



Transcriptions

The Color of What We Know

Ted Ward

Annotation: *Ohio Business Teachers Association Annual Convention, Dayton, OH, April 15, 1983.* Concerned about the increasingly technological nature of learning since World War II, Ted Ward discusses problems created in the separation of cognitive and affective learning.



When I was invited for this session, I was invited in terms of specifically speaking to the matter of the relationship between cognitive and affective learning; one of those topics that is fairly current today. I suspect we would have had the room full had we had this meeting two years ago on this same topic because one of the things that I suspect all of us, as educators, have learned to expect is that some things are almost like cyclic fads because we become very excited about them and then a short time later we become somewhat less excited if not, in fact, jaded.

The area of affective learning, however, has several roots and I'd like to talk with you about these today and hopefully we can make some of this practical enough that it will make a difference in the way you look at this whole matter of affective learning. I think that one of the characteristics of education in the post-World War II era is that it is becoming increasingly technological. We are increasingly thinking mechanistically about how we do things. The foundation that was laid early in the century by the founders really of the field of curriculum, including Bobbitt and others from the '20s, rather well laid a foundation for that technological twist that things have taken particularly since the work of Ralph Tyler has been taken seriously some twenty years after it first was uttered in his classes at the University of Chicago.

During the last 25 years, I think—in the career span of most of us here—we have been in an era where the field of education has increasingly tried to think logically and tried to think in a highly organized manner, particularly putting a great deal of confidence in those things that can be spelled out as objectives, the learning purposes, learning outcomes, and then organizing instruction to achieve these. In some of our States, even, we have mandated now within the school codes the achievement of certain objectives. And these great books of objectives now have become a part of teachers in some fields and virtually everything that a teacher does in the classroom is supposedly now, in some States in the Union, supposedly related one way or another to the achieving of a specific objective that can be found in this massive directory of objectives. Now I don't propose to attack that; I just propose to raise some questions about its realism and what we do in the classrooms as teachers regardless of the things that are mandated of us and regardless of what it is that we're going forward into as a kind of pursuit of this 20th century technology of teaching and learning.

I'd like to start, then, with a parable. It's what I call 'The Parable of the Red Truck,' and you'll pardon me if it sounds a little bit elementary; in fact, the graphics may convince you that it is. 'The Parable of the Red Truck.' Once upon a time, there was a red truck and along came a dichotomistic educator and separated the red from the truck. Why? I think this is the parable that represents something of what we get into when we begin dividing cognitive and affective domains. If someone says can't you tell the difference between red and a truck? I suspect all of us would say, of course I can. Can't you imagine the truck without a color? Yes, I suspect most of us can think black-and-white, but in the real world, trucks tend to come with color. And, as a matter of fact, though you can specify the color when you order your truck or your car, you can't order a truck or a car without color. Do you ever think about that? Sometimes, as educators, we have the tendency to presume that things can be divided that really can't be divided; that things can be separated that really cannot be separated.

Now I think when this really got into high gear was as a consequence of the Bloom taxonomy of cognitive objectives. How many of you are familiar with the Bloom taxonomy of cognitive objectives? This was written by Bloom and several of his colleagues and mostly by several of his graduate students, at the University of Chicago in the late '50s. And it was published in the early '60s and was followed by another volume about four years later called Krathwohl and Bloom, and it was a parallel volume on the affective domain. The cognitive domain came out first. The reason the cognitive domain book came out first is because the teacher is presumed to be primarily in the cognitive domain business. What schools do best is to teach children something and the something is inevitably best expressed in cognitive terms. We teach skills. We teach knowledge. We teach information and we teach abilities of one sort and another; and most of these can be reduced to cognitive domain statements.

Now what I'm suggesting is that all of those things that we teach as cognitive domain achievements are, in fact, like a truck carrying a color. Our primary attention is on the truck but, as a matter of fact, the whole thing comes in the bargain. And I raise the question why would a dichotomistic educator separate cognitive from affective? I think the answer is simple. Some things that can be talked about separately begin to be conceptualized separately. If I were to ask you to consider the aspects of a human being, what could you identify as one aspect of the human person? *Soul*. A soul. Another aspect of the person? *Sex*. Sex. *Body*. Body. *Color*. Color. Okay. Now what are some of the classical ways these are clustered together to talk about the whole person? Now, for

