



Values Development Education: *Are You Ready?*¹

Ted Ward, Duane Elmer, Richard Muzik

I. What is it all About?

Are you ready to participate in Values Development Education? Surprise! You're already involved in it; you have been for years. As a teacher, you affect people's values. We could say the same thing about parents. Perhaps everyone is involved one way or another in values development education. Since each of us serves as a role model and a shaper of the behavior of others, to some extent, everyone is in the act.

But in a very special way, teachers and counselors are more deliberately and more responsibly involved in values development than are *many* other persons except parents. Values development is not just a matter for religious leaders and inspirational speakers! Whether you realize it or not, you are having a very powerful effect on the values development of young men and women.

The idea that school is only concerned with "reading, writing, and arithmetic" is absurd. For too long we have let test designers and educational speculators assure us that since we can't do anything predictable in the area of affective learning that we should see the school only in terms of the cognitive skills and information that it imparts. The tendency to divide learning into cognitive and affective factors is responsible for some of the important shortcomings in American education. It is clear to anyone who reflects on his own experience that all facts, and skill processes are learned in situations in which feelings, attitudes, and values also play very important part.

Rather than thinking of affective learning and cognitive learning as two different things, it would be better to realize that cognitive learning and effective learnings go hand-in-hand and are best seen as a set of affective colorings of cognitive stuff. Affects (feelings and beliefs) don't exist in the abstract. They exist in reference to particular things, ideas, or information. Similarly, cognition (knowledge and mental processes) don't exist in a colorless vacuum—instead, they are the knowledge stuff that floats about in a person's great sea of feelings, attitudes, beliefs, and values.

Educators today are showing more interest in their role in values development than one can remember in recent experience. Indeed, although the approaches are very different, the only precedent in the history of American education is in the colonial Puritan tradition where specific virtues were to be imparted and nurtured by the schoolteacher. What lies behind the great interest today? Some have suggested that it is just one more fad. For sure, there is always the danger that even the important things in education can become matters of fad and overkill. Perhaps the tendency of American educators to jump on the most exciting current bandwagon is somewhat responsible for the widespread interest in values and approaches to values education. But we think that it goes far deeper.

¹ Ted Ward, Duane Elmer, Richard Muzik. Values Development Education: Are You Ready? Self-Examination and Introduction for Teachers and Counselors. The Values Development Education Program, Michigan State University, 1974

Three factors are especially important in understanding the current interest; in fact, if these three factors are carefully observed and respected, it is quite likely that the faddism can be kept to a minimum. Perhaps the most important factor is the growing solemn awareness that all is not well in the educational establishment. Schools are being called to account for their products. The nation has been experiencing a growing sense of malaise, perhaps rooted in many different sources. The fact that general affluence has not produced a state of bliss and secure happiness is perhaps one source. Anxiety about instability in the world, coupled with the growing awareness that America does not rule and control the world, is another; more currently, we have begun to wonder if we even rule and control ourselves! Clearly, all is not well on the home front and the schools must share some of the responsibility for the predicament we are in. We are *beginning* to see the price that must be paid for over-investment in the sort of schooling that values success higher than it values integrity. More and more it becomes clear that schooling of the book learning sort doesn't lead automatically to "the good life."

Perhaps the people who have been writing about "the hidden curriculum" were right after all! For about fifteen years they have been calling our attention to the proposition that schools teach not only what they claim to teach but also a curriculum that is sometimes not even understood by those who run the school. The hidden curriculum, in this sense, refers not to some subversive plot to deliberately undermine this society, but rather to the hidden and yet persistent way in which those things that are basic and fundamental in the social and philosophical orientation of the school are more powerfully teaching about what is important in life than do the teachers through all their telling, showing, and requiring of reading and writing. Especially since the late 1960's when the whole country was caught up in a new concern over rights and privileges of citizenship, the way that people are treated in a learning environment has become of concern to students and teachers everywhere. We are concerned in new ways and to new depths about the meaning of "due process." We are aware of the illogical assumption that people will develop democratic values in an authoritarian structure. We are now sensitized to all sorts of ways in which the inconsistency in what we say and what we do produces results that are devastating. As never before, educators are willing to face up to these issues and to seek out ways of doing something constructive to resolve them.

