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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

We believe that the principle goal of dealing with values in social studies classes is to help students discover and ground a set of consistent values that can be used to form reasoned value judgments on a variety of social issues.

Lee Ehman
Howard Mehlinger
John Patrick

Teachers have no business dealing with values. The school's role is to teach skills - in reading, writing and arithmetic and in vocational areas. The values of youth are the business of the home and church.

Max Rafferty

Clearly, there are opposing viewpoints about the inclusion of values education in the schools. There is also disagreement over what instructional approaches to values education should be used in the classroom. In the overview of values education that follows, the writer will offer arguments both for and against values education in the schools and describe the major instructional approaches to values education that are available for use.

Several arguments (both pro and con) have been developed for teaching about values in the social studies classroom. The most prominent of these include the following:

1. In our rapidly changing society youth are continually faced by complex value choices that require an ever-increasing number of
decisions regarding everything from basic values about sex, marriage and religion to choices about vocation, ideology and self-identity (Barr, 1971, p. 14). Through the media, youth are confronted with many unique problems and inconsistencies of our society, many of which have no precedents. With the rapid changes in our society we are also witnessing a decline of parental and church influences over youth and their values. In light of these circumstances, who is going to teach youth to evaluate the available alternatives in making decisions on what to believe? Increasingly the answer is - the school.

2. Our society is permeated with numerous value conflicts which continue to add to people's value confusion. Within the last two decades we have witnessed this confusion and conflict over such issues as: the violence of the civil rights movement, the student revolution which pitted youth against the old, the Vietnam War, and finally the tragedy of Watergate. Many have said that "our moral problems are so challenging as to make our technical problems minor by comparison" (Metcalf, 1968, p. 121). With such severe moral problems facing Americans, particularly the youth, many educators are of the opinion that progress in resolving our moral problems would occur if the schools adopted a formal program of values education where value conflicts and their alternatives can be studied reflectively. By not addressing value confusion, it is argued, we are helping to perpetuate the sense of moral paralysis in American society.

3. Teachers cannot avoid being involved in values education. It is inconceivable that a student can be in school for seven hours a
day, 180 days a year for twelve years and not be affected in the way he thinks about value issues. The choice before us is not whether to teach values, for clearly we do (a la the hidden curriculum), but whether to teach about values in a conscious and rational manner.

4. The primary mission of the school is to teach basic skills and knowledge to prepare students to be useful and productive workers in our technological society. Considering the limited time and resources that schools have as well as the recent decline in student cognitive competencies, an active program of values education would just detract the school from its basic mission.

5. The fundamental purpose of the school is to transmit a common curriculum with selected experiences that will result in literate citizens committed to a democratic life style. To include a study of ethnic and personal value systems in this country would defeat the purpose of a common school philosophy (Kniker, 1977, p. 12).

6. Factual statements, unlike value statements, can be rejected or verified with public, empirical evidence. Therefore, schools engaged in values education would be tantamount to a formal program of indoctrination.

It is unlikely that these arguments about values education will be settled overnight. In fact, a total consensus about values education may never be reached. However, recent literature about values education (Ryan and Purpal, 1976; Olmo, 1975; Stewart, 1975; and Raths, et.al., 1978) indicates that many teachers have opted for some form of values education. The major problem these teachers face is how to teach about
values. A survey of the literature reveals a number of instructional approaches to values education. These are inculcation, values clarification, cognitive moral development, and value analysis. In order to be conceptually clear throughout this dissertation, each of these approaches will be explained in terms of its primary purpose, teaching methods and related value issues.

**Inculcation**

The primary purpose of this approach is to instill and help internalize values that are assumed to be basic for the survival of our society. The values of patriotism, citizenship, honesty, good character, and personal productivity are assumed to be basic to democratic living. In this approach students are not encouraged to make free choices about value alternatives, but to act according to specific, desirable values.

The methods most characteristic of this approach are modeling, positive and negative reinforcement, manipulation and teacher explanations (Silver, 1976, pp. 45-46). Models are drawn from literature, legend, and teacher and student behaviors. It is assumed that providing students with the proper value models, coupled with positive and negative reinforcement of the desired behavior, will cause students to adopt the values associated with the behavior. Manipulation is used to structure the experiences to which students are being exposed in order to foster the desired value outcomes. For example, a teacher might only expose students to one side of an issue. Finally, the most prominent method used is teacher explanation of the merits of the values
being promoted. Other teaching techniques such as role playing, simulations and games are used to reinforce the value being inculcated.

The study of value issues in this approach is designed to lead students in learning our cultural heritage, which embodies actions, ideas and objects that wise men and women valued in the past. As such, a wide variety of both personal and social value issues can be considered. However, unlike the other approaches to be described, which in varying degrees seek to have students objectively analyze value issues, inculcation does not encourage objective analysis.

**Values Clarification**

The purposes of this approach are:

1. to have students become aware of their values and those of others,
2. to use rational thinking and emotional awareness to examine personal feelings, values and behavior patterns,
3. to help students communicate openly and honestly with others about their values (Superka, 1977, pp. 4-5).

Unlike inculcation, which relies upon outside influences to help students know which values are desirable, values clarification depends upon rational thinking and emotional awareness to make value choices. To make a value choice the individual must apply the value to the seven criteria of the valuing process.

**Choosing**

1. freely
2. from alternatives
3. after thoughtful consideration of the consequences of each alternative

**Prizing**

4. cherishing, being happy with the choice
5. willing to affirm the choice publicly

**Acting**

6. doing something with the choices
7. repeatedly in some pattern of life

A variety of techniques are used in this approach which include large and small group discussions, case studies, moral dilemmas, sensitivity and listening techniques, games, and simulations. A teaching strategy illustrative of this approach is the clarifying response - questions that are linked to the seven processes of valuing. For example:

1. Where do you suppose you got the idea?
2. What else did you consider before you picked this?
3. What would be the consequences of each alternative available?
4. Are you glad you feel this way?
5. Would you tell the class the way you feel sometime?
6. I hear what you are for; now is there anything you can do about it? Can I help?

The value issues that are addressed are both personal and public. Typical of these are conflicts over politics, religion, friendship, work-leisure, love, sex, male and female roles, race, poverty, and personal habits.

**Cognitive Moral Development**

The purpose of this approach is to help students develop more complex patterns of moral reasoning based upon a higher set of values. This purpose is inextricably linked to Kohlberg's theory of cognitive moral development which postulates that there are three levels of morality - preconventional, conventional and postconventional. Each level has two stages totaling six stages of moral reasoning. Kohlberg claims that people move through these stages in an invariant sequence. Persons at a given stage will understand moral arguments at that level,
at every stage level below, and at one higher stage level but never at two stage levels higher.

The only method used is class discussion about a hypothetical or real personal moral dilemma. For example, through a short reading, filmstrip or film, students are presented with a story involving one or more characters who are confronted with a moral dilemma. Students are urged to state a position on what the person(s) in the story should do, to provide reasons for the position, and to discuss their reasons with others. It is assumed that through discussion of the dilemma, students will be exposed to different stages of moral argumentation thus facilitating stage growth.

The value issues this approach is concerned with are personal moral dilemmas which involve conflicts over punishment, property, roles and concerns of affection, roles and concerns of authority, law, life, liberty, distributive justice, truth, and sex (Kohlberg, 1975, p. 672).

**Value Analysis**

The purpose of this approach is to help the student make rational and defensible value judgments about social value issues through the use of logical thinking and scientific investigation.

The teaching methods most frequently used are library and field research, class discussion (socratic style), individual and group study of a social value issue, and other techniques common to the new social studies instruction. The most frequent intellectual operations used are:

1. identifying and clarifying the value question,
2. assembling (gathering and organizing) purported facts,
3. assessing the truth of purported facts,
4. clarifying the relevance of facts,
5. arriving at a tentative decision and
6. testing the value principle implied in the decision
   (Combs and Meux, 1971, p. 29).

Combs specifies the standards or conditions which a value judgment must meet to qualify as rational and defensible.

1. The purported facts supporting the judgment must be true or well confirmed.
2. The facts must be genuinely relevant, i.e., they must actually have valence for the person making the judgment.
3. Other things being equal, the greater the range of relevant facts taken into account in making the judgment the more adequate the judgment is likely to be.
4. The value principle implied by the judgment must be acceptable to the person making the judgment (1971, p. 18).

Unlike cognitive moral development, value analysis concentrates upon social policy and value issues. This is not to indicate that moral issues or statements are not considered, but rather that they are presumed to be factual statements and thus subject to empirical study (Metcalf, 1968, pp. 135-137).

Context of the Problem

The controversy over inclusion of values education in the classroom and how to teach about values seems to have aroused much interest. This is evident both in the professional literature and in what is going on in the classroom. In the last decade an increasing number of journals and yearbooks of professional organizations have been devoted to values education. The range of articles covers a broad educational front, from theoretical issues about education to curriculum materials designed to implement values education.

While little research has been conducted about what is going on in the classroom, the research that has been conducted suggests that
teachers place a high priority on values education. In 1973, Harold Spears asked Phi Delta Kappa members to rank order eighteen distinctive goals of education. Ranked third was developing good character and self-respect. In a more recent survey of members of Phi Delta Kappa, Ryan and Thompson report that 88 percent felt that the school should be directly involved in an active program of moral education. Finally, Olmo surveyed secondary social studies teachers in New Jersey and found that 90 percent of these teachers felt that all aspects of values education should be taught in the schools (1975, p. 19).

This interest is further evidenced by the amount of time, energy, and money expended over the last two decades by academicians in constructing compelling arguments for teaching about values and developing and disseminating the four instructional approaches that have been explained. The picture has also improved in the last decade with respect to curriculum materials currently available. Yet, two persistent problems have developed amidst the wide ranging activities of the last two decades.

First, there is inadequate empirical research about the effects of the approaches upon student valuing. The research conducted in this area has been confined to small isolated experimental groups. Moreover, many of the research designs have been weak and have not employed a delayed post-test to determine whether student learning would decay with time (Ehman, 1977, p. 73). In short, we have insufficient information to generalize about whether the approaches are producing the outcomes claimed by their advocates. Without such knowledge
it can reasonably be expected that school administrators and teachers will be reluctant to adopt formal programs of values education.

Second, academicians are continuing to develop and disseminate approaches to values education with little knowledge of existing practices by social studies teachers. It is commonly assumed that the approaches are being used in the classroom, but empirical evidence about the nature and extent of usage of approaches by social studies teachers, teachers' perceptions of the relative advantages and disadvantages of approaches, reasons for usage and non-usage of the approaches, the courses the approaches are used in, and teachers' perceptions of what needs to be done to improve values education, is simply not available. With insufficient data regarding these factors there exists no way of knowing whether the development of rationales and instructional approaches are paying off. Therefore, a continuation of this pattern is of limited value. Evidence is needed regarding what teachers are doing relative to values education before improvement in this field can be expected. The purpose of this study is to assess the extent of teacher utilization of selected approaches to values education.

Statement of the Problem

This study is an analysis and explanation of the status of current practices in values education by selected public secondary social studies teachers in Ohio. More specifically, the following questions are the central focus of this study.

1. Why are some teachers not teaching in the area of values education?
2. What approaches to values education are social studies teachers using?

3. What are selected social studies teachers' major reasons for using specific approaches to values education?

4. What do selected social studies teachers perceive as the major disadvantages of specific approaches to values education?

5. From what sources did teachers learn to use the methodology of their chosen approach?

6. What further work, as perceived by social studies teachers, is needed in the field of values education?

7. Is the usage of a specific approach to values education related to specific social studies courses?

**Definition of Terms**

1. **Values** - A person's standards and principles for judging worth. They are criteria for determining the degree of goodness, worth and desirability of things, people, ideas, actions, and situations.

2. **Valuing** - The process of developing values.

3. **Values Education** - The conscious and direct attempt to teach or teach about values and valuing.

4. **Approach to Values Education** - A specific orientation that has a guiding purpose with a specific methodology to teach or teach about values and valuing.

5. **Values Education Materials** - Teacher and student curriculum resources specifically designed to implement a given approach to values education.

6. **Secondary School** - Any public school in Ohio that has at least a seventh grade curriculum.

**Assumptions**

For the purposes of this study the following assumptions were made:
1. That secondary social studies teachers would honestly answer the questionnaire about values education.

2. That the principal in each school would distribute the surveys to his/her social studies teachers in a random fashion.

3. That the calculation procedures used to determine the number of surveys to be sent to each secondary school were accurate.

Limitations

The following limitations were taken into consideration in the interpretation of the data from this study.

1. This study was limited to an investigation of four approaches to values education; inculcation, values clarification, cognitive moral development, and value analysis.

2. The research population was limited to teachers from a randomly selected group of public secondary and elementary schools in Ohio. Thus, the population of teachers surveyed is not representative of all Ohio secondary social studies teachers and the generalizations drawn from their responses are applicable only to the population surveyed.

3. The survey instrument used in the study limited respondents' answers to no more than three courses which they were currently teaching.

4. The survey instrument used was not designed to detect approaches to values education other than the four being studied.

5. This study is subjected to all limitations inherent in mailed survey research.

Overview of the Study

In chapter one of this study the writer provided an overview of the state of the field, a rationale for the study, and a statement of the problem. Chapter two presents a review of related literature, including a theoretical summary, empirical research, and criticisms of
each approach to values education. Chapter three provides a description of the research methodology used. Chapter four reports and analyzes the data collected in this study. Chapter five provides the summary and conclusion of this study, and recommends future work that needs to be conducted in this field.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Increased interest in values education over the past two decades has prompted scholars to research the effectiveness of the approaches to values education studied in this dissertation. A review of the literature reveals that a wide variety of research has been conducted on cognitive moral development and values clarification, while very little research has been conducted on inculcation and value analysis. Similarly, the research designs employed vary in quality, with some studies using post hoc designs and others using truly experimental designs.

The following review of the literature about inculcation, values clarification, cognitive moral development, and values analysis has been divided into three categories for each approach and will be discussed using the following framework: (1) a theoretical summary of the approach, (2) a review of the relevant empirical studies investigating the instructional effectiveness of the approach, and (3) a review of the criticisms of each approach.

Inculcation

Theoretical Summary

Many social studies educators agree that when values education takes place in the social studies classroom it is by inculcation.
This approach utilizes direct and dogmatic teaching strategies to endorse the "right" values and avoids critical analysis of values. Presently, this approach is characterized as cultural transmission, moralism and environmentalism, all of which make use of one directional communication which emanates from a single source of authority. In the social studies classroom the source of authority, most often, is the teacher whose job it is to transmit the values society wishes to promote and perpetuate.

Several assumptions underlie the basis of this approach. First, inculcation assumes a body of fixed values that are universally binding and have universal acceptance in our society. Moreover, proponents of this approach claim that the values of honesty, truth, democratic living, and the dignity and worth of the individual transcend the social conditions of a particular time and place (Junell, 1969, pp. 446-451).

Second, there is a need to transmit the basic values of our society to future generations. Implicit here is the theory of education "being a process of cultural transmission, enjoined to pass on the cultural values and all of the knowledge and understandings attendant to those values" (Fisher and Thomas, 1965, pp. 221-222). Advocates of inculcation recognize that many of our cherished values are learned incidentally, yet insist that a direct and systematic approach is not only desirable but necessary because survival of western civilization rests upon the successful teaching and preservation of these unchanging values (Junell, 1969, p. 451).
Third, questions of good and bad, right and wrong, and just and unjust are always resolved in light of fixed moral standards. As such, value conflicts are characterized in terms of opposing forces of good and bad. Value conflicts are resolved by weighing these conflicting values against the unchanging fixed universal values. A situation involving conflicts between honesty and loyalty is resolved by their location in the fixed value hierarchy.

Finally, values teaching and the process of valuing are kept conceptually distinct. The objective of values teaching is to teach students what to value. To accomplish this, teachers provide one-way communications about the value with which they wish students to identify (Junell, 1969, p. 185). In this sense, values are caught, not taught. In contrast, advocates of inculcation feel that teaching the process of valuing is not a legitimate objective of values instruction. The process of valuing involves the consideration of alternatives and consequences of a given value and is therefore an inappropriate method for the resolution of value questions. Instead, these questions are decided in light of a fixed hierarchy of moral standards that do not lend themselves to argumentation and are not amendable to reflective inquiry.

**Empirical Findings**

In surveying the literature this writer found one study that directly related to this approach. Donald Thibeault, 1971, in his doctoral dissertation, studied the impact of two different types of presentations about values contained in the Bill of Rights. Presentations designed to convince students to accept these values were of
two forms: a one-sided propagandistic version and a two-sided version presenting conflicting ideological viewpoints.

The study consisted of 742 twelfth grade students randomly assigned to a control group (N=248) and two experimental groups with one group (N=252) receiving one-sided messages and the other group (N=242) receiving a two-sided presentation. A pre/post-test design was used and both treatment groups changed their value positions significantly on the posttest. Thibeault also found that low IQ students gained more with the one-sided presentation and rejected the two-sided message. Just the opposite occurred with the high IQ students. The obvious implication is that students with low intelligence respond to simple and unambiguous messages and reject messages with alternative viewpoints. Just the opposite occurs with students of high intelligence.

Criticisms

Inculcation has been rejected by social studies educators as an approach to values education for a variety of reasons. First, this approach assumes that what society defines as the good life and what constitutes justice and equality should be taught to students. Many educators and social scientists would argue that in our pluralistic society there are competing conceptions of these values. Under these conditions, Ehman, Mehlinger and Patrick have pointed out one, among many flaws of this approach.

Who chooses the values to be inculcated and on what basis? Depending on who is choosing and on how effective the inculcation is, a range of radically different value outcomes is possible. Some teachers might teach that social change is
always bad and should be fought at every turn; others might instill faith in violence as the answer to social ills. Worship of conformity to authority is another outcome that many might hold to be at the 'core' of society's strengths (1974, p. 262).

