



Values Development Education Program (VDEP): Progress Report 1976

Ted Ward

The Values Development Education Program (VDEP), a special program of research, development and education located in the College of Education, Michigan State University is now in the middle of its second year. The first year was a phase-up period, involving a small staff (1½ professional persons plus support team). Now the project is staffed by three professional persons, six doctoral fellows, one secretary, and part-time clerical help. In addition, a substantial contribution of time and expertise has come to the project from several divisions of the university, notably the Department of Religious Studies and the College of Human Ecology.

What We Said We Wanted to Do

In the *Rationale* of the proposal to The Lilly Endowment we described three major emphases to be pursued in the Research and Development Program for Values Development Education (now called the Values Development Education Program; VDEP, for short):

1. Research, with a special emphasis on collative and engineering research to bring together the theoretical, philosophical, and educational knowledge already extant.
2. Curriculum and instructional materials development.
3. Evaluative studies.

We described a “well-rounded, comprehensive, and efficient plan that would involve a commitment of \$549,000 over a three-year period.”

In the explanation we stated, “Our belief is that the theoretical and practical problems converge into the primary need for two types of engineering. First, the many different theoretical and philosophical islands need to be bridged and integrated. Second, this work then needs to be appropriately engineered into practical and powerful educational methods that can be utilized by secular and religious educators in ways that are congruent with our democratic and pluralistic society.” In making these intentions practical as the program began, four major tasks emerged:

1. Developing a theoretical base for the program—one that is responsibly grounded in philosophical integrity and productively oriented toward empirical evidences.
2. Establishing the substance of ways and means to communicate effectively with the secular education and religious education communities.
3. Exploring and evaluating the contemporary approaches to curriculum and instructional materials in values education.
4. Developing an adequate collection of materials for the Staff and others to use in their studies and activities.

What We Have Been Able to Do So Far

We continue to see our role and contributions as primarily a matter of engineering. We are not attempting to expand significantly the base of empirical research, on the one hand, nor to engage in

the competition for creating the most marketable educational devices and materials on the other hand. Instead, our role is in the middle. The field of education has long labored under the handicap of lacking adequate linkage between research and practice. In the physical sciences, this linkage is provided by the several forms of engineering. In the social sciences, where the empirical research is now steadily improving, the time has come for deliberate engineering—scholarly activity in which people who are knowledgeable of the practitioner’s real world of needs and trained to appreciate the uses and abuses of science develop ways to convert scientific findings into specifications for action. In the VDEP, this concept of engineering is being mobilized, undergirded by a concern for philosophical and theological integrity.

Theoretical base. One of our primary goals has been to develop a theoretical foundation for values/moral education that would be “theoretically integrated, empirically validated, and operationally efficacious.” We have made substantial progress toward this goal. The earliest statement of our conceptual framework was made in July 1973 by John Stewart as Part II of the final report to The Lilly Endowment on the evaluative study of Youth Films, Inc. conducted by Ward and Stewart. This excerpt, entitled *Values Development Education*, has been printed in soft cover form and widely distributed (2,000 copies) and also used as the text in courses and professional workshops on this subject. In December 1973, Stewart enlarged the base somewhat with a set of three essays: (1) The School as a Values/Moral Agent, (2) A Developmental Approach to Curriculum: The School as a Just Moral Community, and (3) Educational Research and Evaluation: Some Problems and Suggestions. These have been widely distributed in booklet form as *Essays on Values Development Education*.

But the basic and most comprehensive statement of our conceptual framework is Stewart’s doctoral dissertation: *Toward a Theory for Values Development Education*. Completed in April 1974, this dissertation was the product of two and a half years of exploration in the related major disciplines, especially psychology, philosophy, and education. The conceptual framework guiding our work is specified in these documents as an *organism: structural-developmental* approach to values/moral education. It integrates the works of many organismic/holistic psychologists and philosophers, but with a special focus on the structural-developmental theories and research. The three principal components are (1) the psycho-philosophic genetic epistemology of Jean Piaget, (2) the cognitive-developmental theory of moral development of Lawrence Kohlberg, and (3) the psycho-philosophic ideas of John Dewey on education, democracy, community, axiology, moral development, and other pertinent issues. Although this theoretical foundation draws on numerous theories and approaches it is soundly integrated, with a high degree of congruence among the components. The major components, especially the structural stage-development theories of Piaget and Kohlberg, have been subjected to intensive and extensive cross-cultural research, and have been systematically validated. Thus we are confident about the integrity of the theory. In the VDEP and elsewhere in the scientific community the operational efficacy of the theory is being explored; there is good reason to be hopeful about its utility and meaningful application. Further support for this position has been provided in the substantial positive feedback we have received from many of the most respected leaders in values/moral development and education. We are especially pleased with the enthusiastic reception and positive evaluation of Stewart’s dissertation by Kohlberg himself, which has resulted in continuing collaboration and communication with him and other leading scholars in the field.

Because of our deep concern for the lack of adequate theoretical foundations for many past and current practices and programs in the field of education, and because of our deep commitment to the belief that educational intervention should be conducted from an integrated, defensible, and rational base, we consider the development of theory to be one of our most important responsibilities. This is

especially true given the values! moral focus of our work and the pluralistic and democratic orientation of our society. We believe that we have made great strides toward meeting this commitment and fulfilling our goals for the Values Development Education Program as stated in our original proposal.