example, you use the word soul which is in the non-empirical domain. We don't measure it. We don't photograph it. We don't touch it, except emotionally. There is an emotional quality of life. There are some things that we can't really assess very well in terms of human spirit; in terms of some of the ways we think about soul. We presume that they're there. And the minute we talk about the unity of the person, we bring together several of these words. So, for example, body, soul, and spirit. Have you ever heard that one? Body, soul, and spirit. Then we talk about mind, body, and . . . *heart* heart, or some other; and again we're in the non-empirical. You see, some of the aspects of personhood are in the empirical, meaning we can see them. We can measure them. We can count them. We can put our finger on them. Others are in the non-empirical and we have to either presume that they're there or get indirect evidences that they're there.

Now, intellect. Can you see an intellect? *No*. No, but you can see some of the things an intellect can do, and we tend to measure these things and we call that, for example, intelligence. And we measure what the intellect is capable of doing, so we try to bring these things down to the concrete. But whenever we're talking about the wholeness of the person, we tend to put those words together and make sets of two or three or four: mind and body; body, soul, and spirit, etc. What is the person? Is the person expressed in terms of body? Is that the whole of the person? Is the person entirely a function of soul, of spirit? We say that the human being is a composite. Bear in mind that you can differentiate aspects, but that doesn't mean that the aspects will, in fact, come apart. Do you see what I'm driving at? It's a little bit like an operating vehicle. You can take the wheels off; but when you take the wheels off it really isn't any longer an operating vehicle. You can describe the parts separately but when you begin taking them apart, they quit functioning. To some extent, cognitive and affective is just about like that.

Now why is this an important bit of rhetoric? Why would we bother with this philosophical introduction? I believe sometimes we are prone to add things to a curriculum on the basis of having been able to define them without recognizing that they can't really be treated separately from the rest of that which they are intimate with. Or putting it in other terms, I'm always uneasy when I hear a teacher talk about, "We need a curriculum in the affective domain," or "We must do more teaching in the affective domain," or "Those teachers are concerned primarily for the cognitive domain; I'm concerned primarily for the affective domain." I'm always uneasy because I think what we're doing is using the language of the technology of part identification to conceptualize what we do with and for people, and I don't think that's a very smart thing to do.

Now in a technological era such as I have already postulated we are in, in terms of the long history of education, there's probably no era of educational history that is any more technological and mechanistic than ours. And though many of us as individuals would deny that we are a technological teacher—we like to think of ourselves as a warm human being teacher. Nevertheless, much of what is put upon us to do and to be tends to have a very technological quality. In such a period, it is especially tempting to divide apart those things that we are trying to achieve especially when we're being held more accountable for one than for another.

Let me suggest, then, that one way to look at this is to try to get clear on what the outcomes are that we are involved with in fields such as business education. There are at least three families of learning outcomes that I can identify here, and I think of them as being separable in the sense that you can talk about them differently, but not separable in the sense that you can't do them separately.

For example, we can seek learning outcomes in facts, concepts, and generalizations. Does that ring a bell? *Yes*. For each of the courses you teach, there are some facts.

Now, for example, let's stay within the business domain. What courses in the business education domain are most heavily laden with facts as intended outcome? *Accounting*. Accounting. Would you compare accounting and typing for a moment? Would you say that typing or accounting is heavier in facts outcomes? *Accounting*. Accounting. I would, too. Now look down at the second category—techniques, skills, and abilities—and ask the same question about the same pair of subjects. See the point? In typing, we can distinguish between facts. Yes there are facts in there, aren't there? In fact, skills of typing depend on facts, don't they? Just like facts of accounting aren't much use unless they are couched in the techniques of accounting. But can you distinguish in your mind the difference between a body of facts, concepts, and generalizations from a body of techniques, skills, and abilities? Does that come apart in your mind? It'll come apart analytically in your mind, but it can't come apart in the classroom. See the point I'm trying to make there? We run a terrible risk when we say, but this learning is focused on facts; tomorrow we focus on ability and skill. It doesn't come apart that neatly and most of us are aware of that.

