



5-1-2005

Relationship of the Pillars of Character and At-Risk Behaviors in Middle School Students

Steven A. Joyal

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Joyal, Steven A., "Relationship of the Pillars of Character and At-Risk Behaviors in Middle School Students" (2005). *Theses and Dissertations*. 682.
<https://commons.und.edu/theses/682>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact zeineb.yousif@library.und.edu.

RELATIONSHIP OF THE PILLARS OF CHARACTER
AND AT-RISK BEHAVIORS IN MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENTS

by

Steven A. Joyal
Bachelor of Science, North Dakota State University, 1970
Master of Education, Auburn University, 1974

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Grand Forks, North Dakota

May
2005

This dissertation, submitted by Steven A. Joyal in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education from the University of North Dakota, has been read by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done and is hereby approved.

Donald K. Lenoir
(Chair)

Dr. Sheryl A. Sondak

Dr. Sharon Evin Johnson

Richard G. Lantry

Andy L. J.

This dissertation meets the standards for appearance, conforms to the style and format requirements of the Graduate School of the University of North Dakota, and is hereby approved.

Joseph N. Benoit
Dean of the Graduate School

May 6, 2005
Date

PERMISSION

Title Relationship of the Pillars of Character and At-risk Behaviors in Middle School Students

Department Educational Leadership

Degree Doctor of Education

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my dissertation work or, in his absence, by the chairperson of the department or the dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this dissertation or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my dissertation.

Signature Steven A. Joyal

Date April 26, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
ABSTRACT	ix
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY	1
Overview of the Problem	7
Purpose of the Study and Research Questions	11
Significance.....	12
Delimitations	13
Definition of Terms.....	13
Assumptions	17
Overview	17
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	19
Historical Perspective.....	19
Revival of Character Education.....	46
Critics of the New Character Education	52
Research in Character Education	61
Summary of the Literature Review	68

III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	71
Site.....	72
Instrumentation	72
Data Analysis	78
IV. REPORT AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	79
Descriptive Report of the Data	80
Summary	84
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	86
Summary	86
Conclusions and Discussion	89
Limitations	92
Recommendations	95
APPENDIX.....	101
Youth Risk Behavior Survey Raters Chart.....	101
REFERENCES.....	105

LIST OF TABLES

1. Reliability Analysis of Responsibility Question Items	75
2. Reliability Analysis of Trustworthiness Question Items.....	76
3. Reliability Analysis of Citizenship Question Items	77
4. Reliability Analysis of Caring/Respect Question Items	78
5. Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVA Results between 2001 and 2003 Four Pillars and Total Scores	81
6. Pearson Product-Moment Correlations between the Character Pillars on the YRBS and Total Risk Behaviors.....	82
7. ANOVA between Character Pillars by YRBS Risk Factors	84

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation is the result of a passion for learning that has been instilled in me by my many teachers and mentors. To the members of my graduate committee, I express my gratitude and appreciation. Dr. Richard Landry provided significant professional guidance and critical feedback toward the completion of this document. He provided needed technical assistance with the design and statistical analyses of this study. Dr. Sherry Houdek, Dr. Sharon Johnson and Dr. Cindy Juntunen who provided guidance and direction, I express my gratitude.

To Dr. Dan Rice, Dr. Jerry Bass, Dr. John Backes, and others for their insight and effort in establishing the cohort doctoral program in Educational Leadership at UND. Without the establishment I would have never been able to achieve this personal and professional goal. The cohort program provided other experienced educators to pursue their educational goals in an atmosphere of professionalism and collegiality that made the personal sacrifices of all members manageable.

Dr. Don Lemon deserves my personal thanks and sincere appreciation for his patience and tutelage. Dr. Lemon continued as my advisor even after he retired from a long and noteworthy career. He continued to serve as my mentor and motivator, and for that I will be forever grateful. His attention to detail and knowledge base was of significant importance to the completion of this study.

His guidance through the dissertation process was dependable and resolute. His encouragement and phone calls were especially appreciated and helpful.

Special thanks to my former Superintendent, Dr. Richard Larson and the Minot School Board for allowing my participation in doctoral cohort program. My administrative colleagues at the Minot Public Schools deserve a thank you for the support and encouragement of my pursuit of this goal.

To my wife, Nancy, I owe many thanks not the least is the technical support of my writing and organization. My fulfillment of this goal has been a mutual achievement as so many of my accomplishments. She never once suggested my pursuit of this goal interfered with her plans. On the contrary, she was rock-solid in her support and encouragement. I never would have completed this document without her understanding and sacrifices during the entire process, and for that I will remain forever indebted.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to analyze data to determine the effectiveness of the Character Counts! education program taught in a mid-sized midwestern public school district. Four independent evaluators compared the Six Pillars of Character to questions from the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS). Four research questions asked whether differences of the YRBS scores of risk behavior related to the character pillars of Character Counts! as linked by the independent evaluators. Questions asked whether there were differences in middle-school student scores from 2001 to 2003 as measured by the YRBS, between males and females, and whether there was a relationship between the students' scores on the four character pillars and risk behaviors on the YRBS in middle-school students. Another question asked if there were differences in the character pillars based on four risk factors.

Significant differences were found between the student scores in 2001 and 2003. However, the scores reported a decrease in the number of positive behaviors from 2001 to 2003. No differences were found between males and females in the two survey reports. A significant negative relationship was found between the character pillars and risk behaviors. The findings suggested that positive behavior changes were difficult to quantify. Recommendations include integrating character education into the entire school program with appropriate staff development for teachers and administrators.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Complexities of a modern society have resulted in a rethinking of moral and character education in public schools. Character education has been imbedded in American education since its inception. The various but predominantly European peoples who settled the colonies shared a common commitment to a Christian faith and a desire to perpetuate this faith among their young as well as among the native population they encountered (McClellan, 1999). A passage of the *Ye Old Deluder Satan Act* (n.d.) by the Massachusetts Bay Company in 1647 required that towns of a certain size establish schools in order to thwart the efforts of that "Old Deluder, Satan" (Pulliam, 1982). Thus, the first schools were to teach the scriptures and to insure the continuation of religious orthodoxy and social norms (McClellan, 1999). In 1836, the *McGuffey Reader* was introduced, and by 1920, it had sold over 120 million copies (Pulliam, 1982). *McGuffey Readers* used many biblical stories and added heroic tales so that as children learned to read, they also learned lessons about honesty, courage and patriotism (Lickona, 1993; McClellan, 1999). Early in American education, religious and moral lessons were an integral part of nineteenth-century textbooks.

Founders and early educators in the United States saw the teaching of values as necessary to educate the diverse, multicultural American populace

with the civic virtues necessary to maintain the nation's novel and social experiment (McClellan, 1999; Etozioni, 1993; Lickona, 1993; Ryan, 1993; Wynne & Ryan, 1992). America's founding fathers were concerned about an educated citizenry; they understood that in addition to reading, writing, and arithmetic, no democratic society could survive without providing a society grounded in core values. Thus, they embedded those values in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights (Schaeffer, 2003). Throughout history educators have had two responsibilities: to educate children to have knowledge and to help them develop the values that result in good behavior (Lickona, 1993).

"Early American beliefs about human nature dictated the course of moral education methods for nearly two hundred years" (Laud, 1997, p. 4). After the American Revolution, colonial education was a means to impose patriotic values of nationalism and citizenship on the individual, and schooling the entire population was necessary in shaping moral character and maintaining social and political order (Spring, 1990). The 1830s and 1840s in America witnessed the common school movement which established a standardization of state systems of education and moral education continued its influence on American youth as the *McGuffey Reader* became a source of proper moral instruction (McClellan, 1999).

In the early 1900s popular tools of moral education were codes, creeds and clubs which stressed desirable character traits such as: self-control, kindness, self reliance, reliability, truth, teamwork and duty (Field, 1996). However, the realities of a World War changed the attitude of the young, leading to the free spirit of the Roaring 20s. This contributed to a mood of social instability

(Leming, 1993). The era was far from perfect; economic exploitation, racial, ethnic, and sexual discrimination were well entrenched in American society (Lickona, 1989). This perceived threat to moral standards resulted in virtually every school in America adopting the educational goal of improving the character of the youth (Leming, 1993, p. 63). Lickona (1989) suggested that the character education of the early twentieth century consisted mostly of the direct moral instruction of democratic and religious virtues such as patriotism, hard work, honesty, thriftiness, altruism, and courage. However, McClellan (1999) noted a different approach emerged in the mid-1920s; a group of educators known as *progressives* rejected the codes as too rigid and encouraged an ethical flexibility toward moral education.

The effectiveness of this early character education movement was the focus of an extensive studies by two Yale University psychologists, Hartshorne and May, from 1928 to 1930. Leming (1993) noted that Hartshorne and May studied the character-related behavior of more than 10,000 children and concluded that, regarding the nature of character, children cannot be divided into two behavior categories of honest and dishonest since the behavior of honesty in one situation could not predict that behavior in another situation. McClellan (1999) stated that the Hartshorne and May study "raised serious questions regarding the value of didactic methods in changing student behaviors" (p. 55). Ironically, Power, Higgins and Kohlberg (1989) found a lack of empirical data proving the effectiveness of character education did not deter the practice of character education in the schools.

John Dewey, Jane Addams, and other legendary American educators extolled instruction in moral character as necessary in the development of a moral society. Fishman (1998) wrote of Dewey as a person who believed democratic and moral communities are identical; Dewey (1959) saw a moral obligation of the school to advance the welfare of society. Dewey encouraged a dual role of the curriculum--moral traits of character such as wholeheartedness, cooperativeness, and responsibility to be taught as well as the academic curriculum. Jane Addams, a contemporary of Dewey, also fostered an educational wholeness through her efforts at Hull House. Addams (1994) wrote of the need for moral education: "The democratic ideal demands of the school that it shall give the child's own experience a social value; that it shall teach him to direct his own activities and adjust them to those of other people" (p. 99). Leming (1997a), in a review of the writing about character education after the decade of the 1930s, found that character education did not disappear but was transformed by the Second World War and the emergence of the Cold War, which rekindled the importance of character.

By the 1950s the character education movement had waned. Lickona (1993), a modern pioneer in character education, noted a decline in character education during the 1960s due to a rise in personalism, which celebrated the worth of the individual, manifested in autonomy and individual rights. The 60s and early 70s in America were marked with protests of social injustice and oppression, but civil unrest also eroded a belief in moral authority and norms. This led to a strengthening of individual rights and a weakening of social commitments (Kilpatrick, 1998).

Cultural pluralism in American society, which clouded the issue of whose values should be taught, and the increase in secularization of the public arena, which raised the concern of separation of church and state, became two obstacles confronting the traditional approach to character education. As a result, the teaching of moral and character education declined in the public schools. In the last half of the twentieth century, character education became influenced by a growing sensitivity to the heterogeneity of American society (Lickona, 1993, McClellan, 1999). Political and social upheaval heightened awareness that not all Americans were white, European, Christian, and that America was not one community but many. In a society where multiplicity of races, religions, and cultures were valued, a cognitive approach to moral education was a safer approach to build community support (Noddings, 1997). The pluralization of society prompted the question of whose values should be taught.

Values education returned in the 1970s with the advent of values clarification. The theory of values clarification was based on the work of Raths, Harmin and Simon (1966). The values clarification approach replaced the direct teaching of the nineteenth century with an approach that focused on the process of identifying the personal values held by the individual. Raths, Harmin and Simon (1966) advocated a seven-step process of values clarification, which allowed for free choice and did not require the teacher to express an opinion of right or wrong. The values clarification approach reflected the individualism of the time, which led to much criticism from those who believed it failed to help students know the difference between personal preference and moral obligation (Kilpatrick, 1992, Lickona, 1993). Harmin (1988), one of the original theorists,

addressed the need of values clarification to present not only a more balanced picture of both helping students to identify their values and how they affect behavior but also on emphasizing the importance of adopting society's moral values.

Lawrence Kohlberg also conducted research in the 1970s on the development of moral reasoning and devised moral dilemmas, which required students to react to hypothetical situations (Power, Higgins, & Kohlberg, 1989). Kohlberg theorized that students develop powers of moral reasoning so that they can judge which values are better than others. Kohlberg's cognitive-developmental theory did not become as popular with teachers as did values clarification, but "both [theories] emphasized that teachers were not to moralize" (Lickona, 1993, p. 64). Based on a review of the research, Leming (1993, 1997a) indicated that although the students had an upward shift in the stages of moral reasoning, only a weak association existed between moral reasoning and moral behavior. Kilpatrick (1992), a critic of the theories of Kohlberg, argued that the moral discussions on dilemmas were subject to failure because morality is not based on forming opinions but in forming good habits; "as a first line of approach for developing values, it [Kohlberg's approach] is woefully inadequate. It involves young people in repeatedly questioning values that may never have taken hold in the first place" (p. 88). Lickona (1993) commented that both values clarification and Kohlberg's moral reasoning made significant contributions to character education, but both missed the mark to restore character education to its prominence as the central desirable outcome of the nations' schools.

According to Field (1996), the pendulum of character education in American schools has swung widely from an idealistic view on the left to a politically conservative approach on the right, yet the debate over the need for character education has reemerged. Leming (1993) recognized that recent revival of interest in character education needed to address the question of assessment of effectiveness of programs if it was to become a central part of American Education.

Overview of the Problem

Character education reemerged as a critical need in the 1990s in response to moral decline in behavior of American youth (Lickona, 1993). Milson and Mehlig (2002) reported, character education advocates have asserted schools have shirked their responsibilities toward character education in recent decades and have contributed toward an increase in violence, drug abuse, teen pregnancy, and other negative behaviors. Kilpatrick's book, *Why Johnny Can't Tell Right From Wrong* (1992), exhorted the educational establishment to return to a traditional moral education in response to a crisis in moral behavior. William Bennett's book, *The Book of Virtues* (1993) emphasized the need for moral knowledge reminiscent of Puritan moral teachings of the 1600's. Lickona (1993) cited indicators of a societal crisis that schools should not ignore: "the deterioration of civility in everyday life; an omnipresent sexual culture that fills our television and movie scene with sleaze, beckoning the young toward sexual activity at ever earlier ages; the enormous betrayal of children through sexual abuse" (p. 6).

National surveys continued the momentum for character education such as a report of the National Research Council cited by Lickona (1993) which stated "The United States is now the most violent of all industrialized nations" (p. 6). In another survey conducted by the Horatio Alger Association (2002), entitled *State of Our Nation's Youth 2000-2001*, American high school seniors identified crime/violence; decline of the family, moral and social values; drug abuse; and AIDS as the top problems facing our nation. In a 2002 survey, *Report Card 2002: The Ethics of American Youth*, 12,000 high school students, when compared to the 1992 benchmark survey, indicated significant increased percentages in the number of students who reported cheating on exams, shoplifting, and lying to parents and teachers. After a lapse of decades caused by the negative reaction to values clarification and the approaches based on Kohlberg's theories of moral development, Lickona (1993) commented on a renewal of the character education movement which sought to restore "good character" to its historical place in American education.

As a result, many character education programs have evolved as means to change the downward spiral in ethical behaviors (Lasley 1997). Throughout history education's two main goals have been to help people become more intelligent, productive members of society and to help citizens become aware of society's moral ethics as a whole (Lickona, 1993). Lasley (1997) stated, "Americans want school to accomplish what is not occurring in the home" (p. 654). Lasley concluded that many experts see the need for renewed character education--or value advocacy--as a result of the value neutral stance of the 1970s. "The antidote for value neutrality, they claim, is value advocacy" (p. 654).

The trend in character education gained direction from two significant meetings of political and educational leaders. The Association of Curriculum and Supervision (ASCD) conducted a Panel on Moral Development (1988) and encouraged all involved in American education to renew their commitment to moral education. The ASCD Panel encouraged educators to form partnerships with parents and community in order to define and to teach a morality of universal values that coincide with traditional religious teachings but are secular values with a genuine respect for the pluralism of modern society. In July of 1992, a national conference of leaders in education, youth-service professionals and ethicists decided to find ways to come together to boost character education efforts. What resulted--the development of the Aspen Declaration--would become a landmark in the new character education and the foundation of the Character Counts! movement. The Aspen Declaration on Character Education (1992) stated:

1. The next generation will be the stewards of our communities, nation and planet in extraordinarily critical times.
2. In such times, the well being of our society requires an involved, caring citizenry with good moral character.
3. People do not automatically develop good moral character; therefore, conscientious efforts must be made to help young people develop the values and abilities necessary for moral decision making and conduct.
4. Effective character education is based on core ethical values rooted in a democratic society, in particular, respect, responsibility,

trustworthiness, justice and fairness, caring, and civic virtue and citizenship.

5. These core ethical values transcend cultural, religious and socioeconomic differences.
6. Character education is, first and foremost, an obligation of families and faith communities, but schools and youth-service organizations also have the responsibility to help develop the character of young people.
7. These responsibilities are best achieved when these groups work in concert.
8. The character and conduct of our youth reflect the character and conduct of society; therefore, every adult has the responsibility to teach and model the core ethical values, and every social institution has the responsibility to promote the development of good character ([http//www.charactercounts.org/aspen.htm](http://www.charactercounts.org/aspen.htm)).

The importance of developing good character has been evident throughout American history (Leming, 1993; Field, 1996; Laud, 1997; McClellan 1999). A Gallup Poll conducted by Phi Delta Kappa (Rose & Gallup, 2000) found that developing citizens of character is still a concern. The poll sought public attitude on various topics including the expectations for the public schools. On a scale of 1 to 10 with 10 the most important, the poll ranked "to prepare people to become responsible citizens" with a mean rank of 9.0. When asked to indicate how effective the local public schools were doing to achieve that purpose the mean rank was 6.1. which indicated an unmet need.

