DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 108 979 SO 008 247

AUTHOR Kingman, Barry
TITLE The Development of Value Clarification Skills: Initial Efforts in an Eighth Grade Social Studies Class, Part 2. Occasional Paper Series No. 75-1.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Stony Brook. American Historical Association Education Project.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 60p.; Part 1 is ED 090 128; Appendices 1, 2, and 3 have been removed to conform with copyright law

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Ethical Values; Evaluation Methods; Formative Evaluation; Grade 8; Instructional Innovation; *Moral Development; Secondary Education; Self Actualization; *Social Studies; *Teaching Techniques; *Values
IDENTIFIERS Raths (Louis)

ABSTRACT

The first part of this manuscript relates the initial efforts of a teacher who attempted to apply the value clarification approach in an eighth grade social studies class. The approach is based on Louis Rath's seven-part approach to values clarification which encourages children to choose and to prize one's beliefs and behaviors, and to act on one's beliefs. Value clarification techniques used in the classroom take place in a broad methodological framework that begins with readings on Africa and Asia, and continues with discussion of universal topics and short thought papers to instill a particular set of values through the Rath technique. In Part II, the author discusses his concern for the need to develop evaluation tools to assess the effectiveness of the value clarification approach, and the steps he takes to design such formative and summative evaluation instruments. In one case, the author analyzes the data he compiles and then modifies his teaching strategies to increase the effectiveness of the value clarification approach. (Author/JR)

American Historical Association History Education Project

Occasional Paper Series

Dr. Eli Seifman, Series Editor

Occasional Paper #75-1

THE DEVELOPMENT OF VALUE CLARIFICATION SKILLS: INITIAL EFFORTS IN AN EIGHTH GRADE SOCIAL STUDIES CLASS PART II

by

BARRY KINGMAN

American Historical Association History Education Project
The State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York
1975

PREFACE

The first part of this manuscript, Part I, related the "initial efforts" of a teacher who attempted to apply the value clarification approach with his eighth grade social studies class.

To review very briefly, the value clarification approach is concerned with helping individuals utilize the seven processes of valuing, which according to Louis E. Raths are:

PRIZING one's beliefs and behaviors
1. prizing and cherishing
2. publicly affirming when appropriate

CHOOSING one's beliefs and behaviors
3. choosing from alternatives
4. choosing after consideration of consequences
5. choosing freely

ACTING on one's beliefs
6. acting
7. acting with a pattern, consistency and repetition.

The object, therefore, is not to instill a particular set of values. There is a very important, indeed a fundamental distinction that needs to be made between teaching the process of valuing and teaching the content of people's values!

In Part II, Barry Kingman discusses his concern for the need to develop evaluation tools to assess the effectiveness of the value clarification approach and the steps he took to design such formative and summative evaluative instruments.

Of special interest is the way in which the author analyzes the data he compiled and then modifies his teaching strategies to increase the effectiveness of the value clarification approach. This clear example of the use of formative evaluation highlights one of the most significant dangers of relying too heavily on summative evaluation. If we delay evaluation until after the instruction (course, unit, etc.) then we no longer are in a position to benefit from this feedback and to make the necessary modifications that would allow us to increase the effectiveness of the teaching-learning experience.

Stony Brook, New York
AHA/HEP Occasional Paper Series

Eli Seifman (General Editor)

The Development of Value Clarification Skills: Initial Efforts in an Eighth Grade Social Studies Class

Part II

Barry Kingman
June 8, 1974

In a paper submitted to ERIC last spring I pointed to the need to hear from teachers trying to incorporate new methods into their classroom activities. I discussed my first attempts with the value clarification techniques suggested by Louis Raths and his associates. This paper continues the discussion covering my efforts from January through the end of the year.* Seven months after encountering Raths, I am convinced that values present a key challenge to social studies teachers. I am also left with strong doubts about how effective I have been. The limitations of the evaluation tools I used make it difficult to assess my success or failure. It might well be that I have failed more than otherwise. I do not feel that this is cause for discouragement. Educators are faced with an enormously complex process, much of which is simply not understood. It should not be surprising that meaningful development does not come easy.

Before moving into the specifics of my classroom experiments, a brief discussion of the materials on which they are based might be helpful. Louis Raths and his associates approach values with an emphasis on skills rather than specific values. They provide a

---

*I am a part-time teacher at Harbor Country Day School on Long Island and a full-time graduate student in history at SUNY Stony Brook. Although my situation is somewhat unique, like most teachers I face two general problems in trying to develop new teaching techniques: I have not done pedagogical research on a doctoral level and I have a busy schedule.

a series of techniques for developing these skills based on seven underlying instructions to the teacher:

1. Encourage children to make choices, and to make them freely.
2. Help them discover and examine available alternatives when faced with choices.
3. Help children weigh alternatives thoughtfully, reflecting on the consequences of each.
4. Encourage children to consider what it is that they prize and cherish.
5. Give them opportunities to make public affirmations of their choices.
6. Encourage them to act, behave, live in accordance with their choices.
7. Help them to examine repeated behaviors or patterns in their life. 1

The mere existence of this outline indicates a contradiction in Raths' approach. He emphasizes free choice, while forcing or manipulating students to follow his model. This year I have faced a similar contradiction. To insure free choice, I have tried to break down the blinders of the students' socialization; yet this in itself was a limitation of choice. These contradictions, however, are more theoretical than real. Whatever the limits of choice implicit in my approach and in Raths', they have far more potential for free choice than any alternative short of chaos, and that has its own confinement.

Lawrence Kohlberg approaches value clarification more empirically. He points to studies that "didactic ethical instruction" and attempts at home to develop "good habits" have little effect.[2] These studies lead to two further conclusions. The first claims that morality is merely a response to the specifics of a given situation. The second

claims that morality is determined in early childhood and stems from "deep emotional tendencies and defenses." Kohlberg admits that these nihilistic interpretations have a limited validity, but stresses the more hopeful results of his eighteen year study of fifty male youths interviewed at three year intervals. The study indicates that children develop through six moral stages. (See Appendix I) Cross cultural studies indicate that these stages are universal, embedded in human nature rather than in specific cultures (although isolated, pre-literate cultures can limit development). Advancement to the higher stages includes "an increasing awareness of justice and a disentangling of justice from the particular accepted rules of the culture."[3] It also means an increasing capacity for moral judgements which "unlike judgements of prudence or esthetics, tend to be universalistic, inclusive, consistent, and to be grounded in objective impersonal or ideal grounds."[4] Kohlberg's age chart indicates that most of my students at age thirteen would be at the two stages with a "good-boy" and an "authority and social-order maintaining" orientation.[5]

Although Kohlberg emphasizes skill development, he denies that all values are relative and urges that we go beyond value clarification.[7] Raths is ambiguous on this point. He says that values are relative to our environment, but in a discussion of bigotry he implies that it is something which should be discouraged regardless of what it is relative to.[8] My own approach has followed Kohlberg's advice. I pursue value clarification by trying to free children from a narrow socialization *AND* expose them to a wider spectrum of choice, but ultimately I impose the limits of a new, broader socialization which stresses the development of humane sensitivity. It limits choice, but not in the parochial sense of patriotism and respect for the teacher.

It does not stress specific values, but rather a broad awareness of man's potential for suffering and happiness.

David Krathwohl, Benjamin Bloom and their associates have expressed concern about the lack of clear affective educational goals. In response to the problem, they have separated affective from cognitive goals and organized a "neutral" hierarchical taxonomy based on increasing complexity, abstractness and internalization. (See Appendix II.) The taxonomy is divided into five major categories beginning with receiving. At this level the learner "is sensitized to the existence of certain phenomena and stimuli" and he is " willing to receive or to attend to them." At the third level the student develops a belief that "a thing, phenomenon, or behavior has worth." At the fifth level the student has developed a consistent value system or "world view" sufficiently internalized that he often acts upon it unconsciously. Krathwohl points out that development on the higher levels will probably not result from the efforts of a single course.[9]

At one point Krathwohl provides a list of actions, asks the reader to respond by identifying where they fit on the taxonomy and then provides his own responses. On a third of the actions my responses did not agree with his. I went back and reread his discussion of the taxonomy and still had difficulty resolving the disagreement. The problem here might have been my lack of understanding, but I also suspect that the taxonomy is somewhat ambiguous. The authors admit in their introduction that they faced greater difficulty on the affective than on the cognitive taxonomy. In spite of this ambiguity the taxonomy has been helpful in placing my work with values in a wider framework. It has sensitized me to the limits of my impact. After a year's

work with values I have found no evidence of value activity beyond the taxonomy's third stage.

Raths, Kohlberg and Krathwohl all approach value development with frameworks which transcend specific values. These frameworks do accomodate a variety of value systems, but they are not all inclusive. Their basis in Western logic and a premise of instability would reject traditional African value systems which tend towards the preservation of relatively stable traditions. There is no assurance that man has become happier or known a better quality of life due to the use of Western type value systems. None of the above writers, however, even considers that there might be an alternative to the Western approach. My own experience has found the Western approach helpful and preferable to the Afrioan alternative. (I have lived in Africa for three years.) The material power resulting from change and Western logic presents the potential for agreater diversity of human experience and provides protection in an aggressive international system. Nonetheless, in face of doubts about whether Western man is really any happier for his material wealth, it would seem unfair to teach the Western approach without at least creating an awareness of the traditional African alternative -- and others as well.