Ironically, the second important factor underlying the current surge of interest in values development and the role of education in values formation is technological. The widespread interest in instructional technology and the development of a wider range of tools for effective learning has produced a much expanded storehouse of ways and means to accomplish educational goals. Instructional games and simulations have become a newly respectable major category of educational procedures. Although the value of learning through a game has been recognized for centuries, formal education has rarely taken very seriously the possibilities of developing important learnings through anything so frivolous as a learning game. Within industry and the military, training procedures have utilized simulations for many years. But then, training isn't the same as education, is it? Because many educators tend to draw this unfortunate distinction between teaching and training, instructional simulation has been left to industrial and technical training until very recently.

Instructional games were once thought appropriate for their motivational characteristics. If you can't get someone interested any other way, let them play a game using the information and skills that you are trying to teach. And simulations were seen as mainly poor substitutes for practical experience in situations where it was too dangerous or too expensive to train people in more concrete ways. But all of this is changing rapidly. We are now aware that the reason that games are motivating and the reason that simulations are potent lie in the fact that instructional games and Simulations are usually

highly loaded with affective learning potentialities. Thus, for the very reason that they are effective in providing rapid cognitive skill development, instructional simulations are also a newly opened door to affective development itself. Now there is a substantial response to the wearying complaint of educators who are hung up on cognitive learning, "But we don't know how to do anything about affective learning--there aren't any instructional procedures that will produce predictable results." We do know: it is now possible to provide, on schedule if necessary, curricular experiences in the development of attitudes and values.

Affective goals cannot be viewed in the same way that we look at cognitive goals. We can't very well reduce affective objectives to the sort of specificity that Robert Mager helps us to see in cognitive learning. And it is likely just as well that we can't, since one of the crucial issues is whether or not we have any business programming people to like or dislike, to Value X over Y or to believe a certain belief. Instructional games and simulations provide exposure and development experience, but they don't show much promise as vehicles through which to inculcate pre-specified value content or positions on issues. So we're relatively safe on that score. But we can help people develop *structures* of values within themselves. The new-found respectability of instructional games and simulations opens the door for the development of a wide range of new approaches to learning experiences that will be important in the development of values.

The third factor underlying the excitement about values development education is the theoretical basis for understanding values development that has recently become available through the work of Lawrence Kohlberg of Harvard University. Although it rarely gets much attention within the profession, substantial educational development almost always occurs after the development of the needed theoretical basis. Educators can play around with procedures and methods and approaches without adequate theory—and quite often a fad can result—but until the theoretical understanding of the nature of the phenomena is developed, nothing substantial happens. Thus it is a most happy coincidence that the earlier work of Jean Piaget and John Dewey has been specifically extended into the matter of how values develop within the human being by the important longitudinal studies of Kohlberg.

We now have something substantial to build on. We have a clear picture of what happens within a person as his value structure develops. We know, for example, that there is a difference between the content of a value system and the structure underlying that system. Thus we are able to make a distinction between teaching the particulars of a content value and helping people develop structurally. Since most anxieties and hostile Complaints about the school's involvement in values education are related to matters of content, we have a responsible answer to this sort of layman's concern. We are also indebted to Kohlberg for important fresh insight into the relationship between cognitive development and moral development. We have a way to understand some previously unexplained observations about the difficulty of children understanding certain value-oriented concepts.

Taken together these three factors constitute a critical mass of readiness for rapid development of new approaches to values development education, within the project at Michigan State University, our problem has not been the matter of getting people interested in what we are doing, but rather to keep people from beating down the door to prematurely put to use the things that we are working on. It seems that everyone is eager to get involved in some form of values development education. The phenomenal expansion of the values clarification approach as Practiced by Simon, Kirshenbaum, Howe and others is a symptom of the same eagerness. But we hold that not everyone should be

involved in the deliberate teaching of values experiences related to values development. Although as we noted in early part of this paper, every teacher, indeed every person, is involved in values development whether they are aware of it or not, we expect that some educators ought not to increase their involvement beyond the casual-and informal. We are concerned about the problem of teacher readiness.