Lyons (1995) admitted the relatively few experimental studies in character education, yet teachers and administrators need an understanding of the history and the research of character education in order to make informed decisions concerning the implementation of character education programs. According to Leming (1993), the current research base in character education is inadequate. He encouraged a coherent approach to character education in order to integrate research, guide curriculum planning and increase the cumulative knowledge of effective programs.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the behaviors of middle-level students from Minot School District middle schools who have been exposed to a character-education program and the risk behaviors reported on the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS). The study focused on middle-level students who were surveyed with the YRBS in 2001 and 2003.

Research questions addressed in this study were the following:

1. Were there changes in the student scores on the four character pillars reported on the YRBS among middle-school students in the years 2001 and 2003?
2. Were there differences between males and females on the four character pillars reported on the YRBS?
3. What was the relationship between student scores on the four character pillars and risk behaviors on the YRBS in Minot middle-school students?

4. Were there differences in the four character pillars based on the number of risk factors exhibited?

Significance

The Minot Public Schools recognized the need for educating students in character development. In the 1970's, the Minot Public Schools initiated a program of character education based on the philosophy of values clarification. However, in part because of the shortcomings of values clarification, as previously mentioned in this chapter, public opposition to this strategy resulted in discontinuation of the program in the early 1980s.

In 1996, the Character Counts! program emerged in Minot as a grass roots effort after several teachers were trained in Character Counts! in a program sponsored by the North Dakota State University Extension Service. Character Counts! training consisted of the integration the Pillars of Character (Aspen Declaration on Character Education, 1992). Michael Josephson, founder of Character Counts!, outlined the six Pillars of Character of Citizenship, Caring, Trustworthiness, Respect, Fairness and Responsibility. The training continued for the next two years. Schools within the district adopted the six pillars, and integrated Character Counts! in discipline plans and identified one or all of the pillars as a goal of their school improvement plans for state accreditation.

In 1998, the Minot Public Schools adopted the Six Pillars of Character as the values base for the district's strategic plan. District administrators and School Board members have expressed support for the character education program. Funds from the Title IV-Safe and Drug Free Schools Grant and other district funds were dedicated to the program. District principals have related anecdotal

evidence of positive behaviors they attribute to the Character Counts! program of character education. Students demonstrated a knowledge base of the six pillars in classrooms and in assemblies. However, no formal research was conducted on the effect of the character-education program on students' behavior. In order to guide the future of character education in Minot Public Schools, research needs to be completed to determine the effectiveness of the program.

Delimitations

Certain limits were imposed and other potential limitations of the study were identified. Survey participants were not selected in a random process. Individual classrooms were selected based on the time of day the survey was administered. All students were asked to complete the survey; however, no attempt was made to survey absent students. Because students at Memorial Middle School are Air Force dependents, many are transient. No control has been established for the number of years they spent in the Minot School System. All students surveyed were Minot students at the time of the survey, yet no measure of control was in place to determine the length of time they were Minot students or how long they had been exposed to the Minot Public Schools character education program.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were employed in this study:

Aspen Declaration on Character Education. A gathering of ethicists, educators and youth service professionals gathered in Aspen, Colorado in 1992 to find ways to boost character education efforts. The declaration that was

developed at this meeting formed the intellectual foundation for the Character Counts! movement (Character Counts!, 1992).

Character Counts! Character Counts! is a nonprofit, nonpartisan, nonsectarian character education framework that teaches the Six Pillars of Character: trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring and citizenship.

Character. A person's organized set of beliefs and values that influence actions related to ethical behavior (Burrett and Rusnak, 1993). Derived from the Greek word "to mark," it signifies the permanence of internal emotional traits humans possess (Wynne, 1997). "It is the sum of our intellectual and moral habits" (Ryan and Bohlin, 2003, p. 9).

Character Education. "Any school-initiated program, designed in cooperation with other community institutions, to shape directly and systematically the behavior of young people by influencing explicitly the nonrelativistic values believed to bring about that behavior" (Lockwood, 1997, p. 179). "The intentional proactive effort to develop good character" (Lickona, 1997, p. 46).

Ethics. The name given to the concern for good behavior. "An obligation to consider not only one's own personal well being but also that of others and of human society as a whole (Schwitzer in Ryan and Bohlin, 2003, p. ix). "Ethics refers to the study of and teaching about right and wrong" (Burrett and Rusnak, 1993, p.14).

Pillars of Character. The six character values that comprise the frameworks of Character Counts! defined by the Aspen Declaration on Character Education (1992). They are as follows:

Trustworthiness. One of the six character pillars employed in Character Counts!, which refers to the following characteristics: Be honest; Don't deceive, cheat or steal; Be reliable — do what you say you'll do; Have the courage to do the right thing; Build a good reputation; Be loyal — stand by your family, friends and country.

Respect. One of the six pillars of Character Counts!, which refers to the following characteristics: Treat others with respect; Follow the Golden Rule; Be tolerant of differences; Use good manners, not bad language; Be considerate of the feelings of others; Don't threaten, hit or hurt anyone; Deal peacefully with anger, insults and disagreements.

Responsibility. One of the six character pillars of Character Counts!, which refers to the following characteristics: Do what you are supposed to do; Persevere: keep on trying!; Always do your best; Use self-control; Be self-disciplined; Think before you act — consider the consequences; Be accountable for your choices.

Fairness. One of the six character pillars of the Character Counts!, which refers to the following characteristics: Play by the rules; Take turns and share; Be open-minded; Listen to others; Don't take advantage of others; Don't blame others carelessly.

Caring. One of the six character pillars of the Character Counts!, which refers to the following characteristics: Be kind; Be compassionate and show you care; Express gratitude; Forgive others; Help people in need.

Citizenship. One of the six character pillars of the Character Counts!, which refers to the following characteristics: Do your share to make your school and community better; Cooperate; Stay informed and vote; Be a good neighbor; Obey laws and rules; Respect authority; Protect the environment.

Moral Education. A term often interchanged with the term *Character education* in the literature to imply training in certain values and virtues. The term *moral education* has religious implications of the colonial desire to insure moral and religious education. It was used as the primary term until the early twentieth century with the onset of the First World War, when increased... "nationalistic, jingoistic fervor in America would strengthen and greatly influence the generation of a concern for character education...with an emphasis on patriotism, duty and civic training. The evolution of morality into civic responsibility would be complete" (Yulish, 1980, p. 35).

Risk Behaviors. Refers to behaviors measured by the Youth Risk Behavior Survey that are critically linked to health-related behaviors often established in youth. These behaviors include: tobacco use; unhealthy dietary behaviors; inadequate physical activity; alcohol and other drug use; sexual behaviors that may result in HIV infection, other sexually transmitted diseases, and unwanted pregnancies; and behaviors that may result in violence and unintentional injuries. (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 2002). The middle school survey does not address sexual behaviors.

Values Clarification. Refers to an approach developed by Louis Rath based on the progressive ideas of John Dewey. Values clarification is based on the process of valuing rather than the content of the values (Simon, Howe, & Kirschenbaum. 1972). The student is given the opportunity to grapple with issues of personal preference and to discover or to clarify what he or she believes or holds dear without the moralizing of the teacher (Ryan, 1981).

Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS): The YRBS is a national, school-based survey conducted by the Center for Disease Control (CDC) as well as state and local, school-based surveys conducted by education and health agencies (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 2002).

Assumptions

This study was based on several assumptions that underlie all the research questions, procedures, and results.

1. It was assumed that the teachers administered the survey in an unbiased and confidential manner in accordance with the methods recommended by the Center for Disease Control.
2. It was assumed that all survey participants responded in a manner that truly reflected their behavior.

Overview

The development of good character has been a part of American education since colonial times. Although the theories and methods of delivery have changed over the years, character education has continued to be an essential part of the school climate and curriculum. Unfortunately, research on the effectiveness of character education has not been definitive. The purpose of

this study was to determine if the exposure to an integrated, character education program changed risk behavior as measured by the Youth Risk Behavior Survey of middle-level students from a mid-western community over a period of three years.

In Chapter I, Introduction and Background of the Study, introduced an overview of the problem, the purpose of the study and research questions, significance, delimitations, and definitions. A review of the literature was compiled in Chapter II. Chapter III describes research methodology applied to this study. Data analyzed in the study are presented in Chapter IV. Chapter V presents a summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

A review of the literature of traditional moral education in America revealed considerable historical, philosophical, psychological and sociological perspectives that contribute to an understanding of the most recent efforts in shaping the character of youth in American public schools. Johnson (1987) referred to the importance of the moral education in the American tradition of seeking a society of more than simple justice for the individual but a society of equality for all. Only citizens of a certain moral character and fundamental moral principles could achieve this goal. "As a consequence of this tradition, education in this nation, as everywhere else, was centered in moral formation or character development" (Johnson, p. 63). Society and education have changed since the colonial period and the early traditions of development. A study of the evolution of moral education in America was critical to understand the current movement of character education, which was the focus of this study.

Historical Perspective

The religious, historical and democratic values of colonial America influenced moral development and character education. Benninga (1997) stated:

From the dictates of the ten commandments through the writings of the Greek philosophers, the modern philosophies of Immanuel Kant and Mortimer Adler, a well established body of thought has directed our relations with others, including the process of educating our youth, the duty of the older generation to form the character of the young, has been a basic principle structuring moral education. Such a consistent tradition is difficult to ignore, and no current research supplants it. (p. 86)

Spring (1990) explained that the roots of the American public schools were with the Protestant church of New England which brought with it a commitment to moral education and a desire to protect Protestant orthodoxy. McClellan (1999) stated the commonality of commitment was based in the Christian faith of the settlers "who did the most to give moral education its character in the thirteen colonies" (p. 1). Puritan religious values strongly influenced their approach to education; as Morgan (1966) stated, "Children were taught to read in order that they might gain a full knowledge of the scriptures" (p. 88). The general expectation of the Puritan society was that the family was responsible for the moral education of their children. All occasions were used to instruct children including how they were taught to read and write. The teaching of reading and writing not only insured individuals could read the *Bible* but also they would become good workers and obedient citizens. The execution of discipline and teaching catechism all contributed to the goal to create a well-ordered religious society and to produce children who would be God-fearing and a credit to their families and communities (Spring, 1990; McClellan, 1999).

As early as 1642, the General Court of Massachusetts, realizing that many parents were neglecting the training of their children, ordered communities to establish and to support schools in order to educate their children (Spring, 1990). In 1647, a Massachusetts Law was initiated due to "It being one chief e project of ye old deluder, Satan, to keep men from the knowledge of ye Scriptures" (Massachusetts Law of 1647, 2004, ¶1). According to Purpel (1997), the Puritan efforts in the moral education of their youth promoted "two obsessions that are

fundamental to the subsequent and continuing development of American culture (and hence a critical dimension of public education): the drive to make the community morally good and the individual materially rich" (p. 141).

In Puritan New England before 1750, schools and churches played a significant part in the moral education process. McClellan (1999) reported that schools, where they existed, reinforced the moral lessons taught in the home, but children also acquired values from associations within the community as the entire village took responsibility for education of the young. Colonial America was primarily uniform in values and culture, thus much of the Puritan heritage and tradition remained in American values and models of accepted behavior and had a profound impact on the history of American education (Spring, 1990). Laud (1997) asserted, the church's influence in schools in colonial times "left a lasting mark on education long after the church's role in schools declined" (p. 7). Pulliam (1982) concluded that an understanding of this historical heritage is essential to appreciate the values conflicts central in many contemporary educational issues.

Early American democratic leaders in the years following the American Revolution insured the principles of democracy and sought to expand the role of the school. Spring (1990) stated the purpose of teaching reading and writing was not only to enable individuals to be able read the *Bible* but also to become good workers and obedient citizens. Pulliam (1982) characterized the life in the American colonies as varied from the theological arguments of the early Puritan settlements to broader scientific dogmas of philosophers of the Enlightenment

which influenced early American leaders like Franklin, Jefferson and Benjamin Rush.

Worried about the ability of the new nation to survive in the face of parochialism and factional disputes, men like Thomas Jefferson, lexicographer Noah Webster, and Philadelphia physician Benjamin Rush proposed the creation of state systems of public schools that would teach 'republican values' and encourage loyalty to the new nation. (McClellan, 1999, p. 120)

Spring (1990) stated that Rush believed that public schools should develop in the individual a system of values that would create what he called "republican machines" and that the goal of public schools was to inculcate youth in the social order on the new republic. Jefferson's ideas on education differed from the drill of religious values and educational methods of imposition and control. He believed that an innate sense of right and wrong could be enhanced through exercise and guided by reason. Spring (1990) stated, "For this reason, [Jefferson's] educational writings do not emphasize the shaping and controlling of students' moral behavior as preparation for citizenship" (p. 43). The question of whether the best approach for developing citizens should be a direct inculcation of values or the development of reason and intellectual tools to enable the young to select their own moral and political values has roots in American history.

According to Pulliam (1982), the new independence was reflected in a desire for a more formal education. Principles of citizenship and patriotism were combined with religious values to enhance the moral development of American youth. Colonials wanted more schooling for their children in order that they might gain the full benefit of the democratic society. An education was

considered a mark of achievement and a step up the social ladder. However, Laud (1996) asserted that development of the schools neither separated church and state in early America nor took religion out of the schools as the church continued to influence the formation and goals of the common school. "Both sectarian and public schools of the revolutionary era continued to use textbooks that were religiously centered" (Pulliam, 1982, p. 39). The *Bible* continued as the instructional manual for both moral and religious instruction (Lickona, 1993). Thus, the church influenced the formation and goals of American public education beyond the colonial period especially with an emphasis on moral education.

Lyons (1995) commented on the view of the importance of patriotic and moral influence in education emphasized by the framers of the Constitution and illustrated by the 75 million copies of Noah Webster's spelling texts sold by 1875 that contained moral and patriotic catechisms. Spring (1990) noted that in addition to the contribution of the dictionary and speller, Webster believed like Rush that moral and political values should be imposed on youth. The methods used to instill these values were the Federal and Moral Catechisms, which appeared in an early version of the Webster spelling book. The content of the Federal and Moral Catechisms required children to memorize questions and answers to teach values which "Webster considered necessary for maintaining order in a republican society" (Spring, 1990, p. 41).

During the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the Industrial Revolution spread from Europe to America, causing a change from an agricultural to an industrial economy. As a result, many reformers saw a need

for an increase of public schools. They hoped to use education as a means to overcome the social problems caused by child labor crime and poverty (Pulliam, 1982). According to McClellan (1999), economic stability along the Atlantic coast allowed Americans to gain a confidence in their society. Many of them lost the moral rigidity and religious orthodoxy that influenced earlier moral education. Moral education from 1750 to 1820 took on a primarily moderate tone as families continued to teach traditional values; most parents still saw the world through a fundamentally Christian viewpoint. Yet, much of the anxiety which was characteristic of the Puritan era had subsided.

The public school emerged between 1830 and 1860 in America. Yulish (1980) reported that the Industrial Revolution impacted the expansion of public education, and moral education paralleled the growth of schools. Laud (1997) commented on the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, which reaffirmed religion and morality as necessary for good government and first endorsed knowledge as a worthy goal. Laud (1997) reported that this act marked a significant shift in the missions of the nation's schools. Through the growth of public schools, Americans sought to spread a common culture and to preserve an order and harmony in an era of increased immigration. Americans not only viewed moral education as a need for their own children but also for other people's children, "especially the children of America's rapidly growing immigrant population" (McClellan, 1999, p. 23). Laud (1997) concluded that with the advent of the "common school" moral education was considered a necessity of social existence. Horace Mann believed even more strongly than Thomas Jefferson did that students needed to be taught to control passions in order to behave morally.

Like Jefferson, Mann was aware of the critical need of moral citizens for democracy to succeed. Pulliam (1982) stated, "Many reformers hoped to use education as a means of overcoming the difficulties produced by the Industrial Revolution such as child labor, crime, drunkenness, and extreme poverty" (p. 67).

Unfortunately, "moral education so pervaded classrooms of the nineteenth century that there was little time for instruction in government or politics" (McClellan, 1999, p. 26). While America moved toward a separation of religion from education (Pulliam, 1982), the textbooks of the nineteenth century schools, which retained Biblical stories, were a primary source for conveying the universal moral truths. Introduced in 1836, the *McGuffey Reader*, "which by 1919 had the largest circulation of any book except the *Bible*, contained readings from Aesop, Shakespeare, and the *Bible*" (Kilpatrick 1992, p. 99). Its stories warned of the dangers of a life of indulgence and promised earthly rewards for courage, honesty, and respect for others. Spring (1990) stated that the popularity of *McGuffey's* readers paralleled the growth of the common school; the moral lessons were designed to teach appropriate behavior in an industrial, capitalistic society with expanding divisions between upper and lower classes.

Yulish (1980) claimed the concept of moral education took on new importance in the latter nineteenth century as the growing impersonality of a technological urban society increased the need for moral training. Crowded conditions in cities and the tremendous variety of culture and language of the new immigrants were seen by many as an increased need for moral instruction. According to McKown (1935), the nineteenth century was a time of secularized, unified morality in American education. While separated from control and

influence of the church as in colonial America, moral education continued to be taught in courses labeled "Moral Education" or "Ethics." Reading from the *Bible* or reciting the *Lord's Prayer* was common practice in opening school since colonial time, but increasing opposition to the dogmatic form of the materials and controversies regarding separation of church and state resulted in state laws prohibiting religious instruction in the school.

Gaddy, Hall, and Marzano (1996) offered some clarity about the division of church and state in American political history since most Americans believed the concept of the Constitution and courts mandated a wall of separation. Yet, there existed considerable disagreement concerning what this meant. "Wall of separation" was a metaphor created by Thomas Jefferson to explain his view of the purpose of the First Amendment. Jefferson's own religious beliefs are unknown. Nevertheless, historians agree that he introduced the "wall" metaphor in an 1802 letter to the Danbury Baptist Association, written eleven years after the ratification of the Bill of Rights, which included the First Amendment.

