit on boards of education and other influential bodies on educational policy. While the global economy requires workers with technical finesse, business leaders have stressed the need for employees with improved communication and general social skills (Freedman, n.d.). Throughout the US, there are numerous forms of business and public education partnerships from Chambers of Commerce to private sponsorship, reflecting a mutual relationship of purpose and support. Governmental education legislation, such as Goals 2000, illustrates the dominating view that the primary function of education is to produce “productive”
and "competitive" citizens for global capitalism, and that the schools are expected to fix social and economic ills, and that education to cultivate our humanity is among the first programs to be cut (Purpel, 1999, pp. 57-64).

While peace education is not as pervasive or embraced in the US, as other nations and international bodies, the proliferation of conflict resolution, multicultural and cooperative education curriculum and practices, while not exclusively identified as "peace education," continue some of the themes in peace education, such as nonviolent dispute resolution, respect and appreciation for cultural diversity, and communal values of interdependence and mutual assistance. Furthermore, the focus of any subject, in this case peace education, can be narrow or broad. For example, a narrow focus of peace education could be limited to: 1) the absence of war, 2) armament/gun restrictions, 3) a limited notion of peace, and 4) cognitive acquisition focus within a traditional classroom arrangement, versus a broad focus expanded to 1) the absence of all forms of violence and presence of justice, 2) the disarmament and dismantling of oppressive structures transnationally, 3) an expanded notion of peace, including ecological awareness, and 4) exercising participatory skills within a democratic classroom (Wals, 1999).

However, content is only one component. The process, particularly in peace education, is an essential application and inculcation of the skills and conceptual objectives. Many character education programs have incorporated progressive education methodology (Ryan, Sweeder & Bednar, 2002) such as blended technologies, balancing self-understanding and social cognition, affective learning, role playing, group learning techniques, and even elements of the frequently criticized values clarification (Lickona, 1989). Similarly, peace education programs can have traditional pedagogy such as value
lists, and formal study of social structures and problems and de-emphasizing affective learning and caring (Noddings, 2002). While there are some sharp divisions between many proponents of character and peace education, particularly over traditional versus progressive pedagogy, there has been much convergence as well.

After reviewing much literature on character and peace education programs, there is a tendency to view them as dualistic, diametrically opposed entities. However, this binary logic is overstated given the varying degrees different programs and pedagogy along a continuum between and beyond the divergent manifestations of character and peace education. It is instructive to examine the different objectives, methodology, motivators, indicators, orientation, bias, perspective and so forth each moral education program carries, regardless of its title, to determine its political and pedagogical orientation.

To some degree, the debate and differentiation between character and peace education can be a false dichotomy. If a character and peace education program espouse similar goals, for example, the inculcation of the value “justice,” then theoretically there should be little difference in its objective. Therefore, difference may lie in pedagogical, political and/or ideological differences towards the process of meeting that objective, and/or a fundamentally different understanding and purpose of that objective in the first place. To expand on the example of “justice,” justice may be narrowly interpreted as “law,” or rules specifying unacceptable behavior and regulating the affairs and of individuals and community, and enforced by a political authority and punitive measures, as in the legal, or “justice” system. However, a broader interpretation of “justice” may be expanded to a principle or spirit of reasonable righteousness, equity and fairness, which
may not necessarily be codified in "laws" as evidenced by laws that have been rescinded due to their violation of the principle throughout history. Naturally, interpretations may reflect class, gender, ethnicity, religious, national and a multitude of other biases, thus a broad perspective may be preferable to a narrow one within a diverse society.

Identifying hidden curriculum is as important as clarifying overt objectives, particularly in moral education. It is no contradiction that Yu (2004) finds similarities between the American Character Education and the Chinese command-state government, as there is an agenda for the preservation and maintenance of a particular political order employed through the dissemination of narrowly defined rhetorical values.

