

ABSTRACT

VALUES CLARIFICATION TEN YEARS LATER: CHANGES AND FUTURES AS PERCEIVED BY SELECTED EXPERTS

By

Stephen J. Taffee

This dissertation concerned itself with two basic research questions:

1. In what ways have the theory and practice of values clarification changed since 1966?
2. In what directions is values clarification likely to move during the next ten years?

To gather data relevant to these questions, the author identified and contacted fourteen leading experts in values clarification and/or values education, with an approximate ratio of two proponents of values clarification to one critic of values clarification. Of the fourteen experts contacted, nine agreed to participate in the study: Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin, Sidney B. Simon, Howard Kirschenbaum, Barbara Glaser-Kirschenbaum, Joel Goodman, John S. Stewart, Alan L. Lockwood, and Milton Rokeach. An interview guide was constructed, and the nine experts were interviewed and the interview tape recorded. Prior to the interviews of the experts, however, the writer answered most of the questions of an argumentative

nature himself in an attempt to discover any assumptions that he may have been unconsciously making and to increase his awareness of the possibility of "leading" the experts during their interviews. These interviews were then transcribed and a transcript returned to each of the experts for editing and clarification. Finally, the edited versions of the transcripts served as the data base from which the author operated.

The author also undertook a review of relevant literature, and in particular concerned himself with the evolution of values clarification practice and theory. The pioneering work of Rath was highlighted, as were the later contributions of Kirschenbaum. Special attention was also given to the major criticisms of values clarification, which were discussed and in some instances replied to by the writer.

In analyzing the data, the author broke down both of the basic research questions into several sub-questions each, and by comparing and contrasting the responses of the various experts to the sub-questions, attempted ultimately to gather information which would yield answers to the two major research questions. The results of the analysis and evaluation of these sub-questions were then compared with the responses of the writer to his self-interview, and while the results of this exercise were mixed, by and large the writer had responded in a fashion similar to the proponents of values clarification.

In regard to the two major research questions, the author came to the following conclusions: (1) since 1966, values

clarification has become an increasingly practical and usable educational tool; (2) since 1966, there has been an increasingly more explicit role for affect in values clarification; (3) since 1966, the number of questions and concerns relative to values clarification has increased greatly; (4) values clarification will remain a popular approach in values education during the next decade; (5) values clarification will become increasingly integrated with other disciplines and approaches during the next decade; (6) the leadership in values clarification will become more diversified during the next ten years as generalists in the approach are joined by specialists in the approach as applied to specific areas; (7) ideally, values clarification can have a great impact on American education and society, and that ideals are an important part of human experience in terms of future planning.

The significance of these conclusions was thought by the writer to be the following: (1) values clarification, at least partially, is responsible for increased public interest in the broader area of values education; (2) values clarification has introduced many people to humanistic educational programs and practices; (3) values clarification's popularity is partially an outgrowth of its practicality and applicability, and curriculum planners should remember this in designing new curricula; (4) values clarification has been a dynamic yet stable approach, changing over the years but also maintaining itself and not passing into oblivion; (5) there is a need for the leaders of values clarification to continue to perform research and development

tasks; (6) values clarification is likely to remain a potent and popular approach within values education during the next decade; (7) there is a need for increased communications between the leaders of values clarification and the leaders of related approaches; (8) two major points which need to be explored by values clarifiers in the future are the charges of ethical relativism and the insufficient research as to the effects of values clarification.

The dissertation closes with some broad action proposals based upon the conclusions given above.

VALUES CLARIFICATION TEN YEARS LATER: CHANGES AND
FUTURES AS PERCEIVED BY SELECTED EXPERTS

By

Stephen J. Taffee

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1976

© Copyright by
STEPHEN JEFFREY TAFFEE
1976

To my father

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I appreciate first and foremost, Linda, my wife, for her caring and support (both emotional and financial), and her willingness to forego all those wonderful aspects of living she so richly deserves. Dear, if we can survive this, we can survive anything.

I appreciate Sarah, my beautiful daughter, for helping me to become more aware of wonder and awe, creativity and spontaneity, touching and caressing, and the need for us grown-ups to laugh, to cry, to shake, and to hug.

I appreciate all of my doctoral committee members, for their unique and individual gifts: Ben Bohnhorst, my advisor and helper, for his capability and scholarliness; his willingness to stretch and reach, and hence, to grow; and his gentle yet probing criticisms. Dale Alam, my dear friend and fellow composer, for always acting as consistently with his beliefs as possible, and in so doing, encouraging me to risk and to try. Charles Blackman, for his incredible ability to see things as they are, and as they should be; and for taking so much time to work with me, when he has so little time, even for himself. John Suehr, for his nourishing frankness and honesty, and for giving me some wonderfully creative ideas in leadership and change. Bill Hinds, for his flexibility in helping me construct a cognate area that looks like me, and for helping me to discover and tie the loose ends.

A special word of appreciation must go to the Alpena Public Schools, and for all that they did to reinforce my ideas about learning and teaching and kids, and for encouraging me to seek an advanced degree.

I appreciate all of the caring and loving friends and/or students from Alpena as well, I remember with great fondness their concern and best wishes for both Linda and myself.

I appreciate Sid Simon, my friend and teacher, for his cooperation in this study, for introducing me to values clarification some five years ago, and for his creativity, dynamism and capability as a leader while assisting in my education of my "self."

I appreciate Howie and Barb Glaser-Kirschenbaum, and Merrill Harmin, for their cooperation in my thesis, their encouragement, and for their capable leadership of the many workshops in values clarification that I have been a part of.

I appreciate Joel Goodman, for his assistance in this dissertation, for his humor and boundless creativity and concern, and particularly for helping me, too, to recognize the wisdom of "Peanuts."

I appreciate John Stewart, for the countless hours of stimulating conversation and genuine sharing and caring, as well as for his cooperation in this study.

I appreciate especially, Dr. Louis Rath, who has been my teacher and challenger for many years, even though we have only recently met. His cooperation in this study has added a dimension for which I will always be deeply grateful.

A word of appreciation too, must go to Drs. Alan Lockwood and Milton Rokeach, for their stimulating comments and for their cooperation in this thesis.

Finally, I deeply appreciate all of my brother and sister graduate students, teachers, students, and friends here at Michigan State University, who have all contributed in some way to this dissertation. A very special word of appreciation to Fred Ebey, a constant and loving friend, who has always been there.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF APPENDICES	viii
 Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	2
IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY	3
OVERVIEW OF METHODOLOGY	6
LIMITATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS	7
OVERVIEW OF THESIS	9
2. A REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE	10
INTRODUCTION	10
RATHS AND DEWEY	12
THE RATHS THEORY OF VALUES CLARIFICATION	15
KIRSCHENBAUM'S MODIFICATIONS OF VALUES CLARIFICATION THEORY	19
THE GOALS OF VALUES CLARIFICATION	25
THE METHOD OF VALUES CLARIFICATION	28
CRITICISMS OF VALUES CLARIFICATION	34
RESEARCH IN VALUES CLARIFICATION	56
SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 2	64
3. METHODOLOGY	66

Chapter	Page
INTRODUCTION	66
METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING THE EXPERTS	67
METHOD OF CONTACTING THE EXPERTS	72
DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVIEW AGREEMENT FORM	72
DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVIEW GUIDE	73
DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVIEW PROCESS	73
SELF-INTERVIEW	76
METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS	76
4. ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF DATA	79
INTRODUCTION	79
MAJOR RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND THEIR RESPECTIVE SUB- QUESTIONS	79
COMPARISON OF SELF-INTERVIEW DATA WITH THE PRECEDING ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF SUB-QUESTIONS	125
5. SUMMARY	127
INTRODUCTION	127
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	127
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	142
SUMMARY	145
PERSONAL REFLECTIONS	148
BIBLIOGRAPHY	153
APPENDIX	169

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
A. Sample Interview Agreement Form	170
B. Completed Interview Agreement Forms	172
C. Interview Guide	182
D. Form Letter Sent with Each Transcript	185
E. Interview with Louis E. Raths	187
F. Interview with Merrill Harmin	233
G. Interview with Sidney B. Simon	253
H. Interview with Howard Kirschenbaum	281
I. Interview with Barbara Glaser-Kirschenbaum	326
J. Interview with Joel Goodman	349
K. Interview with John S. Stewart	389
L. Interview with Alan L. Lockwood	420
M. Interview with Milton Rokeach	455
N. Self-Interview	466

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

In 1966, Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin and Sidney B. Simon, published Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom.¹ Their book was the first comprehensive presentation of the theory and practice of "values clarification." Since 1966, values clarification has enjoyed a tremendous amount of growth in popularity, as evidenced by the proliferation of books, articles, media packages and workshops claiming to utilize the values clarification process. Many colleges and universities have developed graduate and undergraduate courses in values clarification. A significant number of studies have been undertaken to measure the effects of values clarification. Values clarification has also entered the lives of many people not directly associated with classroom teaching, e.g. social workers, counselors, religious educators and civic youth organization leaders. Values clarification probably is, at least partially, responsible for the increased interest in the broader field of values/moral education among educators. Indeed, Milton Rokeach, while expressing strong reservations in regard to values clarification, nonetheless has written:

¹Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin and Sidney B. Simon, Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1966).

