Classroom Discipline and Democracy: Teaching the Skills of Peace

Joy Mosher

Associate Professor, Childhood and Early Childhood Department

State University of New York, College at Cortland, Cortland, U.S.A.

Abstract

Classroom discipline is a potential curriculum of peaceful, democratic citizenship. While holistic, constructivist approaches have gained currency in American public school academic curriculum, traditional, external control methods persist with regard to discipline. However, classroom management is a social curriculum that shapes the life of the society. Children learn to cope in an authoritarian regime or develop essential skills to sustain a democracy. A society desiring peace and equity must support that goal through its institutions. An orderly environment for learning is necessary, but not sufficient to develop the citizens needed to face the challenges of the 21st century. This paper examines philosophical and theoretical support for a new vision of classroom discipline and discusses strategies to support that vision.

Keywords: democracy, citizenship, classroom management, peace

In this paper, I propose that peace is more than an absence of conflict or a state in which non aggression is maintained by an external power. Peace, in its fullest sense requires an active, purposeful and engaged participation by all parties in a society, however large or small. This engagement takes into account the diverse needs and perspectives of all members and requires committed attention and action by all to maintain a just and equal response to those needs and perspectives. I have centered my ideas around John Dewey's conception of democracy and education (1916) and Walter Parker's *Teaching Democracy: Unity and Diversity in Public Life* (2003).

I associate peace with democracy, not in the current meaning most often associated with capitalism, but in the more fully realized and philosophical definition, mentioned by Dewey. True democracy implies peace among a diverse group of members who make up the whole of the community.

> A society which makes provision for participation in its good of all its members on equal terms and which secures flexible readjustment of its institutions through interaction of the different forms of associated life is in so far democratic. Such a society must have a type of education which gives individuals a personal interest in social relationships and control, and the habits of mind which secure social changes without introducing disorder (Dewey, 1916: 115).

I also propose that the establishment and maintenance of peace is a lifetime endeavor, not a static achievement. Those who desire peace must commit to serious contemplation of the moral values and practices that sustain peace and consistent effort in the building of peace within and among diverse individuals and groups. This effort requires careful attention to the development of the knowledge, skills and practice of peace in the young, to establish their role as citizens of a peaceful society and world.

Diversity is inherent in the nature of any vision of peace, and peace cannot demand assimilation or the assumption of shared culture; instead, peace embraces difference and requires recognition, respect and appreciation of difference. Society is no longer confined to the community or the nation, and peace must be defined within the context of nations and cultures. At the same time, to achieve peace when difference is a salient feature of the relationships among people (or peoples) a common commitment to respect and non-violent solutions to conflict is essential. This is the role of each citizen.

Walter Parker (2003) states that "Idiot (*idiotes*) was   a term   of reproach in ancient Greece reserved for persons who paid no attention to public affairs and engaged only in self-interested or private pursuits, never mind the public interest—the civic space and the common good" (2003: xv). Parker rejects the notion that citizens can depend upon elected representatives to enact the democratic ideal, meanwhile retiring to "private life."

> Democratic living is not given in nature, like gold or water. It is a social construct, like a skyscraper, school playground, or new idea. Accordingly, there can be no democracy without its builders, caretakers, and change agents: democratic citizens (2003: xvii).

Parker argues that educators must attend to developing the skills of democratic citizenship in the young, and that the inherent tension of difference must take a central role. In an increasingly multicultural society, each person must be able to maintain the balance between affirming his/her own individual and cultural identity while recognizing, respecting and appreciating difference as it exists within the social fabric.

Political and cultural democracy deserve attention as integral parts of a complex whole, as opposed to the conception that political democracy depends upon a unitary construct of society. Parker points out the reluctant acceptance

of pluralism in past democratic theory, from both conservative and liberal sides (2003: 25). Within the United States, notions of citizenship typically pressure toward assimilation, cultural homogeneity and even at times mount "a repressive, totalitarian, murderous campaign" (2003: 25). While the Holocaust, the Khmer Rouge and the Taliban represent external instances, within the United States the Rev. Jerry Falwell's assertion that the terrorist attack of September 11, 2001 was the fault of diversity (Robertson, 2001) reminds us that the achievement of real peace begins at home, with recognition and appreciation of difference.

Inculcation with the values and skills that sustain a society is deeply embedded in the nature and purpose of the society's educational institutions. Education of the young is a standard societal value and each society defines the character of citizenship as well as how the young are to be brought up into citizenship. Teachers, as representatives of the society are expected to promote the values of citizenship and develop the skills and habits that sustain it. While there are differing perspectives on the nature of responsibility or self-discipline in the young, there is agreement at the general level about the nature of responsibility and discipline expected of adult citizens.