In parallel, there is no contradiction between the overlapping of values embraced by some character and peace education programs. For example, the elements of character listed within the No Child Left Behind legislation (Appendix A) is embraced by many peace education programs and theorists. Character and peace education programs may both cite violence that affects the well-being and safety of the youth, and both share the desire to diminish such danger. It is the interpretations and delivery of the values and causal sources of violence that are in contention.
Chapter Five

Summary and Recommendations

Educators and administrators interested in implementing a moral education program cannot rely on program title alone. It is important to identify where moral education programs fall along a "sliding-scale" of some of the following polarities: pedagogy that perceives societies as individuals versus collectives; pedagogy that is teacher or administrator-centered versus student-centered; pedagogy that emphasizes obligatory community service versus one that emphasizes nurturing quality relations and communication; pedagogy that is content versus process focused; and pedagogy that perceives the role of conflict resolution as a discipline alternative or surrogate for character or peace education versus a component of a comprehensive moral education program.

In addition to pedagogical concerns, there are other orientations that have political implications. Examples include: extrinsic versus intrinsic views of social learning; programs that focus on restoring a preferred time in history versus nurturing what is possible and envisioned for a better society; viewing students as "the problem" versus students as the casualties of social injustice and inequity, or safety from students versus safety for students; and deeper philosophical orientations, such as a presumed human nature as inherently evil, good, socially constructed, neutral, and so forth. These orientations reflect deeper biases shaped by class, gender, culture, ethnicity, religion, generation, and so forth, in combination with other perspectives. It is requisite that such predispositions are taken in account when selecting a moral education program, and that it is congruent with the community interests and representation, and in the best interest of
the youth involved and future generations, rather than covert political impositions by those who would benefit from such behavioral and attitudinal change, or lack thereof.

Given the multiplicity of considerations ranging from student level, process, content, context and so forth, an ideal program may require a hybrid of programs and approaches depending on the objectives of a class or school. If the objective is to control student behavior, then a program where teachers control by decree both means and ends using behaviorist methods of punishment and rewards may be sufficient, with or without a character or peace education program.

However, if the objectives are to aspire students to certain values, such as “responsibility” or “respect,” then it behooves to implement programs by incorporating “responsibility” and “respect” within the process to include administration, if applicable. In addition, there needs to be connotative clarity and understanding of given values. For example, “responsibility” and “respect” may be understood differently from varying cultures and orientations. “Responsibility” may be interpreted as “individual” or “collective” responsibility, or both. “Respect” may be interpreted as deference to hierarchical authority and institutions, or it may be interpreted as reverence for all peoples in spite of ranking ideologies, and extended to environment and all other forms of life. For illustration, proponents of mainstream establishment may presume that troubled urban youth have “no respect” for others or self, yet those intimately familiar with that demographic understand there is very much a code of “respect” and moreover, “disrespect” in urban social environments, however differently it may be defined.

A comprehensive moral education program may incorporate elements of most of the programs that were surveyed in this thesis. Where values and process align, there
may be no need to have to choose a specifically “character” or “peace” education program, but rather a combination of both. For illustration, lists of values and codes of conduct popular with more traditional character education programs may be useful as a component of a more comprehensive program. However, the process of selecting such lists and codes is as important as the moral inventory itself. The involvement of students creating and upholding such standards inculcates democratic, collaborative values towards the perpetuation of such citizenship, as well as empowering students to practice such ideals that they themselves embrace as favorable.