I believe that the values clarification movement has made an extremely important contribution to modern education. It has succeeded in getting across the proposition that beyond making students aware of facts and concepts, it is also important to make them aware of their own values. Such a broadening of educational objectives now has a universal face validity, largely because of the pioneering work of the proponents of values clarification.²

As a theory, values clarification has brought both accolades and applause to itself, as well as harsh criticisms. As a practice, values clarification has been credited with helping students and teachers become closer to one another, and with changing lives in positive directions. On the other hand, values clarification has been disparaged as psychologically dangerous, irresponsible, or a mishmash of silly games.

This writer believes that, despite sometimes heavy criticism, values clarification has had and will continue to have a significant role within education.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to focus upon two important questions regarding values clarification:

1. In what ways have the theory and practice of values clarification changed since 1966?
2. In what directions is values clarification likely to move during the next ten years?

²Milton Rokeach, "Toward a Philosophy of Value Education," Values Education, Theory/Practice/Problems/Prospects, ed. by John Meyer, Brian Burnham and John Cholvat (Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1975), p. 124.

Information regarding these two questions was collected, reported, and analyzed for significance, with the hope that as a result, the genesis and continuing evolution of values clarification may be understood with greater clarity.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

Contribution to Theory

Many authorities, when referring to the theory of values clarification, are relying upon the theory as originally recorded in Values and Teaching ten years ago.³ With the exception of an essay with suggested theoretical changes by Howard Kirschenbaum, the theory has mainly been represented in print as virtually unchanged.⁴ Yet, this writer, as a result of conversations with many of the leading authors in the area, believed that there were some indications of significant, but perhaps as yet unspoken or unrecorded, new perceptions emerging in regard to theory. This thesis serves to investigate the extent to which this is the case.

This thesis also gathers from current leaders in values education, perceptions regarding future developments in values clarification. The writer believes that such warranted predictions, based upon logical trends, would be helpful to other investigators concerned with values education.

³Raths, Harmin and Simon, Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom.

⁴Howard Kirschenbaum, "Beyond Values Clarification," Readings in Values Clarification, ed. by Sidney B. Simon and Howard Kirschenbaum (Minneapolis: Wilson Press, Inc., 1973).

Contribution to Practice

Significant changes or shifts in practice may indicate a change in theory or in interpretation of theory. Therefore, this writer also concerned himself with rationales for any notable changes which occurred.

Since the publication of Values and Teaching,⁵ the overwhelming emphasis in writings about values clarification has been in the realm of implementation as evidenced by such titles as: Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students;⁶ Human Values in the Classroom: Teaching for Personal and Social Growth;⁷ Clarifying Values through Subject Matter: Applications for the Classroom;⁸ Composition for Personal Growth: Values Clarification through Writing;⁹ Personalizing Education: Values Clarification and Beyond;¹⁰ and Beginning Values

⁵Raths, Harmin and Simon, Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom.

⁶Sidney B. Simon, Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum, Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students (New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1972).

⁷Robert C. Hawley, Human Values in the Classroom: Teaching for Personal and Social Growth (Amherst, Mass.: Education Research Associates, 1973).

⁸Merrill Harmin, Howard Kirschenbaum, and Sidney B. Simon, Clarifying Values through Subject Matter: Applications for the Classroom (Minneapolis: Winston Press, Inc., 1973).

⁹Sidney B. Simon, Robert C. Hawley, and David D. Britton, Composition for Personal Growth: Values Clarification through Writing (New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1973).

¹⁰Leland W. Howe and Mary Martha Howe, Personalizing Education: Values Clarification and Beyond (New York: Hart Publishing Co., Inc., 1975).

Clarification: A Guidebook for the Use of Values Clarification in the Classroom,¹¹ to name some of them.

Within this emphasis on implementation, there appeared to be, at least to this writer, a gradual change in emphasis from an early cognitive, logical, weighing orientation, to an orientation which placed greater emphasis upon the affective, feeling and appreciating aspects of an individual's valuing process. The author believed that such a change warranted further investigation and documentation.

What will the practice of values clarification look like ten years from now? Will it be utilized much in the same ways as now, or will it likely undergo significant change? The answers to such questions have obvious relevance to practitioners at all levels, especially the designers of curricula.

Contribution to Self

Obviously, there must be a personal aspect to the selection of any area of investigation worthy of all the time and effort involved in the composition of a dissertation. This writer plans to continue his interest in the area of values clarification, with the definite intention and hope of publishing in the area. Values clarification has been an important part of this writer's personal/professional life since 1971, and it represents an integral dimension of his own evolution. In other words, the questions posed are of

¹¹Sidney B. Simon and Jay Clark, Beginning Values Clarification: A Guidebook for the Use of Values Clarification in the Classroom (San Diego: Pennant Press, 1975).

significance to him personally, as well as to education in general. Instead of representing a final hurdle, the writer wanted this dissertation to hold, at least potentially, as much growth as the preceding portions of this degree program. The writer has not been disappointed.

OVERVIEW OF METHODOLOGY

To gather information relevant to the questions enumerated above, the writer identified, contacted, and then interviewed experts in values clarification. The interviews were recorded on audio tape, transcribed, and the transcripts were then returned to the interviewees for examination and editing for clarification, and then incorporated into the study as important data for analysis. The transcripts of the interviews conducted may be found in the Appendix of this dissertation, along with an Interview Guide.

It should be noted that prior to the interview with the experts, the writer conducted a "self interview" aimed at assisting him in identifying assumption and raising his consciousness in regard to the danger of "leading" an expert. This was done by the writer responding to all "argumentative" questions, i.e., questions which requested more than mere background information and were potentially controversial in nature.

LIMITATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS

Limitations

1. The use of interviews yielded data which are subjective in nature. Nevertheless, for the purposes indicated above, such data were the most valid and relevant. Every effort was made to deal with these data in an objectively critical manner.

2. Face-to-face interviews were not possible in all cases. Thus, in the cases of those interviews conducted via telephone, many non-verbal sources of information were unavailable. While this fact represented a limitation, it did not prove to be a severely limiting one.

3. Certainly not all "experts" in values education could be consulted. The writer acknowledges the existence of many competent, knowledgeable experts within the area, but the study deliberately limited itself to selected experts who have attained prominence within the values education field.

The following, most of whom were personally acquainted with the writer, were contacted to request their participation in the study: Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin, Sidney B. Simon, Howard Kirschenbaum, Barbara Glaser-Kirschenbaum, Leleand W. Howe, Mary Martha Howe, James Raths, Joel Goodman, Michael Scrivens, John S. Stewart, Milton Rokeach, Alan L. Lockwood, and Lawrence Metcalf.

Of this list of fourteen experts, nine agreed to participate and were subsequently interviewed. Lawrence Metcalf, Michael Scrivens and Mary Martha Howe failed to respond in any way to my inquiries. James Raths declined to participate in the study,

indicating that he had not continued to play an active role in values clarification over the years, and did not feel that he could add greatly to any information that I might receive from his father, Louis. Leland Howe, while at first accepting my invitation, later declined, indicating that he was currently reassessing his position on values clarification, and was not ready at this point to publicly share his ideas.

Despite the fact that five people did not participate in the study, the writer still feels that an accurate picture of values clarification emerged. Of the original fourteen, nine were "proponents" of values clarification, and five were critics of it, resulting in a ratio of approximately two to one, proponents to critics. Of the nine who participated, six were proponents, and three were critics, which resulted in the two to one ratio being maintained.

Assumptions

The major assumption of this thesis regards the validity of data gathered from the experts. The writer assumed that the experts did not attempt to mislead him, withhold information, or offer ungrounded speculations. Due to the nature of the personal relationship which exists between the writer and many of the experts, the fact that the transcripts were returned to each expert for his or her clarification and editing, and because the interviews were to be reproduced in the thesis for public consumption, the writer believes it is safe to assume that each expert was most candid.

OVERVIEW OF THESIS

The thesis contains five chapters. Chapter 1 concerns itself with an introduction to the study, as well as a brief discussion of its purpose, importance, and a brief outline of the methodology utilized. This is followed by a section containing a list of limitations and assumptions.

Chapter 2 contains a review of relevant literature.

Chapter 3 contains a specific description of the methodology utilized in the gathering of information, and its analysis. This is based, in large measure, upon the Interview Guide presented in the Appendix of this thesis.

Chapter 4 contains a critical analysis and discussion of the significance of the findings from the transcripts of the interviews. The transcripts of the interviews are reproduced in the Appendix of this study.

Chapter 5 contains a summary of the study as a whole, conclusions, recommendations, and some personal reflections.

Chapter 2

A REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

Many people date the birth of values clarification as 1966, the year in which Values and Teaching was published.¹ And indeed, it was this work which first brought national attention to the idea of values clarification, and hence serves as a useful referent. This dissertation attempts to look at values clarification "ten years later," which means that it will focus primarily on the period from 1966 to the present.