In it he said, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should 'make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,' thus building a wall of separation between church and state. (Gaddy, Hall & Marzanno, 1996, p. 182)

McKown (1935) reported the increased secularization of American education based on Parkin's investigations of the moral and religious content of 1,291 American school readers from the American Revolution to 1920 (p. 74):

1776-1785	100% moral and religious emphasis
1786-1825	50% moral and religious emphasis

1826-1880	21% moral and religious emphasis
1881-1929	5% moral and religious emphasis

This demonstrated an increased secular emphasis in American schools, which would have an impact on the delivery of character education and the idea of fostering American values and beliefs.

While early American education had a religious tone, the changing conditions of the late nineteenth century witnessed a renewed concern for a more secular moral education. Pulliam (1982) commented that it was an American belief in the late nineteenth century that public education should be free to all and was a social ladder that could be used for advancement as well as education for citizenship, morality, and self-improvement. Yulish (1980) noted that religious doctrines were questioned due to evolutionary theories and the rise of scientific industrialization. However, the concern for moral education arose not due to the loss of faith in the church but to rid the country of poverty, disease, crime and disunity caused by crowded conditions. Yulish (1980) attributed much of the new social order in moral training to the psychology and pedagogy of Johann Herbart and his followers. This secularized morality was built on the concept of a well-established moral character through the operation of the enlightened will. The school had the duty to train the disposition and instill the mind with knowledge. "The moral obligation of the school was to impart values, not foster a sensitive moral judgement" (Yulish, 1980, p. 10).

Yulish (1980) reported that the increased nationalism and jingoism of the early twentieth century at the onset of the First World War transformed the concept of a good man as one who not only had a personal morality but also as

one who was a patriotic citizen. This was a gradual transition from the ideal of a nineteenth century moral, just and kind person to a twentieth century person of good character, which meant loyalty and obedience. This signaled a change in emphasis from a mostly religious, moral education to a more secular, character education, which embodied social responsibility, patriotism and citizenship. Americans after the First World War believed it their duty to save the world for democracy; one way to do this was to mold character through courses in patriotism and citizenship (Yulish, 1980).

In early twentieth century America, the concept of public education was growing and evolving. Pulliam (1982) reported an increased demand for vocational skills as well as college preparation; thus, schools experienced unparalleled growth. High schools doubled in enrollment every ten years, and the junior high became a common institution by 1930. Yulish (1980) commented that the need was recognized for American schools to stress both intellectual and emotional training in order to teach not only what one does not know but also to teach one to behave as they do not behave. Field (1996) reported "many worried that moral standards were threatened by industrialization, urbanization, immigration, World War I, Revolution in Russia, and the laissez-faire attitudes of the 1920s" (p. 119).

In 1915 the National Education Association appointed a Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education to address changes needed in education because of increased enrollment in secondary schools. Pulliam (1982) credited the Commission for recognizing the need for schools to be an instrument to build social values. The Commission issued the *Cardinal Principles*

of *Secondary Education* in 1918, which became the standard objectives for teachers and administrators. Four of the seven *Cardinal Principles*--worthy home membership, citizenship and ethical character--related to character development. Spring (1990) noted the *Cardinal Principles* sought to increase socialization in the schools based on a concept of cooperation and emphasized the use of extracurricular activities and assemblies to create a unified spirit for a society based on large organizations and organizational specialization. According to Fine (1995) the *Cardinal Principles*, embraced by progressive educators such as John Dewey, signaled another turn in the direction of moral education.

As schools began to teach students the new social, academic, and vocational skills required by a complex corporate and bureaucratic order, moral education was forced to compete for a place in an increasingly crowded curriculum. At the same time, educators began to debate the adequacy of traditional forms of moral training and to explore the possibility that modernity required entirely new approaches to the ancient task of educating moral men and women. (McClellan, 1999, p.46)

American society began to evolve with the modernization of mass production of the automobile; the growing availability of birth control devices completed the transformation (McClellan, 1999). McKown (1935), Yulish, (1980) and Leming (1993) agreed that schools were now expected to prepare students for a variety of roles across the differentiated spheres of social order. Even with an emphasis on academic achievement in the first three decades of the twentieth century, virtually all American schools were attempting to develop character in the students. McClellan (1999) found that two divergent responses to character education evolved in the early twentieth century: from one that attempted to hold on to a traditional character education of teaching specific virtues to another newer progressive approach adhered to by followers of John Dewey. The

progressives preferred using available opportunities, materials and surroundings for developing a more complete and well-rounded education for students (McKown, 1935).

McKown (1935) reported that a traditionalist's effort to preserve character and traditional morality was to use a direct method of moral instruction with an emphasis on codes of conduct. The direct approach was so called since it concentrated on various virtues by using memorizing, reciting codes, oaths and slogans. A widely used code was the *Hutchins Children's Morality Code*, which was composed of the ten laws of right living which included self-control, good health, kindness, sportsmanship, self-reliance, duty, reliability, truth, good workmanship, and teamwork. Leming (1993) stated that many schools adopted the *Hutchins Code* or some variation and integrated it in all aspects of the school including student clubs that used the power of peers to influence others in the practice of virtues. In the early twentieth century, McKown (1935) explained, an indirect approach to moral education appeared. The indirect approach, rather than concentrating only on a trait or virtue as in the direct approach, discussed a setting or situation as well. This was manifested in schools through group activities such as student government as a method to teach democratic living in a natural setting. Most of the champions of this movement were outside of the school; for example, 4-H, Junior Achievement, Boy Scouts, Camp Fire Girls and clubs such as Hi-Y provided opportunities for the child to practice traits in natural situations (McKown, 1935, & McClellan, 1999).

According to McClellan (1999), the extension of schooling into adolescence made a special challenge for educators as it posed a threat to the masculinity of boys:

In an earlier era, boys had been able to balance the feminized moral education of the elementary school with adolescence that took them rapidly into more masculine worlds of apprenticeship or work. Now, an extended stay in schools threatened to weaken the development of masculine traits that made for success in the acquisitive, competitive world of work. (p. 52)

Interscholastic athletics provided an opportunity to translate the skills needed for the transition to adulthood and character. Development of sports programs in high schools was advocated. Advocates placed faith in the programs such as team sports, where boys could find a useful outlet for their combative instincts and learn both the value of individual excellence and the importance of cooperative lessons thought to be essential for those who would live their lives in business, government, the professions, or the military (McClellan, 1999; Spring, 1990). McClellan (1999) noted the emergence of citizenship grades on report cards. Some of these grades were used as a measure of moral development.

Yulich (1980) interpreted the shift in emphasis of character education in the early twentieth century from a focus of individual morality to good citizenship as a type of civic religion. McClellan (1999) commented on the lack of tolerance for cultural diversity of this period as immigrants were expected to assimilate by adherence to standards of middle-class respectability. Ethical reasoning was subordinated to a training of codes and conformity.

McKown (1935) noted an increase in the need for demonstrable proof of the significance of direct moral education. As an emerging trend, McKown

(1935) reported, "A decreasing confidence in the use of formal rules, slogans, creeds, pledges, courses, and similar formal material, and an increasing confidence in the opportunities that afford actual practice in natural settings and situations in the pupils here and now" (p. 91). McClellan (1999) attributed the decreased confidence in the traditional method of moral instruction on the emerging progressive movement. In contrast, Yulish (1980) credited the perceived need on an increase in the trends to quantify and identify character development in the historical setting of the early twentieth century with the advent of Army Alpha intelligence measures of World War I and other psychological measurement.

The divergent views among educators on moral education prompted the publication of the studies by Hartshorne and May (1928-1930), which raised serious questions about the effectiveness of heavily didactic moral education programs. This provided progressives with justification to shift the methodology of moral instruction and placed the advocates of traditional teaching of morality in a defensive posture (Leming, 1993, McClellan, 1999). Leming (1997a) reported the studies of Hartshorne and May extended over a five-year period. Their 1,782-page study included a sample of 10,850 students in grades five through eight. McClellan (1999) reported the study raised serious questions regarding character education, in particular the heavily didactic approach of direct instruction. Leming (1997a) stated results indicated little carryover for the traits of honesty and service from one situation to another. He quoted a conclusion of the Hartshorne and May study as follows:

The mere urging of honest behavior by teachers or the discussion of standards and ideals of honesty, no matter how much such general ideals may be "emotionalized" has no necessary relation to conduct...there seems to be evidence that such effects as may result are not generally good and are sometimes unwholesome...the prevailing ways of inculcating ideals probably do little good and do some harm. (p.64)

Power, Higgins, and Kohlberg (1989) dramatically illustrate the impact of the Hartshorne and May study on the character education movement through an analysis of research of the entries under "character" in educational periodical indices. "By 1970 the entry 'character' had disappeared altogether; 'personality,' a morally neutral construct had taken its place" (p. 127). However, they concluded the decade of the 1930s showed no decline in the practice of character education. Although the Hartshorne and May report gave critics the impetus they needed to dispose of the traditional approach, character education simply transformed with the times. As McKown (1935) noted, those who advocated a traditional approach to character education were discouraged with the results, while those who stressed a "doing" practice and those who supported a situation-response theory were encouraged. Leming (1997a) maintained that the failure to build a supportive research base led to a decline in character education during this period. Many school practices emerged in response to shifts in societal and educational practices.

McClellan (1999) stated that a progressive movement of the 20s and 30s, led by theorists such as John Dewey, provided a radically different approach to character education. Fine (1995) attributed Dewey's theories and innovations as having profound impact on American schooling in particular, merging Rousseau's notion of child's nature and potential with newer discoveries in child

psychology to address social inequities. Dewey and progressive followers attacked those who advocated using codes or the teaching of specific virtues; simple aphorisms or codes were too rigid to guide men. Rejecting the notion that the school should teach specific moral precepts or encourage particular traits, progressive educators hoped to cultivate in students both a quality of open-mindedness and a general ability to make moral judgements. Dewey (1959) believed that the school had a moral responsibility to maintain and advance the welfare of society. He concluded the only way to prepare for a social life was for students to engage in social life. Thus, intellectual and moral training were considered inseparable, and the school's spirit was deemed to be a model reproducing the conditions of a social life where the students could learn the meaning of a moral life through experiences.

Dewey (1959) attacked virtue-centered character education as he stated:

The moral has been conceived in too goody-goody a way. Ultimate moral motives and forces are nothing more or less than social intelligence--the power of observing and comprehending social situations--and social power--trained capacities of control--at work in the service of social interest and aims (p. 43).

In keeping with this philosophy, the progressive educators advocated a problem-solving approach that would resemble real life situations (Spring, 1990).

Progressives viewed character development as a "way of thinking" rather than as knowledge of particular virtues. They emphasized critical thinking to judge actions by social consequence, a purely secular standard by which to make moral decisions. The progressives held the belief that character could be taught through all subjects. McClellan (1999) stated, "Rarely did progressive moral education root out and replace virtue-centered programs; rather, it functioned as

a continuing alternative, one of the two widely accepted responses to the problem of moral education in the modern world of the early twentieth century" (p. 61).

The progressive movement confronted traditional education with concepts of social and moral development that rested in the child's ability to think critically and reflectively rather than relying on strict moral lessons or codes. However, the method espoused by progressive educators was subject for criticism. As documented by Pulliam (1982), a critical reaction against progressives labeled them as social reconstructionists. Spring (1990) noted that many religious groups reacted negatively to Dewey's ideas since they believed human actions should be guided by the word of God while Dewey advocated a philosophy based on an individual's ability to interpret his own experience instead of relying on the word of God. McClellan (1999), who revealed that teachers often found it difficult to teach process skills, asserted, "...it was easy to confuse trivial classroom discussions with moral deliberation especially in the absence of a clear theory of moral development" (p. 60). Fine (1995) related an account of such a critical reaction in the 1930s; Harold Rugg, a professor at Teachers College of Columbia University, developed a series of pamphlets that integrated lessons from history, civics, geography, and economics. Rugg believed it important that students understand America's weaknesses as well as its strengths and to grapple with them in order to become citizens in a democracy. Conservative groups such as the Daughters of the American Revolution, American Legions and the Veterans of Foreign Wars attacked Rugg's books as contrary to American values of right and wrong and warned that the

encouragement of an unbiased approach to history was a growing danger and anti-American. Fine (1995) stated, "Though the battle over Rugg was perhaps the most notable example of backlash, opposition to the pedagogical and subject-matter reforms of progressive educators continued for decades" (p. 110).

McClellan (1999) noted that during the Second World War, as America united against evils of authoritarian forces, many students were involved in character-building activities. Priorities shifted slowly in the 1940s and 1950s and the "place of moral education eroded only gradually" (p. 75) as the need for more time for academic content grew. However, the shift away from moral education gained momentum in the following decades.

The decades of the 1950s and 1960s witnessed various forces that challenged the place of moral education in the public schools. Pulliam (1982) noted a new demand on education for increased academic emphasis in math and science to keep pace with the Soviet Union and national welfare. The launch of Sputnik in 1957 stimulated the National Defense Education Act that greatly increased technical and science offerings in American high schools. McClellan (1999) reported a greater emphasis of cognitive dimensions of education and a subtle neglect of character education. "Educators who had once prided themselves on their ability to reshape character now paid more attention to the SAT scores of their students" (p. 73). The renewed emphasis on academic performance affected yet another change in the evolution of character education. McClellan (1999) noted another tendency in Americans in a post-war society, as they drew sharp distinctions between private and public realms, "and to establish different behavioral norms for each sphere led many schools to avoid

moral questions that might be considered primarily personal" (p. 74). Leming (1993) stated, "By the 1950s, character education programs had all but disappeared in American schools" (p. 64).

The middle 1960s and 1970s brought times of questioning authority, social unrest of the civil rights movement and the controversy of an unpopular war in Southeast Asia. Character education was impacted by movements of its own. According to Schubert (1993), "attention to the hidden curriculum; advocacy of humanistic curriculum, confluent learning, ecstasy in education, affective instruction, classroom meeting, nongraded school organization, and values clarification are but a few of the ideas now etched in the minds of those who taught in this era"(p. 102). White and Duker (1973) commented on a revolution in thinking since the 1950s about the rights of the individual, which included civil rights, ethnic rights and rights of women. What characterized the revolution was not that all people should be treated equally, but that when rights are violated, redress should be sought through the courts, legislation or the media. This movement led some to put an emphasis on not making value judgements about the lifestyles of others. "Some view this emphasis as leading toward a more humane and liberal attitude toward others, while others maintain that this is a movement toward a breakdown in morals" (p. 301). According to Fine (1995), the 1970s witnessed a growing opposition to what was determined to be moral relativism. The New Right--led by conservatives such as Max Rafferty, Phyllis Schlafly and Barry Goldwater--viewed education as a vital battleground against the progressive legacy and its founder, Dewey, whom they believed, rejected fixed moral laws.

In the last part of the twentieth century, character education became influenced by the growing sensitivity to the heterogeneity of American society. According to White and Duker (1973), advocates of the liberal attitude of the 1970s sought to enhance education as a humanizer, which some attributed to the progressive ideas of Dewey. Advocates of this movement such as Friedenber, Holt, Kohl, Postman, Maslow, Rogers and Neill, assumed "the notion that the child is probably the best guide to his own education, and that he will select an educational structure that is meaningful to him based on his needs and interest" (White & Duker 1973, p. 305). This child-centered approach, which values spontaneity, informality and experience, was an attitude that framed the approach toward character education of the 1970s.

Political and social upheaval heightened awareness of a pluralistic society; all America was not white, European Christian, and America was not one community but many. Noddings (1997) characterized a change in approach toward character education in a society where multiplicity of races, religions, and cultures was valued; a cognitive approach to moral education was a safer approach than a virtues approach that required community homogeneity for support. With the pluralization of society came the question of whose values should be taught. In addition, increasing secularization questioned moral education as a violation of the separation of church and state. In such a climate of heterogeneity, instead of direct inculcating of specific values, cognitive approaches concentrated on the development of moral reasoning.

The political and social climate of America in the 1970s provided an environment that provided a different approach to teaching values (Leming,

1997). Kohlberg (1972) developed a theory of cognitive-moral development on the educational theories of the progressive movement of John Dewey, on the cognitive theories of Jean Piaget and on the Enlightenment tradition of Kant and Rousseau which extolled the moral reasoning of the child (McClellan, 1999). Kohlberg believed moral development occurred in stages. He recorded and labeled six stages of moral development in which the child moved in an orderly way through stages of moral development. McClellan (1999) summarized Kohlberg's six stages of moral development into two broad stages: "an early stage, in which he emphasized a fairly narrow cognitive approach to moral education; and a later stage in which he endorsed a much more comprehensive approach" (p. 83). Mosher and Sprinthall (1972) suggested Kohlberg's theories indicated that moral development, which took place during adolescence, separated adolescents from elementary children. Adolescence was the stage when students moved from a preconventional level to a conventional level. This development was characterized by a shift from a more concrete understanding of moral laws to a level where one thought on an abstract level about concepts such as justice and struggle with situational moral dilemmas. Kohlberg's theory paralleled the work of Piaget in that adolescents had qualitatively different sets of understanding of events than elementary students, and they operated with a different set of assumptions regarding questions of right and wrong.

Kohlberg (1972) stated the research conducted by Hartshorne and May in 1928-1930 and more recent research found the ineffectiveness of a conventional didactic approach to character education and pointed to a cognitive, moral judgment approach to character development. Kohlberg's view was that an

alternative approach, which would stimulate the natural development of a child's moral judgement and character, should be the goal of moral education rather than the teaching of fixed, state-defined values. Leming (1993) commented that Kohlberg's approach involved the presentation of moral dilemmas and conflicts to be discussed by students. The teacher facilitated the students' reasoning and insured the discussions would take place in an environment that promoted stage growth in moral reasoning. Leming (1997a), reporting on the research conducted by Moshe Blatt in 1969 at the University of Chicago, indicated that students exposed to the moral conflicts accompanied by moral reasoning one stage above her own increased the moral reasoning in 64% of the students by one full stage. However, cognitive growth was not directly related to behavioral change. Benninga (1997) addressed that condition: "That is, children become better able to reason how others may think about the same issues and to relate others' thinking to their own. But this ability is limited by their cognitive growth, and that is exactly where the educational implications of the theory may have gone astray" (p. 84).

