DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 295 TE 001 090

By-Clark, Sandra

Color Me Complete and Sequential: The Curriculum Builder's Game Adapted for the Secondary English Program.

Pub Date 68

Note-24p.; In "The Growing Edges of Secondary English: Essays by the Experienced Teacher Fellows at the University of Illinois 1966-1967," ed. Charles Suhor and others (Champaign: NCTE, 1968), pp.28-50.

Available from-National Council of Teachers of English, 508 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Ill. 61820 (Stock No. 02455, HC-$2.95).

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.

Descriptors-Affective Behavior, Classification, Cognitive Processes, *Curriculum Design, *Curriculum Development, Curriculum Evaluation, *English Curriculum, Learning, *Literature, Poetry, *Secondary Education, Sequential Learning, Sequential Programs

Identifiers-Benjamin Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives

Benjamin Bloom's "Taxonomy of Educational Objectives" can be used effectively to develop and evaluate a sequential secondary-school curriculum in literature, regardless of the school's content emphasis or curricular philosophy. The two available volumes of the "Taxonomy"--dealing with the cognitive domain of knowledge, skills, and abilities and with the affective domain of attitudes and values--can provide curriculum designers with a framework for developing (1) a "blueprint" for the total school program, (2) general goals and specific objectives for the various areas of English, (3) various approaches to content favored by individual teachers or departments, and (4) criteria for the evaluation of the completed curriculum. (Charts are included from the "Taxonomy" to illustrate children's sequential patterns of behavior as those patterns apply to learning various cognitive or affective skills.) (JB)

The Growing Edges of Secondary English

Essays by the Experienced Teacher Fellows at the University of Illinois 1966-1967

Editors:
Charles Suhor
John Sawyer Mayher
Frank J. D'Angelo

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH
508 South Sixth Street · Champaign, Illinois 61820

COLOR ME COMPLETE AND SEQUENTIAL: THE CURRICULUM BUILDER'S GAME ADAPTED FOR THE SECONDARY ENGLISH PROGRAM

by SANDRA CLARK

Mrs. Clark received her B.A. and M.A. degrees from Eastern Washington College and an M.A. in English from the University of Illinois. She has taught in high schools in Washington and California and is currently teaching at Bellevue High School, Bellevue, Washington. In this paper she discusses the role the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives *can play in structuring a "complete and sequential" English curriculum.*

Building a curriculum that is both complete and sequential, always a serious educational game and a formidable task under any circumstances, has been further complicated by the growing concern among educators for curricular designs which reflect the learning process of the student and consider the unpredictable nature of the future for which our students must be prepared. The correlation of the curriculum with the learning sequences of the students and with the goals which it is supposed to achieve is mandatory. Despite the lack of consensus among educational theorists and practitioners about the precise nature of the learning process or about the most desirable goals and emphases for curricula, we certainly cannot abrogate our responsibility. Curricula must be written and revised even as we hope for more—and more reliable—information to assist us. Lack of consensus must not provide us with an excuse for apathy or for ignorance.

The task of the curriculum designer is in many ways similar to that of the architect. The underlying aim of each remains stable: the curriculum designer must provide a framework which will allow the maximum educational development of each student; the architect must provide a blueprint which will afford maximum livability for the occupants of the resulting home. But each designer must also consider numerous variables, such as fluctuating needs and the new trends, materials, and methods which may be used by those implementing his plans. The architect must continue to design homes despite the problems of adapting the most suitable of these variables and despite a lack of consensus about the validity or relative importance of certain needs, trends, materials, or methods. The curricular architect must likewise

continue his designs. Both designers know that new theories and research will continue to offer assistance, to pose problems, and to suggest variables now unforeseen. An efficient means of assuring the quality of curricula would help the architect immeasurably. It is such a means, a blueprint for designing and evaluating curricula, that is the concern of this article.

Since any task seems less formidable if tackled in manageable sections, even limiting this discussion of curriculum design and evaluation to English—that segment of the total curriculum with which we are concerned here—would be awesome. Consequently, to allow the remainder of this article to focus on a manageable segment of English, we will consider only the literature portion of our discipline. Realistically, of course, such isolation is usually neither desirable nor possible. The separation has been made here only so that the discussion can be specific and inclusive enough to be clear and useful to designers of secondary English curricula in any kind of school situation. For it seems to me that the major drawback of most curricula is their lack of an inherent element making them adaptable to all school situations, regardless of content emphases, student abilities, and curricular philosophies or goals.

THE *TAXONOMY OF EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES* AS A CURRICULAR BLUEPRINT

To be truly complete and sequential, a curricular blueprint must provide a *design* that is useful even though philosophies, objectives, or subject matter needs are modified or changed. And it must encompass goals which provide for the maximum educational development of each student. The problem arises in designing a blueprint to satisfy such ambitious standards. I believe, however, that we now have a curricular blueprint which meets these criteria. My concern will be to illustrate, using literature as an example, that this blueprint is truly complete and that it reflects inherent learning sequences in literature. This blueprint is provided by the *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives.*[1] (One volume deals with the cognitive domain, which includes knowledge, skills, and abilities; the second covers the affective domain, which

[1] *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals;* Benjamin S. Bloom, *Handbook I: Cognitive Domain* (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956); David R. Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, Bertram B. Masia, *Handbook II: Affective Domain* (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1964); hereafter referred to as *Cognitive* and *Affective*, respectively.

includes attitudes and values.) The *Taxonomy* was developed by a group of college examiners who recognized the need to classify educational goals. They wished to develop a classification system that would provide a common format for curricular development and evaluation and yet not necessitate the standardization of curricula. My discussion of the *Taxonomy* and its implications for a complete and sequential literature curriculum must at times be extremely specific and detailed to justify the volumes as a realistic blueprint for curriculum design. To eliminate unnecessarily laborious detail, charts accompany the later discussion of each domain to provide a synopsis of the material included, and charts in the appendix give a brief overview of the structure of each domain, illustrated with examples from literature appropriate to each objective. The examples given to illustrate the categories in all of the charts are my own—based upon the examples given in the two handbooks but adapted for the content of secondary school literature programs. The volumes provided examples from a multitude of subject matter areas and grade levels; consequently, extrapolation is necessary to use the classification system for any specific purpose.