But values clarification has a fascinating pre-1966 history, which deserves to be at least partially explored if the reader is to fully understand and appreciate its evolution. Thus, a brief section of this chapter is devoted to the early history of values clarification.

It was Louis Rathes who first formulated the idea of values clarification, a fact perhaps too often forgotten or ignored by some contemporary educators. Yet in conversations between the writer and many of the current leaders in values clarification, like Sidney Simon, Howard Kirschenbaum and Merrill Harmin, Rathes

¹Louis E. Rathes, Merrill Harmin and Sidney B. Simon, Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1966).

is consistently referred to with the greatest respect and admiration--almost with reverence. Therefore, it seems appropriate that the following review of the literature regarding values clarification should begin with Raths.

This chapter is organized into the following sections: first, a discussion of Raths and the relationship of his ideas to those of John Dewey; secondly, a brief overview of Raths and early values clarification theory; the third section deals with theoretical modifications offered by Kirschenbaum; fourthly, the writer explores the professed goals and objectives of values clarification; this is followed by a presentation of the methodology of values clarification, including a specific curricular model; attention is given in the sixth section to some of the predominant criticisms of values clarification; seventh is a review of significant research completed in values clarification; and the chapter ends with a summary.

Before entering into the main body of this chapter, however, the writer wishes to make it clear to the reader that in no way should this chapter be perceived as a comprehensive review of all the literature in the area of values education. The writer acknowledges the contributions made by many educational thinkers to the broad field of values education, but the primary purpose of this chapter and this dissertation is to investigate aspects of one area of values education, and not to survey extensively the entire range. Therefore, no attempt has been made to comprehend the whole of the literature within values education.

RATHS AND DEWEY

As early as 1940 there was evidence that Raths had embraced some of Dewey's thinking in regard to values.² Raths himself has always been quick to credit Dewey with having a profound impact on his formulations about values and valuing. In his chapter on "Clarifying Values" in Curriculum for Today's Boys and Girls, Raths acknowledges "having borrowed heavily from Dewey."³ In Values and Teaching, it is written that:

The senior author [Raths] considered for some time what might be the implications of value development for teaching and, based on some of the work of Dewey . . . built a theory of values that seems to offer concrete and effective aid to teachers.⁴

Specifically then, what was it that Raths borrowed from Dewey? To answer that, one must understand what it is that Dewey proposes in the first place.

While Dewey refers to values in a number of different works, probably his most fully developed statement of his position is his 1939 volume, Theory of Valuation.⁵ In it, he argues that scientific methodology can and should be used in making value decisions. He

²Louis E. Raths, "Approaches to the Measurement of Values," Educational Research Bulletin, 19, 10 (May 8, 1940), pp. 275-282+.

³Louis E. Raths, "Clarifying Values," Curriculum for Today's Boys and Girls, ed. by R. S. Fleming (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1963), p. 320.

⁴Raths, et al., op. cit., p. 7.

⁵John Dewey, Theory of Valuation, Vol. II, No. 4 of the International Encyclopedia of Unified Science, Otto Neurath, ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939).

rejects the idea that values are "purely ejaculatory," or that they are merely matters of "liking and disliking." (He does emphasize prizing and caring as a part of the valuing process, but makes important distinctions between them and liking or disliking.)⁶

Dewey then sets forth a theory of values based on scientific reasoning and a rejection of the affective-cognitive dichotomy, which suggested at that time that science had no business in such an "emotive" domain as values.

The hard-and-fast impassible line which is supposed by some to exist between "emotive" and "scientific" language is a reflex of the gap which now exists between the intellectual and the emotional in human relations and activities. The split which exists in present social life between ideas that have scientific warrant and uncontrolled emotions that dominate practice, the split between the affectional and the cognitive, is probably one of the chief sources of the maladjustments and unendurable strains from which the world is suffering. . . . The practical problem that has to be faced is the establishment of cultural conditions that will support the kinds of behavior in which emotions and ideas, desires and appraisals, are integrated.⁷

Dewey further explains his thinking on values by arguing that there is a dual meaning for the word "value." The similarity between his thinking here, and Raths' theory of values clarification is, to this writer, quite striking.

When attention is confined to the usage of the verb "to value," we find that common speech exhibits a double usage. For a glance at the dictionary will show that in ordinary speech of words "valuing" and "valuation" are verbally employed to designate both prizing, in the sense of holding precious, dear (and various other nearly equivalent activities, like honoring, regarding highly), and appraising, in the sense of putting a value upon, assigning value to. . . . The double meaning is significant because there is implicit

⁶Ibid., pp. 6-19.

⁷Ibid., pp. 64-65.

in it one of the basic issues regarding valuation. For in prizing, emphasis falls upon something having definite personal reference, has an aspectual quality called emotional. Valuation as appraisal, however, is primarily concerned with a relational property of objects so that an intellectual aspect is uppermost of the same general sort that is found in "estimate" as distinguished from the personal-emotional word, "esteem." That the same verb is employed in both senses suggests the problem upon which schools are divided at the present time. Which of the two references is basic in its implications? Are the two activities separate or are they complementary?⁸

Raths sees them as complementary.

Dewey himself goes on to say that the double meaning of "value" need not be an "either-or" proposition, but that both aspects are important, that there is an implicit element of prizing, caring, etc., as well as an implicit element of deliberation, an appraising of various alternative desires in the light of foreseeable consequences.⁹

Lastly, it is not enough that our values reflect both affection and cognition, but we must act on our values and ideas, put into practice what has been desired and appraised.

The business of the educator--whether parent or teacher--is to see to it that the greatest possible number of ideas acquired by children and youth are acquired in such a vital way that they become moving ideas, motive forces in the guidance of conduct.¹⁰

These ideas of Dewey, the rejection of the affective-cognitive dichotomy, the dual nature of the word "value," and the necessity of action, deeply affected Raths' thinking, and ultimately

⁸Ibid., p. 5.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰John Dewey, Moral Principles in Education (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959), p. 2.

found themselves contained in his formulation of the basic theory of values clarification, as will become quite apparent in the following section.

THE RATHS THEORY OF VALUES CLARIFICATION

For Raths, teaching about values and the valuing process was a basic function of the educational process. In an article published in 1955, entitled: "What is Teaching?" he wrote:

It can be said . . . that there is an insistent demand that education at all levels should be more concerned with values, with the clarification of them, with the conservation of those we hold most dear, and the reconstruction of others which are inadequate or in conflict.

.

It is widely recognized that all knowledge starts as opinion, and unless opinion becomes tested in a wide variety of situations, it may not become fact or truth or knowledge. Large areas of life remain at the opinion stage. These are concerned with values, attitudes, beliefs, aspirations, purposes, problems and activities.

Teachers, in order to further growth and development, must know how to help their students clarify these aspects of life. It is hypothesized that out of this clarification come clearer purpose, more consistent thinking, and an independence of thought and action that is highly desirable.¹¹

Four years later, Raths wrote:

Values come through "value-ing," they grow through prizing, cherishing, holding dear--and no one can do this for us. Values also come through discrimination in the fact of choices. To discriminate means to weigh, to size up, to judge. . . . When we have made a choice--one that is prized--we are apt to plan our time in a way which gives this value a chance to be expressed.¹²

¹¹Louis E. Raths, "What is Teaching?", Educational Leadership, December, 1955, pp. 146-147.

¹²Louis E. Raths, "Values are Fundamental," Childhood Education, February, 1959, pp. 246-247.

So by the early sixties the stage was set: Rath's was unmistakably in favor of teachers becoming involved in value education, and he was also unmistakably heavily influenced by Dewey. In 1961, Rath's published a work which included five "criteria" for a value, which collectively described his vision of the valuing process. To this writer, these criteria sound so much like Dewey, that a person could easily assume that it was Dewey's own writing:

1. A value implies prizing and cherishing. We may indeed have an attitude toward the lower social class, and may be acting upon that attitude, but if we do not prize it, if this is an attitude which we wish were different, then it cannot be called a value. . . .
2. A value implies choice after deliberation. It involves answering the question: should I choose this? It frequently involves the anticipation of consequences, and a reflection upon the desirability of the choice. . . . If a person is responding impulsively, instinctively, reflexively, we should not associate the response with valuing. . . .¹³

So far Rath's has mentioned two of the three major valuing processes identified by Dewey. Rath's then proceeded to take the third aspect of Dewey theory of valuation, action, and expand it into three, action-related criteria.

3. A value, as such, implies recurrence of the valuing act. To choose something once is hardly indicative that the something has the status of a value. We associate the concept of value with trend, with repetition, with a certain style of life. . . .
4. A value penetrates our living. If it is indeed a value of ours, we may allot some of our finances to support what is valued; we plan our time so that the value may be experienced in our living; we may develop new acquaintance and friendship patterns which are consistent with our values . . . where we value, our lives are influenced. . . .

¹³Rath's, "Clarifying Values," pp. 320-321.