Now let's do the same thing with reference to values and attitudes. Can you think of a subject within the business education curriculum where you really do not teach values and attitudes? Just name the subject within the business education curriculum where values and attitudes aren't part of what is being taught. And, of course, anybody that answers that has stepped into a trap. We dug it long and wide and deep. And, of course, the answer is you just can't do that. Sometimes when I'm working with math teachers I have a very rude way of getting them tuned in to this. I ask how many are conscious of teaching for fact outcomes? All the hands go up. How many of you math teachers are responsible for teaching in the techniques and skills? All the hands go up. Then I then I ask the question, how many of you are responsible for the values and attitudes realm? About the half the hands will go up and the rest will be a little cautious; and I say, well, now wait a minute. It seems to me that what you're doing is denying a responsibility that you actually do the very best in. This one gets really rude. I wouldn't do it to you because you're in business education and this is your convention. These are your days. I wouldn't irritate you. But I'll tell you what I do to the math teachers sometime. I think the math curriculum of many of our schools has a much more predictable outcome in values and attitudes than it does in facts and skill. Now the fact that it's negative doesn't change that in it. In other words, it's a little bit like saying you have to take responsibility for what all you're doing to people in the frame of reference of your course. Is it possible to teach a person how to type and type rather well and even to type rather accurately and rapidly in such a way that the person will never touch a typewriter again after getting out of your course? I think it is. And I think that's the kind of thing we have to be extremely sensitive to so that we take responsibility, and are willing to be accountable for the values and attitudes that come out of this.

Now, again, back to my red truck. A skill or a knowledge, a fact, a concept is like a truck; it comes in color. And someone says but we can separate out the affective. No you can't. Now when people enter into an affective curriculum emphasis, what they usually do is some remediation around some feeling-oriented stuff and try to get people that are badly hung up emotionally able to relate to themselves and to others better, and that's called an affective curriculum. I don't have any objection to that because I think, for example, all of us need opportunities to really look at ourselves and to become more in touch with our emotions. But in the school, our biggest problem is keeping the act

together not splitting it apart so that in every subject those values and attitudes which are appropriate to that subject are functionally being taught, and those attitudes and values which would work against the uses have the affective appreciating of that subject, are minimized or, at least, recognized where they occur and remediated one way or another.

I have three categories of known and unknown outcomes to raise with you as a question: intended, incidental, and unintended. Give me an example of an intended outcome in shorthand. *You have to be able to take shorthand and transcribe it and use it.* Okay. Now there's a quantified skill outcome. That's an intended outcome. When you evaluate your students, you focus on that kind of intention, don't you? So that intended outcome, you're concerned about getting into the known column. Right? So your task then as a teacher includes evaluation in the sense of getting that outcome into the known for you and for the student. Right?

Can you think of an incidental but consistent outcome in shorthand? *Perhaps that punctuation would bring more quality, would improve.* Okay. Let's say that a person doesn't know the difference between a semicolon and a colon when they begin. That's not the prime purpose of the shorthand course, but it's probably going to be an incidental outcome. Now you might not have that on your list of intended outcomes, but you're glad when you get it. Now the minute you start testing for it, you're raising it up into an intended. Right? When you're simply thankful for it, it's in the realm of an incidental. Right? Now I can see us being conscious about that.

Let's try another one and get a little farther away from that which we would be tempted to test for—still in the second category: incidental but consistent. *Reading abilities.* Okay. Reading ability, itself, or some of the sub-abilities that you indicated in the plural. You'd have a hard time seeing yourself testing for that wouldn't you in a shorthand class? If it is in the incidental you're glad if you get it. Are you apt to know it or not know it about everybody? Okay. It's apt to be, for some, a known; and for you with reference to some, a known; and for others, an unknown. Notice, then, that the difference between an intended and an incidental outcome is quite often in terms of the degree to which we are *knowing*, as teachers, about what's really going on there.

Let's look at unintended outcomes. Now what is the quality of an unintended outcome in contrast with an incidental outcome? And, by the way, this language is drawn from several very excellent writers in the field of curriculum. If you've never read any of Elliot Eisner's work, I would say you really would enjoy it. He has written a book called, *Educational Imagination*. It's been out about four or five years now, *The Educational Imagination*. He's an art professor at Stanford University and has a very different orientation to curriculum and to educational objectives and outcomes. He's part of that Stanford milieu there that has been very mechanistic in its approach to education, for the most part. But he is really at its center and some of his work lies behind what I'm sharing with you this afternoon, just to give full credit. What is the characteristic of an unintended outcome? Does that ring a bell? *I don't know, but could it be something that has nothing to do with shorthand or grammar or punctuation or typing or anything? Maybe a value or an emotion?* Yes. Notice how, when she began probing this, some values and emotions began to get into it, too.