The two volumes of the *Taxonomy* contain ample explanations of its purposes, its organization, and its limitations as well as detailed illustrations from a variety of objectives and test items. (The *Taxonomy*'s illustrations were chosen to represent the range of current educational goals and test items, not to reflect the judgment of the authors about the merit of those included. It is beyond the scope of the purpos of the *Taxonomy* to determine the *value* of any goals or methods. uch judgments must be made by each curriculum designer in terms of the philosophy and policy of the district.) A summary of some of these points needs to be included here even so, since the volumes may not be readily accessible to everyone concerned with English curricula, and some background is essential to understand the intentions of the volumes and the nature of the literature sequences given here to illustrate their usefulness. To proceed to the labors of formulating a curriculum, however, the curriculum designer should consult the volumes themselves. The cognitive domain considers the classification and evaluation of knowledge, abilities, and skills—heretofore the major concern of curricula, textbooks, and tests. The affective domain covers interests, attitudes, appreciation, and values—heretofore acknowledged in very general terms, if at all, in most secondary curriculum guides. The third volume, focusing on psychomotor development, has not yet been published.

Purposes of the Taxonomy *and Curricula*

The most important purposes of the two available volumes are particularly significant, since they are also desirable purposes for any curriculum design:

1. To provide a common vocabulary for both curricular terminology (such as *knowledge* and *comprehension*) and the meaning of abstract terms (such as *really understanding* and *application*) to allow educators to communicate about curriculum with as few semantic barriers as possible.
2. To provide a classification of goals upon student behavior—that is, upon whatever can be measured to determine the attainment of any objective, including behavior which manifests the presence or absence of knowledge, ability, skill, attitude, or value.
3. To provide a basis for measuring abstract competencies (such as understanding a poem or appreciating literature) as well as concrete ones (such as translating a metaphor into literal language).
4. To provide a basis for judicious selection from a myriad of desirable educational goals. (By charting possible goals according to the levels within the hierarchy of the two domains, curriculum builders can study the relationships among the goals and the nature of each goal.)[2]
5. To focus on the requisites for student success in achieving any goal (especially those which must be utilized or mastered before a given problem can be solved or a given goal can be reached).
6. To provide an objective means for measuring achievement in both the cognitive and affective domains. (The lack of such a method is a major reason why affective goals are so infrequently found in school programs.)

The authors of the *Taxonomy* recognized that imposing a form upon the objectives not only would be necessary but would also result in some limitations. To provide a sequential classification of these objectives, which was necessary if they were to be useful in developing a sequential curriculum, the authors had to make divisions and subdivisions. Even the basic division between the cognitive and the affective domains was made for the purpose of convenience, as were the subdivisions of these domains into six cognitive and five affective categories (or levels).[3] It is essential to understand that the divisions

[2] It is important to understand that only such objective information about goals can be gained by using the *Taxonomy;* decisions about the *value* of goals must be made in light of the philosophy and needs of the district. See Diane Shugert's article in this volume for a more complete discussion of this issue.

[3] These categories are represented by the whole numbers 1.00 through 6.00; subdivisions of the categories are indicated by the presence of a number following the decimal: 1.10 indicates the first main subdivision under 1.00, and 1.11 designates the first subdivision under 1.10; 1.20 is the second subdivision under 1.00, and 1.23 is the third subdivision under 1.20; the number of subdivisions indicates only the amount of separable material which composes the category—not the relative importance of any entry.

are occasionally arbitrary; still, they reflect the inherent similarities in behavior, appropriate to all subject disciplines, which make any category unique. Such divisions also allow the labeling of categories, which must precede an accurate definition of the terminology involved; the delineating of a hierarchy of objectives which reflects the gradual growth of competence inherent in any sequence; and the including of descriptions of behavior which are specific enough to be of practical value in both planning and evaluating a curriculum. Since these divisions and definitions must be generally applicable to any learning process, some will be more arbitrary or less applicable in certain subject matter areas than in others, but they are appropriate nonetheless.

Nature of the Classification System

The hierarchy of objectives in each domain progresses from the simple and most concrete to the most complex and abstract elements. In a study of poetry, for example, the lower levels of the hierarchy deal with such things as definitions of *metaphor* and the higher levels with such skills as explaining how metaphors are used to convey the meaning of a poem. (The hierarchy of objectives in both domains will be considered in more detail later in the article.) Some of the categories in the hierarchy may pertain to some subjects more than to others. (Knowledge of precise definitions of terms, for example, may be more essential in biology than in literature.) And some categories may be more appropriate in certain instances if placed in another position in the hierarchy. (The definition of *metaphor,* for example, is probably more easily learned in conjunction with the study of a specific work—a higher level learning process than learning the definition in isolation.) Their placement was determined by their relative degree of difficulty, since achieving the more abstract and complex objectives is more difficult and commonly requires the prior achievement of the simpler and more concrete ones. The sequence, then, does not imply that learning always does—or should—begin with the lowest level objective and proceed in lockstep fashion through the succeeding levels.

A specific curriculum, like English, designed on the basis of the classifications in the *Taxonomy* would be characterized by precise distinctions among its goals, completeness, minimum of overlapping of material, and correlation among its categories. But most significantly, in light of the limitations of other methods of curriculum development, such a curriculum could encompass both the cognitive and the affective domains and provide descriptions of objectives suitable to the

needs of the school situation. Because the *Taxonomy* is to a curriculum what a blueprint is to a house, not only can it be used to build a curriculum or to evaluate the soundness of its structure, it can also be used to incorporate or reject proposed additions or alterations to its structure. In addition, it can be useful in developing or evaluating the sequence and completeness of objectives at any level of generality—from those proposed for a particular unit to those suggested for the total school program.

DEVELOPING A SEQUENTIAL PROGRAM IN LITERATURE

With this introduction to the *Taxonomy* as a basis, we can now turn to the illustrations of the usefulness of its classification system in building and evaluating a sequential program in literature. We need to examine specific examples of the literary objectives designed to help students work toward the general goals of the total English program. These general goals are the foundation upon which the "house of English" is built, using the *Taxonomy* as our blueprint.

