



Values Development Education Program: *Interim Report to the Lilly Endowment*¹

Ted Ward

Introduction

The Values Development Education Program set out to accomplish two major tasks. First was the generation of a theoretical understanding of values development. Second was the generation of curricular materials for values development education.

The first of these two tasks, to generate a theoretical understanding of values development, is essentially completed. This has been done through the research and writing of several people associated with the program. John Stewart brought together various understandings from empirical theories into an empirical/philosophical theory about values development and values development education. Samuel Rowen, Ted Ward and others associated with the program have dealt specifically with the relationship of various empirical/philosophical understandings and theological issues related to values development.

We feel that the three-pronged theoretical basis, consisting of empirical, philosophical, and theological understandings provides us with a sound basis for concentrating our efforts on our second major task of generating curricular materials for values development education. The three-pronged theoretical basis gives support for educational implications that have meaning for public school, religious education, and adult education.

The following report outlines the activities of the Program in pursuing the second major task of generating curricular materials based on the theory. As work was done in designing and disseminating curricular ideas, new theoretical problems and understandings emerged, so that it was necessary to return, periodically, to the theory in order to refine it. This report is divided into three sections that will deal with: 1) field projects; 2) dissemination activities; and 3) practical implications of the theory, which will include some of the refinements of the theory.

I. Field Projects

Two field projects that were begun during the 1974-75 academic year were brought to a close during 1975. They were both located in public elementary schools. The *Just Community Exploratory Project* attempted to work with a total institution attempting to influence the moral atmosphere of the school as a whole. The *Perspectivism Project* worked with selected teachers who were interested in what can be done to help children develop perspectivism.

The Just Community Exploratory Project

The conceptual framework for the project reflects an organismic-structural-developmental approach. The writings of Dewey, Piaget and Kohlberg provide the major theoretical groundwork. A major implication of this conceptual framework, pointed out by John Stewart in his dissertation, is

¹ Interim Report to The Lilly Endowment. The Values Development Education Program. College of Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, December 13, 1976

that “democracy (as a socio-psychological system) is both structure and process for values-moral development and education. That is, democracy is the methodological process that enhances, encourages, and maximizes values/moral development; and principled morality is essentially based on democratic moral principles democratically derived. From this standpoint the school is examined as a values/moral agent.

The concept of the “just community” has been developed through the work of Lawrence Kohlberg. He derived the notion from his understanding that democratic environments provide the opportunity for those factors which promote development. Kohlberg identifies these factors as:

1. Role-taking opportunities
2. Intellectual stimulation
3. Responsibility
4. Cognitive-moral conflict
5. Living in a school perceived as fair and concerned

In *The Just Community Approach to Corrections: A Manual*, Kohlberg, Kaufman, Scharf, and Hickey define certain characteristics for creating a just community. The characteristics for creating a just school would then include: 1) establishing a community based on democracy and fairness, 2) extending responsibility to the members of the school (appropriate to the members’ capabilities), 3) encouraging collective responsibility, 4) creating a climate of trust, 5) establishing a social contract, constitution, rules, 6) raising the moral level of the group as a group.

Further development of the concept of the school as a just community was described in *The School as a Just Community: A Transactional-Developmental Approach to Moral Education*, by John Stewart.

Goals and Objectives

The following goals were identified for the project:

1. To assist the faculty in realizing that values education is a process which is continual, ongoing, and cannot be fragmented or isolated in the school day. In other words, the members of the school community are values agents as they normally interact during a school day.
2. To assist the faculty and staff in exploring the use of democratic principles and methods in the school.
3. To help establish a sense of trust and group unity among all members of the faculty and staff in a community spirit.

It was hypothesized that from these three main goals others more specific in nature would follow for the following year, possibly within the initial phase of this school-based project.

The implementation of the project involved several different means over the nine months of activity. These included: 1) classroom-centered activities: observations, special events, and class meetings; and 2) faculty committee meetings, faculty workshop dinner meeting, planning sessions, individual meetings with teachers, and mini-sessions on theory and practice.

Most of the VDEP staff was involved in the mini-sessions; but the bulk of the activities were carried on by Valerie Janesick and John Stewart. John Stewart acted as coordinator of the project. The main emphasis of the project involved class meetings in the fifth-grade class under the supervision of Valerie Janesick.

The project can be briefly evaluated in light of the three main goals.

