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CHAPTER 5

VALUES EDUCATION OF HAWAI’I: THE INTERSECTION OF HAWAI’IAN, AMERICAN, AND ASIAN VALUES

Gita Steiner-Khamsi
Ying Ying Joanne Lim
Walter P. Dawson

Introduction

Which values should be taught in Hawai’ian schools according to Hawai’ian elites? In this chapter we are able to scratch at the surface of convergence, divergence, and indigenization in the Pacific region by taking a closer look at what is occurring in Hawai’i, the geographical center of the Pacific Basin region. Hawai’i is, in more than one sense, at the crossroads of American and Asian spheres of influence. The United States and Japan, in particular, have had a visible impact on the economy and demography of Hawai’i. To what extent, and how, did these two countries also have a cultural impact on Hawai’ian values education? Have Hawai’ian educational elites also adopted the value systems from these two countries? What we will examine here in more depth for Hawai’ian elites might reflect trends within values education in other countries of the Pacific Basin region that are similarly exposed to American and Asian value systems. The study helps to address a topical question that is genuinely comparative (Steiner-Khamsi, 2000): Are there signs of transnational convergence or divergence in Pacific Basin countries?

Social and Political Context

The first introduction of a foreign value system in Hawai’i came in 1819 when Hiram Bingham was sent by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to establish the Sandwich Islands Mission as the first Christian mission in Hawai’i. His arrival along with the 1778 arrival of Captain James Hook are commonly pointed to as the beginning of Hawai’i’s modern history (Tabrah, 1984: xiii). The subsequent promotion of immigration was prompted by the decrease in the Hawai’ian population from around one million to 82,000 resulting from the introduction of Western diseases. The following waves of immigrants consisted of predominantly Asian immigrants who provided labor for the sugar plantations in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The sheer number of immigrant populations in Hawai’i has given the immigrants a prominent role in the formation of Hawai’ian culture in the twentieth century. The following examples of waves of immigration illustrate the magnitude of immigration in Hawai’i. A tax on agricultural land in Japan, introduced in 1873, impoverished many farmers leading to the immigration of 180,000 Japanese to Hawai’i between 1885 and 1924. In addition to the Japanese population, over 46,000 Chinese had settled in Hawai’i by the time of annexation in 1898. The Hawai’ian government made several attempts to curtail Japanese immigration in particular. For example, the “Gentlemen’s Agreement” between Japan and the United States was signed in 1908 to prevent fur-
their immigration from Japan. However, as soon as controls for Japanese immigrants were imposed, restrictions for immigrants from other Asian countries were lifted. By 1932, for example, 126,000 Filipinos had immigrated to Hawai‘i. In addition, during the first two decades of the twentieth century, 5,600 Puerto Ricans, 7,000 Koreans, and 8,000 Spaniards immigrated to Hawai‘i to offset the predominance of Japanese immigrants in the territory (Tamura, 1994). Although the American government of Hawai‘i sought to curb the alien influence of the Asian immigrants, the new immigrants proved themselves resilient in their efforts to take the reins of economic and political as well as educational leadership from the Americans.

Nevertheless, throughout these power struggles, the exclusion of the native Hawai‘ian in the governance of education remained the one constant in the administration of the Hawai‘ian system of education. The systematic subjugation of the native Hawai‘ians by subsequent groups of power-holding elites, such as the nii or Hawai‘ians of Japanese descent, is elucidated by the following citation (Benham and Heck, 1994, p. 145):

“The American missionaries saw a heathen society in need of Christian values and thus employed education as a means of devaluing native culture while creating their heaven on earth. The American business elite saw paradise in a governing structure in which their economic desires were met, thereby creating a school system that gave Caucasians privileges over Hawai‘ians and Asians. The Democratic nii saw education as a means to attain the benefits of such American ideals as private land ownership and economic prosperity.”

The conscious creation of inequality was manifest in the dilemma faced in the early 1920s by Governor Farrington and Superintendent Givens. They were confronted with the bureaucratic conundrum of how to “maintain an elite organization on one hand, and the need to uphold the ideals, or at least the rhetoric, of democratic participation on the other” (Benham and Heck, 1994, p. 151). Both men supported opening secondary schools to instruct non-caucasians (non-whites) as long as the curriculum of those schools was heavily focused on manual labor and agricultural industry. The result was the creation of the “English Standard School” by the administration of Superintendent Givens in 1924 and the institutionalization of segregation in the Hawai‘ian education system. The “English Standard School”, as its name suggests, was an institution comparable to the schools for non-whites. The curriculum consisted of English-only academic instruction for whites and vocational education for local youth. Stueber (1981, p. 6) refers to the ideology of the colonial administration at this time as “corporate liberalism” describing the marriage of co-opting democratic rhetoric and collusion with the corporate industrial interests leading to “severe erosion” of Hawai‘ian culture and community.

The education system in Hawai‘i was viewed as a means to incorporate the Hawai‘ian people into the industrial superstructure by devaluing their native culture and using compulsory education to provide for better accountability and acculturation of the youth, ensuring the socialization of American values. To this end, the expansion of secondary schooling, originally carried out for establishing vocational training, had an important additional effect on acculturation processes. They became the most prevalent sites for peer pressure which, in turn, undermined the values and native languages of native Hawai‘ian parents and, subsequently immigrated parents. In thus trying to give the public schools primacy in the acculturation of Hawai‘ian youth, the colonial administration sought to create “common identity across ethnic lines” (Stueber, 1981, p. 6).