It's quite possible that people can get some work habits that are not intended. So it's not altogether emotions that we're fetching for here. But quite often these are things that we really didn't want to have happen. Not only are we not aware they're going to happen, but they're unintended. I didn't intend that to happen. It's like my math teachers, again. We have this rather universal

despising of arithmetic and mathematics that seems to be characteristic of the American curriculum. Where do kids learn that? You say they learn it at home. No, they don't learn it all at home. They learn a lot of it in schools. Those are unintended outcomes. Nobody claims that that's what they're trying to do, but it's happening. *They could be positive or negative.* They could be positive or negative and that's the important thing. An unintended outcome could be unintended out of a non-concern of the teacher. And you know if that happens, fine, kind of an attitude. Or it could happen out of a "Gee, I don't want that to happen, but what am I going to do if it does?"

Now let's look at some of the positives of this in terms of unintended outcomes of typing, just to shift the parameters a little bit. Let's go back to typing. Unintended outcomes of typing. *Hand and elbow activity, and finger dexterity, and rhythm.* Finger dexterity, I have a hunch, has a central place in the intended outcome, but probably rhythm doesn't. [Digression] Unintended outcome. You tend to think of that as something that you know about or don't know about. *Well, I think you do know about it, I think.* Some. *Some, okay.* But, again, we're on this axis here. I think you'll find that there's a kind of an axis here from the known to the unknown. In general, the positives, once we do begin to know about them, we tend to raise them into higher levels of consciousness and make them more intended. For example, the more experienced teacher tends to take a lot of things that have been incidental but consistent and raise them on up so that quite often the more experienced the teacher, the larger the package of intended outcomes. Do you ever think about that? The less experienced, the more we're inclined to focus on a limited body of objective. See it? So even experience has a characteristic gain here that is almost counter to this mechanistic characteristic that we spoke of.

Let's look at the negative of an unintended outcome of typing. Can you think of a negative outcome, unintended? *Well, you might destroy creativity if you get wrapped up in it.* I'm a little worried about that with reference to some of the things that kids do with computers. Just like I'm concerned about some of the things kids do when they get wrapped up with television. It may have a certain kind of informing quality, some kind of skill-building quality but, at the same time, some anti-creative quality. I'm reasonably sure, for example, that in my generation growing up on radio stories—how many of you remember radio stories? Between 5 and 6 in the afternoon we had Jack Armstrong, Sky King. Little Orphan Annie, and Dick Tracy. Who else was it, for a time? And, of course, the half-hour three times a week, Lone Ranger. How many of you remember *that*? Well, that dates us. And one of my colleagues at the university, who also does work in the area of instructional simulation and games-building along with me, we feel one of the reasons we do that field rather well, and we do, is because we have this capacity to visualize. And we can take a script, or something; we can take a scenario and we can visualize it because we began early in life listening and then building our own mental pictures.

Where I've noticed with my own children who've come up on this television generation—my children range from 32 down to 19—and that bunch is not nearly as visually creative. Now two of them aren't. But in terms of taking words and converting those words into pictures and drama in their minds, they have to work at it. They really have to work at it in different ways than my generation. At least, the fanatics among us had to work at it. One of the things we can be doing in a field such as typing, unintended, is reducing creativity.

Now I'm not suggesting that we suddenly get excited about a lot of these sorts of outcomes and get all uneasy. But I think we have to raise the question, when we're looking at this whole category of the cognitive and the affective, we have to become sensitized to the possibility that some

of the things that we're doing have affective outcomes that are unknown to us, and because they're unknown to us we're not monitoring whether or not they're intended. And it helps to be sensitive to that if you're really concerned about the overall impact of your courses. How do you ever notice, for example, if a person is getting a positive affect about typing? How do you ever raise that into a known? The positive affect is probably an intended outcome, but it's one in which we tend not to evaluate. How would you ascertain that your typing students have a positive affect toward typing? *They'll have to sit down and type.* Yes, I would say that one of the clues would be whether or not they're using it and seeking out opportunities to use it in other situations where it can be a . . . *a function*, a help to them and whether they see it as a help because the negative affect toward typing would be a resistance quality. Again, the extreme of that might be the person who never touches a typewriter again after your class. So if I were in your situation, I would look particularly at my sophomores when they become juniors, and my juniors when they become seniors and find out the extent to which the little bit of writing that they are doing for the few teachers that do ask for writing, there's a dig, is coming in a typed form. That's probably a pretty good index as to their affective involvement with typing. And if it's not coming in a typing form, you can't simply assume that they don't have a typewriter at home because one of the qualities of an affective involvement with something is that people find a way to do it. And I notice that if they want an Atari at home they manage to figure out somebody to put the bead on, and there's not that big a leap between an Atari and a decent typewriter.