To further simplify, unify, and (it is hoped) clarify the following illustrations, I will relate literature objectives in the cognitive domain to one possible general goal for an English program—developing the capacity to judge the literary quality of an unfamiliar work—and those objectives in the affective domain to another—furthering the understanding of one's self and one's environment through literature. These two goals were chosen because of the frequency with which they appear in curriculum guides and professional publications, because they are feasible goals regardless of departmental organization, and because they were so situated in the hierarchy of each domain that they will provide examples from the greatest range of categories. Taking into consideration the limitations of the *Taxonomy* (such as the placement of categories in the hierarchy and the arbitrary divisions between some categories) and the amount of explanation required to show a cogent relationship between the two domains, I will examine the goals separately. Since I have provided examples from various aspects of literature in the appendix, I will single out just one learning sequence for each of the goals as an illustration of how their inherent sequence is paralleled by the hierarchy of the *Taxonomy* and how the objectives can be checked against the classification system to determine their most logical placement in the total English curriculum.

Cognitive Objectives

Let us look first at the cognitive domain by examining a sequential pattern of behavior relating to poetry as the student progresses toward the capacity for evaluation at the sixth level in the cognitive hierarchy. This pattern is illustrated in Table I. With this in mind, the teacher must first determine what knowledge and skills his students must acquire before they can make an evaluation of even a very simple poem.

TABLE 1[4]

SEQUENTIAL BEHAVIOR RELATING TO A CAPACITY TO EVALUATE LITERATURE

	Cognitive Level	Examples of Expected Behavior
Knowledge of	1.11	definitions of *meter, rhythm, sonnet, pentameter, anacrusis, octave*
	1.12	characteristics unique to poetry
	1.21	sonnet conventions
	1.22	relationships between octave and sestet in a Petrarchan sonnet
	1.23	types of lyric poetry
	1.24	means of distinguishing between well-written and poorly written poetry
	1.25	means of determining the literal meaning of a figure of speech
	1.31	characteristics of the sonnet form
	1.32	theories for evaluating poetry
Comprehension of	2.10	meaning of a figure of speech; meaning of each sentence of a sonnet
	2.20	main idea developed in a poem
	2.30	attitudes towards women in the seventeenth century as shown in poetry
Application	3.00	selection of one sestet from a given group that would best fit with a given octave of a sonnet
Analysis of	4.10	distinction between the central and supporting ideas in a poem
	4.20	interrelationships among elements (rhythm, tone, diction, etc.) of a poem
	4.30	structure and organization of a poem
Synthesis	5.10	explanation of how the meaning and implications of a given unfamiliar poem are conveyed
	5.20	explanation of how an unfamiliar poem could be explained to the rest of the class
	5.30	determination of a poetic theory from a given group of poems
Evaluation of	6.10	relative merit of two similar poems on the basis of unity, structure, and coherence
	6.20	quality of a given sonnet in terms of conventions and known good examples of the form

[4] Adapted by permission from pages 187–193 of *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II: The Affective Domain*, by David R. Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom and Bertram B. Masia; copyright © 1964, David McKay Company, Inc.

Later he must determine what additional knowledge and skills they must master to successfully evaluate more complex poems.

Therefore, he might logically begin at the end—with an evaluative task (at the 6.00 level). By having students evaluate a poem which requires no knowledge or skill beyond that which they should have developed previously, he can compare their answers to the levels of the *Taxonomy* to determine what knowledge and competence each student must acquire before he can perform such a task with the desired degree of success. Such a pretest is more valuable than one which simply attempts to determine the degree of mastery of specific knowledge, abilities, or skills allotted to previous classes, for it also helps students to perceive the nature of the goal for which they are striving in the learning situations which follow; that is, by understanding the nature of the behavior th y are expected to exhibit, students can better understand the purpose of these learning situations which are designed to assist them in achieving the goal. Using this pretest poem, students can be led to formulate definitions of terms important to their understanding of the poem. It could also be used to develop other basic understandings, such as the unique characteristics of poetry (1.12), the means of determining the literal meaning of a figure of speech (1.25) or an entire poem (2.10), and the means of distinguishing the central idea from its components (4.10).

Here we can see more clearly how the *Taxonomy* reflects the inherent sequence in which these understandings develop. Before a student can identify the central idea (4.10), he must be able to understand the literal meaning of the poem (2.10). To do this, he must be able to translate any figurative language into a literal statement (1.25). And to become competent in translating figures of speech, he should first understand that the meaning of a poem most often hinges on a nonliteral statement (1.12); and he must understand how to recognize a figurative statement (1.11). The *Taxonomy,* then, can also help the teacher determine what has not been mastered if a student does not exhibit the behavior expected in a particular situation—in this case, the ability to evaluate a poem. Because the concepts in this sequence are basic ones (as the preponderance of objectives at the 1.00 and 2.00 levels indicates), these portions of the program in literature might well be the responsibility of, say, the freshman or sophomore teacher.

Once students have mastered the concepts outlined above, the teacher can repeat the process with a second pretest to begin to develop more complex evaluative skills appropriate to the objectives of the course.

For instance, he might use a Petrarchan sonnet in the pretest which could be a basis for teaching the characteristics of that convention and some of the features unique to lyric poetry (1.21), the interrelationships among the elements within each of the two sections of the sonnet—such as diction, tone, rhyme, and point of view (4.20)—and the elements which commonly provide the sonnet with a unified structure—such as interlocking rhyme, point of view, and order of development (4.30). These concepts would probably not be clear to the students if presented in a different order. If, for instance, the teacher first attempted to use this pretest to develop an understanding of the principles which provide unity (4.30), he would have to either provide much of the information encompassed by the categories at the lower levels or have the students embark on a lengthy and potentially frustrating inductive search. For without the requisite information, students would have little guidance in their search, which could lead to irrelevant hypotheses and possibly to incorrect or incomplete solutions, as would be the case if they applied criteria appropriate to narrative poetry, for example. At best, such a situation is time-consuming (although pedagogically sound in some cases); at worst, it is a negative learning experience which could well obstruct their development of positive cognitive and affective behavior. Again the logical pattern of learning parallels that established by the *Taxonomy*. We notice also that this sequence includes more material from the more abstract and complex levels of the hierarchy and that it builds upon the basic understandings developed in the first example. Common sense and the *Taxonomy* both indicate that the more abstract and complex sequence must follow the other, either in the same course or in a subsequent one, depending upon the nature of the curriculum.