The colonial school culture itself also alienated Hawai‘ian children from their communal values in more direct ways. Benham and Heck point out that Hawai‘ian culture favors cooperation, with learning taking place in a variety of informal and formal settings. In contrast they state that American classroom structures served to “foster individual competition [...] which forces some to lead, others to follow, while still others become marginalized” (Benham and Heck, 1998, p. 192). This erosion of Hawai‘ian culture was by no means incidental, as ethnic communal life was viewed by reformers of the time as reactionary and as a barrier to social progress and modernization. Therefore, in line with the ideology of the “white man’s burden” the objectives of colonial education were often clothed in the language of “social progress” which was endemic of the educational climate of the mainland U.S. during the early twentieth century.

The Interpretive Framework of the Hawai‘i Case Study

It is instrumental for our case study to explore the impact of Hawai‘ian, American, and Asian values on educational policies in Hawai‘i. Our literature review of Hawai‘ian, American, and Asian values will therefore serve us, later on, as an interpretive framework for analyzing the empirical findings of the case study.

Hawai‘ian Values

It is interesting to note that when the state of Hawai‘i decided to commemorate Captain Hook’s 1778 expedition to Hawai‘i, Governor appointee Kenneth Brown chose to commemorate the arrival by creating a Bicentennial Conference on Hawai‘ian Values to rediscover the values of the Hawai‘ian peoples whom Captain Cook encountered. Although this project was cut short for lack of funds, its inception is indicative of the degree to which Hawai‘ians wish to revive indigenous Hawai‘ian values.

George Kanahæle in his book, Ku Kanaka, Stand Tall: A Search for Hawai‘ian Values (Kanahæle, 1986), tries to approach this effort through his own study of texts pertaining to Hawai‘ian culture. In examining the Hawai‘ian cultural tradition, Kanahæle describes the value system of the indigenous Hawai‘ians as being characterized by “spiritual attunement with the gods, harmony with the cosmos and nature, loyalty to leaders, unity with companions, physical and mental health, personal achievement, hospitality and generosity, and aloha” (Kanahæle, 1986, p. 13). However, Kanahæle does not restrict his search for Hawai‘ian values to ancient Hawai‘ian texts. It is in

1 In other dependent territories and countries of that time this focus on manual labor and agricultural education was known as “Adapted Education” (see, for example, Barrington, 1983, Bude, 1983).
surveying present day Hawai`ians that Kanahele seeks to define a set of Hawai`ian values relevant to the lives of people whose value system has been shaped by interaction with many different groups of immigrants.

George Kanahele (1986) asked one hundred native Hawai`ians to rank values that are important to them today. The three highest-ranking values were: aloha, humility, and spirituality (Kanahele, 1986, pp. 19-20). Despite the shortcomings of Kanahele's research methods—the respondents participated at one of his "Hokosaka Training Workshops" and, therefore, were prompted to reflect on native Hawai`ian values—it is interesting to note that several of these values are similar to the values that Kanahele (1986) discusses for the pre-colonial period in Hawai`i. Moreover, he should be credited for abstaining from romanticizing all pre-colonial Hawai`ian values only because they are "ancient" and "traditional". In fact, he is not remiss in pointing out the rigidity of the pre-colonial value system (Kanehele, 1986, p. 16): "Some people maintain, for example, that the political system under the sacred ali`i nui of ancient Hawai`i was so repressive that commoners exercised almost no freedom in choosing their values, but that, rather, those were dictated to them by the chiefs and priests in power." This is attested to by the extremely rigid moral code of the indigenous Hawai`ians called kapu.

The kapu system dictated the relations between the Royal line of ali`i or chiefs who were regarded as living deities and the commoners. The ali`i could be contaminated by the slightest contact with commoners. As a result the kapu system consisted of a moral code which “prescribed the proper conduct for everything from land ownership to sexual relations” (Tabrah, 1984, p. x). The penalty for violating kapu was death and taboo actions included actions such as letting one's shadow pass over the possessions of a chief. Tabrah (1984, p. x) describes this system as follows:

"As representatives of the gods, the ali`i presided over the elaborately detailed kapu system that regulated the everyday life and buttressed the ancient Hawaiian religion. Because these laws were believed to be divinely given, violation was an offense to the gods and thus required punishment by death lest an offended god take his revenge out on everyone."

It is interesting to note that the kapu system was abolished in the same year that the American missionaries arrived in Hawai`i. In 1819 King Kamehameha purposefully committed many taboos thus overturning the kapu code as a result of the Hawai`ians' contact with the Western settlers. Depending on different interpretations, it is not clear whether the King lost faith in the power of the gods, was corrupted by the power of Westerners who increasingly joined his group of advisors, or sought to consolidate his worldly power in the face of worldly threats. Whichever the case, the rejection of the kapu and the gods could only have been triggered by a sense of profound disillusionment which the King felt in the face of American hegemony. It would be wrong to assume, however, that the rejection of the kapu system signaled an abandonment of all Hawaiian values. However, the end of the kapu system can be seen as the end of a purely indigenous set of Hawaiian values.