5. When asked about our values we affirm them. Having reflected upon them, prized them, repeatedly chosen them, having lived them--quite naturally--we affirm them when asked or challenged. We know what we are for. We have not only the moral courage, but in our lives we have demonstrated the moral energy.¹⁴

Raths continued on to say that unless something satisfies all five criteria, it cannot be called a "value." Hence, he concedes that most people do not have many values. What others call "values" may instead be beliefs, attitudes, interests, etc., unless they meet all five criteria.^{15,16}

Three years later, Raths and two of his students, Merrill Harmin and Sidney B. Simon, published Values and Teaching, the first extended explanation of the theory and practice of values clarification. Contained in it are the now famous "seven criteria," which are essentially similar to the five criteria noted above. The one major addition is that of "free choice." The seven criteria are reproduced here because it is this conception of the theory which has become best known, and which serves as the basis for much of the criticism by others in values education, to be discussed later.

Unless something satisfies all seven of the criteria noted below, we do not call it a value. In other words, for a value

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 320-321.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 322.

¹⁶ Raths is not consistent in his use of the word "values" as he defines it, however. Nor are Harmin and Simon in their work. All three authors quite often will make statements like: "Everything we do demonstrates our values," but according to their definition, action alone is not enough.

to result, all of the following seven requirements must apply. Collectively, they describe the process of valuing.

1. Choosing freely. If something is in fact to guide one's life whether or not authority is watching, it must be a result of free choice. . . . Values must be freely selected if they are to be really valued by the individual.
2. Choosing from among alternatives. This definition of values is concerned with things that are chosen by the individual and, obviously, there can be no choice if there are no alternatives from which to choose. . . . Only when a choice is possible, when there is more than one alternative from which to choose, do we say a value can result.
3. Choosing after thoughtful consideration of the consequences of each alternative. Impulsive or thoughtless choices do not lead to values as we define them. For something intelligently and meaningfully to guide one's life, it must emerge from a weighing and an understanding. . . . There is an important cognitive factor here. A value can emerge only with thoughtful consideration of the range of the alternatives and consequences in a choice.
4. Prizing and cherishing. When we value something, it has a positive tone. We prize it, cherish it, esteem it, respect it, hold it dear. We are happy with our values. . . . We prize and cherish the guides to life that we call values.
5. Affirming. When we have chosen something freely, after consideration of the alternatives, and when we are proud of our choice, glad to be associated with it, we are likely to affirm that choice when asked about it.
6. Acting upon choices. Where we have a value, it shows up in aspects of our living. . . . Nothing can be a value that does not, in fact, give direction to actual living. The person who talks about something but never does anything about it is dealing with something other than a value.
7. Repeating. Where something reaches the stage of a value, it is very likely to reappear on a number of occasions in the life of the person who holds it. It shows up in several different situations, at several different times. We would not think of something that appeared once in a life and never again as a value. Values tend to have a persistency, tend to make a pattern in a life.¹⁷

This writer believes that the mark of Dewey on these "criteria" in particular and on values clarification theory in general is beyond question. Furthermore, the "seven criteria" listed above have

¹⁷ Raths, et al., Values and Teaching, pp. 28-29.

remained intact since 1966, the one major exception being Howard Kirschenbaum's suggested modifications, which are discussed below.

KIRSCHENBAUM'S MODIFICATIONS OF VALUES CLARIFICATION THEORY

In 1973, Howard Kirschenbaum wrote:

Like many other approaches in the humanistic education field values clarification has grown up as a separate "movement" with its own terminology, concepts, and methods. Although I believe the approach, by itself, has a great deal to offer, over the last several years I have felt increasingly hamstrung by some of its theories and concepts. Many of my colleagues and students in this field have expressed similar misgivings.¹⁸

One of the major misgivings Kirschenbaum wrote of was that values clarification appeared to be primarily a cognitive process, to the neglect of affective components he saw as also being important in the valuing process.

In the summers of 1968 and 1969, we [Merrill Harmin, Sidney Simon and Kirschenbaum] began to introduce these communications exercises into our week-long values workshops. We made two big charts, headed "Values-Clarification Strategies" and "Feeling Strategies" (or "Emotional-Awareness Exercises"), and after the group had participated in or observed a particular strategy, we would write the name of the technique on the appropriate chart. The implication was that "values" was the primarily cognitive area and "feelings" was, of course, the affective area. . . . At the end of the workshop, we would offer a theory I had developed, based on an essay by Carl Rogers, for how the feeling area and the values area fit together.^{19,20}

¹⁸Howard Kirschenbaum, "Beyond Values Clarification," Readings in Values Clarification, ed. by Sidney B. Simon and Howard Kirschenbaum (Minneapolis: Winston Press, Inc., 1973), p. 92.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 94.

²⁰The essay referred to by Kirschenbaum is Carl R. Rogers, "A Modern Approach to the Valuing Process," Freedom to Learn (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1969).

Another misgiving that Kirschenbaum experienced related even more directly to the "seven criteria." He wrote of being uncomfortable with the whole notion of "criteria" to begin with. Kirschenbaum believed that the word "criteria" suggested specific standards or measures, but that the seven "criteria" of Raths, et al. were vague.

How proud must someone be of his belief in order to meet the prizing criteria? Very proud? Just a little proud? What about pleased? When does pleased turn into proud?

How many times must someone publicly affirm something in order to satisfy the fifth criteria? . . .

How many alternatives does one have to choose from before whoever is doing the judging tells me I have met the third criteria?

And how free does my choice have to be?

The argument becomes almost absurd. Of course no one can answer these questions. By using the word and the concept "criteria," we suggest that it is possible for someone . . . to judge whether or not a particular belief or behavior of someone else is a value. . . . Ironically, we become another type of moralizer, making people feel guilty because they haven't met this or that criterion on a given issue.²¹

Hence, Kirschenbaum prefers not to speak of "criteria," but of "processes" of valuing, "to emphasize that there are seven ways we develop and enrich the values in our lives. . . ." ²² This is a very important theoretical modification, for a number of reasons.

First of all, by changing from "criteria" to "processes," Kirschenbaum offers Raths et al. a way to extract themselves from the peculiar dilemma of on the one hand, claiming to clarify values,

²¹ Kirschenbaum, op. cit., p. 96.

²² Ibid., pp. 96-97.

while on the other hand, claiming that very few people probably have many values, because of the special nature of a value.

Secondly, Kirschenbaum's modification also gives rise to the question: "Well, if you no longer define a value by these seven criteria, how do you define it?" This point was investigated by the writer, and is reported upon later in the dissertation.

Finally, by switching from "criteria" to "processes," the emphasis falls upon valuing, as opposed to having values. That is, in the Raths system, wherein certain clarifying criteria were established, when those criteria were met you could be said to have a value. The process terminated when the criteria were fulfilled. In the Kirschenbaum system, however, the emphasis shifts to established clarifying processes, which are dynamic and ongoing. The process does not terminate, clarification is never fully achieved. There is always more to do.

And so, while the writer is sure that Raths would not see the notion of "criteria" as contributing to quiescence, it conceivably could if a person felt that they had met the seven criteria on a particular issue, and had no further need to seek clarification.

Kirschenbaum then attempted to augment the fourth criteria, "prizing and cherishing," arguing that its affective base needs to be broadened.

It seems clear that the affective realm, the feeling area, is one of the crucial ingredients in values clarification, and that the process by which one discovers what he prizes and cherishes is, in part, a deepening awareness of one's own

feelings. In Carl Rogers' terminology, it would be an "openness to our inner experience." And this included not only the positive experience, it involves the full gamut of human emotion.²³

Finally, Kirschenbaum isolated the fifth criterion, that of "public affirmation" for examination. He pointed out the very possible, perhaps even likely dilemma of two values in conflict because of this criteria, and offers the following illustrations.

What about the person who gives to charity but also holds a value of not publicly identifying himself as the donor? What about the many times in history when to publicly affirm one's beliefs on religion or politics would mean death or imprisonment or dismissal to the affirmer? What about the times when public affirmation would be hurtful to some individual or group that is also valued? In short, what happens when the value and benefits of public affirmation conflict with other values that need to be considered? Are there not times when it is inappropriate to publicly affirm one's values?²⁴

Kirschenbaum answered his own question in the affirmative: yes, there are times when it is inappropriate to publicly affirm a value.²⁵

But he did not want to do away with the idea entirely. He noted that, in practice, public affirmation had always been qualified by "when appropriate." "Ultimately," he wrote, "each person must decide for himself when not to publicly affirm is the better part of valor and when it is a cowardly cop-out."²⁶

He then went on to say that in their workshops in values clarification, "affirmation" had always seemed to be too strong a

²³ Ibid., p. 98.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 99.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 99.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 99.

word, that it had "connotations of rigidity and imposition." Instead, the word "sharing" seemed to convey

much more of the flavor for what we hope most discussions of values might become. It suggests more of an offering--we offer our value alternatives to others for their consideration. They are free to reject the offering, without our rejecting them. For these reasons, I have gradually begun to describe the fifth process of valuing as that of "appropriate sharing" instead of public affirmation.²⁷

With all of this groundwork laid, Kirschenbaum then offered an expanded version of the original seven criteria (now "processes"), which he feels more accurately described the essence of values clarification. Here, in a necessarily brief form, is his schematic:

THE VALUING PROCESS

I. Feeling

1. Being open to one's inner experience.
 - a. awareness of one's inner experience
 - b. acceptance of one's inner experience

II. Thinking

1. Thinking on all seven levels.
 - a. memory
 - b. translation
 - c. application
 - d. interpretation
 - e. analysis
 - f. synthesis
 - g. evaluation
2. Critical thinking.
 - a. distinguishing fact from opinion
 - b. distinguishing supported from unsupported arguments
 - c. analyzing propaganda, stereotypes, etc.
3. Logical thinking (logic).
4. Creative thinking.
5. Fundamental cognitive skills.
 - a. language use
 - b. mathematical skills
 - c. resource skills

III. Communicating--Verbally and Nonverbally

1. Sending clear messages.
2. Empathetic listening.
3. Drawing out.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 100.