1. Through the mechanism of class meetings in one classroom, democratic methods were introduced and practiced in a specific setting. In this instance the second goal of the project was achieved.
2. The teachers on the whole understood that values education can’t be isolated, in fact should be integrated within life in classrooms. Thus the first program goal, as mentioned

- earlier, seems to have been successful.
3. The third major goal of the project was achieved only partially. The failure to achieve the goal was partially evidenced by a lack of understanding and consensus on the goals of the project, which resulted in some frustration among the staff and teachers. There seemed to be no evidence that the school as a whole changed because of the project.

The Perspectivism Project

During the 1974-75 academic year, the Values Development Education Program worked on a sporadic basis with some of the teachers at the Glencairn Elementary School in East Lansing. This involvement was stimulated at the request of the teachers and principal to assist the school faculty in more effectively dealing with some student behaviors that were felt, by the school faculty, to be counter-productive to the goals of the school. Specifically, the faculty were concerned with the growing incidence of student actions that demonstrated a disregard for the feelings of others. It was felt that these actions (i.e. name calling, fighting, destruction of property, etc.) had greatly increased during recent years and attempts by the faculty to effectively deal with them were unsuccessful. The faculty were aware of the complexity of the problem they described and were not looking for immediate answers. They realized the necessity for long-range goals, but wanted assistance in working efficiently toward those goals. In essence, they wanted some reassurance that any immediate strategies they might implement would eventually contribute to the alleviation of the problem.

The specific objectives of our involvement was to help the teachers accomplish the following:

- a) Become more aware of their instructional behaviors.
- b) Be able to better understand exactly what constitutes a behavior problem.
- c) Evaluate the effectiveness of various strategies for promoting perspectivism.
- d) Become aware of the full moral development theory.
- e) Plan appropriate values development education strategies for classroom use.

The primary objective was to examine strategies for assisting teachers in their awareness/understanding of the theories that constitute values development education. It was felt that the opportunity afforded by the involvement with a local school faculty could serve to test dissemination strategies. In particular, the approach that would be examined would be that of a needs-based system for responding to teachers' request.

There appeared to be three strategies for assisting teachers. First, the *entirely needs-based approach* focuses on needs expressed by a teacher, even when the consultants feel that there are more important needs. Second, the *entirely content-based approach* focuses on what the consultants think is important often without much regard for the felt needs of the teacher. Third, the *developmental needs-based approach* works through meeting the teachers expressed needs in such a way that the teacher can become aware of other needs; needs seen in the perspective of developmental theory.

The main result of the Perspectivism Project was the awareness of these three strategies, and an attempt at defining the nature of the *developmental needs-based approach* in such a way that teachers can become more aware of the theory for values development education and its practical implications.

II. Outreach Activities

The project's first phase, as supported by the grant from Lilly Endowment, was to be primarily a matter of developing a foundation for the subsequent practical operations. Nevertheless, a substantial portion of the efforts have gone into outreach activity. One of the major purposes was to become thoroughly aware of the readiness in various professional sectors and to give preliminary exposure to some of the more vital materials. The outreach activities have consisted of three major thrusts: 1) development of training procedures and materials; 2) training activities in the field; and 3)

writing.

Development of Training Procedures, and Materials

Parent training. Jim McCue has given major focus to the concern for family processes that contribute to values development. He has been assisted by others on the staff in developing and refining materials and procedures for helping parents better understand in what ways they affect the development of their children.

The materials have been used in several settings including church workshops for parents, and the Cooperative Extension Service's College week for Women. It was used with the College Week for Women in June, 1975 and June, 1976.

"The Parents' Part in Values Development", October 17-18, 1975. Christ Church, Oakbrook, Illinois, Jim McCue and Ted Ward

A day-and-a-half seminar designed for couples concerning parents' roles in the values development of their children. Over 60 couples attended the seminar. The seminar consisted of lectures, mediated presentations, and participant activities which led to understandings of both theory related to values development, and some practical implications.

Oklahoma Baptist University, November 5, 1975. Ted Ward

A chapel presentation on moral development plus two faculty workshops dealing with the role of faculty members on the level of justice in the college community.

"Family Interaction and Values Development", November 15, 1975. Michigan Women's Commission, Kellogg Center, MSU Jim McCue

A three-hour conference was conducted for over 100 housewives and extension workers from throughout Michigan. It was a series of lecture presentations designed to help the participants understand values development. Suggested family implications included the dimension of support and control, and participatory decision-making.