Another objection is the way value conflicts are conceived in this approach. Conflict is seen as conflict between good and bad values. The idea of conflict between competing goods is foreign to this approach. Yet, in our society most value conflicts are between competing goods. The inflexibility of a hierarchy that does not permit values to move up and down on a scale according to qualifying circumstances, makes intelligent decisions about value conflict impossible (Metcalf, 1968, p. 124). Opponents of this approach claim that its utilization does not provide students with a reflective method to use in settling value conflicts.

A third objection to inculcation is that it indoctrinates and rarely results in behavior change. Various research studies have indicated that one-way communications are ineffective in changing people's values.

McGinnies (1966) studied the effects of persuasive one-way communications in modifying Japanese university students' attitudes on broad issues of the cold war. One hundred and ninety students participated in the experiment. All of the subjects were given one-way communications about the cold war in general and specific communications about the Cuban Missile Crisis. Subjects were pre- and post-tested on this information to determine any attitude change that was
induced by these communications. McGinnies concluded that the persuasive communications failed to induce a measurable amount of attitude change in the subjects.

Fleishmann, Harris and Burtt (1955)* sought to determine if attitude change could be brought about by persuasive communication and if so, would it be reflected in subsequent behavior. The subjects in the study were industry foremen enrolled in a two week training course in human relations. During the course, the subjects received one-way communications about the principles of human relations involved in dealing with subordinates. Analysis of the results revealed a significant opinion change after the training course.

Once these trained foremen were on the job, the investigators obtained various behavior measures related to human relations. These measures were compared to those of non-trained foremen. Analysis of the data obtained indicated that there was no significant difference between the behavior of the two groups. The researchers felt that these results were due to the lapse of time since training. To test this proposition the investigators divided their group of trained foremen into sub-groups according to how recently they had completed the course. The results showed that the most recently trained sub-group rated lower in consideration behavior than any of the other sub-groups and lower than the foremen that had never been exposed to the impact of persuasive communications. The researchers concluded that there was an inverse relationship between attitude change and behavior.

*Cited in Festinger, "Behavioral Support for Opinion Change."
Finally, Peck and Havighurst (1960) have captured the essence of the fallacies in the indoctrinative techniques of the inculcation approach. They state:

It is temptingly easy and insidiously gratifying to 'mold' children, or to 'whip them into line' by exercising one's superior status and authority as an adult. It is often personally inconvenient to allow children time to debate alternatives, and it may be personally frustrating if their choice contradicts one's own preferences. If there is any selfish, sensitive 'pride' at stake, it is very hard for most adults to refrain from controlling children in an autocratic manner. Then, too, like any dictatorship, it looks 'more efficient' - to the dictator, at least. However, the effect on character is to arrest the development of rational judgment and to create such resentments as prevent the growth of genuinely altruistic impulses. For thousands of years, the long-term effects have been ignored and sacrificed to short-term adult advantages, most of the time. Probably, it is no accident that there are relatively few people who are, or ever will become, psychologically and ethically mature (p. 191).

**Values Clarification**

**Theoretical Summary**

In 1966, Louis Raths and associates published *Values and Teaching*, which explained the theory behind the values clarification approach. Raths' theory of values emphasizes the process of valuing rather than inculcating specific values. According to Raths, a value denotes those beliefs, purposes and attitudes an individual holds (Raths, p. 46). Raths also maintains that for something to be a value it must be screened through the criteria of:

(1) choosing freely ... (2) choosing from alternatives ... (3) choosing after thoughtful consideration of each alternative ... (4) prizing and cherishing ... (5) affirming ...
Collectively, these seven operations define valuing, with the product of these processes being a value.

Preferences which do not meet all seven criteria are called value indicators, which include aspersations, beliefs, attitudes, interests, worries, goals, purposes and feelings. Value indicators suggest the possibility that a person may have a value, and, as a result these indicators, are subjected to the process of valuing. If the value indicators meet all seven criteria then it is considered a value. These criteria suggest that Raths is more interested in the processes and cognitive operations used for arriving at a value than in the value itself. As such, cognitive operations such as weighing issues and choosing from alternatives, are essential if one is to become clear about what he values.

Raths developed his theory against the backdrop of complexities and contradictions of modern life. He contends that our culture is literally permeated with many competitive and often times contradictory values which have the effect of promoting value confusion in the minds of children. Moreover, values confusion hinders the positive and purposeful behavior development of children. What does develop, according to Raths, are behavior patterns that are best described as apathetic, flighty, inconsistent, over conforming, dissenting, and role played. These behavior manifestations inhibit rational thinking in children. Finally, Raths claims that when children are given opportunities to clarify their values through the values clarification process, they
will develop behavior patterns that are "less apathetic, confused, and irrational and in ways that are more positive, purposeful, and enthusiastic" (1966, p. 11).

**Empirical Findings**

During the last two decades many research studies have been conducted on values clarification. Early research studies provided very tentative support for the claim that values clarification experiences contributed to ... "helping students to clarify and develop their own values and values systems, and helping them learn a valuing process which can serve them throughout their lives" (Kirschenbaum, 1977, p. 30). Most of these studies contained fundamental research design weaknesses that led to little or no control over independent variables. As such, the findings of these studies are far from conclusive and will not be reviewed. Only studies that can meet the minimum requirements of a scientific research design will be reviewed. These minimum requirements are: (1) a randomly selected experimental and control group and (2) the employment of pre- and post-testing procedures.

Within the last six years four studies have been conducted which meet the above criteria. Thomas Covalt, in his doctoral dissertation, 1973, examined the effects of values clarification strategies on the coping and interacting behaviors of fifth grade students. Covalt sought to prove one of the major hypotheses of this approach, to wit, that students who experience values clarification activities will become less apathetic, uncertain, inconsistent, flighty, over-conforming, over-dissenting, drifty and role playing in their behaviors.
The study was conducted in Northeastern Local School District in Clark County, Ohio. The selection of students for the study was made from all fifth grade classes in two elementary schools. The students in these classes were heterogeneously grouped and randomly assigned at the beginning of the school year. A total of six classes comprised the population from which the investigator randomly selected two classes to serve as the experimental group (N=55) and two classes to serve as the control group (N=48) of the study.

The experimental group received eleven hours (one hour per week) of values clarification teaching composed of treatments designed to expose students to the process of valuing as described by Raths and associates. To control for the influence of teaching styles and personal factors, the investigators led the eleven, one hour sessions while the regular classroom teachers observed in the back of the class. The control group received physical education training by the investigators for the same amount of time.

Both the control and experimental groups were pre- and post-tested on twenty-two hypotheses about self-concept, classroom behavior, and value related behavior. The three instruments used in the pre- and post-testing were: 1) a modified version of the Sears-Concept Scale, 2) a Student Classroom Behavior Rating Form developed by James Raths and 3) the Student Value Related Behavior Form contained in Raths', *Values and Teaching*.

The conclusions reached by Covault were that students who experienced values clarification improved significantly.
1. Improved in 'self-concept' as measured by the Sears Self-Concept Scale.
2. Improved in 'initiation and self-direction of classroom activities.'
3. Improved in 'positive attitude toward learning.'
4. Demonstrated 'less acute and less frequent apathetic behavior' in the classroom.
5. Demonstrated 'less acute and less frequent flighty behavior' in the classroom.
6. Demonstrated 'less acute uncertain behavior' in the classroom.
7. Demonstrated 'less acute and less frequent inconsistent behavior' in the classroom.
8. Demonstrated 'less acute and less frequent drifting behavior' in the classroom.
9. Demonstrated 'less acute and less frequent overconforming behavior' in the classroom.
10. Demonstrated 'less acute and less frequent overdissenting behavior' in the classroom.
11. Demonstrated 'less acute and less frequent role playing behavior' in the classroom (pp. 79-80).

In 1975, Guziak, in his doctoral dissertation, replicated Covault's study. Guziak investigated the same dominant claim held by proponents of values clarification and the same twenty-two hypotheses.

The study was conducted in three local school districts in Madison County, Ohio. The population of the study was twenty-one, heterogeneous fifth grade classes. The investigators randomly selected four classes to be studied. The two experimental classes (N=51) received the treatment of selected values clarification strategies contained in Simon, Howe and Kirschenbaum's, *Values Clarification*, 1972. These treatments lasted for one hour per week for eight weeks. The regular classroom teachers were excluded from the treatment sessions which were conducted by two psychologists, one of which was the investigator. The control classes did not receive the treatments but received one hour sessions per week for eight weeks of a formal music program. The control classes
were conducted by the same people who administered the treatments in the experimental groups.

The research design employed was that involving a randomly selected experimental control group that was pre- and post-tested. Three instruments were used in the pre- and post-testing; 1) a modified version of the Sears Self-Concept Scale, 2) the Student Classroom Behavior Rating Scale and 3) the Student Value Related Behavior Form. The reliability of the three instruments was determined by correlating the control groups pre- and post-test scores.

The findings of the study were as follows:

1. Improved in 'self-concept' (demonstrated by a significant frequency change of the individual items in the positive direction but not a significant degree of change for the mean scores for the experimental group as measured by the Sears Self-Concept Scale).
2. Improved in 'raising of relevant questions and alternatives in the classroom.'
3. Improved in 'initiation and self-direction of classroom activities.'
4. Demonstrated 'less acute and less frequent apathetic behavior' in the classroom.
5. Demonstrated 'less acute and less frequent flighty behavior' in the classroom.
6. Demonstrated 'less acute and less frequent uncertain behavior' in the classroom.
7. Demonstrated 'less acute and less frequent inconsistent behavior' in the classroom.
8. Demonstrated 'less acute and less frequent drifting behavior' in the classroom.
9. Demonstrated 'less acute and less frequent overconforming behavior' in the classroom.
10. Demonstrated 'less acute and less frequent overdissenting behavior' in the classroom (Guziak, 1975, pp. 90-91).

These findings strongly indicate that the utilization of values clarification strategies were effective in improving the self-concept and value related behaviors of the experimental groups of this study.
Considerable confidence can be placed in these findings because they are very similar to Covault's study and the design of Guziak contains several design modifications that strengthen the generalizability of the results. These modifications include random selection of experimental and control group within a randomly selected sample, a larger population, and the regular teachers were excluded from all treatment sessions.

A third study conducted by Karen Fritzpatrick, 1975, studied the effects of values clarification strategies upon the self-concept and reading achievement of seventh grade students. She hypothesized that as a result of experiencing values clarification strategies seventh grade students would exhibit significantly higher gain scores on: 1) overall self-concept as measured by the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale, 2) personal, social and total adjustment measured by the California Test of Personality and, 3) reading achievement as measured by the Iowa Silent Reading Tests of Reading Comprehension and Reading Efficiency.

The population targeted for study was all seventh grade students enrolled in the parochial schools of the Archdiocese of Washington, D.C. Ten schools were randomly selected out of twenty-four schools containing seventh grades. Within each of the ten schools two seventh grade classes were randomly assigned to the experimental and control groups. This resulted in an experimental group of (N=282) and a control group of (N=265).

A randomized pre- and post-test experimental control group design was used. The treatment group experienced sixteen sessions (one hour
per week) of selected value clarifying strategies led by their regular teachers. The control group did not experience the treatments but was otherwise given the same learning experiences as the treatment group.

Fitzpatrick concluded that value clarifying strategies had a significant influence on the self-concept and reading achievement of students comprising the treatment group.

In a similar study, Eleanor Pracejus, 1974, studied the affects of values clarification on reading comprehension and the values of eighth grade students. The investigator theorized that the values clarification process requires students to make choices among alternatives, and that to make such choices requires a high level of thinking and comprehension. Similar processes are performed in reading comprehension. Pracejus hypothesized that: 1) values clarification exercises would improve reading comprehension, 2) a significant relationship exists between knowledge of values clarification processes and an increase in reading comprehension and, 3) usage of values clarification would cause changes in the value ranking of students.

The population for this study was eighth grade students in a rural school district in Southwestern Pennsylvania. The sample for study was randomly selected from a study hall in a single school. Sixty students were randomly selected and twenty were randomly assigned to an experimental group, twenty to a comprehension group, and twenty to a control group.

The instruments used for pre- and post-testing were a comprehension sub-test of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Survey Test (survey E, form 1)
and the Rokeach Value Survey. The experimental group was exposed to fourteen treatments (45 minutes per week) of values clarification strategies adapted to teach reading comprehension. The control group was exposed to the same reading comprehension material as the treatment group but there was no emphasis on values clarification.

Pracejus concluded that exposure to values clarification did result in an increase in reading comprehension scores and that there was a positive relationship between knowledge of the values clarification process and reading comprehension. Finally, she found that exposure to values clarification did not have any effect on the value rankings of students.

Two tentative conclusions can be drawn from the studies on values clarification. First, all but one study found that students who were taught the values clarification process greatly improved in their self-concept and classroom coping and interacting behaviors. Second, two of the studies cited support for the usage of values clarification in developing the reading comprehension of seventh grade students.

There are three problems with these studies that affect their generalizability beyond the samples studied. First, all but one study were conducted in agricultural and/or rural areas. Second, all of the populations studied were not selected randomly. Finally, none of the studies employed a delayed post-test to determine if the changes between control and experimental groups deteriorated in time.

Criticisms

Of the nonindoctrinative approaches to values education, values clarification has been the most widely adopted approach by social
studies teachers. Unfortunately, it is likely that values clarification has been adopted uncritically. An analysis of literature critical of this approach reveals a number of severe conceptual and ethical problems. The most poignant of these being:

1. a poorly conceptualized process of valuing,
2. an inadequate moral point of view,
3. an invasion of student privacy.

This approach's conceptualization of the valuing process poses a number of problems. First, by defining a value simultaneously with the process by which it is achieved severely limits the number of values a person can hold. Rarely can all seven processes be performed in obtaining values. In this regard, Shaver writes, "... often they are not 'freely chosen' from among alternatives, after reflection, but are the unconscious result of our experience" (1976, p. 120). A simple example illustrates this point. A nun who was reared in a Catholic orphanage and who claims to value religion cannot do so because according to the values clarification process she did not choose freely among alternatives. Second, by saying that values must be acted upon to be values is misleading because we all hold values that we do not act upon consistently and repeatedly for a variety of reasons. Moreover, the approach gives no clues of how to determine "... what action should follow from any stated value" (Lockwood, 1975, p. 155). Finally, Raths and associates give the impression that it is only through the values clarification process that people become positive, purposeful, enthusiastic and proud. Lockwood has shown the fallacy of this claim in the following syllogism:
Persons who go through values clarification become positive, purposeful, enthusiastic, and proud. Johnny is positive, purposeful, enthusiastic, and proud. Johnny has gone through values clarification. (1975, p. 157).

**Ethical Relativism**

Values clarification asks students to clarify their values on a wide variety of moral and non-moral value issues. Yet, this approach makes no distinction between decisions that affect the rights and welfare of other persons and decisions relating to one's personal preferences and tastes. Students are to clarify their values and make decisions about both types of value issues in a personally satisfying and intelligent way. However, as Lockwood, 1976, notes in "Moral Relativism and Values Education," the processes used (choosing, prizing and acting) to determine if a value is satisfying and intelligent can be applied to any person's value or value system. In this regard, we can reasonably expect that both Hitler's and Churchill's value systems satisfied the requirements of the process as each man arrived at values that were satisfying and intelligent to him. Surely, Raths and associates are not suggesting that the values represented by Hitler's Germany were as good as Churchill's England. Because this approach eliminates any notion of general and public standards that can be applied to a value judgment, Lockwood concludes that values clarification deliberately takes a relativistic stand about values in general (1976, p. 334).

The ethical relativism of values clarification has encouraged scholars to identify other shortcomings of the approach. Fraenkel, 1977, questions the shallowness of the approach's methodology in helping students analyze their values. Students in this approach are asked
to identify their values from among alternatives, yet the approach ignores the fact that values often conflict and that the choice selected needs to be selected on a rational basis. Such a basis would require students to set up criteria to evaluate alternatives and their consequences (1977, pp. 27-32). Following such a formula would also help students to begin to appraise their own values critically.

John S. Stewart, 1975 in, "Clarifying Values Clarification: A Critique," states that a great number of the questions, issues, and activities used in this approach are superficial and trivial. This is largely because the strategies and methods of this approach deal with the content of values (what it is a person should do in answer to a dilemma), rather than the structure of values (the underlying cognitive logic on which the content is based) (1975, p. 684).

Both Fraenkel's and Stewart's criticisms point to the central weakness of this approach, to wit, its ethical relativism which necessitates the avoidance of controversy associated with value conflicts, their resolution and their justification.

**Invasion of Students' Privacy**

Rath and associates in Values and Teaching, 1966, stress to the teacher that the classroom environment must be one that honestly attempts...

to help a student look at his life and to encourage him to think about it, and to think about it in an atmosphere in which positive acceptance exists. No eyebrows are raised. When a student reveals something before the whole class, he must be protected from snickers from other class
members. An environment where searching is highly regarded is essential (p. 80).

In analyzing the activities in this approach, a number of scholars question whether Raths and associates have followed their own advice. Both Lockwood, 1977, and Stewart, 1975, are concerned about the potential of many of the classroom activities to invade personal privacy. Stewart feels that usage of many of these activities with adolescents who are highly sensitive and attuned to the judgments of others may foster undue peer pressure and coercion in the classroom. Lockwood questions the advisability of using many of the approach's activities because they have students disclose personal information about themselves and their families. For example, one strategy in Simon, et.al., 1972, asks students to complete the following sentences and then read them to their classmates.