Religious education emphasis. Perhaps the most encouraging and gratifying consequence of the first year and a half is the affirmation that we are able, in fact, to relate to the secular education and religious education mainstreams from the stance we have taken. The strength of a scientifically and philosophically valid foundation lies at the heart of the unusually high interest and acceptance of the program within the University, the educational community, and on the religious education scene.

The Program has attracted over a half-dozen highly competent doctoral students who are committed to thesis research in the area. Surrounding this core is a circle of well over 100 graduate students who are particularly attuned to the practical applications of values development theory within school-based situations. Several schools are reporting spin-off activities; faculty and administrators who have participated in courses and workshops with us are initiating study group and justice-development activities back in their schools.

It is unusual for such a university-based program to be able to relate, with similar competency and uniformly high acceptance, to a high level professional invitational conference on an international basis (the First Invitational Conference on Developmental Education for Moral Values, co-sponsored by Harvard University), a national scope conference on developmental religious education (co-sponsored by Asbury Theological Seminary), and a college faculty workshop on values education (Greenville College)—and all of these within the most recent six weeks prior to writing this report.

Curriculum development. We have not yet found any approach to the curricularization of values development education that can be recommended without fundamental reservations. As we have examined the various leading contenders among instructional materials and curricular series, three classes of flaws have been identified. Though we make no claim to having systematically reviewed each and every set of curricular materials now in use (indeed, some are homemade and of limited distribution, impossible to obtain for review), on the basis of what we have seen, we are not optimistic about what we haven't seen! Following is a specification of the three classes of flaws that our curricular development activities will ultimately have to transcend:

Class I Flaws: Misunderstanding of the nature of values development. Materials in which this flaw occurs are mostly didactic and “preachy,” committed to pushing given virtues. They lack breadth and surely enjoy only limited acceptability; or yet, more important, they are virtually incapable of dealing with value *structures*, limited as they are to a preoccupation with value *content*.

Class II Flaws: Failure to guard against the effects of peer pressure. Many of the “values clarification” sorts of materials are seen as dangerous, especially when used in sensitive groups (teenagers or insecure adults, for example) because of their supposed relativistic nature. “Values clarification” is far less a matter of relativism and perspective-induction than a matter of peer hyper-sensitization. Thus we see these materials as potentially coercive and manipulative.

Class III Flaws: Inadequate attention to the quality of justice within the learner's environment. We are becoming convinced that no bits-and-pieces approach to curriculum for values education will suffice, either in reference to school or in reference to church-based education. Many, if not all, of the routes

being traveled by publishers of values development education materials are flawed in this way. The challenged assumptions that underlie this flaw are 1) that something can be added to an existing curriculum and change its moral tone or effect it for the better and 2) that one or two teachers or influencers within a child's mosaic of experiences will fundamentally alter the overall effect. We suggest that educational developments that proceed on these assumptions have low probability of success.

We are, nevertheless, developing modular learning experiences; but so far, the emphasis is on instructional materials to assist in rudimentary learnings in human development, such as the slide-tape set, "An Experience With Kohlberg," by Catherine Stonehouse and the instructional game "A Game of Stages: Using Piaget's Concept of Cognitive Development," by Edward Seely. These are designed for audiences of professional practitioners and are being used in increasingly varied situations. Many more will follow, but they will be faithful to the theoretical foundation set down in our program.

Library and materials collection. As part of providing a center for research and development for values development education we have invested in books, instructional materials, and journal subscriptions related to this field. The library collection includes titles from the fields of psychology, philosophy, anthropology, communications, education, and other disciplines. A special effort has been made to obtain a fairly complete collection of the writings of Piaget, Dewey, and Kohlberg, as well as the books written about them and their works. Also included is an ever-growing collection of periodical articles, unpublished manuscripts, and other kinds of writings in this field.

The materials collection includes a sampling of curriculum modules and kits, simulations and games, filmstrips, and other kinds of instructional materials. We have decided against a heavy investment in this sort of material because of problems of quality and validity.

The library and materials collection is heavily used by members of the faculty of the College of Education and by faculty members from other units at Michigan State University, e.g., Family and Child Sciences and Religious Studies. Students from education and many other fields have found the facility a great help in their investigations in values/moral subjects, especially because we carry titles not included in the Michigan State University main library. The faculty and graduate assistants of our own Program, of course, find the library and materials collection invaluable in performing their duties.

A special effort has been made to obtain for our own library the books and articles used in preparing our own writings. We have, for example, tried to obtain for our own collection all the books and articles used in the preparation of Stewart's dissertation. Many of the items are out of print, but most of the original sources used in the preparation of the theoretical foundation have been obtained, making it possible for scholars and students to refer to the primary and secondary sources in order to understand and critique the organismic-structural-developmental framework from which we operate.

Established necessary recognition and acceptance. In our brief existence we have been able to establish the VDEP as a significant organization in the field of values/moral education. Within the past seven months alone we have become known and accepted among the leading professionals in this field, and co-sponsored (with Harvard's Center for Moral Education) a major national conference. The co-directors have, individually and together, been invited to serve leadership and participation roles in many important conferences, symposia, and workshops. We have become known to and/or involved with leading centers in this field and educational organizations of many kinds in the United States and Canada, and have become significantly involved with a major educational institution in Mexico City.