American Values

In pre-1776 America, the experience of the American colonists' economic subjugation under British rule forms the background for the formation of Anglo-American values, and those origins have had residual effects on the interplay of economic and social values in the United States to the present day. While the colonization of North America was motivated by Puritans escaping religious persecution, the American preoccupation with the concept of liberty arose, primarily, from the desire to escape the exploitative taxes placed on the American colonies by the British Crown culminating in the Stamp Act of 1765. Several scholars therefore suggest that libertarian economic forces have had primacy over liberal social forces in the establishment of American values (see Greene, 1992).

Tracing American values to the history of European settlement in the Eastern regions of the United States, however, only partially illuminates the foundation of American values. A nation of immigrants with an extensive history of slavery, racism and exclusion of African Americans, native Americans, and non-European immigrant groups, the formation of American values need to be discussed against the backdrop of race relations in the United States (see Kaplan and Pease, 1993). As James D. Anderson points out with regard to the United States history of education, there are two traditions that have existed side by side. He identifies “schooling for democratic citizenship and schooling for second-class citizenship” as the two basic traditions in American education and this pattern holds true for Hawai`i (Anderson 1988, p. 1).

With respect to the mainland's colonization of Hawai`i, the forces of assimilation in Hawai`i clearly leaned more towards the goal of “Americanization” to the detriment of self-determination and democratic citizenship, and, thus pursued “schooling for second-class citizenship”. The creation of a “common identity” in Hawai`i relied on the standard menu of nationalist symbols and curriculum. Throughout Hawai`i, in schools using American textbooks, the standard nationalist rituals (flying the American flag, saying the Pledge of Allegiance, and singing the national anthem) were followed. The goal of the institutionalized form of cultural dominance can be dated to the U.S. Marines' invasion of Hawai`i in 1893, for as soon as the Republican colonists came to power education in the Hawaiian language was outlawed in 1896 (Benham and Heck, 1994, p. 436). However, the devaluation of Hawaiian culture extended beyond linguistic discrimination to the realm of socio-economic relationships and communal structures. Teachers were charged with the task of conveying to Native Hawaiian students the values of individual labor, private ownership, and individual responsibility for economic and spiritual well-being. The long-held Native belief in community (ohana) “gave way to valuing personal accumulation of wealth” (Benham and Heck, 1998, p. 171).

The bearers of the canon were teachers educated on the mainland and sent to Hawai`i to serve as models of American culture and language. Influenced by the Progressive Education Movement on the mainland, this influx of Progressive educators in the 1930s brought with them “progressive ideas” about equal opportunity, political participation, and school governance and earnestly introduced these ideas into the secondary school curriculum. Nevertheless, within these efforts was a hidden curriculum geared towards forced acculturation that was manifest in the degree to which Progres-
sive educators, until the late fifties, sought to undermine the cultural heritages of native Hawai`ians and Asian immigrants.

The promotion of values education by the Progressive educators is outlined in a 1930 publication of the Hawai`i Department of Public Instruction titled, "Character Education". It is interesting that this book compares values education in the present (the 1930s) to the past, in analyzing the writings of R. Armstrong, Minister of Education in 1848, who stated "indolence" as "one of the great master evils which hinders the progress of the Hawai`ian race" (Hawai`i Department of Public Instruction, 1930, p. 18). This statement seems to indicate some effort to instill the Puritan work ethic or the value of "industry" in the native Hawai`ians.

For example, the character education project implemented at McKinley High Schools during the 1929-1930 school year was based on the "character traits" outlined in the school's "code of honor" (Hawai`i Department of Public Instruction, 1930, p. 82):

- As a student of McKinley, I stand for HONESTY in all I do and say;
- for INDUSTRY in study, work and play;
- for PURITY in spirit, thought and deed;
- for COURAGE to meet life's every need;
- for BROTHERHOOD of races all combined, and LOVE for GOD and all mankind.

The students participated in this project by writing essays on the six "character traits" and staging a play in which the traits were personified by George Washington, Thomas Edison, Sir Galahad, Abraham Lincoln, and Florence Nightingale respectively (Hawai`i Department of Public Instruction, 1930, p. 84). The institution of this list of "character traits" or values is interesting, in that it parallels the development of lists of values in the character education curricula of Georgia, Virginia, and Hawai`i a half-century later. Therein lies a continuity in the evident mainland dominance of Hawai`ian values education, which suggests hints of convergence with mainland models of character education.

Asian Values

Underlying the Asian value systems is the Confucian philosophy of what constitutes a "cultivated" or "superior" person (shih, chun-shi), which combines the ideal of being both knowledgeable as well as human (jung). Several scholars have examined how Confucius' philosophy has been translated into educational practice (see Hu and Robinson, 1999). Ren (1987), for example, analyzes in detail Confucian educational philosophy and finds that there is a strong emphasis on moral education. Confucius stressed the importance of teaching literature (wen), behavior (xing), loyalty (zhong), and reliability (xin). Except for literature (wen), these subjects are mainly focused on students' moral improvement. In his analysis of Confucian values, Ren (1987, p. 45) lists the following five characteristics that are targeted in moral education. Students should become honest and gentle, comfortable with poverty, responsible, diligent, and persevering.