Speaking on the freedom to learn in 1945, Carl Becker said that he was less concerned about this issue in the high schools because that was a time to learn the facts.[10] Twenty years later, Arno Bellack's observations indicated that contemporary teachers, whatever their rhetoric, were following Becker's advice. They were consistently using a fairly rapid teacher solicitation, student response, teacher reaction pattern on material that required memory rather than higher

cognitive processes.[11] With such a "classroom language" there is little potential for dealing with values.

There should certainly be a place in the classroom for new data to expand undeveloped perspectives, but the reality revealed by Bellack's observations indicates a failure to balance this need for data with other equally important needs. This problem has been so extensively discussed over the past century that the failure seems to be less one of understanding than implementation. The data trap seems to have an irresistable attraction similar to the mileage syndrome on a long trip: you always want to make a few miles more. Hunt and Metcalf present one way to avoid the trap: begin with reflection and let it determine what and how much data is needed.[12] The problem is that such an approach requires a flexibility that is impossible with a fixed curriculum or a text book orientation. Even if the teacher is willing to be flexible, he faces the problem of finding the needed data and making it available to his students. In a school with a limited library I have found it helpful to give brief lectures when data not found in the readings is needed.

Writing for the National Council for the Social Studies, Richard Gross says that during a value discussion the teacher should maintain focus and calm and "see that the class perceives the objectives in the study; that it really understands the issues involved and their implications."[13] While the teacher undoubtedly must do this at first to establish a model, it would seem equally important to encourage the students to do this themselves, even if the discussion becomes less efficient and sophisticated. Students are probably influenced more by process than content anyway; better a process of responsibility

and self initiative than one of dependence.

Gross also stresses the need for compromise in discussing controversial issues: Kohlberg criticizes this approach as a facade for forcing sub-cultures into a middle class mold.[14] While a certain level of consensus and compromise is essential for a functioning social order, one can easily think of compromises which should not be made. If a fellow soldier is killing innocent civilians, should an objecting comarade agree to a reduction of the victims by half? Rather than stressing compromise, it would seem better to bring up the issue of when compromise is justifiable and when it is not.

In Self-Awareness Through Group Dynamics, Robert Reichert stresses that true education must have an impact on life style. The thoughts of the classroom must be linked to action. He proposes that the link be encouraged through simulated experiences. For example, during a unit on freedom and responsibility he would use a simulation where the students are divided into groups and told to hold their arms out as long as possible, even if it hurts. Those who let their arms down would make their whole group suffer. This experience is followed by a discussion of how the different people felt and behaved.[15] I have not yet tried such simulations because at first I felt that they would be superficial and contrived. A recent experience at a workshop for teachers*, however, has changed my mind. A discussion full of glib rhetoric was made productive by a simulation that forced the participants to consider their words in terms of real action.

Raths also stresses the thought-action link. He proposes action projects where students would try to have an impact on their community. Such projects might be good learning experiences and might establish a model of active concern, but they have serious limitations. Raths

*American Historical Assoc., Faculty Development Program, William Taylor Director.

sees these projects as a means of showing the students that they have power.[16] In fact children and adolescents are virtually powerless. Until recently they could be expelled from school without the fourteenth amendment protection given adults. The result is that action projects must be limited to marginal activities like the student campaign promoting seat belts described by Raths. (Even here the ACTIVITY is necessarily a token due to lack of resources.) It is difficult to imagine school administrators tolerating an action project to limit the principal's punishment powers, or to organize a truly independent student newspaper. In face of these realities action projects face the danger of encouraging meaningless gestures as a substitute for real action. This does not mean action projects should be eliminated. Proposed projects within school rules might be encouraged, but with a discussion of the realities of power and tokenism. With more radical projects the teacher might initiate a discussion of possible consequences and then withdraw to let the students make their own decision. The teacher then must examine his values to decide how far he will support them if they decide to continue.

Several times this year my students have shown a sharp interest in value discussions on issues clearly outside their realm of action -- interventionism, foreign aid, abuse of presidential power, capital punishment. Since there can be little potential for effective student action in these areas, are the discussion worthwhile? Reginald Archambault in an article in the Harvard Educational Review says yes.

> ...it would be dangerous to believe that success in moral instruction in this [non-active] sense would be trivial or vacuous. For although it is true that knowing the good does not guarantee the doing of it, it is similarly true that an absense of knowledge of the good and skill in judging the good often makes moral conduct impossible, even if one desires

to do the good and has the will to do so.[17]

I have often found it possible to translate value topics with a low potential for action into issues in the students school life where at least some action is possible. Presidential abuse of power might be translated into teacher abuse of power. Foreign aid problems might be brought home by relating them to the issues of financial aid for poor students.

Raths brings up a further problem in developing the thought-action link. Teacher police duties place them among those limiting student actions. Raths accepts this and merely urges the teacher to be honest about his position.[18] But to confine the students within the rules is to guide them into a conservative or liberal mold. To permit a radical option, it would seem better to leave open the possibility of breaking the rules as long as the students consider in advance the possibility of punishment.

Perhaps as fundamental as the need for a link between thought and action is a need for a free flow of ideas without closed topics or taboo opinions. I have already mentioned doubts that the skills of Western logic necessarily lead to social progress. However, given that American society suffers from an underdeveloped sense of social justice and is still not even approaching an equitable distribution of its resources, it seems to me that, however dim the hope, there is a greater potential in change than in stability. Thus the need for a free flow of ideas, even those which challenge sacred traditions.

Raths' concern for a free flow of ideas is reflected in his emphasis on alternatives. He specifies, however, that "available" alternatives be considered. It is not clear what he means by available, but this might impose a bias for moderation. Raths sees the media

as a positive force in the presentation of alternatives.[19] But if the media expose youths superficially to other cultures, they also manipulate them into a moderate mold. Radical alternatives are simply left out or relegated to some midnight talk show. The media, for example, have consistently based their Watergate coverage on the assumption that it stems from evil men or inadequate laws rather than from a dysfunctional social order. No one has looked to the predatory basis of our economic system as a possible answer. This should not be surprising. One would be naive to expect the American ruling class to use the mechanisms at its disposal to increase the ptoential for its own destruction.

If the discussion of alternatives is to be more than mere sham, the teacher has a major responsibility to break the blinders imposed by the media and the present socialization process. In face of this responsibility there is no time to present all the sides of an issue as Richard Gross suggests.[20] Students have already been subjected to an overdose of establishment alternatives. For real choice they now need an awareness of new alternatives.

As a teacher who finds the predatory basis of American society distasteful, I am particularly willing to create this awareness. When issues come up I express my cooperative values, but "as a learner among learners."[21] In doing so I fulfill an obligation to act upon my values and present the students with non-establishment alternatives. Anyone who suspects that I am actually indoctrinating my students need only observe the regularity with which they contradict me.

Given the need for first amendament rights in the classroom, the constitution as interpreted in the courts gives the teacher only

partial protection. The National Council for the Social Studies suggests:

> Current issues, planned or incidental should be calibrated by the teacher like degrees on a thermometer. Those that register about 212° in the local climate of opinion are usually best left alone. 22

Until 1952, government jobs were considered a privilege and any restrictions on constitutional rights was acceptable. Although this has been reversed, the degree to which teachers are free to speak has still not been clearly defined by the courts. Most decisions protecting academic freedom apply to the college level with greater restrictions allowed at a high school level. As late as 1965 in Parker v. Board of Education, the Supreme Court ruled that a teacher could be fired for assigning Brave New World. Since then the courts have moved towards greater teacher protection, but in 1971 a court of appeals again stressed that teachers do not have completely free speech:

> Free speech does not grant teachers a license to say or write in class whatever they may feel like.... the propriety of regulation of sanctions must depend on such circumstances as the age and sophistication of the students, the closeness of the relation between the specific technique used and some concedely valid educational objective, and the context and manner of presentation. 23

To avoid unnecessary confrontations between school administrations and teachers the courts also require that clear guide-lines be established on what is or is not acceptable.

If a teacher feels he has been dismissed in violation of his rights he can sue for "injunctive relief and damages" under the Civil Rights Act of 1871. This also applies to teachers who have lost their jobs because their contracts were not renewed.[24]

Since I teach in a private school, constitutional protection does not apply. To protect myself, at the beginning of this year

(my first), I usually discussed controversial materials with my principal before presenting them to the class. I also made a point of showing her other materials I was developing in order to establish "professional" credentials.