4. Asking clarifying questions.
5. Giving and receiving feedback.
6. Conflict resolution.

IV. Choosing.

1. Generating and considering alternatives.
2. Thoughtfully considering consequences, pros and cons.
3. Choosing strategically.
 - a. goal setting
 - b. data gathering
 - c. problem solving
 - d. planning
4. Choosing freely.

V. Acting.

1. Acting with repetition.
2. Acting with a pattern and consistency.
3. Acting skillfully, competently.²⁸

Kirschenbaum wrote that each of the skills would contribute to a person living effectively in a society, and hence were not only valuing skills, but "life skills."²⁹ This expansion of the theory seems to this writer, to thrust values clarification into a much more general framework, a framework which is perhaps best described as "humanistic."

It is not clear, from a reading of the literature, if Kirschenbaum's reformulations have caught on amongst the other leaders in values clarification. The extent to which Kirschenbaum's modifications are used by the other leaders was one of the points investigated and reported upon later in this dissertation.

The writer believes that much of what Kirschenbaum has done is significant, and improves the theory. In many ways it just seems to "make sense." Who can dispute his elaborations on such

²⁸Ibid., pp. 105-106.

²⁹Ibid., p. 102.

categories as "Feeling," "Thinking," and "Communicating?" A person looks at them, and feels compelled to say: "Yes. That's right."

Yet the writer wonders: has such an expansion gone beyond expanding the original theory into transforming it into something else? The answer to that, at this point in time, is unclear. Perhaps in the natural evolution of any idea there comes a time when it must branch out in new directions, which seem to be quite different in many ways from the old. In any event, it is clear to the writer that this is a consideration which will have to extend beyond the bounds of this dissertation, in both scope and in time.

THE GOALS OF VALUES CLARIFICATION

What does values clarification do? Why is it important? Why are clear values desirable? How would a person with "clear" values differ from a person with "unclear" values?

To answer these questions, we must turn again to Rath. Once again it is his original arguments on the subject which continue to provide the basis for discussion and research in the area.

To begin with, Rath sees the world of children as one filled with confusion and conflict.

The many and conflicting patterns of life to which our children are exposed, the lack of a strongly integrated community, the reduced impact of the family and the church, the deterioration of the relationship between education and virtue, the world-wide upheavals, all point to the realm of values as a needed research in curriculum.³⁰

An entire chapter in Values and Teaching, entitled "The Difficulty of Developing Values," serves as a more extended argument that the

³⁰ Rath, "Clarifying Values," p. 319.

world of the child is often bewildering and confusing, with the result being confused and bewildered values.³¹

What can help the child deal with such value problems? Certainly not traditional approaches to values, argues Rath. Such approaches as "setting an example," "persuading and convincing," "limiting choices," "inspiring," "rules and regulations," "cultural or religious dogma," and "appeals to conscience," cannot lead to values as Rath defines them, "values that represent the free and thoughtful choice of intelligent humans interacting with complex and changing environments."³²

Where then does all of this lead? What happens to a child, if Rath is correct in saying that the world is full of confusion and conflict, and that traditional means for values education are ineffectual? Rath answers by suggesting that we begin by looking at the *field* of health, and draw an analogy from it.

We may get a starting direction by examining the concept of health, that is physical health. It is almost impossible to *define* the term so that it has practical meaning for an individual. . . . Suppose, however, we ask about deviations from *health*? About sickness? Here we secure a much greater amount of agreement. In the area of values, by analogy, we would not seek to identify the values of children. Instead, we would ask: When children have not developed values, how might it show up in their behavior? And, if there is a widespread lack of value development in our culture, might the symptoms vary, and wouldn't many children be afflicted?³³

³¹ Rath, et al., Values and Teaching, Chapter Two.

³² Ibid., pp. 39-40.

³³ Rath, "Clarifying Values," p. 319.

Raths then offered a list of eight types of persistent behaviors which he sees as symptomatic of the lack of values.

1. Children who are apathetic, listless, dull. . . .
2. Extremely flighty children. . . .
3. Children who are extreme over-conformers. . . .
4. Nagging dissenters. . . .
5. Persistent, continuing, under-achievement. . . .
6. The Role-Players and Poseurs. . . .
7. Extreme hesitancy, doubt, uncertainty. . . .
8. Very, very inconsistent children. . . .³⁴

Be that as it may, however, some people would still argue that values are the realm of the home or the church, and if a child lacks clear values, then the situation should be remedied there and not in the schools. But Raths rejects the idea that values have no place in the school, and returns to his mentor, Dewey, for support.

I think we must assume that the school, like every other institution, has some responsibility in this matter. We are, therefore, back to Dewey's idea that the function of social institutions and arrangements is to help create personality; that in association with young learners, we should be helping them to arrive at a sense of discrimination, a basis for making choices that are relevant to the worth of their lives.³⁵

Thus it is that Raths and others involved in values clarification see a world full of confusion and conflict, with the results clearly identifiable through certain behavior patterns, and they want to do something about it.

We believe that we have the means for identifying many of the children who are having difficulty in forming values and, having identified them, we have found that teachers can do a great deal about the problem. It need not plague the child throughout his life. On many occasions we are going to need help from the family, from other teachers, and perhaps from a counselor, but . . . the main burden in this confused and

³⁴ Ibid., pp. 323-325.

³⁵ Ibid., pp. 325-326.

confusing world can be borne by the classroom teachers of America.³⁶

Raths, et al. believe that if certain values clarifying techniques are used, children who are apathetic, listless, flighty, etc. can be helped to move towards the opposite end of the behavior continuum, to a point where:

Each seems to be dealing with life in a consistent and purposeful way. We talk to a few and each appears to know what he wants in life and how to work for it. Although in somewhat different styles, each person . . . seems to relate to the forces and events and persons around him with considerable verve, purpose, and pride. . . . If we seek words to describe the persons who live their lives at this extreme point on the . . . continuum, we think of positive, purposeful, enthusiastic, proud.

All is not so rosy at the other end of the line.³⁷

Kirschenbaum, in his 1973 essay, also believes that clear values would lead an individual to be a more effective member of society as a whole, thus interjecting a note of social consciousness into the approach's outcomes.³⁸

How is this to be done? How are values clarified? This is the **topic** for exploration in the following section.

THE METHOD OF VALUES CLARIFICATION

Values Clarification Strategies

In the writer's opinion, it is the methodology of values clarification which has brought it its tremendous popularity.

³⁶ Raths, et al., Values and Teaching, p. 26.

³⁷ Ibid., pp. 4-5.

³⁸ Kirschenbaum, "Beyond Values Clarification," p. 102.

Surely the underlying theory and rationale has attracted much attention, but it is the practice of values clarification, its hundreds of examples which can be put to use in the classroom, that has catapulted it to a position of national prominence in education.

As with the rest of values clarification, it is to Rath that we must turn for information regarding early values clarification techniques. As early as 1959, there was evidence of what might well be called the first values clarification "strategy," the "clarifying response."

We must talk man to man with children about their purposes, interests, attitudes, beliefs, aspirations, feelings, activities and ways of thinking. We must ask children intelligent questions for which only they have the answers. One or two questions at any one time, involving not more than two or three minutes, would be the maximum. The child's answers would always be accepted with a comment, suggesting that he had now made it plain, that you understand better what he said. He leaves this brief encounter in a thoughtful mood.³⁹

Seven years later, an entire chapter in Values and Teaching was devoted to the explanation of the clarifying response. Rath, et al. offer, in that volume, this concise description of the clarifying response:⁴⁰

Fundamentally, the responding strategy is a way of responding to a student that results in his considering what he has chosen, what he prizes and/or what he is doing. It stimulates him to clarify his thinking and behavior and thus to clarify his values; it encourages him to think about them.⁴¹

³⁹Raths, "Values are Fundamental," Childhood Education, February, 1959, p. 247.

⁴⁰Raths, et al., Values and Teaching, Chapter Five.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 51.