In the case of Hawai`i, however, Asian values translate more concretely into Japanese values. The large immigrant populations in Hawai`i were subject to the same Americanization efforts as the native Hawai`ians. However, from the very beginning of their presence in Hawai`i, the Japanese, in particular, made great efforts to preserve their language and culture while adapting to their new situation as residents of Hawai`i and citizens of the United States. It was this Japanese refusal to reject their native culture which led to the intense conflict over the Japanese language schools in Hawai`i.

The movement against the Japanese language schools started with the xenophobic movements arising from the entry of the U.S. into World War I. Soon after, in a report issued in 1920, the Japanese language schools were accused of being "un-American". In addition, Americanizers of the time blamed them for "retarding" the Nisei "in accepting American customs, manners, ideals, principles, and standards" (Tamura, 1994, p. 152). However, in response the Japanese argued that Japanese sought to "incorporate the best of Japanese culture with the best of American culture" (Tamura, 1994, p. 152).

"While Americanizers believed that language schools retarded Nisei in accepting American customs, manners, ideals, principles, and standards," Japanese believed the schools advanced acculturation by teaching moral education, or shusin, one of the most important subjects of study in Meiji Japan. Moral values taught at language schools, Japanese correctly believed, were compatible with American values and helped Nisei become better citizens. To that end, all revised textbooks continued to advocate filial piety, duty, honesty, perseverance, industry, courtesy, cooperation, and courage. The only value that may have conflicted with American thinking was filial piety, since it subordinated the individual to the family and thereby discouraged individualism. On the other hand, respect for parents and siblings and honoring family obligations, all part of filial piety, were certainly compatible with American values" (Tamura, 1994, pp. 154-155).

What this illustration indicates is the incompatibility of Japanese and American values that Tamura (1994) seems to embrace, but rather conflicting notions of cultural adaptation (see, for example, Dawson, 1999). Where the "Americanizers" saw Japanese culture as an impediment to acculturation, the Japanese community recognized the need to revise the Japanese language textbooks being used to teach Japanese language and culture to Nisei in Hawai`i. Tamura (1994) reports that the teachers of Japanese language in Hawai`i complained that textbooks from Japan were "inappropriate for Hawai`i-bom children", and these teachers were "uncomfortable with books encouraging emperor worship and Japanese nationalism" (p. 153). As a result in February of 1915, the Hawai`i Japanese Education Society was formed and with the help of Professor Yaichi Haga from Japan, textbooks were adapted for use in Hawai`i and were subsequently revised in 1924, 1927, and 1937. This continued until the closing of all Japanese language schools after the beginning of World War II. Thus, in contrast with other educators in Hawai`i, the efforts of the Japanese were unique in that they attempted to adapt the values education curriculum to the local situation in Hawai`i and thus enacted their own indigenization of a curriculum originating in Japan.

Values Education Policies in Hawai`i

We need to acknowledge that several values associated with Asian societies are...
different from American values. At the same time, we would like to point out that there is a tendency in the research literature to unnecessarily define Asian values as being diametrically opposed to American values (see, for example, Kim, et al., 1994).

As other researchers have pointed out, more often than not, differences between Asian and American values are overemphasized (Cummings, 1989; Finkelstein, et al., 1991). This results in a binary construction of value systems in which Asian values of individualism, diversity, and personal freedom are placed at one end and Asian values of collectivism, homogeneity, and social responsibility are located at the opposing end. Worse, yet, are the stereotypes associated with the two value systems such as the American stereotype that Asian values epitomize blind obedience towards authority, and the Asian stereotype that American values promote immorality. It is important to emphasize that the articulation of Asian values has been conducted almost exclusively at the national and international levels; therefore, an examination of this discourse is important to frame our single case study of Hawai'i within the wider context of this regional discourse.

At the heart of the Asian values debate is the question whether there is a specific Asian conception with regard to the role of the state that is fundamentally different from non-Asian conceptions. Some have argued that in Asian countries the state emphasizes this specific model of state sovereignty, point at several Asian states that have pursued a model of the state that can be best described as one that is based on a single, state-defined ideology. For them, it is therefore not surprising that schools in many Asian societies promote values such as "orderly society" and "respect for authorities" (see Hitchcock, 1994). Critics of this supposedly Asian model of the state have not held back in pointing out the dangers of co-optation of other ideologies driven by elites' political self-interest. However, the problem lies in the dichotomy between the Asian and non-Asian conceptions of the state that the Asian values debate is assuming. There are numerous studies that critically reflect on this assumption of dichotomy and, instead, call for a more differentiated perspective that draws attention to the intersection of different value systems.