Following the philosophers of the Enlightenment such as Immanuel Kant, Kohlberg (1983) argued whether, given the right classroom conditions, children would apply cognitive skills to the development of moral reasoning. Honig (1985) claimed that because of the Enlightenment heritage, the United States tended to emphasize the development of the individual. Schools were encouraged to enshrine and to celebrate the individual, but doing so tended to overshadow the requirements of the community. Honig emphasized that

schools should recognize that the American society requires all citizens to attach to the group, whether it is family, church, community or country.

Although the shift from character education to the decision-making model was meant to help students to think more independently and critically about values, proponents claimed that a young person would be more self-committed to self-discovered values than to ones that were simply handed down by adults (Kilpatrick, 1992). He attributed Kohlberg's theory of moral reasoning as a carryover from the Enlightenment tradition because it attempted to establish morality on a rational basis and questioned whether Kohlberg had made moral decision making too abstract and had lost human perspective. The abstractness of Kohlberg's theory did not make it a popular approach used in schools (ASCD Panel on Moral Education, 1988).

In addition to Kilpatrick, Kohlberg's cognitive approach had other critics. Kohlberg's research methods were questioned due to a sexual bias, since his moral dilemma discussions were based on only male subjects. Further research by colleague-turned-critic, Carol Gilligan, did not find a gender difference in the development of moral decision making (Tronto, 1994). However, Kohlberg's approach to moral reasoning seemed to be more suited to research than to teaching. When using Kohlberg's theory in the classroom, teachers needed special preparation. Furthermore, the emphasis on reasoning and critical thinking offended many parents (Kilpatrick, 1992; Leming, 1997a; Noddings, 1997). Fine (1995) claimed that Kohlberg was heavily criticized by the New Right. For example, activist Barbara Morris in her pamphlet *Change Agents in School Destroy Your Children, Betray Your Country*, determined Kohlberg's goal of developing

“students' moral growth was an attempt to subvert parental values”; furthermore, Kohlberg's theories of moral development were flawed since “adherence to transcendent ethical principles represented a higher stage of moral development than obedience to the strictures of state or religion” (p.121). In conclusion, McClellan (1999) reported that it was Kohlberg's narrow focus on the abstraction of moral dilemmas that did not guide the teacher who deals in a morally concrete world where behavior as well as reasoning must be guided.

More popular with teachers, values clarification emerged in schools at approximately the same time as Kohlberg's theories. Values clarification intended to alleviate values confusion by teaching individuals how to apply a valuing process and to clarify their own values without being influenced by others (Kirschenbaum, Harmin, Howe, & Simon, 1977). In *Values and Teaching* Raths, Harmin, and Simon (1966), explained the theory and provided strategies and exercises for teachers to help students to clarify their values. Built upon the thinking of John Dewey, the approach developed by Raths theorized that certain beliefs are explained in a seven-step valuing process.

Prizing one's beliefs and behaviors

1. Prizing and cherishing
2. Publicly affirming, when appropriate

Choosing one's beliefs and behaviors

3. Choosing from alternatives
4. Choosing after consideration of consequences
5. Choosing freely

Acting on one's beliefs

6. Acting
7. Acting with a pattern, consistency and repetition (p. 19)

A book of values clarification strategies (Kirschenbaum, 1992) sold over 600,000 copies. Kirschenbaum (1977) explained the process of values clarification as:

If we moralize to students, then we stop giving them practice using that process. For me, the most gratification comes from facilitating the valuing process while simultaneously modeling my values and sharing them with students at appropriate times in the discussion. (p. 67)

Simon (1976) referred to the direct approach of inculcating and instilling values as nothing more than indoctrination; thus, he deemed it ineffective. In place of indoctrination, values clarification provided a process approach based on the premise that no one has the "right" set of values or the right to pass theirs on to others. Proponents of values clarification did not attempt to impose the traditional values of the past but to assist students in clarifying their own values (Leming 1997).

Leming (1993) compared the values clarification method of character education and the moral development approach of Kohlberg:

Although the two approaches were different in many ways, they both emphasized that teachers were not to moralize. In Kohlberg's moral dilemma discussion approach, the teacher facilitated student reasoning, assisted students in resolving moral conflicts, and ensured that the discussion took place in an environment that contained the conditions essential for stage growth in moral reasoning. Values clarification sought to have each student clarify his or her values by following the prescribed seven step valuing process. The teacher only facilitated the valuing process and, for fear of influencing students, withheld personal opinions. The teacher was to respect whatever values the students arrived at. (p. 64)

Because values clarification left many questions open for student interpretation, the idea of relativism became a controversial topic by religious conservatives (Kilpatrick 1992). A. T. Lockwood (1997) believed that a values clarification approach promoted moral confusion and rationalization of bad behavior. Leming (1993) reported that research findings of values clarification did not yield any significant changes in the dependent variables. Because values clarification was criticized by religious leaders, rationalized bad behavior, and

lacked effect research findings, schools eventually rejected it as an effective approach to teaching character.

Values clarification is often coupled with Kolberg's theories of moral development (Rest, 1997). However, Kohn (1998) argued that Kohlberg's moral development theories should not be confused with values clarification and should be given credit for calling attention to the child as a moral reasoner, which is necessary if not sufficient for good character (Lickona, 1991, p. 238). Both values clarification and the cognitive moral reasoning approach were similar in that

In both cases, we see a complete neglect for habit formation. The concept of virtue is alien to both. Both place a higher value on autonomy than on morality. Both approaches seem to assume that moral education can be carried on without any reference to the culture or the cultural knowledge. (Kilpatrick, 1992, p. 111)

Honig (1985), a former superintendent of schools for the state of California, concluded:

In retrospect, it's apparent that the public schools took the easy way out in the sixties. A serious discussion of deep values can be controversial in a pluralistic society so we found a way to avoid it--by feigning moral neutrality . . . It's not good for our children and it's not what people want. The people do want the schools to be intellectually objective, but they also want them to convey a challenging moral and ethical message. (p. 106-107)

Character education in public schools regressed due to the criticisms of the moral reasoning and values neutral approaches. Lasley (1997) stated that the antidote for the value neutrality of the 1960s and the 1970s was a value advocacy--all individuals need to be responsible for their own behavior. He claimed that the real challenge would not be value advocacy but to change behavior of those

who influence children to be adults of good character who are models for children.

Gaddy, Hall, and Marzano (1996) reported a call by the conservative right for a return of school prayer as a means to restore moral behavior in American youth. They stated:

Conservatives have voiced numerous reasons for their support of some form of school prayer. Some link prayer to patriotism . . . A more widely used argument is that since 1962, when the Supreme Court declared official school prayer unconstitutional in the Engel v. Vitale decision, America has been suffering a precipitous moral decline. (p.162)

According to Gaddy, Hall, and Marzano, some people believe the recent deterioration of public education can be linked to the inability to teach values and show respect for God in the classroom.

Grant (1981) asserted that public schools have had a tremendous burden to create a moral and just society after a social revolution of the 1960s and 1970s that introduced disorder into the schools. Grant believed schools were challenged to develop moral and intellectual virtues in students, what R. S. Peters portrayed as a "provisional morality." A provisional morality, as a way for a teacher to "initiate children into such beliefs in a nonbehavioristic way, not stamping or 'fixing' a particular moral content for life, but teaching in such a way that the children recognize those beliefs" (Grant, p. 146). Grant criticized a return to the traditional "golden age" of the *McGuffey's Reader* style of moral education and advocated a new character education based on a provisional morality--that is, not an attempt to indoctrinate but to teach in a way that children will realize the responsibility and freedom to reevaluate their beliefs as they grow into adults.

A legalistic and adversarial attitude has dominated the public schools since the 1960s (McClellan, 1999). A series of reports such as *A Nation at Risk* (1984) and William Bennett in the *Book of Virtues* (1993), which advocated a return to traditional values and school prayer, targeted public schools as failing America. Kilpatrick (1992) stated, "The core problem facing our schools is a moral one. All other problems derive from it. Hence, all the various attempts at school reform are unlikely to succeed unless character education is put on the top of the agenda" (p. 225). Johnson (1987) concurred: "To be a virtuous people, a people of character, was believed to be the necessary condition of a free and just society" (p. 63). In response to the adversarial attitude of the 1980s, a renewed and widespread interest in character education emerged in the 1990s. Based on the long history of character education in America, any revival was certain to be held under scrutiny as to how character education would be taught and from what perspective it would revive.

Revival of Character Education

The 1990s experienced an emergence of a new type of character education. According to Kilpatrick (1992) the former decade saw a number of exciting new developments in theory and research which did much to substantiate the case for character education. "Philosophers, psychologists, and educators, working separately and pursuing different lines of inquiry, have been arriving at similar conclusions about the need for stories and models in moral formation" (p. 26). Public outcry for school reform and dissatisfaction with the perceived ills of society have all contributed to a renewed emphasis on traditional values. Rest (1997) also pointed to a failure of liberalism and a swing to conservatism that

coincided with a revival in the agenda of traditional core values. A look at high schools raised concerns of depersonalization and alienation of too many young people. The loss of personal contact appeared to be related to the loss of character, thus the reemergence of character education programs. Huffman (1993) suggested that renewed efforts in character education that return to core values must take a comprehensive approach that integrates the values into all segments of the school community in order to create a caring school environment.

Kirschenbaum (1992), one of the advocates of the failed values clarification approach, re-examined the theories of the values clarification approach. He stated the need to blend the traditional approach to character education with a new approach that would combine the need to identify "good values" and exhort students to adopt them. Kirschenbaum encouraged educators not to return to the past of the permissive 1960s and 1970s nor the conservative 1950s and 1980s, but to adopt a new character education that would draw on the experience of past character education approaches and synthesize and improve them. Kirschenbaum advocated an approach that was comprehensive in content and methodology by using all value-related issues and various methods of implementation. He also encouraged character education that would take place throughout the school and the community.

The Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development Panel on Moral Education (1988) organized a committee of experts to review the status of character education. The panel stated a growing concern for moral education was due to a number of factors: "a fragmentation of the family, decline of trust in

public institutions, increasing public concern about questionable ethical practices in business and industry, the impact of the mass media, and gradually increasing affluence"(p. 4). The panel urged schools not to ignore moral education and declared it one of their most important activities. They recommended that all those involved in education renew their commitment to promote moral education in the schools.

In 1989, the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development issued *Turning Points*, a report of the Task Force on Education of Young Adolescents. The report concentrated on the challenges and pressures on the young adolescent of American middle schools. They characterized the middle level students as not able to find their way to adulthood, confused and in a desperate sense of isolation and making poor decisions with severe consequences. The report made several recommendations, one of which was to develop the 15-year-old to learn to act ethically and to embrace the qualities of courage, responsibility, integrity, tolerance, honesty, appreciation of individual differences and caring about others.

In 1992, the Josephson Institute of Ethics brought together over 30 educational and political leaders who drafted The Aspen Declaration on Character Education, which became the foundation of the Character Counts! Coalition. Rest (1997) stated:

The purpose was to compose a united front that would promote declarations to be signed by governors within their states and similar sorts of efforts. It was the initiation of a campaign, one that would hopefully hook into political candidates, school boards, and local politics in drumming up both support and money for character education. (p. 34)

Character education curriculums have proliferated over the last decade, promoting a traditional but sectarian approach to character education in the schools. Lickona (1993), a proponent of the new character education, stated that there are three causes for the resurgence of character education: 1) the decline of the family; 2) troubling trends in youth behavior, including violence, disrespect, dishonesty, decline in work ethic, and sexual precocity; and 3) a recovery of a shared ethical value. Paige (2002), Secretary of Education, placed character education as a central part of the landmark legislation No Child Left Behind.

Paige stated:

While reading, math, and science can give our children strength of mind, character education is necessary to give them strength of heart. It is time for schools to return to teaching children that character, honesty, and integrity are important. Good character is not something you are born with; it is something you must learn from those who have it. (p. 712)

The No Child Left Behind federal legislation provided \$25 million in funding for character education grants to states and districts that were able to demonstrate results. The accountability of this law dictates the need to prove the efficacy of character education programs.

Current character education efforts have distanced themselves from the "ill conceived efforts of the 60s and 70s"(Lickona, 1993, p. 5). Educators realized that the dilemma discussions, which presented moral choices without a definitive right or wrong, promoted an ethical relativism. Noting a pendulum swing to the right in the late 1990s, as occurred in the World War II era, Field (1996) recognized the renewed prominence of character education. Although the goals of the current character education movement vary in scope and size, they unite against ethical relativism of values clarification or moral reasoning which

can promote both moral confusion and rationalization of bad behavior. According to A. L. Lockwood (1997), the common goal of revived character education was to “seek to change youth behavior on both an everyday scale--transforming every day casual rudeness to polite conduct--and a larger scale--seeing youth choose prosocial 'moral' behavior, no matter what the situation” (p. 10). The goal of character education was to help students understand the core values exclusive of religious affiliation, commit to them and act upon them. The new character education acknowledged the cognitive nature of moral development and recognized the emotional nature of character development. Character education that merely concentrated on intellectual involvement missed the connection between judgment and action.

According to Lickona (1993) the cognitive side of character has at least six moral qualities: “awareness of the moral dimensions of the situation at hand, knowing moral values and what they require of us in concrete cases, perspective-taking, moral reasoning, thoughtful decision-making and moral self-knowledge”(p. 9). These qualities are required in order to be morally mature. In addition to the cognitive qualities, the emotional qualities--conscience, self-respect, empathy, loving the good, self-control, and humility--are required to connect moral judgment to action. Without the emotional side of character, knowledge of the values does not equate into moral action, or, as referred to by Martin (1994), the necessity of care, concern and connection. Lickona (1993) continued with the third part of character for moral action: competence skills (listening, communication, and cooperation) will (which mobilizes our judgment

and energy) and moral habit (a reliable inner disposition to address a situation in a morally good way).

The new traditionalists in character education call for a comprehensive approach to developing character. Ryan (1993) encouraged educators to teach positive character development both in the formal and the informal curriculum. The formal curriculum is the planned educational experience of the school. Though not all the curriculum relates to character integration, many examples can be found in the writings of Lickona (1993), Rusnak, (1998) Ryan (1993), and Wynne (1989). Literature is a prime example of how, through stories, formal curriculum can teach the core values. Ryan (1993), and Sizer and Sizer (1999) extol the use of emotional and value-laden literature and literary characters--such as Atticus Finch in *To Kill a Mockingbird*, Elie Weisel in *Night*, or the frailties of characters such as Brutus in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, or Jay Gatsby in Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby*--to teach character.

Lickona (1993) summarized that the relevant issue is not to teach values but to determine how they will be taught. Lickona (1991) stated, "There is no such thing as value-free education"(p. 20). In addition to the formal curriculum, students are continually subject to a hidden curriculum. The hidden curriculum involves all the interaction of the student and the school, including the school rules and attitudes toward student learning. Much of the programming of character education is reinforced by the school climate, a large part of the hidden curriculum. In truth, teachers teach values whether they realize it or not. The way they dress and act toward children, establish classroom rules and discuss a story conveys attitudes and values that are learned and modeled by students.

According to Lickona (1993), schools that successfully implement a character education program identify their values and beliefs, incorporate their values in the school mission, and formulate their school goals around those espoused values. Lickona (1993) stated, "Schools need to look at themselves through a moral lens and consider how everything that goes on in a school affects the values and character of the student"(p. 11).

Critics of the New Character Education

Not everyone is completely accepting of the new traditionalist approach to character education. Lewis (1998) claimed the need for character education and personal values as a part of the purpose of public education as articulated by Thomas Jefferson in 1818 as "to improve, by reading, his morals and faculties; to understand his duties to his neighbors and country, and to discharge with competence the functions confided to him by either and in general, to observe with intelligence and faithfulness all the social relations under which he shall be placed" (p. 100). Lewis viewed the traditional character education approach as too narrow, segmenting character education into lessons that "can be turned on and off by the ringing of a school bell"(p. 100). According to Lewis, every school needs to identify its mission of building character and to ensure that those traits are exemplified by all that is around them, not merely by a class exercise.

More critical, Purpel (1997) viewed the emphasis on character education as an "overtly partisan political issue, serving as metaphor and code for those interested in pursuing the neo-conservative social and cultural agenda"(p. 140). He saw the movement as neither innovative nor as a reform for lack of family values or media influences; rather, it represented a long-standing use of the

public schools as a means of perpetuating a political status quo of social stability and cultural preservation. Dating back to the colonial times, intervention in behavior and character development has been a central theme in public schooling. Purpel (1997) pointed to the contradiction in the argument of Lickona, who calls for a need in character education at the same time that he asserts that "there is no such thing as value-free education"(Lickona, 1991, p. 20). The purpose of the discourse on the need for moral education, according to Purpel (1997), is to polarize education into those concerned about character education and those who are not. By separating character education from the curriculum, it has allowed the politicians to "claim a monopoly on a concern for the moral character of society and individuals"(Purpel, 1997, p. 143).