The *Washington Post*, in reporting a hearing on the notorious abuse of prisoners at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq, conducted on May 7, 2004 by the United States Senate Armed Services Committee, quoted General Peter Schoonmaker, U. S. Army Chief of Staff as saying "… discipline is doing what's right when nobody's watching" (*Washington Post*, 2004). Within cultures, there is a generally shared understanding of what is "right" and the obligation do what is "right" as well as a perceived goal that each citizen develop "discipline" to the degree that supports responsible behavior.

Parker suggests that both traditional and progressive views of citizenship

have offered an inadequate response to the need for true citizenship in a democracy, through their failure to acknowledge and make room for diversity. "Traditionalists want more study, progressives want more practice. Traditionalists concentrate on knowledge of constitutional democracy, progressives concentrate on this *plus* deliberation on public issues, problem-solving/community action…." (Parker, 2003: 21).   But, as Parker points out, "the two wings share the narrow conception of unity and difference. This conception has only one viable approach to the unity/difference tension, only one tool at its disposal, and that is assimilation. Assimilation is thus built into the common sense of citizenship education as one of its bearing walls … Social and cultural diversity, having been driven away from this site, had to find attention in what, remarkably, became an altogether different literature: multicultural education" (20). However, in the face of significant and persistent difference, notions of citizenship that require sameness fail establish or nurture unity.

Civic virtue and the establishment and protection of peace, then rests on a strong education in citizenship that prepares each individual for an informed, active engagement in the workings of a just society that contains highly diverse social and cultural elements. This is as true of the classroom as it is of the country as a whole, or of world civilizations, *in toto.*

Historically, in the United States civic education at the secondary and college levels receives significant emphasis. In the foreword to *Educating Citizens: Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility*, Lee S. Shulman lauds the authors' assertion that "achieving this combination of moral and civic virtue accompanied by the development of understanding occurs best when fostered by our institutions of higher education" and argues that "there may well be a critical period for the

development of these virtues, and that period could be the college years" (Colby, *et al.*, 2003: viii).

Attention to the development of attitudes and skills in younger children to support that function has not been adequate. "Citizenship" in the early grades is typically defined as appropriate (respectful, responsible) behavior, knowledge of important historical events, patriotic songs and sayings and participation in historical and political holiday celebrations. Serious review and a more fully developed response to address the requisite knowledge and skills of citizenship must guide the education of the young, at every level. To do less is to undermine the success of later approaches to developing citizens.

As a teacher educator in a childhood/early childhood program in the United States, I am situated within an institution devoted to reproducing the society. Pre-service teachers learn academic content to be transmitted, heuristics of delivery and practical methods of managing the classroom endeavor. They inculcate children with the values of the society, establish the norms and enforce penalties for violation. Teachers are viewed as models of civic virtue and citizenship, yet rarely have opportunity to deeply consider the nature of citizenship in a democracy or what that role requires. While at the core of the school day, children are learning that they live in a society where individuals have an equal right to voice their views and determine their lives, the classroom approach to discipline frequently teaches children that their job is to obey the authority of the adult and to follow the rules unquestioningly - defined as "cooperation."

Dewey (1916: 16) addressed this very concern:

Now in many cases—too many cases—the activity of the immature human being is simply played upon to secure habits which are useful. He is trained like an animal rather than educated like a human being … In

other cases, he really shares or participates in the common activity.

Classroom discipline from pre-school through secondary school, has always served the primary purpose of instructing students in the values and habits of the community, in "citizenship." Schools and teachers, as representatives of parents and the community are charged with guarding and guiding the young into the values of the community and the habits of responsible participation. Bathed in the philosophy of constructivism, pre-service teachers affirm the belief that knowledge cannot be simply transmitted or "told" to children, but that children construct knowledge through active engagement with materials and experiences. If that is the case, then how should educators address citizenship?

To more deeply explore the constructivist assumption, consider a lesson in mathematics for the child in the early classroom. Imagine the teacher telling the child "now, write 2 x 2. Now write the answer, which is 4. Now we will do the next problem." Such an event is nonsensical; it would certainly not be considered good teaching. We recognize that the teacher must scaffold learning, and the child must work with the ideas and develop the concepts in order for real learning to take place. Practice and rote memorization contribute to speed and efficiency; they are important *tools* in learning, but we do not mistake them for the learning itself.

However, the "truth" of constructivism seems curiously absent when the social curriculum comes into play. Consider a disciplinary event in the early childhood classroom. Imagine the teacher saying, "We treat everyone with respect. Say you are sorry."   Imagine the teacher telling the child, "Every time I see that you have raised your hand for a turn to talk, I will make a check mark here on the board. When we have 35 check marks on the board, we will have a popcorn party." Imagine a class of twelve year-olds, where the teacher offers

the popcorn party, or says "There will be no calling out. The first time, I will give you a reminder. After that, each offense will result in detention. After two detentions, I will call your parents." These events are not nonsensical; in fact, they are quite familiar. In the area of the social order, there seems to be a confusion of the tools and the learning, a confusion of means and ends. The teacher tells the answers, and the students are expected to remember and respond with efficiency.

