

## The Effects of Moral and Multicultural Education Approaches to Promoting Adolescents' Tolerance\*

Lim, Sung-Taek\*\*

This paper is an attempt to explore the direction and methods of citizenship education in a democratic and pluralistic society of the 21st century. In this paper, tolerance is proposed as a necessary virtue that citizens should exercise in dealing with others who have different values, perspectives, religions, and ideologies from their own in a democratic and pluralistic society of the 21st century. Also it is required in making our society more democratic and pluralistic. This paper presents two alternative approaches to promoting students' level of tolerance, which can be implemented in at the high school and college levels. Moral Dilemma Discussion is presented as an indirect but effective approach to promote tolerance. This approach aims to provide students with the opportunity to be exposed to the community where different points of views regarding to controversial issues coexist. Students have the opportunity to practice skills to understand and respect the perspectives of others and to cooperate with them through the moral dilemma discussion. Two Multicultural Education programs are also presented in this paper. The first program describes the nature of cohesive forces in a society by teaching about the common good. The idea is to promote a democratic approach to making collective judgments about issues of justice in a pluralistic society. The second program describes the pluralistic nature of a society using the concept of narratives to portray individual differences in life stories and the effects of culture on the meanings that people give to these stories. All these programs aim to teach students to appreciate and celebrate social and cultural diversity. The effects of these programs were evaluated, and finally some implications are discussed with the results of the evaluation.

### I. Introduction

Schools have been charged with the task of promoting students' citizenship and developing their sense of responsibilities as a citizen in a community. Traditionally, schools have tried to teach citizenship directly as part of the regular course of studies that apart from other socializing

---

\* The 'Multicultural Education' section of this paper was adapted from the paper, "Evaluating the effects of human diversity courses," presented by Lim, S.T., Colesante, R., & Biggs, D.(1996) at the 22nd Annual Association for Moral Education Conference, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

\*\* Senior Researcher, Korea Institute for Youth Development

agencies, and they have been expected to teach 'good and correct' values, attitudes and beliefs which are often assumed by adults and government(Lickona, 1992). Many current education classes designed at raising the level of citizenship responsibilities consist of learning the basic principle of the government's structure of rights and responsibilities as stated in the Constitution and laws, or learning educators' lists of the values and principles aimed to teach in school curricular.

The key word in the previous sentence is 'learning'. There the word is being considered in the passive sense. Secondary school classroom has not been a place where students can be actively involved in discussion on social, political and moral issues. Rather, it is as an opportunity to indoctrinate students with the list of values established in a dogmatic manner. Schools have served to 'control dissonance' rather than to stimulate students' debates and the questioning of authority(McNeil, 1986). This is a kind of paradox that high schools present to students, as long as they attempt to teach students the principles of democracy in the school. The paradox, of course, involves the attempts to foster the development of democratic citizens in one of the least democratic environments of all institutions in the country.

Moreover, the ways of teaching citizenship also simply involve organizing information and transmitting it to students. For many high school students, the school is not a place where they are encouraged to express their feelings about issues important to them. They are supposed to simply respect authority, complete assignment of little relevance to their life. As a result, students are not in fact taught citizenship in any meaningful sense, rather they are taught in slogans or principles without any understanding of what those principles mean in specific situation(Zellman, 1975; Zellman and Sears, 1971). The major reason courses in traditional civic education do not capture students' interest is that they are uninteresting and unpractical.

People(especially students) are often faced in the real-life situations where they are not certain 'what is good' and 'what is correct'. Likewise, they have different definitions regarding on 'what is a good citizen' or 'what is good citizenship.' These value-related conflicts will become even more

problematic in the 21st century for two reasons. One is that the world is becoming more and more a globalized community requiring its citizens to create new values and paradigms and to adapt to them. Korean society has been characterized as a homogeneous community which has often been differentiated from other societies. This characteristic of Korean Society has often been over-emphasized in school curricular when our ethnic identity is to be taught. However, Korea will be part of world community in the next century, and Korean people will have to live with different people from different backgrounds.

The other is that our citizens will be charged with the responsibility to resolve the ideological, moral and value-related conflicts after the political unification of two Koreas(South and North Korea). Again, the ethnic homogeneity of Korean is emphasized and used as a rationale of the unification of two Koreas, which, in fact, have become somewhat different each other in terms of values, ideologies, and ways of lives. For these reasons, we need to prepare students to live with diversity and difference while making efforts to make two Koreas homogeneous. Problem is that our school curriculums that claim to provision for teaching citizenship often lack essential tools and methods that promote citizens' understanding the diversity and difference.

In order to resolve ethnic and cultural conflicts, American schools usually over-emphasized the need for citizenship education to be concerned with understanding the nature of the unifying forces in the country in the first 60 years of the Twentieth century. The concept of 'Melting Pot' was a powerful influence on citizenship education at that time. But it became increasingly clear that American citizens had a great deal of difficulty in understanding the concept of a 'Melting Pot'. As a result, many American educators argued that citizenship education should prepare students to understand the pluralistic nature of the United States. This is often stated as the 'celebration of diversity.'