After my first attempts with value clarification exercises, I began to sense a need for some sort of evaluation beyond mere impressions. Bloom and his associates point to the tendancy of teachers to expect about a third of the class to really understand, another third to partly understand and a final third to fail. They criticize this as wasteful and claim that 90% with thorough understanding is not an impossible goal.[25] I was certainly nowhere near this. To increase efficiency Bloom recommends a more precise statement of goals and the development of evaluation devices to determine the degree to which they are fulfilled. He admits that curriculum variation from class to class and school to school makes it difficult to develop ready-made evaluation materials.[26] To help teachers develop their own devices he presents a variety of techniques including interviews and a projection technique which presents an image and has the students describe what they think is going on. He also provides sample questionnaires designed to measure attainment of different levels on his taxonomy.[27]

Bloom admits that affective evaluation devices face special problems. On questionnaires, students can hide behavior they feel will cause disapproval. Attempts to observe student behavior in natural situations face logistical problems that make a systematic approach difficult. Teachers usually do not have students long enough for measurable changes in the higher levels of the taxonomy. Changes that do occur might be only temporary.[28] It would also seem difficult

to pin-point cause and effect with something as complex as developing a consistent life philosophy. Development that occurs might be due to influences outside the classroom. Bloom and his associates do not feel these problems are insurmountable.

Edmund Amidon and Arno Bellack have developed evaluation devices which measure classroom interaction. (See Appendix III) These tools provide precise information about classroom discussion that indicates whether or not the students are actively using various skills and the degree to which the teacher is translating his discussion strategies into reality. Amidon's system tells who is making a comment, where it is directed and whether the comment is responding or initiating. It has been helpful in showing the degree to which interaction has been initiated by the students and how often interaction is between students rather than between student and teacher. Without a large amount of student initiative and student to student exchanges value clarification becomes a teacher dominated process, with a high degree of student dependence. Amidon's system is limited because it does not indicate which cognitive processes are occurring and because out of fifteen categories, only five are for students. Thus in student to student discussions, the information provided is insufficient.[29]

Bellack's system indicates who is speaking and whether the comment is structuring, soliciting, responding or reacting. His system goes beyond Amidon's and indicates the logical and instructional content of what is being said. The system's complexity is both an aid and a barrier. Full utilization would require a greater effort than most teachers, with a variety of responsibilities, have the time to make.[30]

One might object to the above evaluative tools on the grounds that teaching is an art like music or painting. Excellence is based

on creative sensitivity which cannot be measured with quantitative evaluation. This partly true, but even the musician and the painter deal systematically with technique. Technical expertize, which can be measured, increases the potential for the creative capacities.

I did not feel a need to develop evaluation tools until after several months of work with Raths' value clarification techniques and some of my own. I began with the clarifying response and the value sheets I discussed in the paper submitted to ERIC last spring.[38] At that time I proposed a more systematic approach to clarifying responses to insure that I was encouraging all seven parts of the clarifying process on more than just a small group of students. Several weeks later I made a clarifying response chart showing the student involved and those aspects of the clarifying process encouraged by the exchange. At the end of each morning's classes (I am with the students for two hours, three days a week) I recorded the value clarifying exchanges that I could remember. After two weeks, I had recorded seventeen exchanges. With a class of twelve students, I had used the technique three or four times with a third of the class, one or two times with a third of the class and not at all with a third of the class. I might have been more thorough than the chart indicates. Some clarifying responses might have been made unconsciously or might have been simply forgotten before I had a chance to record them. The students that I had highest contact with were students who seemed to need a high level of teacher contact. Of the four students who received no clarifying responses, three were students who generally preferred peer company and had little informal contact with me.

To extend my use of clarifying responses to students who rarely spoke to me, I decided to try initiating exchanges that would lead

to these responses. I made a brief list of possible questions which might serve as catalysts:

1. What are you going to do today after school, during recess, this weekend etc.
2. When did you do last night's homework?
3. How much time did you spend...?

The results of these questions were mixed. They succeeded in leading to clarifying exchanges, but because they came from the outside rather than from the student, the discussion that followed was sometimes polite, but less than enthusiastic. For example, I asked a student what he was going to do after school. He replied that he was going to play basketball. I then asked him if there were other things he might do after school. He answered, but I sensed that he was merely being polite and was not really concerned with what we were talking about. In contrast to this, clarifying responses in exchanges initiated by students tended to receive more careful attention. This was true in exchanges on whether or not women should have to take their husband's name, on how to stop an exam that was coming up, on the use of films in class.

The chart I had divised on clarifying responses also indicated which parts of Raths' valuing process were encouraged during the two week period. In the seventeen exchanges I recorded the emphasis was uneven:

Parts of the process	Number of times encouraged
1. Make choices	14
2. Examine alternatives	9
3. Weigh consequences	9
4. Consider what you prize & cherish	3

5. Make public affirmation of choices	5
6. Act on choices	4
7. Examine life patterns	4

The frequent emphasis on choice occurred because it seemed the natural starting point in an exchange. Before pressing a student on the other parts of the valuing process I instinctively asked questions requiring him to clarify and affirm his choice. Since the fourth part is sometimes implicit in the first, recording of encouragement of the two categories might have been confused. The fifth and sixth parts are essential, but in exchanges on topics beyond student control, it seemed unfair to stress action too strongly. Several times I sensed a need to encourage students to clarify the terms they were using in their choices. This did not seem to fit into any of Raths' categories.

I feel that I have had only partial success in developing an instinctive ability to use clarifying responses. Even during an intensive effort during the two weeks when I was recording my efforts, I frequently became caught up in other concerns and let good opportunities pass by. Since then I have often reverted back to old habits while my attention was focused on other techniques. I suspect that these responses are a bit like playing a musical instrument. Both require long periods of practice in order to develop unconscious habits.

While I was trying to develop clarifying response skills, I also began with several of Raths' other techniques. He proposes that the students keep a time diary in order to document how they are spending their lives and to make some decisions about whether

or not changes are necessary.[31] I had the students keep the diary for a week and then asked them to add up how much time they had spent on various activities and to write a few pages on what changes they would like to make. The results of this exercise were sufficiently poor that I have to fall back on the lame adage that if you have reached just one student, you should be happy. One student found that he had watched forty one hours of television and seemed genuinely appalled.

Many of the students did not follow directions and kept only a general account of the amount of time spent on various activities. Perhaps sensing that the data in the time diaries was not accurate, the students did not use it in more than a general sense and often fell into adult platitudes about doing more homework and watching less television. I graded the papers on the basis of effort and skill rather than content, writing clarifying responses in the margins and identifying the adult platitudes as such. I would have preferred to avoid grading, but since it is sometimes an effort to have enough grades to make a "fair" assessment at the end of the quarter, it seemed wasteful not to utilize the students' and my efforts for this purpose. (My grades are hardly a threat. Any effort at all gets an A or a B, usually an A.)

I doubt that the adult platitudes were in response to pressure from grades. They are probably the result of a hundred socialization factors and would have occurred with or without the grade. There has been no observable variation in the content of the graded and the few non-graded papers that have been assigned this year except that the students tend to invest more time when there is a grade involved.

The time diaries generally failed to do more than create a

vague awareness because the students were unwilling to do the exercise carefully. This is probably because I presented the assignment abruptly without creating a need first, a problem to keep in mind for next time.

Raths proposes encouraging individual students to take five minutes at the beginning of class to speak out on something which they have been thinking about. To insure that the speaker will not be attacked, he specifies that no response should be allowed at that time.[32] Students have used this option four times this semester. The topics included comments on an article on India, the Israeli-Arab conflict, the degree to which Hitler is blameworthy, and the implication of housing ordinances. After the third and the fourth topics, I allowed discussion to occur afterwards. Both times the class seemed interested and the speaker willing. Since such ideal situations cannot always be produced at will, I saw no reason to cut things off. In both cases a productive student dominated discussion followed. After the talk on the Israeli-Arab conflict, the students wanted to discuss, but they were getting emotional so I moved on to something else.

The topics brought up in these five minute presentations were all related to things we had discussed in class. I was surprised, however, that talks on the first and the third topics had little to do with the student's life and seemed to be motivated by a genuinely academic interest.

Raths suggests a voting technique that provides students an opportunity to publicly state their views in a fairly depersonalized and unthreatening manner.[33] When a value related proposal is before the class, students are asked to show approval or disapproval by raising their hands. The most interesting use of this technique grew out of discussion of a Martin Luther King documentary.

asked the students how many would be willing to have black families live in their neighborhood. All answered yes. The next day I asked how many would be willing to allow low income housing in their neighborhood, mentioning the problems that could entail. All voted no. These two votes did not necessarily indicate a concern for integration divorced from a concern about poverty, but they did bring up the issue. The following class I gave a brief lecture on the problem of an unjust distribution of resources and outlined a racial and a class approach to the problem. Since there was no way I could be objective on this, I stated my point of view (favoring a class approach) stressing that the students had to make their own decision. In the student dominated discussion that followed most of the class disagreed with me, and in fact conviced me, that both a racial and a class approach are necessary.

In retrospect I notice that I presented the students with only some of the alternatives. I did not mention an approach that says that those with money deserve it because they worked for it and were clever. The approach concludes that there is no injustice to deal with in the first place. If I had thought of this at the time, I would have mentioned it. But I feel no sense of failure that I did not. Given the vast amount of material that might be presented in a course, it is inevitable that much will be left out and that this will be determined, at least in part, by the teacher's perspective. What the students do not get from my radical perspective, they will pick up in the media or from other teachers.