The arguments for the infusion of character education are remarkably similar to those of the political arena of the Right. Purpel (1997) commented "There is an implicit, fairly consistent, and coherent political orientation embedded within the message of character education and that this message has strong and vital resonance with neo-conservative political and cultural programs" (p.149). Purpel argued that real societal and political problems such as poverty, disparity in medical care, ecological devastation and an increased division in our country of the haves and the have-nots were minimized since the problem was one of moral decline rooted in a sense of personalism and self-centeredness of the youth and not the social, political and cultural institutions. Character education in this context took on the inclination of preserving the politics of the privileged against the challenges of society in movements of civil rights, multiculturalism, gay rights and women's rights. In this context the

character education movement appeared to be an effort of the privileged to defer the challenges of change, as stated by Purpel (1997):

The conservative call for an increase in such admirable qualities and civility, deference to the community, stability, and orderliness serves to consolidate the gains and authority of those already in power. It also serves to distract attention from a potentially disruptive substantive critique of established social institutions and focus on the more emotionally charged issues of personal morality and conduct. Better to discuss poverty in terms of personal laziness and moral flabbiness than as an inevitable consequence of our economic system; better to discuss the alienation of youth in terms of school violence than as an aspect of a culture drowning in dispiriting materialism and consumerism. (p. 150)

More divisive was that it detracted from the real discourse that was important in fostering change as advocated by other critics of the social and cultural establishment such as Tronto (1994) and Martin (1994). In summary, Purpel's critique of character education was based on the tendency to judge a program on a broad diagnosis and apply the treatment in a narrow scope. According to Purpel, the problems of society and the culture at large would not be solved in the classrooms and the schools. A moral society would not be achieved by compiling lists of ethical behaviors, but by examining the relationship of the conditions in which the contradictions exist between the ideals and the deeds of society.

Kohn's (1997a) critical look at character education began with much the same argument as Purpel. He looked at what level the problems are to be addressed and questioned whether the solution to social problems was character development. Kohn said that such an approach ignored the evidence accumulated by social psychologists who found that "how we are and who we are reflects the situation in which we find ourselves" (p. 431). Kohn also

portrayed the new character education movement as having a negative view of children as self-centered and which natural egoism inhibits children working together. Kohn simplified character education as the need to develop the capacity to control impulses and defer gratification. The need for self-control was considered an internal war with self versus desires and reason as enforced by existing social norms.

Like Purpel, Kohn (1997b) questioned whether the ultimate goal of character education was to help children become involved in a democratic society as agents or whether the values of citizenship, respect, and responsibility are just "slippery terms, frequently used as euphemisms for uncritical deference to authority" (p. 157). In Kohn's view the goal should be to create responsive and caring citizens dedicated to promoting change in the direction of the equity and equality principles of a democratic society, rather than to inculcate habits of obedience and social order. If character education was a means to enforce obedience, it was not education. It really was, as A. L. Lockwood (1986) said, "mindless conformity to externally imposed standards of conduct" (p. 10).

Kohn (1997a) claimed that much of the practice in the schools with character education was "highly structured lessons in which character-related concepts are described and the students are drilled until they can produce the right answers" (p. 433). According to Kohn, this style of pedagogy viewed children as objects to be indoctrinated rather than learners to be engaged. Kohn argued that pedagogical research tells us that this direct transmission model of instruction would be ineffective in providing higher level thinking, analysis, and synthesis. A basic transmission model of values and rewards to reinforce

compliance may temporarily change student actions, but is not likely to permanently change behaviors. However, Kohn warned if the goal was to gain simple compliance, rather than create learners that are able to distinguish between social and political oppression and equity and justice for all citizens, this strategy was sufficient.

According to Noddings (1997), teachers should borrow from both a didactic character education approach and one emphasizing cognitive development. The story approach proved compatible with both character education and cognitive approaches. Creating dialogues involving stories allowed students to have a voice in the understanding of the conflicts and dilemmas of the characters. These discussions became a constructivist approach to help students create meaning from a story as well as relating the expressed values to their own lives and situations. Noddings recommended that schools create a vision of what the school is about. If educating all learners to the best of their abilities--regardless of ability, race, gender, or economic status of parents--was the mission of the school, then that philosophy should be incorporated in the school mission statement and acted upon by the entire school staff. If an educational community emphasizes equity and equality as an espoused value, then the actions and programs of the school should reflect that philosophy.

Kohn (1997a) suggested that literature can do more than induce mere conformity and that "whether the students are 6-year-olds or 16-year-olds, the discussion of stories should be open-ended rather than relentlessly didactic"(p. 437). He focused on how the classroom was structured and purported that the real learning came when the students had a chance to grapple with issues.

Implementation of a character education program need not require a packaged curriculum. When staff modeled values of character and accompanied instruction with the vocabulary of expected behavior, a foundation of character program was established. In the elementary school, exercises helped students to recognize what was expected by teaching that good character promoted good behavior, but the research did not show that a program designed to promote good behavior by teaching values existed (A. L. Lockwood, 1993).

Schaps, Schaeffer, and McDonnell (2001) claim that too many character education programs primarily promote good manners and compliance to the rules and are not developing students of independent character able to function in a democratic society. They summarize these ineffective types of character education into four varieties: 1) A "cheerleading" approach uses posters, banners and high profile events to create a feeling of good character in the school. This approach uses positive messages, thinking students will assume a commitment to doing the right thing. 2) The "praise and reward" approach uses a behaviorist method to catch the students being good and reinforce the desired behavior. 3) The "define and drill" approach relies on memorization of a simple list of character terms as a means of learning a complex disposition to do the good. 4) The "forced-formality" approach required students to comply with specific rules and procedures to promote order as a means of training students to be compliant. Schaps et al. (2001) claimed that these approaches may yield limited benefits but will not have enduring effects on character development. An effective character education program creates a school that values the students and enlists them as active participants in creating a caring and just environment.

A school should demonstrate the values and goals it professes by what it does; the policies and procedures it avows are what it expects of its students.

According to Sizer and Sizer (1999), a school can instill positive habits that bring safety to the school, but the meaning of positive civil behavior requires more than catch words or behavior lists. A curriculum concerned with coverage of material would have difficulty allowing the time necessary to grapple with morals and values, which could not be measured on any standards assessment. The Sizers maintained that a moral education is an intellectual undertaking. Thus, exposure only to lists to be rote learned and blindly followed mistreats children. They advocated that educators must enable the students to grapple with the moral and character matters that are embedded in a rich curriculum. Ryan and Bohlin (1999) described this approach as developing in youth a moral literacy that will help them develop a meaningful frame of reference by exposing them to the knowledge of memorable lives both good and bad. This further contributes to the students' faith in the power of individuals to change their lives.

Ryan (1981) admitted that the theory was rather narrow since it concentrated on reasoning and had little to say about how children behave.

It is questionable whether American parents are going to buy an approach to moral education that concentrates exclusively on thinking and has so little to say about how children actually behave. My own concern is the turning of this whole issue of moral education into a word game with few implications for action. Teaching our children how to discourse about complex and social issues without helping them in the world of action could be an empty and dangerous victory" (p. 24).

Character education needs to permeate the entire school (Ryan and Bohlin, 1999; A. T. Lockwood, 1997). It should be reflected in the school vision and mission statements. All staff must model it and it must be integrated into

the curriculum. Rusnack (1990) stated, "In the integrated view of character education, cognition is a part of the moral development, not a means to an end. The impact of social environment, culture, and emotion also play an important part in the development of an individual's character. Moreover, the integrated view of character developments relies on action rather than only moral reasoning through discussion to enhance character growth" (p. xiv). While a minimal amount of didactic instruction is required to incorporate the language of character education, simple lists and drill-and-skill activities will not affect behavior. Making meaningful connections with the curriculum will allow students to find meaning in caring concern and connection with the world outside of themselves.

As in all aspects of school, we should try to ascertain the impact of what we do. At this stage there are no highly developed evaluation techniques for moral education. There are some common-sense approaches, such as checking to see if there have been any changes in the rates of vandalism and absenteeism. Another source of evaluative feedback comes from teachers. Do they see the program making a difference with students in their classrooms? A survey of teacher attitudes and observations could be an important source of data. In addition, there are instruments that measure the level of moral development. (Ryan, 1981, p. 36)

Walberg and Wynne (1989) reported a degree of consensus among experts and practitioners of character education. They found experts favored a variety of approaches to character development including group activities; extracurricular activities; ethical and moral approaches such as codes of values, a caring environment, and moral discussions; and teaching practices such as using traditional subjects to teach values. These practices can be used simultaneous and may reinforce each other.

Ryan and Bohlin (2003) advocated building a school of character with certain key elements in place: a relevant mission statement, identified core virtues the community would like to see practiced, partnerships with the home, teamwork with all teachers and administrators, regular meetings, involved staff and students, integrated extracurricular activities, and relevant evaluation--not only assessment results, but how character education is doing in relation to the mission. Yet, concerned educators continued to lack evidence of the effectiveness of character education. A. T. Lockwood (1997) claimed that "perhaps the largest criticism of character education is the failure of its advocates to engage in empirical research"(p. 10). "Educational research is needed to track and document current character education efforts, to evaluate the effectiveness, and serve as a basis for refinement of existing programs or reconfiguration of character education itself" (p. 11).

In view of the critics of the implementation of character education, Hogg-Chapman (2002) conducted a four-year ethnographic study in a suburban middle school to gain understanding of "best practice" of character education. The following conclusions were drawn from the study:

1. Knowledge of character education is critical.
2. Character education needs to be an intentional approach to help students develop character.
3. Informed and effective leadership from the school district, principal, and committees is essential.
4. The school should be a caring community.

5. The school district needs to be proactive in working with parents and community.
6. The character education program needs to be evaluated.

Hogg-Chapman concluded that to sustain character education in the school, strong moral leadership is required from the principal, district administration, and the school board.

Knowledge of principles of good character does not necessarily mean that good behavior will result. Hogg-Chapman (2002) stated that "although behavioral assessment is an important indicator of successful character education, caution must be taken as to not expect too much too soon concerning behavior" (p. 380). Lasley (1997) commented on the need of educators to communicate the behaviors that exhibit good character. He stated, "Character education programs espouse responsibility, while the culture sends a strong countervailing message: 'if it feels good, do it!' " (p. 655). Lasley warned that schools might not be able to attain what society contradicts. The importance of the individual in American culture preempts many Americans from cooperating in a competitive society. School environments must model the respect and responsibility they want students to emulate.

Research in Character Education

Leming (1997a) pointed out that the Hartshorne and May research of the 1920s and 1930s recommended indirect methods of teaching character as more beneficial than didactic, direct methods.

Current character educators do place much more attention on cooperative work in the classroom, having teachers function as good role models, establishing a classroom climate of caring, and making sure there is

consistency between classrooms--as well as consistency between teachers, students and parents (p 24).

Leming (1997a) conducted a review of over 411 articles or paper presentations of character education for the years 1993-1995. Citations were categorized into one of five types of research: 1) psychological inquiries in the nature of morality, 2) measurement techniques for qualifying variables relevant to the study of moral education, 3) philosophical inquiries into the nature of moral language and experience, 4) descriptive and analytic studies of moral education programs, and 5) evaluation of programs to determine educationally significant outcomes. The largest number of articles and papers, 172 or 24%, was categorized as those that described, advocated, analyzed, or critiqued moral education programs. The smallest number, 17 or 4%, assessed program effectiveness. "Overall, only 8% of these articles addressed questions concerned with assessment and program evaluation" (p. 41). Leming emphasized the need for character education assessment that goes beyond anecdotes--frequently provided by character educators as evidence of effectiveness--and provides evidence that is objective and credible.

Rest (1997) also expressed a need for solid research on character education. However, he claimed character education is especially vulnerable to outside forces and warned that research, even though much needed, can be a dangerous way of calling attention to the enterprise. He stated:

There are reasons for not doing research. One reason is that once you do research, the school board in your district pays attention to the fact that you are doing something with morals or values. That is likely to cause civil war in a district. (p. 35)

Rest (1997) maintained that research results which proved a failure of the character education movement could cause a backlash from supporters of the religious Right and even from proponents of the new character education movement, who support the secular traditional values rather than religious values. The alliance of the religious Right and the proponents of character education are politically volatile according to Rest (1997):

They have gotten their support by talking about bringing back tradition. They have given the religious Right the idea that they will return prayer to schools. When the bomb goes off, it will come from the religious Right, who will accuse character educators of secular humanism. (p. 35)

Despite this possible outcome, Rest still maintains that research on character education is needed in order to track different approaches and to evaluate the success of those efforts. Research needs to be done in order to generalize what works for whom and to make use of activities and how to profit from them.

Walberg and Wynne (1989) defined character as "engaging in morally relevant conduct or words, or refraining from certain conduct or words" (p. 38); good or bad character is reflected in one's conduct. Regarding the research on the behavior of students, A. L. Lockwood (1997) stated that the "relationship of values to behavior shows no connection between the two" (p. 183). Knowledge about ethical values does not necessarily mean that good behavior will result. A. L. Lockwood (1997) advocated for a "more complex research-based psychology of moral behavior than is currently being offered" (p. 183).

The most thorough and multi-faceted assessment of character education has been taking place in South Dakota since 1997-98. Moss (2001), in an on-going five-year study of Character Counts! by the South Dakota 4-H Foundation, used

an extensive questionnaire covering demographics, attitudes, and behavior. Each year researchers based at South Dakota State University collected the evaluation forms from large numbers of students and teachers. The year 2000 student sample comprised 8,419 middle and high school respondents. In addition, over 345 teachers responded to the questionnaires about the students. When compared to the baseline data of 1998, the study indicated a more positive trend in students' behavior resulted from more student exposures per month to character education. Since 1998, students reported a 17% decrease in cheating on exams, a 10% drop in student detentions or suspensions, a 19% decline in failure to get homework turned in, a 4% drop in teasing because of race or ethnicity, a 15% increase in students who reported not drinking alcohol, an 18% increase of students who reported never lying to a teacher, and a 22% improvement in the number of students who reported never letting someone copy their work. Students reported improvement in every category of misdeed assessed. Furthermore, teachers reported better student behavior toward others and authority.

Anthony (2002) investigated the efficacy of a character education program in a middle school population. The study focused on the behavior change of an experimental group of sixth-grade students as measured by discipline infractions, unexcused absences and suspension/expulsion data compared to a seventh grade control group. A semantic differential instrument measured the student valuation of the core values of respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, citizenship and trustworthiness. Results of the study failed to find any significant differences between the discipline infractions of the control group and

the experimental group. No significant differences were found in the experimental group and the control group on a pre and post survey regarding their understanding and valuation of identified character traits.

In a study of the effects of a Character Counts!, Cryer (2002) researched student behavior in one middle school and one high school in rural Texas. After student behaviors of the experimental group and the control groups were observed for six weeks, the students and teachers were surveyed. In contrast to Anthony's findings, significant difference was measured among the experimental-group of students; they exhibited a more positive attitude, ability to set goals, oral presentations, organization, and record keeping skills.

Williams (1993) commented on the importance of teachers' behaviors as they model respect for each student as a responsible active learner. Ryan and Bohlin (1999) stated, "One of the stumbling blocks preventing schools from embracing character education is that few teachers have been trained for this work" (p. 152). Study results indicated teachers felt confident in their abilities to serve as role models and to foster such traits as responsibility, respect, courtesy compassion and honesty even though they lack pre-service or in-service training. A study by Milson and Mehlig (2002) surveyed 254 elementary teachers who indicated that they felt capable of providing character education despite the lack of training provided. Yet, teachers indicated that because they received minimal training in teaching character, they were less confident with their ability to redirect students who exhibited poor character.

Wood and Roach (1999) conducted a study of 200 school administrators in South Dakota and found 81% were supportive of character education in the

curriculum even though 72% did not have a school policy regarding character education. The administrators tended to believe that teachers and parents would support the teaching of character education in the schools. Ellison (2002) examined the perceptions of the principal and the effectiveness of a character education program and the principal's response to the demographics in their middle school. Principals were surveyed on the importance they placed on character education and the level of implementation at their schools. Ellison reported the level of character education varied based on the importance placed by the principal on character education, the amount of training in character education the principal had received, the ethnicity of the school's population, and the percentage of students on free/reduced lunches.

Pilcher (2003) studied the relationship between two factors of character education, the learning environment and school performance. The study surveyed school principals and teachers in 17 elementary schools and over 2,000 students in grades 4-6. The mean scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills were used to measure the relationship of character education and school performance. Character Counts! was the character education program used by 86% of the principals who responded. No significant relationships were found between the level of implementation of character education and the learning environment or the school performance scores. However, a significant relationship was found between the students' perception of learning environment and the school performance scores. Pilcher concluded that positive learning environment and a creation of a school community might be particularly helpful in types of impoverished environments like those included in her study. She recommended

a longitudinal study to examine students' learning environment and School Performance Scores.

Thompson (2002) conducted a qualitative, multiple-case study to determine the effects of character education on the behavior of elementary students. The research consisted of observing student behavior; interviewing students, teachers and parents to determine the perceptions of the effects of the character education program on student behavior; and reviewing students discipline records. Character Counts! was the program used in the school and was well integrated into the curriculum. Each of the 10 case studies included positive comments by parents and teachers, especially in the areas of respect and responsibility. Parents identified positive changes in their children's behavior. Teacher interviews indicated that the students had become more responsible during the year in areas of homework and assignments and credited the character education program. When the 10 students in the case study were asked who had most influence on the positive changes in their behavior, five indicated the teacher had the most or some influence. Two indicated other family members had influenced them, and two indicated peers had influenced them most. One student could not identify who had most influenced the change in behavior, but the parent interview indicated the teacher had the most influence in the positive behavior change. When a review of discipline records was made on each student, 70% showed evidence of improvement in behavior. Findings from this study led to the following recommendations: implementation of character education programs in elementary schools, integration of character

education into the curriculum, and principles of good behavior should be the basis of classroom rules with teachers serving as role models.

Summary of the Literature Review

This chapter has reviewed the history of character education in America. Social, cultural, religious, and political factors have influenced the evolution of character from its beginnings as a religious moral education, to a means of assimilation of immigrants and fostering democracy, to a moral relativism of a pluralistic society, to a new form of character education which incorporates the traditional values of character and attempts to integrate them throughout the curriculum (McKown, 1935; McClellan, 1999; Spring, 1990).