A brief digression here can perhaps clarify earlier allusions to the necessity for including affective as well as cognitive goals in the curriculum. Our examination of the preceding learning sequences illustrates the interrelationships between the domains. Let us assume, for example, that the teacher begins a study of poetry with what he assumes to be appropriate experiences for his students. If he assumes that they know very little about poetry, he may spend time on material they have already mastered; on the other hand, if he overestimates their competence, he may begin with material which is beyond their comprehension. Either approach can obstruct their affective as well as their cognitive development. We know that students frequently stop paying attention when the material being considered is either beyond their understanding or without any appreciable challenge to them.

Inattention itself can become habitual, just as it can lead to the substitution of other behavior in place of that desired by the teacher. And like any other pattern of behavior, it does not automatically cease when the initial cause of inattention is no longer present. Attention (at the 1.00 level of the affective domain) is exceptionally important in any sequential learning situation if students are to be successful at each step of the sequence. Success, in turn, is essential before the students can proceed to a cognitive sequence which builds upon the background being developed at the time.

Attention is equally essential to students' affective development. Students cannot respond to the material (the 2.00 affective behavior level) if they have not been attentive to the presentation or discussion of it. As a result, the sequential development of affective behavior is also obstructed. Without pursuing the ramifications of lack of attention any further, we can see clearly that attention, at the lowest affective level, is basic to successful response. This success, in turn, is necessary to assure further success in cognitive achievement and in development of a willingness to respond and the subsequent satisfaction in response which are necessary to assure the development of the desirable attitudes and values in the affective domain. Since affective components—whether positive or negative—are present in any learning situation, our failure to consider them in our curricular designs is to ignore an essential segment of our students' educational development.

If we were to trace further cognitive learning sequences, we would notice similar parallels between the logical sequence for teaching these concepts and the sequence established in the *Taxonomy*. We would also notice that levels 3.00 (application) and 5.00 (synthesis) are usually omitted as we trace the sequential development of the capacity to evaluate literature. Since these two categories are in some way different from the other categories, we need to understand how the two levels do become operative in an actual teaching situation. They must *not* be omitted in the learning process itself. Application (3.00) is the level between the categories concerned with content alone and those concerned also with form. At this level, which introduces no new material, students should be able to recognize and verbalize and write about the kind of content which has been the focus of learning at the first two levels of the sequence—in our examples, the content of a poem. Synthesis (5.00) is the second culmination point. At this level, students should be able to recognize and to verbalize and write about both content and form and to have the necessary command of the content and form of their writing and speaking to present their

ideas clearly. As a result, they will be able not only to recognize but also to discuss those elements and concepts about poetry necessary in conveying the judgments required of them at level 6.00 (evaluation).

These two points of culmination are also important because they represent two of the stages in the students' development of the ability to deal with literature independently. To do so, students must be able to analyze or synthesize by drawing only on their own knowledge and competence. Teachers, then, must gradually withdraw the motivation provided by their questions and suggestions to allow students the opportunities to provide such stimuli for themselves. If we agree that the students' ability to deal with literature independently is necessary, then we must be as concerned with their ability to initiate that activity as we are with the results they achieve when we provide the initial guidance.

As we have seen in our examination of some cognitive learning sequences, the *Taxonomy* can be of definite help in determining what students need to learn and what sequence is most appropriate for this learning. On such limited evidence, of course, I would not assert that we have conclusive proof of the utility of this blueprint in building a curricular castle. But I do feel justified in claiming that it has passed inspection sufficiently to be used to design the cognitive portion of our model house.

Before we proceed to the affective domain, I want to stress also that charting the sequences leading to any goal has benefits that ultimately exceed the time and labor initially expended—fringe benefits, that is, not overtime pay. For example, even in our brief examination of cognitive learning sequences, it helped to clarify several distinctions: (1) between basic poetic understandings and the more specialized competencies required for evaluating a sonnet; (2) between specific knowledge (of terms and facts) and abstract knowledge (of theories and processes); (3) between understanding concepts (such as the means of discovering the purpose of a poem) and applying them (such as independently determining the purpose of an unfamiliar poem); and (4) between those levels of cognition, such as knowledge of terms, which are more relevant when learned in conjunction with the concepts at another level and those, such as comprehension of the purpose of a selection, which are learned as they appear in the sequence of the *Taxonomy*. Such charting would also help to distinguish those elements which are necessary to the development of goals and those which could be excluded without affecting students' progress toward attaining the goals. The process of charting appropriate student be-

havior for each level would also stress the necessary increase in student-centered motivation and the corresponding decrease in teacher-initiated motivation as students progress from the lower level categories which usually lend themselves to group learning experiences to the higher categories in the domain which are more appropriate for independent work. Finally, such charting would expose repetition and omission. All of these things must be considered in building a curriculum.

Affective Objectives

Let us now examine the affective domain in light of the contribution of sequences in literature to the achievement of a second goal, that of furthering the understanding of one's self and one's environment. The nature of the affective goals renders them far more personal, and hence more individual, than those in the cognitive domain. Therefore, progress will depend upon the behavior of each student individually, not upon behavior of an entire group. Some aspects of this goal have been charted in Table II. There are a number of obvious differences between the examples given here and those listed in the table of cognitive examples earlier. Ideally, by the time a student reaches high school, he will be prepared to receive information about literature (1.00) and respond to motivation to examine the information (2.00), at least; and one hopes he will have acquired a degree of acceptance for the value of literature (3.10). Realistically, however, we know that this is not always true. In either case, some pupils might need to begin any sequence at the 1.00 level. This is particularly true whenever there is evidence of lack of response to, or value for, any aspect of literary study. For we realize that attainment of goals depends in most cases upon adequate awareness and attention (1.00), which may in turn depend upon knowledge and comprehension, the first two cognitive categories.