I would like to tell my best friend ...,  
I think my parents ...,  
My best days are ...,  
People can hurt my feelings most by ...,  
It makes me most uncomfortable when ...,  and  
I feel the warmest to a person when ...  
(pp. 241-247).

One has to wonder if even the strongest or well-adjusted students in the class will complete these sentences honestly.

Activities like this have prompted Strong and Shaver, 1976, to ask if social studies teachers should not " ... be more reluctant to explore values having to do with private sexual behavior, on the one hand, than values having to do with racial discrimination, on the other?" (p. 122). In answer to this question, Strong and Shaver opt for only
value questions that deal with public policy issues and call for Raths and associates to reconsider this important question.

Although this approach to values may be easy for teachers to understand and utilize in the classroom, there are significant flaws that teachers should consider before using it in the classroom, namely its process of valuing, its ethical point of view, and its potential for privacy violation of students.

Cognitive Moral Development

Theoretical Summary

During the last two decades, Lawrence Kohlberg has been developing and refining his theory of cognitive moral development. Kohlberg has identified three levels of moral development - the pre-conventional, the conventional and the post-conventional. Each of these levels contains two stages for a total of six stages of moral development. Kohlberg defines each of the levels and stages as:

I. Preconventional level
At this level the child is responsive to cultural rules and labels of good and bad, right or wrong, but interprets these labels in terms of either the physical or the hedonistic consequences of action (punishment, reward, exchange of favors), or in terms of the physical power of those who enunciate the rules and labels. The level is divided into the following two stages:

Stage 1: The Punishment and Obedience Orientation. The physical consequences of action determine its goodness or badness regardless of the human meaning or value of these consequences. Avoidance of punishment and unquestioning deference to power are valued in their own right, not in terms of respect for an underlying moral order supported by punishment and authority (the latter being stage 4).
Stage 2: The Instrumental Relativist Orientation. Right action consists of that which instrumentally satisfies one's own needs and occasionally the needs of others. Human relations are viewed in terms like those of the market place. Elements of fairness, of reciprocity, and of equal sharing are present, but they are always interpreted in a physical pragmatic way. Reciprocity is a matter of 'you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours,' not of loyalty, gratitude, or justice.

II. Conventional level
At this level, maintaining the expectations of the individual's family, group, or nation is perceived as valuable in its own right, regardless of immediate and obvious consequences. The attitude is not only one of conformity to personal expectations and social order, but of loyalty to it, of actively maintaining, supporting, and justifying the order, and of identifying with the persons or group involved in it. At this level, there are the following two stages:

Stage 3: The Interpersonal Concordance or "Good Boy-Nice Girl" Orientation. Good behavior is that which pleases or helps others and is approved by them. There is much conformity to stereotypical images of what is majority or 'natural' behavior. Behavior is frequently judged by intention - 'he meant well' becomes important for the first time. One earns approval by being 'nice.'

Stage 4: The 'Law and Order' Orientation. There is orientation toward authority, fixed rules, and the maintenance of the social order. Right behavior consists of doing one's duty, showing respect for authority, and maintaining the given social order for its own sake.

III. Postconventional, autonomous, or principled level
At this level, there is a clear effort to define moral values and principles which have validity and application apart from the authority of the groups or persons holding these principles, and apart from
the individual's own identification with these groups. This level again has two stages:

Stage 5: The Social-Contract Legalistic Orientation, generally with utilitarian overtones. Right action tends to be defined in terms of general individual rights, and standards which have been critically examined and agreed upon by the whole society. There is a clear awareness of the relativism of personal values and opinions and a corresponding emphasis upon procedural rules for reaching consensus. Aside from what is constitutionally and democratically agreed upon, the right is a matter of personal 'values' and 'opinion.' The result is an emphasis upon the 'legal point of view,' but with an emphasis upon the possibility of changing law in terms of rational considerations of social utility (rather than freezing it in terms of stage 4 'law and order'). Outside the legal realm, free agreement and contract is the binding element of obligation. This is the 'official' morality of the American government and constitution.

Stage 6: The Universal Ethical Principle Orientation. Right is defined by the decision of conscience in accord with self-chosen ethical principles appealing to logical comprehensiveness, universality, and consistency. These principles are abstract and ethical (the Golden Rule, the categorical imperative); they are not concrete moral rules like the Ten Commandments. At heart, these are universal principles of justice, of the reciprocity and equality of human rights, and of respect for the dignity of human beings as individual persons (1971, pp. 164-165).

Kohlberg claims that people think about moral issues in six qualitatively different stages. A stage is an organized system of thought which individuals consistently use to make moral judgments on moral issues. People move through these stages in an invariant sequence. Each stage a person reaches represents a hierarchical interrogation of thought as each stage represents a cumulative hierarchy of cognitive complexity in terms of logical and problem solving operations.
Kohlberg states that persons at a given stage will understand moral arguments at their stage level, at every level below, and at one higher stage level, but probably never at two stages higher (1975, p. 670).

Evidence supporting the existence of stages, their developmental sequence and their universality comes from a number of longitudinal and cross-cultural studies that Kohlberg and others have conducted (Kohlberg, 1971, pp. 163, 180 and 1975, pp. 670-671). These include a twenty year longitudinal study of fifty Chicago area boys, a longitudinal study of Turkish village and city boys of the same age, and a variety of cross-cultural studies in Britain, Canada, Israel, Taiwan, Honduras, Mexico and India. In these studies the subjects' stages of moral reasoning were determined by judges evaluating their responses to hypothetical dilemmas. A subject's stage was not determined by the choice he made about what the character should do but rather by the reasons the subjects gave for the choice.

The results of the studies indicate: 1) that most of an individual's thinking is always at one stage with the remaining at the next higher stage, 2) that subjects gradually advance to higher stages, and 3) that subjects tend to prefer the highest stage they can understand which is one stage above their predominant stage of reasoning.

In general, Kohlberg claims that the results of these studies indicate that moral development is not merely a matter of learning verbal values and rules of an individual culture but reflects a similar pattern of development in all cultures (1971, p. 171).
Kohlberg suggests that stage development occurs by the individual interacting with his environment. The individual builds a cognitive structure (the way a person organizes, analyzes and interprets data to solve problems) that interacts effectively with his environment. However, when new experiences transpire which cannot be accounted for by the existing cognitive structure the individual seeks to revamp his thinking. Thus, the essential ingredient for cognitive moral development appears to be the presentation of experiences which stretches one's cognitive structure so that more adequate ways can develop to organize experiences and actions. Accordingly, Kohlbergian's programs of values education have not only included discussions about controversial issues but have made them a staple item.

According to Kohlberg, there are two reasons why higher stages of moral reasoning are better than lower stages. First, higher stages represent a higher structural organization for analyzing problems both in terms of tracing out implications and integrating diverse considerations. Second, higher stages represent a more mature sense of justice. The major purpose of this approach to values education is the facilitation of individual stage transition. Although stage transition occurs naturally, very few people in our society achieve the highest stage of moral reasoning. Kohlberg states that intervention by way of values education programs in the schools based upon the cognitive moral development model can speed up a person's stage development.

Empirical Findings

This approach to values education has been the most thoroughly researched of any reviewed in this chapter. The range of studies covers
a wide research front, from Kohlberg's cross-cultural and longitudinal studies of stage development to studies of variables that are used to measure hierarchical personality development. It is beyond the scope of this review to report all the empirical findings associated with this approach. This review will be limited to the research that has direct implications for: 1) the impact of overall curriculum programs using this approach and 2) the specific instructional treatment effects on students' moral development.

Curriculum Program Effects

Cognitive moral development is premised upon the assumption that moral development passes through a natural sequence of stages. As such, this approach defines the central purpose of moral education curriculum as the stimulation of the child toward the next step in natural development. The movement to the next stage of development rests not only on exposure to the next level of thought but also on experiences of conflict in the person's application of his current level of thought in problematic situations (Rest, 1974, pp. 244-245).

Recently, there have been studies on a number of curriculums based on the Kohlbergian model. In 1975, Sullivan, et.al., reported the effects of courses that involved the study and discussion of personal events involving moral issues on fifth grade students. A wide range of topics were included in the course such as, rules people give us, the place of laws, judges and police, prejudice against races, social class and other groups, and settling conflicts of interest in society.
The experimental group (N=24) consisted of students in the course just described, but the control group (N=24) did not participate in the above course or have discussions about value issues. A moral reasoning questionnaire (the source and type were not specified) was used in pre- and post-testing of both groups.

Analysis of pre- and post-tests indicated that both groups changed from predominantly stage one to predominantly stage three reasoning in the treatment year. However, the administration of the delayed post-test a year later revealed two differences - 1) the appearance of stage four reasoning in the experimental group but not in the control group, and 2) the disappearance of stage one reasoning in the experimental group but not in the control group. This study also suggests that conventional thinking may be stimulated in the elementary school child where before such thinking had been the norm for secondary students.

Although these results initially tend to support usage of the cognitive moral development to teach about values, a few words of caution are in order. The design of the study did not employ randomization, the number of subjects was small and no information about the types of measures used was given.

A study conducted by Beck, et.al., 1972, evaluated high school students in an experimental ethics course. The aims of the course were to stimulate students' moral development. Seventeen students comprised the control group and were enrolled in an unrelated course. The experimental group (N=17) was exposed to a variety of ethical topics over a span of four months for two, forty minute periods a week. Both the
experimental and control groups were within the same I.Q. range. Pre-, post- and delayed tests utilized the Kohlberg Moral Judgment Scale.

An analysis of the pre- and post-test revealed that both groups were essentially the same in moral reasoning with the majority of students reasoning at stages two, three and four. However, the follow-up post-test administered one year later indicated that two-thirds of the experimental group were using some stage five reasoning while only one-tenth of the control group used some stage five thinking.

As in the study reported by Sullivan, this study tends to support the claim that when students are exposed to higher stages of moral argumentation repeatedly over a period of time, they will adopt higher stages of moral reasoning themselves. However, the findings of this study should be viewed in light of its several shortcomings, namely, randomization was not employed in the design of the study, the number of subjects was small, and no reliability data was furnished for Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Scale.

Beck and Sullivan conducted a study of lower middle class Canadian twelfth grade students. The experimental and control groups were equally divided between males and females and met biweekly (four classes per week) for fall and spring semesters. The ethics course they were taking included the same topics as the course mentioned in the Beck, 1972 study. A matched control group did not take the ethics course.

Due to problems beyond the researcher's control the control group could only be pre-tested. The experimental group received both a
pre- and post-test and a delayed (one year) post-test. The Kohlberg Moral Judgment Questionnaire was used in all the testing. Due to this problem, no comparison between groups could be made. The researchers did plot a profile of major stage usage of the experimental group. Pre-, post- and follow-up testing of the experimental group revealed that there was no significant increase in stage five reasoning although there was a trend in this direction in the follow-up assessment. The dominant stage of reasoning for this group was stage three. Like the earlier Beck study, there was a negligible amount of stage one and stage six reasoning.

Erickson, 1975, studied twenty-three tenth grade women enrolled in a one quarter course, "A Study of Women Through Literature," at a Minneapolis alternative school. The course contained both practicum experiences and seminar sessions to examine and reflect upon the process of women's psychological development. The content of the course was a combination of historical and contemporary moral dilemmas about women. One of the central aims of this study was to determine the amount of stage change in the twenty-three subjects.

The study employed a one group pre- and post-test design. A variety of assessment instruments were used in pre- and post-testing, one of which was the Kohlberg Moral Judgment Scale. The data gathered by the Kohlberg instrument indicated that the average amount of pre- and post-test change represented a one-third stage increase, from stage three to stage four, during the period of intervention.
These results must be interpreted cautiously as no randomization was employed in the research design and a delayed measure was not used to determine if these results would decay with time.

**Instructional Treatment Effects**

This section will report the empirical studies of specific ways in which learning conditions and treatment mechanisms can be manipulated to promote moral development in individuals.

Rest, et al., 1969, examined Kohlberg's claim that persons tend to prefer stages of thinking about their predominant stage rather than stages below their stage orientation. Kohlberg further claims that persons at a given stage will understand and reproduce stages at their level, at stage levels below and at one stage higher, but probably never at two stages higher. Hence, it is expected that persons exposed to one stage higher than their predominant stage will be able to assimilate this stage into their cognitive framework better than two stages higher.

Rest studied eleven male and eleven female fifth grade students between the ages of ten and twelve years and twelve male and eleven female eighth grade students between thirteen and fourteen years of age. All subjects were obtained from a Catholic parochial school in New York City. The average I.Q. of the subjects was 119, ranging from 95-150.

Subjects were pre-tested with Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview which consisted of five hypothetical conflict situations. Responses were scored and the stage of each individual was determined. In the experimental sessions students were exposed to two additional conflict situations and their responses were scored by stages.
Analysis of the results indicated that students tended to prefer stage reasoning higher than their own. Further analysis of the data revealed that the accuracy of recapitulation of stage arguments declined as the stage of the statement was advanced. This supports the notion that comprehension above the subject's predominant stage is more difficult than the stage thinking below. Finally, it was found that subjects assimilate thinking that is directly above their own stage more readily than thinking one stage below or two stages above their own.

In a similar study, Rest, 1974, replicated his 1969 study with a group of forty-seven twelfth grade students in a Chicago suburb. Students were pre-tested with Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview. The major difference in this study was that Rest tested the students' comprehension of all stages below their predominant stage.

This study supported the findings of the previous Rest study. In addition, the study indicated that students were able to comprehend all the stages below their own. These students also rejected all staged advice to the character in the dilemma that was below their predominant stage. One interesting and contrary finding was that there was a tendency for students to prefer stages way past their predominant stage even though they could not comprehend the structure of the stage argument.

Leming's, 1974, study addressed two questions. 1) Is there a difference between the moral reasoning people use to justify actions they claim they would take and the moral reasoning they use in judging the actions of others? 2) Is there a difference between the moral
reasoning people use in dealing with situations which are unfamiliar to their life space and the moral reasoning they use in situations which are familiar to their life space?

Sixty public school students were randomly selected from two middle schools and two high schools in the Madison, Wisconsin area. These eighth and twelfth grade students were measured on two variables, moral judgment (determining after the fact whether a person's actions were justified), and moral deliberation (deciding the correct course of action for yourself in an incomplete situation). The second treatment variable was the type of situation used as the basis for the dilemma which also consisted of two levels, 1) the classical dilemma in which the student judges the action of others portrayed in a story and 2) the practical dilemma which involves ones own actions in a realistic situation. Realistic situations were determined by an analysis of a survey that asked one-hundred and eighty-six students in these schools to identify everyday moral conflict situations.

A 2x2x2 factorial design was utilized to analyze the data which resulted in the following findings.

1. Twelfth graders had significantly (.05) higher mean moral maturity scores than eighth graders.
2. Mean moral maturity scores were significantly (.05) higher for all subjects in the judgment mode than in the deliberation mode.
3. That significantly (.001) lower moral maturity scores were found on moral deliberation about practical moral dilemmas than on classical dilemmas for both groups.
4. That twelfth grade students reasoned at predominantly stage two on practical moral dilemmas and stage three on classical moral dilemmas.
Leming concludes that both types of moral dilemmas should be included in the social studies curriculum so that moral development can occur in reasoning about one's own, as well as others' actions.

Harris, 1976, in his doctoral dissertation, reasoned that instruction in psychological awareness (classroom instruction about interpersonal communication skills) would sensitize and equip students to make rapid moral maturity gains in subsequent moral discussions. Harris studied forty-five eleventh grade students randomly selected from one-hundred and ninety-eight volunteers from world history classes. Students were stratified by sex and I.Q. and were randomly assigned to each of three groups. Harris employed a pre- and post-test control group design which utilized two experimental groups and one control group. One experimental group received nine weeks (one hour a day) of psychological awareness (PA) and another nine weeks of moral discussion (MD) in a values education course. The second experimental group received eighteen weeks of MD in a values education course. The control group received eighteen weeks of instruction in economics. All three groups were administered a pre-, mid- and post-test. The instrument used for testing was the Kohlberg Moral Judgment Interview.

Data analysis reveals that both treatment groups advanced one-half stage during the experiment while the control group only advanced one-sixth stage. When comparing treatment groups, Harris found that there was little stage growth in the PA/MD group the first nine weeks. However, in the second nine weeks this group's rate of MD was much greater than that of the MD group for the first nine weeks.
Although the size of this study was small it points to an interesting hypothesis - that certain educational experiences implemented prior to discussions of moral dilemmas will help increase a person's rate of moral development. Further research is needed to confirm this hypothesized dormant seed effect.

**Criticisms**

During the last five years cognitive moral development has been addressed in both professional conferences and educational journals. Presumably, many educators and classroom teachers have boarded the Kohlberg "bandwagon." While this approach to values has received much attention, not all of the attention has been favorable. Most of the criticisms to date have centered around the universality of stages, implementation of the approach in the classroom, and the research instrument used to empirically gather data.

**Universality of Stages**

On the evidence compiled from longitudinal and cross-cultural studies, Kohlberg claims that his six stages of moral reasoning are universal. A number of scholars have questioned this universality. Both Fraenkel, 1976-1977 and Simpson, 1974, question whether a dozen studies are sufficient to make such a claim for all mankind, especially in light of Kohlberg's own admission that the incidence of persons reasoning at stage six in western societies is marginal and that in pre-literate societies there is a noticeable absence of post-conventional thought.

Kurtines and Greif, 1974, also question the notion of universality because in the reporting of the studies in America, Taiwan, Mexico and
Turkey, Kohlberg has left out quantitative information about the sample. (Size, characteristics of subjects; the range, percentage and standard deviations of the subjects' stage scores; the methods used to determine a person's stage; and a reporting of the reliability of the Moral Judgment Scale.) Without such information the scholarly community is left to accept Kohlberg's word on faith, and these two authors are reluctant to do so.