Certainly, maintaining an orderly environment is essential. Just as a society must have order to maintain the safety of citizens and institutions, the classroom must have order to maintain the safety and learning of students. One might consider this establishment of order the "social curriculum" (Charney, 1991: 11) and carefully consider the content and methods of that curriculum. In academic areas, we do not mistake the teacher's directions for effective learning. Teachers cannot simply tell students the answers and proclaim that teaching and learning has taken place. Similarly, in the endeavor to establish order, we cannot assume that knowledge of how to behave as a citizen in the classroom is simply transmitted to students via external control, however benign.

The importance of developmentally appropriate curriculum is a relevant consideration. We know that the ability to reason in practical, logical and moral ways is different in children of different ages and stages. It would not be reasonable to simply tell a seven year-old to figure out how to multiply; the child's cognitive development requires an appropriate scaffolding and guidance from the teacher. As children grow older and develop logical skills, we recognize that they can work more effectively with abstract concepts and do not need the same kind of guidance and concrete experiences.

Similarly, in the promotion of "social growth and ethical behavior"

(Charney, 1991: 10) developmental abilities and needs dictate the nature of teacher guidance and control. Good curriculum and good teaching provide an appropriate structure for learning. In the same sense, good teaching does not simply provide answers, because that does not promote good learning. Most young children in school, for example can work effectively with two options, when older children can typically consider multiple possibilities. But in all cases, we recognize that development of knowledge and skills is a process that depends on rich incremental and regular steps. The foundation will affect the nature of the outcome.

Experience shows us that children are not, by nature "responsible" and that it is the teacher's obligation to maintain an environment of responsibility in the primary classroom. The appeal of quick and efficient means that bring order and build a constructive environment is powerful. The use of reinforcement, particularly in the hands of a loving and effective teacher inculcates good habits and does not establish an environment of fear or avoidance. But, this begs the question, at what age is it appropriate for a child to begin making informed decisions about how to act, how to evaluate the behavior of self and others, and even, in rare cases, when to disobey?

As teachers attempt to find a balance between quick and efficient means to establishing an orderly environment for learning and the greater goals of curricular issues, it is worthwhile to consider those curricular issues. Even at the kindergarten level, while the primary emphasis is on socialization and the development of language and mathematical literacy (not necessarily in that order), children are also being inculcated into the belief system and values of American society in the United States. Yet, the conditions under which children function at school and perhaps in the society at large vary significantly from those ideals. Every interaction, including those related to the classroom social

structure teaches a lesson. Children learn how the society of the classroom works, who has power (and who does not have power) and how power is to be used in their daily lives in the classroom. Approaches that use external control to establish and maintain order inure the young to a system which defines citizenship as obedience, not thoughtful participation.

In the area of the social curriculum, external control, behaviorist approaches offer an "effective" solution to the problem of order. Positive Behavior Support is one of the most promising recent programs using "behaviorally-based systems" of support for children with "challenging behavior." Primarily designed to address the needs of at-risk students and students with chronic or severe behavior problems, the approach has been extended school-wide, and claims to be appropriate for all children. Warger (1999: n.p.) reports:

> Research studies have demonstrated that when PBS strategies are
> implemented school-wide, children with and without disabilities benefit
> by having an environment that is conducive to learning. They learn more
> about their own behavior, learn to work together, and support each other
> as a community of learners.

One can think of "… School-Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) as the 'macro' version of Positive Behavior Support (PBS)" (J. Oakes, personal communication. June 2, 2006).

School-Wide Positive Behavior Support rejects traditional, past approaches that used "punishment-based strategies including reprimands, loss of privileges, office referrals, suspensions, and expulsions," citing the inconsistency and lack of positive reward that accompanied them. Positive Behavior Support instead, is focused upon "Teaching behavioral expectations and rewarding students for following them…." According to PBIS (Positive

Behavior Interventions & Supports), "the purpose of school-wide PBS is to establish a climate in which appropriate behavior is the norm" (Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports, n.d.).

However, the assumption that a behaviorally-based approach which is effective in addressing the behavior problems of individuals with severe or chronic needs should be extended to all children raises serious questions about what educators assume about youth as well as significant issues related to social learning. Butchart notes that "mainstream discipline practices … may achieve a modicum of order, but they subvert intellectual growth, moral maturity, and democratic potential…" (Butchart & McEwan, 1998: 5).