The VDEP is also gaining recognition among leaders in religious education.

Recognition and support for the VDEP in our own university and college has broadened and deepened. Members of the staff are increasingly being invited to make presentations to classes, committees, and other groups on the campus. We were successful in obtaining the support of our administration in filling our pressing need for adequate space to house the Program in our already overcrowded Erickson Hall.

Numerous school districts have invited us to conduct in-service workshops and consult with faculty. And our involvement with the Walled Lake Consolidated School District has continued to develop, with a special focus on the Just Community Exploratory Project at the Oakley Park Elementary School.

In general, locally and nationally, the Program is establishing itself as one of the major centers for values/moral education.

What We Have Learned

We are still in the formative and “phase-up” stages of the program. But since our first concern was with foundational questions rather than products, we are pleased to report progress in terms of what we have learned and, particularly, how our thinking has been affected by these initial experiences of the Program.

Validity of the developmental approach. The research conducted by many developmental psychologists has revealed that human development, especially moral development, is extremely complex and takes place over a long period of time as a result of a number of complex factors. It seems unlikely that significant gains in values/moral development can be achieved by short-range, fragmented, and technological approaches to curriculum. The landmark research of Hartshorne and May in the 1920's revealed the inadequacy and ineffectiveness of traditional-authoritarian approaches to what was then called “character education.” Hartshorne and May, unfortunately, had only the dominant behavioristic psychology of the day available to them to help interpret their findings, and concluded that moral behavior is completely situation-relative. Fortunately, we have available to us the findings and theories of the organismic-structural-developmental scholars that corroborate the findings of Hartshorne and May, but substantially alter their conclusions about moral behavior. We know now that moral behavior is the result of a number of factors of which *situation* is only one, and that an even more important factor is the structural development of the individual.

The implications of the structural-developmental theories and research for curriculum development for values/moral education are profound. First, the focus shifts from the acquisition of appropriate content via moralizing, preaching, exhortation, modeling, conditioning and shaping, and the other methods of traditional-authoritarian approaches to a focus on total human development with an attempt to provide the kinds of active experience that serve as the aliment for structural development. The latter include maximum opportunity for involvement, role-taking, decision-making, cognitive stimulation and reflection, and democratic social living. In other words the focus shifts from achievement to development. Second, the emphasis changes from the immediate to the long-range. We know, for example, that the level of principled morality (Kohlberg's Level III, or highest level of moral development) is an adult phenomenon. Consequently, the school must focus on providing the kinds of experience that will lay the foundation that will maximize the possibility of more learners reaching the adult stages later in life, often long after they have left school. Schools, as they are pre-

sently operated, tend to retard development, or prematurely crystallize the development of students at the lower levels and stages, which minimizes or makes impossible later development to principled morality. Given the hierarchically-integrated nature of the structural-developmental stages, this focus on the long-range means that the schools must concentrate on maximizing the *quality* of experience at the lower levels and stages. Education must become a lifelong continuous process rather than preparation in childhood and youth for adult tasks.

Third, the developmental approach calls for a stronger focus on the *human* resources of the school than on the *technological* resources. The paraphernalia of education should serve the educators and the students, rather than determine the nature of education. Occasionally we hear the claim made that values/moral education needs “teacher-proof” curriculum materials. This claim reflects the failure to understand the nature and role of human beings as values/moral agents, and is founded on the idea that significant learning in this area can come directly from technology rather than through the transactions among people. The developmental approach emphasizes the roles of parent and teacher as both medium and message. Technology may aid and augment but cannot replace or bypass the human transacting in values/moral education.

Fourth, the present fragmented-mechanistic approach to curriculum needs to be replaced by a developmentally oriented integrated-holistic approach to curriculum. The present focus is on the micro-experiences of the individual classroom; in contrast, the developmental orientation speaks also to the importance of the macro-experience of the school as community and to the importance of the quality of justice in that community. We consider this to be of great importance, and will discuss it below.

Our commitment to the developmental approach to both general and values/moral education has grown out of an in-depth examination of the theories and empirical findings of many developmental psychologists, as well as from our own experience in the schools. We believe that this approach will become increasingly important with the rapidly growing recognition of the significance and implications of developmental theory and research, and with the growing realization that most other approaches are ineffective and/or unethical.

Religious development, values development, and pathology of development. Among religious education leadership persons, the high levels of motivation and concern for values development create a high state of readiness to act on any rational and responsible basis. The people that we are dealing with are asking not only “how should it be?” but also “what accounts for things going wrong?” Thus we have found a need to develop from the research base not only a normative concept of educational development in values, but also a concept of pathology. The research base from which we are drawing the educational models is able to suggest a symptomatology and a promising hypothesis of pathology. The needs that this work relates to are following:

1. The discipline of a scientific framework in which to diagnose and treat value development malfunctions (non-development or “stuck-at-stage” development).
2. The availability of an (ethical) disequilibrium inducer for treatment of Level II pathology through objective examination of Level I pathology. (In other words, our tentative procedure, now under test, is to introduce the descriptions of symptomatology of Level I pathology to people who are “stuck” at Level II, in order to sensitize them to the validity of a self-awareness in light of the subsequent exposure to the Level II symptomatology.)