December 5, 1975. Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois. Ted Ward, Jim McCue, Rod McKean, Steve Hoke

A seven-hour introduction to the area of values development and moral development education was presented for students, faculty, and church education personnel under the auspices of the Dept. of Christian Education of the Graduate School. A definitional review of the problem, a survey of the research in moral development, applications in the areas of theology and in church, and alternative responses were the four topics covered in the one-day workshop.

"The College as a Community for Values Development" January 5, 1976 Bryan College, Dayton, Tennessee. Ted Ward

A series of six seminars were conducted for a faculty in-service training day. The focus of the seminars was one of the ways a faculty has moral influence. A group activity was designed and used to focus on the kinds of experiences people in the community need for moral development and the ways those experiences are or can be provided.

"Workshop in Values Development Education", January 9-10, 1976, Ottawa, Canada, Ted Ward, Jim McCue, Rod McKean, Steve Hoke, Cathy Stonehouse

A ten-hour workshop was presented for over 120 lay people and clergy from the Ottawa area. It was split into two tracks, one for parents and the family, the other for persons involved in church

education. Cathy Stonehouse directed the church education segment and pretested her materials for the module on the levels of moral reasoning. Jim McCue and Rod McKean led the family workshop in exploring 'What is Development,' Content-Structure Distinction, Support and Control, and Responsive Listening.

"Conference on Human Development and Christian Education" January 25-27, 1976

Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, KY. Ted Ward and Donald M. Joy, Professor of Religious Education, Asbury Theological Seminary, Glen Taylor, Peter Mullen, Mildred Wynkoop, Catherine Stonehouse, Michigan State University, Values Development Education Program Staff. This conference was designed in part to be a follow-up to a similar conference held a year earlier. The earlier conference attempted to establish a common understanding of the ground-work in Human Development and Christian Education. This conference was designed to build on that ground-work some practical implications for 1) work in curriculum development, 2) pastoral development—especially continuing education, and 3) educational institutions. This conference consisted of plenary sessions featuring Wynkoop, Stonehouse, Ward, Mullen, Joy, and Taylor, as well as workshop groups which focused on specific areas of practical application. The conference was attended by professionals in church education, both local church and denominational/publishing company personnel, as well as people involved in Christian educational institutions, primarily colleges and seminaries.

"Staley Missions Lectureship", February 17-20, 1976. Canadian Theological College, Regina, Saskatchewan. Ted Ward

A series of lectures for the graduate students of Canadian Theological College, plus some students from Canadian Bible College. The lectures were centered around the ideas of moral development as they related to *leadership*. There were also two meetings with faculty groups: one group interested in student personnel work; and the theological faculty.

"Communicating Values to Your Children", February 20, 1976. Fenton Free Methodist Church, Fenton, Michigan. Rod McKean, Steve Hoke

A six-hour workshop planned for parents to help them understand values development and their role in facilitating their children's development. In three sessions it used mediated presentations and participant activities development, and some implications for a teacher's role in values development education.

"Staley Lecture Series", April 13-16, 1976 Grand Rapids Baptist College, Grand Rapids, MI. Ted Ward

A series of five lectures, primarily for college students, with a focus on moral development. There was also some faculty involved and emphasis was given to the role of the college faculty in the moral development of the students.

Writings

The writings that have been generated in the last year have addressed topics for both public school and religious education. The range has included writings on the level of lay-practitioners and the professional journal level. Following are abstracts of the major writings:

Six Models of Teaching for Values Development (for publication as a journal article)

Moral/values education is being focused upon in nearly every segment of education today. But what is a teacher to do when involved in values education? A model of teaching for values education is helpful. Those things that a teacher does, the teacher acts, can be described by a model of teaching.

A teacher generally uses a basic model of teaching such as “telling” or “guiding” but a model should not be seen as a prescriptive limit to what a teacher can do. The acts of a given teacher can seldom be assigned to only one model. A model of teaching is a logical organization of teacher-acts along with certain theoretical and philosophical assumptions; it is attempt to develop a consistently whole approach to teaching.

Currently in values education at least six models of teaching can be identified. Some view values as being acquired, others as mentally constructed. Some deal with what the cognitive structural developmentalists call “structure,” others deal with “content.” Some are based on the scientific work culminating in Lawrence Kohlberg and some have age-old roots in philosophy and religion.