Your readiness for values development education leadership is a matter of understandings, skills, and, most importantly, your own orientation toward others. Development education is sure to be related to how well you understand values development—and you can help yourself through reading. It will also depend on your skills in handling discussions and counseling situations. These skills don't emerge overnight, though workshops and the training experiences will help. But your effectiveness will also depend on *you* as a person and how *you* view others and act toward others. Here there may be some deep-seated difficulties. Before you decide to plunge ahead into values development education, take a look at yourself through the questions and problems that are presented following. For you, this exercise will be a sort of “values confrontation” experience: where do you stand and why?

On the basis of what we've discovered about values development and the ways teachers and counselors can and do relate to it, we also see this as a sort of readiness test. We claim no predictive reliability for it, so don't take it as the last word; but it will ask you to face up to some matters that are important, according to the best evidence we've seen. Are you ready?

II. Readiness Test

After you decide on your response to each item, turn to the numbered paragraph indicated for your response. The paragraphs are in the back pages of the booklet. In the numbered paragraph you will find some interesting feedback. The number of points to add to your score will be specified. Please write the score value in the blank beside each problem.

POINTS

1. What do you look for as-strong evidence that learning is occurring? _____
 - a. Listening and attention. (See paragraph 112)
 - b. Problem-solving and acting out new ideas. (See paragraph 130)
 - e. Responding in class and scoring high on tests. (See paragraph 103)

2. Your class has just completed a study on social issues in your school. _____

One of the points emphasized was equality and dignity of all people.
The president of the student council, a member of your class, comes to you for advice on forming a committee to investigate racism in the school.
The student wants your support in the project. How would you respond?

 - a. Support him and suggest he develop it in his own way, or with some like-minded fellow students. (See 145.)
 - b. Support him but suggest that he turn it over to the committee on faculty-student relations. (See 120)
 - c. Remain neutral and-keep yourself out-of-the matter. Help him to see why the issue is apt to get him into trouble. (See 144)

3. Because you are a conscientious teacher, you are concerned that your philosophy of education, teaching principles and classroom structure are consistent with good learning theory. You operate on the belief that

- a. The child is shaped and determined largely by environmental factors. (See 104)
- b. The child is born with instincts and drives which need to be controlled and molded so that he can become a good citizen and take his place in society. (See 127)
- c. The child is a participant in his own development; both the child and the environment shape each other. (See 129)4.

4. You are telling a story to a second grade class. The story:

A little boy climbed up on a chair and reached into the cupboard to take a cookie. His mother had told him not to. As he was climbing down, he broke one cup. In the house next door a second little boy heard his mother call him to help her in the kitchen. He was so eager to help that he rushed into the kitchen. He pushed the door open so hard that it hit his mother and she dropped four cups and they broke. Now you ask the class, “Which boy was more naughty?” You predict that

- a. Most children will say “the boy who broke one cup.” (See 102)
- b. Most will say “the boy who caused four cups to break”. (See 125)
- c. The class will be divided on the issue. (See 115)

5. A family of another racial group has moved into a house near yours. You would want to

- a. Make an effort to get to know them fairly soon. (See 124)
- b. Wait about a month until they can get settled. (See 142)
- c. Casually get acquainted at a convenient time. (See 109)

6. Some of the music students come to you with the protest that the athletes in the school are given preferential treatment. They state their case explicitly and want the privileges equalized or extended to all groups in the school. Your response probably would take the form of

- a. Hearing them out so they can get it out of their system. (See 117)
- b. Offer to get their complaint on the agenda for a faculty
- c. Suggest they take their case to the Student Council. (See 108)

7. Imagine yourself teaching a high school history class. Things seem to have been going very well and you are happy with the progress of the class as you approach the end of the term. You estimate that the students had verbally interacted with you in class