Another value clarification technique Raths recommends asks the students to hand in a weekly thought sheet briefly discussing something which came up in the past week that is related to values.

The teacher keeps these comments and hands them back at the end of the year for discussion.[34] Each week after collecting the thought sheets, I found myself looking forward to reading them. They were intrinsically interesting and thought provoking. One student asked: if it is sexist to exclude girls from little league, is it not also sexist to exclude old men from the girl scouts. I did not use these sheets as the basis for student discussions partly because interesting discussions were arising without them and partly because of oversight. This remains an option to keep in mind for next year.

Unfortunately there was not sufficient time for a thorough discussion of the thought sheets at the end of the year. (We were short on time to review for the final exam.) When I handed them back we did spend a half an hour discussing questions suggested by Raths. An interesting problem came up when I asked if the sheets reflected the students' interests. One student responded that his real interests were stamps and model building, but he wrote about foreign affairs and domestic politics because the thought sheets were for school. Although this division undoubtedly comes from the nature of American educational institutions, one of the major obstacles I faced this year in trying to break the division was the students themselves. Normally, whenever an issue was brought home to the students' lives, about half the class would turn off, as if this could not be serious business. If the discussion continued beyond five or ten minutes, they would complain that we were wasting time.

While applying Raths' techniques, needs arose that led me into several ideas of my own. I had noticed that the students were using clarifying responses on each other, but were limiting themselves to only one or two types of responses. ("Are you saying...?" "Do you

mean...?") It seemed important that the students expand their ability to use clarifying responses so that they could clarify their thoughts without the teacher and move beyond dependence.

To further develop the use of clarifying responses, I distributed a sheet summarizing the seven parts of Raths' valuing process and asked for a volunteer to take a stand on some issue so that the rest of the class could question him using Raths' model as a guide. The discussion which followed was interesting, but the students were not using Raths' instructions systematically. By chance most of their questions were directed towards consequences. I tried this exercise again in the next class with the same problem. At this point I became caught up in new subject matter and the project was momentarily left behind, having created at best a passive awareness.

Later I tried again to present Raths' model, this time in a simplified form. I stressed that in value discussions, students should keep in mind alternatives, consequences and possibilities for action. I combined these factors with two general discussion skills, maintaining focus and calm, into a list of five things to keep in mind when discussing an issue. While there was some success on the general discussion skills, an active concern for alternatives, consequences and action never developed. When I reminded the students about the "five things" they could recite them, but with the exception of focus and calm, this remained a mechanical gesture.

It might have been too ambitious to try to develop in eighth graders the same value skills I was finding difficult to develop in myself. I am not convinced this is true, however, and would like to try again. Perhaps it was too much to present all seven aspects of Raths' valuing process at once. Next time I might introduce the

aspects one at a time with more systematic exercises to insure that a clear model for the activity has been established. There might be, for example, role playing exercises where one student takes a stand and another questions him initiating an aspect of the valuing process.

While working with various valuing techniques, it became apparent that for any serious work with values, the students would have to develop a sense of the fallibility of adult authority. I suspected that while superficial disrespect for authority was easy to find, underneath was a feeling that adults know what is best. To undermine this unwarranted respect, I initiated discussions and assigned papers that included the possibility that adult authority was in error, and I required the students to make a decision about what should be done. One paper required an evaluation of a hypothetical punishment of a student and a decision on what, if anything, might be done to reverse it. We also had a discussion on the misuse of power touching on such international leaders as Nixon and Hitler and then coming home to the problem of a malicious teacher. Once when the students were upset because their graduation was going to be different than they had expected, I encouraged them to find out what was going on and do something about it.

A comparative project on the nature of authority was the most extensive assignment to break down an excessive respect for authority. This project illustrates how the social studies teacher can move from subject matter to problems in the students lives by focusing on issues and concepts important in both areas. I asked the students to write a series of four brief papers: one discussing the nature of adult authority in the African village we were reading about, a second on the nature of authority in the students' parents' lives (based on data

gathered in interviews), a third on authority in the students' own lives and a final paper discussing what an ideal type of authority would be based on the insights of the first three papers. The last papers did not indicate a radical break from authority, but they did indicate a vivid awareness of its possible abuses.

In addition to dealing with the authority problem, I wanted to develop a sense that history should be more than a collection of data on a given time and place. Before we began the project I asked the students to write a history of a day in their lives to show me what they thought history was. During the project I stressed that history at its best should marshal data towards a better understanding of a problem relevant both to the past and to today. The analysis should lead to a value decision about what should be done. I went back over past discussions to illustrate how we had been doing this and emphasized how the authority project followed this model. At the end of the project I again asked the students to write a history of a day in their lives to see if I had had any impact. The results were not outstanding, but some progress was made. On the first effort three students (out of twelve) related the events of their day to an issue and four used the data for a value decision. After the authority project, five students related the data to an issue and six used the data for a value decision.

In developing a sense of the fallibility of authority, I was conscious of my own role as an authority figure. I made it clear to the students that the institution required that I maintain ultimate authority, but I also encouraged them to take an active role in classroom decisions. For efficiency, we normally proceeded with activities that I had decided on, but if there was strong objection,

I allowed a group decision as long as it was not too directly in opposition to the appearances necessary for me to keep my job. The most important decision the class made was to drop a dull textbook and stop the exam based on it. This, of course, was just benevolent paternalism, but little more is possible given institutional requirements.

To encourage the students to exert their will, I tried to be honest about my weaknesses and failures. Once after a poor class, in frustration I blamed the students for not making an effort. Afterwards I realized that the fault was as much mine as theirs. The next day I told them so and apologized. Some of the studnets have trouble spelling, a problem that at age 27 I have still not completely overcome. I told the class some of the trouble this has caused me. When I am doing work at the blackboard and a word I am not sure about comes up, we look it up together. To further bring my authority into question, halfway through the year, I stated what the students already knew -- that I am a socialist -- and asked them if I should be fired. They assured me I could stay, but not because radicals should be allowed to teach. Rather, they stressed that I had not done anything wrong, not exactly a compliment coming from an establishment perspective.

One of the results of too much respect for authority is that students fail to consider more than a narrow spectrum of alternatives when making decisions. In value discussion, I tried to reduce this problem by setting up continua of alternative decisions and asking the students if they could extend the extremes. At first this exercise was somewhat ineffective because the students tended to offer alternatives which they felt were ridiculous and the discussion became a joke. In response to this problem I began moving more directly to

a consideration of consequences to eliminate the truly absurd alternatives from those that appeared absurd, but when subjected to analysis became real possibilities. I am still uncertain about the potential of this exercise because after initial experimentation my attention was diverted and I stopped using it.

I also tried to broaden the students sense of alternatives by exposing them to my socialist perspective. Classroom discussions indicated that most of the students believed in a competitive social order with an unequal distribution of wealth. By presenting the possibility of a more cooperative social order, I hoped to at least create an awareness and a willingness to consider this alternative.

My efforts to broaden the spectrum from which the students make choices were incomplete. I did lay an essential groundwork with efforts to undermine authority and to present neglected alternatives. The initiative here, however, was mine. There was little effort to transfer this initiative to the students. This remains a challenge for next year.

The value clarification techniques discussed here have taken place in a broad methodological framework that begins with readings on Africa and Asia and continues with discussions of universal topics and short thought papers. It is important to phrase the topics in universal terms to insure that past and far off developments are are connected to the needs of American society today and to concerns in the students' own lives. This does not mean that content has to be limited by a narrow concept of relevancy. All historical developments are relevant in that they make us aware of possible alternatives and consequences to keep in mind in dealing with contemporary

problems. The problem that often arises, however, is that these developments are taught in an "isn't-that-interesting" manner that fails to establish the connection with contemporary needs.

Below are some of the issues we discussed:

The role of respect in a child's life
Cultural stability and change
The prerequisites for political unity
Implications of the Buddhist maxim against jobs which injure others
Killing deviants for a larger social good
The role of women
The right of one society to impose its morality on another
The potential and threat of alternative life styles

All these topics can easily be applied to Africa or Asia, contemporary America and the specific life of an individual adolescent. The discussion of killing deviants for the larger social good, for example, dealt with African witchcraft, capital punishment, and severe punishments at school like expulsion.

In planning for class discussions I tried to insure that students understood the appropriate data on Africa or Asia, that the topic concerned problems they were likely to be interested in and that they were developing the discussion and cognitive skills necessary to handle such topics without a teacher. The challenge was to provide for the above needs as efficiently as possible and withdraw to allow the students time to practice with their developing skills and understandings.

In fulfilling my responsibility to clarify relevant data, I found myself in trouble while working with India. I have little background in this area which is all right if you are teaching a series of facts strung out in a textbook. For the issues we were dealing with, however, the text simply did not have the needed data.

It seems that a liberation from dull chronologies places an added responsibility on the teacher to do serious reading. If you are going to go beyond names and dates, then you have to understand what you are talking about.