A “relational model” of teaching seems to be most consistent with the theoretical findings of the cognitive developmentalists. It also rests on a philosophical base that draws from a Judeo-Christian view of man and nature. It involves the teacher “being alongside” the learner in the learner’s naturally occurring developmental *process*, rather than the teacher being involved in giving moral products (“right answers”) to the learner.

Growing Values Under Stained Glass (for publication as a small book)

The Biblical mandate for religious education seems to involve more than merely biblical and doctrinal converts and scholars; it involves discipleship. Discipleship involves a daily process of living the kind of life that Christ did; a life that reveals the person of God. This kind of life involves a commitment to, and lifestyle of justice and mercy and honesty; moral maturity of holiness.

In light of a biblical view of man, the most meaningful explanation about moral development has come from those educators and psychologists who see learning as a developmental process of reconstruction. In the developmental view the learner is seen to be actively constructing mental values. The Apostle Paul tells us that God’s basic revelation of moral order is at the level of *principle*. God has revealed his moral order through his spoken word and creation. In Romans 2 Paul says that the “Gentiles who do not have the Law do instinctively the things of the Law.”

In answering the second question we can learn some things from the work of Jean Piaget and Lawrence Kohlberg. They make a distinction between moral judgment and moral action. Piaget has identified a pattern in intellectual development and the factors which contribute to development. Kohlberg has identified a common pattern in the development of moral judgments. This pattern consists of 3 levels of moral judgment.

Implications for teachers and parents include: 1) provide a learning and growing environment in which justice is central and the participation of everyone in the striving for justice is encouraged, 2) accept the reality of levels of moral development and don’t expect too much of people, especially children, 3) develop a relationship with children and students in which open dialogue and rich experiences are continually shared.

A Theological Book Of Readings

A book of readings is currently in production which will collect papers that deal with theological issues touched on by the values development education theory.

The book contains three sections. The first section is a general but brief introduction into developmental conceptualizations and how they are seen to touch areas of Christian thought and ministry. The second section goes into more detail of the theory and looks closer at more specific concepts of Christian theology. The third section explores the implications of research in moral development for religious education.

Contributors to the book of readings include: Ted Ward, Sam Rowen, Don Joy, Cathy Stonehouse, Ed Seely, Rod McKean, Jim McCue and others.

Research on Moral Judgment: Developmental Implications for Parents and Teachers (for Asbury Seminarian)

In the current widespread interest and attempts to do something about values development, three groups of enthusiasts have emerged: the cult of character, the cult of clarification, and the cult of Kohlberg.

Religious educators are apt to be involved in *character* education which rests heavily on the idea of the parent/teacher *showing and telling* another person the right morals and values. Its main weakness seems to be a lack of effectiveness.

The *values clarification* movement has attempted to identify the importance of people understanding themselves and how values affect their individual lives. Its weakness is its own lack of clarity about the source of values, which leads to ideas about values relativity. It also promotes self-disclosure without identifying situations in which it may or may not be healthy.

The followers of Kohlberg do not all agree on the practical or philosophical implications of Kohlberg's work, but they all do agree on the importance of his research.

In understanding moral development, Kohlberg's research shows that a child's life moral judgments are highly ego—based. At this period rewards and punishments have their greatest potentialities to communicate moral influence. As the child grows, *others* become important as the source of moral authority. At this period the child becomes more alert to models and rules as moral influencers. Later in a person's development, transactions and dialogs with others become more meaningful as people see the source of moral authority in internal ethical principles.

Rewards and punishments, rules and models, and transactions and dialogs always have influence on moral development. But a person's own level of development will determine which kind of influence he or she is more receptive to at a given period of development. Since the pattern of development follows a general pattern related to age periods, practical implications can be generated in light of the general level of development of the particular people one is interested in helping.

Another implication from Kohlberg's research is that the quality of justice in the learning environment in which practical strategies are employed will affect the positive influence of those strategies.

III. Practical Implications of the Theory

As we have attempted to help people understand the theory for values development education, and find implications of the theory, and as we have observed ways in which other people have attempted to build educational implications on the theoretical work of Piaget and Kohlberg, we have become aware of new ideas within the theory which will influence the practical application of the theory.

Concepts About Development

Following are a series of short statements about some of the ideas that emerge from our exploration of theoretical literature in order to build a foundation for instructional approaches.