Various approaches have been used to help children to become good citizens and to have good moral character. Early approaches included a direct telling approach. Creeds, codes and slogans characterized character education in the early twentieth century. By the 1920s, the progressive education movement, led by John Dewey, influenced the teaching of character. Dewey saw moral education as central to the school's mission; however, he lacked empirical research to prove the effectiveness of character education. Hartshorne and May's research concluded that didactic methods alone are unlikely to positively affect character. By the 1950s, character education had all but disappeared in public schools (Leming, 1993, 1997b). Values clarification and moral decision-making models were dominant approaches in the 1960s and 1970s; however, the controversy over their relativism caused a decline in the teaching of character education by the 1980s. The 1990s witnessed a revival in character education due to renewed public interest (Lickona, 1993). New character education models

have incorporated the direct transmission of universal values in addition to the integration of character education throughout the curriculum and the school culture. Teachers as role models and support from building principals, district administration, parents and community are important factors in sustaining character education in the school.

The lack of quantitative research on character education's impact on changing student behavior has not limited its teaching nor its influence on the learning environment of the school (Leming, 1993). Review of recent research indicates the difficulty in identifying changes in behavior attributed to character education. Despite the minimal evidence of effectiveness of character education, a revival of its teaching reflects the public consensus of the need to transmit positive values to children in an era of persistent societal ills (Kilpatrick, 1992; Lickona, 1993; Benninga and Wynne, 1998; Etizone, 1998).

Character education reappeared in the 1990s with a renewed emphasis on universal values of good character (Lickona, 1993; Ryan and Bohlin, 1999). The new character education is characterized by a comprehensive approach to character education based on knowledge, feeling and action. An integrated approach incorporates character education through the entire school, adds meaning to learning and provides opportunities for service learning activities (Wynne & Walberg, 1989; Burrett & Rusnak, 1993).

Critics of the new character education question the true motives of character education--to create citizens who have an intrinsic desire to do good or who are trained to be mindless followers of authority (Kohn, 1997a; Purpel, 1997). Lasley (1997) warned that if the adults do not model the desired behavior,

it is unlikely the children will learn the desired behavior. Etizone (1998) response to Kohn was that public schools are limited in the values they teach to the values that we all share. Noddings (1997) recommended a comprehensive approach involving a cognitive approach as well as a didactic approach.

Empirical research of the efficacy of character education is lacking. A review of recent studies of character education has had inconclusive results, which substantiates the need for further study.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of a character education program on students from the middle schools at Minot School District as measured by the behaviors reported on the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS). This study focused on the Minot Public School middle-level students who were surveyed with the Youth Risk Behavior Survey in 2001 and in 2003. Research questions addressed in this study were the following:

1. Were there changes in the student scores on the four character pillars reported on the YRBS among middle-school students between 2001 and 2003?
2. Were there differences between males and females on the four character pillars reported on the YRBS?
3. What were the relationships between student scores on the four character pillars and risk behaviors on the YRBS in middle-school students?
4. Were there differences in the four character pillars based on the number of risk factors exhibited?

Items selected from the Youth Risk Behavior Survey 2001 served as a baseline measure of student behavior. The survey data, initially compiled by the Center for Disease Control, were analyzed to determine if any significant changes occurred between the four variables. The University of North Dakota

Bureau of Educational Services and Applied Research ran the raw data to make the comparisons. Individual identifiable student data were not collected in this study.

Site

The school district under study is located in a mid-western city with a population of approximately 33,000. A U.S. Air Force base is located nine miles north of the city. By enrollment, the school district is the fourth largest in the state with 6,750 students with approximately 28% eligible for free or reduced lunch. This study focused on middle-level students who were administered the Youth Risk Behavior Survey in 2001 and in 2003. The Minot Public Schools have 1,000 student in grades 7 and 8 in three middle schools. Two of the three are located in the city; the third is located on the U.S. Air Force base. The number of students included in the samples were 278 in 2001 and 644 in 2003.

Instrumentation

The Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) served as the measure of behavioral change. The YRBS is a survey administered by the Center for Disease Control on odd numbered years to grades 7-12. The youth risk behavior system was developed in 1989 by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to monitor health risks that contribute to the mortality, morbidity, and social problems among youth in the United States. The YRBS targets six categories of behaviors: (1) those that contribute to unintentional injuries and violence, (2) tobacco use, (3) alcohol and other drug use; (4) sexual behaviors that contribute to unintended pregnancy and sexually transmitted disease, including Human Immunodeficiency Virus infection; (5) dietary behaviors; and (6) physical activity (Center for Disease Control, 2002). The middle school version of the YRBS does not address the risk factors attributed to sexual behavior.

The YRBS consists of national, state, and local school-based surveys of representative samples of students in grades 7-8 and in grades 9-12. Grumbaum, Kann, Knichen, Williams, Ross, Lowery, and Kolbe, (2002) reported in 2001, thirty-eight states participated in the YRBS with sample sizes for state and local survey administration ranging from 955 to 7,191. These surveys have been developed with extensive research (Kolbe, Kann, & Collins 1993) and have proven reliability. A study of the 1999 Youth Risk Behavior Survey by Brenner, Kann, McManus, Kichen, Sundberg, and Ross (2002) indicated, "Nearly all items on the YRBS questionnaire had at least 'moderate' reliability and nearly half had 'substantial' reliability" (p. 341). They reported results of Kappas from 23.6% to 90.5% and a median of 60.0%, and no difference was found in Kappas of respondents by gender, grade or ethnicity. This assessment of test-retest reliability was conducted on the YRBS instrument designed for grades 9-12. There were no studies found using the middle school (grades 7-8) version of the YRBS. No validity studies of either version of the YRBS were found.

The survey procedures were designed to protect students' privacy by providing anonymity and voluntary participation. Surveys were administered to intact class periods or intact classes of a required subject (e.g., second period or all English classes). All students in selected classes were eligible to participate in the survey. Students completed the self-administered survey during one class period and recorded their responses directly on a computer-scannable answer sheet. Additional questions were added with each of the three survey administrations. The total number of multiple-choice questions varied from 52 in 2001 to 67 in 2003. Only the items that appeared on both of the 2001 and 2003 survey administrations were considered for this study. The school district gave permission to use the local data for this study.

In order to determine a connection between behavior items on the YRBS and the Six Pillars of Character, four independent experts in character education were asked to review the YRBS survey items and match them with one or more of the character pillars. For example, a survey question that dealt with seat belt usage could be matched with the pillar of responsibility, since wearing a seat belt is being responsible for one's own safety. All four reviewers had experience with the Six Pillars of Character as defined by the Josephson Institute. The experts included: a State Department supervisor of character education, an educator who has responsibility for character education in a similar size district as the study group, a middle school administrator from the study group school district with responsibility for character education and, a representative of the Josephson Institute. The four independent experts were asked to match the pillars of character with items on the 2001 middle-level YRBS. The experts were mailed a YRBS survey and a definition of each of the character pillars as defined in the study. Only matches that were consistent with at least two of the four experts were used in the study.

The researcher identified 30 questions from the 2001 YRBS (see Appendix), which assessed four of the major risk factors of the YRBS: safety/violence, alcohol use, tobacco use, and dietary behaviors to be matched to the character pillars. The majority of experts had to match the question to a character pillar in order for the question to be used in the study. The pillar Fairness was eliminated because, according to the experts, questions on the YRBS did not elicit information on this character pillar. The pillars of Caring and Respect were combined due to the fact that the character experts identified the same questions as measuring both these pillars.

Table 1. Reliability Analysis of Responsibility Question Items.

Question (2001 YRBS)	Item Discrimination
8. How often do you wear a seat belt when riding in a car?	.433
9. When you ride a bicycle, how often do you wear a helmet?	.415
10. When you rollerblade or ride a skateboard, how often do you wear a helmet?	.393
15. Have you ridden in a car driven by someone who had been drinking alcohol?	.463
26. Have you ever smoked cigarettes daily, that is, at least one cigarette every day for 30 days?	.319
31. Did you drink 5 or more drinks of alcohol in a row, that is, within a couple of hours?	.476
35. How old were you when you sniffed glue, breathed the contents of aerosol spray cans, or inhaled any paints or sprays to get high for the first time?	.338
36. Have you used methamphetamines (also called speed, crystal, crank, or ice)?	.296
38. Have you used a needle to inject any illegal drug into your body?	.311
43. Have you gone without eating for 24 hours or more (also called fasting) to lose weight or keep from gaining weight?	.413
44. Have you taken any diet pills, powders, or liquids without a doctor's advice to lose weight or to keep from gaining weight? (Do not include meal replacement products such as Slim Fast.)	.371
45. Have you vomited or taken laxatives to lose weight or to keep from gaining weight?	.352

Reliability coefficients 12 items
Cronbach's Alpha = .695

The original reliability analysis identified two questions on the YRBS to be unreliable: Question 13. During the past twelve months, how many times were you in a physical fight? and Question 38. Have you used a needle to inject any illegal drug into your body? Because they proved unreliable, they were not included in the analysis of data.

Table 2. Reliability Analysis of Trustworthiness Question Items.

Question (2001 YRBS)	Item Discrimination
22. During the past 30 days, on how many days did you smoke cigarettes?	.622
24. During the past 30 days, how did you usually get your own cigarettes?	.665
25. When you bought or tried to buy cigarettes in a store during the past 30 days, were you ever asked to show proof of age?	.380

Reliability coefficients 3 items
Cronbach's Alpha = .592

Two of the four raters defined the pillar Citizenship as any situation where laws dictate the behavior since a part of being a good citizen is abiding by the law. For example, laws prohibit underage smoking and the use of drugs as well as promote positive behavior such as using seat belts. The character experts deemed questions on these behaviors as measurements of Citizenship. The analysis of reliable questions on citizenship is reported in Table 3.

Table 3. Reliability Analysis of Citizenship Question Items.

Question (2001 YRBS)	Item Discrimination
11. Have you carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club, other than for hunting?	.384
12. Have you carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property?	.380
27. How old were you when you used chewing tobacco, snuff, or dip for the first time?	.400
29. Have you had a drink of alcohol, other than a few sips?	.628
30. How old were you when you had your first drink of alcohol other than a few sips?	.558
32. Have you used marijuana?	.663
33. How old were you when you tried marijuana for the first time?	.607
34. Have you used any form of cocaine, including powder, crack, or freebase?	.511
37. Have you used steroids?	.411
Reliability coefficients 9 items Cronbach's Alpha = .716	

The raters identified the same questions on the YRBS as measures of the pillars of both Caring and Respect, particularly the questions that dealt with caring for oneself and others. For example, all four experts felt that eating a meal with family was an indicator of caring. However, on questions about suicide the raters split; two experts identified these under the pillar of Caring while the other two determined they measured respect for self. For this reason, the researcher

combined questions for the two pillars on each YRBS to make a reliable comparison of change.

Table 4. Reliability Analysis of Caring/Respect Question Items.

Question (2001 YRBS)	Item Discrimination
14. Have you been in a physical fight in which you were hurt and required medical treatment?	.212
16. Have you seriously thought about killing yourself?	.593
17. Have you made a plan about how you would kill yourself?	.635
55. Yesterday, did you eat a meal with your family?	.146

Reliability coefficients 4 items
Cronbach's Alpha = .598

Data Analysis

The purpose of this study was to collect and analyze data from the Youth Risk Behavior Survey to determine if there was a change over a three-year period in the behavior of middle-level students who had been exposed to a character education program. Four research questions were posed. The Bureau of Educational Services and Applied Research at the University of North Dakota applied statistical tests to determine changes in behavior over time. Research questions one, and two were analyzed using a single factor ANOVA. The third question was analyzed using a Pearson product-moment correlation. In a fourth research question, a MANOVA was used to determine the differences on the four character pillars by the number of risk factors exhibited by the respondents. Each of these questions was tested using a .05 alpha level.

CHAPTER IV

REPORT AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of a character education program on middle-school students' behaviors as measured by the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS). In this chapter, the reader will find statistical analyses of the YRBS from school data. The questions from the middle school YRBS were matched to the Pillars of Character, as defined by Character Counts!, by a panel of four independent experts on character education. The computer program SPSS and the Bureau of Educational Services and Applied Research at the University of North Dakota were used in the analyses of the data.

The specific research questions to be answered were the following:

1. Were there changes in the student scores on the four character pillars reported on the YRBS among middle-school students between the years 2001 and 2003?
2. Were there differences between males and females on the four character pillars reported in the YRBS?
3. What were the relationships between the student scores on the four character pillars and risk behaviors on the YRBS in middle-school students?
4. Were there differences in the four character pillars based on the number of risk factors exhibited?

Descriptive Report of the Data

This section describes the sample studied, the total scores on the YRBS, and the match of the YRBS questions to the four character pillars. The YRBS, developed by the Center for Disease Control (CDC), was provided by the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction every two years to be administered by local classroom teachers. The teachers read the instructions provided to ensure a standardized test administration. The surveys were answered anonymously by all participants. Two samples were examined in this study. The YRBS administered in 2001 served as the baseline measure of student behavior, and the survey of 2003 acted as a second measure. In 2001, 278 students in grades 7 and 8 were surveyed, and 644 students completed the survey in 2003.

Four research questions guided the study. Results of analyses of data on each question are reported in this chapter.

Research Question 1: Were there changes in student scores on the four Pillars of Character on the YRBS among middle school students from 2001 to 2003? To determine if there were changes between the two years, a Wilks' lambda MANOVA was applied. It compared the YRBS student responses for 2001 to student responses for 2003 on four pillars. The Wilks' lambda of 4.655, with 4 and 917 degrees of freedom, determined that there were significant differences ($p < .001$) between student scores in the two years. ANOVA tests were conducted to determine which means on the individual variables were significantly different. The findings of this analysis are reported in Table 5.

Table 5. Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVA Results between 2001 and 2003 on Four Pillars and Total Scores.

Character Pillars	2001 (N = 278)		2003 (N = 644)		F	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Responsibility	42.9	4.6	42.7	5.1	.341	.560
Caring/Respect	10.1	1.4	9.8	1.5	6.089	.014
Trustworthiness	12.5	1.5	12.3	1.9	3.317	.069
Citizenship	42.1	5.0	40.8	5.8	11.227	.001
Total	107.6	10.2	105.6	11.8	6.289	.012

Table 5 reports there was an overall difference ($p = .012$) between 2001 and 2003 on the Total Category, and there was a difference in the Caring/Respect variable ($p = .014$) as well as in the Citizenship variable ($p = .001$) of the four Pillars of Character. The mean of the student scores decreased significantly in 2003 from 2001 on the Caring/Respect variable and the Citizenship variable.

Research Question 2: Were there differences among males and females in student scores on the four character pillars? In order to answer this question, a Wilks' lambda MANOVA was applied to compare the responses of 460 boys to the responses of 462 girls. The Wilks' lambda of 11.226, with 4 and 917 degrees of freedom, determined that there were no significant differences (.540) based on gender.

Research Question 3: What were the relationships between the student scores on the four character pillars and risk behaviors on the YRBS in middle-school students? These risk behaviors include tobacco use, unhealthy dietary behaviors, safety/violent behaviors, and alcohol and other drug use. In order to answer this question, a Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated to compare the character pillars. Table 6 presents the data showing the relationships between the four pillar variables and total risk behaviors. Total risk was defined as the total number of the risk behaviors reported on the YRBS.

Table 6. Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Between the Character Pillars on the YRBS and Total Risk Behaviors.

Character Pillars	Total Risk
Responsibility Pearson Correlation	-.580*
Caring-Respect Pearson Correlation	-.362*
Trustworthiness Pearson Correlation	-.599*
Citizenship Pearson Correlation	-.683*

N = 922 students

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

The Pearson product-moment correlation reported significant negative relationships among the scores on the Responsibility, Caring/Respect, Trustworthiness, and the Citizenship variables and the Total Risk.

Research Question 4: Were there differences in the character pillars based on the number of risk factors exhibited? The survey asked students to respond to questions related to four risk behaviors. Risk factors were numbered from 0 (no risk) to 4 and compared to the four character pillars linked to each question from the YRBS (Appendix). A Wilks' lambda was applied to determine the differences between the four character pillars and the total risk factors reported by the students. The Wilks' lambda of 77.099 with 16 degrees of freedom indicated that there were significant differences at the .001 level. Table 7 reports the differences between the number of risk factors--drug/alcohol use, tobacco use, safety violence, and nutrition--from 0 to 4 for each of the four Pillars of Character. A total of 262 (28%) students indicated they did not engage in risk behaviors. The largest number of students (362/38%) admitted to at least one risk behavior, while 27 students (3%) admitted to engaging in four risk behaviors. The largest difference, a 17% decline, appeared between students admitting to one risk factor and those exhibiting two or more risk factors for each of the four character pillars. As the number of risk factors increased the mean value of the Responsibility pillar decreased from 45.3 to 33.7, the Caring/Respect pillar decreased from 10.5 to 9.1, the Trustworthiness pillar decreased from 13.0 to 7.7 and the Citizenship pillar decreased from 44.5 to 30.4. Results are reported in Table 7.

Table 7. ANOVA between Character Pillars by YRBS Risk Factors.