Motivation was not a major problem this year partly because the students were remarkably self motivated, partly because the issues discussed were couched in relevant terms, partly because the social contact involved in group discussions makes it a rather enjoyable way of learning. Once I began class by throwing out an issue, asking what the students thought about it, and withdrawing. The discussion never really got started. Sometimes this technique worked, but it seems worthwhile for the teacher to direct the discussion at least until students have developed a momentum of their own. I began one of our most intense discussions by asking the students to spend a few minutes thinking and then write a brief statement on the issue to be discussed. I then had some of the students read what they had written. During the discussion which followed, the students who had read their statement paid particularly close attention as if they had an investment to protect.

If the class as a whole has expressed a willingness to work out its ideas in classroom discussions, four out of the twelve students feel uncomfortable when I withdraw and leave the students on their own. These four students rarely talk during student to student discussions and at various times have told me that time spent without firm direction from me is wasted. I have tried to explain to them that although student to student discussions might appear more inefficient, they give the students time to practice running their own discussions so they do not become too dependent on the teacher.

I have encouraged these four students to speak up when they feel other students are being silly or not staying on the topic. Several times they have made an effort, but usually they simply withdraw. I have avoided pushing them too hard. Class discussions seem to require an initiative that borders on aggressiveness. Some personalities are less suited for this than others and learn in other ways.

While working with discussion skills, I tried to relate class activities to the cognitive taxonomy developed by Benjamin Bloom. The six part taxonomy begins with knowledge and moves up through comprehension, application, analysis and evaluation.[35] It presents a wide array of needs and possibilities, but as only one part of an extensive series of materials that I was learning about, there were limits to how much I could do. To establish whether or not the students were being directed to activities covering a large segment of the taxonomy, I kept a chart of which categories had been practiced during each class. The chart indicates that my largely instinctive approach to cognitive development has led to activity encouraging most of the skills in the taxonomy. It does not show, however, if this encouragement had any impact. Next year I would like to try a more systematic approach.

Implicit in Bloom's taxonomy are two skills which have proved essential for productive discussion: an ability to maintain the focus of the discussion and keep emotions under control. I have already mentioned a limited success in developing these skills. After initial discussions during which I maintained the focus and a calm atmosphere, I explained what I had been doing to the students and told them they should try doing this themselves. For the rest of the year, I placed this responsibility more and more in student

hands. When a discussion started to wander or become overly emotional, I waited to see if the students would try to correct the problem themselves. Often they did, coming forth with comments like, "What's that got to do with what we're talking about?" "What's your point?" "You're getting emotional."

In preparing for class discussions I would select several topics and see which one caught the students' interest. At first I thought it was enough just to have the topics and see what developed. This resulted in classes where I was clarifying my own ideas as the students clarified theirs. This might appear to be a good way to break down authority with a learning process where students and teacher grow together, but if we were growing together, I was also taking up class time with my own confusion. Since the students still looked upon me as much as a teacher as a fellow learner, confusion from me was detracting from the discussion more than confusion from another student. To avoid this problem I began preparing somewhat detailed outlines on possible discussion topics, not to impose them on the students, but rather to insure that any direction I provided was as efficient as possible.

At times I still became just one more confused learner. Topics would often develop in directions I had not anticipated and I would have to deal with ideas I had not worked out in advance. Once the class wanted to work on definitions for terminology being used in our discussion of African and Western thought systems. What, for example, is the difference between common sense and other types of thought? I was so uncertain about a distinction that I had previously taken as obvious that I had to give up any directive function and join the students in working out the problem.

It seems fairly important that topics for discussion develop from the students as much as possible -- especially those dealing with values. Some of Sidney Simon's value lessons are ready-made and could be used the next day. Observation of one of these lessons indicated a motivation problem. The students went through the motions but were not really interested. I have had the same problem with several assignments that developed from my interests rather than the students. Although I can sense which topics have more potential for students interest than others, I am continually surprised with what really gets the students excited and what leads only to a polite interest.

The discussions this year have indicated that the students are, at times, willing to discuss topics not immediately connected to their lives. The discussion of whether or not one culture has the right to impose its morality on another focused largely on the British interference with Indian tradition. There was no need to translate this into, say, student athletes making fun of other students who study a lot and do not like sports. In one sense I was encouraged that the students had a humanistic curiosity and did not require a narrow relevance in everything we discussed. Ultimately, however, such topics have to be translated into personal terms if there is to be any potential for action.

Early in the second semester I began to wonder if I was allowing the students enough class time for student dominated discussions. If students were "to make choices and to make them freely,"[36] then regular sessions with a low teacher profile were essential. To establish more precisely how often various types of discussions were occurring, I devised a series of categories and began to keep

a record. These categories indicated the degree of teacher dominance, who had initiated the topic under discussions and who had insured that the discussion did not wander from it. The table below covers 28 classes from February through April. (The class meets only three times a week.) The figures indicate both shorter discussions and entire class periods.

I

Nature of the discussion	Number of sessions
1. Discussions to develop student knowledge rather than thought skills. Teacher does more than half the talking.	10
2. Discussion for skill development. Teacher does about half the talking	21
3. Discussion for student practice. Teacher has largely withdrawn and speaks either not at all or only at intervals of several minutes.	11

II

Who defines and maintains the focus	Number of sessions
1. The teacher defines the focus of the discussions and with some flexibility enforces it.	22
2. The teacher defines the focus of the discussion but places the responsibility for maintaining it on the students	6
3. The teacher allows the students to define the focus of the discussion but enforces it himself.	5
4. The teacher allows the discussion to follow its own course.	9

(The term "skill development" in number two of part one refers to a largely instinctive effort to move the students towards clear thinking by encouraging them to state their ideas and pressing them when they are not clear or consistent.)

The first part of the table indicates an encouraging link between what I wanted to do and what I was actually doing. I spent half the recorded discussions on skill development, allowing a fourth for data clarification and a fourth for student practice discussions. (This record is somewhat imprecise because the time of each discussion is not given.) It might be desirable to reduce the time developing skills and allow more time for practice, a problem for experimentation next year. I also suspect that my "withdrawal" from student run discussions might be more complete. It might be helpful to reduce the frequency of teacher comments during these discussions.

The second part of the table is also encouraging. During a fourth of the time, I shared with the class the responsibility for establishing and enforcing the focus of the discussion. Almost another fourth of the time the students were on their own. In dealing with these numbers it is difficult to know what is satisfactory or good. Next year I might try to see if student initiative and responsibility here can be increased. It might also be helpful to add a third part to the table recording who had taken responsibility for focus and for keeping emotions under control.

The above chart was helpful in a general sense, but it did not provide detailed information on classroom interaction. I wanted to establish just how much of that student initiative essential for value clarification I was allowing in the various types of discussion. To obtain this data, I began taping my classes and applying Edmund Amidon's measurement system. Amidon's system measures interaction by recording each three-second period of talk in one of twelve categories. I applied the sytem to eleven different discussions of

about ten minutes each and made the recommended charts showing the pattern of the interaction.

I now needed a means of comparing the amount of activity that had occurred in each of Amidon's categories in any given discussion. A series of ratios seemed the best method. I made a list of six including a ratio of any type of student talk to any type of teacher talk and a ratio of extended student talk to extended teacher talk. (In Amidon's system extended talk is two or more 3-second talk periods in succession.) I arranged the two numbers of each ratio so that the higher the ratio the higher the degree of student initiative. For example, in the ratio of any type of student talk to any type of teacher talk, I placed the number of 3- second talk periods of student talk before the number of periods of teacher talk. Thus if the number of student talk periods was high, let's say 80, and the number of teacher talk periods was low, let's say 20, the ratio would be high, 400:100 or 4:1. To facilitate comparison, I also converted all ratios so that the second number would always be 100. Thus 15:60 would become 25:100.

The ratios served as a convenient method of collating an overview of the data collected. I merely had to compute an average for each of the six ratios based on the discussions I had measured. Below is a table of the ratio averages. Column A gives averages based on five skill developing discussions with active teacher participation. Column B gives averages based on six discussions centering largely on data clarification with a strong element of teacher dominance. Column C gives averages based on two skill developing discussions with active teacher participation which occurred after a month's effort to improve upon the discussions in column A.

Ratios Based on Amidon's Measurement System

Ratio Explanation			Averages A	B	C
1. Any type of student talk	to	Any type of teacher talk	91:100	48:100	107:100
2. Extended student talk	to	Extended teacher talk	82:100	36:100	110:100
3. Student initiated talk	to	Teacher initiated talk	58:100	38:100	54:100
4. Teacher questions	to	Teacher statements	36:100	11:100	55:100
5. Teacher response	to	Teacher initiated talk	29:100	22:100	14:100
6. Student remarks (initiated or not) directed to other students	to	Student remarks (initiated or not) directed to the teacher	18:100	20:100	5:100

The ratios present both encouragement and a need for improvement. The measurement of skill development discussions in column A indicates that in our most frequent form of discussion, the students talk almost as much as I do. For any type of talk, if I spoke for one hundred 3-second periods, the students spoke for ninety-one 3-second periods. For extended talk (two or more 3-second talk periods in succession), if I spoke for one hundred 3-second periods, the students spoke for eighty-two.