Increased emphasis on evaluation can increase the known for which of these categories of outcomes? I'm asking you now, increasing emphasis on evaluation will increase the known component for which of these categories of outcomes? *What limit? What'd you say?* Increasing emphasis on evaluation in a course can increase the known for which of the categories of outcomes?

The incidental, I would say, because you really can't do much about the intended. That's a fixed. You already have them set up that way.

Yeah, but if he doesn't know it, it can be pretty nebulous.

You can increase more to get the incidentals, but it's very nebulous to get the unintended.

Yes, this is the nature of that question. The problem here is that increasing the emphasis on evaluation will increase your level of knowing and that's important because, for example, if you are operating within a series of intended outcomes and not doing adequate evaluation, too much of what is intended is not really known and evaluation becomes very important in order that you can ascertain whether or not the intended is, in fact, occurring. So it can move clearly if you increase emphasis.

[Here Ted refers to an illustration that is not available.] Now how about this one? *Well, I think that it could be impacted.* But there's a funny interaction occurs when you do that. When you increase the emphasis on evaluation in reference to *this* stuff, what happens to it? *The intended goes down.* It tends to slide up and become a larger component of the intended. *Sorry.* And I just want you to see that that's what happens. And that's, again, what I call the experienced teacher phenomenon where you know that there are more things that can happen and you test more widely for them; which is, by the way, one of the reasons why I think standardized approaches to tests that are assumed to be similarly adequate for all teachers is not a very realistic approach because some

teachers need to know more than other teachers because they have a greater sensitivity to the possible. That's, again, one of my own biases.

And then in reference to this unintended, I think here's where your biggest anxiety comes in. You really don't know what all to get at here, but it's at this point where I think it does pay to at least become sensitive to some of the really hazardous unintended outcomes, especially in the negative, and monitor for them to make sure that they're not occurring. Again, I think if math teachers were more sensitive to this, we'd have somewhat better math students across the nation.

It's possible for teachers who have *this* fixation to be ignoring *this*. And if we're really concerned about affective learning in our schools, that's one of the first places to start, subject by subject, teacher by teacher to become honestly concerned about particularly the negative affects associated with the course. So rather than having somebody else come in and add something to the curriculum called the affective domain curriculum, I'm saying, no, the place to start is, even in the so-called skill subjects like typing and shorthand—that's one reason that I tried to use those illustrations—because what goes there goes double in virtually anything else that we teach in the schools. For example, history if not taught within a cognitive awareness on the part of the teacher is going to be a real waste.

I've got two summaries of what I call the key problems. They're each problem chains. Series one is a problem chain that begins with 'educators tend to emphasize whatever is to be evaluated'. Do you believe that? *Yes. That's true.* Yes, we all believe that and even the kids know that. And in fact, they order their lives around that. That's one of the unintended outcomes that schooling does for people. *That's why they've bought their books and look at what chapter you're reading.* That's right. And if they aren't sure you're going to use it, they won't buy it.

Second: certain things are easier to evaluate than others. Do you believe that? *Yes.* Now put those first two together and you've got a whale of an interaction going there. Right? The most likely outcomes to be evaluated and, thus, to be emphasized are the intended outcomes of information at recall level, and of skills which can be handled within the constraints of four walls and a small clock. Am I right? *Right.* And there lies a good bit of the rub because in the affective domain we have a harder time evaluating. Very hard to evaluate. Therefore, a lot of other things tend to crowd out any kind of responsible evaluating in the affective. And what really crowds it out is not cognitive, in general, but a very limited slice of cognitive stuff that Bloom would call the first two levels on his taxonomy: the basic information, recall.