The family and values/moral development. Among the institutions of our society which are promising avenues for vital contributions to values development, the family ranks high. Although some sociologists and psychologists seem ready to write off the family and the home, it has been our growing conviction that this is not a viable option. The growing awareness of concern for the importance of community experience in the development of a sense of justice, and hence a higher structure of values has impressed us of the centrality of the family experiences of child. Thus we are aware of the importance of family-oriented interventions. Work has begun to augment both our school and church projects with counterpart learning experiences for parents. We have come to feel that they are inseparable and that the school and church models will have vitality only to the extent that parent—development experiences are integral.

Importance of the learning community and the quality of justice. One of the most important outcomes of our work is the realization of the developmental significance of the overall learning environment (i.e., the school as community) and the nature and quality of justice that prevails in that environment (the so-called moral atmosphere).

The major claim made here is that traditional curricular and modern technological approaches to moral education are unlikely to succeed, and in fact may retard moral development. Morality is inherently a developmental social phenomenon that is constructed in and through the myriad of complex, longitudinal, and powerful forces that the child encounters in the course of social living in the major communities in which he or she is a part. Support for this claim and this view is derived from the philosophical explorations of John Dewey, Jean Piaget, Lawrence Kohlberg, and many others; and from the empirical research of many developmental psychologists, especially that of Piaget and Kohlberg, but also from the important research of Harvey, Hunt, and Schroder, Jane Loevinger, and other structural-developmental scholars.

The findings of these researchers lends strong support for the thesis that it is the massive impact of the general environment and the interrelationships among its parts that influences learning and development *more* than the particular impact of any specific feature or limited part of the environment. This is not to deny the importance or the impact of particular experiences or smaller segments of the environment, but it is to claim that the general orientation and structural features of the larger environment are more developmentally determining and influential. The claim is for *more*, not for *sole* influence. To assert that this claim is merely a truism reflecting the obvious differential in size and quantity of and time of exposure to the larger environment partly misses the nature and significance of the claim. The massiveness claimed for the developmental impact of the larger environment is not one attributable only to size and/or time—it is massiveness attributable to the holistic nature of the larger environment, and is thus a qualitative factor that goes beyond the quantity of size and time. The influential power of the moral environment of a school taken as a whole, for example, exceeds that of any classroom primarily because of the possibilities available for experiencing justice and injustice in more complex ways that are less likely, unlikely, or even impossible to occur in the individual classroom. The socio-moral relationships that pertain among the faculty offer an example, as does the nature of the administration's treatment of the staff and vice versa. The nature, distribution, and utilization of power and authority in the whole school provide experience not available in the smaller units of the school. The way older and higher-grade students are permitted, encouraged, and directed to treat younger and lower-grade students provides significant and powerful moral education.

Many more examples can be offered to illustrate the nature of the claim; hopefully, these sufficiently

illuminate the point. But beyond these are those effects generated by consistencies and inconsistencies between the micro-experiences of the individual classroom or those provided by the products of educational technology and the macro-experiences of the school as a whole. Lessons on the subject of justice will take on added significance vis-a-vis the nature of justice that prevails in the school. A movie or presentation by the teacher on the theme of due process, for example, will probably be assimilated in terms of the availability or unavailability of due process in the school. The larger developmental impact claimed for the school as a whole is based on both the availability of experience at the larger community level and the opportunity for experience that grows out of the transactions between the smaller units and the larger community.

We believe that the developmental research shows that the quality of justice in the learning environment is of utmost significance for values/ moral education. A school community operating at the lower levels of justice (Levels I and II) has a restricting effect on moral development and fails to provide the kind of experience, for most people, that increases the probability of later development in adulthood to Level III principled justice. The operating level of justice in the home and school seems to act as a developmental ceiling for most children and youth.

Given (1) the massive holistic impact of the learning environment and (2) the central role of justice for values/moral development, the optimal school for human development in general and moral education in particular emerges in the notion of *the school as a just community*. This is further supported by the research findings that indicate that maximally developed human beings seem to have what we can call “the democratic mind” or the democratic orientation to life, human relationships, morality, law, authority, and justice. The just community school would attempt to promote this kind of development.

The concept of the school as a just community is rapidly becoming one of the most important, exciting, and promising ideas among the leading professionals in moral education. We are one of only a few centers to have already begun to explore the meaning and applicability of this idea. We are also pioneering the development of the theory for the school as a just community (see chapters. 5, 6, and 7 of Stewart’s *Toward a Theory for Values Development Education*, Essay No. 2 in Stewart’s *Essays in Values Development*, and his latest book (in preparation) entitled *The School as a Just Community: A Transactional-Developmental Approach to Moral Education*).

The problems of evaluation. A major problem in evaluation has become clear. The solution is not so clear! In fact, the more we understand the problem the more unlikely it seems that a solution will be found.

The crucial distinction between content of a value (the *what*) and structure of the value (the *why* of holding onto the content) is a basic premise in the developmental view of moral judgment. Evaluating the changes in a person’s values is relatively easy only to the extent that content is more important than structure. Since what develops is the *structure* of a person’s values, evaluation that deals only with content is superficial and usually trite. But the best research on structural development uses elaborate and demanding interview procedure and individual data analyses, case by case. Even here, as in the research done by several of Kohlberg’s followers, the evaluation problem is compounded and the findings rendered virtually useless by almost unmanageable inter-judge reliability problems and contamination of the data by the developmental stages of the interviewers or scorers. (It is highly improbable that anyone is able to assess accurately a person whose value structure is more developed than his own.)