Any educational encounter produces both explicit and implicit learning. Children learn about the requisite behavior, they learn about themselves and they learn about the world. The call for consistent, research-based and humane approaches such as Positive Behavior Support is a welcome change from hostile and damaging approaches. This approach extends civility and dignity (of a sort) to students, which is a recognizable advantage. But civility and dignity perhaps mean more than humane and positive control. While this venue is not appropriate for in-depth discussion of hostile, intimidating teachers, it is worth noting that such approaches at least sometimes prompt recognition and resistance to oppression. When teachers use external control in a fair, consistent and clear way, expectations are reasonable, and the consequences are commensurate. However, the painlessness nature of the control does not cancel out the basic meaning.

John Dewey noted that, "Plato defined a slave as one who accepts from another the purposes which control his conduct" (1916: 98). At what age do we determine the young to longer be "slaves" but valid participants in the social

endeavor of the classroom society?

Parker notes that "schools are potentially rich sites for citizenship education," presenting

> both a formal curriculum … and learning that can be aimed directly at the development of enlightened political engagement—along with daily situations of living together 'in public' outside the family. Schools, then, are both curricular and civic spaces, and both can be marshaled toward the education of democratic citizens (2003: 41).

> Extracurricular approaches involve the implicit or informal curriculum of the school. They focus not on what students should be learning directly from classroom instruction but on what they should be learning indirectly from the governance and climate of the classroom and the school (2003: 49).

The explicit learning of an external, behavioral-based goal is easily articulated: "children will learn to behave appropriately in a given situation." It is important to consider who defines "appropriate," and who evaluates the behavior. In the external control situation, the teacher defines, evaluates and provides consequences—that is, the teacher does all of the complex, higher-order thinking. The child may participate in discussion, but the premise exists that the discussion is basically rhetorical and/or didactic in nature. At the very least, it is cajoling. The child's role is to listen and comply, to know, comprehend and apply the rule (Bloom, 1956: 18).

The implicit learning might include *this is how you behave when you are big*. In the instance of harsh traditional methods such as intimidation, punishment and humiliation, the playground and neighborhood bear witness to the bullying and victim behavior that emerges in the absence of adult supervision. In the instance of the friendly and "warm" external control, the

child may adopt a similar friendly approach, but may also construct the idea that decisions are made by those "in control" and that the role of others is simply to "obey" without question, or even the need to question. The dire consequences noted at the Nuremburg Trials make evident why this learning is problematic. There is also the unfortunate failure to develop the knowledge and skills of responsible citizenship through significant participation.

Positive Behavior Support addresses this issue. It claims to

> … create environments in which: a) learning and teaching are valued, and aggressive, unsafe behavior[s] are discouraged; b) respect, responsibility, cooperation, and other highly valued character traits are taught and encouraged; c) individual differences are valued rather than criticized; d) educating students with disabilities can be supported more effectively and efficiently, and e) teaching fundamental skills like reading and math can be maximized (Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports, n.d.).

It appears that within some behavioral-based approaches, there is a voiced appreciation and concern for democracy. But how is democracy to be defined, if control remains external to students and the system is reinforcement-based? In cases of special needs and challenging behavior, such an approach makes sense. Developmentally speaking, there are individuals who need external control. But even with those individuals, the goal is internalization of control into self control (as PBIS posits). When the external, reward-based approach becomes a paradigm extended to a global view of children, grades kindergarten through eight, or even beyond, there is an attitude toward young citizens that is problematic. These young citizens are presumed to be incapable of the "personal interest in social relationships and control, and the habits of mind which secure social changes without introducing disorder" (Dewey, 1916: 115).

Education for citizenship occurs consciously and deliberately, or unconsciously and without adequate deliberation. Both approaches shape children's citizenship, and if the end is thoughtful responsible citizenship, the means should support that end.

The question of good teaching in the social curriculum bears heavily on citizenship education, democracy and peace. The establishment of an orderly environment for learning is a critical first step. The development of self-control and constructive membership in the group is another essential step. If one assumes that children must be controlled and told what to do, rewarded for "appropriate" behavior and punished (when necessary) for rule violation at the early and primary levels, can one assume that at the secondary or college level, young people will have the appropriate knowledge/skill base to assume the role of citizen-learner?

Imagine an analogous process in the teaching of mathematics. Would one assume that, mathematical learning proceeds through lecture, recitation and memorization in the nine years of schooling before high school, then at the high school level, students are presumed ready to think through the equations of geometry, algebra, calculus and trigonometry? If mathematical knowledge must be carefully constructed in a developmentally appropriate way through all levels of schooling, we cannot assume anything less for citizenship education in a complex and diverse world.