Aside from problems in quantity and quality of research conducted, Fraenkel, 1976-1977, Simpson, 1974, and Peters, 1975, also question universality from the standpoint of the rather western concept of justice, that is the unifying concept for reasoning, at each of Kohlberg's six stages. In this regard, Simpson has stated,

> Highly abstract concepts such as justice have so little commonality in meaning from one group to another as to be practically useless as cross-cultural generalizations. Concept development simply does not mean the same thing from one class of one culture to another (1974, p. 96).

Fraenkel provides further support for this idea when he talks about the Ik of northeastern Uganda who apparently have no conception of the justice Kohlberg is talking about. In fact, one would have difficulty in saying that any notion of justice is at stake in their social relations with one another.

**Implementation**

The bulk of writing about cognitive moral development has been devoted to reporting the research about the approach and arguing its rationale rather than clearly detailing the specific knowledge, teaching methods and classroom operations a teacher must possess for
effective implementation of the approach. Recently, several publications (Beyer, 1976 and Galbraith and Jones, 1975-1976) have attempted to address these matters. In these publications the authors specify a variety of instructional organizational formats to engage students in the discussion of moral dilemmas, the role of the teacher as a discussion leader, the purpose of moral dilemmas, and how to create and use moral dilemmas.

In "The Kohlberg Bandwagon: Some Reservations," Fraenkel questions the wisdom of always making moral dilemmas devoid of many facts and circumstances, and involving few characters in uncomplicated situations. He feels that these types of dilemmas are unrealistic in a world where moral dilemmas are rarely simple and easily understood. He criticizes the methodology of the approach for its shallow emphasis on inquiry skills such as, clarifying facts and circumstances, the role of evidence in making decisions, and the testing of consequences of actions. Without these skills being used by the student in working through a moral dilemma, one has to question the amount of wisdom that will result from a discussion of moral dilemmas.

Another problem in implementing this approach is whether the teacher is supposed to stage score his students. In a "Review of Kohlbergian Programs," Rest, 1974, states that there are at least three purposes for stage scoring students. First, to assess student changes in moral thought before instruction so that higher stage models can be placed in each group of students. Second, so that the teacher can supply proper retorts in the class discussions of moral dilemmas. Third, to evaluate stage change after instruction. Although the
literature does not exactly specify the role of the teacher, we can reasonably expect that some sort of stage scoring is necessary to maximize the effects of this approach.

Recent research by Napier, 1976-1977, indicates that teachers cannot adequately stage score the moral reasoning of their students even with the aid of a training sequence and rater guide. In his experiments with elementary teachers and pre-service social studies teachers, Napier concluded, "At present, teachers should not try to stage score moral thought statements because they most likely stage score invalidly on the basis of content" (1977, p. 15).

Another difficulty with stage scoring is that some teachers may be reasoning at lower stages than their students, thereby making it difficult to recognize the moral stages of their students. Without this recognition, how are these teachers going to provide the appropriate verbal retorts during class discussions of moral dilemmas?

Instrumentation

The majority of research studies conducted about cognitive moral development have utilized Kohlberg's original Moral Judgment Instrument. This instrument contains nine moral dilemmas and two scoring guides - a global rating guide and a sentence rating guide. These guides are used to stage score the subjects' responses to moral dilemmas based on the subjects' justification of choices made about the dilemmas. The global rating guide is used to determine the stage response for the entire dilemma, and the sentence rating guide is used to determine a stage score for each thought-content unit about the dilemma. A
thought-content unit is any statement that expresses a single moral idea (Oldham, 1977, p. 3).

Three recent critiques of Kohlberg’s instrument reveal a number of critical shortcomings. Simpson, 1974, criticizes the instrument for its reliance upon the use of sophisticated theoretical modes of thought and analytic language by the subjects to score at the principled stages. For example, in responding to Hines’ dilemma one subject made the following responses to the questions, "Should the husband steal the drug to save his wife’s life? Should he do it for someone he just knows?"

Yes. A human life takes precedence over any other moral or legal value, whoever it is. A human life has inherent value whether or not it is valued by a particular individual.

He adds: The inherent worth of the individual human being is the central value in a set of values where the principles of justice and love are normative for all human relationships.

If this type of response is required to score a principled hit then most of the world’s population are disqualified. One can also question whether the instrument measures the ability to succeed in Philosophy 700 or the development of moral reasoning.

Oldham, 1977 and Kurtines and Greif, 1974, state that the results of research studies using this instrument cannot be generalized primarily because the interview questions and the dilemmas used vary considerably from study to study. This results in a continually changing moral judgment scale which gives no basis for making comparisons among studies.

Both of these authors also question the reliability of the instrument as there are no published estimates of stability and standard
error. As a result, it is not known whether moral development stage scores are stable over time and if these scores are internally consistent among dilemmas (Oldham, 1977, p. 4 and Kurtines and Greif, 1974, p. 457).

The predictive and construct validity of the instrument are also questioned. From a predictive standpoint little evidence exists that indicates that an individual's stage score is predictive of what moral action he will take (Oldham, 1977, p. 4 and Kurtines and Greif, 1974, pp. 459-460). Whereas, Kohlberg, 1975, has indicated that an individual stage score has some behavior correlates, he still has not shown how persons at the same stage behave alike or differently (Kurtines and Greif, 1974, p. 459).

Finally, if Kohlberg's instrument has construct validity, data gathered from this instrument should show the existence of the invariant sequence of stages and successive reorganization of these stages. Probably the most damaging evidence comes from Kohlberg himself and Leming, 1974. In a 1969 study of high school students Kohlberg found that the principled reasoners of this group, in time, regressed to lower stages. Although Leming did not find stage regression in students who were scored on the basis of hypothetical dilemmas, considerable regression was found when real-life moral dilemmas were discussed. These findings appear to directly contradict the theory of invariant sequence.
Value Analysis

Theoretical Summary

The value analysis approach to values education is designed to address two types of value conflicts that exist in American society - intrapersonal (when a person is forced to choose between competing good values rather than between good and bad values) and interpersonal (when two or more people assign different values to the same act or object).

In order to deal with these two types of conflict, this approach adopts a reflective methodology which has a close correspondence with the scientific mode of verifying questions of fact. Although value claims and factual claims are two different, yet related types of content, the reflective examination and verification of value judgments involves much more than the validation of judgments of fact (Philips, 1974, p. 117). Unlike the resolution of factual claims, the resolution of value disputes requires the individual move from an awareness of the value disputes to the empirical operations of predicting and testing consequences in order to anchor the value disputes in their factual setting. The individual is also required to stipulate a value criterion against which the values in conflict may be judged.

These general operations for justifying value judgments are generally translated into the following intellectual procedures.

1. An analysis of value concepts
2. An empirical or factual exploration of consequences
3. An appraisal of the consequences in terms of criteria
4. A justification of the criteria used to appraise the consequences (Metcalf, 1968, p. 134).
The initial step of concept analysis requires the students to identify the value issue, state of affairs or behavior, to define the value concepts by example as well as by their general characteristics, and to stipulate the concept's meaning. These procedures are intended to make terminology in the value realm precise, explicit and meaningful so that initial inquiry will not be confounded.

The second step is designed to shift the inquiry from the value domain to the factual or empirical realm. It requires the disputants to perceive, predict and explore the possible consequences of their value choices. When disputes arise over whether all courses of action will accomplish a stated end, students are asked to gather and assemble empirical and factual data to test their hypothesis. Hunt and Metcalf argue this point when they state, "Only by testing various and conflicting judgments of fact can students decide on the truth about consequences" (1968, p. 136).

The third step is a shift from the empirical to the normative realm. At this stage students are asked to appraise the consequences of the conflicting values in terms of a set of criteria. The consequences of a value judgment must be matched against their appraisal criteria and a judgment must be made as to their worth.

The final step is an inquiry into the justification of the criteria used in the assessment of the worth of the consequences. Coombs and Meux (1971, pp. 54-58) identify four procedures that can be utilized to accomplish this end. First, the student considers whether he can accept the judgments that result from applying it to new cases that
are logically relevant. Second, the student assembles evidence that shows that the value criteria used is derived from a basic moral principle or standard which he accepts. Third, the student exchanges roles with someone who is affected by the application of the criteria and then considers whether he can accept the criteria in this new role. Finally, the student can speculate what the consequences would be if everyone were to engage in the actions being evaluated and then be commended if he can accept the consequences.

**Empirical Findings**

This approach to values education is widely accepted by scholars in social studies education. This approach has been advocated in a wide variety of pre-service social studies methods texts and is the major approach to values education in many of the new social studies curriculum projects. With this widespread acceptance one would reasonably expect that this approach would have a substantial research base behind it. However, in reviewing the research literature this writer found only three studies that dealt with value analysis.

In her doctoral dissertation, Levande, 1971, studied effects of the presentation of specific value information and the application of the value analysis approach to selected social studies content by means of two teaching methods with middle school students. The two teaching methods utilized were teacher and programmed instruction about valuing and the value analysis approach.

Levande randomly assigned one-hundred and fifty-eight seventh and eighth grade students to four treatment groups: a teacher led
value information and analysis group, a programmed instruction-value information and analysis group, a teacher led values information group, and a control group receiving no formal instruction about values. These treatments lasted ten weeks.

A "Knowledge of Values Test," designed by Levande, and the Moral Judgment Test (type unknown and designed by another researcher) were used to collect pre- and post-test information about acquisition and retention of information on values and moral maturity of the subjects. Additionally, a content analysis of subjects' essays about resolution of value conflicts was used.

Levande found that presentation of specific value information and its application to selected social studies content resulted in a significant increase in knowledge about values and maturity of moral judgments for all treatment groups, regardless of type of instruction. With regards to the value analysis approach and its application, she found it did not have a significant effect on maturity of moral judgment and it was not significantly reflected in students' essay responses to selected value conflict situations.

In another study, Wright and Simon, 1976, chose just one element of value analysis - systematic data classification - to examine. This element was divided into two categories - desirable (D)/undesirable (UD) and feasible (F)/infeasible (IF). This element was examined for the impact it had on reducing a student's mind set towards a value laden communication about controlling water pollution.

The study's sample was the entire sixth grade population (N=248) from four schools which were considered representative of all elementary
schools in Calgary Catholic School District No. 1 in Canada. Students were pre-tested to determine the students' mind set towards the F and IF of taking action on water pollution.

In the experimental situation the subjects were randomly assigned to one of four treatment groups. Group 1 received the experimental instrument (information about water pollution and the D/UD, F/IF of action to control pollution) and was asked to conclude whether the evidence pointed to the D/UD, F/IF on taking action on water pollution.

Group 2 received the same instrument and instructions as Group 1, but in addition was given written information on how to classify data about D and UD. No criteria for classifying evidence in the D and UD categories were given. However, criteria were specified for classifying data into the F and IF categories. With this information subjects were asked to conclude the D/UD and F/IF of action on the problem.

Group three was given the same instrument, instructions and tasks as Group 2, but was also given criteria for classifying information into the D and UD categories and then was asked to conclude the D/UD and F/IF of action on the problem.

Group 4 was given the same instrument, instructions and tasks as Groups 2 and 3. In addition, it received a forty-five minute training program about using classification procedures on materials other than the experimental materials. Subjects were then asked to conclude the D/UD and F/IF of action on the problem.

Analysis of the data suggested the following conclusions.

1. The mind set in Group 4 was reduced by the usage of the classification procedure.
2. The use of this procedure is feasible with sixth grade students.
3. Training in relevant classification skills is necessary for the classification procedure to have a significant effect on mind set.

VanSickle, 1977, chose to study three preconditions of value analysis - describing a value dilemma, identifying alternative value choices, and identifying the problem consequences of each choice. He examined slow learner achievement of these preconditions by means of aural and visual presentations which differed in the amount of concrete and sensory experiences they contained.

The sample (N=75) was selected from two junior high schools and one high school. The Iowa Test of Basic Skills subscores for reading comprehension, language usage, and work-study skills were used to identify the population. Intelligence scores from the Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test were also recorded. Students were randomly assigned to one of five treatment groups, each containing fifteen students.

The value dilemma used for each group was what action the President of the United States should take in a hypothetical international crisis. The presentation of the dilemma varied in the degree of experimental concreteness for each of the five groups. For example, Group 1 was provided with only a verbal description of the dilemma while Group 5 received a presentation that contained an audio tape, teacher role playing, and pictures illustrating the dilemma. Each group was then asked open-ended questions about each of the three preconditions of value analysis. Students' responses to these questions were recorded and coded and resulted in a score for each question.
Analysis of the scores for each question revealed that there were no statistically significant differences between the five treatment groups. The effects of the presentations were not significant and no significant degree of achievement of the preconditions for value analysis was found for any of the five groups.

Criticisms

In reviewing the literature about value analysis, this writer found one article that criticized value analysis. In "Moral Education: Is Reasoning Enough?" Oliver and Bane (1971) discuss their experiences in teaching students to use this approach in analyzing public issues. They state that under the leadership of a competent instructor, students can learn to carry out rational discussions about value issues. However, these authors also specify a number of serious problems they encountered in using this approach.

Although students often become interested in a wide variety of value issues they do not necessarily take these issues seriously. While students relish the opportunity to state their opinions, they are reluctant to listen to and entertain the opinions of others. When issues are raised that are personally relevant to students they seem to be unable to view these issues objectively, thus the ensuing discussion serves as an arena for airing opinions rather than clarification. Likewise, when issues are not perceived as important, class discussion becomes a game where students second guess the teacher for the right answers.

In light of these problems, Oliver and Bane doubt that there is much transfer of learning to situations outside the classroom. Students
may do well on paper and pencil tests that purport to measure the process of value analysis but spontaneous student dialogues are little effected.

**Chapter Summary**

Research investigating the effectiveness of inculcation, values clarification, cognitive moral development and value analysis as instructional approaches used to teach and/or teach about values is still in its infancy. However, several tentative findings from these studies warrant attention.

Although the actual classroom research about inculcation is slim, it does indicate that this type of approach is effective with students of low intelligence because other approaches may be beyond their cognitive reach. However, this idea should be viewed with extreme caution as more research is needed to support such a finding. Whether more research will be conducted remains doubtful in light of the philosophical grounds of the new social studies and the research findings cited by McGinnies, Flieshman, et.al., and Peck and Havighurst.

When looking at values clarification, the research indicates that the utilization of this approach by social studies teachers may be effective in improving students' self-concepts, value related behaviors and reading achievements. However, the type of research that is needed to support these findings are studies that employ delayed post-tests to help determine whether these results will, in time, decay. Should future research provide reliable information about the effectiveness of this approach, one still should consider its ethical and conceptual problems before using it in the classroom.
A review of empirical studies about cognitive moral development partially warrants the claim that the discussions of moral dilemmas can promote stage growth in students at both elementary and secondary levels. An ancillary finding is that the effects of such curricula may remain dormant for a period of time.

Research about specific treatments indicates that student exposure to divergent stage levels of more argumentation, is one necessary factor for moral development. Also one finding indicates that students who are instructed in psychological education prior to the discussion of moral dilemmas, may accelerate their stage growth.

While much of the research is supportive of this approach to values education, many of these studies have collected data by using the original Kohlberg Moral Judgment Instrument. Serious questions have been raised about the reliability and validity of this instrument.

Unlike value clarification and cognitive moral development, value analysis has few research studies conducted about its effectiveness as an instructional tool. It seems that this approach is just accepted by social studies scholars as the approach to teach about values.

The findings by Levande, Wright and Simon, and VanSickle suggest that: 1) students have difficulty using it to resolve value conflicts, 2) it is possible to teach sixth grade students the preconditions of this approach and that these preconditions may help reduce their mind set about value laden communications and 3) students with low intelligence have difficulty in utilizing the preconditions of this approach. These findings suggest that future research should be conducted on the
specific components of this approach. Whether this approach can be taught to students so that they can effectively utilize it to resolve value conflicts can not presently be determined.

This chapter provided a theoretical summary and reviewed the relevant research and criticisms about inculcation, values clarification, cognitive moral development and value analysis. Chapter three provides a description of the methodology used in this study.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology used in this study. Specifically, a description of the population under study, sampling procedures, design of the survey instrument, follow-up procedures, and problems confronted during the study will be offered.

Population

The population studied was public secondary, social studies teachers in Ohio. The schools composing the sample were secondary schools (grades 7-12) and elementary schools that contained a seventh and/or eighth grade curriculum.* For example, Comron School of Switzerland, Ohio Local has grades K-8. Though the majority of the faculty are elementary teachers, it is conceivable that the seventh and eighth grade social studies teachers may be teaching in the area of values education. Since the writer wanted an accurate description of the current practices of teachers engaged in values education, such schools as Comron were included in the sample. Teachers employed by vocational and special need schools+ were not included in the population.

*Schools in Ohio having grades K-8 may apply for either an elementary or junior high charter.

+The state of Ohio also grants special need charters to schools who offer special programs to students in need of emotional and physical rehabilitation, and evening education.
Sampling Procedures

A mail survey was judged to be the most appropriate technique to gather data, as the population was geographically scattered throughout the state. A simple random sampling technique could not be used because no list of social studies teachers by school was available; therefore, teachers could not be contacted directly. A cluster sampling technique was used where schools were randomly selected from those listed in the Ohio Educational Directory. Principals of the schools selected were relied upon to distribute the survey randomly to their social studies faculty. The population of the study was 12,807 public secondary social studies teachers in Ohio. A sample of 750 of these teachers was selected by a two stage cluster sampling procedure wherein 205 schools were randomly selected as clusters, and teachers were proportionally sampled within each cluster.