What was true about the necessity for motivation to be transferred from the teacher to the student in the cognitive domain is essential at an even earlier level in the affective domain. This process of transfer must begin at the lowest affective level, receiving. Otherwise, what appears to be an internalized literary value of the student, even at level 2.00 (responding), may actually be only a shift of motivation. Instead of a positive motivation provided in part by the teacher's approach to literature, the stimulus to respond may, in fact, be only a motivation to please the teacher, get good grades, or gain attention and recognition. While such stimuli can probably never be completely absent (nor without certain value) in a competitive situation, we need

TABLE II[5]

SEQUENTIAL BEHAVIOR RELATING TO THE ROLE OF LITERATURE IN FURTHERING THE UNDERSTANDING OF SELF AND ENVIRONMENT

Affective Level		Examples of Desired Behavior
Receiving (Attending)	1.10	notices existence of important literary phenomena
	1.20	attends to literature itself and to discussions of it
	1.30	notices familiar phenomena in new literary selections
Responding	2.10	completes literary assignments
	2.20	participates voluntarily in discussions and does unassigned reading
	2.30	enjoys activities such as reading, attending plays, and leading discussions of literature
Valuing	3.10	shows a degree of acceptance of the pleasures and values of literature
	3.20	reads extensively, contemplates implications of material, and seeks opportunities to discuss ideas gained from literature
	3.30	extends literary involvement and attempts to convince others of the value of literature as a source of ideas
Organization	4.10	reads extensively and critically to confirm, resolve, or determine the nature of the ideas and attitudes found in literature
	4.20	shows a definite preference for literature in relation to other sources of information and has ordered the ideas found in literature into a tentative hierarchy of values
Characterization by Value Complex	5.10	continues to expand contacts with the total environment by reading, discussing, and contemplating ideas in relation to a personal value system
	5.20	applies hierarchy of values in all aspects of life and continues to seek further information about man and his environment

to minimize them as much as possible. This is, of course, not to suggest that pleasing the teacher and getting good grades, for example, are not positive goals if social or economic advancement is our concern. The danger is that we may be interpreting the resulting student behavior as evidence of a developing value for literature, while it is possibly a manifestation of a quite different need or value. For the student to internalize positive attitudes toward literature sufficiently to incorporate them into his value system, his primary satisfaction must come from the literature itself, not from the recognition he receives from peers, teachers, or parents. This recognition, for our purposes in teaching literature, must be subordinate. If not, the withdrawal of recognition will probably also result in the withdrawal of that student behavior which we had interpreted as a value for literature.

[5] Adapted by permission from pages 176–185 of *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II: The Affective Domain,* by David R. Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom and Bertram B. Masia; copyright © 1964, David McKay Company, Inc.

Achievement in the affective domain is frequently sporadic and covert, making teacher judgments about student progress especially difficult. But since research confirms what our common sense tells us—although sometimes it apparently whispers very softly—we cannot continue to provide most of the motivation past level 2.10 (acquiescence in responding). To attempt to do so makes apparent student progress a negative value in terms of our literary goal by reinforcing his dependence upon external stimuli. Unless the motivation for his response to literature is internalized so that the student is voluntarily and willingly responding to teacher stimuli by level 2.20, the process of internalization of values, the entire key to progress in this domain, has been thwarted. This may have particularly serious ramifications in the affective domain, partly because of the student's innate ability to masquerade in a socially acceptable guise in most of these learning situations. But it is even more serious because his behavior stems from having internalized a value for recognition that will be hard to replace with a value for literature, particularly so long as success in dealing with literature is being used as a means of gaining recognition. The possibilities of developing a value for literature decrease proportionately as the value for recognition is increasingly internalized.

We might liken lack of achievement in the cognitive domain to the warped floor in one part of a house or to cracks in one of its walls. They can be easily and objectively perceived, and, once the cause has been eliminated and the damage repaired, they will probably have no further effect on the quality of the house. A lack of affective achievement, however, is more akin to a rotting foundation or the presence of termites. These weaknesses are much more difficult to spot in their early stages. Moreover, the task of repairing the damage they have caused is much more difficult because a repair of only the visibly affected portion and the elimination of the cause of the problem in that portion will not be a permanent solution. The complete eradication of the cause is necessary. The authors of the *Taxonomy* recognize that the methods available for interpreting even the visible manifestations of damage to affective development are not yet satisfactory. Yet this is not the argument against concerning ourselves with affective development that many educators would claim that it is. Granted that it may be many years before educators will be able to devise valid and reliable tools to diagnose the causes of unsatisfactory affective development, the absence of such tools is not sufficient reason to abandon our attempts to develop our students' affective abilities. To do so would be irresponsible. And educators can ill afford to sacri-

fice the positive contributions that a conscious effort to include affective learning can make to the total educational development of most students.

The behavioral sequence charted in Table II is phrased in terms of the affective goals of a *total* English curriculum, since a goal such as the one selected for illustration cannot be fully achieved in a single class, a single year, or a single secondary school experience. We must be cautious about forcing students to develop a value for literature as a source of information about themselves and their environment. Such understandings would be classified at the 4.10 level in the affective domain, a level usually not attained until quite late in a student's educational development—perhaps not until several years after he leaves high school. It seems advisable to concern ourselves more with reinforcing the behavior at the first three levels of the hierarchy in terms of the literature being studied each year to assure adequate development of the contributing cognitive objectives and to provide a secure basis for further affective development. We must also be cautious about relying too heavily upon a few symptoms of affective development so that we do not mistake enthusiasm or avid reading for commitment to the value of literature.

To a greater degree than in the cognitive categories, sequential development in the affective domain is so essentially individual that it often resists inclusion in a traditional class situation. Current concerns for varying the learning experiences to allow for more individualized learning and more student-teacher contact time are indicators of an increasing recognition of the necessity for providing a course of study suitable for every student. Besides aiding cognitive learning, these innovations can unquestionably provide the opportunities for a more realistic approach to affective learning.