The very nature of diversity poses a powerful challenge in the establishment of democratic institutions. Because people are so very different, their conflicting styles and cultures can lead to mistrust and conflict. Within a group, there is pressure toward sameness. Parker proposes "difference" as an alternative to the "pluralism/assimilation" which either tolerates or seeks to assimilate diversity. Unity is not defined as a defensive sameness, but "means

the political one alongside the cultural many. Parker believes it is important to "educate children for political oneness and cultural diversity, with the understanding that these exist parallel to and in support of one another" (2003: 30).

Diversity provides an additional perspective on the nature of the social curriculum. It is not the words or the cultural style at issue. Utley, in a syllabus for the course *Positive Behavior Support* at the University of Colorado at Denver emphasizes the "unconditional value" of students as individuals with a particular identity and family identity (2005, n.p.). In *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom* (1995) Delpit reminds readers that oral interactions frequently reflect social, cultural and ethnic differences. For example, teachers of young children in the United States tend to be predominantly white, middle class females. Indirect statements such as "you want to do good work today" are often used as directives that display the power and authority of the teacher, but may be meaningless to the child whose culture uses a more authoritarian, direct style, such as "you do your best today!" (1995: 33-34); "but, those veiled commands are commands nonetheless, representing true power, and with true consequences for disobedience" (1995: 34).

Education for peaceful citizenship does not reside in the words, alone and does not reside in a positive support for individual behavior without assiduous attention to the knowledge and skills of civic life. Behind the style and the words, there must exist the shared understanding that at every step of the way, the child has both the right and the responsibility to partake in establishing, evaluating and enforcing the norms of the just society of the classroom community.

It is necessary, but not sufficient to establish a caring and orderly environment where children can enjoy school and feel good about themselves.

One would never consider it adequate in terms of academic knowledge; similarly, one cannot claim any less for the skills of peaceful citizenship. Butchart states:

> The management of behavior - in contrast to a curriculum of democratic civility- deflects students and teachers from practicing the intellectual and moral skills and propensities requisite to a future as members of a democratic society. Those skills and propensities include authentic and frequent opportunities to debate issues of principle and justice, to become comfortable with argument, disagreement and conflict, to test competing claims, and to engage in moral inquiry. Mainstream modes of discipline and management abort those skills and propensities, instilling in their place passivity, irrationality, and a tolerance for manipulation (Butchart & McEwan, 1998: 7-8).

Engaging students as participants in building the classroom society correlates with Parker's proposed building blocks to develop "a more wholesome conception that brings both difference and democracy into a single frame as parallel phenomena" (2003: 29). He suggests "participation" in which

> citizens emerge from idiocy to puberty, thereby regarding themselves as having a public life in which they are challenged to manifest as democrats. This requires them to reflect on public life and to form it anew, again and attain, in community service, social action, and deliberation. (pp. 29-30)

Citizenship education in schools, then, is inextricably bound up with the approach to order in the classroom. Classroom discipline is not merely an approach that "works" but a social curriculum in which children construct the essential knowledge to make a place for themselves in the community and to function in society. We must consider the elements of a constructivist approach to peaceful citizenship. Butchart calls for a critical constructivism:

A "pure" constructivism is always in danger of collapsing into radical possessive individualism when it deals with issues of society, power and privilege, however. Critical constructivism provides constructivism with a moral core. Critical constructivism asks the learner to construct social meaning with careful regard for the common good and for democratic values (Butchart & McEwan, 1998: 6).

Children must have opportunities to build their society in order to construct the knowledge and skills of democratic citizenship. Choice is an essential element in that development. The choices must be real choices, and must also be based upon more than self-interest. External control programs offer choice, and often emphasize that individuals "chose" a reward or a consequence. Beyond the limited binary nature of those choices (obey and receive a reward, disobey and receive a "consequence") there is the additional problem that the thinking elicited by such choices is characterized by simple knowing and comprehending, and perhaps applying (Bloom, 1956: 18). It is essentially lower level thinking. While it may be developmentally appropriate to offer binary choices to the two or three year-old, cognitive development depends a great deal upon experiences that are appropriately rich and challenging to that development. Additionally, choices that focus on serving one's own needs and wants without opportunity to also consider and respond to the needs and wants of others fails to develop a deep and insightful habit of thought, positive relationships with others and the balanced citizenship skills necessary in a democracy.

The critical skill of problem solving depends upon the ability to consider getting one's needs met. But positive and long-term satisfaction emerges from solutions that respond to the needs of others, as well. This is the essential nature of life in a peaceful, democratic community. Problem solving involves more than merely proceeding through a static formula or procedure; it requires the

ability to gather and analyze data, engage in perspective taking and generate an array of possible solutions. The ultimate solution ideally reflects the "win-win" situation in which the outcome best serves the needs and wants of all involved and in which all played a significant, participatory role. This is a characteristic of peace. This process of problem solving requires higher order thinking: analysis, synthesis and evaluation (Bloom, 1956: 18). When children engage in genuine problem solving as an integral element of their life in the classroom community, the development of their reasoning ability produces personal gains, gains to the community and also skills for peaceful citizenship in a democracy.