The diversity can be maintained only when citizens practice the virtue of tolerance. In a pluralistic society of the 21st century, citizens should exercise the virtue of tolerance<sup>1)</sup> in dealing with people who have different

ideologies, backgrounds, religions and values from their owns. Specifically, tolerance is required for the following three reasons. First, tolerance is required because citizens have to cope with diverse and conflicting values in a pluralistic society of the 21st century. They have to be able to appreciate and celebrate diversity without responding irrationally and destructively to others' actions or ideas which are simply different from their own. When citizens are intolerant, it is impossible to maintain peace in the society(Vogt, 1997).

Second, tolerance is required in creating a democratic pluralistic society that allows individuals to have the rights to pursue their diverse values and perspectives. Individual freedoms can be maximized in a community where collective norms demand tolerance for those holding minority positions. Any conception of the common good in a pluralistic society should be a 'thin' concept of the good(McLaulin, 1992), free of significantly controversial assumptions and judgments, which in turn maximizes the freedom of citizens to pursue their diverse private conceptions of the good life within a framework of social justice.

Finally, tolerance is required when citizens need to actively participate in the process of building a democratic society. Individuals cannot be allowed to pursue their diverse values and perspectives when members of community do not have tolerance. The concept of democracy has been used by citizens as a rationale for unfettered individual liberties. However, democracy also demands that citizens learn to cooperate with others in resolving their conflicts about individual and/or group rights and obligations. In a democracy, these processes of social cooperation need to be carried out

---

1) According to Vogt(1997), tolerance refers to "intentional self-restraint in the face of something one dislike, objects to, finds threatening, or otherwise has a negative attitude toward--usually in order to maintain a social or political group or promote harmony in a group(p. 3)". He classifies tolerance by reference to the objects of tolerance. The first domain is political tolerance which means tolerance of acts in public sphere, such as giving a speech, demonstrating, disturbing leaflets, organizing meetings, and so on. The second domain is moral tolerance which means tolerance of acts in the private sphere. Most typically and controversially in recent decades this has concerned sexual conduct, such as living in sin, pornography, homosexuality, and abortion. The issues in matters of moral tolerance are usually whether private acts should be subject to public control. The last domain is social tolerance which means tolerance of peoples states of being - that is, of characteristics people have at birth(such as skin color), or as the result of early socialization(such as language).

within a model of social morality that includes democratic procedures for finding, defining and revising concepts of the common good. When citizens do not exercise tolerance in the process, they cannot have the opportunity to learn to respect the rules of social cooperation that are used to protect the common good, to resolve conflicts over their rights and obligations, and to make decisions on what is common good for community. The community should be neutral on matters of private good, but is strongly committed to the basic principles of justice involved in the notion of public good.

This paper proposes that citizenship education in making our society democratic and pluralistic needs to promote students' levels of tolerance. Then, the central tasks of education in a democratic pluralistic society are to promote students' tolerance that makes them able to understand and appreciate various and different values, positions, ideologies and perspectives by encouraging their personal exploration, understanding and critical reflection in making decisions on the controversial issues.

In this paper, we will look at several alternative educational approaches which have been implemented to promote students' levels of tolerance at the high school and college level in the United States. Also, we will review empirical effects of those approaches to promoting students' levels of tolerance.

## II. Educational Programs for Promoting Tolerance

There is a significant body of research documenting the relationships between individuals' levels of tolerance and their personal characteristics such as personality, cognitive maturity, demographic variables, and backgrounds. The major concern of the research was to identify variables to explain individual or group differences in the level of tolerance. This reflects social scientists' concerns which are mainly focused on describing psychological and social phenomena related to the construct of tolerance. Educators may have different research questions from social scientists. Their concerns are usually focused on 'how to promote students' levels of

tolerance' and 'what to do to promote their levels of tolerance.'

As noted earlier, traditional civic courses developed by educators were ineffective in teaching about tolerance. Measures of the effects of these traditional civic courses have shown that students' attitudes do not change simply by enrolling in the courses. In this chapter, Moral Dilemma Discussion and Multicultural Education approaches will be introduced as alternative educational interventions to promote students' levels of tolerance.

Traditional civic courses attempted to teach tolerance as a virtue and intolerance as a vice. However, tolerance is not a virtue, but an intermediate and partial value(Vogt, 1997). In practice, it is not clear whether citizens should always practice tolerance in the face of actions or ideas that they dislike, oppose, or disagree with. Moral Dilemma Discussion may provide students with the opportunity not only to be exposed to different positions or perspectives on a controversial issue, but also to make judgments whether or not they should exercise tolerance in real-life situations. Multicultural Education is a more direct approach to promote students' levels of tolerance by providing them with the opportunity to contact and interact with members of diverse ethnic, cultural and social groups.