The authors offer this as a typical example of when and how a clarifying response can be used:

A student says that he is planning to go to college after high school. A teacher who replies, "Good for you," or "Which college?", or "Well, I hope you make it," is probably going to serve purposes other than value clarity. But were the teacher to respond, "Have you considered any alternatives?", the goal of value clarity may well be advanced. The "alternatives" response is likely to stimulate thinking about the issue and, if he decides to go to college, that decision is likely to be closer to a value than it was before. It may contribute a little toward moving a college student from the position of going because "it's the thing to do" to going because he wants to get something out of it.⁴²

The authors then go on to offer a list of thirty possible clarifying responses, as well as a list of ten criteria to be used in judging the effectiveness and appropriateness of a clarifying response.⁴³

It has been the experience of this writer, that the *clarifying* response, as such, has for the most part fallen into *disuse*, **at** least in the workshops presented to teachers by leaders such as **Harmin**, Simon and Kirschenbaum. Clarifying questions are **certainly** still asked, but usually as a part of a different strategy **or** technique, and not as part of an unplanned encounter with **another** person. There is nothing in the literature (except perhaps **by** the fact that the clarifying response is, for the most part, **omitted** from the recent literature) which would either support **or** refute my position. However, reference is made to the clarifying response in the interview with Sidney B. Simon, which is discussed in Chapter 4, and is reprinted in the Appendix.

⁴²Ibid., p. 52.

⁴³Ibid., pp. 53-65.

Probably the second strategy invented by Rath was the "values sheet," which also has an entire chapter devoted to it in Values and Teaching.⁴⁴ In this strategy, a short, written and provocative statement is given to the student, with several clarifying questions regarding the statement posed at its end. Such a statement is usually not longer than several paragraphs. The questions asked, are quite similar to those used in a clarifying response, in that they are designed to encourage the student to explore alternatives, how he feels about a particular position, or how he is acting or would act under similar circumstances.

The values sheet has been one of the most adaptable of the values clarification strategies. Nearly any typical newspaper, for example, will yield at least one story suitable for use as a values sheet. Teachers in different subject areas can easily adapt some of their written materials to a values sheet format. Values sheets can be very simple, or complex, depending upon the age of the children, reading ability, and so on. The activity is repeatable, because of the endless array of situations available.

Raths, et al. offer a list of ten topics which they feel are rich in terms of values possibilities, and encourage the teacher to create his or her own values sheets. Possible topics include:

⁴⁴ Ibid., Chapter Six.

⁴⁵ Ibid., pp. 105-106.

1. Money, how it is apportioned and treated.
2. Friendship, how one relates to those around him.
3. Love and sex, how one deals with intimate relationships.
4. Religion and morals, what one holds as fundamental beliefs.
5. Leisure, how it is used.
6. Politics and social organization, especially as it affects the individual.
7. Work, vocational choices, attitudes toward work.
8. Family, and how one behaves within it.
9. Maturity, what one strives for.
10. Character traits, especially as they affect one's behavior.⁴⁵

The Three-Level Curriculum

No discussion of the methodology of values clarification would be complete, however, without bringing in a particular curricular theory which attempts to meld values clarification with subject matter areas. Even before Values and Teaching was published, Simon and Harmin, in 1965, published an article which set forth a curricular model which involves three levels of subject matter.^{46,47} They describe these three different levels thus:

Level I. This is subject matter composed of facts, details, and specifics. Such subject matter we submit is difficult to remember, of little interest to most students and of little use even if it is remembered. It does, however, and unfortunately, provide the stuff for much of the teaching going on in America's classrooms today.

Level II. This subject matter goes beyond specifics and moves towards generalizations. A generalization is here defined as a statement of a relationship between concepts, or generalized attributes of things.

.....

⁴⁵ Ibid., pp. 105-106.

⁴⁶ Raths, et al., Values and Teaching.

⁴⁷ Merrill Harmin and Sidney B. Simon, "The Subject Matter Controversy Revisited," Peabody Journal of Education, 42, 4 (January, 1965), pp. 194-205.

Level III. This subject matter is restricted to those generalizations that in some way touch the personal life of the student, his interests, concerns, or feelings. . . . Unlike Level II, which may only involve the student intellectually, Level III often affects his emotions, attitudes, or values and is more directly concerned with helping him discover his own personal way of living a richer, happier, more productive life.⁴⁸

The authors then go on to describe the sample lessons, one each in social studies, English, and science, using the three levels, which they name "Fact-oriented" (Level I), "Generalization-oriented" (Level II), and "Value-oriented" (Level III).⁴⁹

Harmin and Simon end their article with an appeal for more teachers to "risk the uncharted seas of Level II and Level III lessons." They feel that "the rewards in zest, increased productivity, and the sense that it adds up to something significant in teaching makes the bumps and bruises all very worth while."⁵⁰

Since 1965, numerous articles have appeared on the use of values clarification in practically every conceivable subject matter area, including the humanities, English, foreign language, ecology, agriculture, science, biology, health, art, geography, home economics, music and so on. Most of these ideas have been pulled together by Simon, Harmin and Kirschenbaum in their 1973 book, Clarifying Values through Subject Matter: Applications for the Classroom.⁵¹

⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 198-199.

⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 199-200.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 204.

⁵¹ Merrill Harmin, Howard Kirschenbaum, and Sidney B. Simon, Clarifying Values through Subject Matter: Applications for the Classroom (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973).

The three level curriculum appears to be of considerable use. It can certainly inject interest into those classrooms where the norm is to deal only with facts; and where there is interest, children can learn more. Secondly, it serves as a useful device for teachers who are interested in dealing with values, but feel that it must somehow relate to their particular area of responsibility. This may be especially true of so-called, cut-and-dried areas like science.

Those two reasons are certainly enough, in the eyes of this writer to justify the existence of this particular curriculum design. It has not, however, in this writer's opinion, had the impact on classroom teaching that the specific values clarification strategies have had.

CRITICISMS OF VALUES CLARIFICATION

No educational innovation which has reached the popular proportions that values clarification has, could possibly exist without **having** stirred some criticism. In the last several years, criticisms of values clarification have been advanced from a number of quite **different** sources, from groups like the John Birch Society, other **right-wing** political groups and fundamentalist religious organizations, to persons and groups involved in educational psychology and philosophy.

The writer has identified seven major criticisms of values clarification each of which will be presented as succinctly as possible, and in turn be analyzed critically. The writer wants

to make it clear, however, that his intention as a responder to the various charges is not that of a defender or vindicator of values clarification, but rather that of a clarifier and questioner.

The seven major criticisms of values clarification identified by the writer are reflected in the work of four scholars: John S. Stewart, Alan L. Lockwood, Lawrence Kohlberg and Milton Rokeach. While other critics of values clarification exist, the writer has chosen to focus upon the arguments of these four writers because of the significance of their criticisms, the responsible nature in which they are presented, and the fact that their arguments are representative of the vast majority of critics of values clarification. The writer has chosen to ignore, at this point, criticisms from members of right-wing political or fundamentalist religious groups, because of the difficulty involved in ascertaining their logic, due to the characteristically high degree of emotion which seems to be contained in their attacks on values clarification.

The four critics who were chosen basically represent two schools of thought within values education. Stewart, Lockwood and Kohlberg are identified with "moral reasoning" or "cognitive moral development." Rokeach is identified with the "inculcation" orientation. Prior to investigating the seven criticisms of values clarification represented in the remarks of these thinkers, it seems appropriate that their own values education approaches be outlined briefly, so that the differences between them and the values clarification approach might become more apparent. These outlines will be quite abbreviated, and by no means are they

designed to represent the entirety of each approach and their own peculiar complexities.

Moral Reasoning and Development Approach

This approach grows out of the work of Lawrence Kohlberg and his associates, including Stewart and Lockwood.

Kohlberg postulates that there are six cross-cultural and sequential stages in the development of moral reasoning. The purpose of the values educator is "to help students develop more complex moral reasoning patterns based on a higher set of values," and "to urge students to discuss the reasons for their value choices and positions, not merely to share with others, but to foster change in the stages of moral reasoning of students." This is done primarily through the use of hypothetical moral dilemmas, with students encouraged to argue and confront one another in non-destructive ways. The role of the teacher is to help focus and guide the discussions.⁵²

Inculcation Approach

Advocates of the inculcation approach believe that certain values exist which are desirable, and that the responsibility of educators is to instill these values in students.

⁵²Douglas P. Superka, Christine Ahrens, Judith E. Hedstrom, Luther J. Ford, and Patricia L. Johnson, Values Education Source-book: Conceptual Approaches, Materials Analyses, and an Annotated Bibliography (Boulder, Colorado: Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., 1976), pp. 4-5, 31-35. This book is also listed in Resources in Education, and can be obtained in microfiche and hard copy from the ERIC Document Reproduction Services identified as SO 008 489.

Superka, et al. identify the chief teaching methodologies of the inculcation approach as follows: "modeling; positive and negative reinforcement; mocking; nagging; manipulating alternatives; providing incomplete or biased data; games and simulations; role playing; discovery learning."⁵³

Rokeach believes that each institution in society has the responsibility to inculcate certain values into individuals. He argues that the educational institution has the obligation to inculcate "educational values," such as the "terminal values" of "a sense of accomplishment, self-respect, wisdom and freedom," and the "instrumental values" of being "responsible, capable, broadminded and intellectual."⁵⁴

The Seven Major Criticisms of Values Clarification

The seven major criticisms of values clarification which the writer isolated and identified are as follows:

1. Values clarification deals with "content" to the neglect of "structure." (Stewart.)
2. Values clarification relies unduly upon peer pressure in many of its activities. (Stewart.)
3. Values clarification is a form of "therapy," claims to the contrary notwithstanding. (Lockwood.)