The dissertation research of Roost (a VDEP-related study) suggests that there is little hope for a substitution of any short and teacher-manageable measurement procedure for structural development. This finding is a setback, because we were hoping to find or develop a testing procedure that would become the key tool in our evaluation activities. As it stands now, the timetable for evaluative studies is put at least a year behind original expectations.

Another major problem relates to the use of objective tests for structural—stage evaluations. The best evidence available suggests that to attempt to “observe” and measure stage development with instruments that offer pre-structured choices is illogical. The structural orientation of the instrument impedes the expression of the subject’s own structure, which must be spontaneous and undirected. Also, paper-and-pencil tests contaminate the evaluation by injecting reading and language skills into the picture.

What is Underway Now

During the first year of phase-up (1973-74), the major activity was singular, the staff small, and the progress slow but substantial. During that period a vital foundation was laid. The basic conceptual framework of the program was established in John Stewart’s widely accepted document: *Toward a Theory for Values Development Education*. (This doctoral dissertation is to be published as a pair of books.) Some of Stewart’s other contributions were also written during this period.

During the latter part of 1973-74 the writing of a series of five papers was contracted to qualified scholar-writers. These papers helped to broaden the platform for the program and to provide initial substance for the writing program that has now developed. In 1974-75, the VDEP has moved confidently into “high gear,” as evident in the following list of activities now underway.

The Just Community Exploratory Project. For nearly two years we have been involved with the Walled Lake Consolidated Schools, Walled Lake, Michigan, exploring the application and utility of the VDE theory in actual school settings. Starting in the fall of 1974 this project took on a special focus, viz., the exploration of the meaning and implementation of the concept of *the school as a just community* at the Oakley Park Elementary School. This phase of the project is being conducted by Stewart and a small team of graduate students in collaboration with the principal and faculty of that school. Other people, especially parents, are becoming increasingly involved as the exploration moves ahead.

The principle focus is on the nature of justice and community in the school, and on expanding the already established developmental orientation of the curriculum. Various members of the faculty have also requested that we consult with them on special classroom problems, including the management of discipline and control from a just, humane, and developmental perspective. Attempts are being made to help the teachers become aware of the need to build or improve the community aspects of staff relations and classroom living.

More than half of the professional staff of the school has been enrolled in at least one of the MSU-based graduate courses in Values Development Education offered by Stewart. Nearly all of the staff, including para-professionals, food service personnel, and the custodian, as well as some parents, have participated in a series of orientation experiences designed to communicate the basic ideas of VDE and the nature and purpose of the project at Oakley Park. The VDEP team members observe and participate in the classroom activities of the school, and have spent time in nearly all of the classrooms. We have become a part of the school family in many ways. We frequently meet with the Principal, and have had many meetings with the Staff Committee of the school. Recently we

sponsored and conducted a dinner meeting-workshop-community experience which nearly all the school staff attended, along with the Director of Elementary Education for the district and the chairperson of the district school board, as well as several parents and key personnel from other services and schools. This week the VDE Just Community project is the occasion for a special meeting of the PTA, at which the basic ideas will be presented and discussed.

During the initial phase of this project we are primarily *exploring* the application of the VDE theory and the idea of the just community. During the coming year we hope to deepen the involvement and systematically extend the scope of the work.

The Perspectivism Project (Continuation, in conjunction with the public schools of East Lansing, Michigan.) Relatively simple and easily replicable in-service education activities for teachers are being developed to assist them in comprehending the child's perspective and thus to affect their ability to help children who are in the Piagetian-stage task of perspective development. (This function is an essential for development of Level II moral judgment.) It is expected that this procedure will increase one's awareness of (1) their classroom behaviors that support or hinder student perspectivism, (2) the differential abilities of students (based on development) to act in perspectivistic ways, and (3) procedures and strategies to assist students in becoming more perspective-oriented. The project is to be documented through observation reports of classroom interaction and recordings of teacher discussions.

Publications (Listed here are materials for which at least partial or preliminary drafts now exist.)

1) Doctoral dissertations:

Charles Roost: *An Instrument for Assessing Impact of Curricular Experience on Values*

John Dettoni: *Increasing the Classifiability of Verbalizations in Discussions of Values-Oriented Curricular Experiences*

Jeff Richberg: *A Descriptive Analysis of Teachers' and Pupils' Perceptions of Rewards and Punishment*

Linda Jo Strong: *The Impact of Value Education on Children's Moral Judgment*

2) Books:

John Stewart: *The School as a Just Community: A Transactional-Developmental Approach to Moral Education*

Rodney McKean: *How to Grow a Value Under Stained Glass*

Ted Ward, et al: *What Does It Take?* (to engage competently in values development)

Ward and Stewart: *Readings in Teaching Role in Values Development* Ward and James McCue: *Values Confrontation*

3) Articles and booklets:

James Emery: "Values Development in Biblical Perspective"

Samuel Rowen: "Theological Issues in the Kohlberg Structural-Developmental Model of Moral Judgment"

Edward Seely: "Theological Issues of Kohlberg's Cognitive-Developmental Theory of Moralization"

John Stewart: "A Critique of Values Clarification," to be published in the June 1975 issue of the Phi Delta Kappan, a special issue on moral education