#### 1. Moral dilemma discussions

This approach was extremely popular in the 1970s and early 1980s. Lawrence Kohlberg developed this format with the intention of promoting the moral reasoning of his subjects. The forms of an individual's understanding of 'justice' determine each of Kohlberg's(1984) six stages of moral development. Again these six stages are divided into three levels(Preconventionanl level, Conventional level, and Postconventionanl level) based on ways that individuals think about controversial moral issues. Tolerance is mostly a Level III phenomenon(the Postconventional level), which means the highest level of moral reasoning in Kohlberg's system of moral development. Previous studies have documented the relationship between the levels of moral reasoning and levels of tolerance. For example,

Avery(1988) found that students become more politically tolerant as they progress through Kohlberg's levels of moral development. Specifically, individuals who reason at the Postconventional level of moral reasoning are more tolerant than those who reason predominantly at the Conventional level(Breslin, 1982). Individuals' levels of moral reasoning also have to do with the ways of making decisions on whether they should exercise tolerance or intolerance in the face of the positions or perspectives of others which are different from their own(Lim, 1998). At the Preconventional level, moral judgment is based solely on an individuals' own needs and perceptions. These people have not internalized the standards of their community even though they know what these standards are. The rule enforcer, but not the rules, constrains their actions. Since moral judgment are made an egocentric perspective, tolerating or not tolerating a certain position or perspective is based on whether or not the position or perspective maintains or promotes an individual's egocentric interests.

At the Conventional level, individuals think that they should live up to the standards of their community. These standards have become their own; they are no longer others' rules. Individuals adopt the norms or standards of in-group or society, and their decisions about tolerance reflect the norms and standards of society. Since this reflects ethno-centric or in-group-centric perspective, tolerating or not tolerating a certain action of idea is mainly based on whether or not it violates the norms of community to which an individual belongs.

Finally, at the Postconventional level, moral judgments are based on principles of justice that are not necessarily defined by social convention or law, and therefore individuals' moral principles can be separated from conventional values. Tolerating or not tolerating a certain position or perspective is based on 'universal' standards over the conventions of their community. They can realize that values can be changed over times and situations, and therefore exercise tolerance more than people at preconventional and conventional levels of moral reasoning.

Movement from one stage to the next in moral development is prompted by the need to resolve conflicts. This conflict arises when one realizes that

others may view things differently. Individuals gain insight into the perspectives of others through increases in role-taking skills. As they become able to put themselves in the place of another, they can see things as that person does. Cognitive maturity, that is, the ability to think about and balance the competing and conflicting demands produced by examining different perspectives also contributes to moral development. Moral dilemma discussions require a minimum degree of procedural or functional tolerance, because participants can not rationally discuss controversial issues without putting up with others whose views and positions differ from their own.

Kohlberg(1984) claimed that group discussions of hypothetical moral dilemmas would result in an increase in students' stages of moral reasoning. Two key factors were identified as essential in promoting increases in stages: 'stage mixture' and a 'trained teacher' to lead moral discussions. The former indicated that the students varied or were heterogeneously mixed according to Kohlberg's stages of moral reasoning. The latter meant a trained teacher who can understand the theory of moral development and ask questions like those of Socrates. These two elements were examined by Blatt, leading to what Kohlberg termed the Blatt Effect(Blatt & Kohlberg, 1975). He found that one third of all students in stage mixed groups raised one stage and another third of the students raised 1/2 a stage following a moral dilemma discussion intervention(Kohlberg, 1986). Marvin Berkowitz (1986) reviewed these studies and found some convincing evidence that supports the effects of stage mixture. He cites the positive influence peers have on the communication process can be increased if adolescents and young adults receive training in communication skills before they participate in moral discussions.

The evidence of peer influence in moral discussions raises interesting concerns regarding the role of the teacher in a moral discussion. Teacher as a facilitator needs to be more completely defined. Rather than the teacher serving as a teacher assumed traditionally, s/he needs to be moving the dialogue and discussion among the students without dominating in the process of the discussion. Her/his role is to facilitate the discussion and s/he is just one member of participants in the discussion. Many



philosophers have criticized this approach to moral development. For example, Peters(1980) has stated that Kohlberg promotes a 'teacherless role' that does not provide enough guidance for students to attain a 'core set of values'. He expresses the need for students to be led to acquisition of a set of values before students can adequately make moral decisions of their own. After they have attained this moral code, they are prepared to discuss moral dilemmas and use rational and reflective thinking.

Others have disagreed with this position, calling it a 'bag of virtues' and criticizing it as 'indoctrination'. For example, Mosher(1994), who always believed in the spontaneity of the group in moral discussion, argues that students begins to think and discuss out of the reasoning of other participants in the group. Then the teacher or discussion leader must utilize their facilitation skills to keep the discussion going on and to encourage students to react and respond to peers' contentions and arguments (Berkowitz, 1986).

In their meta-analysis of moral development interventions, Schelaefi, Rest, and Thoma(1985) present positive results in moral development following dilemma discussion programs. The criteria for inclusion in the study includes practice in moral problem solving, stimulated by peer 'give and take'(challenging one another thinking, reexamining assumptions, being exposed to different point of views, building a line of argument, and responding to counterarguments(p. 342)). The interventions involved students from various ages and ranged in length from one-hour discussions to year-long classes that utilized moral dilemmas through the curriculum. A large effect size was found in the 23 experiment samples(.41) compared to the 17 sample control group(.09). These findings are consistent with evidence presented by Leming(1981). Using a different pool of programs, he reported similar findings. Of the 27 studies reviewed, 81% found significant differences in favor of the treatment groups(p.160). So far, we have looked at the moral dilemma discussion approach. It is an indirect, nonformal and noncurricular way of education that might foster tolerance. Now we will turn to how American schools have tried to teach tolerance directly as part of the regular course of studies. In the previous section(Introduction

section), we saw that traditional civic education courses did not have significant influence in promoting tolerance. In the next section, we will see how formal school curricular could be used to promote students' levels of tolerance. Two alternative approaches in Multicultural Education will be introduced; one is entitled 「Education and Schooling in a Pluralistic Society」, the other 「Social Morality and Citizenship Education」.