The Ohio Educational Directory lists the size of each school by the number of students and faculty. Since the writer was surveying only secondary social studies teachers, it was necessary to decide how many surveys should be sent to each school. To solve this problem, a determination had to be made as to (A) how many social studies teachers there were in a given school and (B) how many social studies teachers existed in the clusters. This was necessary in order to assume that the ratio of surveys sent to each school was in proportion to the number of social studies teachers in a school and to the total number of social studies teachers in the sample. To calculate (A), the number of social studies teachers in a school, the total number of social studies teachers in
Ohio (12,807)* was divided by the total number of secondary teachers in Ohio (58,047)+. This quotient was then multiplied by the number of teachers in a school (number will vary by school). To calculate (B), the total number of secondary social studies teachers in the clusters (1,568), the total number of social studies teachers in the state was divided by the total number of secondary teachers in the state and this quotient was multiplied by the total number of teachers in the clusters (7,111). Normally, calculating (B) would have been an easy task if it were not for some schools containing both secondary and elementary teachers. Elementary teachers were eliminated by taking the total number of teachers in the school (both elementary and secondary), dividing by the number of grades in the school and multiplying this quotient times the number of secondary grades, resulting in the number of secondary teachers in the school. The remaining elementary teachers were subtracted from the sample, and the secondary teachers were added back in, giving the writer 7,111 secondary teachers in the sample.

Once (A) and (B) were calculated, the quotient was multiplied by 750 (sample size) which gave the writer the number of surveys to send to each school. For example, Eastmoor High School in Columbus, Ohio would receive six surveys when employing the formula \( A = \frac{12.79}{B = 1568} \times 750 = 6.\)

*This information was supplied to the writer by Mr. Jim Daubenmire at the Ohio Department of Education's Division of Computer Services and Statistical Reports.

*If the formula indicated less than .5 of a survey was to be sent to a school, no survey was sent.
Design of the Survey

A survey was designed to gather data regarding teachers' perceptions and utilizations of inculcation, cognitive moral development, values clarification, and value analysis. There were three reasons for only surveying teachers about these four approaches. First, to have included more than four approaches would have increased the length and complexity of the instrument thus adversely affecting the response rate. Second, the approaches represented in the instrument have received a majority of the scholarly attention in terms of publications and conference topics. Finally, many of the published curriculum materials about values education utilize one of the approaches included in the instrument. In light of the last two reasons one can reasonably expect that many teachers who are teaching values education are using one of the four approaches represented in the survey. Certainly it is possible that some teachers may be using other approaches to values education and that some teachers may be using a hybrid of the approaches being surveyed, however, the survey is not designed to collect data on either of these two situations. Therefore, when the writer refers to the approaches to values that teachers are using, he is referring to the approaches contained in the survey instrument.

The survey contained two parts. Part A was designed to assess whether teachers were teaching about values and to determine what approaches to values education they were using. Teachers who indicated usage of an approach were directed to answer questions about its use in each subject currently being taught. Teachers were asked what they
perceived was the purpose of values education and were directed to answer questions about the major advantages and disadvantages of the approaches they were using. Other questions sought to discover where teachers learned about the approach and its methodology. Finally, teachers were asked whether the decision to teach about values was made individually or as a result of district policy. Teachers who indicated that they did not teach in the area of values education were directed to answer a question concerning their reasons for choosing not to teach in this area.

It is reasonable to assume that, with the existence of a number of approaches to values education and their supporting curriculum materials, many teachers may be confused about the purpose and student outcomes of the approaches, thus making efficient and effective instruction difficult. Questions (1 and 3) were used to indicate the teacher's understanding of the approach he had chosen. Question 1 asked the teacher to check the statement that best reflects his approach to values education (See Appendix A). Several statements in the response pool represented a specific purpose and approach to values. For example:

1. To instill certain values in students so their values more nearly reflect those desired by our society. = Cultural Transmission*

2. To help students develop more complex reasoning patterns based upon a higher set of values. = Cognitive Moral Development

3. To help students use logical thinking and scientific investigation to analyze social value issues. = Value Analysis

*The term cultural transmission was substituted for inculcation as the writer felt inculcation would convey a negative connotation to the respondents of the survey.
4. To help students become aware of and identify their own values and those of others.

Question 3 asked teachers what they felt were the major advantages in using a given approach to values education. The response pool contained specific student outcomes for each of the approaches being studied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Transmission</td>
<td>16. It helps my students learn the right values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Moral Development</td>
<td>7. I agree with its stage theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. It helps my students develop higher stages of moral reasoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Analysis</td>
<td>13. It helps my students become more adept at thinking logically and using the scientific method.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. It helps develop my students' capabilities in decision making and problem solving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Clarification</td>
<td>10. It is applicable for a wide variety of value issues both at the personal and social level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. It helps my students develop empathy for people who have different values.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a teacher checked response 2 of question 1 and responses 7 or 14 of question 3, the teacher was judged to understand cognitive moral development. Similarly, if a teacher answered question 1 with response 3 and answered question 3 with response 16, the teacher was judged not to have an understanding of value analysis. Though the exact degree of teacher understanding of any of the approaches cannot be achieved by merely charting his consistency of responses to two questions, a determination can be made as to whether the teacher has any idea of what the approaches' purposes and designated student outcomes are.
Part B of the survey was primarily designed to gather information about specific personal and professional characteristics of the teachers using approaches to values. Teachers were directed to answer questions about their age and sex, along with questions regarding the location and size of their school, the number of professional organizations belonged to, and a number of degrees earned. Other questions were asked concerning the ways teachers felt the field of values education could be improved and what subjects were currently being taught.

A number of books and empirical studies were helpful in conceptualizing and constructing the survey. The studies by Blaga (1978), Ernster (1976), and Turner and Haley (1975) involving surveys of social studies teachers, served as a model for constructing the questions pertaining to the professional and personal characteristics of the teachers surveyed. Unfortunately, studies concerning teachers' perceptions and utilizations of specific approaches to serve as models for constructing Part A of the survey were nonexistent. There were, however, a number of books about values education that aided the writer in conceptualizing and designing Part A of the survey. Purple and Ryan's, Moral Education and Kinker's, You and Values Education, both contained arguments for and against values education in the schools. Many of these arguments were distilled and adopted as part of the responses for questions 2 and 5 of the survey. A number of authors (Superka, 1973; Wease, 1973; and Silver, 1976) have indicated that with the growing number of curriculum materials and approaches to values education there is confusion among teachers about the approaches' purposes, teaching methodologies, instructional models and student outcomes. Both Superka's, Values Education Sourcebook and
Silver's, *Values Education*, offer typologies of approaches to values in order to help eliminate teachers' confusion over the approaches. These two sources were particularly useful in constructing responses to questions 1 and 3 in the survey. Finally, Kerlinger's, *Foundations of Behavioral Research* and Babbie's, *The Practice of Social Research*, provided information about the limitations of survey research, proper construction and wording of the questions and responses, and proper sampling procedures.

The first draft of the survey was circulated among three professors of social studies education and one professor of curriculum and foundations, all of whom were faculty members in the College of Education at The Ohio State University. The survey was also circulated among four of the writer's graduate colleagues in the College of Education at The Ohio State University. All of the reviewers were asked to make written and verbal criticisms about the survey. The reactions varied, with the majority of the criticisms being directed at the length and complexity of the survey. Several professors felt that the directions were too complex and expressed their fear of a low response rate. These suggestions and others were incorporated into the refinement of the survey.

The survey was revised and pilot tested in one of the professor's graduate seminars. The majority of the persons in the seminar were social studies teachers. The teachers completed the survey in the author's presence and were asked to make written and verbal reactions as to the survey's clarity of directions, organization and length.
Though a plurality of the teachers completed the survey without complications, they did make suggestions as to how to streamline the survey.

The final revision of the survey, was reviewed by Mr. Alvin Stutz and Ms. Judy Johnson of Systems Engineering at The Ohio State University in terms of its adaptability to statistical and computer analysis. Each question in the survey was assigned a numeric code for the coding of returned surveys. Both of the consultants agreed that the SASS computer program would be able to perform the necessary variable transformations needed to compute the data.

The survey, along with the proper documents, was sent to the Human Subjects Review Committee of The Ohio State University Research Foundation (See Appendix B). A letter requesting a waiver of the informed consent rule accompanied the documents sent to the committee. The writer felt that if he had to send an informed consent waiver to all the subjects participating in the survey, that it would not only add significantly to the cost of the study but would add a sinister air to the study itself, thereby affecting the response rate. The writer was informed by the Human Subjects Review Committee that the informed consent rule had been waived for this study.

The surveys were mailed to the participating schools. The mailing included letters of introduction to both principals and social studies teachers, and stamped, self-addressed envelopes for return of the surveys. The letter sent to the principals requested that they distribute the surveys randomly to members of their social studies staffs.
These letters also briefly explained the nature of the survey, how schools were selected and assurances of confidentiality of each school's name (See Appendix A).

Follow-Up

The writer applied for the Graduate Student Alumni Research Award for spring quarter and was granted one-hundred dollars for use in the follow-up of this study (See Appendix C). The grant was used to finance the duplicating and mailing of letters and telephone calls to principals of schools with low return rates.

Three weeks after the initial mailing, a return of 20.9 percent (160 surveys) was received. Of the 186* schools receiving surveys, 69 had not returned any surveys and 117 returned at least 1 survey. Letters were sent to principals of schools having a return rate of less than 60 percent. The letter explained the nature of the follow-up and requested the personal assistance of each principal in increasing his school's percentage of responses. Enclosed in the letter was a stamped, self-addressed postcard that was to be returned should the principal need additional surveys. Fifteen postcards were returned and additional surveys were sent.

Out of the thirty-four schools originally sent six or more surveys, twenty-eight had a response rate of less than 60 percent. Principals of these schools were contacted by telephone and were asked to personally assist in increasing the responses from his social studies teachers.

*Recall that the formula described on page three indicated that some schools would not receive surveys. Of the original 205 schools being surveyed, 19 did not receive surveys.
Four principals indicated that they had either lost or had not received surveys but were willing to distribute them if additional surveys were sent. This was done. Two principals informed the writer that it was late in the year and their social studies teachers would not have time to participate in the survey.

The above efforts produced an additional 52 surveys, making the total number of surveys received 223, of which 211 were usable. Based on the 762 surveys sent, the response rate was 27.6 percent.

Problems of the Study

Several problems arose during the study which affected the representativeness of the sample. First, a two stage cluster sampling technique was employed where schools were randomly selected as clusters and principals of each school were relied upon to carry out the second stage of random sampling. Whether principals distributed the surveys randomly to their social studies faculty cannot be determined. In all probability, however, the random procedures were broken at the second stage of sampling, thereby inflating the sampling error and making the representativeness of the survey questionable. Second, two major city school systems are not represented in the survey. Both of these systems required prior permission to participate before principals could distribute the surveys. The writer determined that it was too late in the academic year to file the proper documents and to reasonably expect that surveys would be returned. Not having returns from these schools resulted in under-representation of major city school systems in this study. Third, the response rate to this study was low, 27.6 percent.
The writer feels that two factors contributing to the response rate were timing and the complexity of the questionnaire. The surveys were mailed at a time of year when most teachers have additional responsibilities associated with the end of the school year, thus when confronted with a complex questionnaire asking information about teaching approaches to an abstract and perhaps controversial area of study, many teachers just never bothered filling it out. Many of the school systems were also being faced with teacher strikes due to financial and other internal problems.

With such a low response rate, the writer is hesitant to offer any generalizations beyond the actual respondents of this study. Finally, efforts to gather demographic data on a state wide basis to match with the teachers surveyed were thwarted. To retrieve such data would be too costly, as indicated by Mr. Gary Orr of the Ohio Department of Education's Computer Services and Statistical Reports. An effort was made to validate the representativeness of the study against a previous study of the same population (Blaga, 1978). These findings will be reported in Chapter Four.
CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS

The focus of this chapter is the analysis of the 211 returned surveys. For clarity, this chapter will be divided into two parts. Part I reports the personal and professional characteristics of the respondents as well as the geographical location and size of the schools in which they taught. Part II will report and analyze the data obtained from Part A of the survey.

A large portion of the data to be reported and analyzed in Part II, is in the form of frequencies and percentages of weighted teachers. It was necessary to weight teachers because the data gathered from them were for each course they taught. If data were tabulated without using a weighting procedure, a person who was teaching several sections of different courses would be counted by the computer as more than one person. To remedy this problem a weighting system was employed that assigned a weight to each teacher according to the percentage of total sections he was teaching of a specific course. For example, a teacher who taught a total of five sections of economics would receive a weight of one because each section taught was the same subject. Alternatively, a teacher who taught two sections each of psychology, government, and sociology would receive a weight of .333 for each course, the total being one.
In this chapter whenever the data involved are weighted, the writer is referring to the weighting factor just described. Similarly, when the writer mentions unweighted data he is referring to the raw frequencies and percentages of teachers.

**Part I: Characteristics of Teachers**

**Personal Characteristics**

Table 1 contains the data pertaining to the sex of the teachers participating in the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRIBUTION OF FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR TEACHERS' SEX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 1 the largest percentage of teachers surveyed were males (80 percent) while females represented only 21 percent.

*Percentages have been rounded out to the nearest whole number on all tables in Part I. Therefore, the totals at the bottom of the tables will vary from base 100.*
The data in Table 2 contains the age of the teachers responding to the survey.

**TABLE 2**

**DISTRIBUTION OF FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES FOR TEACHERS' AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 or younger</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 or older</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that the teachers surveyed represented a wide range of age groups. The smallest concentration of teachers was between the ages of fifty-six and sixty while the largest concentration was between the ages of twenty-six and thirty-five. Nine percent of the teachers
surveyed were under twenty-six while 36 percent of the teachers were over the age of thirty-five.

**Professional Characteristics**

Table 3 indicates the respondents' number of years of teaching experience, including the present year of teaching.

**TABLE 3**

DISTRIBUTION OF FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES
FOR RESPONDENTS' YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 or more</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>211</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows that the largest percentage of teachers (25 percent) had taught from seven to ten years while the smallest percentage of teachers (8 percent) had taught from eighteen to twenty-one years.

Table 4 shows the breakdown of teachers according to professional positions held.
Table 4 indicates that the majority of respondents (82 percent) were social studies teachers and only thirty-eight teachers (18 percent) were leaders of their departments.

Table 5 shows the degrees held by teachers who participated in the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies Teacher</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairperson/Coordinator</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 indicates that of all teachers surveyed, 98 percent held at least a Bachelor degree of which 96 teachers (46 percent) held only Bachelors and 109 teachers (52 percent) held Masters. Four respondents indicated they were working on their Bachelor degrees.

Table 6 shows the teachers' memberships in professional organizations.

TABLE 6
DISTRIBUTION OF FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES
FOR TEACHERS' MEMBERSHIPS IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Organizations</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated by Table 6, there were 103 teachers (50 percent) who did not belong to any professional organizations. Table 6 also indicated that the highest concentration of membership was only in one professional organization (33 teachers, 16 percent).
Table 7 shows the grade levels the teachers were currently teaching.

Table 7

DISTRIBUTION OF FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES
OF GRADES TAUGHT BY TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 indicates that the grade level most frequently taught by teachers participating in this survey was seventh grade.

Table 8 shows the breakdown of the courses the respondents of this survey were teaching.
TABLE 8
DISTRIBUTION OF FREQUENCIES OF COURSES TAUGHT BY TEACHERS (N=211)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American History</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio History</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>327</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

American History was the most frequently taught subject among the respondents with 95 of the 327 courses taught being American History. Anthropology was the least often taught course with only one teacher indicating that he taught one section. The "others" category was made up of a variety of special topic courses being taught for one semester.
The last professional characteristic dealt with was whether teachers had established tenure. Table 9 shows the results of this tabulation.

**TABLE 9**

**DISTRIBUTION OF FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES**

FOR TEACHERS WITH TENURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes or No</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 indicates that a majority of teachers surveyed did have tenure at the schools in which they taught.

**Geographical Characteristics**

The teachers surveyed were asked three questions regarding the location of their school, the student population of their schools and how far their schools were from the nearest teacher training institutions. Table 10 illustrates the location of the teachers' schools.
### TABLE 10

**DISTRIBUTION OF FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES FOR THE LOCATION OF TEACHERS' SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban-inner city</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban-outer city</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small town</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>211</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greatest concentration of teachers worked at suburban schools. Three teachers did not respond to this question perhaps because they felt that their schools did not fit into the provided classification scheme.

Teachers were asked the approximate number of students attending their schools. Table 11 indicates the student population of the teachers' schools based on four categories.
### TABLE 11

**DISTRIBUTION OF FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES**

**FOR THE STUDENT POPULATION OF TEACHERS' SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300 or less</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-500</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1000</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 or more</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows that a plurality of teachers taught at schools with populations of 1001 or more (42 percent) and that a minority of teachers taught at schools whose student population was 300 or less (7 percent).

The last question about geographical characteristics asked the teachers was how far their school was from the nearest teacher training institution such as a college or university. Table 12 provides data in four mileage categories for this question.
### TABLE 12

**DISTRIBUTION OF FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES FOR THE LOCATION OF TEACHERS' SCHOOLS FROM A TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 or less</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 or more</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 indicates that over half of the teachers (123 teachers, 59 percent) taught in schools that were less than ten miles from a teacher training institution and another 33 percent (70 teachers) were within thirty miles. A total of only sixteen teachers were over thirty miles from a teacher training institution.

**Significance of These Characteristics**

In chapter three it was reported that efforts to obtain state wide demographics about secondary social studies teachers, in order to make a determination as to the representativeness of this survey, were thwarted. The only demographics of Ohio secondary social studies teachers this writer could obtain were from another survey of the same population (Blaga, 1978). Selected personal, professional and geographic
demographics of the writer's survey and Blaga's survey were compared. The comparison was made by testing the null hypothesis (there are no statistical significant differences between the selected demographics of the two surveys) with Chi Square tests. Table 13 reports the results of these tests.