The general nature of the goal illustrated in the table helps to indicate another aspect of teaching that is commonly overlooked. Values are not developed in a vacuum. They must be developed in some context. If we use literature as an example of a context which can serve as a catalyst for developing values, we must not overlook the neglected intermediary: a student cannot develop significant positive values from a context which he does not value. Before he will accept the value of the ideas presented in literature sufficiently to internalize them as part of his value system, he must accept the value of literature itself. An illustrative analogy can be drawn from *Hamlet*. Along with the observant members of Shakespeare's audience, Laertes paid little heed to the admonitions of his loquacious father, Polonius, although he

received his long-winded aphorisms politely (1.00 affective level) and was acquiescent in making a minimal response to them (2.10). But, since Laertes did not value the context in which the advice was given, he attached almost no value to the content. We need to recognize that an attitude toward a teacher or an author also cannot be misconstrued as being commensurate with an attitude toward literature in general as a context of ideas, any more than Laertes' real affection for his father was reflected in his negative attitude toward the value of what his father said.

I do not mean to imply that it is necessary to develop a commitment to the value of literature before even beginning to develop a belief in or a value for the ideas which it contains. One undoubtedly assists and reinforces the other. What is important is that the valuing of the beliefs and ideas found in literature will be based on less secure and defensible grounds—much as one accepts the validity of a statement simply because it is frequently repeated—until all aspects of the value are examined carefully. Such an examination requires conscious attention to the total context in which concepts occur and involves consideration of conflicting values, reliability of sources, and appropriateness of the value in numerous situations. It is such attention to literature that offers the English teacher a means of helping students develop a value for literature as a context for understanding themselves and their environment. (We must also be realistic enough to recognize that, with the number of desirable values confronting students, our task is principally to make the acquisition of a value for literature *possible,* not to expect that all students will acquire it to the same degree.) This scrutinizing of values is also a means of teaching students to examine, question, and draw relationships among ideas—an important foundation for the continued development of affective behavior. Briefly, then, it is clear that before any value can be confidently internalized within an individual's hierarchy of values (4.20), it must be understood rather fully (3.20). To gain this understanding, a student must be sufficiently interested in the phenomenon to explore it more fully than would be possible in most classroom situations (2.20). And interest obviously cannot be developed before the phenomenon is recognized (1.10). The teacher's most important task is to be sure that students develop the skills necessary to make their independent explorations of ideas, essential from the 2.20 level on, as thorough and logical as possible. Beyond this level, the process of internalization makes objective examination extremely difficult, as we have already seen, and allows others little opportunity to guide the process.

The authors of the *Taxonomy* have noted several other characteristics of the affective domain which are important in building a high school English curriculum. Because of the number of years required to develop the more complex objectives at levels 3.00 and 4.00, an entire staff must commit itself to providing numerous situations designed to foster their development. The authors also feel that because of biological changes and the normal adolescent questioning of adult standards, the secondary school years may be one of the levels at which changes in beliefs and values can most easily be accomplished (*Affective,* p. 85). But since acceptance of peer group standards is exceptionally strong during these years, change will probably not be effected successfully unless certain conditions exist. The peer environment must be conducive to the change, unless individuals can be isolated from that environment to a marked degree and extensively exposed to situations that are structured to bring about the desired change (*Affective,* p. 84). Student-teacher interaction and greater student involvement yield better results than a teacher-controlled learning situation, regardless of the teacher's skill and the soundness of his persuasion (*Affective,* p. 82). The important element here is the location of the stimulus. The motivation, which must be transferred from the teacher to the student very early in the affective process, cannot be provided by the student who is not involved in the learning process.

The authors also stress that, in spite of the progress that is being made in understanding the nature of the affective domain, hard work and ingenuity must continue to provide means of working with our present knowledge about affective learning and its evaluation. At this time, developing and evaluating the affective portion of the total curriculum suffers from a shortage of adequate materials, tools, and skilled manpower similar to that curtailing construction of civilian buildings during World War II. But, just as architects and contractors sought means of adapting what was available, so must educators. The authors suggest that as research attempts to provide new tools for evaluating affective learning, educators must provide statements of goals which are phrased in terms that clarify their intent and hence make objective evaluation possible (*Affective,* p. 87). Only then can researchers devise appropriate evaluative tools. Other problems must also be solved: Which beliefs and values should rightfully be developed by the schools? (This decision must of course precede curriculum construction. The *Taxonomy* cannot assess the *value* of the goals; it can only help to organize and evaluate the objectives in relation to one another and to the goals which they have been selected to achieve.) What are the

characteristics of those situations that allow the greatest amount of affective learning in a given period of time? What processes cause major affective changes within an individual (*Affective,* pp. 88–89)?

Along with the authors, educators realize the difficulties involved in stating and implementing affective goals. But the authors note that "The affective domain contains the forces that determine the nature of an individual's life and ultimately the life of an entire people." To abrogate responsibility for providing for affective learning because of difficult problems is to ignore reality (*Affective,* p. 91). People cannot function satisfactorily either as individuals or as members of society solely on the basis of acquired knowledge and skills, especially in a dynamic and universal environment such as ours. Since we must share the blame for undesirable results, whether or not we have consciously designed a program to develop values, it would be foolhardy not to accept our responsibilities to develop those student competencies which can lead to more desirable results. The *Taxonomy* provides the blueprint, and, regardless of how modest our efforts may be, we must develop a *complete* curriculum—one with affective as well as cognitive goals. Otherwise we have built a house with only two sides, not just a smaller house.

Conclusion

Let us review the entire building process which our discussion has considered to reemphasize how much a process can assure the development of a complete and sequential curriculum and, thereby, a complete "house of English." The curriculum architect, with the *Taxonomy* as his blueprint, designs a set of specifications—the goals for the total school program providing the specific requirements which the curriculum must fulfill. Then the contractors, the staff members, lay the foundation—the general goals in the various subject matter areas. As the frame of specific objectives is raised upon this foundation, the teacher subcontractors develop the specific objectives of particular grade levels or courses, the walls of the house—two being built of cognitive material; two, of affective. (See the appendices for examples.) Then these subcontractors must put in the necessities like plumbing and wiring, the means of articulation which link the parts of the house and make it functional. This articulation must not only link those parts of the house occupied by the English department but also connect each department's section of the house with every other portion.