## 2. Multicultural Education

Multicultural education has been used in various meanings and defined by different ways. Although there is no consensus about the definition of multicultural education, one thing that most multicultural Education programs have in common is that their main focus is on social diversity and the celebration of that diversity(Vogt, 1997). Indeed, multicultural education usually aims at students' 'broadmindedness', that is, positive acceptance of social diversity, cultural differences, and people who have different backgrounds(Pratte, 1985). In ordinary discourse, people often call people who value diversity tolerant. When multicultural educators use the term tolerance, it is often what they mean. The curriculum of multicultural education consists of facts and concepts that can affect students' attitudes toward other people and cultures in ways that lead them to be more tolerant of human diversity. In short, celebration of diversity is the fundamental aim of multicultural education.

One of big issues in multicultural education concerns whether curricular should stress similarities or differences among individuals and the groups to which they belong. We can see this controversy clearly by comparing the recommendations of the American Association of College and Universities(1995) with those of a group of faculty and graduate students teaching diversity and pluralism courses at the State University of New York at Albany(1996a, 1996b). These two camps agree that schools and colleges have to teach their students how to live in a diverse society. However, what they disagree about is how the education system can best help students to learn how to thrive heterogeneity among groups.

The AACU report assumes that stressing the similarities among cultural, ethnic, and racial groups is not a good approach. They see this approach as denial of diversity. Rather, they recommend respectful attention to difference and preparing students for world in which unitary agreement does not exist and is not likely ever to exist(pp. xx-xxi). Biggs and Colleagues in SUNY at Albany developed two human diversity courses in ways similar to those suggested in the AACU report; The first course entitled 'Concepts of Education and Schooling in a Pluralistic Society' was designed to help better understand the pluralistic nature of the United States. The goals of this course were to make students knowledgeable about cultural pluralism in the United States and to make them celebrate diversity. The second course entitled 'Social Morality and Citizenship Education' was designed to provide students with the opportunity to examine the concept of common good in a pluralistic society. Students struggled with two questions in the course. Do the rights of citizens exist independently of their membership in a particular community? and Do citizens achieve these individual rights only as a consequence of their membership in a particular community?

Biggs and Colleagues in SUNY at Albany were faced with the unexpected problem that giving students knowledge about groups differences in their classes tended to reinforce students negative stereotypes against a certain group, usually minority group so that they have negative attitudes toward the group. And they realized that they gave harmful information to student stereotypers by reviewing social science research on group differences. This kind of research usually finds statistically significant differences between groups, but such differences are not practically significant. In the classes, students usually said that 'students like them' did not understand 'students like us' or 'students like us' can never understand 'students like them'. Sometimes, these students concluded that there was no compelling reason to question their stereotypes about others. They also observed that students were using knowledge of statistical differences between groups to reinforce their stereotypes about individuals. They used their knowledge about group differences to justify the way that they led segregated lives on campus and in their communities. Students did not

recognize the fact that all types of human characteristics are found within all ethnic groups and social classes. Finally, Biggs and Colleagues realized that teaching group differences actually make it less likely that students would learn how to tolerate or to respect one another. As a consequence of observations of the problems of their approaches, Biggs and Colleagues decided to make some significant changes in their approaches to teaching about citizenship in a pluralistic society. They reorganized their two human diversity courses as follows;

1) Course One : Education and Schooling in a Pluralistic Society

This course(Biggs and Colesante, 1996) examines the concepts of moral sensitivity, tolerance, and human diversity in a pluralistic society. This course is based on the assumption that morally sensitive citizens will be more likely to interpret social situations in their lives in terms of what actions are possible, who and/or what will be affected by each of possible actions and how the involved parties might react to the possible outcomes associated with different actions(Rest, 1983). Students in the class are encouraged to appreciate and understand the life stories of others and are capable of seeing the reasons behind others' choices, and therefore are more tolerant in the face of those that they may dislike, disagree with or find threatening.

Biggs and Colleagues call this approach 'narrative approach'. They introduce students to Bruner's thesis(1986) that "we have no other way of describing lived time except in the form of narratives". Students learn about narrative thought and how it differs from propositional thought. The former presents concrete human and interpersonal situations in order to demonstrate their particular validity while the latter aims to present theoretical and formal interpretation. The former describes individual ways of seeing the world while the latter focuses on categorization of group differences and the establishment of generalizations about these group differences.

