

The Development of Character Education Implementation Model

S. V. Olishkevych*

The National University of Ostroh Academy, Ostroh, Ukraine

*Corresponding author. E-mail: svitlanaolishkevych@gmail.com

Paper received 11.11.15; Accepted for publication 25.11.15.

Abstract. The eleven principles of character education and the major types of character education (moral, developmental and caring character education) are mentioned, analyzed, and compared in the article. Particular attention is paid to developmental character education model and its stages (early, middle and adolescence stage). The four aspects of character education program built on caring approach were identified: 1) molding, 2) dialoging, 3) practice, and 4) confirmation. Common and different aspects in the character education curriculum were listed. A number of implementation models and practices were proposed.

Keywords: *character education, eleven principles of character education, moral character education, developmental character education, caring character education, implementation model*

Introduction. Within the last 20 years the character education revival experienced success. In the early 1990s, Dr. Thomas Lickona directed movement towards the value-oriented education. This approach marked the development of particular core values and brought a significant change into American character education [7], [13]. During his research at the University of Georgia Cletus Bulach developed the unique scale that was to measure 45 patterns of behavior associated with effective implementation of character education programs. These behavior patterns became the main components to assess the character education programs. The presentation of core values stimulated some scientists to develop key components of character education. In cooperation with Cletus Bulach a number of experts, including the members of the Center for the 4th and 5th R's of Education at the State University of New York Tom Lickona, Eric Schaps, and Catherine Lewis developed the "Eleven Principles of Character Education". Consequently, in 1993 with the assistance of a number of teachers, community leaders, state and federal government agencies Character Education Partnership (CEP) – a nonprofit coalition which provides resources to organizations and people interested in the development of effective character education was founded in Washington, DC [8]. The organization also works as a clearinghouse for generating ideas for the development of curricula and training programs of character. The Company also provides grants for character education curriculum, funded by the Federal Department of Education. CEP also promotes eleven principles of character education, which is the basis for effective implementation of character education at public schools [10], [13]. According to CEP, there are following fundamental principles of character education [8]:

1. Character education promotes core ethical values as the basis of good character.
2. Character education includes thinking, feeling, and behavior.
3. Effective character education requires an intentional, practiced, and comprehensive approach that promotes the core values in all aspects of school.
4. The school is developed as a caring community.
5. To develop character, students must have opportunities for moral action.
6. Meaningful and challenging academic curricula that respects all learners and helps them succeed are essential to the success of character education.
7. Character education should strive to develop internal motivation in students.

8. The school staff must be a learning and moral community in which all share responsibility for character education and attempt to adhere to the same core values that guide the education of students.
9. Character education requires moral leadership from both staff and students.
10. The school must involve parents and community as full partners in the character education program.
11. The effective assessment of the character education program is essential.

Every year, CEP gives \$ 20,000 to 10 schools that highly demonstrate the implementation of eleven principles model of character education. Fundamental principles include compliance with the "eleven principles", but do not constitute a program. Schools and districts have developed their program implementation and rated in comparison with 'good practice'. Financing provided by CEP indicates the important role assigned to character education by the Federal Department of Education.

The purpose of the article is to analyze the character education implementation model components based on the eleven principles of character education by particularly paying attention to its main features and types of character education.

Results and their discussion. It is stated that there are three major types of character education: 1) moral, 2) developmental, and 3) caring [6], [11]. Moral education, sometimes called general character education, focuses on developing sensitivity to other students and to aspects of their character. Kohlberg described the character as an attempt not to expose uncomfortable situations to others. The emphasis is on the ability of the student to develop the skill of moral judgment. Students often ask what he would do in a given situation. Ensuring safe arena for discussion and evaluation is the main purpose. Aristotle believed that we are acting morally and faithfully by controlling ourselves and tempering courage. Students receive direct support for the acquisition of their skills. The main goal is to improve the environment by creating educated students with high character who can act in a proper way in all the surroundings. The moral type supports student learning, but has a limited impact on the real world, as it does not require action and decision making.

Developmental type of character education influences the stages of student's development. Young identified six major stages of development proposed and studied by Kohlberg The first was the stage in which reward and punishment guide the moral actions of a child. With the se-

cond, the shift was made to personal needs and some identification of the needs of others. The third was the identification of good behavior as a way to help others. In the fourth stage, one's duty manifested itself as positive behavior, and respect for authority was developed. The fifth stage was the development of democratically agreed upon values. In this stage, "right action" revealed itself through the exposure of personal values and opinions. The highest stage in the Kohlberg model was that of respect for individuals and the dignity of all human beings as the major guiding principle at the basis of all ethical decisions [15].

Nucci carefully described three modern stages of developmental character education [11]. Stage of early childhood was the first stage in which there is "framing". The goal is to control a child through moral experience and strategies of conflict resolution. Stage of middle childhood, in which a child faces specific examples, demonstrates equal distribution of resources and proper use of praise. The mediation introduction is a major component of this phase. The adolescence stage shows a shift to the creative side for the participant. The child becomes less dependent on the teacher and prone to become involved in student participation process. The developmental approach that provides the combination of skills and knowledge can be developed as a result of student interaction with the environment. Children gain knowledge of the environment in which they exist. As Kohlberg described, they come to understand and address the ethical aspects of life through active experience. Howard points out the studies of Kant, Dewey, Piaget, and Kohlberg as the leading representatives of this theory [6]. Freire links this theory with the passive "banking" theories, in which education deposits character knowledge in the student mind. The goal is not to cultivate specific traits in the child directly but encourage the child to develop and achieve these features through natural phases of development. This gives the idea of baby actions, but not for social positive action.