Table 13 indicates that there was no statistically significant differences in the following demographics; 1) the number of miles a teacher's school was from the nearest college or university, 2) the number of teachers having tenure, 3) the age of teachers, and 4) the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Demographics</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miles from the university</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of school</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>5.971</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees held</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional organizations</td>
<td>107.49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>4.925</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional positions</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses taught</td>
<td>133.9166</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade levels taught</td>
<td>94.770</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years of teaching experience</td>
<td>24.98</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 indicates that there was no statistically significant differences in the following demographics; 1) the number of miles a teacher's school was from the nearest college or university, 2) the number of teachers having tenure, 3) the age of teachers, and 4) the
degrees held by teachers. Statistically significant differences were found in the following demographics: 1) membership in professional organizations, 2) sex, 3) professional positions (whether a teacher was a department chairperson or just a social studies teacher), 4) the type of courses taught, and 5) the grade level teachers taught.

The significant difference between memberships in professional organizations can reasonably be accounted for because of the difference between the writer's and Blaga's definition of what constituted a professional organization. In Blaga's survey membership in a professional organization was both teacher associations such as NEA, AFT and OEA and professional social studies organizations such as NCSS and OCSS. In the writer's survey membership in professional organizations was limited to such organizations as NCSS, ASCD, OCEE and OCSS. As a result of these definitional differences, the respondents in Blaga's survey belonged to significantly more organizations than in the writer's survey. For example, in Blaga's survey the category receiving the largest percentage of responses (30 percent) was membership in three organizations. In the writer's survey 50 percent of the teachers belonged to no professional organizations. One can reasonably expect that if such organizations as NEA and OEA had been included in the survey that a greater percentage of teachers would have indicated membership.

One can only speculate as to why the rest of the demographics in Table 13 are significantly different. Perhaps the major reason for these differences is the sampling error contained in both surveys.
Each of the surveys had three levels of error. The first level of error was in selecting the sample and the second level of error was the result of having the principals distribute the surveys to their teachers. A third level of error was introduced by the low response rate of each of the surveys. It is entirely possible that any or all of these errors in each survey were working against one another and would be evident in the Chi Square tests. Clearly some of the demographics in the writer's survey are not different when compared with the same demographics in Blaga's study. However, other demographics are different thus the overall representation of the survey can not be determined.

Part II: Teachers' Perceptions and Utilizations of Approaches to Values Education

Table 14* shows the number and percentages of teachers who were teaching values education.

*Frequencies and percentages have been rounded out to the nearest whole number or percentage on all tables in Part II. Therefore, the totals at the bottom of the tables will vary from base 100.
As illustrated in Table 14, 80 percent of the weighted teachers were teaching values education in one or more of their social studies courses and 20 percent were not teaching values in one or more courses. Although thirty-two weighted teachers refused to check just one statement that best described their approach to values in a particular course, they did indicate they were teaching values education. Whether these teachers were using a number of separate approaches or a hybrid of approaches could not be determined. Thus, in one sense, 175 out of the 211 teachers were teaching values education.

Teachers who indicated they were not teaching values education in one or more courses were asked what their major reasons were for not teaching values education. Data obtained for this question is summarized in Table 15.
### TABLE 15

**DISTRIBUTION OF FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF THE REASONS WHY WEIGHTED TEACHERS DID NOT TEACH ABOUT VALUES EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-I do not have the necessary information and training to teach in the area of values education.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-The content of this course is not suitable for teaching in the area of values education.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-To execute properly, values education requires too much work and preparation.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-The priorities of this course do not allow time for teaching in the area of values education.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-I am quite satisfied with the way I teach now.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Teaching about values cannot be performed objectively. It is a form of indoctrination.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-I have enough to do already without trying everything that comes along.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-My students would not be receptive to values education.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-The teaching methodology is too complex to execute properly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-I cannot evaluate students objectively.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 indicates that 28 percent of the weighted teachers who claimed that they did not teach values education were not doing so because they did not have the necessary information and training.
Another 19 percent of these weighted teachers felt that the content of their courses was not suitable for teaching values education. Seventeen percent of the weighted teachers felt that values education required too much work and preparation to execute properly. None of these teachers said that the schools in which they taught frowned on teaching values education or that values education was primarily the duty of the church and/or family.

A majority of the respondents (80 percent), as indicated by Table 14, were teaching values education. These teachers were asked a number of questions to determine what approach to values education they were using. First, the teachers were asked, "Which of the following statements best reflects your teaching approach to values education in this particular course?" This question was followed by five statements. The first four statements represented the following four approaches to values education: 1) inculcation, 2) cognitive moral development, 3) value analysis, and 4) values clarification. The fifth statement indicated that the teacher did not teach values education. Data obtained by this question is compiled in Table 16.

Another question asked teachers to choose from a listing of four approaches, the approach to values education that they were using in each course. A third question asked teachers to state their major reasons for using this particular approach to values. In this question teachers could select up to six of seventeen possible responses for up to three separate courses. The data for these questions will be reported in Tables 16, 17, and 18.
Table 16 shows by number and percentage the generalized statements of purpose weighted teachers chose to reflect their approaches to values education.

**TABLE 16**

**DISTRIBUTION OF FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF WEIGHTED TEACHERS' PURPOSES FOR USING APPROACHES TO VALUES EDUCATION (N=143)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-To instill certain values in students so their values more nearly reflect those desired by our society.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-To help students develop more complex reasoning patterns based upon a higher set of values.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-To help students use logical thinking and scientific investigation to analyze social value issues.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-To help students become aware of and identify their own values and those of others.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>175</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 shows that 42 percent of the weighted teachers felt that the purpose of values clarification reflected their approach to values. Another 36 percent of the teachers stated the purpose of value analysis. The two least mentioned purposes were those of inculcation (11 percent) and cognitive moral development (12 percent).
Table 17 shows the approaches teachers indicated when they were asked to name their approaches.

TABLE 17

DISTRIBUTION OF FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES
OF NAMES OF APPROACHES USED BY WEIGHTED TEACHERS (N=137)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inculcation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive moral development</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value analysis</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values clarification</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 shows that 50 percent of the weighted teachers claimed that they were using values clarification. The least used approach (10 percent) was cognitive moral development.

Table 18* represents a computation of the major reasons weighted teachers gave for using a particular approach to values education. The information reported in Table 18 is the result of a cross-tabulation of teachers' responses to questions one and three in the survey (See Appendix A).

*The percentages contained in Table 18 exceed 300 percent because teachers in question three of the survey could choose up to six responses for three separate courses. If every teacher chose to use the maximum of six responses, the total percentage would be 600.
### TABLE 18
PERCENTAGES OF WEIGHTED TEACHERS' REASONS FOR USING APPROACHES TO VALUES EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>n=15 Inculcation%</th>
<th>n=17 Cognitive Moral Development%</th>
<th>n=51 Value Analysis</th>
<th>n=59 Values Clarification%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-The methodology is clear and understandable thus aiding me in efficient instruction.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-It takes a non-relativistic position on value issues.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-I agree with the way values are defined by this approach.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-The methodology clearly defines the instructional role of the teacher.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Its recommended class activities are interesting.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-I agree with its theory about how value conflicts are dealt with and resolved.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-I agree with its stage theory.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-I have received workshop and/or in-service training in using this teaching approach</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-I have information only about this approach.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 18 (Continued)

PERCENTAGES OF WEIGHTED TEACHERS' REASONS FOR USING APPROACHES TO VALUES EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>n =15 Inculcation%</th>
<th>n =17 Cognitive Moral Development%</th>
<th>n =51 Value Analysis%</th>
<th>Clari fi cation%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-It is applicable for a wide variety of value issues both at the personal and social level.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-It provides a change of pace for my students.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-It helps my students learn to cooperate with one another.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-It helps my students become more adept at thinking logically and using the scientific method.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-It helps my students develop higher stages of moral reasoning.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-It helps develop my students' capabilities in decision making and problem solving.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-It helps my students learn the right values.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-It helps my students develop empathy for people who have different values.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
<td><strong>891</strong></td>
<td><strong>442</strong></td>
<td><strong>392</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 18 shows the reasons teachers stated when they were asked to select the statement that best reflected their approach to values education. When looking at inculcation, 43 percent of the teachers' major reason for using this approach was that it helped their students learn to cooperate with one another. The reason receiving the smallest percentage (3 percent) of these teachers' responses was that they agreed with its theory about how value conflicts are dealt with and resolved.

Of the teachers who said they were using cognitive moral development, 75 percent responded that it helped to develop their students' capabilities in decision making and problem solving. None of the teachers using this approach responded that they agreed with its stage theory.

That it helped develop their students' capabilities in decision making and problem solving was the reason checked most often (76 percent) by teachers using value analysis. Only 3 percent of these teachers said that they agreed with its stage theory as a major reason for using value analysis.

Sixty-four percent of teachers using values clarification said that it helped their students develop empathy for people who have different values. Only 4 percent of these teachers stated, as the major reason for using values clarification, that the methodology clearly defined the instructional role of the teacher.

Discussion

When comparing Tables 16 and 17 it is apparent that the percentage of weighted teachers claiming to use a specific approach varies considerably. When teachers were asked to identify a statement that best
reflected their approaches to values. The data in Table 16 indicates that fifty-nine teachers (42 percent) were using values clarification, fifty-one teachers (36 percent) values analysis, seventeen teachers (12 percent) cognitive moral development, and fifteen teachers (11 percent) inculcation. Yet, when teachers were asked to name the approach they were using, Table 17 shows that sixty-eight teachers (50 percent) were using values clarification, thirty-three teachers (24 percent) value analysis, thirteen teachers (9 percent) cognitive moral development, and twenty-four teachers (17 percent) inculcation. It appears that many teachers in the sample were confused about the approach they said they were using in terms of its purpose and name.

New evidence to support the above claim is contained in Table 18 (Question three, See Appendix A). One would reasonably assume that if a teacher is knowledgeable about an approach's theoretical base and its instructional methodology that he also has some idea about what type of student outcomes the approach is designed to achieve. Thus when a teacher is asked to select the major reasons for using a specific approach, from a list of reasons containing specific outcomes relating to his and other approaches, he should only choose the reasons that isolate the outcomes of his approach.

When analyzing the data contained in Table 18, one does not find much evidence that inculcation teachers demonstrate an understanding of the purpose or the matched outcomes of their approach. One clear and desirable outcome of inculcation which also matches the purpose of this approach is that it helps students learn the right values (response sixteen), but only 41 percent of the teachers claiming to use inculcation
checked this reason. If the reasons in question three, in Table 18, were checked at random an expected 20 percent of the teachers would answer each response. This indicates that response sixteen received only 21 percent above what one would expect at random. Moreover, a sizeable percentage of these teachers checked other statements that inculcation is unlikely to achieve, witness reasons fourteen, fifteen, and seventeen. Rarely does one find in the research and theoretical literature that this approach achieves or promotes these outcomes.

The two reasons one would expect to be checked by cognitive moral development teachers are that they agree with its stage theory (reason seven), and that it helps their students develop higher stages of moral reasoning (reason fourteen). These two reasons are solely applicable to cognitive moral development. None of the theoretical or practical writings about the other approaches lay claim to stage theory nor to the fact that students will develop higher stages of moral reasoning as a result of its use.

Contrary to this expectation, Table 18 shows that none of the teachers claiming to use cognitive moral development selected reason seven and only 58 percent of the teachers chose reason fourteen. However, reasons thirteen, fifteen, and seventeen all received a very sizeable percentage of these teachers' responses. One can partially understand why teachers might choose reasons thirteen and fifteen since much of the practical literature published about this approach indicates that students will become more competent in making decisions and solving problems in a logical and scientific manner. Yet, as indicated in chapter two, a close analysis of this approach's methodology reveals
that it is not as capable of achieving these results as value analysis. It is difficult to determine why seventy of these teachers chose reason seventeen for rarely does one find any claims in the literature that students exposed to this approach develop empathy for people who have different values.

The significance of 58 percent of the teachers checking reason fourteen as a major reason for using cognitive moral development, is diminished when one considers that if teachers using cognitive moral development had been answering question three randomly, 24 percent of the responses could be expected for each of the seventeen reasons. Thus, the percentage of teachers indicating that reason fourteen was a major reason is only 34 percent above what one would expect at random. It appears that teachers claiming to use cognitive moral development are confused about the purpose and claimed outcomes of this approach.

When charting the consistency of the major reasons teachers gave for using value analysis one expected the greatest percentage of teachers to respond that it helped their students become more adept at thinking logically and using the scientific method (reason thirteen), and that it helped develop their students' capabilities in decision making and problem solving (reason fifteen). Of all the approaches surveyed, this approach specifically details the intellectual operations that students must perform and specifies the standards any value judgment must meet before it is to be considered rational and definable (See chapter one, page eight). Presumably students who have been exposed
to this approach are better equipped to use logic and the scientific method in making decisions and solving problems.

Table 18 indicates that teachers claiming to use value analysis were fairly consistent in selecting reasons that were appropriate for this approach. Seventy-four percent of these teachers chose reason thirteen and 76 percent chose reason fifteen. In fact, these two reasons each received a 30 percent greater response rate than any other reason. Thus, even if these teachers were to answer question three at random (each response receiving 26 percent of the responses) one still finds that reason thirteen is 48 percent above what one would expect at random and reason fifteen is 50 percent above what one would expect at random.

One would reasonably assume that teachers who claimed to be using values clarification would agree with the theme that is echoed throughout Raths', *Values and Teaching*, to wit, students need to be aware of and identify their own values and those of others. According to Raths, this approach can be applied to a wide variety of personal and social value issues, and people who are clear about their values can develop more empathy for persons with different values.

When looking at Table 18 one finds that 44 percent of the teachers said that values clarification was applicable to a wide variety of value issues both at the personal and social level, and 64 percent of these teachers indicated that it helped students develop empathy for people who had different values. Fifty-five percent of these teachers felt that it helped develop their students' capabilities in decision-making and problem solving. Although this reason is more closely identified
with value analysis, one can still understand why teachers might choose this reason. The theoretical and practical literature about values clarification both say that this approach helps students make rational decisions and solve problems. However, a critical analysis of the approach reveals a number of shortcomings which undermine this claim (See chapter two, page 31). Teachers who are only familiar with the literature about this approach and not its critical analysis, may not realize that it does not promote rational decision making and problem solving.

Initially it appears that there is some consistency between the teachers' reasons for the purpose of the approach and its claimed outcomes. However, both major responses (ten and seventeen) were popular reasons for teachers of all the approaches (See Table 18). Therefore, the percentages were not discriminating enough to warrant any determination about values clarification teachers' understanding of the approach.

Teachers who said they were using a specific approach to values were asked their perceptions of the major disadvantages of the approaches they were using. This question had a pool of fifteen responses and the respondent could choose up to four responses for each course taught. Table 19 is a compilation of the data for this question.
TABLE 19

PERCENTAGES OF WEIGHTED TEACHERS' PERCEIVED DISADVANTAGES OF APPROACHES TO VALUES EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>n=15 Inculcation%</th>
<th>n=17 Moral Development%</th>
<th>n=51 Value Analysis%</th>
<th>n=59 Clarification%</th>
<th>Row Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-It is difficult to evaluate students objectively.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-The approach leads students to believe one opinion is just as good as another.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-It is difficult to evaluate student progress.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-The approach's recommended activities foster too much peer pressure for students to make independent judgments about value issues.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-The approach does not deal with the decision making process.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-The approach itself is value-laden.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 19 (Continued)

PERCENTAGES OF WEIGHTED TEACHERS' PERCEIVED DISADVANTAGES OF APPROACHES TO VALUES EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>n=15 Inculcation%</th>
<th>n=17 Cognitive Moral Development%</th>
<th>n=51 Value Analysis%</th>
<th>n=59 Values Clarification%</th>
<th>Row Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7- The approach concentrates upon what the student thinks rather than why the student thinks the way he/she does.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Teaching in the area of values education reduces the available time spent in the content area of this course.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- To execute properly, teaching about values requires a great deal of work and preparation.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- In teaching about values, one runs the risk of community disapproval.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- In teaching about values, the issue may become too controversial.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total rows: 5
TABLE 19 (Continued)
PERCENTAGES OF WEIGHTED TEACHERS' PERCEIVED DISADVANTAGES OF APPROACHES TO VALUES EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>n=15 Inculcation%</th>
<th>n=17 Cognitive Development%</th>
<th>n=51 Value Analysis%</th>
<th>n=59 Values Clarification%</th>
<th>Row Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-At times, the discussion about values may invade a student's privacy.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-There are more discipline problems with values education than there are with the lecture method.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Students get tired of having one kind of values lesson after another.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Students begin to think that values are just something to play around with instead of something serious.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19 indicates that the disadvantage receiving the greatest percentage of responses for weighted teachers of inculcation, values clarification and value analysis was that it was difficult to evaluate students objectively. A similar disadvantage receiving the largest percentage of responses of cognitive moral development teachers was that it was difficult to evaluate student progress. When looking at disadvantages receiving the smallest percentage of responses, one finds that value analysis and values clarification teachers both felt that these approaches did not deal with the decision making process. Zero percent of the inculcation teachers felt that the approach's concentration upon what the student thinks rather than why the student thinks the way he does was a disadvantage of this approach. None of the cognitive moral development teachers felt that there were more discipline problems with values education than with the lecture method.

Discussion

It is interesting to note that in Table 19 the row totals for disadvantages one and three indicate that these disadvantages received the highest percentage of responses from teachers teaching values education. Although this survey did not contain questions that would explore the origin of the above concerns, one still might speculate as to the reasons for their existence.