The second task in the course is to discuss the concept of social responsibility and how it is related to the concept of human diversity in a pluralistic society. The idea is based on the notion that socially responsible

citizens are able to consider the impact of their anticipated actions on the lives of others whom they like as well those that they may dislike, disagree with, or find threatening. Students were organized into group investigation teams to explore following five questions (Biggs and Colesante, 1996; pp.1-2):

- (1) How do students and faculty members define social responsibility on this campus? What are examples of individual and collective perspectives on social responsibility? What are the major issues regarding social responsibility on this campus?
- (2) How would you describe the present level of social responsibility on campus? Provide evidence to support your evaluations.
- (3) Are there good reasons to believe that increasing the level of social responsibility on campus would improve the level of academic achievement and the quality of life? Would increasing the level of social responsibility on campus positively affect the relationships among students from different ethnic groups?
- (4) How would students like to see the level of social responsibility on campus improved? Describe changes in campus life that they would like to see occur in the next year.
- (5) What kind of programs and/or activities would promote socially responsible citizenship on the campus? Describe both classroom and out-of-classroom activities and experiences that would encourage socially responsible citizenship on campus?

Students discussed the results of these investigations in class forums. They learned the concept of social responsibility which adopt a narrative perspective on individual differences rather than a propositional perspective on group differences. Students learned to interpret individuals' lives in terms of narratives rather than race, gender, social class, and group differences between categories.

## 2) Course Two: Social Morality and Citizenship Education

This course focuses on increasing social competence in democratic living. It is based on the assumption that socially competent citizens are able to cooperate with other citizens within a framework of norms and laws.

Students were asked to become involved in the democratic processes in a pluralistic society and committed to live together according to a democratic ideal of freedom which respect both collective and individual rights(Wentzel, 1991). Democratically competent citizens should be able to conform to the norms and rules of a community and committed to public virtue of diversity, equality, and peace that provide the cooperation which keeps society being pluralistic and diverse. They should be capable of living together in a democratic community in which individuals identify their common interests and make collective decisions about their public lives. Tolerance or supporting the rights of others in a pluralistic society is a major characteristic of socially competent citizens.

The first task in the course is to develop democratic ways of solving problems and making decisions. Their initial efforts focus on keeping order and respecting individual rights.

The second task is to develop standards for making decisions about social morality in their campus community. Small groups are given case studies in which students are accused of various violations of the Campus Code of Conduct. The cases are real but all of the identifying data is removed. Students answer the following questions about the cases(Biggs and Smith, 1996):

- (1) Were the standards for governing human cooperation violated in this case? What were they?
- (2) Were these standards known and agreed upon by all of the parties in the case?
- (3) What were the consequences or outcomes of the actions described in the case?
- (4) What, if any obligations or responsibilities were not met? By whom?
- (5) Did the individual person in the case intend to violate the rights or welfare of others?
- (6) Should the case be resolved through mediation or arbitration?
- (7) State your recommendations and your rationale. What criteria did you use to judge the actions of the students in the case?

Students met as Campus Ethic Committees to discuss the above questions

and develop their recommendations. In the Town Meetings, the various campus ethics committees presented their recommendations. At the conclusion, they adopted a set of recommendations that reflect a consensus of the Town Meeting. The faculty and administration observers were asked to provide feedback and comments about the content of the recommendations and the processes used in generating them.

### 3) Outcomes of Human Diversity Courses

The courses were evaluated by researchers in SUNY at Albany (Lim, Colesante, & Biggs, 1996). The first purpose of the evaluation was to identify the positive characteristics of the outcome variables using students' self-reported estimates of satisfaction with the courses, gains from the courses, and effects on conversations among students in the classes and on students' making acquaintances from the courses. These outcome variables were used to indicators of tolerance in the study. Results are summarized in Table 1-A and Table 1-B.

Table 1-A: The frequency and proportion of subjects who reported positive outcomes.

Variables	Outcomes	Frequency	Percent
Satisfaction	Satisfied	52	83.9
	Unsatisfied	10	16.1
Estimates of Gains	Very often/Often	54	87.1
	Occasional/Never	8	12.9
Effects on Conversation	Very Often/Often	34	54.8
	Occasional/Never	28	45.2
Student Acquaintances	Very Often/Often	41	66.1
	Occasional/Never	21	33.9

Overall, most students indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the courses. Approximately 84% of the students reported that they were satisfied with the courses. They were particularly satisfied with the small group discussions, the topics in the classes and opportunities to present their views. Additionally, 87% also felt that they had often

personally gained from participation in the activities of the courses. They reported that they often had opportunities to form their own views, to see relationships, similarities and differences among people, and that they gained opportunities to understand themselves better from the courses.

Table 1-B : Top three rankings for course outcome variables(Satisfaction, Estimate of Gains, and Effects on Conversation)

Top 3 items by outcome	Mean	SD
<u>Rank Satisfaction</u> (total 6 items)		
1. The small group discussions.	3.37	.76
2. The topics that have been discussed in the class	3.33	.71
3. Opportunities to present your view on the topics	2.97	1.10
<u>Rank Estimate of Gains</u> (total 11 items)		
1. Ability to form your own view on cultural/ethnic/racial issues in society	3.29	.76
2. Ability to see relationships, similarities, and differences between people	3.21	.72
3. Understanding yourself-your political and social views	3.17	.79
<u>Rank effects on Conversation</u> (total 6 items)		
1. Referred to something a professor or peer said about a topic in this class	2.84	.93
2. Explored different ways of thinking about topics discussed in this class.	2.72	.81
3. Referred to knowledge you had acquired in this class.	2.70	.87
<u>Rank Student Acquaintances</u> (total 9 items)		
1. Made friends with students whose academic major fields were very different from you.	3.10	.94
2. Made friends with students whose ethnic, cultural, or racial background was very different from you.	2.83	.88
3. Had serious discussions with students whose philosophy of life or personal values were very different from you.	2.79	.95

Note. Numbers in parentheses are total number of items on each scale. Mean scores on a 4-point Likert-type scale.