- a. Enough—about 10% of the class-time. (See 106)
- b. Quite a lot—about 10-25% of the class time. (See 111)
- c. Very much—about 25-40% of the class time. (See 128)

8. Much to her surprise, the teacher has discovered a student cheating on an exam. The exam is to count as one-third of the grade for the semester. The teacher informs the principal and together they discuss the matter with the school counselor. Which position would you take?, _____

- a. The *teacher* thinks the student should be given a failing mark on the exam (See 140)
- b. The principal believes the student ought to be given a chance to retake the exam and be penalized one letter grade. (See 114)
- c. The *counselor* suggests that the student be given extra assignments relating to the material and then be allowed to retake the exam with no further penalty. (See 118)

9. A five year old child is playing with some other children. The child refuses to share the blocks with the others and the game they were playing is ruined. What do you think? _____

- a. The child knows better but is selfish. (See 126)
- b. The child does not yet understand sharing. (See 143)
- c. The child has not yet been taught to share. (See 113)

10. You are scheduled to teach a class in social studies. You are considering your goals for the course. Of the following which would you consider most important _____

- a. To encourage curiosity and exploration of social relationships. (See. 101)
- b. To convey the values of parents and society to the student. (See 119)
- c. To equip the learner with knowledge and skills for success in the future. (See 122)

11. As part of a community-school study team, you are asked to help put a finger on needed improvement. Questions have been raised about the school and its relationship, to the students, with special attention to the principles of democratic process. After careful thought, you have concluded that your school is in many ways like schools in general. Your opinion is that: _____

- a. The school is not as democratic as it could be. (See 123)
- b. The school is about as democratic as it can be. (See 121)
- c. The school is more democratic than it should be. (See 107):

TOTAL SCORE _____

Your score suggests the next step you might take toward becoming more involved in values development education. Three different steps are suggested:

If your score is below 30, you will likely want to read in order to become more acquainted with the principles underlying values development education. We would urge you not to try to lead any values

clarification or values confrontation exercises with students until you brush up on your non-directive discussion leadership skills.

If your score is 30-40, you are likely ready for an intensive workshop in values development education. Through such a workshop you would have opportunities to see and participate in some experiences that would give further insight into what values are and how they develop. Your score is higher than would result from random choice, so you at least have many of the important ideas in mind.

If your score is 41 or over, at least you know some of the important “right answers”. How far is what you know from what you actually do with students? If you recognize that you operate inconsistently most of the time, take ten points off your score and drop back to the step above. But if you feel that your responses are fairly indicative of the way you actually relate to students, we’d be rather optimistic about your doing some developmental work with your students rather soon.

The next two sections of this booklet are especially intended for you. Section III is an introduction into the theory underlying values development education. It is especially concerned with what we know from Kohlberg’s research and how these, principles relate to what a teacher can do to help young people develop in healthy ways.

III. The Scope of Values Development Education

Now for a bit of theory: as indicated in Section I, the new research in values development provides a sound basis for more knowledgeable educational planning.

What is Values Development Education?

Values development education is concerned with what it is like to be a child, with the importance of being a teacher, with the basic purposes and goals of education, with the nature of justice and with the value of life.

Does all of this seem important? Yes, it is *very* important. Education toward the development of values can be approached four different ways. The *traditional-authoritarian approach* is the most widely practiced. This approach assumes that there are absolute values which must be transmitted to the child. Everything can be divided into clear-cut matters of right and wrong; by the application of punishment and reward the child can be shaped into a functional member of society. Values are constant, everywhere and always the same.

The second approach—the *cultural relativity approach*, is similar except that it assumes that each culture may have different values. It relies on social experience to induce guilt and anxiety within the child. These experiences and especially the feelings they produce shape the conscience and the personality. Thus, introspection and self-criticism coupled with peer pressure and social approval are the forces that develop the child—adapting him or her to the values of the society.