⁵³Ibid., pp. 4-5, 7-13.

⁵⁴Milton Rokeach, "Toward a Philosophy of Value Education," Values Education, Theory/Practice/Problems/Prospects, ed. by John Meyer, Brian Burnham and John Cholvat (Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1975), pp. 117-118.

4. Values clarification utilizes a poor definition of a "value." (Lockwood, Rokeach.)
5. Values clarification claims values neutrality, but in actuality teaches values. (Stewart, Rokeach.)
6. Values clarification fails to treat "moral" issues adequately. (Kohlberg.)
7. Values clarification is "ethically" or "morally relativistic." (Stewart, Lockwood, Kohlberg and Rokeach.)

In the following seven sub-sections, the writer will attempt to present and explore each of these criticisms.

"Content," not "structure." In the June, 1975, issue of the Phi Delta Kappan, Stewart wrote:

Perhaps a good place to begin is to deal with the superficiality of Values Clarification [sic]. Why isn't it enough? Because, I believe, it deals primarily with the content of values and somewhat with the process of valuing, but ignores the most important aspect of the issue--namely, the structure of values and valuing.⁵⁵

Stewart goes on to write that in its simplest terms, content and structure may be described respectively as the "what" and the "why" of an answer to a moral or value question expressed by a person.⁵⁶ He concludes by writing:

A survey of the VC strategies and methods reveals the content focus, and also reveals the superficiality, banality, and triviality of a great deal of the questions, issues, and activities VC deals with.⁵⁷

⁵⁵John S. Stewart, "Clarifying Values Clarification: A Critique," Phi Delta Kappan, 56, 10 (June, 1975), p. 684.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 684.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 684.

As with each of the seven criticisms to be dealt with, two questions must be posed about Stewart's charge. First, is the criticism accurate, and if so, is the criticism important or significant?

Before responding to the accuracy of Stewart's criticism, however, the writer believes that there is an aspect of the "content-structure" dichotomy which needs to be spoken to. The writer believes that the "content-structure" dichotomy is one with ill-defined boundaries. It is quite possible for both content and structure to be dealt with simultaneously, and perhaps even unconsciously in values education. The two terms might better be represented by a continuum than by an either-or proposition. Be that as it may, does values clarification, in fact, deal primarily with content to the neglect of structure as Stewart contends?

When Rath, et al. first outlined values clarification theory and methodology, they wrote: "For us, it is less important to know that a person values something, than it is to know how he arrived at that 'value.'"⁵⁸ From this statement, it is clear that the intent of values clarification was to focus primarily on structure and not on content. In practice, it may be that values clarification deals with structure and content in an even-handed manner, with essentially equal emphasis placed upon both of them. Furthermore, valid questions may be raised with respect to Stewart's contention that structure is the "most important aspect of the

⁵⁸Rath, et al., Values and Teaching, p. 206.

issue." It may readily be argued that content can also lay claim to importance. It matters that a person values racial justice, perhaps as much as it matters why he does so.

Values clarification relies unduly upon peer pressure.

Stewart also charges that:

Considerably more important than VC's superficiality is its reliance on peer pressure and a tendency toward coercion to the mean in many activities. In spite of the emphasis on individuality and the many statements in the VC literature about avoiding peer pressures, many of the strategies and the social aspects of the methodology are highly conducive to peer pressure, especially among highly sensitive teen-agers and even adults who are particularly attuned to the judgments of others. The emphasis on frequent public affirmation of positions, for example, carries this danger.⁶⁰

No system of values education is going to eradicate peer pressure. The proponents of values clarification realize this, and as Stewart points out, make numerous statements about how to minimize its effects. It is not clear that Stewart, because of the possibility of peer pressure, would attempt to avoid any program of values education with teen-agers, yet such a position might appear to derive logically from his concern.

Moreover, in view of the ubiquity of peer pressure, it might be that a system of values education wherein the phenomena of peer pressure could be dealt with openly would be beneficial. Values clarification offers such a possibility, for one of the basic tenets of values clarification involves "free choice." A person who chooses something as a result of peer pressure cannot

⁵⁹Stewart, op. cit., p. 684.

⁶⁰Ibid., pp. 684-685.

be said to have made a free choice. Explicitly helping teen-agers consider if their choices are indeed freely made, can perhaps help them learn to examine peer pressure explicitly and the degree to which it may affect their decisions.

In any case, both in theory and in its suggested guidelines for practice, values clarification does not appear to rely on or encourage peer pressure. On the contrary, values clarification offers a mechanism by which peer pressure can be explicitly discussed and explored, and quite possible be mitigated as a result.

Values clarification is "therapy." Of the four critics cited in this section of Chapter 2, only Alan Lockwood criticizes values clarification as "therapy." He compares the problems dealt with, the goals, and the methodologies of Rogers' Client-Centered Therapy and values clarification, and declares that they are essentially identical.⁶¹

Lockwood feels that the declaration that values clarification is a form of therapy is very important.

The claim that values clarification is a form of client-centered therapy is significant in a number of ways. First, it asserts that, in spite of their protestations, practitioners of values clarification are employing a treatment which may fairly be called therapy. Advocates of values clarification should clarify their position on this point, especially since they feel that therapy is inappropriate for the problems they are treating. Second, the effective psychological processes stimulated by values clarification should not be characterized as rational-intellectual. The processes stimulated by successful client-centered therapy would best be characterized as emotional-affective. Finally, casting values education curricula in the mold of therapy, with its primary emphasis

⁶¹ Alan L. Lockwood, "A Critical View of Values Clarification," Teachers College Record, 77, 1 (September, 1975), pp. 40-44.

on personal dysfunction, unnecessarily restricts the range of objectives, issues, and questions which may be encompassed by values education curricula.⁶²

The central problem with Lockwood's criticism hinges upon the meaning to be ascribed to the word: "therapy." Common usage of the word suggests an intervention of some sort, into a situation where something is wrong, either a bodily dysfunction (as physical therapy tries to correct), or a mental dysfunction (as psychotherapy tries to correct). In any event, it is generally understood that therapy is used with persons who are ill in some manner, and are different from "healthy" or "normal" people.

While a reading of Values and Teaching may suggest that values clarification is designed to be used only with those who exhibit non-valuing behaviors (apathetic, listless, flighty, etc.), the leaders in values clarification currently believe that values confusion is universal, and not confined to certain individuals.⁶³

It is the hope of those involved in this new work that all students will learn the process during their years in school. It seems ultimately important that every human being be given the opportunity to become clearer about what he or she wants, is living for, and may perhaps die for.

Every man, woman and child needs help in trying to make sense out of the confusion and conflict of today's world.⁶⁴
(Italics added.)

In the sense, therefore, that "therapy" refers to procedures designed to be applied only to a specific, "abnormal" population, the

⁶²Ibid., pp. 45-56.

⁶³Raths, et al., Values and Teaching.

⁶⁴Sidney B. Simon and Polly deSherbinin, "Values Clarification: It Can Start Gently and Grow Deep," Phi Delta Kappan, 56, 10 (June, 1975), p. 680.

•

•

10

•

• • •

• •

• •

•

10

10

10

•

5

•

• •

1

•

—

writer feels that Lockwood's criticism is not valid. Values clarification procedures are not designed for abnormality--they are designed for Everyman.

But there is another sense of the word "therapy," which does involve practically a universal population. Many medical doctors, for example, feel that most Americans are physically degenerated, and could use much more exercise in their lives and a much more careful regulation of their dietary habits. In one sense, prescribing a physical fitness program could be described as a therapeutic intervention, an attempt to return people to some "ideal" or "normal" physical state. It is abnormal, in this sense, to be physically unfit, even if ninety percent of the people in America are that way. Doctors are making the value judgment that it is "bad" to be physically unfit.

Is it "bad" not to have clear values? In Values and Teaching, that very question is dealt with.

It depends upon what one means by "bad." For a person in a period of great change . . . few values may exist. For those in a more stable portion of life, one might expect some patterns of life to have been worked out based on free choice, understanding, and pride. If this has not happened, one would suspect that such a person is operating at a lower level of life than need be.

But, especially for children, the crucial question is not how many values one has or what those values are, but what process a person uses when faced with value-related decisions.

... We would be inclined to say that, from our set of values, it is "bad" not to use the valuing process.⁶⁵

⁶⁵ Rath, et al., Values and Teaching, p. 194.

Thus, in the sense that values clarification attempts to offer remedy for an essentially universal malady, it can be said to be a form of "therapy." (However, in using such an argument as this it can be said that in some schools where children consistently have problems learning to compute, any attempts to help them with their mathematics skills could also be labeled as "therapy.")

For the sake of argument, then, the writer will assume that, in a limited sense, values clarification is a form of therapy and that Lockwood is correct in so calling it. Is this an important criticism?