Over half of the participants reported that their class had affected their conversations. They often referred to knowledge they had acquired from their class discussion. During the semester of their enrollment in one course



or the other, 66% of participants reported that they had frequently made friends or had serious discussions with other people who are different from them.

A second purpose of the evaluation was to identify variables which could account for the desired outcomes of the courses. A series of multiple regression analyses were conducted to identify correlates of the four outcome variables. The findings from these regression analyses are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Correlates of Satisfaction, Estimate of Gain, and Effects on Conversation and Student Acquaintances(Stepwise Multiple Regression)

Predictors	Satis.	Est.of Gains	Effects on Con.	Stu. Acquaintances
<i>Background Factors</i>				
Sex	-.27*	-.14	-.11	-.10
Class Year	.19	-.32**	-.08	-.21*
<i>Experience Factors</i>				
Course Enrollment	-.35**	.02	.03	-.10
Course Involvement	.09	.30*	.22	.25*
Diversity of Conversations	.17	.04	.43***	.39***
<i>Attitude Factors</i>				
Dogmatism	.09	.06	.32**	-.08
Empathy	-.03	.02	-.03	.24*
F(df)	10.37(2,59)	6.42(2,59)	12.83(2,59)	11.49(4,57)
R <sup>2</sup>	.26***	.18**	.30***	.45***

Note. Standardized beta weights, Multiple F(df), and R<sup>2</sup> values are shown. R<sup>2</sup> values reflect the variance explained in the dependent variable by the predictor variables in the equation after controlling for the other predictors not in the equation. Course Enrollment refers to whether students were enrolled in Social Morality and Citizenship Education(SMCE) or Education and Schooling in a Pluralistic Society(ESPS). Sex, Class, and Course Enrollment were coded such that high score represent female, higher class year, and ESPS.

With regards to the first two variables, twenty six percent of the variance in course satisfaction could be explained by two correlates, sex and enrollment(R<sup>2</sup>=.26, p<.001). Male students were significantly more

satisfied with their classes than female students( $\beta = -.27, p < .05$ ). Students in Social Morality and Citizenship Education(SMCE) were significantly more satisfied with their class than those in Education and Schooling in a Pluralistic Society(ESPS)( $\beta = -.35, p < .01$ ).

Eighteen percent of the variance in students' estimates of gains could also be explained by two correlates, class year and course involvement( $R^2 = .18, p < .01$ ). Students in the lower class year groups reported that they got greater gains from courses than those in higher class year groups( $\beta = -.32, p < .01$ ). In addition, the more students reported that they were involved in the experimental courses, the more they reported gains from the courses( $\beta = .30, p < .05$ ).

Several independent variables were found as correlates of the behavioral outcomes(Effects on Conversation and the Student Acquaintances). Thirty percent of variance in the effects of conversations could be explained by two variables, the diversity of the conversations and students' levels of dogmatism( $R^2 = .30, p < .001$ ). Students who have diverse conversations are more likely to talk about their experiences in the class with others who have different backgrounds( $\beta = .43, p < .001$ ). Students who were more highly dogmatic also tended to talk about their experiences in the class( $\beta = .32, p < .01$ ).

With regards to the effects on student acquaintances, forty-five percent of the variance in this outcome variable could be explained by four correlates including class year, course involvement, diversity of conversations, and level of empathy( $R^2 = .45, p < .001$ ). Younger students more likely to report that they had more frequently made friends or had serious discussions with others who were different from them during semester than older students( $\beta = -.21, p < .05$ ). There was a direct relationship between course involvement and student acquaintances. Students who were more involved in the class were more likely to report that they made friends and had serious discussions with people who were different from themselves( $\beta = .25, p < .05$ ). Students who normally talk about diverse topics tended to make friends with diverse people and to have serious discussions with people who were different from them( $\beta = .39, p < .001$ ). Finally, students who were higher in

their levels of empathy reported that they had made more friends or frequently had serious discussions with people who were different from them( $\beta=.24$ ,  $p<.05$ ).

All these findings imply that two human diversity courses were effective in promoting students' involvement in the classes, increasing the opportunities to interact with a diverse group, stimulating students thinking about controversial issues, and providing opportunities to participate in making democratic decisions real issues on their campus. Two human diversity courses were developed on the foundation of the successful approaches to citizenship education including the use of discussions, group process and participatory democracy. They attempt to answer the question, "Can college courses affect students' attitudes toward diversity?" The answer could be 'yes'. However some limitations of these findings should be addressed; One is that the high responses on these outcome measures could be attributed either to enrollment in one of the two courses or to characteristics of students who enroll in such course(Pascarella, et al., 1996). Additionally, No control group was used to confirm the effects of the courses. The researchers are still gathering data to confirm the effects of the courses.