John Stewart: "The School as a Just Community," to be presented to the Moral Education Interest Group of the Philosophical Education Society annual meeting, Kansas City,

Missouri, March 24, 1975

Catherine Stonehouse: "The Child's Egocentrism"

Catherine Stonehouse: "The Child's Perspective of Moral Values"

Valerie Janesick: "Foundational Contributions of Teilhard de Chardin and Jean Piaget"

Ted Ward: "A Pathology of Values Development in the Christian"

Ward and McKean: "Trouble Ahead for Values Clarification"

Ward, et al: "Three Classes of Flaws in Current Approaches to Values Education"

Instructional Materials (Completed field testing; ready for production)

"A Game of Stages" (Instructional exercise to teach the application of Piaget's model of cognitive development)...Edward Seely

"An Experience With Kohlberg (Slide set and sound track presenting Kohlberg's model of six stages of moral judgment)...Catherine Stonehouse

Continuation of each of these writing and development tasks into publication and dissemination is one of the expectations of the program. Some will be completed under the present year's funds, (1974-75), others will carry over into 1975-76. (Numerous "bridges" are being built, many of them in promising situations, such as the Continental Congress on the Family (St. Louis, Fall 1975), for which we have been invited to make a plenary session presentation; and Stewart's presentation to the Philosophical Education Society annual meeting, mentioned above.

Lecture Series on Values Development Education.

6 lectures: Asbury Theological Seminary, 1974, Wilmore, Ky. (Ward)

5 lectures: Southwestern College, 1974, Phoenix, Ariz. (Ward)

2 lectures: Biennial Conference of Christian (Camping) Instructional, 1974, Glorieta, NM (Ward)

4 lectures: Flint Community Schools, February 1975, Flint, Mich. (Stewart)

Seminars and Workshops.

Graduate Workshop in Instructional Simulation for Values Education Walled Lake, Michigan (20 students). Summer 1974 (Ward)

Graduate Seminar in Instructional Concepts for Values Development Education Walled Lake, Michigan (20 students). Summer 1974 (Stewart)

Continuing Forum on Values Development Education

weekly, on campus, faculty and graduate student participation (Stewart)

Graduate Seminar in Values Development Education

Weekly, graduate credit

Northeast Region (Michigan) off-campus center, Flint (20 students).

Fall term 1974 (Stewart)

On campus (55 students).

Fall term 1974 (Stewart)

Graduate Workshop in Values Development Education

6 days, for the American School Foundation, Mexico City

(attended by 100 members of the faculty, 35 for credit)

September 1974 (Stewart)

Graduate Independent Study in Values Development Education, weekly

graduate credit (10 students), Southeast Region (Michigan)

off-campus center, Flint, Michigan

Winter term 1975 (Stewart)
 Doctoral Seminar in Values Development Education (with a special focus on *the school as a just community*) weekly, advanced graduate credit (20 student limit) On campus, Spring term 1975 (Stewart)
 Graduate Seminar in Values Development Education weekly, graduate credit (25 student limit) Southeast Region (Michigan) off-campus center, Livonia
 Spring term 1975 (Stewart)
 Graduate Seminar in Values Development Education (with special focus on *the school as a just community*). Special two-week course to be conducted daily at Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y. Graduate credit.
 June 1975 (Stewart, as visiting professor by invitation)

Participants included faculty from Jewish Theological Seminary, NYC; Harvard Divinity School; Asbury Theological Seminary; Center for Human Development, St. Mary's College, Winona, MN; and Department of Religious Studies, Yale University.

Previous to these listed, graduate seminars & workshops in VDE have been conducted by Stewart in Walled Lake, Mich. (3 classes, Enrollments: 38, 45, 80); Saginaw, Mich. (1 class, Enrollment: 44); Cranbrook Institutions, Bloomfield Hills, Mich. (3 classes, Enrollments: 20, 30, 20). Totals: 7 classes, 282 students.

Graduate Mini-seminar in Values Development Education (special focus on *the school as a just community*). Special two-week course conducted three times per week at Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y. Graduate credit.

June 1975 (Stewart, as visiting professor by invitation)

Graduate Workshop on the Theory and Practice of the Just Community two-day segment of a four-day workshop on moral development at the University of California at Irvine. Graduate credit. Expected enrollment: approximately 30.

June 1975 (Stewart, as visiting professor by invitation—the workshop team includes L. Kohlberg, N. Sprinthall, L. Erickson, P. Scharf, et al).

Graduate Workshop on Moral Education in the Elementary School. Part of the above program at the University of California at Irvine. (Janesick)

Other courses of various kinds, levels, and subjects dealing with Values Development Education are being planned for Spring, Summer, and Fall 1975 and for 1976, to be taught by Stewart, Ward, and other members of the Program. There is a possibility that the American School Foundation in Mexico City may request another workshop by Stewart as part of their inservice development in September 1975

Identification of Persons Who Constitute the 1974-75 Staff of VDEP

Faculty:

John S. Stewart, Co-director

B.S. Pennsylvania State University, 1951 M.A. Michigan State University, 1972 Ph.D. Michigan State University, 1974

Teacher (ethics, personal development, psychology), Acting Chairman of Department, and Assistant Director of Adult Education (Aquinas High School, Southgate, Michigan), 1967-1969. Experience includes: Executive, management, and supervisory positions in business, industrial, hospital-medical

organizations (total 7 years); other administrative, business, and personnel positions (total 8 years); social science related positions, including psychiatric social worker in state hospital, cottage supervisor in prison for juveniles, and counseling (4 years).