Measurement of data clarification discussions in column B indicates a higher level of teacher dominance, but these discussions occur less frequently and seem naturally to lead to a higher level of direction simply because I have been exposed to the data longer. Even here, however, student initiative existed. For any type of talk, if I spoke for one hundred 3-second periods, the students spoke for forty-eight. For extended talk, if I spoke for one hundred 3-second periods, the students spoke for thirty-six.

In considering the ratios in columns A and B, the frequency with which these discussions occur should be kept in mind. The chart on page 31 indicates that skill dovelopment discussions occur about half the time, and data clarification discussions about half as often. (Unfortunately I neglected to indicate the length of the discussion.) If I appear more enthusiastic about student initiative in the measured discussions than the ratios warrant, it should be kept in mind that these discussions are the ones based on teacher direction. Thus it should be neither surprising nor discouraging that student initiative has occurred within a structure of my dominance. For every three of these directed discussions, however, there is a discussion where I withdraw allowing the students to speak with only occasional interruption. (I have not used Amidon's system with these discussions because it is ill suited for them.)

I realize that the question of how much teacher dominance is acceptable is a difficult one. What seems a constructive level of direction to me might appear outrageously coercive or permissive to another, with little potential for either of us to establish conclusively that we are right. As with other impossibly complex teaching problems that demand a decision now, I proceed from what experience and reflection tell me is right. It seems to me that some adults have thought tools and data that are potentially useful. Efforts to pas these skills and data on to the next generation require a degree of adult direction. Without this direction there is no reason for adult presence. Any need for teacher direction, however, should not become an excuse for consistent dominance. The students should have a chance to use the data they have learned and the tools they are developing to reach autonomous decisions about what they think

is right and wrong. This leaves the teacher with the contradictory, but productive task of asserting his authority while teaching skills and data and then undermining it so that the students can make their own decisions.

Whatever encouragement the ratios provide, they also indicate that my direction might be stronger than necessary for the goals I have outlined. After compiling the data in columns A and B based on earlier discussions, it seemed clear that work was needed to increase student initiative in the areas measured by the fourth, fifth and sixth ratios. While the data clarification discussions measured in column B were probably not ideal I decided to focus efforts for improvement on the skill discussions, where the potential for student initiative seemed higher.

In these discussions, the low ratio of teacher questions to to teacher statements indicated that I was spending ten minutes presenting anecdotes and data for every three and a half spent questioning. Teacher statements are sometimes necessary during skill discussions to clarify data and to present anecdotes which increase interest and give the discussion a personal flavor. Nonetheless, an effort was needed to see if these teacher statements were excessive. The low ratio of teacher response to teacher initiated talk indicated that I was perhaps responding to student comments and continuing extensively with my own ideas instead of giving a brief response and stopping to see if the students had further comments to make. The low ratio of student remarks directed to other students to student remarks directed to the teacher indicated a failure to effectively encourage students to address comments to individual students or to the class as a whole.

In response to this diagnosis, I made a list of questions to keep in mind during skill discussions:

1. Which teacher statements are essential for data or to set a productive atmosphere and which stem from the enjoyment of being the center of attention?

2. Do teacher responses tend to become unnecessarily long, leading to non-essential teacher initiated talk.

3. Is the teacher taking students' comments directed to him and redirecting them to the class with an explanation that it is better if he is not always the center of attention.

Although ratios one, two and three seemed fairly satisfactory, I wanted to see if they too might be improved so I added two more questions:

4. Was I cutting students comments short and limiting the potential for extended comments?

5. Was I allowing an occasional silence to encourage student initiated comments?

With the multiple demands placed on a teacher's attention during most classes, I found it difficult to maintain these questions at a conscious level during actual classes. After initial failures, I started writing lesson plans on only half a sheet of paper with the questions in bold letters on the other half. I also found it helpful to select one question at a time for concentrated attention. After a month's effort, I was sure I had only made a beginning.

The two skill discussions measured at the end of that month (column C on the chart on p. 34) indicate a mixed success when compared with earlier skill discussions (column A). The ratio of teacher questions to teacher statements increased from 36:100 to 55:100. The ratio of any type of student talk to any type of teacher talk increased from 91:100 to 107:100, and the ratio of extended student talk to extended teacher talk increased from 82:100 to 110:100. The ratio of

student initiated talk to teacher initiated talk stayed about the same. The ratio of teacher response to teacher initiated statements and the ratio of students remarks directed to other students to student remarks directed to the teacher both decreased. The decrease in these two ratios might have been partly due to varying interpretation while applying Amidon's system. While measuring the discussions, I am not sure I applied a uniform definition of initiated and responding talk. A distinction which at first seemed obvious no longer seems so. It was also difficult to distinguish between student remarks directed to the teacher and those directed to other students. Some were just thrown out to no one in particular. This should indicate the cloudy nature of some of the figures that appear so crisp and clear in the table.

The first, second and fourth ratios are probably the most accurate. For ratio one, there is no trouble determining if a student or the teacher is talking. For ratio two, every consecutive three-second period after the first was recorded as a unit of extended talk, again no definitional ambiguity. For the fourth ratio there were no problems distinguishing teacher questions from teacher statements. It is encouraging to note that all three of these ratios recorded improvement. (I noticed this <u>after</u> establishing that these ratios seemed more reliable!)

The main limitation with the ratios is that they do not give the content of what is being said. One could conceivably have a large degree of student initiative based on shared ignorance. The chart I kept based on Bloom's taxonomy, however, indicates a daily development of new knowledge plus a variety of the higher cognitive processes (excepting the highest).

To further establish the quality of the comments measured in the ratios, I kept a profile on each student where I recorded what I thought were significant STUDENT comments. (Teachers with a larger class might do this with only a sampling of their students.) The profiles soon indicated a mixture of nonsense and mature thought. They were also helpful in showing me the problems individual students were having. With eight weeks left in the semester, I made a list of five students who seemed to be having special problems and resolved to make an effort with them. To make my efforts openly directive rather than manipulative, I told each of these students what I suspected might be a problem and suggested that we make a special effort together to correct it. Listed below are the problems I diagnosed:

1. Student has a consistent hostility for anything strange either in African culture or in fellow students.
2. Student has the potential for clear and original thoughts, but his comments are frequently disoriented.
3. Student has a problem similar to number two.
4. Student has great difficulty in discussing calmly.
5. Student has good ideas, but frequently leaves them half-stated due to lack of confidence.

It is difficult to determine the impact of my efforts. I am fairly certain that little progress was made with the first, fourth and fifth students. My effectiveness was limited by the variety of demands placed on my attention at school which made my efforts less than systematic. I also suspect that some of the problems went deeper than I was trained to handle. If my school had had a psychologist, cooperation with him might have been helpful.

Early in the second semester I sensed a need for a summative evaluation that would indicate whether or not there had been a change

towards those student attitudes essential for value clarification. I devised three questionnaires based on Bloom's suggestions and his affective taxonomy.[37] I realized that ideally these questionnaires should be given at the beginning of the year, but hoped that a period from February to May would provide at least some data. (The questionnaires are included in Appendix IV.)

The first questionnaire measures awareness, the lowest category on Bloom's hierarchical taxonomy. I wanted to see the degree to which I had broken down the blinders of the students' socialization and expanded their awareness of ways to respond to their environment. I presented a series of situations and asked the students to list about five ways a boy or girl their age might respond. My evaluation of the responses was based on four possible "grades" -- one for conventional responses and three more for increasingly unconventional responses. I phrased the evaluation in these terms because, as I have already stressed, it is essential for meaningful value clarification that the students consideration of alternatives go beyond the narrow continuum of convention.

The results of this questionnaire are uncertain. The ratio of responses in all three unconventional categories to responses in the conventional category was 0.53 in February. In May this ratio had increased to 0.74, an increase of 42% of the original ratio. However, this might have been due to variations in my application of the categories. I tried to use the term conventional to apply to actions acceptable to middle America, but this is so vague that wide variations in interpretation were possible. Even with this problem, however, I will continue to use the questionnaire. It is a useful way to introduce the students to the problem of underdeveloped awareness. The questionnaire

mi ght even be adapted into a series of exercises.

The second questionnaire dealt with willingness to receive, a category slightly higher on Bloom's taxonomy. It takes awareness and goes a step further into passive action, a willingness to expose yourself to an experience. The questionnaire provides a list of experiences that the students probably consider weird and asks them to indicate if they are willing or unwilling to try it. As with the awareness of unconventional responses measured in the first questionnaire, I felt it was essential that the students be willing to go beyond convention, if value clarification was to be more than an exercise in provincialism.

The data from this questionnaire seems fairly reliable. The greatest danger was that students would anwer what they thought I wanted to hear rather than what they felt. I hoped, however, that the atmosphere of the course would encourage them to be honest. Although I did not ask them to, most of the students wrote their names. Comparing names with answers and student personalities, I was quite sure that ten out of the twelve students were being honest. In February the ratio of willing to unwilling responses was 1.78, in May 2.56. An increase of 44% of the original ratio. Even if 17% is subtracted as error from the two students who were not honest, the progress is significant.