	<u>Number of Risk Factors</u>					<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
	0	1	2	3	4		
N = 922	262	351	191	91	27		
Percent of N	28%	38%	21%	10%	3%		
<hr/>							
Responsibility							
Mean	45.3	44.0	41.1	36.7	33.7	128.5	<.001
Standard Deviation	3.4	3.9	4.4	4.5	5.4		
Caring/Respect							
Mean	10.5	10.1	9.5	8.6	9.1	38.6	<.001
Standard Deviation	0.9	1.3	1.7	2.0	1.6		
Trustworthiness							
Mean	13.0	13.0	12.4	9.7	7.5	233.8	<.001
Standard Deviation	0.1	0.5	1.6	2.9	2.3		
Citizenship							
Mean	14.5	42.9	39.3	32.3	30.4	240.3	<.001
Standard Deviation	2.0	3.4	4.8	6.0	7.9		
Total							
Mean	113.3	109.9	102.3	87.4	80.7	325.8	<.001
Standard Deviation	4.2	6.5	8.6	11.4	13.1		

Summary

This chapter presented the findings of statistical analysis designed to identify differences or relationships among students in grade 7 and 8 in three public middle schools in north central North Dakota based on their responses to the Youth Risk Behavior Survey in the years 2001 and 2003. Survey results from research question #1 comparing 278 students with 644 students demonstrated some significant differences in the scores on the YRBS when matched with four

character pillars of Responsibility, Caring/Respect, Trustworthiness, and Citizenship. The mean scores for all four character pillars decreased from 2001 to 2003. The mean scores of the Caring/Respect and the Citizenship pillars decreased significantly from 2001 to 2003. Research question #2 found no significant differences in the scores were found between males and females on their responses to the four pillars of character beyond that which might have been expected through normal variation. Research question #3 reported a significant negative relationship between each of the four character pillars and the total risk behaviors. Both a MANOVA and ANOVA to determine the differences on the four character pillars by the number of risk factors exhibited by the respondents. The findings in research question #4 indicated that as the number of risk factors increased, the mean value for the four character pillars decreased. Two-thirds (66%) of the total students who responded to the surveys indicated they engaged in none or one of the risk factors. Chapter V presents a summary and discussion of these findings. Included are some recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of the Character Counts! program on the behavior of students in three middle schools in a mid-sized, mid-western school district. In this chapter, the writer summarizes the findings, shares some conclusions, points out the limitations, and offers recommendations.

Summary

This study examined three middle schools that have implemented Character Counts! since 1996. Anecdotal and staff perception of the effects of the character education program on students was positive, but indicated the need for further quantitative study of the impact of the program on middle level students. The Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS), a measure of student involvement in four risk behaviors areas, alcohol/drugs, safety/violence, tobacco and nutrition, was used to determine if any change in behavior had occurred. The 2001 YRBS results were compared to the 2003 survey to determine changes in student behavior. Four research questions were asked to investigate the impact of Character Counts! and the Pillars of Character on middle school students' behavior.

Research Question 1: Were there changes in the student scores on the four character pillars reported on the YRBS among middle school students between

the years 2001 and 2003? The question was asked to determine if the character education program of Character Counts! had a positive effect on students' behavior over the two years. The study used two surveys of student responses to measure changes in risk behavior. The student responses were linked to the Pillars of Character of Character Counts! Four independent raters linked the pillars of character to thirty survey questions on the YRBS. A MANOVA was used to compare the student responses from the 2001 YRBS to the 2003 YRBS results.

Results indicated two areas of significance. The pillars of Caring/Respect and the Citizenship pillar both were significant. However, the means for both pillars decreased from 2001 to 2003. The results indicated an increase in the risk behaviors reported by the middle school students in 2003 as compared to the 2001 results. The means of the other two pillars of trustworthiness and responsibility also had decreased, but were not significant. The significant decrease in the mean scores would indicate that the students increased their involvement in risk behaviors, rather than decreased them. These results are reminiscent of the Hartshorne and May studies, reviewed by Leming (1997a), which indicated character was situationally specific; traits of honesty and service did not necessarily carry over from one situation to another.

Research Question 2: Were there differences between males and females on the four character pillars reported in the YRBS? Does the Character Counts! program have differing effects on behavior between males and females? A MANOVA was conducted to compare the responses of males and females on the YRBS. The results found no significant distinction in student scores on the four

pillars among males and females. A common stereotype is that males are greater risk takers than are females (Burton, 1976). However, this study found no difference between males and females on the risks behaviors they reported.

Research Question 3: Was there a relationship between the students' scores on the four character pillars and risk behaviors on the YRBS in middle school students? Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated to determine the relationships between the character pillars and the total risk. The YRBS surveys students in four major risk areas: drug/alcohol, tobacco use, nutrition, and safety/violence. Total risk was defined as the number of risk behaviors the youth reported from 0 to 4. The correlation results indicated a negative relationship between each of the four character pillars and the total risk behaviors. The negative relationship indicated that understanding the character pillars was not related to the risk behaviors.

Research Question 4: Were there differences in the four character pillars based on the number of risk factors exhibited? The final research question was asked to determine the differences in the number of risk factors and the four character pillars. A MANOVA indicated that as the total number of risk factors reported by the students increased, the mean value for each pillar decreased. This may indicate a positive collective effect of the character pillars on a decrease in the risk factors reported by the students. There appeared to be a definite decline in the standard deviations between two and three risk factors. This may indicate that more students engaged in one risk behavior than those who engaged in two risk behaviors did. For example, a student may have admitted to having a cigarette in the past 30 days, but not to an alcohol/drug, violent action

or unhealthy dieting behavior. Results indicated that only 13% of students had engaged in three or four negative risk behaviors. This may suggest that the knowledge of the character pillars had an impact on students engaging in risk behaviors, but they still may have exhibited impulsive risk behavior on occasion.

Conclusions and Discussion

Adequate measures of the effectiveness of moral and character education have been elusive. Quantitative data that indicates a change in student behavior has been limited. However, many of the research studies of character education have provided perceptions of effectiveness by teachers and administrators. Furthermore, discipline records and attendance have been used to measure the effectiveness of character education programs. Changes in the 2001 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), known as No Child Left Behind, has included character education programs as approved programs to address the issue of school climate and safe schools. Even so, data, which indicates positive changes in student behavior, has been inconclusive.

Previous research studies have not convincingly determined the influence of character education programs in changing student behavior. This study linked the pillars of character from the Character Counts! Program with the risk factors surveyed by the YRBS to middle school students. Lickona (1993) emphasized that the characteristics of an effective character education program are that it affects knowing, feeling and action. It is assumed that if people have the moral knowledge and emotion, they are likely to do what they know and feel is right. However, Lickona maintained that there are times when individuals do not or are unable to translate knowledge and feeling into moral action.

This study reviewed previous studies that attempted to evaluate character education programs and their effect on behavior change. Mischel and Mischel (1976) found in studies involving moral development that the relationship between moral reasoning and moral behavior did not appear to be reliable. They also reported that moral reasoning depended upon expected consequences. A young child's behavior may be governed by immediate consequences, but with greater maturity the behavior may become more autonomous of immediate rewards and punishments, but this does not imply that the behavior does not still depend on expected consequences. A study by Anthony (2002) also failed to find any significant differences in discipline infractions in middle school students measured by student valuation of the character pillars. Although no evidence of significant change in positive behavior was found in this study, evidence of a positive relationship between the character pillars and responsible behavior was found. If moral knowledge, moral feeling and moral actions are connected as Lickona (1991, 1997) suggested then the relationship of the character pillars to responsible behavior is important to consider in the continued implementation of character education.

It did not appear that gender was significant in the effect of the character pillars on the risk behaviors. Others have supported the findings of this study regarding the lack of gender difference in the reporting of risk behaviors between boys and girls. Tronto (1994) who reviewed research on gender differences and moral development also found no difference between male and female moral development.

Lickona (1998) emphasized a broad and developmental approach to character education that gives students repeated opportunities to practice good behavior. The right conduct comes with cognitive development and moral judgement. The fact that middle level students may practice risk behaviors may be a result of their developmental growth rather than a lack of strong character.

Since the students involved in this study were middle school students ages 12 to 14, it may be that the character pillars may have not been sufficiently ingrained in the students to show a predictable pattern of moral behavior. While this may have some basis in Kohlberg's theory of stages of moral development, studies by Peck and Havinghurst (1960) indicated that the children from age 10 to 17 tended to show a predictable pattern of moral character. Their longitudinal studies found that a child with poor values at age 10 can be expected to be relatively no better at age 13 or 16. Likewise, a student of good moral values for a 10-year old would be expected to behave with appropriate standards at age 13 and at age 16. Kohlberg (1981) believed the internalization of values was a long process that depended on the environment and the student's situation. This research reinforced the need to establish a character education program in the elementary schools and to evolve as it continues in the middle and high school. It also needs to be coordinated with efforts of the parents and community.

The studies by Hartshorne and May indicated that didactic instruction in character traits had little effect on changing students' behaviors (Leming, 1997b). The development of an effective character education program needs more than instruction in the Pillars of Character; it requires a staff who models positive character. Williams (1993) reported that the teachers viewed the character

education program positively, but the students believed the teachers' modeling positive character behavior was more important than just teaching the behaviors. According to Lickona (1998), an effective character education program should be broad and comprehensive. Some programs restructure the school itself to become a more just and caring community. Such a comprehensive approach calls for ongoing staff development and continuing, shared reflection on the moral life of the school" (p. 454). While the schools in this study have made a commitment to teaching character education, and anecdotal evidence has indicated many positive behavior actions on the part of students, empirical evidence of positive behavior change among the students was not conclusive. Hence, continued restructuring and evaluation are required of the schools.

Limitations

The YRBS was designed to provide an indicator of student behavior as it relates to several health risk factors. While the YRBS has been used as a measure of student behaviors by the Title IV, Safe and Drug Free Schools section of the ESEA to judge program effectiveness, it has not been used to judge the effectiveness of character education programs.

The number of participants in the 2001 study was considerably less than the total number of students available to survey. In 2001, only 278 seventh and eighth grade students answered the survey. In contrast, 644 students completed the 2003 survey. Difference in the samples was attributed to a change in practice of the data collection consultant for the North Dakota YRBS. Larger sample sizes were taken because of feedback from several of the larger school districts indicated they wanted larger sample sizes in order to provide relatively sound

data for each of their schools. The difference in the number of participants in the two survey administrations was considered a limitation since the increase in the number of students may have been a factor in the regression toward the mean of the 2003 scores.

The YRBS survey had been conducted in 1999, and the original design of this study intended the inclusion of this data for analysis. However, a change in the data collection consultant contracted by the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction resulted in the loss of the 1999 data. Consequently, the use of the lost data may have provided a more accurate baseline of the reported risk behavior data. The length of time for the study may not have been long enough to give an accurate measure of the program's effectiveness.

The questions on the YRBS were all weighted equally. For example, a student response that indicated not wearing a seatbelt was considered not responsible and was weighted as the same risk as a student who indicated they exhibited risk behaviors such as smoking marijuana or use of cocaine. Not eating a meal with the family the previous day may seem benign when compared to having used inhalants. A student who exhibited only one risk factor may have admitted to riding a bicycle without a helmet but may not be considered as high a risk as students engaged in two less-threatening risk behaviors.

Minot Public Schools operates a middle school on the Minot Air Force Base, but many military and civil service families also reside in Minot. The terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001 had a significant impact on the families associated with the Minot Air Force Base. The air base was on alert for several months and some military personnel were deployed

overseas. The effect of this tragedy on the military dependent students surveyed by this study was not fully known; however, counselors and teachers dealt with many families on the air base and in Minot who were affected by these events.

Although research on the effectiveness of character education has been conducted (Leming, 1993; A. L. Lockwood, 1997), the susceptibility of character education to outside forces makes positive findings difficult. The assessment of character education is challenging for educational research (Thomas, 2001). He cited Cline and Feldmesser (1983) and Pritchard (1988) for expressing concerns for methodological issues because of the inability to isolate character education programs from other contextual factors for behavior change. Many complex variables impact behavior of youth, including an increased media pressure that portrays contradictory behaviors as normal and acceptable.

The school climate and teacher training are two factors to be considered in the implementation and assessment of a character education program. Yet, Ryan and Bohlig (1999) commented that lack of teacher training was a stumbling block in implementing a character education program. Teachers indicated they received little pre-service training in character education (Milson & Mehlig, 2002). Staff training should to be addressed by a school district's professional development for character education to become a part of a school's values and beliefs. Thomas (2001) encouraged future assessment of character education to examine the relationships between the values taught through the character education program and the implicit values taught by the hidden curriculum and the school's culture. The lessons taught through a formal character education

program are not as pervasive as the hidden curriculum and the social interactions of the school's culture.

Staff development in Character Counts! varied among the three middle schools. One of the schools had extensive staff development; the second somewhat less, and the third had minimal staff training in Character Counts!. The school district made the commitment to the values of the pillars of character, yet the implementation and staff training was voluntary and arbitrary. Failure to provide consistent staff development and expectations for implementation of the character pillars throughout the school district was a serious limitation in the established goals of a character education program.

The lack of consistent and comprehensive staff development could have contributed to a lack of integration of character education in this study. The fact that the pillars of character were sometimes taught in isolation such as the "pillar of the day" may be considered artificial. Kohn (1998) criticized character education programs that attempt to indoctrinate with a list of traits; this training is not the best approach to transmit values. In Kohn's view, character education is too narrow, and he advocated a more constructivist approach, which would engage students in a meaningful way. Primack (1988) commented that the orientation to the status quo inherent in character education programs was designed to develop students to do what they believe with little understanding of why they believe it.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the review of the literature and the findings of this study.

Recommendations for Action and Policy

1. The YRBS is administered every other year on odd numbered years. This study provided a baseline of data to measure change in reported student behavior over time. Continued monitoring of the YRBS to measure change in student behavior over a longer time is recommended to allow the impact of the Character Counts! program to influence school culture and students' attitudes and behaviors.
2. Staff development varied among the three schools. Additional staff training in character education is required to develop consistent and effectively integrated character education. Staff development is necessary to insure the understanding of the need of character education to permeate the entire school climate. The literature clearly states that character education must secure administrative support to coordinate staff and student expectations with the character education program. A comprehensive and consistent staff development program would insure a consistent approach to character education throughout the school district.
3. Parent and community support needs to be coordinated throughout the school district to insure the promotion of character education. School district efforts to strengthen and sustain parent and community involvement are essential for program success.
4. The use of the YRBS should be continued and participation encouraged. The difference in the participation between 2001 and

2003 indicates a need to coordinate survey administration to insure that a consistent number of students complete the survey.

5. The character pillars are a part of the school district's strategic plan. It is recommended that continued support and reinforcement from the school board and central office administration be continued and strengthened to sustain the character education efforts throughout the school district.
6. Character education needs to be integrated throughout the curriculum. Activities such as service learning need to be incorporated at the middle and secondary schools to provide opportunities to put the knowledge and feeling of good character into action.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. A study investigating the relationship between the character pillars and student discipline records is needed. The literature review indicated a need for character education to pervade the school climate and culture. A study of how student discipline records are affected would provide relevant information regarding the impact of the character pillars on the school environment.
2. Lickona (1988), Wynne & Walberg (1986) maintained that character education has a direct and positive relationship to high standards and academic responsibility. A longitudinal study to investigate the impact of the character education on student achievement should be conducted.

3. A qualitative study is needed to determine students', parents', and teachers' attitudes toward character education and to record the anecdotal incidences of good character behavior that are associated with the Character Counts! program.
4. Variation in the quantity and quality of the staff training in character education was noted during the study. Survey of administrators and staff regarding the extent of their training is warranted. A study to determine the need of implementing character education in teacher training programs is recommended.
5. The literature recommends the use of service learning as a means of re-enforcing moral knowing and moral feeling into moral action. A study of the influence of students involved in service learning projects would be helpful in determining the effectiveness of character development through service learning projects.
6. The continued study of the research questions investigated in this report of the character pillars and behaviors reported on the YRBS should be expanded to grades 9 through 12 where the YRBS is also conducted biennially during odd numbered years.
7. A longitudinal study of the effects of character education on students from kindergarten through grade twelve is recommended in order to determine the change and development of character traits over time and their relation to moral behavior.

8. A longitudinal study is needed to compare the teacher self-reported character modeling and the students' perceptions of the teacher's character modeling.
9. A longitudinal study should be conducted to examine the relationship between involvement with the character pillars and dropouts and the level of social and human capital in the school.

The literature review has established that character education is an essential part of public education, for the transmission of values has been a part of public education since its inception. Character education should be taught in a comprehensive, interrelated and integrated approach. To exhibit positive character, a student must exhibit all the character traits. While it may be convenient to isolate the pillars as a method of teaching the meaning and importance of each individually, it is essential to convey the collective importance of the pillars in an integrated and meaningful way.

Inconclusive evidence of character education program effectiveness places public support at risk and continuation of funding unlikely with the continued pressure to insure all students make adequate academic yearly progress as mandated by the federal legislation. Leming (1997a) reported that only 8% of the research reviewed addressed assessment and program effectiveness. In order for character education to develop a common core of practices and provide evidence of program effectiveness in affecting positive behavior change, additional quantitative research is needed.

Character education has a long history in America. An integral part of the first educational efforts of colonial America, it has evolved into a variety of

methods and has recently experienced a renewal in American education. Quantitative evidence of the effectiveness of character education has proven to be illusive over its long history, but a perceived need by the public and education professionals has continued to support its implementation. Accountability has become an essential component of all education. School data is generated, desegregated by a variety of conditions, and released to the public. Therefore, it is essential that effective evaluation of character education is given a priority, that the philosophical and ethical foundations of character programs are identified, and that their implementation be assessed and evaluated to understand the nature of the complex characteristics of moral development.