Richard Robison, for example, argues that the "Asian Values' thesis represents one ideological pole in an ongoing political struggle between conservatism, liberalism and social democracy which straddles East and West" (Robison, 1996b, p. 307). In divorcing the debate from its ideologically anchored component, Robison and other researchers (Robison 1996a; Robison, 1996; Freeman, 1996) have pointed out many similarities between Western and Asian values. Freeman, for example, finds that "Asian elites would not differ fundamentally from many conservative Western elites who have won more or less genuine elements of traditional culture into the 'political formula' that legitimizes their rule" (Freeman, 1996, p. 363). Further doubt is shed at the culturally relativistic argument in that some Westerners have embraced Asian values, while some prominent Asians such as Kim Dae Jung and Aung San Suu Kyi have rejected them (Robison, 1996b, p. 321). To further confuse matters, the key proponent of Asian values, Malaysian Prime Minister Mohammad Mahathir, has stated that "Asian values' were once "Western values' before the West went morally bankrupt because of rampant liberalism (Robison, 1996b). This divergence in credence in the
It is interesting to note that four of the five values listed in this policy document (civic responsibility, compassion, honesty, and integrity) are identical to values listed in the Georgia character education curriculum. The Character Education Policy states that the Hawai‘i Board of Education’s vision of character education is characterized by a cross-curricular approach informed by the participation of school staff, students, parents, and other members of the community. However, the apparent borrowing from the Georgia curriculum calls into question the degree to which this values education curriculum was defined by local community members.

In March of 1998, the Hawai‘i character Education Policy was linked to the Improving America’s Schools Act in order to fund “Partnerships in Character Education Pilot Projects” (Hawai‘i Board of Education, 1998). The Hawai‘i project called “Infusing Character Education in the School Curriculum” funded seven pilot schools from around the state, which designed programs for their schools. These pilot programs were implemented in the fall of 1999 and there will be ongoing evaluation of the programs throughout the years 2000 and 2001. Schools will develop draft versions of their curriculum framework and a resource handbook, which will be ready for dissemination around the state to other schools by the end of 2001.

In addition to this project aimed towards the public school system, Punahou School, one of the most prestigious private schools in Hawai‘i, developed a two-year program and disseminated it in the form of a handbook called “Character Education Handbook”, written by Chaplain John Heidel and Marion Lyman-Mersereau (1994). Their work is particularly interesting because it highlights twenty-four virtues (one for each month, for two years), translates them into Hawai‘ian, provides definitions, lists sources for readings and videos for each level from kindergarten to eighth grade, provides discussion questions and proverbs, then provides suggestions as to how to incorporate the virtues into action. The Punahou curriculum is one important resource that the pilot programs are expected to tap into in formulating their own curricula (Heidel & Lyman-Mersereau, 1994).

Character education programs have been criticized for emphasizing content over teaching practices that promote social skills and the personal growth of students. The danger of creating a value set for values education for any population always lies in the consolidation process by which the values are defined. Character education programs that focus on content have therefore come under serious attacks for promoting conservative, middle-class Anglo-American values (see also Nash, 1997). Nevertheless, the movement to introduce character education and moral education in U.S. schools has been quite successful. Despite vocal opposition, the National Council for the Social Studies issued a position statement in 1997 urging social studies teachers to "re-focus their classrooms on the teaching of character and civic virtue" (National Council for the Social Studies 1997).

Methods and Data Source

The survey was sent to thirty-five educational elites, and thirty-one persons responded. One third of the respondents chose not to disclose background information with regard to the sample bias. The non-response rate was extremely high for the question regarding age, only thirteen respondents stated their age. Despite these incomplete responses, we assume that there is a sample bias towards an over-representation of female elites (thirteen females, eight males). The two other sample characteristics, ethnicity and age, seem to correspond to the features of Hawai‘ian elites, who tend to be Asian American, Pacific Islanders, and over forty years old. Six elites did not indicate their ethnicity, and an overwhelming majority (n=20) of the remaining twenty-five respondents identified themselves as Asian American and Pacific Islanders. Unfortunately, the survey did not distinguish between Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, a distinction that would have been helpful for the Hawai‘ian case study. The majority of respondents are between forty and sixty years old.

This paper focuses on the analysis and interpretation of one set of survey questions (Question 4) which used a Likert scale as the method of response (range 1 – 7). Question 4 of the survey was formulated as follows: “Concerning each of the themes listed above, there are differences of opinion on content. What are your views with respect to the following controversial issues?” Following this question is a list of twenty-five items from Question 4 (e.g., “Schooling should first promote an understanding and love of nation and then teach about the rest of the world?”, “Schools should foster an understanding of all religions?”, etc.). All twenty-five items deal with themes of values education. Thus, the items measure elites’ opinions with regard to which of these themes should be included or excluded in values education.

Findings

A Principle Components Factor Analysis with Varimax rotation was performed on the items from Question 4. Table 5.1 summarizes the results: five significant factors were extracted from this analysis. From Table 5.1, we see that they comprise 64.15 percent of the variance with the first 3 components encompassing the majority of these variances (22.82 percent, 14.24 percent, and 11.98 percent, respectively). In addition, we performed a scree plot to decide how many factors should be considered in the interpretation of our finding. An additional scree plot confirmed our decision to only consider five factors in our interpretation. The remaining factors would have consisted of 1 or 2 items and added very little to explaining the variance.

Included in the tables for each factor are the mean values on the seven-point Likert scale for each item in the factor. These Likert scale mean values (in the tables referred to as “means”) represent the relative emphasis which respondents thought should be placed in each of the themes in values education. A numerical value of “1” indicates “very strong emphasis”, a numerical value of “4” indicates a “neutral” stance, and a numerical value of “7” indicates that this item “should be left out” of the school curriculum.