The last model of character education is caring character education. It originates from Dewey's Just Community Model of character education. The program focuses on the development of democratic system. Students, in fact, serve apprenticeship developing the system of civil liability with the participation of their teachers and under their guidance. Students are taught tolerance, rationality, responsibility and concern for the common good, and then apply these skills in real surrounding with the help of their teachers. The Just Community Education is intended to move beyond the classroom. The "School within a School" movement also reflects the value-oriented model of community spirit of caring character education. In modern conditions, Ryan and Bohlin define caring approach like "knowing of the good, loving of the good, and doing of good [13, p. 62]. In this approach, the community establishes a set of rules that every student should acquire while learning. These programs can be centralized or developed locally, but in most software systems, there is a typical local component. Berkowitz and Bier explained that programmed types have particular content and training materials [3]. Self-created version can contain conventional features of the 'programmed type', but has a local design. Other names for self-created versions of programs training are "generic" or "grass roots" types of character education programs created individually or locally [1], [3]. In the caring model, the local community

has a considerable influence on the final product. Caring approach focuses on moral education component of the student. Gilligan hypothesized that this model was a continuation of development model with some differences related to the development of core values and insisted on moral action and participation of the whole community [5]. Since caring approach was further developed, Noddings identified four aspects of character education program built on caring approach: 1) molding, 2) dialoging, 3) practice, and 4) confirmation.

Noddings argued that the model should show what it means to "care" for everyone. The dialogue aspect there is in order to open a relationship at the individual and social level. Howard defined this practice as the only way to develop the capacity to participate in care-giving activities [6].

Caring Model has incorporated many aspects of the previous character development types adding positive action and community involvement. The common feature of the mentioned types is thought common – understanding and movement of the student to act as a positive and productive member of society. Caring model turns out to be a practical model when considering the current needs.

Distinguishing three types of character education it is necessary to mention some common and different aspects in the curriculum and name some implementation models. A number of scientists advocate for moral lessons using a set of real rules and virtues, as well as their practice. At the same time Kohlberg focused on the moral lessons with real examples and relied on stories or incidents related to the environment to give students the chance to demonstrate their skills and their character. The development of the combination of active classes and active participation was an integral part of a number of ideas to create curricula and programs. Singh noted that character education is extremely valuable at all stages of education (since primary school to high school) [14]. Using literature and art was proposed as a means of instilling positive character traits and students moral judgments. Caring model demonstrated in eleven principles of character education focus on these aspects, as well as on the student participation in the development of a specific program that supports the needs of students, school and society.

Conclusion. To conclude, we would like to mention that the nature learning alone cannot lead to good character or good behavior. It is emphasized that schools need to distinguish between the idea of moral action and inert ideas that motivate students to moral behavior. Students must act, not just talk about the theoretical aspects of the model. According to Dewey, the school allows teachers to help students understand their current and future role in society and develop their active interest in the general welfare [4]. For this reason, the school needs to carefully plan and develop the local character education program and its implementation model taking into consideration the needs of the particular community and school. It was also found that the program of career and technical education regards character education as a basis for interaction in the community [12]. Vocational programs have adopted a variety of programs from the Seven Habits of Highly Effective People to the Character Counts six-character traits: trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship.

REFERENCES

1. Althof, W. & Berkowitz, M.W. (2006). Moral education and character education: Their relationship and their roles in citizenship education. *Journal of Moral Education*, 35, 495-518.
2. Berkowitz, M. W. (1998). *Educating for character and democracy: A practical introduction*. Washington, DC: Character Education Partnership.
3. Berkowitz, M. W., & Bier, M. C. (2005a). What works in character education? A research-driven guide for educators. Washington, DC: Character Education Partnership.
4. Berkowitz, M. W., & Bier, M. C. (2005b, September). Character education parents as partners. *Educational Leadership*, 63, 64.
5. Dewey, J. (1934). *Art of experience*. New York: Balch and Company.
6. Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
7. Howard, T. A. (2005). *The effects of a responsibility-based education on middle school academic achievement and school climate at and international school in East Africa*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, 2005, AAT 3188115).
8. Lickona, T. (1991). *Educating for character: How our schools can teach respect and responsibility*. New York: Bantam Books.
9. Lickona, T. (1993). The turn of character education. *Educational Leadership*, 51(3), 12- 15.
10. Lickona, T. (1997). Educative ethics: Lessons for teacher preparation programs. *Journal of Education*, 179(2), 63-80.
11. Lickona, T. (2004). *Character matters*. New York: Touchstone.
12. Nucci, L. (2001). *Education in the moral domain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Ries, E. (1999, May). A question of character. *Techniques*, 74(5), 26-30.
14. Ryan, K., & Bohlin, K. (1999). *Building character in schools: Practical ways to bring moral instruction to life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
15. Singh, G. R. (2001). How character education helps students grow. *Educational Leadership*, 59(2), 46-49.
16. Young, J. (1997). The history of character education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 68(9), 35-38.