When this process of developing objectives and the means of articulation is completed, the roof is put on the house as the work of each

contractor and subcontractor is checked once again, step by step, against the specifications and the blueprint. Only then can the teachers begin to furnish and decorate their own rooms with the content and approaches they favor, limited only by the necessity for these personal choices to be appropriate to the total structure and, of course, by the built-in limits of budgets and available choices. One freezer, one washing machine, and one hi-fi system should suffice, and too many brightly colored rooms or too many overstuffed chairs would not lead to a coordinated effect. (Translated into curricular jargon: any desirable method or literary work will probably lose its effectiveness if it is included too often.) The house would be more convenient, of course, if these furnishings and decorations were in the most appropriate places to perform the functions for which they were intended. (Or we might say that certain methods and literary selections are more appropriate in some courses than in others.) If all has gone well, our curricular house is ready to be evaluated whenever the building inspector arrives, *Taxonomy* in hand, to judge our accomplishments.

APPENDIX A[6]

Categories—Cognitive Domain

Levels	Titles	Definitions and Descriptions of Categories; Sample Behaviors

1.00 ***KNOWLEDGE OF:*** recalls basic factual information about isolated specifics, universals, methods, processes, pattern, structure, setting.

1.10 ***Specifics:*** remembers specific isolated elements (symbols with a concrete referent) which have some meaning and value by themselves.

1.11 ***Terminology:*** recalls definitions of terms and of basic conventions in a field. EXAMPLES: defines *iambic, alliteration, unity, image, mood.*

1.12 ***Specific Facts:*** recalls specific facts that can be objectively verified. EXAMPLES: knows the major library sources of biographical information about authors; knows when local color writing flourished in the United States.

1.20 ***Ways and Means of Dealing with Specifics:*** remembers the processes by which specific knowledge is obtained and used (such as ways and means of organizing, studying, judging, and criticizing ideas) which have been agreed upon by authorities in a given field.

1.21 ***Conventions:*** recalls characteristic ways of treating and presenting data. EXAMPLES: knows various common ballad rhyme schemes, unique conventions of drama, and poetic means of telling a story.

1.22 ***Trends and Sequences:*** recalls processes, directions, and movements of phenomena in time, including interrelationships between specific events or series of specific events. EXAMPLES: recalls ways that the content of the American novel changed between the Civil War and World War II; knows the effects of the Reformation on English drama.

1.23 ***Classifications, Categories:*** recalls classes, sets, division, and arrangements fundamental or useful for a particular field, purpose, argument, or problem. EXAMPLES: remembers types of short prose narratives and differences between lyric and narrative poetry.

1.24 ***Criteria:*** recalls the criteria for testing or judging facts, principles, opinions, or conduct. EXAMPLES: knows what elements to consider to evaluate a novel, to identify bias in literary reference material, to distinguish among the types of lyric poetry.

1.25 ***Methodology:*** recalls method of inquiry, techniques, and procedures in a particular field or for a specific problem or phenomena. EXAMPLES: remembers the means of determining the literal and extended meanings of a poem, finding references on the drama of a specific era, finding material about the changing concepts about the nature of pastoral poetry.

1.30 ***Universals and Abstractions:*** remembers the major ideas, schemes, and patterns for organizing ideas and phenomena—the abstract and complex structures, theories, and generalizations in a field, type of problem, or kind of phenomenon.

1.31 ***Principles and Generalizations:*** recalls specific abstractions which summarize a body of specific, observable phenomena and serve to explain, describe, predict, or determine action or direction. EXAMPLES: knows the characteristics of pre-Revolution American prose, the literary principles of Coleridge, the characteristics of realistic writing.

1.32 ***Theories and Structures:*** recalls the interrelated principles and generalizations which afford a clear, complete, and systematic view of a complex phe-

[6] Adapted by permission from pages 187–193 (Appendix B) of *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II: The Affective Domain*, by David R. Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom and Bertram B. Masia; copyright © 1964, David McKay Company, Inc.

nomenon, problem, or field and illustrate its organization. EXAMPLES: remembers the common theories about determining the literary merit of poetry and the nature of the development of the realistic novel.

2.00 *COMPREHENSION:* understands the literal ideas given and can make some use of the ideas by restating them or making simple extensions of them.

2.10 *Translation:* expresses an idea in another form or level of abstraction. EXAMPLES: restates a metaphor in literal language, paraphrases a poem.

2.20 *Interpretation:* explains or summarizes ideas by reordering them, giving a new view of them, or generalizing about them. EXAMPLES: summarizes a short story plot or the theory of poetry explained in a given selection; explains main idea of poem.

2.30 *Extrapolation:* determines implications, consequences, corollaries, or effects of specific ideas or selections when applied to other contexts. EXAMPLES: identifies the parallels between the attitudes and situations in *Juno and the Paycock* and *Death of a Salesman;* recognizes the implications about the Union attitude toward the war in *The Red Badge of Courage.*

3.00 *APPLICATION:* selects the appropriate abstraction for solving a new problem. EXAMPLES: selects the most appropriate couplet to conclude an unfamiliar Elizabethan sonnet and justifies the choice made; determines which poems in a given group best satisfy Coleridge's criteria for poetry; explains why a given fourteen-line poem does not qualify as a sonnet.

4.00 *ANALYSIS OF:* breaks the content and form of material into its constituent elements to see their interrelationships.

4.10 *Elements:* recognizes and differentiates among hypotheses, conclusions, stated and unstated assumptions, and the nature, function, and relevance of statements of fact, value, or intent. EXAMPLES: determines the function of the unstated assumptions in a poem or passage (such as Antony's funeral speech in *Julius Caesar*); the nature and purposes of the hypotheses and conclusions in *Paradise Lost* or Dryden's *Essay on Dramatic Poesy.*

4.20 *Relationships:* sees the relationships among the elements and parts of a communication and distinguishes essential from nonessential. EXAMPLES: identifies the relationships between the descriptions of Egdon Heath and what happens to Clym in *Return of the Native;* recognizes the relationships among diction, rhythm, tone, and content in Macbeth's "Tomorrow and tomorrow . . ." speech.

4.30 *Organizational Principles:* identifies structural principles governing organization and unity in a selection. EXAMPLES: determines how chronology, tone, and point of view are used to unify Hardy's poem "Channel Firing"; recognizes the organization and unity provided by parallelism between the halves of Whitman's "A Noiseless Patient Spider."