Additionally, the more culturally relevant the values are, the more meaningful and connected they may be for the students. For example, the American English word “unity” may be interpreted as national singularity, as in the popular idiom “united we stand” re-popularized after the September 11, 2001 retaliation against the USA. However, in the context of other cultures and languages, unity as expressed as yuimaaru in Okinawan Shuri dialect may be perceived as more as a “humanistic mutual assistance between peoples.” Similarly, “unity” in Hawaiian language may be expressed in terms of laulima and pono, in terms “cooperation” and “balanced harmony” between peoples and nature which are perceived inseparable, according to former Native Hawaiian charter school educator Ikaika Hussey (personal communication, May 23, 2005). The American English term “unity” can have a political, nation-state orientation pending usage, while other existential understandings of the term, particularly from other cultures and nations may express a more relational orientation, such as unity through diversity. Language can be subjective and cultural; therefore values may be treated as such, rather than assumed universal.
Codes and lists may facilitate the cognitive memorization of given values through structure. Culturally relevant schools, such as Halau Ku Mana, a Hawaiian charter school, are often founded upon lists of values in Hawaiian language vernacular, providing a meaningful connotation beyond governmental mandate. An example of a code of conduct that has transcended national boundaries and time is the Eight-Fold Path of Buddhism. This list of ethical conduct and awareness includes: Right View, Right Intention, Right Speech, Right Action, Right Livelihood, Right Effort, Right Mindfulness, and Right Concentration (Narada, 1993). It is intentionally subjective and unspecific, evoking a spiritual interpretation by the adherent towards a general direction and spirit of behavior, rather than a narrowly defined one by an authority or culture, thus allowing this code to persist throughout the many ethnic variations and lineages of Buddhism (Deshung, 1983). Codes, such as the Ten Commandments, have different interpretations even among sectarian Christians that can be specific and narrowed within each sect, making a universal reading of this Judo-Christian-Islamic guideline potentially contentious (Robinson, 2005). This is not to value one list over another, but to illustrate the significance of narrow versus broad readings of given moral values and their subjectivity.

In addition to the use of broadly defined codes, lists and literature popular in traditional character education pedagogy, is the integration of the social sciences into moral education pedagogy, both suggested by Lickona (1989). Lickona’s emphasis on both process and content, and the significance of addressing moral knowing, moral feeling and moral action underscores the importance of a comprehensive moral education
program. Empowering youth with critical thinking, communication and social skills is as important as identifying values to guide behavior, attitudes and cognition.

DeRoche and Williams (1998) offer an organizational model towards a comprehensive moral education program that proponents of both character and peace education can advocate. It is no coincidence that both “sides” agree on the importance of the larger social environment of the student, from the classroom to the school, and from the home to the larger community in the cultivation of values. This is a reasonable part of the larger process, as a principle becomes a societal value when adopted and practiced by a society, rather than through individual preference. DeRoche and Williams’ “11 C’s” principles of implementation standards is crucial to the integrity of any moral education program in its applying of advocated values among the implementers, not just applied to the students.

Hart and Hodson (2003) provide a model of communication and social skills that have been underserved in character and peace education programs that emphasize content. It also offers an infrastructure for relating to others, as well as an application of non-violence practice at intra- and interpersonal levels, which is requisite for practicing non-violence at societal and international levels. A “win-win” orientation may mediate conflict more functionally and successfully, than an orientation that is founded on competition and dualism.

The Peacemaking I & II curriculum produced by the Hawai‘i Department of Education (1995) offers a practical integration between skill and theory. It also illustrates the importance of incorporating peacebuilding with peacemaking. The latter provides conflict resolution skills, while the former works towards the reduction of conflict in the
first place through peaceable attitudes and orientation, not coercion. Conflict resolution by itself may not necessarily bring positive peace, in that violence in all forms including war and force may be used to suppress or repress conflict. However, when incorporated with an orientation of peace, it becomes a model of conflict resolution without violent intervention.

Finally, the Educating for Peace and Justice curriculum (1985) extends the personal awareness of character and peace to the application to democratic society. By addressing and challenging institutional violence, the individual understands the relationships between all human institutions and nature, causal roots of violence, and builds character by empowering students to address and challenge cyclical violence, from the personal to the international. McGinnis (1985) strengthens moral education by stressing critical thinking skills, including serious evaluation of the moral education content and process itself, so that it is self-renewing and avoids becoming dogmatic.

A comprehensive moral education program should contain elements of the several programs reviewed if it is to be transformative, as prescribed by Reardon (1988). A traditionalist program like Wynne & Ryan (1993) may be counter to the aims of transformation, as it sets out to preserve a pre-existing social order in the name of tradition through authoritarian, absolutist and sometimes dogmatic means (Ryan, n.d.), and would be contrary to transforming a society from violent institutions. Furthermore, traditionalists of the USA have been decrying the demise of society since its early days as a British colony. Considering youth violence has not ceased despite centuries of traditional education and over a century of formalized public education, it behooves society to consider they may not have found the best educational prescription for
addressing societal violence, and that it may require the empowerment of future
generations to help create an education system that is more effective towards that end.