Communication skills are critical to the development of thoughtful citizenship. Learning to state opinions and contribute ideas develops through valid opportunities to do so, but cannot be separated from thoughtful listening to the opinions and ideas of others. In young children, even the basic skills of taking turns, listening without interruption and responding to one another require support from the adult community. The motivation to "be a friend" or "be good" is inadequate to fulfill the goal, without development of the skills that support that purpose.

Basic respect for others, acceptance of their right to participate and contribute to the construction of the community develops through models and guidance from the teachers, or elders. Conversely, denial of respect or the right to participate at the very least fails to develop the attitudes and skills that develop ethical values and habits. Characteristics of respect and responsibility are synergistic. While they may be discussed as separate components of the peaceful classroom, they work together in creating the community within which children live during the school week, as well as creating the society in which they will participate as adults.

Characteristics of respect and responsibility develop within a rich and

supportive environment. Like external approaches to discipline that tell children what to do and reward (or punish) failure to comply, external approaches to developing habits of good character are inadequate. Promotion of the "virtue of the week" or didactic tales of moral virtue presented *to* children that do not also involve children in constructing and maintaining the classroom community fail: true citizenship requires significant and respectful participation in a community that includes everyone. Carefully planned and implemented learning experiences lead to genuine development of character.

Just as mathematical knowledge and skill is constructed through active, long term engagement with the materials, problems and concepts of mathematics, the development of citizenship in a peaceful world is constructed through active, long term engagement with the social life, problems and decisions of the small society of the classroom. Teachers must view children of all ages as valid, legitimate participants in the formulation of that society, making room for and carefully scaffolding opportunities to practice the skills of citizenship. Discipline then, is transformed from teacher-centered imposing of "an orderly environment for learning" into a social curriculum, immersing children in the real life experiences of planning and shaping their community, solving problems within the community and sharing the common good of the community.

Within such an approach, activities should be developmentally appropriate. Discussions, problem solving and judgments must not rest on inadequate conceptions or undeveloped ideas ("he hit me first"), and must not reflect self interest or unequal relationships. Just as effective teachers' questions related to mathematical concepts must reflect sound principles, the scaffolding and steps of decisions in the social curriculum must emerge from a foundation of sound principles, such as fairness. With teacher support, those principles guide the

discussion and serve as the test of solutions or judgments. Whether contributing ideas for the rules of the classroom, consequences for rule violation or something as simple as choices for a field trip, the children's ultimate decision must reflect the sound principles that undergird the operations and interactions of the classroom community and the society as a whole. In a peaceful, democratic society, such principles include respect for each individual in the society, and that individual's right to equal access to the shaping and the advantages of that society.

Parker speaks of the limits of the conventional notion of democratic citizenship, which shelters those who have attained membership and exhibits the "tendency to minimalize social and cultural diversity, as those these were different matters entirely. This is a nominal and exclusive notion of democracy, one driven by fear of difference and dissolution" (2003: 29). In a society marked by increasing diversity, tensions of difference counter traditional notions of democracy. Some perceive diversity and pluralism as a threat to peace; peace is viewed as the safety of sameness. However, diversity and pluralism also represent the vital and irrefutable element in a true achievement of peace. Parker calls for "a citizenship that embraces individual differences, multiple group identities, and a unifying political community all at once. The task ahead is to recognize individual and group differences *and* to unite them horizontally in democratic moral discourse" (2003: 25).

It follows then, that to sustain a vigorous and peaceful society, young people must have long-term and carefully developed practice in the knowledge, attitudes and skills that are fundamental to democratic living. Multiculturalism is often associated with the belief that one must recognize, respect and appreciate difference. In its richest meaning, this paradigm neither celebrates individual difference to the exclusion of the whole nor requires what Parker

calls the "unitary" view that requires assimilation to sameness. It does require an appreciation of the often deep differences that balance with the complex whole of a unified and democratic social fabric. Citizens who emerge from such development are equipped to assume the burdens and the formidable task of achieving and maintain peace in the world.

The basic foundation consists of respect for others and respect for their right to contribute to the shaping of a highly diverse and multicultural world society. It requires the ability to effectively communicate with others, given difference, the ability to identify problems, and the ability to cooperatively generate solutions. Responsibility is enacted respect. In schools, defining and creating classroom community is the means to developing such knowledge attitudes and skills. Issues of personal interaction, social norms and the working out of conflict provide the occasion, the teachable moment for that development. If the teacher takes control of determining the issues, norms and solutions, young people are denied the opportunity to develop the necessary democratic attitudes and skills. Conversely, if the teacher invites the citizens of the classroom into democratic participation, the setting is ripe for development.