We would like to thank Professor Gay Garland Reed, University of Hawaii, for helping us with contacting educational elites and for her detailed and helpful comments on the first draft of this chapter. Dr. Shyri Matias was an invaluable help for distributing the surveys.
Table 5.1 Principle Components Analysis of the Sigma survey data from Hawai'i

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>22.82</td>
<td>22.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>14.24</td>
<td>37.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>49.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>57.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>64.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After reviewing the thematic foci for each group of items that are associated with the five different factors, we discussed the interpretation of the extracted factors. Based on these discussions and the review of literature, we chose to label the five factors as follows:

Factor 1: Family and Community Values
Factor 2: Gender Equality and Human Rights Values
Factor 3: Social Cohesion and Social Harmony Values
Factor 4: Personal Growth Values
Factor 5: Legalistic Values

Factor 1

From Table 5.2, we can see that items 4g, 4a, 4w, 4q, and 4e load together on the first factor. This factor seems to incorporate family and community values. The Likert scale means show more preference for emphasizing familial and community values (4s, 4w, 4q, 4e) as opposed to national values (4g, 4a, 4o) although these means all range from a "neutral" value of four to a maximum value of 1.82 for "strong emphasis".

Table 5.2 Items that Load on Factor 1: Family and Community Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4g</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4w</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4h</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4i</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 2

Table 5.3 Items that Load on Factor 2: Gender Equality and Human Rights Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4u</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4x</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4m</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 3

Table 5.4 documents that items 4h, 4l, 4c, 4b, 4i, and 4f load on factor 3. We have classified these items as measures for social cohesion and social harmony. It is important to note that items 4h and 4l have means that are greater than the numerical value 4.00 (4=neutral, 7=should be left out) indicating that respondents prefer to place less emphasis on these two themes (4h="Schools should help every child gain a deeper understanding of their own religion", 4l="Schools should help young people appreciate the essential role of unions in guaranteeing safe work conditions and fair wages") in comparison to the other themes loading on this factor. This means, they do not wish to emphasize students' individual religious beliefs (item 4h) nor would they like to see students being taught the "essential role of unions in guaranteeing safe work conditions and fair wages" (item 4l). This factor clearly suggests that attention should be given to social cohesion and social harmony rather than emphasizing values that the Hawaiian elites in our sample see as socially disruptive such as religious beliefs (item 4h), unions (4l), and students' individual values (note that item 4c carries a negative loading).

Table 5.4 Items that Load on Factor 3: Social Cohesion and Social Harmony Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4i</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4l</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4h</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 5.5, we can see that items 4t, 4p, and 4k load on the fourth factor. This factor includes themes of values education that address issues related to personal growth such as health education, promotion of empathy and prevention of gender stereotyping. It is important to note that the Likert scale mean for item 4k (“Girls are destined to have significant home-building responsibilities and the schools should prepare them for this future”) is almost “5” (4= “neutral”, 7= “should be left out”). This means that the Hawai’ian elites in our samples wish to place little emphasis on preparing girls for “home-building responsibilities”. We have therefore interpreted that the Hawai’ian elites oppose gender stereotyping in school.

### Table 5.5 That Load on Factor 4: Personal Growth Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4t: Values education should take up issues relating to human sexuality and health, such as chastity, preserving the integrity of the body against drugs and prostitution, and understanding the risks of promiscuity</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4p: Schools should encourage empathy for people of different ethnic, language, and social backgrounds and create opportunities for growth through shared experiences</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4k: Girls are destined to have significant home-building responsibilities and the schools should prepare them for this future</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 5

Table 5.6 documents the loadings and means for items 4d and 4h. Both themes measure constitutional or legalistic values: equality before law as well as no discrimination based on class, ethnicity or religion. Both items in the factor have very high means indicating a desire for strong emphasis of these values in the curriculum.

### Table 5.6 That Load on Factor 5: Legalistic Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4d: Schools should stress that all are equal before the law</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4h: It is best for schools to teach common values to all children without differentiation on the basis of class, ethnicity or religion</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions and Policy Implications**

The results from the factor analysis lead us to confirm that Hawai’i is at a crossroads of different value systems. This applies especially for the first three factors: “Family and Community Values” (factor 1), “Gender Equality and Human Rights Values” (factor 2), and “Social Cohesion and Social Harmony Values” (factor 3). The second factor “Gender Equality and Human Rights Values” corresponds clearly to American values, whereas the third factor “Social Cohesion and Social Harmony Values” is associated with Asian values. As discussed in the literature review section of this chapter, American values tend to emphasize, among other things: gender equality, individual rights, and critical thinking. All items measuring these values loaded high on factor 2: “Gender Equality and Human Rights Values”.

We have traced an equally consistent pattern corresponding to a specific value system for the third factor, labeled “Social Cohesion and Social Harmony Values”. The values loading on factor 3 are commonly referred to as Asian values. A clear example of an Asian value is item 4i, which is characterized by the downplaying of social differences and stressing obligations to “help those who encounter difficulties”. The same line of argumentation can be found in two other items: Schools should understand social differences based on religion (item 4h) or social class (item 4i) in order to promote social cohesion and social harmony. The common theme of “Social Cohesion and Social Harmony Values” is the emphasis on commonalities rather than on issues that are potentially disruptive to social cohesion and social harmony. Thus, differences should be downplayed in values education, and commonalities or “broader social issues” (item 4c) should be stressed. Closely related to the emphasis on social cohesion and social harmony is the teaching of empathy and tolerance which schools should promote by helping students “gain an understanding of all political and social viewpoints from the most conservative to the most liberal” (item 4d).