Pascarella(1996) suggests that at least four important factors affect students' openness to diversity; "1) the initial or pre-enrollment characteristics of students, 2) the organizational or environmental emphases of the institutional attended, 3) students' academic experiences, and 4) students' social or nonacademic experiences."(p. 176). He found that most significant predictor for openness to diversity was students' characteristics before entering college.

Although there is not much we do about that in the college level, we can address the other factors by encouraging students to examine the quality of the environment, provide for active learning and opportunities to meet people who have diverse backgrounds. This finding also implies that students need to be taught about tolerance earlier.

### III. Summary and Conclusion

Citizens need to develop multicultural perspectives and cross-cultural competency if they are to become citizens who are knowledgeable, reflective, and caring other citizens in a democratic and pluralistic society of the 21st century. With regard to this notion, one might ask the question: Why should tolerance be so important in Korean society which is homogeneous in terms of values, norms, language, and ethnicity. We need to ask two questions for the question to reply to it. First, can or should we keep our society homogeneous in the next century? Second, should homogenizing members of our community be emphasized in education in the century? It seems to be difficult to say 'yes' for both questions. Globalization requires our community to be part of the world community and our citizens to be members and leaders of the community where they have to cooperate with others who have different cultures, religions, backgrounds and values from their owns. Students have to learn about what and how they have to do in dealing with others who are different from themselves. Then, tolerance should be a virtue that citizens have to practice to get along with others. Tolerance is especially required because our citizens will be faced with the responsibility to get along with North Korean people after the political unification of two Koreas. Only when our citizens have tolerance, they can work together to resolve some of ideological, cultural and value-related conflicts possibly occurred in a politically unified Korean community of 21st century. In short, our citizens should be prepared to be capable of resolving possible various conflicts in the process of globalization and the unification of our country.

In general, tolerance has been considered as a virtue to resolve conflicts between individuals or groups and to maintain peace in a community. Tolerance, in fact, has been called for in a pluralistic society like the United States where conflicts among ethnic groups often jeopardizes the peace and harmony of the community. However, this is just one of various functions of tolerance. Tolerance is also called for in a homogeneous society like

Korea where members of the community do not allow individuals to have personal perspectives which clash with those of the majority. We need to teach citizens to practice tolerance to make our society more democratic and pluralistic and to allow our citizens to pursue and maximize their personal values and perspectives.

In this paper, moral dilemma discussion and multicultural education were suggested as alternative educational approaches to promote tolerance, and the effects of those approaches were evaluated. Moral dilemma discussion is an effective way to teach students skills to resolve ideological and value-related conflicts in a diverse society. This approach provides students with the opportunity to practice the skills to understand and respect the perspectives of others and to cooperate with others who have different value, positions, and backgrounds. Because moral dilemma discussion is possible when participants have a minimum degree of procedural and functional tolerance, it also is an effective way to teach students the importance of tolerance and to promote their level of tolerance which is required to live together in a democratic pluralistic society.

To acquire the virtue of tolerance, students should be helped to view both our and others' knowledge, values and cultures in new and different perspectives. Multicultural Education is an attempt to teach students to understand and appreciate the concept of social diversity in a pluralistic and democratic society. Student should be able to understand and appreciate diverse values, perspectives, and cultures.

However, Many debates are raging on how to do Multicultural Education in a pluralistic society. Two issues seem to be of central importance. The first is whether we should focus on teaching the most accurate and up to date information on group differences, or on teaching students narrative strategies to understand and appreciate individual differences rather than group differences. The Narrative approach is to teach students interpretive strategies which lead them to adopt more complex, individualized views of others in a pluralistic society. On this issue, we are not certain yet which approach is more effective and better. However, research finding(Lim, Colesante, and Biggs, 1996) suggests that latter argument is likely to be

more effective and better than the former argument in teaching about tolerance.

The second issue is whether teaching about differences is more effective and better than teaching about similarities. When students are taught about group differences, they were apt to segregate themselves more, and to form negative stereotypes against a certain group of people because people tend to selectively attend to information that confirms their beliefs on the group and use this information to reinforce stereotypical views about people who are not like themselves. The range of group differences usually is smaller than that of individual differences within a group. Although group differences are usually statistically significant in social science research, they are not practically significant. Also, the categories of people such as gender, ethnicity, and race is not clear-cut, but arbitrary. Then, we can ask a question: Why should group differences be so important to us?

## References

- American Association of Colleges and Universities.(1995). *American Pluralism and the college curriculum: Higher education in a diverse democracy*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Avery, P.(1988). Political tolerance among adolescents. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 183-201.
- Banks, J. A.(1990). Citizenship education for a pluralistic democratic society, *The Social Studies*, September/November.
- Berkowitz, M. W.(1986). The role of discussion in moral education. In M. erkowitz and F. Ozer(Ed.), *Moral education: Theory and Application*. Hillsdale. New Jersey: Lawlence Erlbaum Associates.
- Biggs, D. A., & Smith, J.(1996). *Syllabus: Social Morality and Citizenship Education*, Albany, New York: State University of New York at Albany.
- Biggs, D. A., & Colesante, R.(1996). *Syllabus: Education and schooling in a pluralistic society*. Albany, New York: State University of New York at Albany.
- Blatt, M., & Kohlberg, L.(1975). The effects of classroom discussion upon children's level of moral judgment. *Journal of Moral Education*, Vol. 4,