Now many of you use problems in your tests. I'm thinking that's going to run you up into the third or fourth level of taxonomic structures in the cognitive domain. But not many of us are able to take the time and the patience to even read an examination of a student that is written at a much higher level and about halfway up the cognitive domain. It's just too hard to do. So we tend to ask the simpler stuff which tends to focus heavily on fact recall. So then one of the unintended outcomes that students get as what's important in school is that first level of recall. Then they say, most of that you'll forget anyway, why bother. Now that is one of the affective learnings that I suspect every one of us, in one way or another, contributes to; but nobody would want to claim any credit for it. That's a series of problems. Do you see it? *Right.* You can't talk very long about the affective domain without getting into this whole question of what we do in schools as evaluation, because evaluation has a heavy influence on what is emphasized. And this series of problems

suggests that the emphasis on lower levels of cognitive learning, because it's easy to assess, tends to rule out higher levels of cognitive focus for kids and also rule out preoccupation with the affective outcomes for the teachers. So we exempt ourselves from that and shrug.

There's a second series of problems: education tends to emphasize whatever has apparent purpose. Do you ever have parents saying: "What in the world will we ever be able to do with that?" Do you ever have kids saying: "What in the world would we ever be . . . ?" Do you ever have principals saying: "What in the world would kids ever be able to do with that?" *Business people say that.* Yeah right, especially in the marketplace, you know: "I don't care about that stuff. What I want is somebody who can spell or whatever his local hang-up is." And education tends to emphasize whatever has apparent purpose. Now some things in the affective domain don't seem to have much apparent purpose: "I don't really care how he feels but, as long as he does it." Sounds a little like the Army, doesn't it? Or the old French maxim: "Yours not to reason why, but yours to do or die," which is exactly our problem.

The curricular decisions tend to leave gaps. Is any school that you know of teaching everything that a kid really needs? I don't know. I never see any such thing. We teach some things and we don't teach others. But you see, the schools have a commitment. Schools have a purpose. The issue is that schools have a mandate. They interpret that mandate in terms of apparent purposes; that 'aware of apparent purpose' is spotty. Do you follow that curriculum concept there? It a spotty thing and has holes in it, and those holes are particularly where purposes haven't been made very conscious.

Now, from time-to-time, a new purpose bubbles up. For example, when we discovered that the Russians can count and Americans have to be able to count, too. Soon they'll discover that Russian children all eat spinach and there'll be a tremendous campaign to get all the American children to eat spinach, too. From time-to-time a gap will be recognized and raised to the level of a purpose. Have you lived through any of those? The whole science and math thing which she's gone through. What else have you lived through where something that, in fact, was an under-emphasis and suddenly it made a purpose and then it—*business ethics*. Business ethics, yes, indeed. That's one reason we're here today is because this whole matter of values and ethics and moral concern is big business today. We've got to be doing something about it because—what was it in American history that said, "Even in high places, we seem to have lost a sense of basic truth." Do you remember the event? It occurred in Washington, D.C. *Watergate*. I think so. And that really set the American public to thinking, and a gap became a purpose. Now I don't know that we've done much about it, but the static is there, the pressure is there.

Four: each newly recognized purpose is expected to become an added component in the curriculum and to compete with all others, and here's the rub. So somebody says: "Hey, we haven't been doing that. We need to add it." That second line: "Therefore, we need to add it." And it then becomes the new competitor—and *worse*—and the question is what do you trade off. You just crowd more in. I'm deeply concerned that the emphasis on affective learning does not become something new to press in and compete. I'm concerned—and that's what I'm trying to share with you this afternoon—that every teacher within every given content area asks the question with reference to the affective domain: attitudes, values, ethics, and the like. Is there something I need to be doing within my course, never mind another competing course? Never mind another unit within your course. What about the permeation within the course? Because you're doing it anyway.