5.00 *SYNTHESIS:* combines material into a meaningful original communication utilizing individual creativity within limits of regulations or conventions appropriate to the purpose of the communication.

5.10 *Unique Communication:* conveys ideas, feelings, and experience effectively. EXAMPLES: writes a satirical account of an experience using the satiric devices in one of Thurber's essays or two or three stanzas to complete a ballad with a given first stanza.

5.20 *Plan or Proposed Set of Actions:* develops a definite plan to accomplish a specific purpose or a proposed method for testing a hypothesis or solving a problem. EXAMPLES: produces a detailed plan to explain how Poe's short stories illustrate his theories about the genre; proposes a research project about the controversy over Shakespeare's authorship.

5.30 *Set of Abstract Relations:* classifies or explains material inductively by deriving a set of abstract relations from it and deduces propositions and

relations from material from basic propositions or symbols. EXAMPLES: deduces a poetic theory from a given group of poems; develops a system to classify and describe a group of stories.

6.00 *EVALUATION:* makes qualitative and quantitative judgments about the value of specific materials or methods on the basis of internal or external standards.

6.10 *by Internal Evidence:* judges the value of a communication on the basis of internal logic, consistency, precision, accuracy, completeness, unity. EXAMPLES: judges the quality of a poem on the basis of the relationships of its ideas, the appropriateness of form, devices, techniques, and figurative language or of a short story on the basis of its economy and consistency of characters.

6.20 *by External Evidence:* judges the value of material on the basis of its purpose and its appropriateness to achieve its purpose and on the basis of generally accepted criteria or comparison with good models. EXAMPLES: judges the quality of an elegy in terms of the appropriateness of its content and form in comparison with elegiac conventions or with a generally acclaimed elegy; evaluates Faulkner's Nobel acceptance speech in light of its purpose and the intended audience.

APPENDIX B[7]

Categories—Affective Domain

Levels	Titles	Definitions and Descriptions of Categories; Sample Behaviors

1.00 *RECEIVING (ATTENDING):* receives or attends to specific phenomena or stimuli presented.

1.10 *Awareness:* recognizes the existence of a phenomenon, situation, or object at a passive level requiring no fine discrimination or ability to verbalize about its nature. EXAMPLES: recognizes existence of obvious similarities among works; is aware of the names of famous authors.

1.20 *Willingness:* tolerates, rather than avoids, certain stimuli. EXAMPLES: attends to discussions of literature; is tolerant of literature containing unfamiliar or unacceptable beliefs.

1.30 *Control or Selection:* controls attention sufficiently to focus on particular stimuli when others are present and responds to the presented stimuli. EXAMPLES: indicates having noticed previously studied elements in later reading; notices such elements during the first reading.

2.00 *RESPONDING:* shows evidence of involvement in or commitment to a subject, phenomenon, or activity by actively responding to an earlier stimulus.

2.10 *Acquiescence:* complies with suggestions and regulations even if the reasons for doing so are not fully clear or accepted. EXAMPLES: completes literary assignments having no current appeal; completes assignments designed to compensate for gaps in the individual's previous learning.

2.20 *Willingness:* engages in voluntary activities because of personal interest. EXAMPLES: participates willingly in discussions of literature; seeks additional information and literary experiences voluntarily.

2.30 *Satisfaction:* exhibits satisfaction, pleasure, or enjoyment in responding. EXAMPLES: reads for pleasure during leisure time; initiates discussions about literary experiences of various kinds.

[7] Adapted by permission from pages 176–185 (Appendix A) of *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II: The Affective Domain*, by David R. Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom and Bertram B. Masia; copyright © 1964, David McKay Company, Inc.

3.00 *VALUING:* has internalized an ideal or value sufficiently to be consistently identified as one having worth to the individual, to be noticeable in the absence of external stimuli, and to be willingly exhibited in the presence of conflicting ones.

3.10 *Acceptance:* has a consistent commitment to a belief held tentatively and subject to reevaluation. EXAMPLES: reads reviews of and discusses books read independently; argues in defense of a book but reassesses it in light of new insights.

3.20 *Preference:* has a sufficient commitment to a value to lead to overt action or extensive inquiry and thought and to be identified as having predominance above other interests, beliefs, and values. EXAMPLES: reads extensively to discover implications of having a certain value; speaks to individuals and writes letters to papers in support of a value.

3.30 *Commitment:* values a belief with a high degree of certainty, perhaps bordering on faith, and manifesting itself in deep and extended involvement to convince others to value the belief. EXAMPLES: appears before influential groups and individuals to support actions commensurate with the beliefs; compiles extensive evidence to support such proposals.

4.00 *ORGANIZATION:* begins to build a value system by seeing the implications, relevance, and relationships involved in separate values in several situations sufficiently to place values in a hierarchy.

4.10 *Conceptualization:* has sufficiently internalized a value that it is manifested in abstract ways and related to values already held or considered. EXAMPLES: reads extensively to try to resolve apparent conflicts between values; critically reexamines books to discover the reasons for liking or disliking them.

4.20 *Organization:* internalizes a number of values sufficiently to order them in a personal hierarchy, to test them in many situations, and to further refine, synthesize, or adjust them. EXAMPLES: determines a tentative resolution between conflicting values; constructs an extensive argument supporting an action commensurate with a personal value system which takes into account its value to others and the arguments against it.

5.00 *CHARACTERIZATION BY VALUES:* internalizes a hierarchy of values sufficiently that it consistently informs and evokes behavior without conscious effort and without emotion or affect unless threatened.

5.10 *Generalized Set:* possesses the basic orientation for internal consistency of value system, selective response in generalized situations, consistent response in similar situations, and ordered perception of the environment. EXAMPLES: consistently opposes literature which appears to support immoral values; accepts tentative alternatives if original goal cannot be attained; willingly changes opinions when evidence is given that discounts original opinions.

5.20 *Characterization:* has an internalized value system which is inclusive and consistent enough to encompass the broadest range of phenomena and behavior—considered a philosophy of life. EXAMPLES: possesses generally esteemed traits which are consistently manifested in all aspects of life; strives persistently toward ideals while accepting and working to remove obstacles and taking all things into consideration.