The third questionnaire was designed to measure student attitudes to learning activities and went beyond a willingness to receive into more active response. The questionnaire provides a list of learning experiences and four possible responses. If a student selects the first response which indicates a high degree of interest, he is asked to provide a second response to indicate the extent of his interest. Response E is a control to see if the students are doing

questionnaire seriously. The number of answers here indicates the level of inaccuracy in the results. The first time the questionnaire was taken, the E response indicated a margin for error of 11%, the second time 16%. Questions seven, ten and sixteen are also controls to determine the veracity of student responses. The first two are activities that the students are sure to enjoy and do on their own. The last is an activity they are sure to do only under pressure. Both times the questionnaire was taken, questions seven and ten indicated honest repsonses. Question sixteen, however indicated problems. In February five out of eleven students indicated a low veracity or a misunderstanding (an error of 45%), and in May two students out of eleven (an error of 18%). The possible error in February of 45% indicates that the results are probably not reliable. The problem might lie in the wording of the responses which all might be taken to occur within the context of school and assigned tasks. It might be helpful for next year to add an explicit explanation of whether or not the task was an assignment or something connected with school life.

It should be clear by now that the quantitative results from the questionnaires are highly tentative and at best can serve as one among a variety of evaluative devices. Although some of the problems I have encountered can be minimized through revision, three problems are inescapable: 1) the results registered might be only temporary; 2) some results might be latent and presently unmeasureable; 3) results might be due to a mixture of factors including some outside of the teacher's influence. Nonetheless, I plan to continue with these and other questionnaires. I have found them helpful not as a replacement for my impressions, but rather as a supplement to those impressions that creates new awarenesses and finer sensitivities.

To supplement the data from the questionnaires, I decided to take one of the last student-run discussions and use it for summative evaluation, keeping in mind how it differed from earlier student-run dicsussions and how characteristic it was of such discussions at the end of the year. The discussion began with comments on the use of poorly paid Africans as servants for white expatriates and then moved to whether or not the students' families were justified in having servants. It lasted about eighteen minutes. I spoke for about a minute at the beginning and a minute at the end and took another two minutes with six comments and six questions in the middle. Periods of student talk without teacher interruption varied, but two reached four minutes in length. This pattern for student-run discussions is typical. I suspect that many of my comments in the middle were an unnnecesary interference. I occasionally refrain from introductory or concluding remarks, but probably not often enough.

The tape of the discussion indicated a substantial progress with discussion skills. With no help from me the students stayed on the topic approaching it from several different angles. Emotional behavior occurred, but it came almost entirely from one student who has special problems with this anyway. The class was quite effective in isolating her outbursts with a quiet disgust and then continuing with what they were talking about. The ability to both maintain focus and isolate emotionalism was fairly consistently displayed towards the end of the year and marks a contrast to earlier discussions that had more difficulty developing a meaningful mementum. (This is based on impressionistic non-systematic observation.)

The students, however, have not reached a point where they take

the initiative to direct the discussion towards Raths' model. During the discussion, consequences were dealt with extensively, and a somewhat effective link was made between rhetoric and action, but this happened by chance without a conscious connection with value clarification.

If the skills displayed in the discussion were at least somewhat encouraging, the content of what was being said was not. The students (with only a few exceptions) took a callous stand towards the poor saying essentially that you could make the poor do anything you wanted as long as you paid them. One of my objectives in the course was to develop humane sensitivities. If I have had any success, it was not evident in this discussion.

Whatever doubts this raises about my approach, I see little attraction in approaches which try to inculcate specific values. My instincts agree with Kohlberg. Even if you try, you cannot teach value content; opportunism and rhetoric perhaps, but not real convictions. I do, however, try to develop humane sensitivities. To more effectively move towards this goal next year, it might be helpful to try simulations and role playing exercises.

It might be argued that I have rejected teaching specific values and then tried to do just that: instill humanitarian values. Humane sensitivity, however, is so general it can hardly be called a specific value. With it one can argue both for and against on a variety of fundamental issues. It is certainly much more general and open than the contemporary socialization process whose blinders I have tried to undermine. Ultimately, however, there are limits to how far I will encourage free choice. I seek to widen the alternatives from which students choose, but I stop short of nihilism. I do so on faith.

While discussing my efforts with value clarification, I have tried to be honest about this year's failures. Everything I have tried has had some sort of problem, from administrative oversights like not allowing enough time to carry through on the thought sheets, to more fundamental problems like failing to develop automatic clarifying responses. If everything had worked smoothly, there would be no need for this paper. One need only consult the experts. My experience, however, has indicated that value clarification is an enormously complex process riddled with technical and theoretical problems. This paper assumes that that process is beneficial. It presents my difficulties and failures as a guide for fellow teachers and as a personal challenge for next year's course.

Appendix I: Kohlbergs' Six Stages of Moral Development from "Moral Development in the Schools: A Developmental View," The School Review, 1966 p.7.

Appendix II: A Condensed Version of the Affective Domain of the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives from Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia, Taxonomy of Education Objectives, The Classification of Educational Goals, Handbook II: Affective Domain. New York: David McKay, Co., 1956.

Appendix III: Systems for Measuring Classroom Interaction from Edmund Amido andcElisabeth Hunter, Improving Teaching, The Analysis of Classroom Verbal Interaction. New York: Holt, Rinehart Winton, Inc., 1966, p.21

The above appendices have been removed from this document prior to its being submitted to the ERIC Document Reproduction Service because of poor legiblity.

Appendix IV

Questionnaires Measuring Development as Outlined on Bloom's Affective Taxonomy

Awareness Questionnaire*

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine what sort of responses you are aware of for the following situations. Consider each situation and give about five ways a boy or a girl your age might respond. The responses included in your answers can be actions you have seen or heard about or actually done yourself, or simply actions which might occur. Limit your description of each response to a sentence or two.

1. Your parent called you to dinner at the usual time.

2. Your alarm clock accidentally went off at 6:00 on Sunday morning.

3. Because of heavy snow, school has been called off.

4. A fellow student pushed you down the stairs at school.

5. You and your frineds had decided to play outside after school, but now it is raining.

6. Your parent looked tired after a long, difficult day.

7. You were watching television with a friend. He/she wanted to turn to another channel, but you wanted to see the rest of the show.

8. You were assigned to read ten pages ~~of reading~~ in a book on Africa for the next history class.

9. You were sent to the principal for not doing your homework.

10. When you went out for recess you found the school yard covered with new snow.

11. Your family just bought a new stereo.

Are there any situations you would like to add to the list? If so, describe the situation and make a list of responses that occur to you.

---

*This questionnaire is an extension of ideas expressed in Bloom, 1964, pp. 101-107.

Willingness To Receive Questionnaire*

The objective of this questionnaire is to determine whether or not you are willing to expose yourself to unusual, unconventional or difficult experiences. Respond to the following activities with one of three possible answers: willing, uncertain, unwilling.

1. Discuss the natural advantages of never washing.
2. Discuss the various techniques for picking someone's pocket.
3. Read a book on different types of fish in the Bay of Bengal.
4. Discuss the advantages of living in a Communist society.
5. Discuss how to keep a healthy flower harden.
6. Discuss the causes of body odor.
7. Watch a movie that encourages people to burn every American flag they see.
8. Listen to a lecture calling for the extermination of all remaining American Indians.
9. Look at a picture that is just two straight lines on a solid white background for ten minutes.
10. Go to a party held for homesexuals.
11. Listen to a Brahms symphony.
12. Eat fried termites or locusts to see if they are as good as some Africans say.
13. Smell the garbage pile of a fish canning factory just to see what it smells like.
14. Roll in the sand on a beach to see what it feels like.
15. Swim in very cold water to see what it feels like.
16. Eat something that used to disgust you to see if you tastes have changed.
17. Listen to various types of boat horns?
18. Go for two days and two nights without sleeping.
19. Fast for one day of every week.

---

*This questionnaire is an extension of ideas expressed in Bloom, 64, pp. 126-130.

Questionnaire on Student Responses

I. The purpose of this questionnaire is to discover what you really think about what we do in social studies class. Answer each question as honestly and as frankly as you possibly can. There are no "right" answers as such. It is not expected that your own thoughts or feelings or activities relating to class work should be the same as the teacher's or similar to those of other students. (Adaptation from Bloom, 1964, pp. 124.)

To complete the questionnaire, consider each activity below and:

1. Write A if you perform the activity without being told or reminded to.
2. Write B if you perform the activity only when told or reminded to.
3. Write C if you sometimes perform the activity when told or reminded to, but not all the time.
4. Mark D if you do not perform the activity

(Adaptation from Bloom, 1964, p. 123.)

II. After considering all the items below, go back and reread all items that you responded to with letter A. For each of these mark a second response as follows: (Adaptation from Bloom, 1964, p. 128.)

1. Write E if you are not really interested in the activity and generally avoid it.
2. Write F if you are interested in the activity and do it willingly.
3. Write C if you do the activity because it makes you feel good, gives you a feeling of satisfaction.