Ted W. Ward, Co-director B.Mus.Ed. Wheaton College, 1951 M.Ed. University of Florida, 1954 Ed.D. University of Florida, 1956

Has served at MSU as Director, Learning Systems Institute; Director, Human Learning Research Institute; Associate Director for Research USOE Center for Instructional Materials for the Handicapped; Visiting Professor and Scholar-in-Residence at Wheaton College; author, lecturer, consultant in international education.

S. Joseph Levine, Instructional Design Specialist

B.M. Michigan State University, 1962

M.A. Michigan State University, 1967

Ph.D. Michigan State University, 1974

Instrumental Music Teacher (Pontiac Public Schools); Psychometrist (District of Columbia Children's Center); Assistant Professor (Department of Elementary and Special Education/Learning Systems Institute, MSU); Coordinator: Technology of Dissemination, USOE/MSU Regional Instructional Materials Center for Handicapped Children and Youth, MSU).

Faculty Consultants:

Z. George Barnett, Ed.D., Professor

Social and Philosophical Foundations

Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum

Charles A. Blackman, Ph.D., Professor assistant to the Dean for Continuing Education

Ben A. Bohnhorst, Ed.D., Professor

Curriculum and Instruction Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum

Mary Lea Schneider, Ph.D., Assistant Professor Department of Religious Studies

Walter W. Scott, Ph.D., Associate Professor

Department of Administration and Higher Education

Graduate Fellows:

Valerie J. Janesick

B.S. Eastern Michigan University, 1970

M.A. Bowling Green State University, 1971

Elementary school teacher (3 years); Dormitory Director at Eastern Michigan University (2 years); Campus Coordinator for Orientation Program, Eastern Michigan University.

James R. McCue

B.A. Wheaton College, 1966

M.A. Wheaton College, 1970

Minister to students, Christ Church of Oak Brook (5 years); Assistant Dean of Students and Resident Director, Wheaton College; Education Consultant to Greater Europe

Mission.

Rodney B. McKean

B.S. Simpson College, 1971

M.A. Asbury Theological Seminary, 1975

Part-time Youth Director and Christian Education Director in local churches for past 6 years.

Richard C. Muzik

B.S. Philadelphia College of Bible, 1968

M.A. Wheaton College, 1971

Regional Supervisor and Trainer, American Foresight, Inc.; Assistant Dean of Students and Resident Director, Wheaton College; Education Consultant to Greater Europe Mission; Resource Consultant, InterVarsity Fellowship (East Lansing, Michigan).

Edward D. Seely

B.A. Hope College, 1963

B.D. Western Theological Seminary

Th.M. Western Theological Seminary, 1970

Minister of Education, Fifth Reformed Church (Grand Rapids, Michigan) for past 8 years; author.

Catherine Stonehouse

B.S. Greenville College, 1962

MRE Asbury Theological Seminary, 1964

Coordinator of curriculum development, Aldersgate project, Light and Life Press, Winona Lake, Indiana; editor and author.

Heidi E. Wilkins

B.S. Eastern Michigan University, 1966

First grade teacher, Oakley Park Elementary School, Walled Lake, Michigan.

Special Education, 3rd, 2nd, and 1st grade teacher, Oakley Park, for 9 years.

Secretary:

Margie E. Nainstone

B.S. Western Michigan University, 1968

Teacher (6th-7th grades, 1968-69); Secretary (MSU, 1971-75).

Student Clerical Help:

Charlene L. Gill (Senior in Elementary Education, MSU).

Mark C. Jaede (Junior in Justin Morrill College, MSU).

What We Want to Do in 1975-76

We are essentially on target and on time, according to the specifications of our original proposal to The Lilly Endowment. Except for the changes in emphasis that result from increased understanding of the problem (noted in section 3, above), we are pursuing the course staked out in that document and are encountering a reasonable mixture of success and frustrations in which advances far outweigh setbacks. Having used the initial seed grant of \$40,000 to get the first year underway as a more gradual phase-up, we will likely be able to carry out four years of activity for the seed grant plus the originally

requested three-year total. Thus we see 1975-76 as the second full pace year of the program.

In 1975-76 we anticipate the following major activities:

- a) The *Just Community Exploratory Project* (continuation) in conjunction with the public schools of Walled Lake, Michigan, and possibly the American School Foundation of Mexico City. Other extensions of this project may develop in other parts of Michigan and Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- b) The *Perspectivism Project* (continuation) in conjunction with East Lansing Public Schools.
- c) The *Pathology Project*, defining pathology, specifying symptomatology, and testing treatment plans for stuck-at-stage adults.
- d) Regional workshops in religious education (Protestant and Catholic) in five or six locations.
- e) Workshops on Values Development Education for public school districts and other elements of secular education.
- f) The *Parent Development Project*, leading to instructional materials and learning experience design for parent roles in values development—for themselves and for their children.
- g) The “*Explore Today*” Project, leading toward child-use experiences on explorations of values aspects of day-to-day life. This material will result from a substantial effort to overcome the inherent flaws observed in the currently prominent approaches to values development education.
- h) Continued development of the theory for *the just community concept*.
- i) Sponsorship and conducting of a national level conference (possibly more than one).