American thought is characterized by *more, bigger, and faster*. This kind of thinking is also present in education. Even educators who attempt to build their ideas and practices on the theories of the cognitive structural developmentalists sometimes see development as something to "make happen", "stimulate", or "increase."

However, a careful consideration of the ideas of Piaget, and even those of Dewey, reveal that development can be seen as a naturally occurring phenomenon. It cannot be made to happen. Intellectual development is the result of reconstructing understandings and ideas through the process of trying to interpret one's experiences. Providing certain kinds of experiences is all that educators can do. The mental construction (development) occurs within the learner and cannot be manipulated.

Often people who talk about structural stages are seen as prescribing an order or pattern

through which people can be stimulated. This is an inaccurate understanding of structural stages. Structural stages are seen as ways of understanding development as it naturally occurs. Both Piaget and Kohlberg describe development that does in fact naturally occur, not development as it can be made to happen.

Holistic Concerns

Affective education is currently being emphasized after a seemingly long neglect. Sputnik was fuel for the fire of the essentialists who saw the purpose of education as only the developing of cognitive skills and storing of knowledge. However, it may be that the current emphasis on affective education is as lopsided as the essentialists appeared to be.

Can a learner really be divided into an *affective domain* and a *cognitive domain* in such a way that education can impact them separately? What learner learns some math skills without at the same time developing favorable or unfavorable attitudes about math? Likewise what student learns historical facts without passing some sort of judgment on the appropriateness of the acts of the people; or on the sort of implication, or lack of it, of the historical lesson for contemporary situation? What learner is daily exposed to a teacher or series of teachers without developing some moral ideas about how people should be treated? No, the division cannot be made! The human being is a holistic being.

Holism seemed to be recognized by historical thinkers such as Plato and Dewey as well as by contemporary psychologists such as Piaget and it is also important to realize that the levels (and stages) are not technically descriptions of people; there is no such thing as “stage-four person” but descriptions of value judgments that are made by people. A healthier view of values development and of people as learners is more likely to follow from looking at the broader and underlying nature of growth and development rather than specific time and situation-bound products of that development.

Role of Environment

When educators focus on the stages of development they tend to define educational implications that are stage-specific. A focus on the process of developing can enable an educator to define implications appropriate for all stages.

One of the factors which Piaget says contributes to development is experiences that one has with the physical and social environment. In light of the idea of the naturalness of development, it is seen that the environment does not, and cannot be manipulated to make development happen. The environment presents experiences that can stimulate thinking, or provide new data that can be applied to specific problems. Or it can be seen that the environment can fail to provide potentially contributive experiences.

The richness of one’s environment in providing experiences that encourage and enhance intellectual problem-solving plays a major role in development.

The Relational Model of Teaching

Human development, including values/moral development is seen as a naturally occurring phenomenon. It doesn’t need to be *stimulated, induced, or taught*. Therefore the role of the teacher is seen differently than it is commonly seen. The role of the teacher is determined by the conditions of development.

The conditions of development include experiences and the person’s mental process of interpreting and attempting to make sense of the experiences. The mental process is internal and cannot be manipulated by a teacher. Experiences that contribute to development include social interaction. It is through processing interpersonal experience that a learner develops ideas about value and moral judgment. The quality of interpersonal relationships seems to have a major effect on moral development.

Thus the role of a teacher is seen as being involved in an interpersonal relationship with the

learner, a relationship characterized by *justice*, by a concern for what Piaget calls *mutual respect*, and a concern for the *self-esteem* of the learner. The teacher is also seen as one who provides experiences that encourage the mental inquiry process that is a condition of development. The role of the teacher is not primarily seen as a provider of knowledge or *right answers*.

A relational model of teaching seems to contribute to overall development better than other models of teaching. It is not without its problems, however. It appears that it will be harder to carry out as it puts major responsibility on the judgment of the teacher and the ability of the teacher to promote interpersonal relationships.

Source Orientation

In moral education an important question demands a clear answer: Where do moral values come from? A pluralistic society finds it very difficult to come to some common agreement as to where values come from. It is reasoned that if all values are relative to given cultures, then educators have no right to teach a value which is relative to a particular culture.