There is an abundance of solid research literature discussing Asian and American values (see, for example, Ban and Cummings, 1999; Cummings and Altbach, 1997; Cummings, Gopinathan and Tomoda, 1988). However, we have restricted our review of the literature on studies that, in particular, discuss American, Asian, and Hawai’ian values in Hawai’i. Based on this review of literature, we were able to identify those values that are listed under “Gender Equality and Human Rights Values” as American values, and values loading on “Social Cohesion and Social Harmony Values” as Asian values. Nevertheless, there is a need for caution given that all societies, Asian and American alike, are multicultural, and thus, are comprised of residents of different cultural backgrounds holding different value systems. Hence, “American values” or “Asian values” do not refer to actual cultural practices in these countries but rather reflect on the cultural norms that residents, especially immigrants and minorities, are expected to assimilate to and internalize.

Whereas “Gender Equality and Human Rights Values” (factor 2) and “Social Cohesion and Social Harmony Values” (factor 2) correspond to clearly defined cultural norms in American society and in Asian societies respectively, we are not able to identify one consistent set of values within “Family and Community Values” (factor 1) that corresponds to one specific value system. Instead, we are left with a series of dazzling questions: Are “Family and Community Values” Hawai’ian values or a mixture of Hawai’ian, American and Asian values? As we will illustrate in the following, we can make a compelling case for each of these two interpretations.

First, there is empirical evidence for interpreting “Family and Community Values” as the Hawai’ian dimension of values education. Two of the seven items (items 4a, 4l) explicitly address themes that are associated with Hawai’ian values (supporting the family, solidarity within communities) because they emphasize the need to care for the community (ohana). As mentioned earlier, the most recent Hawai’ian policy stresses the importance of teaching these ohana values. This factor can therefore be interpreted as a revival of Hawai’ian values. The highest loading items 4g (“Schools should teach young people to venerate their heroes and promote national pride”) and 4a ("Schooling should first promote an understanding and love of nation then teach about the rest..."
of the world") lend further support to the interpretation that this factor reflects a nationalist, Hawai’ian values education revival in schools. Eric Yamamoto (1979) has characterized the resurgence of emphasis on “local culture” in Hawai‘i as being focused on multiculturalism, a shared value orientation, and the creation of a new culture. Thus it can be stated that “Family and Community Values” (factor 1) reflect an emphasis on Hawai‘ian “local culture”. In addition, the inclusion of nationalism (items 4g and 4a) can be explained by the fact that as Woodon (1995: 128) states, “there is increasingly a strong nationalist feeling within local culture, and an increasing polarization away from the mainland”.

Second, there are also compelling arguments for interpreting the first factor as characteristic of “Pacific values” because we can see a set of indigenous and nationalistic values (items 4g, 4s, 4w) that are supplemented with Asian values (items 4a and 4d) and American values (item 4q). Two items are closely associated with Asian values because they reflect a strong work ethic including the need for loyalty, obedience, punctuality at the work place (item 4e) and demand that “schools should teach children to respect hierarchy and to support the government” (item 4o). In contrast, item 4q comprises a set of values that are associated with the American norms of individualism (“recognizing the importance of personal pride and identity”) and diversity (understanding students “unique origins and heritage”).

In sum, based on the interpretation of the individual items, “Family and Community Values” (factor 1) can be either interpreted as a factor that represents Hawai‘ian values or as a factor that integrates Hawai‘ian, American and Asian values. A closer examination of Hawai‘ian educational elites, presented in the following, has led us to opt for the latter interpretation. Consequently, we feel that “Family and Community Values” should be regarded as an integration of Hawai‘ian, American and Asian values, and therefore be interpreted as “Pacific values”.

Eighty percent of our Hawai‘ian elite sample is comprised of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. All but two of the thirty-one respondents agreed that there is a distinctive set of Asian values (survey question 16a), but only half of the respondents would want to see schools “make an effort to teach Asian values” (survey question 16b). What does this discrepancy between familiarity with the Asian value system and distancing oneself from this very value system suggest? Are we dealing here with Asian Hawai‘ian elites who are assimilated, that is, have internalized three different value systems: Hawai‘ian, Asian, and American values. We suggest here that certain Asian values such as emphasis on community and family values are closely related to what are perceived in Hawai‘i as typical indigenous values. These Asian values have therefore found fertile ground in Hawai‘i and now pass as Hawai‘ian values. An analysis of which Asian values found great resonance (family and community values), and subsequently were indigenized, and which values have remained contested (e.g., respect for hierarchy), helps us to understand local resistance and adaptation processes in Hawai‘i.