First, it is reasonable to assume that teachers do not have trouble evaluating only when it comes to values education but have trouble evaluating students in general. In fact, many articles and books about this subject go to great lengths trying to get teachers to broaden their
conceptions of evaluation and to create interesting and varied ways to evaluate their students.

Second, some teachers who are teaching values education may feel reasonably comfortable with employing a variety of techniques to evaluate students in the content area of their courses but find that this process breaks down when it comes to values education. Their instruction gained from methods books and social studies methods courses was adequate for the content area of the course but not for the area of values education.

Finally, the teachers who indicated they were using approaches to values in this survey may have had specific reasons that were contingent upon the approach they were using for their concern about evaluating students' progress and evaluating students objectively. While the literature about inculcation contains arguments about the necessity of inculcating specific values that are the bedrock of our culture and contains a bag of tricks about how to go about inculcation, it offers little if any guidance to teachers about how to evaluate values objectively or to assess student progress. Thus, one can understand why a large percentage of these teachers expressed difficulty in evaluating students objectively.

When speculating why cognitive moral development teachers felt that disadvantages one and three were problematic, it seems reasonable that these teachers were not clear about how to evaluate students, largely through no fault of their own. The practical literature about this approach does not clearly specify the intellectual operations that
students should perform in order to improve their reasoning about moral dilemmas. Thus, any objective evaluation of the process is difficult. Moreover, the literature about this approach is sending teachers conflicting signals about whether they should stage score their students.

Teachers who claimed to be using values clarification and those using value analysis both felt that the difficulty in evaluating students objectively and evaluating students' progress were disadvantages of these approaches. Although both approaches clearly specified the intellectual procedures that must be mastered by students, teachers may not realize that these processes can be evaluated objectively. Literature that explains values clarification (Raths, 1966 and 1978 and Kirschenbaum, 1977) rarely details how students are to be evaluated. Similarly, the intellectual procedures and standards of rationality involved in value analysis are clearly defined and can be evaluated objectively. However, teachers in this sample may not be receiving the guidance they need from publications about this approach.

Teachers who indicated they were using a specific approach to values education were asked where they learned how to use its methodology. Table 20 represents the data obtained from this question.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>n=15</th>
<th>n=17</th>
<th>n=51</th>
<th>n=59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inculcation%</td>
<td>Moral Development%</td>
<td>Value Analysis%</td>
<td>Clarification%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-District resource consultant</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-District resource center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Librarian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Professional social studies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publication (book or a journal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Department chairperson/coordinator</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Representative of a textbook publisher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Advertisement from a publisher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Colleague</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Workshop or institute</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>n=15 Inculcation%</td>
<td>n=17 Cognitive Moral Development%</td>
<td>n=51 Value Analysis%</td>
<td>n=59 Values Clarification%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Professional meeting (OCSS or NCSS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Values education journal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Books about values education</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-College or university speaker or consultant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-College or university undergraduate course</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-College or university graduate course</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20 indicates that a college or university course was the source most often cited by teachers using cognitive moral development (100 percent), value analysis (100 percent), and values clarification (81 percent). The source receiving the highest percentage of inculcation teachers' responses was books about values education. None of the weighted teachers, regardless of approach, indicated that they learned how to use their approaches' methodology from a representative of a textbook publisher.

**Discussion**

The data in Table 20 seems to highlight the importance of graduate and undergraduate courses as major vehicles for disseminating information about the teaching methodology of approaches to values education. Likewise, books on values education in general, rather than specific publications relating to social studies and publications in values education journals, seem to be more important for disseminating instructional information about the approaches' teaching methodologies.

In Table 20, books about values education and workshops both received a fairly high percentage of inculcation teachers' responses. The writer is skeptical of these responses as few books endorse this approach. When inculcation is mentioned in books about values education it is used as an example of what not to do when teaching about values. Moreover, it is also doubtful that many workshops and institutes are conducted about this approach, particularly in light of academicians disdain for this approach.

The teachers who participated in the survey were asked, "Of the following ways to improve values education, which do you think are the
most important?" Teachers had seven responses to choose from and they could choose no more than four responses. Table 21 shows the data from this question.

**TABLE 21**  
**DISTRIBUTION OF FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF UNWEIGHTED TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF WAYS TO IMPROVE VALUES EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements Needed</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Sponsor more workshops and institutes</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Publish more curriculum materials that relate to a particular approach to values education</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Inform administrators, district resource consultants and department chairpersons of the educational worth of values education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Develop methods to disseminate information about values education teaching approaches</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Publish values education materials in specific subject areas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Publish more values education journals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Publish information about the research on the educational value of values education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the seven ways to improve values education, 56 percent of the unweighted teachers felt that more workshops and institutes needed to be sponsored. Only 2 percent of the teachers felt that publishing more values education journals and more information concerning the educational value of values education were needed. In retrospect, one wonders if a statement indicating the need to publish more material about how to evaluate students would not have received a substantial percentage of teachers' responses.

The last set of data to be presented pertains to the relationship between the usage of a specific approach to values and a specific social studies course. Table 22 shows this relationship.
### TABLE 22

**PERCENTAGES OF WEIGHTED TEACHERS USING AN APPROACH TO VALUES BY COURSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Inculcation%</th>
<th>Cognitive Moral Development%</th>
<th>Value Analysis%</th>
<th>Values Clarification%</th>
<th>Non-Teachers%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-American History</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-World History</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Sociology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Psychology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Ohio History</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Economics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Geography</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Government</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Social Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Anthropology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As indicated in Table 22, there is some relationship between certain courses and approaches to values education. The approach most often used by weighted teachers of sociology, anthropology, social studies, and "other" courses (mini-courses about a variety of topics and social issues) was values clarification. Value analysis was most often used by teachers of economics and Ohio history. No clear relationship emerges from Table 22 with regards to inculcation and cognitive moral development.

Discussion

At the beginning of this project, the writer hypothesized that approaches to values education probably would not be used in all subjects for a variety of reasons. First, it is probable that many persons teaching anthropology, geography, economics, psychology and sociology would perceive these courses as "traditional" courses in a given discipline and not appropriate for values education.

Second, if some teachers were using the new social studies curriculum materials in these courses, more often than not, the fundamental teaching approach used would be the "structure of the discipline." If this were the case, then teachers would reason that values education was not appropriate for their courses because the central thrust of the structure of the discipline approach is to teach students a fundamental understanding and concepts of a discipline.

Finally, it was thought that teachers of American history, world history, government and social studies would perceive that values education was more appropriate to the content of their courses than to
their counterparts' specific disciplines. This was primarily because these courses contain a wide variety of historical and contemporary issues that are value laden.

According to the data contained in Table 22 there is no evidence indicating that the above reasoning was correct, as one of the approaches to values education was used in all courses. It does appear that the two most popular approaches used by teachers engaged in values education were value analysis and values clarification.

Conclusion

This chapter has presented and analyzed the data obtained from 211 secondary social studies teachers. Chapter five will present the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of this study.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this exploratory study was to determine secondary social studies teachers' perceptions and utilization of inculcation, cognitive moral development, value analysis, and values clarification. This was accomplished by gathering data in an attempt to answer the following questions:

1) Why are some teachers not teaching in the area of values education?
2) What approaches to values education are social studies teachers using?
3) What are selected social studies teachers' major reasons for using specific approaches to values education?
4) What do selected social studies teachers perceive as the major disadvantages of specific approaches to values education?
5) From what sources did teachers learn to use the methodology of their chosen approach?
6) What further work, as perceived by social studies teachers, is needed in the field of values education?
7) Is the usage of a specific approach to values education related to specific social studies courses?

A survey consisting of twenty-four questions was designed to answer the above questions and was administered through the mail to a randomly selected group of Ohio secondary public school principals. The principals were instructed to distribute the survey randomly to members of their social studies faculty. The data from the returned surveys were compiled and analyzed by computer.
Conclusions

Based on the return of 211 surveys, 36 weighted teachers indicated they were not teaching values education. When asked why, the three reasons receiving 64 percent of these teachers' responses were: 1) not having the necessary information and training to teach values education (28 percent), 2) that the content of their courses was not suitable for values education (19 percent), and 3) that values education takes too much work to execute properly. None of these teachers responded that the school in which they taught frowned on teaching about values or that values education was primarily the duty of the church and/or family.

Of the 143* weighted teachers who said they were teaching values education; 11 percent indicated they were using inculcation, 12 percent indicated cognitive moral development, 36 percent indicated value analysis, and 42 percent indicated values clarification. Although these teachers may have been using these approaches, one should view these results with suspicion. As previously mentioned in Chapter Four, many of these teachers appeared to be confused about the approach they claimed to be using. However, the data do serve as a measure of what teachers think they should be doing regardless of whether they are properly executing their approaches.

*Recall that 175 weighted teachers answered Part A of the survey but 32 of these teachers failed to properly answer questions 1 and 2. As a result, their specific approach to values could not be determined, nor could their reasons for using a specific approach. All that can be inferred about these teachers is that because they filled out Part A of the survey, they were teaching some sort of values education.
These results are not surprising as it has only been within the last few years that educators have published literature directed at teacher audiences which seeks to illustrate major distinctions between various approaches' theories, teaching methodologies, and outcomes. Moreover, many teachers do not read the literature in their field, and this seems particularly evident with the teachers of this study. The majority of these teachers did not even belong to one professional organization and these organizations are prime sources of current literature. Whether the needed information will be disseminated to these teachers by other means remains an open question.

When looking at teachers' perceptions about their reasons for using a particular approach, the study found that a sizeable percentage of teachers of cognitive moral development and value analysis felt that these approaches helped develop students' capabilities in decision making and problem solving. Values clarification teachers most frequent response was that it helped students develop empathy for people who have different values. As might be expected, most inculcation teachers cited that it helped their students learn the right values.

Interestingly enough, there appeared to be considerable agreement among teachers, of all approaches, about the major disadvantages of the approaches to values education. The largest percentage of all teachers engaged in values education perceived that objective evaluation of students and evaluation of student progress were the major disadvantages with the approach to values they were using.
The data pertaining to the source of teacher information about the teaching methodology indicated that both undergraduate and graduate courses, and books about values education were the primary vehicals for disseminating this information.

All teachers participating in the survey were asked to indicate what improvements were needed in values education. The largest number of these teachers said that more workshops and institutes were needed, and more published curriculum materials that related to a particular approach. Few teachers felt that more values education journals or more research on the educational value of values education would improve this field.

As mentioned in Chapter One, Spears (1973), Ryan and Thompson (1975), and Olmo (1975), have all surveyed teachers about values education and have found that teachers place a high priority on values education. Similarly in this study, a clear majority of the respondents appear to have accepted the importance of values education. Only a small percentage of teachers teaching inculcation, cognitive moral development, value analysis, and values clarification indicated that the major disadvantages of their approaches were that they would run the risk of community disapproval and that value issues might become too controversial. Likewise, none of the teachers not involved in values education responded that the school they taught in frowned on teaching about values or that values education was primarily the duty of the church and/or family. Further evidence that tends to support the acceptance of values education is that 92 percent of the teachers teaching
values education said they made the decision to teach about values individually, with only 4 percent of these teachers indicating the decision was made by the department chairperson. Another 4 percent of these teachers indicated that it was a school-building policy.

Recommendations

Since this study was an initial attempt to investigate teachers' perceptions and utilizations of approaches to values education the following recommendations seem warranted.

1. Social studies methods instructors need to intensify their efforts to help teachers select approaches to values that are consistent with their rationale for teaching values education. To help achieve this goal methods instructors need to have their students:

   a) analyze each approach to values in terms of its primary purpose; teaching techniques; instructional strategies; and proposed student outcomes.
   b) critically evaluate each approach to values in light of the research about its classroom effectiveness and theoretical inconsistencies.
   c) develop a defensible rationale for teaching values education.
   d) select an approach to values that is congruent with their rationale for teaching values education.

If social studies methods instructors include the above procedures in their instruction about approaches to values education then one can
reasonably expect that their students will be able to utilize approaches to values purposefully and effectively.

2. Social studies educators need to address the role of evaluation in values education. Much of the literature about values education either does not address this issue or treats it in a manner that is of little practical use for teachers. This is particularly evident for inculcation and cognitive moral development. The literature about values clarification and value analysis clearly specifies the intellectual procedures that are to be used in meeting decisions about value issues. What is not enumerated, however, are ways to evaluate student progress and growth while using these approaches. In light of the current trends of "teacher accountability" and "back to basics," it is crucial that teachers be able to obtain evidence that their efforts at teaching students about values have been successful if this field is to continue to grow and mature.

3. A more rigorous survey, void of this study's errors, needs to be conducted. The following suggestions would enable the researcher to conduct a similar survey that would yield more reliable information about teachers' perceptions and utilization of approaches to values education.

a) Lists of the names and school addresses of social studies teachers in the sample should be obtained. This allows for: direct contact with teachers, the establishment
of a finite population, the use of probability sampling as opposed to cluster sampling, and a more effective follow-up.

b) Prior permission should be obtained from all schools and/or school systems included in the study, thus allowing for easier distribution of the surveys.

c) The study should include both surveying and interviewing teachers. This would provide more reliable information about the following questions:

1) What specific approaches are teachers using?

2) To what extent are approaches to values education utilized in the social studies classroom?

3) What methodological and instructional problems do teachers experience with an approach?

4) Why are certain approaches utilized more frequently than others?

5) What specific problems do teachers have with evaluating students?

6) What types of value issues do teachers address in the classroom?

A study like the one just described would not only enable the researcher to make in-depth probes of the current perceptions and practices of teachers using approaches to values education, but would also allow him to identify additional variables that may be related to teacher usage of approaches to values.
APPENDIX A

VALUES EDUCATION SURVEY AND LETTERS TO
PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS
Dear Principal:

Your school has been selected by random sampling to participate in a statewide study examining the nature and extent of teaching in values education by secondary social studies teachers. Please do not confuse this survey with a previous one that you may have received from Ohio State. Since the sampling was random in both cases, a few schools may have received both surveys. I am requesting your cooperation and assistance in making sure members of your social studies faculty (grades seven through twelve) including the department chairperson/coordinator, receive a survey. The survey data will serve as the basis of the doctoral dissertation I am completing at The Ohio State University.

Enclosed is a packet of surveys. Please distribute the surveys randomly to social studies faculty members. In pilot studies, I have found that most persons can complete the survey in ten to fifteen minutes.

Information supplied by your teachers will be held in strict confidence. No mention of your school or teachers will be made and no attempt at evaluation is implied or intended. Self-addressed, stamped envelopes have been provided for the return of the surveys.

Results of the survey will be mailed upon request. I will be grateful for the time you spend in making this study a success. Thank you.

Cordially,

Stephen A. Rose

SAR/rkt

Number of Surveys
Enclosed
Dear Member of the Social Studies Faculty:

This letter is a request for your assistance in completing a survey measuring the nature and extent of teaching in values education by secondary social studies teachers in Ohio. The survey data will serve as the basis for my doctoral dissertation at The Ohio State University.

You may be teaching in values education in one or more of your social studies classes. If so, I would like to ask you some questions about the teaching approaches to values education (defined as: a specific orientation that has a guiding rationale and a specific methodology to teach or teach about values) that you are using in your social studies classes. Even if you do not teach in the area of values education (defined as: the conscious and explicit attempt to teach or teach about values) your professional responses to certain questions in Part A and in all of Part B are still very much needed.

This survey will only take a few minutes of your time. In pilot studies the survey was completed in 10 to 15 minutes. A self-addressed envelope has been provided for its return. You may be assured that all information you provide will be held in strict confidence. No mention will be made of you or your school. All information is to be given voluntarily.

Your cooperation in returning the survey, minus this letter, at your earliest convenience is greatly appreciated.

Cordially,

Stephen A. Rose

SAR/rkt
VALUES EDUCATION SURVEY

The purpose of this survey is to measure the nature and extent of teaching in values education by secondary social studies teachers (grades seven through twelve) in Ohio. The survey has two parts. Part A deals with specific questions about your teaching in values education. Part B is designed to gather general information about you and to ascertain your opinions regarding work you think needs to be done in the field of values education. Even if you do not teach in the area of values education, please complete the appropriate questions in Part A and all of Part B.

There are no right or wrong answers to this survey. It is not a test. All information is to be given voluntarily and will be held in strict confidence. The numbers appearing to the left of each question are for computer analysis.

GENERAL DIRECTIONS: Please answer the questions by placing a check (✓) in front of the appropriate response(s). Please read all directions carefully as some questions have specific directions. Thank you.

PART A

DIRECTIONS FOR PART A: Your teaching about values may vary depending upon the social studies course you are teaching. You may even be choosing not to use values education in some courses. This survey has been designed to gather specific information regarding what you are doing in each different social studies course you are teaching.

PLEASE WRITE THE NAME OF EACH DIFFERENT SOCIAL STUDIES COURSE YOU ARE TEACHING AT THE TOP OF EACH COLUMN. YOU WILL NEED TO DO THIS AT THE TOP OF EACH PAGE OF PART A.

Write in the Name of Course(s) — — — — — — — — — — — —

Card 1
2/1:4 3/6:5-10

4/1:11 5/1:12 6/1:13

1. Which of the following statements best reflects your teaching approach to values education in this particular course? (Check (✓) only one.)

   1. To instill certain values in students so their values more nearly reflect those desired by our society.
   2. To help students develop more complex reasoning patterns based upon a higher set of values.
   3. To help students use logical thinking and scientific investigation to analyze social value issues.
   4. To help students become aware of and identify their own values and those of others.
   5. I do not teach in the area of values education in this particular course.
## PART A

**IMPORTANT:** For each course that you checked response #5 of question #1, answer only question #2 in Part A and skip questions #3 through #8. For each course that you checked response #1, #2, #3 or #4 of question #1, skip question #2 and answer questions #3 through #8 in Part A.