The basis of this form of relativistic argument rests ultimately on the assumption that humans are the final or ultimate reference point in human thought and action. Judeo-Christian reasoning rests on the presupposition that God, speaking by his Spirit in the Word, is the final or ultimate referent. In the end one must appeal to something or someone outside the system to establish its basic axioms. Secular society answers the first question in a relativistic fashion: "It depends on the situation or upon the particular society's norms." The biblical view answers that there needs to be a reference to an objective standard or criterion of values. The Christian for example, sees this objective referent in the divinely revealed Word of God and in his creation, God is the source. Although an organismic-structural-developmental view can be rationalized on naturalistic and humanistic grounds alone, a Judeo-Christian view of values implies or demands some essential (though perhaps minimal) nomothetic elements. In other words, values development, in the frame of reference of the church, includes a concern for both the naturalistic (creational) and the scriptural (revealed) dimensions or aspects of values.

Since Kohlberg ultimately appeals his case for the centrality of justice to a humanistic philosophy and to the aspirations of a democratic society, and since he does not adequately deal with the source of values or with the developmental function of obedience, a biblical perspective that informs the understanding of source and the human being's orientation to source is necessary to complete the model of values development.

Re-examination of Kohlberg's findings in biblical perspective suggests that the three levels are better explained as three stages of orientation to source of values. Level I: Self as source; Level II: Recognition of externality of source; Level III: Incorporation into oneself of the principles from the external source so that they become internal and liberating. Kohlberg's model is constructively augmented by a biblical view of humanity's response to authority. Three levels of response to authority can be seen as inherent in the three levels of structural development. Level I: response to authority as response to forces which are seen as punishing or rewarding; Level II: response to authority in respect for that authority and the worthiness of its being; Level III: response to the principles seen as essence of authority, willingly, even eagerly, as appropriate in a relationship of love.

Further, we can see the two basic biblical exhortations, to obedience and to trust, as the keys to deliverance from the pathological stalemates, respectively at the hurdle from Level I to Level II and from Level II to Level III.

People who are concerned about adult education seem to be more open to "other-than-schooling" approaches to developmental needs. They are also more open to seeing developmental needs of people holistically and to focus on human development in its larger senses rather than merely focusing on cognitive recall and manual skills, though many schooling approaches to adult education

are still limited to the latter focus.

The new concern for equity of relationships in cross-cultural relations makes cross-cultural educational enterprises very ripe for a developmental approach to learning. In the developmental approach the teacher is seen as standing alongside the learner in helping the learner identify significant personal needs and helping the learner develop solutions to those needs. Adult education, especially in cross-cultural settings, seems to be most open to a developmental approach to education.

Role of the Family

The family is an important educator. This fact was recognized by the December 1974 issue of *Teachers College Record* which was entirely given to exploring the family as educator. The role of the family involves education beyond mere cognitive skills and recall, but is holistic in involving socialization as well.

As the process of values development has been described, as well as the kinds of influences that contribute to development, it has become clear that the family is the educational context most suitable for providing for values development.

In the family, people are more naturally involved in a relational model of teaching. In the family, "the educator" is more likely to be concerned for the developing persons' needs and continued growth. The family is capable of providing social experiences that age-segregated schools and the topic-focused community groups are unable to provide. The family is more capable of being flexible and responsive to its members' current real needs, than being previously committed to a content or agenda.

Religious Education

The commitment to values has always been a basic element of religion. At times it has been jealously maintained that values development and moral education are the private domain of religion. This position has, on numerous occasions and in numerous ways, been challenged.

The battle over the teaching of values is not as intense in the religious sector as it is in the public sector. First, one of the basic assumptions related to the propagation of religion is for the teaching and development of moral values in its adherents. On the other side, however, it has been argued that religion has no unique role. Kohlberg says (1972: 16), "Religion and religious education also do not appear to have a unique role in moral development . . . In general, our studies indicate that variations in religious affiliation and attendance are unrelated to moral development." But it is seldom questioned that the development of moral values is a primary purpose of religion. Therefore, the problem of whether values should or can be taught is not a central issue in the religious sector. It is an assumed obligation and possibility.

It would be nice to put the issue at rest here and claim that values development is the private domain of religion (along with the family) or that all public institutions ought to admit the inherent superiority of the religious institutions in this area. However, the fact that it might be easier institutionally to teach values does not mean that success is inherent in religious institutions. One of the great questions to be answered is how people committed to the same faith can have such radically different values toward a given issue. How can people committed to the Christian faith have such divergent views on race, politics, war, social welfare, etc.? Some of the differences may be explained by showing that there are substantive variations in the content of faith. But there are too many instances where the same substance is used to come to almost irreconcilably different value orientations. There is not a solid foundation for ease in the religious sector. The issue of what values are and how they are taught and learned remains a critical issue.