Coming full circle back to policy issues related to values education in Hawai‘i, we now can understand why from all existing U.S. educational policy options, Hawai‘ian educational elites have chosen to adopt character education that had been previously implemented in several states of the United States. The values promoted in character education—civic responsibility, compassion, honesty, and integrity—strongly resonate with Pacific values held by Hawai‘ian educational elites. Although character education was adopted from other states in the United States, the values promoted in character education are closely associated with Asian values, or, better, with Americanized Asian values or Pacific values. We find it noteworthy that from all educational policy options regarding values education, Hawai‘ian educational elites have chosen the least American version, or, the version that is most closely associated with Asian values: character education.

We started out by searching for a factor that would manifest unique Pacific values that are quite distinct from the well known Asian and American values. What we found in our Hawai‘i case study, instead, are transnational realities integrating three distinct value systems: Hawai‘ian, Asian, and American. Upon reflection, we proceeded with international convergence processes in education. Transcultural realities within a nation—in this case within Hawai‘i—are as much a consequence of globalization as are the transnational flow of capital, technology, finance, media, and other spheres that are most commonly associated with globalization processes. Our Hawai‘ian elite sample epitomizes transculturalism; they are transnationals. Being mostly second or third generation Hawai‘ians of Japanese background, they have managed to integrate values from three different value systems. Lately, scholars in Postcolonial Studies have coined the term “hybricity” to denote this integration of different value systems. We purposely avoid using this term in this context because it might lead to the inference that cultural spheres can be divorced and selectively adopted.

The Hawai‘ian elites’ integration of different value systems explains only part of our findings. It does not explain why this complex value system promoted by Asian Hawai‘ian elites has found entry into the Hawai‘i policy on values education. It would be naïve to assume that educational elites can simply impose their ideas of values education on the education community. Given the contested nature of new reforms, especially in values education, it is pertinent to examine which reforms are most likely to be accepted by the local community. “Power” alone is not sufficient for understanding cultural reproduction in schools. Such an explanation falls short of explaining why the Asian Hawai‘ian elites have found political support for the new policy on values education.
laboring this intersection of native (Hawai'ian), Asian and American values as "Pacific values". Admittedly, this is a tentative connotation that needs to be substantiated by additional case studies in other Pacific countries. A more "detached", de-contextualized cross-national analysis in which we compare the data from the ten participating Pacific countries is needed to further explore whether this intersection of native, Asian and American values also applies to other countries in the Pacific Rim. Pacific values might be, after all, an integration of various value systems rather than exhibiting divergence from Asian and American value systems. Our case study highlights a particular bias in Pacific studies. Could it be, for example, that we lack research on value systems in Pacific states, and therefore unfairly compare Pacific states with regard to their similarity and difference to Asian and American value systems? Postcolonial Studies in Education certainly would suggest that we should stop seeing the Pacific states as being placed "in the middle" between Asian countries and the United States assuming that they are automatically exposed to these two "big value systems". Instead, we should place our object of study—values education in Hawai'i and other Pacific states—at center stage and analyze what is occurring around these countries. From this postcolonial perspective in which we locate the Pacific Ocean at the center, the United States needs to be referred to as an Eastern country and the Asian countries at the Pacific Rim as Western countries. Taking on the perspectives of those whom we study needs to be an imperative for comparative education researchers who attempt to be culture and context-sensitive.
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Values Education in Hawai‘i

Introduction

The teaching of values is a long-standing concern in Japanese education. Japan carried on its Confucian tradition of education under Government patronage of the Tokugawa shogunate from the seventeenth century. The schools established by feudal lords put extreme stress on training for the mind using a curriculum focused on the teaching of Confucius, mainly consisting of virtues such as humanity, justice, loyalty, and filial piety.

Even after the formation of the modern educational system in the Meiji era, the Confucian values were emphasized as the basis for nationalistic moral education. The 1880 Education Order gave precedence to morals (Shushin), over other subjects and the 1890 issuance of the Imperial Rescript on Education including Confucian tenets was the most significant development in the formation of guiding principles of moral education in Japan. The Rescript stressing absolute loyalty to the emperor on every aspect of life as well as school life continued to be effective until the end of World War II.

After Japan’s World War II defeat in 1945, the General Headquarters (GHQ) undertook government functions and issued a directive to remove the subject of morals (Shushin) from the educational curricula with the purpose of abolishing militaristic and ultranationalistic thinking. In place of morals, social studies was acclaimed as the core of the new curricula, and it had the formal objective of educating children for democracy. As the deletion of morals as a subject of study caused much criticism, the Ministry of Education published a handbook of moral education in 1951, and then instituted moral education as a formal subject in 1958. In spite of the formalization of moral education as a subject in the school curriculum, teachers were reluctant to implement it due to popular feelings of rejection regarding values that could be identified with the prewar military regime.

Recurrence of Moral Values

Recently there has been a resurgence of interest in moral and values education under the slogan “Educating for Sound Minds” triggered by a shocking case of murder at a junior high school in Kobe where a student killed a boy and put the cut head in front of the school gate. At the same time, the above case triggered a rush of bloodshed at the hands of junior high school students. In January 1998, a junior high school female teacher in Tochigi prefecture was killed at school with a knife by a seventh-grade student who suddenly flew into a blind rage when he was admonished for coming late to class. In March 1998 in Saitama prefecture another seventh-grade student killed a classmate out of revenge for being bullied for a long time. The opposite case of a suicide of an eighth-grader to stop money blackmail by senior students came to