It is frequently assumed that participatory decision making is best left to educational settings where children are able to engage in formal reasoning, that is, high school and college. However, there are compelling reasons to engage all children in reflection to the degree they can manage it developmentally, to assist children in the process of examining situations, forming judgments and determining a course of action. This approach, of course, is not "quick" or "efficient" and it counters the idea of responsibility as unthinking obedience and loyalty to adult authority.

In the early or primary classroom, teachers often assume that, because the child is young, external control of the child's environment and behavior is an

appropriate choice for maintaining order and a safe environment. In any case, the notion that the external approach which focuses on "responsibility" as compliance with adult directions is a dominant paradigm in many schools. Canter's newer approach to *Assertive Discipline* (2001) emphasizes a strong, warm relationship with students, yet reveals merely a "kinder gentler" approach to external control, for instance.

The paradigm itself is problematic; external approaches, however benign, pressure toward conformity and unthinking loyalty. In *Classroom Discipline in American Schools*: *Problems and Possibilities for Democratic Education* Butchart states

> Grounding our case in the fundamental premise that, above all other ends, public education exists to preserve and promote democratic social and political life, the volume asserts that contemporary mainstream modes of classroom orchestration and student discipline are morally obtuse (Butchart & McEwan, 1998: 3-4).

Working from the premise of external control undermines the greater goal of developing citizens with the values and skills to support and contribute to a democracy and a peaceful world.

The influence of schools and teachers is immeasurable and each year in the classroom is an invaluable opportunity to develop genuine citizenship. During the school year, a kindergarten teacher works with a child for about one seventh of that child's entire life experience. The emphasis on early education and early intervention when anti-social behaviors are noted highlights the importance of this developmental period. The assumption that an approach based on external control makes sense and is developmentally appropriate, because of the immaturity of these children, fails to respond to their potential and the needs of civilization. Like beginning mathematical learning, beginning

citizenship learning has a valid place in the classroom. Social learning will occur, whether administered informally and without careful thought, or whether as part of a thoughtfully-developed introduction to life in the small community of the classroom. In the foreword to *Starting Small*, the authors note that even at the preschool level

> The children are ready. They come to school wondering how those so different from themselves can have the same feelings and desires. And we, in turn, must learn how to help them put their intuitive knowledge of commonality into words and actions … In so doing, they give credence to our ultimate goals as teachers in a democratic society: helping children become kind and caring participants in a world that includes everyone (McGovern, 1997: ii- iii) .

At every level in the educational institutions, educators must dedicate careful thought and preparation to development of peaceful citizens.

What might the social curriculum look like, then? As is developmentally appropriate, students would not only have the right, but also the responsibility to contribute to formulating the principles and procedures to guide the class. Norms and rules emerge from thoughtful discussion of how we want to be treated—essentially, the kind of world we want to live in. Rules will be violated, just as interaction among real people creates conflict. Conflict is not a sign of wrongness, but a naturally occurring outcome in any social interaction. How conflict is managed and the nature of the outcome is important. Resolving problems and creating win-win solutions creates a society that meets the needs of all, considers the needs of all and develops essential skills of peace. Children not only learn the skills of citizenship, they learn invaluable lessons about how to get their needs met in ways that do not interfere with the needs of others, and they learn that others may see the world in ways that are very different from the

way they see the world. Perspective taking, an essential cognitive skill emerges as children learn to listen to and think about how others experience the world and the conditions of others' lives. Recognition of difference, respect and appreciation emerge naturally in such a setting.

The Child Development Project proposes class meetings as a means to developing social interest, as well as the knowledge and skills of ethical, democratic citizenship.

> The CDP approach to creating such a learning community is multifaceted; it incorporates constructivist learning theory, cooperative learning techniques, classroom and schoolwide community-building strategies, and classroom management that helps students develop self-control and commitment to fundamental values such as fairness, kindness, and responsibility (Child Development Project, 1996: 1) .