The *absolute relativity approach*, the third approach sharply contrasts with the first. It rejects any absolute values, even those that have their roots in a particular culture. Everything is left to the individual child. What he or she decides about good and bad is what matters. Presumably there should be no punishment or guilt-inducing sanctions: the child should have absolute freedom to develop without “hang-ups”. Values are all relative and changeable, according to this approach.

Each of these three positions seems seriously inadequate. In our attempt to find a position that takes account of more factors, we have suggested a fourth approach based on several significant precedents in social science and philosophy. We call it the *organismic-structural-developmental approach*. Every word in this long title is important. *Organismic* refers to the concept of the person as a functional whole—not divided into parts and dissected for study. The emphasis is on the integrated state of persons rather than on the many parts and aspects of their being. To be human is more than body, soul, and spirit; a whole person is more than a sum of parts! The organismic view sees people as healthy and promising, rather than as sick and confused. Further, the organismic approach does not see people as a passive victim of their environment, but as active, constructive, valuing organisms in a state of interaction with the environment. Thus, the human personality is not just a product of culture, but is seen as the producer and shaper of culture, influencing and being influenced. This stands in direct contrast to much of the popular behavioristic personality theory

Structural refers to the underlying rationale and cognitive processes of an individual's behavior. A structural view is as concerned about the *why* of behavior as about the *what* of behavior. For example, one person might answer "No" to the question, "Is honesty always the best policy?"

And another person might answer, "Yes." From a structural viewpoint, would want to know more before passing judgment on these people. Judgment about a person's morality must be based on more than the verbal response to a question about a "virtue". No matter which way a person answers a yes-no, right-wrong, good-bad question we have little indication of that individual's level or kind of moral reasoning. The answer could indicate only a superficial verbal behavior (the *what* or content of a value) and we know nothing about the deeper processes of rationale and thought (the *why* or structure of a value) underlying that answer. Thus we conclude that it is difficult, if not impossible, to judge morality on the basis of *content*. Instead we must probe into structure and discover why the individual said "no" or "yes"! If one accepts the idea of structure, he criticizes educational efforts that are loaded down with teachers' right answers while neglecting the matter of right reason! A person's overall behavior is less related to the answers he has learned to give than to the reasons he has in giving the answers! To a person who sees the importance of structure, it makes a difference whether a student acts honestly because honesty is being rewarded or because he believes the principle of honesty is right and good. It makes a difference whether a person sees honesty as good because of what he gets out of it, or because he has in mind the good of others. Even if he accepts honesty as a principle larger than any rule about honesty, we would want to see what underlies his belief in that principle.

Developmental refers to the natural growth of an individual through a series of stages. Research in human development shows that all human beings grow up through the same basic stages regardless of cultural differences. The most thorough and well-documented research in the development of human thought and reasoning processes has been conducted by Jean Piaget and his followers. Piaget, a Swiss psychologist, whose intense interest in children, has led to a productive and influential career in the study of human development, sees four stages of 'cognitive (thought) development, regardless of national background, race, culture or language. Children's thought processes develop through four stages, each building upon the former. This means that at each stage the child is reasoning on a different level than at the previous stage. Every child begins in the stage of senses and physical movements (*sensorimotor*), developing to the stage of basic speech and elementary thinking (*pre-operational*), to logical thinking limited to concrete ideas (*concrete operations*) initially to abstract and hypothetical thinking (*formal operations*). Herein lies one of the applications for values development: is a four-year old child able to understand the "adult"-concept of honesty? Sharing? The "golden rule"? Fair play?

An adult may interpret a child's response as being at a higher level of reasoning while the response is actually at a more elementary level. Thus adults, usually confuse themselves when they view children as miniature adults who can be helped to see things from an adult perspective. Piaget reminds us that only after the child proceeds through three other necessary and sequential stages of cognitive development will he be ready for "adult" reasoning (formal operations).