Integration of Biblical Theology

The Bible is basically a developmental document, developmentally unfolding, developmental in concept and developmental in its assumptions about man and man's relation to God. The Bible reveals principle to be the highest structural level of human morality (e.g., higher than prescriptive (legalistic) obedience, Hosea 6:6, Matthew 9:13, 12:7, 5:21-48, Romans 7:6). For these reasons it can be concluded that a developmental view of moral values incompatible with biblical premises.

We see that the propositions and assumptions underlying Kohlberg's research respect the reality of essential righteousness (as defined biblically in terms of justice). Further, Kohlberg's findings relate human values to the fundamental issue of authority. We conclude that Kohlberg's findings can be understood in biblical perspective.

Therefore, we have begun inquiry into the theological issues involved in values development education as they relate to the cognitive-developmental approach to moral education as described by Lawrence Kohlberg and more recently elaborated by John Stewart.

The particular methodology used in this inquiry is philosophical analysis, based on the classical Biblical-Christian approach. More precisely, it is predicated on the view that the Hebrew-Christian Scriptures are a revelation of the divine will. In probing issues relating to the nature of man, for example, the approach will be to look at the biblical data to ascertain the value of the congruities or incongruities which may exist.

The conclusions reached and interpretations rendered will flow from the application of the method to the data under consideration. It is important to understand the method in order to understand the conclusions. The basic discipline in this theological methodology has been the scientific exegesis of the Scriptures. This raises the issue of hermeneutics (the science of interpretation) and the view assumed is the historical-grammatical approach which is the historic protestant hermeneutic.

So What Can We Do?

The above ideas about values development and its educational implications tell more of what education shouldn't be than what it should be. Or, though positive, they may be seen to be so general that they are hard to put into practice. Thus we ask ourselves, "So what *can* we do? The following set of statements explores this problem.

1. Values development has both *process* and *outcomes*. The outcomes are usually seen as either the content of people's values, or, in the "Kohlberg" sense, the structural stages of development; the process is the growth and restructuring that are characteristic of the stages.
2. It seems to be normal for people to look at the outcomes first and see only the stage descriptors and characteristics of the stage system. But outcome can also be seen as continued growth and development.
3. As one seriously examines the process of values development one realizes that seeing *continued growth* as the outcome is more consistent with the process than to see a *stage* as an outcome.
4. People who look at the stage outcomes tend to see them as static descriptors and they attempt to design education that can move people from one stage to another, giving only passing attention to the process of values development.
5. Those who see the outcome of continued growth as more consistent with the process of values development say that educational design based upon focusing on stages and stage growth may be unnecessary or even a hindrance to the outcomes of continued growth.
6. These typical educational purposes are based on the idea of changing people's stage of moral judgment. They may be counter-productive:
 - a) Trying to induce disequilibrium

- b) Trying to move a person from one stage to another
 - c) Trying to make development to happen (or to accelerate development)
 - d) Trying to communicate value content at an appropriate level.
7. In designing instructional experiences one should always ask, “What can we do?” only after answering the, question, “What ought we to do?” Some strategies can appear to have immediate beneficial results, but their appropriateness can ultimately be evaluated only in terms of what ought to be done. When we assume that the appropriate purpose is continued growth, the primary focus of the educator must be on processes of development and their continuation as the important outcomes.
8. We suggest seven functions in which educators ought to be involved. Performing these functions will provide experiences which will enhance the process of values development and lead to the outcome of continued growth.
- The seven tasks of an educator are the following:
- 1) To stimulate inquiry
 - 2) To stimulate verbalization
 - 3) To ask “why?”
 - 4) To provide experiences wherein moral issues are examined
 - 5) To dialogue (listen responsively)
 - 6) To explore disequilibrium states with the dis-equilibrated
 - 7) To stand alongside.
9. Various specific teaching methods and materials can be used to accomplish the important tasks of an educator in values development education.

IV. Next Steps

The remaining months of supported activity are committed to the development of exemplary instructional materials. In an urgent attempt to clear the way for more responsible approaches to values education, we are now attempting to create a small variety of sample and pilot teaching units.