In the early childhood classroom, when youngsters discuss "Ways we want our class to be" (1996), help formulate the rules of the classroom community and help create solutions to problems that occur, they build the foundation for later civic participation. By the age of three or four years old, most children have the language of "fair" and "not fair" and assert it, typically to mean "I didn't get what I wanted!" While it is a crude beginning, this response indicates that the child has developed the capacity to engage in moral thinking. To ignore the opportunity to engage the child in that reflection truncates development. Using the opportunity to reflect upon situations and make judgments scaffolds cognitive and moral development, as well as citizenship skills. Pre-school teacher Eric Hoffman says "we don't talk about justice; that just wouldn't be appropriate. But we do talk about 'fair' and 'not fair' because that's something the children can understand" (McGovern, 1997). Repeated experiences with analyzing fair and not-fair situations deepen understanding from a conceptual

perspective; the experiences also can contribute to a more fully developed concern for others and even for justice as a more abstract concept. In Hoffman's classroom, when a group of boys were whooping and engaging in tomahawk play, "one of the four-year-olds said 'That's going to hurt Mary's feelings. Her Grandma's an Ohlone'" (Teaching Tolerance, 1997: 33). Teachers must make time to develop the vital skills of peaceful citizenship in children.

The issue of time is a significant concern. Engaging children in the often messy work of creating norms, discussing problems and creating solutions is neither quick nor simple. External methods provide an efficient, easy means to establishing order: they *work*. If the goal is merely order, such a choice might make sense. But if the goal is the "public life" and "public citizenship" to which Parker refers, then the more complex approach to citizenship education is as deserving of time and attention as mathematics or reading education. To quote Butchart,

> The question is never, 'What works?'—all manner of barbarity works, if the end is orderliness alone. The question is, what works to assure the sorts of civility and dignity that is essential in the short term for effective learning, and vital in the long run for democratic life? (Butchart & McEwan, 1998: 3)

If educators are charged with contributing to the development of citizens, and by extension contributing to the prospects for a peaceful world, every educational encounter must build the requisite attitudes, knowledge and skills to contribute to peace. The social curriculum is inherent in every classroom encounter. Discipline must be recognized as a teachable moment and an entire social curriculum; discipline is not merely the means that "work" to establish an orderly environment, but the means to a peaceful world.

References

Bloom, B. S. 1956. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Butchart, R., and B. McEwan, eds. 1998. *Classroom Discipline in American Schools: Problems and Possibilities for Democratic Education*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.

Canter, L., and M. Canter. 2001. *Assertive Discipline*. 3rd ed. Bloomington, Ind..: Solution Tree.

Charney, R. S. 1991. *Teaching Children to Care: Management in the Responsive Classroom*. Greenfield, Mass.: Northeast Foundation for Children.

Child Development Project. 1996. *Ways We Want Our Class to Be: Class Meetings that Build Commitment to Kindness and Learning*. Oakland, Calif.: Developmental Studies Center.

Colby, A., T. Erlich, E. Beaumont, and J. Stephens. 2003. *Educating Citizens: Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Delpit, L. 1995. *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom*. New York: New Press.

Dewey, J. 1916. *Democracy and Education*. New York: Macmillan.

McGovern, M. (Writer/Director). 1997. Starting Small: Teaching Children Tolerance [Videorecording] (Available from Margie McGovern Films Inc. for Teaching Tolerance. 400 Washington Avenue, Montgomery, AL 36104).

Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports. n.d. "School-wide PBS." (http://www.pbis.org/schoolwide.htm) (2006/6/2)

Parker, W. C. 2003. *Teaching Democracy: Unity and Diversity in Public Life*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Robertson, P. (Executive producer). 2001. The 700 club. [Television broadcast]. Virginia Beach, VA: Christian Broadcasting Network.

Teaching Tolerance. 1997. *Starting Small: Teaching Tolerance in Preschool and the Early Grades*. Montgomery, Al.: Southern Poverty Law Center.

Utley, B. L.   2005.   "Positive Behavior Support." (http://www.cudenver.edu/Academics/ Catalog/Documents/w05-SEHD_FIN.pdf) (2008/3/7).

Warger, C., and ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education, R.   1999. Positive Behavior Support and Functional Assessment. ERIC/OSEP Digest E580. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED434437) Retrieved February 22, 2008, from ERIC database.

Washington Post.   2004.   "Rumsfeld Testifies Before Senate Armed Services Committee." May 7 (http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/AI%&%-2004 May7.html) (2006/6/26).

課堂紀律與民主——和平能力之教學

Joy Mosher

紐約州立大學幼兒教育學系副教授

摘　要

　　課堂紀律是一門關於和平與民主公民的課程。當美國公立學校的理論課程採用全觀的建構主義方式時，在紀律部分則堅持傳統外部控制的方法。然而，課堂管理是形成社會生命的社會課程。學童在威權體制中學會因應之道，或發展維持民主的基本能力。一個希冀和平公平的社會必須藉其制度以支持此一目標。有秩序的學習環境是必要的，但卻不足以使其市民發展出面對 21 世紀挑戰的需要。本文檢視了一個課堂紀律新願景之哲學和理論依據，也討論了維持此新願景之策略。

關鍵字：民主、公民、課堂管理、和平