1. Continue to read a book, even if it does not seem interesting at first.
2. Think about a problem over several days to clarify your thoughts on it.
3. Set up a continuum of possible choices before coming to conclusions.
4. Put your ideas on paper to clarify them.
5. Consider the consequences of something you assume to be right.
6. Examin your actions to see if they contradict your beliefs.
7. Watch television.
8. Make an effort to alter your behavior to fit your ideals.

9. Take a public stand on something you think is right.

10. Go to the movies.

11. Use a dictionary to expand your vocabulary.

12. Watch the news or read a newspaper daily.

13. Use your free time to discuss topics brought up in class.

14. Try to understand something which seems strange.

15. Go to a movie which your friends did not like because they did not understand it and said it was, "kirda wierd".

16. Take notes on data in a history book and then learn the data.

Footnotes

[1]Quoted directly from Raths, 1966, pp. 38-39.

[2]Kohlberg, 1966, pp. 3 & 15.

[3]Kohlberg, 1973, p.373.

[4]Kohlberg, 1966, p. 21.

[5]Kohlberg, 1973, pp. 372-373. Kohlberg, 1966, pp. 5, 11, 21, 7, Kohlberg, 1964, p. 403.

[6]Kohlberg, 1973, p. 374. Kohlberg, 1964, p. 424.

[7]Kohlberg, 1973, p. 374.

[8]Raths, 1966, pp. 27 & 74.

[9]Krathwohl, Bloom & Masia, 1956, pp. 77-78, 176, 180, 184.

[10]Becker, 1945, p. 54.

[11]Hoetker, 1969, pp. 147-148.

[12]Hunt & Metcalf, 1955, p. 283.

[13]Gross, 1964, p.4.

[14]Kohlberg, 1973, p. 371.

[15]Reichert, 1970, p. 9, Ch. 4.

[16]Raths, 1966, pp. 160-62.

[17]Archambeault, 1963, p. 17.

[18]RAths, 1966, p. 34.

[19]Raths, 1966 pp. 38 & 17.

[20]Gross, 1964, p. 3.

[21]Gross, 1964, p. 2.

[22]Gross, 1964, p. 3.

[23]Ruben, 1972, pp. 31-32.

[24]See the first chapters in Ruben, 1972.

[25]Bloom, 1971, p. 43.

[26]Bloom, 1971, p. 250.

[27]Bloom, 1971, pp. 237-238, 243.

[28]Bloom, 1971, pp. 483 & 489. Krathwohl, Bloom & Masia, 1956, p. 80.

[29]Amidon, 1966, pp. 209-219.

[30]Bellack, 1966, pp. 38-41.

[31]Raths, 1966, p. 139.

[32]Raths, 1966, p. 155-56.

[33]Raths, 1966, pp. 152-154.

[34]Raths, 1966, pp. 130-131.

[35]Krathwohl, Bloom & Masia, 1956, pp. 186-93.

[36]Raths, 1966, pp. 38-39.

[37]Krathwohl, Bloom & Masia, 1956,

[38]Kingman, Barry, "The Development of Value Clarification Skills: Initial Efforts in an Eighth Grade Social Studies Class," Educational Resources Information Center, August, 1974, ED 090 128.

Annotated Bibliography

Amidon, Edmund & Elizabeth Hunter, Improving Teaching, The Analysis of Classroom Verbal Interaction, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston Inc., 1966.

The authors have developed a system for measuring classroom discussion based on categories indicating the source of a comment, where it was directed, and whether it was responding or initiating something new. I have found it helpful in measuring the degree to which I allow the student initiative essential in value clarification discussions.

Archambault, Reginald, "Criteria for Success in Moral Instruction," Harvard Educational Review, 1963, pp. 472-83.

Archambault points to the distinction between moral instruction linked to action and moral instruction based on discussion. He says that it is impossible for the school to insure a connection between thought and action. Schools nonetheless provide an essential service by making students aware and giving them skills to cope with moral problems.

Aries, Philippe, Centuries of Childhood, A Social History of Family Life, New York: Alfred A. Knapf, 1960.

Aries discusses the various ways western civilization has raised children from the middle ages through the nineteenth century.

Barr, Robert (ed.), Values and Youth, Washington D.C., National Council for the Social Studies, 1971.

A series of articles dealing with the challenges and frustration students face followed by specific classroom suggestions. Some of the articles are written by students.

Becker, Carl, Freedom and Responsibility, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1945.

The third chapter, "Freedom of Learning and Teaching" deals with the need for academic freedom. Becker thinks this is more important at the college level. High school is a time to learn data.

Bellack, Arno & Herbert Kliebard & Ronald Hyman & Frank Smith, The Language of the Classroom, New York: Teachers College Press, 1966.

Bellack has developed a highly complex system for measuring classroom interaction and applied it during observations of fifteen classes in seven New New York high schools. His research indicates an unvarying recitation pattern based largely on memory work.

Bloom, Benjamin & J. Thomas Hastings & George Madaus, Handbook on Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

The authors document the need for more extensive evaluation of classroom activities and present an extensive overview of the problems and possibilities involved.

Buros, Oscar Krisen, Mental Measurement Yearbook, Highland Park, New Jersey, The Gryphon Press, 1972.

Buros presents a catalogue of available testing materials. I found nothing directly applicable to my work with values.

Gelatt, H. B. & Barbara Varenhorst, & Richard Carey & Gordon Miller, Decisions and Outcomes, New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1973.

ETS has designed a colorful, eye-catching value work-book for high school students. Rather than imposing the workbook's organization on the class, it might be better to adapt the various exercises to the needs that arise from classroom interaction.

Gross, Richard, "How to Handle Controversial Issues," How to Do It Series - No. 14, Washington D. C., National Council for the Social Studies, 1964.

Gross presents a series of suggestions which were, for me, controversial in themselves.

Hunt, Maurice & Lawrence Metcalf, Teaching High School Social Studies, New York: Harper & Row, 1955.

In a text book on teaching techniques the authors stress the need to deal with the contradictions and problems of American society.

Kohlberg, Lawrence, "Development of Moral Character and Moral Ideology," In Martin Hoffman and Lois Hoffman (eds.), Review of Child Development Research, Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.

_____, "Moral Development and the New Social Studies," Social Education, 1973, pp. 369-373.

_____, "Moral Education in the Schools: A Developmental View," The School Review, 1966, pp. 1-30.

In these articles Kohlberg discusses the six stages of moral development documented in his eighteen year study. Cross-cultural studies indicate that these stages transcend cultural boundaries. He calls for a moral education that helps students through these natural stages rather than one which stresses specific values.

Krathwohl, David & Benjamin Bloom & Bertram Masia, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, The Classification of Educational Goals, HandbookII: Affective Domain, New York, David McKay Co., 1956.

The authors present a hierarchical taxonomy of affective education objectives based on increasing internalization, complexity, and abstractness. I found the taxonomy helpful although application leaves room for enormous variation due to individual interpretation.

McGovern, Eleanor & Maria Piers, "Child Care for Nonviolence," Childhood Education, Vol. 49, pp. 9-12.

The authors deny that playing guns or watching television causes violence. They point to two major causes which present a challenge to educators: 1) an inability to empathize with others, 2) an inability to verbalize, internalize, and sublimate.

Miner, Horace, "Body Ritual Among the Nacirema," American Anthropologist, 1958, pp. 503-507.

Miner describes generally accepted American behavior from a foreign and unsympathetic perspective. Good material for a lesson on value relativity.

Peddiwell, J. Abner, The Saber-Tooth Curriculum, Including Other Lectures in the History of Paleolithic Education, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1939.

Peddiwell (a pen name) presents a satirical allegory underlining some of the failures of progressive education. Although written 35 years ago it is still highly relevant.

Raths, Louis & Merrill Harmin & Sidney Simon, Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom, Columbus, Ohio, Charles Merrill Books Inc., 1966

The authors present a seven part process for value clarification and specific techniques for implimenting the process.

Reichert, Richard, Self-Awareness Through Group Dynamics, Dayton, Ohio: Pflaum/Standard, 1970.

Reichert has designed a series of exercises to make the students aware of their attitudes. He stresses the importance of experience for true learning.

Ruben, David, The Rights of Teachers, The Basic ACLU Guide to a Teacher's Constitutional Rights, New York: Avon Books, 1972.

Ruben shows the ambiguities and limits of the judicial protection of a teacher's first amendment rights.

Seifman, Eli, "Teaching Strategies," in Dwight Allen & Eli Seifman (eds.), The Teacher's Handbook, 1971, Scott, Foresman & Co, Genview, Ill.

The article provides a broad overview.

Simon, Sidney & Leland Howe & Howard Kirschenbaum, Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students, New York: Hart Publishing Co. 1972.

The suggested techniques are an elaboration of those described by Raths and his associates.

Spring, Joel, Education and the Rise of the Corporate State, Boston: Beacon Press, 1972.

Spring documents the use of "progressive" American educational institutions as mechanisms of control. This, it seems to me, is the central obstacle to Raths style value clarification.

Wiebe, Robert, "The Social Functions of Public Education," American Quarterly, Summer, 1969, pp. 147-164.

Wiebe briefly outlines nineteenth century, early twentieth century, and post World War II American education goals. I found it helpful in placing my efforts in perspective.