EVERYONE IS TO COMPLETE ALL OF PART B ON PAGE 6.

Write in the Name of Course(s) __________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/8:14-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/8:22-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/8:30-37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What are the major reasons that you do not teach values education in this social studies course? (Check (√) no more than 4 responses.)

1. I cannot evaluate students objectively.
2. The teaching methodology is too complex to execute properly.
3. The content of this course is not suitable for teaching in the area of values education.
4. I do not have the necessary information and training to teach in the area of values education.
5. The school in which I teach frowns on teaching about values.
6. Teaching about values cannot be performed objectively. It is a form of indoctrination.
7. My students would not be receptive to values education.
8. I have enough to do already without trying everything that comes along.
9. I am quite satisfied with the way I teach now.
10. Values education is primarily the duty of the church and/or family.
11. To execute properly, values education requires too much work and preparation.
12. The priorities of this course do not allow time for teaching in the area of values education.
3. What are the major reasons for using this teaching approach to values in this course? (Check (√) no more than 6 responses.)

1. The methodology is clear and understandable, thus aiding me in efficient instruction.
2. It takes a non-relativistic position on value issues.
3. I agree with the way values are defined by this approach.
4. The methodology clearly defines the instructional role of the teacher.
5. Its recommended class activities are interesting.
6. I agree with its theory about how value conflicts are dealt with and resolved.
7. I agree with its stage theory.
8. I have received workshop and/or in-service training in using this teaching approach.
9. I have information only about this approach.
10. It is applicable for a wide variety of value issues both at the personal and social level.
11. It provides a change of pace for my students.
12. It helps my students learn to cooperate with one another.
13. It helps my students become more adept at thinking logically and using the scientific method.
14. It helps my students develop higher stages of moral reasoning.
15. It helps develop my students' capabilities in decision making and problem solving.
16. It helps my students learn the right values.
17. It helps my students develop empathy for people who have different values.

4. Below are a number of teaching approaches to values education. Please check (√) the approach used in this course.

1. Value Analysis
2. Values Clarification
3. Cultural Transmission
4. Cognitive Moral Development
5. What do you feel are the major disadvantages of the teaching approach to values education used in this course? (Check ✓ no more than 4 responses.)

- It is difficult to evaluate students objectively.
- The approach leads students to believe one opinion is just as good as another.
- It is difficult to evaluate student progress.
- The approach's recommended activities foster too much peer pressure for students to make independent judgments about value issues.
- The approach does not deal with the decision making process.
- The approach itself is value-laden.
- The approach concentrates upon what the student thinks rather than why the student thinks the way he/she does.
- Teaching in the area of values education reduces the available time spent in the content area of this course.
- To execute properly, teaching about values requires a great deal of work and preparation.
- In teaching about values, one runs the risk of community disapproval.
- In teaching about values, the issue may become too controversial.
- At times, the discussion about values may invade a student's privacy.
- There are more discipline problems with values education than there are with the lecture method.
- Students get tired of having one kind of values lesson after another.
- Students begin to think that values are just something to play around with instead of something serious.

6. Who made the decision to teach about values in this course? (Check ✓ one.)

- You, individually
- Department chairperson/coordinator
- School district or building policy
**PART A**

Write in the Name of Course(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22/2:32-33</th>
<th>7. Where did you find out about the approach to values education used in this course? (Check ✓ only 1 response.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23/2:34-35</td>
<td>1. District resource consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/2:36-37</td>
<td>2. District resource center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Professional social studies publication (book or a journal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Department chairperson/Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Representative of a textbook publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Advertisement from a publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Colleague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Workshop or institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Professional meeting (OCSS or NCSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Values education journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Books about values education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. College or university speaker or consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. College or university graduate course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25/8:38-45</th>
<th>8. Where did you learn how to use the methodology of the approach to values education used in this course? (Check ✓ no more than 4 responses.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26/8:46-53</td>
<td>1. District resource consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/8:54-61</td>
<td>2. District resource center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Professional social studies publication (book or a journal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Department chairperson/Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Representative of a textbook publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Advertisement from a publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Colleague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Workshop or institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Professional meeting (OCSS or NCSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Values education journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Books about values education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. College or university speaker or consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. College or university graduate course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART B

EVERYONE IS TO FILL OUT ALL OF PART B.

28/2:62-63 9. Of the following ways to improve values education, which do you think are most important? (Check (✓) no more than 4 responses.)

1. Sponsor more workshops and institutes
2. Publish more curriculum materials that relate to a particular approach to values education
3. Inform administrators, district resource consultants and department chairpersons of the educational worth of values education
4. Develop methods to disseminate information about values education teaching approaches
5. Publish values education materials in specific subject areas
6. Publish more values education journals
7. Publish information about the research on the educational value of values education

29/5:64-68 10. What social studies courses are you presently teaching? (Please check (✓) the courses and to the right circle the number of sections you teach in each course.)

1. American History 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. World History 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. Sociology 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. Psychology 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. Ohio History 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. Economics 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. Geography 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. Black Studies 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. Government (Political Science, Civics, Problems of Democracy) 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. Social Studies 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. Anthropology 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. Other (Please Specify) 1 2 3 4 5 6

Card 3

2/1:4

32/1:5 11. Have you ever attended a values education workshop or institute?

1. Yes
2. No

33/1:6 12. At the end of this academic year how many years of teaching experience will you have had?

1. 0-3
2. 4-6
3. 7-10
4. 11-13
5. 14-17
6. 18-21
7. 22 or more

34/1:7 13. Do you have tenure?

1. Yes
2. No
PART B

14. What is your sex?
   ___1. Female
   ___2. Male

15. What is your age?
   ___1. 20 or younger
   ___2. 21-25
   ___3. 26-30
   ___4. 31-35
   ___5. 36-40
   ___6. 41-45
   ___7. 46-50
   ___8. 51-55
   ___9. 56-60
  ___10. 61 or older

16. Which of the following best characterizes the location of your school?
   ___1. Urban-inner city
   ___2. Urban-outer city
   ___3. Suburban
   ___4. Small town
   ___5. Rural

17. Do you teach at:
   ___1. Middle school
   ___2. Junior high school
   ___3. Senior high school

18. What grade levels do you teach?
   ___1. Seventh
   ___2. Eighth
   ___3. Ninth
   ___4. Tenth
   ___5. Eleventh
   ___6. Twelfth

19. What is the size of your school?
   ___1. 300 or less
   ___2. 301-500
   ___3. 501-1000
   ___4. 1001 or more

20. How far is your school from a teacher training institution such as a university, college or teaching center?
   ___1. 10 or less miles
   ___2. 11-30 miles
   ___3. 31-50 miles
   ___4. 51 or more miles

21. What is the highest college degree you have earned?
   ___1. None
   ___2. Bachelors
   ___3. Masters
   ___4. Doctorate
   ___5. Other (Please Specify)

22. Are you presently taking education courses?
   ___1. Undergraduate education courses
   ___2. Graduate education courses
PART B

23. What is your current position?
   1. Social studies teacher
   2. Department chairperson/coordinate
   3. Other (Please Specify) ____________________________

24. How many professional organizations do you belong such as OCSS, NCSS, OCEE, ASCD, etc? (Please specify the name of each organization to the right of the appropriate response.)
   1. None
   2. One ____________________________
   3. Two ____________________________
   4. Three ____________________________
   5. Four or more ____________________________

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY. PLEASE RETURN THE SURVEY IN THE STAMPED, SELF-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE. THE RESULTS OF THIS SURVEY WILL BE PROVIDED UPON REQUEST. AGAIN, THANK YOU!

Stephen A. Rose
730 Thurber Drive W.
Apt. D
Columbus, OH 43212
APPENDIX B

HUMAN SUBJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE DOCUMENT AND
WAIVER OF INFORMED CONSENT
Memo to: Chairperson of Human Subject Review Committee  
O.S.U. Research Foundation, Room 205

From: Stephen A. Rose  
Graduate Teaching Associate  
The Ohio State University

Re: Request for waiver of informed consent

Attached are the necessary materials for clearance of my dissertation study with your office.

I am requesting that the form concerning informed consent be waived for this study. Every effort has been made to inform the subjects of the nature and purpose of this study. Answering the questionnaire is completely voluntary. Information has also been provided to the subjects of the complete confidentiality of their responses.

Requiring me to use an informed consent form would add an almost sinister air to my study and might significantly increase response bias. Moreover, I am financing this study from my own funds and such a form would increase the mailing cost of this study twofold.

There are absolutely no risks to the subjects participating in this study!

My proposal has been accepted by my reading committee. Thank you for your time and consideration of this request.

Cordially,

Stephen A. Rose
A Study Of The Status Of Current Practice Of Ohio Secondary Social Studies Teachers Engaged In Values Education

1) In a sentence or two, briefly describe why the proposed project is of interest. The intent of this question is to give the reviewer a brief idea of the background and purpose of the research.

This study is intended to examine the status of current practice in values education by Ohio secondary social studies classroom teachers. Presently, this information does not exist in the field of values education.

2) Briefly describe each of the different conditions or manipulations to be included within the study.

A survey will be used. Ohio social studies teachers will be chosen at random and asked to complete the survey.

3) What is the nature of the measures or observations that will be taken in the study?

Questions will be asked concerning teachers' uses of values education teaching approaches in their classrooms and also personal and professional information will be sought.

4) If any questionnaires, tests, or other instruments are to be used, please provide a brief description and either include a copy or indicate approximately how many copies will be submitted to the committee for review.

The questionnaire is attached for review.
5) Will the subjects encounter the possibility of either psychological, social, physical or legal risk? □ Yes □ No If so, please describe.

6) Will any stress be involved in the study? □ Yes □ No If so, please describe.

7) Will the subjects be deceived or misled in any way? □ Yes □ No If so, please describe and include a statement regarding the nature of the debriefing.

8) Will there be any probing for information which an individual might consider to be personal or sensitive? □ Yes □ No If so, please describe.

Two questions will be asked which might be construed as personal; age and sex of teachers.

9) Will the subjects be presented with materials which they might consider to be offensive, threatening or degrading? □ Yes □ No If so, please describe.

10) Approximately how much time will be devoted of each subject?
    Ten to fifteen minutes

11) Who will be the subjects in this study? How will the subjects for this study be solicited or contacted?
    Ohio secondary social studies teachers Teachers will be contacted through letters sent to principals asking him/her to distribute the surveys.

12) What steps will be taken to insure that the subject's participation is voluntary?
    The survey is voluntary. No pressure is applied to any person. A cover letter will be sent requesting teachers to complete the questionnaire. This letter makes it clear that participation is on a voluntary basis. No other inducements will be offered for participation.

Form HS-005B (8/77)
15) **It is important that a subject be informed regarding the general nature of what he will experience when he participates in a study, including particularly a description of anything he might consider to be either unpleasant or a risk. Please provide a statement regarding the nature of the information which will be provided to the subject prior to his volunteering to participate.**

A cover letter will explain the purpose of the study. The purpose is also reiterated in the introduction to the survey. Attached is a cover letter that will be used to inform survey participants.

14) **What steps have been taken to ensure that the subjects give their consent prior to participating? Will a written consent form be used?**  
**YES** ☑  **NO** ☐  **If so, please include it. If the subjects are minors, will their parents' consent be obtained?**  
**YES** ☑  **NO** ☐  **If so, please include the form and if not, please indicate why not.**

There are absolutely no repercussions if teachers do not wish to complete the survey. The following statement is part of the cover letter:

You may be assured that all information you provide in the survey will be held in strict confidence. No mention will be made of you or the name of your school. All information is to be given voluntarily.

15) **Will any aspect of the data be made a part of any permanent record that can be identified with the subject?**  
**YES** ☑  **NO** ☐

16) **Will whether or not a subject participated in a specific experiment or study be made a part of any permanent record available to a supervisor, teacher or employer?**  
**YES** ☑  **NO** ☐

17) **What steps will be taken to insure the confidentiality of the data?**

I will keep the completed surveys. Any reference to subjects in my dissertation will be made by number rather than name. No discussion will occur about one person's responses with another.

18) **If there are any risks involved in the study, are there any offsetting benefits that might accrue to either the subject or society?**

There are no risks in this study.

19) **Will any data from files or archival data be used?**  
**NO** ☑  **YES** ☐
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Date: April 13, 1978

Please type or print legibly; submit five (5) copies. Please complete all blanks; be brief, concise, yet complete, and use language understandable to one not necessarily expert in your field. Additional information the applicant considers necessary may be attached to this form.

NAME: Stephen A. Rose

POSITION TITLE/ APPOINTMENT: Teaching Associate

LOCAL ADDRESS: 790 Thurber Dr. \# D
Columbus, Ohio 43215
PHONE: 221-0065

GRADUATE PROGRAM/DEPARTMENT: Education-Humanities

ADVISER: Dr. Robert E. Jewett

DATE GENERAL EXAMINATION PASSED: Spring, 1977

TITLE OF DISSERTATION RESEARCH PROJECT: A Study of Current Practice of Ohio Secondary Social Studies Teachers Engaged In Values Education

GRANT PERIOD: Present to August, 1978

LOCATION OF WORK: If the work will be done somewhere other than OSU, please indicate location.
DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED STUDY (limit to one page)

You should describe your research objectives and the methodology you plan to use and provide an outline of the research schedule which you plan to follow during the tenure of the grant.

The problem being investigated is the status of current practice in values education by secondary social studies teachers in Ohio. The study will be limited to an investigation of the following areas.

1. What approaches to values education are teachers using?
2. Why have teachers elected to use one approach over another?
3. What teachers feel they need, in terms of training and information, to become more effective in teaching about values.
4. What are the professional characteristics of teachers using values education teaching approaches?

Research Strategy

Gathering data about the status of practice in the field of values education, will be accomplished by surveying social studies teachers (grades 7-12) in Ohio. Packets of questionnaires will be sent to 210 public schools with a cover letter explaining the distribution procedures. Likewise, each of the 750 participants will receive a cover letter containing instructions and definitions for the questionnaire and a self-addressed envelope for return of the questionnaire.

Follow-Up

Follow-up studies will be made to increase response rates and to reduce response bias. The procedures for the follow-up are:

1. to send letters to principals
2. to make telephone calls to principals
3. to send additional questionnaires to schools where they were lost or misplaced.

The returned questionnaire data will be analyzed, a description of the status of practice will be made, and conclusions offered.

Does this project involve the use of humans as research subjects?
Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, provide protocol number and date of review by human subjects review committee. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ April 7, 1978 ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
CURRICULUM VITAE

This is to be a brief description of post-high school education, professional employment, major honors, and publications or presentations, if any. (This information will be used for publicity purposes.)

Educational Background

The Ohio State University - B.S. in Education, June, 1971
The Ohio State University - M.A. in Education, December, 1973
The Ohio State University - Ph.D. in Education, Projected date August, 1978

Major Area: Social Studies Education
Minor: Curriculum and Foundations and Sociology

Teaching Experience

1972-1973 Social Studies teacher at Lee Bonneson Jr. High
Westlake, Ohio
1973-1975 Social Studies teacher at Fairview High
Fairview Park, Ohio
1975-1976 Research Associate at Ohio State University
1976-Present Teaching Associate at Ohio State University

Presentations

Section chairperson at the Ohio Council for the Social Studies Convention, April, 1977
Recruiter for Economic Literacy Workshop, May, 1977
Director for Consumer Education Workshop, Delaware City Schools, Teachers K-12, June, 1977
Director for Consumer Education Workshop, Worthington City Schools, Teachers K-12, June, 1977
Section presenter at the Ohio Council for the Social Studies Convention, April, 1978
Please justify the need for the funds requested. Indicate potential alternate sources for the equipment, facilities, or services required or for the funding of this project (such as departmental funds, existing grants held by departmental faculty members, foundation or government grants, etc.), and why these alternate sources are unavailable or inappropriate for the requested expenses.

I have explored the possibilities of using existing departmental funds and existing grants held by departmental members with my advisor, Dr. Robert S. Jewett. These funds and grants are simply not available. Foundation and government grants take too much lead time to have any financial bearing on this study. As a result, I have had to finance the bulk of this research project out of my personal funds which are limited. To date, the bill is $350 and running.

As with most survey research, response bias can drastically affect the results of the study. Since I have used all of my personal funds in sending out the survey, I am requesting financial assistance in minimizing response bias by the following follow-up procedures.

1. Follow-up mailing of questionnaires and letters requesting each building principal's assistance in eliciting greater returns from his/her school.
2. Telephone calls will be made to each principal, whose school has a low percentage of responses, requesting his/her personal assistance in increasing response rates from his/her school.

Your financial assistance with the follow-up procedures for this study will help make it a success.
BUDGET:

**CONSUMABLE MATERIALS (Itemize)**
- 200 Follow-up Surveys: $33.00
- 200 Teacher Cover Letters: $8.00
- 75 Principal Cover Letters: $3.00
- 200 Envelopes: $2.20
- 75 9X12 Envelopes: $4.50

**Mailing:**
- Sending: $22.00
- Returning: $6.00

Subtotal: $106.70

**TRAVEL (Itemize; give transportation and subsistence separately.)**
- Telephone calls to building principals: $50.00

Subtotal: $50.00

**OTHER COSTS (Itemize)**

Subtotal: $156.70

**TOTAL REQUEST**: $156.70

This proposed project has been approved as a dissertation topic, and there are no alternate sources of funds from either the department, outside grant or contract support, or the Development Fund.

*Signature of Applicant*

*Signature of Advisor*

*Signature of Graduate Committee Chairperson*
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