In summary, the organismic-structural-developmental approach is based on a view of humanity and their relationships with the environment fundamentally different from other approaches. It is concerned about the developing human being; how a person develops cognitively, in valuing processes, the resultant behaviors; it is concerned, in a special way, about the relationship of the child to home, school, and other social institutions

The Stages of Moral Development

Lawrence Kohlberg of Harvard University has provided a significant breakthrough in the understanding of how values develop within the individual. In a longitudinal study of seventy people, begun in the 1950s and is still continuing, he has observed six distinct stages of moral development. In the cross-cultural studies based on his own early finding, he discovered that the same six stages were the same in other culture. Each of the six stages represents a different structural basis for making moral decisions. In effect, Kohlberg discovered that there are six stages of the development of the structure (the "why") of moral judgment. In *Stage 1* (typical of children roughly 5-11 years of age) a person will base their moral judgments on what is punished or not punished. *Good, right, and moral* are determined by what is not punished. What is bad is that which punished. For this reason Stage 1 is called the *punishment and obedience orientation*.

Stage 2 is the stage of *instrumental relativism*, best summarized as a concern for "what's in it for me." At this stage what is right is what promotes one's own good. Everything and everybody are viewed as instruments to promote one's own well-being. In both of these earliest stages, people are egocentric; justice is seen individually—getting even or getting your share. Stages 1 and 2 are concerned with self-serving.

Stage 3 is called *interpersonal concordance*. Moral decisions are based upon a stereotypic role definition. That is, what would the "good girl," the "good boy," the "good administrator," the "good teacher," or "good student" do? Peer pressure is very important at this stage so the expectations of other people often determine what one values. Whoever one sees as an important person is especially influential—for adolescents in Stage 3, peers are especially important.

Stage 4 is *orderliness through law*. Society is seen as being superior to individuals; individuals exist to serve society. This, moral decisions are based on one's duty to society and the responsibilities of a law-abiding citizen. Justice is a societal matter and therefore the purpose of punishment is the improvement of society. Stages 3 and 4 are concerned with social law.

The 5th stage, the *social contract orientation*, sees society as existing to serve people and to maximize human and individual potential. What is important is less a matter of what is best for the individual than what is best for the most people. The "best" state of human life is seen as a mutual interdependence of all people.

The top of the stage-scale is the 6th stage, self-chosen universal ethical principles. The highest value is seen as human life itself, and moral decisions are made on the basis of what will maximize life—and

particularly, justice in life—for every person, Both Stages 5 and 6 are concerned with social principles rather than with self-concern, social pressure or law as an end in itself.

What are some of the implications for educators? Even if all this sound theoretical, its implications are very practical:

For the *Curriculum*: Most of the educational emphasis in the school is on the content level to the neglect of structure. A student often knows the “right answer” (content) but not the reasoning for that answer; sometimes he or she does not even believe the “right” answer is right. Yet they know when to say it! It is also possible for a student to get straight “A”s in math and yet graduate hating the subject, never wanting to hear about it or work with it again. Is this education? All cognitions have accompanying effects. Knowing cannot exist without its accompanying feelings. Everything people learn they learn also to have feelings about. They learn what and who, to trust—when to be themselves, when to act a role.

For the *Structure of the School*: Our society trusts the school to teach “tomorrow’s citizens” to maintain the democratic system. Thus, it is important to ask if the school is practicing the democratic principles of justice, freedom, and equality which it purports to teach. If not, which will the student learn—the school verbalizations or its practices? At what stage does the school operate: punishment and obedience, law and order, or on universal ethical principles? What sort of resolution does it offer to children who must deal *now* with this society’s persistent clash between integrity and aspiration to “succeed.”

For *Communication*: Is the purpose of the school to teach the child what he ought to know and believe? Is “knowing” more a matter of facts or of processes? To what extent does the classroom encourage the spirit of inquiry, individual reflective thought, interaction, and problem-solving? To the extent that communication with the students is one-way and authoritarian, real learning is retarded. If learners were computers, the school could be designed to efficiently program them but since they are real people in the midst of a developmental process, they need opportunities for continuing transactions with teachers, peers, and subject matter. They need support and encouragement, not pressure and rejection.