- pp. 129-161.
- Breslin, A.(1982). Tolerance and moral reasoning among adolescents in Ireland. *Journal of Moral Education, Vol. 11*, pp. 112-127.
- Bruner, J. S.(1987). Life as Narrative. *Social Research, Vol. 54*, pp. 11-32.
- Kohlberg, L.(1986). The just community approach to moral education. In M. W. Berkowitz and F. Ozer(Ed.), *Moral education: Theory and Application. Hillsdale*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kohlberg, L.(1984). *The psychology of moral development*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Leming, J. S.(1981). Curricular effectiveness in moral/values education: A review of research. *Journal of Moral Education, Vol. 10 No. 3*, pp. 147-164.
- Lickona, T.(1992). *Educating for character: How our school can teach respect and responsibility*. New York: Bantam.
- Lim, S. T.(1998). *The influence of justice and care moral orientations in teaching about controversial moral issues*. Paper presented at the Association for Moral Education Conference at Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire, November, 1998.
- Lim, S. T., Colesante, R., and Biggs, D.(1996). *Evaluating the effects of human diversity courses*. Paper presented at the 22nd Annual Association for Moral Education Conference, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- McLaulin, T. H.(1992). Citizenship, Diversity, and Education: A philosophical perspective. *Journal of Moral Education, Vol. 21 No. 3*, pp. 235-250.
- McNeil, L. M.(1986). *Contradictions of control: school structure and school knowledge*. New York: Routledge.
- Mosher, R., Kenny, R. A., and Garrod, A.(1994). *Preparing for citizenship: Teaching youth to live democratically*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.
- Pascarella, E. T., Edison, M., Nora, A., Hagedorn, L., and Terenzini, P.(1996). Influence on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the first year of college." *Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 67*, pp. 174-195.
- Peters, R. S.(1981). *Moral development and moral education*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Pratte, R.(1985). Tolerance, permissiveness, and education. *Teachers College Record, Vol. 87*, pp. 103-117.
- Rest, J. R.(1983). Morality. In J. H. Flavell & E. Markham(Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology, Vol. 3*(4th ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Schelaefi, A., Rest, J. R., and Thoma, S. J.(1985). Does moral education improve

moral judgment? A meta-analysis of intervention studies using the Defining Issues Test. *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 55 No. 3, pp. 319-352.

Vogt, W. P.(1997). *Tolerance and Education: Learning to live with diversity and difference*. Sage Publications.

Zellman, G. L.(1975). Antidemocratic beliefs: A survey and some explanations. *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 31-53.

Zellman, G. L., & Sears, D. O.(1971). Childhood origins of tolerance for dissent. *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 109-135.



## 청소년의 관용성 증진 프로그램의 효과

임 성 택\*

이 글은 21세기에 도래할 다원주의 사회가 요청하는 민주시민 교육의 방향과 방법을 탐색하려는 시도의 결과이다. 다원화된 사회에서 시민은 관용의 덕을 실천해야 한다. 그 이유는 21세기 다원화된 사회에서 우리 시민들이 다양한 가치, 시각, 문화, 종교 및 이념을 가진 타인들과 생활해야 하기 때문이다. 또한 관용은 확실성을 강조하는 우리 사회를 보다 민주적이고 다원화하는데 있어서도 필요한 덕목이다. 이 글은 학교교육에서 실천할 수 있는 세 종류의 관용증진 교육 프로그램을 제시한다. 우선 Moral Dilemma Discussion이 관용을 증진하기 위한 간접적이지만 효과적인 교육프로그램으로 제시되었다. 이 접근법은 논쟁적인 도덕적 문제에 대해 각기 다른 시각이 공존하는 상황에 학생들을 노출시키고, 그 상황에 학생들을 참여시키는데 그 목적이 있다. 이러한 기회를 통하여 학생들은 타인의 시각을 이해하고 존중하며, 그들과 협동하는데 필요한 사회적 능력을 습득할 수 있을 것이다.

두 가지 유형의 다중문화 교육 *Multicultural Education* 프로그램도 제시되었다. 첫번째 프로그램은 다원화된 사회에서 정의로운 집단적 의사결정능력을 학생들에게 함양시키는데 그 목적을 둔다. 두번째 유형의 프로그램은 학생들로 하여금 다원주의적 사회의 성격과 그 의미를 개인의 인생사를 통하여 이해하도록 하고, 특히 개인이 각자의 인생사에 어떠한 의미를 부여하고 있는지를 파악하도록 함으로서, 결국 집단간 차이보다는 개인차를 강조하여 집단적 갈등을 해소하려는 데 그 목적이 있다. 이 모든 프로그램들의 공통된 목표는 학생들로 하여금 사회적 문화적 다양성의 가치를 이해하고 수용할 수 있는 능력을 기르도록 하는데 있다. 이 논문에서 이 프로그램들의 효과가 평가되었으며, 그 평가결과가 가지는 교육적 함의가 논의되었다.

\* 한국청소년개발원 선임연구원