	YRBS Question	2001 Question #	2003 Question #	Character Pillar		Risk Factors 1 - Injury/Violence 2 - Tobacco Use 3 - Drug/Alcohol 4 - Dietary
				•Caring •Citizenship •Fairness	•Trustworthiness •Respect •Responsibility	
1	How often do you wear a seat belt when riding in a car?	8	8	Responsibility - 1, 2, 3, 4 Citizenship - 3, 4		1
2	When you ride a bicycle how often do you wear a helmet?	9	9	Responsibility - 1, 2, 3, 4		1
3	When you rollerblade how often do you wear a helmet?	10	10	Responsibility - 1, 2, 3, 4		1
4	Have you carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club other than for hunting?	11	11	Citizenship - 1, 2, 3, 4 Responsibility - 2, 3, 4 Trustworthiness - 2		1
5	Have carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property?	12	12	Citizenship - 1, 2, 3 Responsibility - 1, 4 Respect - 4		1
6	During the past 12 months, how many times were you in a physical fight?	13	13	Citizenship - 1, 2, 3 Respect - 2, 3, 4 Responsibility - 1, 2 Fairness - 4 Trustworthiness - 2		1
7	Have you ever been in a fight in which you were hurt and had to be treated by a doctor or nurse?	14	14	Caring - 2, 3 Respect - 2, 3 Citizenship - 4 Responsibility - 2		1
8	Have you ridden in a car driven by someone who had been drinking alcohol?	15	15	Responsibility - 1, 2, 3, 4 Trustworthiness - 1, 4		1

	YRBS Question	2001 Question #	2003 Question #	Character Pillar		Risk Factors
				•Caring •Citizenship •Fairness	•Trustworthiness •Respect •Responsibility	1 - Injury/Violence 2 - Tobacco Use 3 - Drug/Alcohol 4 - Dietary
9	Have you seriously thought about killing yourself?	16	16	Caring - 2, 3 Respect - 2, 3 No Response - 1, 4		1
10	Have you made a plan about how you would kill yourself?	17	17	Respect - 2, 3, 4 Caring - 2, 3 Responsibility - 1, 4		1
11	During the past 30 days, on how many days did you smoke cigarettes?	22	22	Citizenship - 2, 3, 4 Trustworthiness - 2, 3, 4 Responsibility - 1, 4		2
12	During the past 30 days, on the days you smoked, how many cigarettes did you smoke per day?	23	23	Citizenship - 2, 3, 4 Trustworthiness - 4 Responsibility - 1, 2, 3		2
13	During the past 30 days, how did you usually get your own cigarettes?	24	24	Citizenship - 1, 2, 3, 4 Trustworthiness - 2, 3, 4 Responsibility - 1		2
14	When you bought or tried to buy cigarettes in a store during the past 30 days, were you ever asked to show proof?	25	25	Citizenship - 1, 2, 3 Trustworthiness - 3, 4 Responsibility - 1		2
15	Have you ever smoked cigarettes daily, that is, at least one cigarette every day for 30 days?	26	26	Responsibility - 1, 2, 3, 4 Citizenship - 2, 3, 4 Trustworthiness - 4		2

	YRBS Question	2001 Question #	2003 Question #	Character Pillar		Risk Factors
				•Caring •Citizenship •Fairness	•Trustworthiness •Respect •Responsibility	1 - Injury/Violence 2 - Tobacco Use 3 - Drug/Alcohol 4 - Dietary
16	How old were you when you used chewing tobacco, snuff, or dip for the first time?	27	28	Citizenship - 1, 2, 3, 4 Responsibility - 2, 3 Trustworthiness - 4 Respect - 4		2
17	Have you ever had a drink of alcohol, other than a few sips?	29	30	Citizenship - 1, 2, 3, 4 Responsibility - 2, 3, 4		3
18	How old were you when you had a first drink of alcohol other than a few sips?	30	31	Responsibility - 2, 3, 4 Citizenship - 2, 3, 4 Trustworthiness - 4		3
19	During the past 30 days did you drink more than 5 drinks in a row?	31	32	Responsibility - 1, 2, 3, 4 Citizenship - 2, 3, 4 Trustworthiness - 4		3
20	Have you ever used marijuana?	32	33	Citizenship 1, 2, 3, 4 Responsibility - 2, 3, 4 Trustworthiness - 4		3
21	How old were you when you tried marijuana for the first time?	33	34	Citizenship - 1, 2, 3, 4 Responsibility - 2, 3, 4		3
22	Have you used any form of cocaine, including powder, crack, or freebase?	34	35	Citizenship - 1, 2, 3, 4 Responsibility - 2, 3, 4		3

	YRBS Question	2001 Question #	2003 Question #	Character Pillar		Risk Factors
				•Caring •Citizenship •Fairness	•Trustworthiness •Respect •Responsibility	1 - Injury/Violence 2 - Tobacco Use 3 - Drug/Alcohol 4 - Dietary
23	How old were you when you sniffed glue, breathed the contents of aerosol spray cans, or inhaled any paints or sprays to get high for the first time?	35	36	Responsibility - 1, 2, 3, 4 Citizenship - 2, 3, 4		3
24	Have you ever used methamphetamines (also called speed, crystal, crank, or ice)?	36	37	Responsibility - 1, 2, 3, 4 Citizenship - 2, 3, 4		3
25	Have you ever used steroids?	37	38	Citizenship - 2, 3 Responsibility - 1, 4 Fairness - 3		3
26	Have you used a needle to inject any illegal drug into your body?	38	39	Responsibility - 2, 3, 4 Citizenship - 1		3
27	Have you gone without eating for 24 hours?	43	44	Responsibility - 2, 3, 4 Respect - 1		4
28	Have you taken any diet pills, powders, or liquids without a doctor's advice to lose weight or to keep from gaining weight?	44	45	Responsibility - 2, 3, 4 Respect - 1		4
29	Have you vomited or taken laxatives to lose weight or to keep from gaining weight?	45	46	Responsibility - 1, 2, 3, 4		4
30	Yesterday did you eat a meal with your family?	55	47	Caring - 1, 2, 3, 4 Respect - 4		4

REFERENCES

- Addams, J. (1994). *On education*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Anthony, M. C. J. (2002). *An investigation of the efficacy of a character education program in a rural middle school* (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Orleans). (Digital Dissertations AAT 3051350)
- ASCD Panel on Moral Education. (1988). Moral education in the life of the school. *Educational Leadership*, 45(8), 4-8.
- Aspen Declaration on Character Education. (1992). *Ethics in action*. Marina del Rey, CA: Josephson Institute of Ethics.
- Bennett, W. (1993). *The book of virtues*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Benninga, J. S. (1997). Schools, character development, and citizenship. In A. Molnar (Ed.), *The construction of children's character: Ninety-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 77-97). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Benninga, J. S., & Wynne, E. A. (1998). Keeping in character: A time-tested solution. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 79(6), 439-448.
- Brenner, N. D., Kann, L., McManus, T., Kichen, S. A., Sundberg, E. C., & Ross, J. G. (2002). Reliability of the 1999 youth risk behavior survey questionnaire. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 31, 336-342.
- Burrett, K., & Rusnak, T. (1993). *Integrated character*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

- Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. (1989). *Turning points: Preparing American youth for the 21st century*. New York: Carnegie Corporation.
- Center for Disease Control. (2002). *Assessing health risk behaviors among young people: Youth risk behavior surveillance system*. Retrieved September 12, 2002, from <http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dash/yrbs/yrbsaag.htm>
- Cline, H. F., & Feldmesser, R. F. (1983). *Program evaluation in moral education*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Cryer, A. (2002). *A study of the effects that character education has on students' behaviors*. Unpublished master's thesis, Stephen F. Austin State University.
- Dewey, J. (1959). *Moral principals in education*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Ellison, M. F. O. (2002). *The relationship between the levels of character education implementation, the principals' personal characteristics, and the principals' perceptions of character education in Georgia middle schools* (Doctoral dissertation, Georgia Southern Univeristy). (Digital Dissertations AAT 3041653)
- Etzione, A. (1996). *The new golden rule: Community and morality in a democratic society*. New York: Basic Books.
- Etzione, A. (1998). How not to discuss character education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 79(6), 446-448.
- Field, S. L. (1996). Historical perspective on character education. *Educational Forum*, 60, 118-123.
- Fine, M. (1995). *Habits of mind*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Fishman, S. M., & McCarthy, L. (1998). *John Dewey and the challenge of classroom practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gaddy, B. B., Hall, T. W., & Marzano, R. J. (1996). *School wars: Resolving out conflicts over religion and values*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Grant, G. (1981). The character of education and education of character. *Daedalus*, 110(3), 135-149.
- Grunbaum, J., Kann, L., Kinchen, S. A., Williams, B., Ross, J. G., Lowery, R., & Kolbe, L. (2001). *Youth risk behavior surveillance—United States, 2001*. Retrieved March 10, 2003, from <http://www.cdc/mmwr/preview/Mmwrhtml/ss5104a1.htm#tab10>
- Harmin, M. (1988). Value clarity, high morality: Let's go for both. *Educational Leadership*, 45(8), 24-30.
- Harms, K., & Fritz, S. (2001). Internalization of character traits by those who teach character counts! *Journal of Extension*, 39(6). Retrieved April 4, 2004, from <http://www.joe.org>
- Hogg-Chapman, C. L. (2003). *Developing habits of the heart: A case study of character education in one suburban middle school* (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo). (Digital Dissertations AAT 3076487)
- Honig, B. (1985). *Last chance for our children: How you can help save our schools*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley Publishing Co.
- Horatio Alger Association. (2001). *State of our nation's youth 2000-2001*. Retrieved June 20, 2004, from <http://fcs.tamu.edu/the/facts&fig/PrintFriendly/survey.htm>

- Huffman, H. A. (1993). Character education without turmoil. *Educational Leadership*, 51(3), 24-26.
- Johnson, H. C. (1987). Society, culture, and character development. In K. Ryan & G. F. McLean (Eds.), *Character development in schools and beyond* (pp. 59-93). New York: Praeger.
- Josephson Institute of Ethics. (2002). *The ethics of American youth: 2002 report card*. Retrieved June 20, 2004, from <http://www.josephsoninstitute.org/Survey2002/survey2002-pressrelease.htm>
- Kilpatrick, W. K. (1992). *Why Johnny can't tell right from wrong*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kirschenbaum, H. (1977). *Advanced value clarification*. LaJolla, CA: University Associates.
- Kirschenbaum, H. (1992). A comprehensive model for values education and moral education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 73(1), 771-776.
- Kohlberg, L. (1972). Moral development in the school: A Developmental view. In D. Purpel & M. Belanger (Eds.), *Curriculum and the cultural revolution: A book of essays and reading* (pp. 455-478). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). Theory of moral thought. In S. A. Rathus (Ed.), *Psychology* (pp. 392-396). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Kohlberg, L. (1983). The moral atmosphere of the school. In H. Giroux & D. Purpel (Eds.), *The hidden curriculum and moral education* (pp. 61-81). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.

- Kohn, A. (1997a). How not to teach values: A critical look at character education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78(6), 428-440.
- Kohn, A. (1997b). The trouble with character education. In A. Molnar (Ed.), *The construction of children's character: Ninety-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 154-162). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kohn, A. (1998). *What to look for in a classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kolbe, I. J., Kann, L., & Collins, J. L. (1993). Overview of the youth risk behavior surveillance system. *Public Health Report*, 108, 2-10.
- Lasley, T. J. (1997). The missing ingredient in character education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78(8), 654-655.
- Laud, L. E. (1997). Moral education in America: 1600s-1800s. *Journal of Education*, 179(2), 1-10.
- Leming, J. S. (1993). In search of effective character education. *Educational Leadership*, 51(3), 63-71.
- Leming, J. S. (1997a). Research and practice in character education: A historical perspective. In A. Molnar (Ed.), *The construction of children's character: Ninety-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 31-44). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Leming, J. S. (1997b). Whither goes character education? Objectives, pedagogy, and research in education programs. *Journal of Education*, 179(2), 11-35.
- Lewis, A. (1998). Seeking connection through character education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(2), 99-100.

- Lickona, T. (1991). *Educating for character: How our schools can teach respect and responsibility*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Lickona, T. (1993). The return of character education. *Educational Leadership*, 51(3), 6-11.
- Lickona, T. (1997). Education for character: A comprehensive approach. In A. Molnar (Ed.), *The construction of children's character: Ninety-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 45-62). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lockwood, A. L. (1993). A letter to character educators. *Educational Leadership*, 51(3), 72-75.
- Lockwood, A. L. (1997). What is character education? In A. Molnar (Ed.), *The construction of children's character: Ninety-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 174-185). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lockwood, A. T. (1997). *Character education: Controversy and consensus*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Lyons, L. (1995). *Public education: A means of affecting character development*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. Retrieved May 17, 2004, from <http://www.chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/files/chardev.html>
- Martin, J. R. (1994). *Changing the educational landscape*. New York: Routledge.
- Massachusetts law of 1647*. (n.d.). Retrieved April 18, 2004, from <http://www.Extremeintellect.com/08EDUCATION/masslaw1647.htm>

- McClellan, B. E. (1999). *Moral education in America: Schools and the shaping of character from colonial times to the present*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- McKown, H. C. (1935). *Character education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Milson, A. L., & Mehlig, L. M. (2002). Elementary school teachers' sense of efficacy for character education. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 96(1), 47-53.
- Mischel, W., & Mischel, H. N. (1976). A cognitive social-learning approach to morality and self-regulation. In T. Lickona (Ed.), *Moral development and behavior: Theory, research and social issues* (pp. 84-107). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Morgan, E. S. (1966). *The puritan family*. New York: Harper.
- Mosher, R. L., & Sprinthall, N. A. (1972). Psychological education: A means to promote personal development during adolescence. In D. Purpel & M. Belanger (Eds.), *Curriculum and the cultural revolution: A book of essays and reading* (pp. 284-410). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.
- Moss, M. (2001). *South Dakota's character counts! evaluation results*. A study conducted by South Dakota State University Cooperative Extension Service/4H.
- Noddings, N. (1995). A morally defensible mission for schools in the 21st century. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(5), 365-368.

- Noddings, N. (1997). Character education and community. In A. Molnar (Ed.), *The construction of children's character: Ninety-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 1-16). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Paige, R. (2002). An overview of America's education agenda. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83(9), 708-713.
- Peck, R. F., & Havighurst, R. J. (1960). *The psychology of character development*. New York: Wiley.
- Pilcher, C. F. (2003). *A study of the implementation of character education, learning environment, and school performance score in selected parishes in Louisiana*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Louisiana Tech University.
- Power, F. C., Higgins, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1989). *Lawrence Kohlberg's approach to moral education*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Primack, R. (1988). No substitute for critical thinking: A response to Wynne. *Educational leadership*, 43(4), 12-13.
- Pritchard, I. (1988). Character education: Research prospects and problems. *American Journal of Education*, 96(4), 4609-493.
- Pulliam, J. D. (1982). *History of education in America* (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Purpel, D. (1997). The politics of character education. In A. Molnar (Ed.), *The construction of children's character: Ninety-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 140-153). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Purpel, D., & Ryan, K. (1983). It comes with the territory: The inevitability of moral education in the schools. In H. Giroux & D. Purpel (Eds.), *The hidden curriculum and moral education* (pp. 267-275). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.
- Raths, L., Harmin, M., & Simon, S. (1966). *Values and teaching*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Rest, J. (1983). Development psychology as a guide to value education: A review of "Kohlbergian" programs. In D. Purpel & K. Ryan (Eds.), *Moral education: It comes with the territory* (pp. 252-274). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.
- Rest, J. (1997). Character education and its prospects for success. In A. Lockwood (Ed.), *Character education: Controversy and consensus* (pp. 31-37). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Rose, L. C., & Gallup, A. M. (2000). The 32nd annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll of the attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81(1), 41-52.
- Rusnak, T. (1998). *An integrated approach to character education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Ryan, K. (1981). *Questions and answers on moral education*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Ryan, K. (1993). Mining the values in the curriculum. *Educational Leadership*, 51(3), 16-18.
- Ryan, K., & Bohlin, K. E. (1999). *Building character in schools: Practical ways to bring moral instruction to life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Schaeffer, E. F. (2003). Character education makes a big difference. *Principal*, 83(3), 36-39.
- Schaps, E., Schaeffer, E. F., & McDonnell, S. N. (2001, September 21). What's right and wrong in character education today. *Education Week*, 21(2), pp. 40-44.
- Schubert, W. H. (1993). Curriculum reform. In G. Calwelti (Ed.), *Challenges and achievements of American education* (pp. 80-115). Alexandria, VA: Association for the Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Simon, S. B. (1976). Values clarification vs. indoctrination. In D. Purpel & K. Ryan (Eds.), *Moral education: It comes with the territory* (pp. 126-135). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.
- Simon, S. B., Howe, L. H., & Kirschenbaum, H. (1972). *Values clarification: A handbook of strategies for teachers and students*. New York: Hart Publishing.
- Sizer, T. R., & Sizer, N. F. (1999). Grappling. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81(3), 184-191.
- Spring, J. H. (1990). *The American school 1642-1990: Varieties of historical interpretation of the foundations and development of American education* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Thomas, R. S. (2001). *Assessing character education: Paradigms, problems and potentials*. Retrieved October 31, 2001, from <http://www.quest.edu/content/whatsnew/archives/wnarticles.2.htm>
- Thompson, W. G. (2002). *The effects of character education on student behavior*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University.
- Tronto, J. C. (1994). *Moral boundaries: Political argument for an ethic of care*. New York: Routledge Press.

- Walberg, H. J., & Wynne, E. A. (1989). Character education: Toward a preliminary consensus. In L. P. Nucci (Ed.), *Moral development and character education: A dialogue* (pp. 37-50). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.
- White, M. A., & Duker, J. (1973). *Education: A conceptual and empirical approach*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Williams, M. M. (1993). Actions speak louder than words. *Educational Leadership*, 51(3), 22-23.
- Wood, R. W., & Roach, L. (1999). Administrator's perceptions of character education. *Education*, 120(2), 213-232, 238.
- Wynne, E. A. (1989). Transmitting traditional values in contemporary schools. In L. P. Nucci (Ed.), *Moral development and character education: A dialogue* (pp. 19-36). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.
- Yulish, S. M. (1980). *The reach for a civic religion: A history of the character education movement in America, 1890-1935*. Washington, DC: University Press of America.