How We Plan to Staff the VDEP For 1975-76.

Present plans call for staffing the Program for the second full academic year of 1975-76 (September 1, 1975 through August 31, 1976) in the general terms of the original proposal, as follows:

Co-Directors (Faculty):

John S. Stewart	Ted W. Ward
Full time	Half time

Instructional Development Specialist (Faculty):

S. Joseph Levine, Full time

Curriculum Development Specialist (Faculty): Full time

Business and Editorial Assistant (Administrative—Professional): Full time

Doctoral-level Graduate Assistants (Graduate Students):

Visiting Scholars/Fellows: Total of two, full time for three months each

Program (Departmental-level) Secretary (Clerical-Technical):

Full time (present secretary tentatively planning on leaving this area by summer 1975)

Student Clerical Help (Student): Quarter time

What Our 1975-76 Program Will Cost

Immediately following this brief discussion of our proposed budget for the VDEP for the year September 1, 1975 through August 31, 1976, is our specific request for extension of financial support from The Lilly Endowment. Our total request for funds for the second year of full operations amounts to \$236,121. This represents an increase of \$52,221 or 28% over the tentative budget for the

second year submitted in the original proposal in May 1973. This increase can be accounted for primarily by three important factors, viz., (1) program changes, (2) indirect costs (overhead to MSU), and (3) inflation. There is no simple way to clearly identify these factors in a complex proposal, but we estimate that the 28% increase over the original \$183,900 proposal can readily be accounted for with the following analysis:

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Amount of Increase</u> <u>(Rounded figures)</u>	<u>Percent of original</u> <u>Proposal (\$183,900)</u>
Program changes (net increase)	\$11,000	6%
Indirect costs (net increase)	\$15,000	8%
Inflation (conservatively estimated for last two years)	<u>\$26,000</u>	<u>14%</u>
Totals	\$52,000	28%

Program changes. Earlier in this report we discussed what we have learned as a result of our work, and indicated the changes in our thinking. This experience is naturally reflected in our proposed budget. We have decreased the amounts planned for books, materials, and related items, while significantly increasing the amounts for field research and development, conferences and workshops, visiting scholars, and the necessary travel to make these possible. This category has increased more than any other item for direct expenses. Then combined with the other two professional—research categories (Salaries and Honoraria) it brings the total planned investment for human resources, scholarship, and research and development to a total of \$188,355, or 88% of the budget (excluding indirect, overhead, expenses). Of the 28% increase over the original proposal, approximately 6%, or \$11,000 can be accounted for by increased investment in program changes that result from our later thinking. This will greatly improve our capacity to contribute on the national level, expand our fieldwork, and generally strengthen the total Program.

Indirect costs. In the original proposal no provision was made for indirect (overhead) costs per se. Instead we planned a direct expense for Space (\$6,600). This was not entirely acceptable to the University. Consequently, after negotiations between the Program, the University, and the Lilly Endowment were completed, the result was a flat charge of 10% to be applied across-the-board to all expenditures as incurred. This came to more than \$13,600, \$7,000 beyond the \$6,600 budgeted for space. To accommodate this increase, we adjusted the budget in order to absorb the increase rather than to request additional funds.

In the request for second year funds being submitted here, however, we have included the indirect costs as agreed to by the University and the Endowment. We have applied the 10% figure to the \$214,655 subtotal, thus adding \$21,466 to the budget for a Grant Total of \$236,121. Consequently, after allowing for the \$6,600 in the original proposal, we experience a net increase of slightly under \$15,000, which accounts for 8% of the 28% increase in total funds requested.

Inflation. The single most important factor in the increased budget, however, is inflation. Because of the general understanding of this current major problem, we feel that little need be said here except to acknowledge and try to estimate the effect on our request. In the nearly two years since the original proposal was drafted inflation has risen dramatically. We conservatively estimate that of the 28% increase about 14% of it, or about half, is attributable to inflation. This amounts to about \$26,000 of

the \$59,000 increase.

We would like to specifically highlight our improved position as a result of the solid foundation established in the first year of operation. In spite of all the factors that have resulted in increased costs for support items (equipment, furniture, supplies, reproduction, postage, and contract services, etc.), that portion of the budget has been reduced in relation to the professional—research part of the budget. In the original proposal the ratio was 83% *professional-research* to 17% *support*. In the current request, before indirect costs are included, the ratio is 88% to 12%, respectively. This is partly the result of support from the College of Education, primarily in the form of more adequate space and some furniture, and partly the result of our careful utilization of resources.

In general, there is a sense of significant gratification in the results of our first full year of operation; we believe that the time, money, material, and human resources have been used to good advantage, securing a good foundation, local and national recognition and support, and a much clearer direction for the future. We feel, however, that we are still in the beginning, building a foundation for the future; the future holds the tasks that will make it truly worthwhile. Our experience has not only been valuable for itself, it has made clear the need to move ahead and use what has been developed. This can only happen with continued support as requested in this report. We are deeply grateful to The Lilly Endowment for expressing confidence in us and for sustaining and maintaining us. Along with this gratitude is our conviction that we can take the investment already made and enlarge our contribution to values/moral education in partnership with the Endowment.