It may also be the case that education alone is not enough to address societal
violence, and that it requires a different or mixture of approaches and policies to address
the phenomena of violence. US education, as it is, may even indirectly contribute to the
perpetuation of violence and injustice, in terms of what it chooses not to teach (Purpel,
1999). Society becomes a society by its reproduction of norms. If an education system
focuses on societal reproduction as defined by those with power and shuns
transformation, then it is unlikely it will question and renovate the status quo.

It is unlikely US education will transform significantly without transformative
thinking. Towards that end, it would mutually require that society embrace change. The
UN goal of creating a “culture of peace,” entails deconstructing a “culture of violence.”
For example, violent media may not necessarily “cause” violence (Malcolm, 1999), but
finding violence in general as “entertainment” may reflect cultural violence and may
perpetuate an insensitivity and indifference towards other forms of violence that
proliferate throughout societal institutions. Holistic education may be one way towards
the process of empowering citizens with social skills and a worldview of peaceful
possibilities, rather than perpetuate an expectation of perpetual violence (Purpel, 1999).

Traditionalists often say society requires more structure. Progressives often say
society requires new infrastructures. Humans are a species that have developed through
social evolution. However, we have developed particular institutions that are detrimental
to the survival of our species, such as modern warfare, substantial ecocide and various
“lifestyle diseases.” If we are to perpetuate our species, we will require an evolved
affective and social intelligence, in addition to intellectual development, moving beyond a reptilian brain survival mode of “us versus them,” towards an expanding neo-cortex capacity for higher collective intelligence, if we are to transcend the status quo. Moral education programs need to measure their effectiveness, not just by noting the reduction of undesired behavior, but also by noting the increase of desired attitudes, behavior and awareness. An effective moral education program will provide some structure to aid in understanding, as well as new infrastructures in communication and relational orientation that empower and inspire citizens to create new possibilities and potential. A transformative moral education program will require transcending duality and embracing interdependency, perhaps towards value and character of peace.
Appendix A: PL 1-7-110, Sec. 5431. Partnerships in Character Education Programs
(excerpts)

(b) CONTRACTS UNDER PROGRAM-

(1) EVALUATION- Each eligible entity awarded a grant under this section may contract with outside sources, including institutions of higher education and private and nonprofit organizations, for the purposes of —

(A) evaluating the program for which the assistance is made available;

(B) measuring the integration of such program into the curriculum and teaching methods of schools where the program is carried out; and

(C) measuring the success of such program in fostering the elements of character selected by the recipient under subsection (c).

(c) ELEMENTS OF CHARACTER-

(1) SELECTION-

(A) IN GENERAL- Each eligible entity awarded a grant under this section may select the elements of character that will be taught under the program for which the grant was awarded.

(B) CONSIDERATION OF VIEWS- In selecting elements of character under subparagraph (A), the eligible entity shall consider the views of the parents of the students to be taught under the program and the views of the students.

(2) EXAMPLE ELEMENTS- Elements of character selected under this subsection may include any of the following:

(A) Caring.
(B) Civic virtue and citizenship.

(C) Justice and fairness.

(D) Respect.

(E) Responsibility.

(F) Trustworthiness.

(G) Giving.

(H) Any other elements deemed appropriate by the eligible entity.
### Appendix B: Partnerships in Character Education Pilot Projects, 1998-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Model of Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Moanalua Middle School</td>
<td>Tribes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>Central Middle School</td>
<td>Punahou Character Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeward</td>
<td>Mauka Lani Elementary</td>
<td>Ohana Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windward</td>
<td>Benjamin Parker Elementary</td>
<td>Violence Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai‘i</td>
<td>Laupahoehoe High &amp; Elementary</td>
<td>SathySai (Indian Peace Education Model and Service Projects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauai</td>
<td>Elsie H. Wilcox Elementary</td>
<td>Hawaiian Values (Kupuna &amp; Technology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui</td>
<td>Kamali‘i Elementary</td>
<td>Heartwood Ethics Curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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