Every teacher teaches in an affective context. Do you believe that? *Yes*. Whether you're conscious of it, whether you're intending to, every teacher teaches in an affective context. Every student learns an affect within the frame of reference of your course. Do you believe that? *I don't know*. You don't know. That's a good point. You don't know because it's down here in this unintended outcome, but it's there. Again, we're back to the red truck hypothesis: if they're getting any truck, it's got a color on it. If they're getting any typing, they're having a feeling about the typing. If they're getting any office management skills, they have a feeling about those office management skills. If they have any bookkeeping, they have a feeling about bookkeeping. Now I'm not talking about in general, a feeling about—they have very concrete things like, "Is this worthwhile?" Let's name some more affects with reference to bookkeeping. Is this worthwhile? What other affects are involved? Do I enjoy doing it? What else? *Will it get me a job?* Will it get me a job? How do I relate it to my bigger values for my future? Does it relate, in one way or another, to truth and integrity? Does it give me a chance to say something in the realm of truth and integrity? Or, conversely, is this some way that, if I really knew how to do it, I could make it work out for me? Okay? *What you're saying in essence, there is no such thing as a failure. You try something; you at least know that that won't work and that's what you're saying here is it?* I think you're going a step beyond what I'm saying, but I wouldn't reject that. I think that you do a good job of anticipating where an idea might lead you. I like that. You know Radar on M*A*S*H when Potter says something or other, Radar's already saying the next line, you know. Now I get the feeling that you're already on the next line.

Let's look at the teacher influence in the affective domain and pursue this very thing we were talking about right now. I call this, the media of teacher influence in the affective domain. Do you ever think of yourself as having media of affective influence? You say, media? That sounds like a projector or a recorder or something. Yes, but it's more than that—media, modes, devices, the processes, the newspapers, the medium of communication. You have media and there's one right there. The way you organize your course is an affective media. Do you ever think about that? If your subject is organized with a balanced emotional appeal and orientation, it has an affective consequence. Do you ever hear of students rejecting something because their first exposures to it are too erratic? Disorienting? Confusing? *Doesn't make sense*. Doesn't make sense? Or the teacher is so gung ho that it's so overpowering? Or the teacher is so careless that you're quite convinced that it really isn't important to the teacher either? Right? Now would you say that it's better to be gung ho or to be lackadaisical? *Gung ho. Not only about*. Good. I'd say that's a bad question. *It's not*. It's better to be—what's my word? *Happy medium?* First word? *Balanced*. Because the real world seeks balances. There is such a thing as being too gung ho. There is such a thing as being too cool; too laid back to use a Southern California expression. And what we really have, as a teacher, right off the bat is the way we orient our course; the way we look at it ourselves and the way we present it to the students. That has an affective message in it. Do you see? That's a medium.

Here's another one: modeling. That one you could have come up with yourself, I'm sure: personal commitment to the subject and to one's career. If there's anything that's distressing to me is a person who tries to say something about the importance of career to a student who is not exemplifying an important career. There is such a thing as a teacher who's had such a sloppy attitude toward her/his own career that there's almost no other message that the student is going to hear with reference to the place of this learning in the student's career. Follow? Now that's a message and the medium you have is your own example, your own model, your own personal commitment to the subject, and to your own career. That clearly is a medium. It has an affective consequence much more important than the information that it communicates and students could say, "Well, Mrs.

Smith really thinks office practice makes a good career.” That’s the information component, that’s the cognitive component. But that is nowhere near as significant as the affective component that says, “Mrs. Smith is the kind of person that I’d like to be.” That’s an affective involvement, that’s a medium.

Here’s another one: classroom climate, especially the quality of interpersonal communication and the quest for a just community. The quality of interpersonal communication: how people relate to people. The teacher has a lot to do with setting that up, but the teacher is not the exclusive factor within that. The teacher relates to other people; sets an example, but the teacher also encourages and discourages relationships between and among students. The quest for a just community is out of the literature in the moral development domain, itself, and if you’ve read any of that literature you know how important it is that people in any kind of a learning situation have a sense of what is fair, and work on making the environment more fair. That means that the teacher has to share some of the fairness logic of the teacher and let the students see that the teacher is also working on the fairness issues. So what’s that got to do with typing? It has a lot to do with the affective involvement with typing. It’s one of your media. It’s one of your media if you’re concerned about the affective consequences of even a skill learned.

And the last one: out-of-class accessibility and openness to relate to students on their agenda of needs. And that’s an old one. That one’s been around a long time, and it’s one of those that some people can buy it and some people won’t. But it’s still there and it’s still real. And the teacher who is too busy to relate to kids on their agenda is losing an important medium for affective influence.

I hope you’re a little clearer than you were an hour ago about what is involved in business education in the affective domain. And I hope you’re a little less inclined to get wild-eyed in your enthusiasm for a separate curriculum of affective learning. And I hope you are more serious about your own contribution to the affective postures and learnings of the boys and girls in your charge.

I thank you very kindly.