As mentioned above, Lockwood believes that such a criticism is significant in three ways. To begin with, Lockwood feels that because the advocates of values clarification feel so strongly that values clarification should not be used for therapy, and because values clarification is therapy, that a basic inconsistency exists which has not been dealt with.⁶⁶

Lockwood argues that the "unmet emotional needs" identified by Rath, et al., which are supposedly not to be treated by values clarification, are virtually indistinguishable from the "unmet values needs" which values clarification supposedly does treat.⁶⁷ Indeed, Rath, et al. have written:

It is important, regardless of what measuring system is used, to eliminate from the list of value-related behavioral

⁶⁶Lockwood, op. cit., p. 45.

⁶⁷Ibid., p. 41.

problem cases all those who suffer from physical or emotional disturbances, for those disturbances need treatment other than value clarifying. . . . Children in need of physical or emotional treatment should be helped to get those first. Until a child feels emotionally secure, for instance, value-clarifying experiences are probably of little benefit and may even add to his disturbances.⁶⁸

Raths, et al. later write that "the behavior patterns associated with unmet needs are usually distinguishable from those associated with unclear values."⁶⁹ Thus, it should be quite evident as to when values clarification can be appropriately used and when it cannot.

Lockwood, however, believes that it is very difficult to distinguish between the symptomologies of unmet values needs and unmet emotional needs, as characterized by values clarification proponents. He compares the two thusly:

Symptoms of
Unmet Emotional Needs

Aggression
Withdrawal
Submission
Regression to an
earlier age
Psychosomatic illness

Symptoms of
Unmet Values Needs

Overdissension
Apathy
Overconformity
Flightiness
Indecisiveness
Pretending/role-playing⁷⁰

Lockwood concludes that "This symptomology makes it difficult to determine if values clarification is treating emotional needs or value needs."⁷¹

⁶⁸Raths, et al., Values and Teaching, p. 182.

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 200.

⁷⁰Lockwood, op. cit., p. 41.

⁷¹Ibid., p. 41.

The writer feels compelled to agree with Lockwood. While trained psychologists may be able to distinguish between values needs and emotional needs as described above, few classroom teachers would likely be able to do so. Lockwood's criticism on this point warrants further investigation. The writer has asked each of the experts interviewed to respond to the question: "Is values clarification 'therapy?'" Their responses can be found in the Appendix and are discussed in Chapter 4.

Lockwood further feels that his criticism of values clarification as therapy is significant because as such, it deals primarily with "emotional-affective" processes and not, as its proponents claim, with primarily "rational-intellectual" processes.⁷²

While values clarification historically has claimed to be more cognitively oriented (but with an explicit recognition of the role and importance of the affect), in the eyes of this writer values clarification, in practice, has grown to be more affectively oriented over the years. This belief is based on the writer's personal experience as participant in a large number of values clarification workshops over the past several years. It is what led the writer to ask each of the experts interviewed: "Is values clarification more affective in nature now than it was ten years ago?" The responses to this question may be found in the Appendix and are discussed in Chapter 4. The writer feels that Lockwood may have a valid claim, but will withhold judgment until Chapter 4.

⁷²Ibid., p. 45.

Finally, Lockwood feels that his criticism of values clarification as therapy is significant because as such, it deals primarily with "personal" value problems, and neglects "interpersonal" value problems. Because of its overwhelming personal nature, Lockwood concluded that values clarification represents an "ethically relativistic" position.⁷³ His charge of relativism will be responded to later, when this writer attempts to explore not only his charges of relativism, but also those of Stewart, Kohlberg and Rokeach.

Values clarification relies upon a poor definition of a "value." Both Lockwood and Rokeach assail the definition of a "value" as described in Values and Teaching.⁷⁴ Lockwood believes that the definition reflects certain theoretical inadequacies. He claims that the definition is poor (1) because it arbitrarily distinguishes between values and such things as attitudes, beliefs, interests, and so on; (2) because it is unrealistic to expect a person to always be able to meet the seven criteria; (3) because it gives no guides as to what actions should follow a particular value; (4) because it fails to deal with the possibility of a person holding conflicting values; and (5) because the definition erroneously leads people to believe that only through values clarification can a person become "positive, purposeful, enthusiastic and proud."⁷⁵

⁷³Ibid., p. 46.

⁷⁴Raths, et al., Values and Teaching, pp. 28-30.

⁷⁵Lockwood, op. cit., pp. 37-40.

Rokeach objects to the "all or none" quality of the definition of a "value" put forth by Raths, et al. in Values and Teaching.⁷⁶

Such an all-or-none conception makes it difficult to think in terms of such notions as value importance, value hierarchy, value priority, or value conflict. More important, it makes value measurement virtually meaningless and, consequently, comparisons with others impossible.⁷⁷

The writer finds it difficult to respond to these criticisms because it is unclear at this point if the leaders in values clarification continue to define a "value" in the same way as it was defined in Values and Teaching ten years ago.⁷⁸ When Kirschenbaum suggested in his 1973 essay that "processes" better represented the theory than "criteria," in effect he also said that he no longer defined a "value" through the seven criteria. He offered no definition in its stead.⁷⁹ Furthermore, the extent to which others in values clarification have assumed Kirschenbaum's position in regard to "criteria" is not entirely clear. The extent to which various experts agree with Kirschenbaum's reformulations, as well as how each of them defines a "value" was a topic of conversation in the interviews conducted, and information pertinent to this criticism is therefore to be found in the Appendix and in Chapter 4. In any event Lockwood's and Rokeach's criticisms may

⁷⁶Raths, et al., loc cit.

⁷⁷Rokeach, "Toward a Philosophy of Value Education," pp. 123-124.

⁷⁸Raths, et al., loc cit.

⁷⁹Kirschenbaum, "Beyond Values Clarification."

be criticisms of a definition which is no longer current or which is currently in process of reformulation.

Values clarification claims neutrality, but actually teaches certain values. Stewart and Rokeach believe that the advocates of values clarification claim "values neutrality," but are actually encouraging certain values. Rokeach has written:

Value clarification's insistence about value neutrality notwithstanding, an examination of its basic tenets suggests that it nonetheless has certain value commitments that remain silent, and that it moreover attempts through the back door to inculcate students with these values.⁸⁰

The values which Rokeach feels that values clarification attempts to inculcate into students are things like broadmindedness, a futuristic time perspective, independence, self-awareness, courage, logical consistency, and reliability.⁸¹ Finally, he concludes that:

All these refer to values that are not all that different from those that I have empirically identified as educational values. But a question remains: Is it not value-obfuscating rather than value-clarifying to teach such values through the back door, and at the same time give the impression of value neutrality through the front door?⁸²

Stewart echoes many of Rokeach's concerns:

. . . the judgmental nature of values clarification is pervasive. The creators have built a methodology based on their own values, which are frequently in conflict. They claim value-neutrality with regard to the content of the methodology, but fail to see that their own values are built into the methodology.⁸³

⁸⁰Rokeach, op. cit., p. 123.

⁸¹Ibid., p. 123.

⁸²Ibid., p. 123.

⁸³Stewart, "Clarifying Values Clarification," p. 685.

The proponents of values clarification have never attempted however, to hide the fact that certain values are built into the values clarification process. They have written that in certain instances where a teacher's expression of his or her value may unduly influence students, it may be more appropriate for the teacher to remain totally neutral. Furthermore, the emphasis is upon each child's process of valuing, and not the content of the value. Finally, the authors of Values and Teaching have stated point blank that "from our set of values, it is 'bad' not to use the valuing processes."⁸⁴ In other words, Rath, et al. admit that they "value" the process of values clarification, and admit that their values are a part of it.

Kirschenbaum, et al. issue similar responses to the charge of values neutrality. They believe that in a limited sense, values clarification does attempt to be value free.

. . . when discussing value-laden area and controversial issues, the value clarifying teacher or parent accepts all viewpoints and does not try to impose his or her own views (although these may be "shared"). In that sense, the approach is "value free," and we can honestly say to parents that we are not trying to impose any set of values, but rather teach a valuing process.⁸⁵

However, they go on to say:

No matter what their viewpoint, all students are asked further clarifying questions. All are encouraged to keep

⁸⁴Rath, et al., Values and Teaching, pp. 193-194.

⁸⁵Howard Kirschenbaum, Merrill Harmin, Leland Howe, and Sidney B. Simon, "In Defense of Values Clarification: A Position Paper" (Saratoga Springs, N.Y.: National Humanistic Education Center, 1975), p. 4. (Mimeographed.)

developing their values through the use of the valuing processes. And it should be clear from the process that values clarification definitely promotes the value of choosing, prizing and acting, or if one prefers, thinking, feeling, choosing, communicating, and acting. Thinking critically is regarded as better than choosing impulsively or thoughtlessly. Choosing freely is considered better than yielding passively to authority or peer pressure. And so on.⁸⁶

Only in a very narrow and explicit sense, therefore, can values clarification be considered to be value free. Looking at the process as a whole, however, one finds that the proponents of values clarification do not claim value neutrality, and are, on the contrary, quite willing to admit that they do encourage certain values, and to identify what those values are.

Values clarification fails to treat "moral" issues adequately. Kohlberg distinguishes between "morals" and "values," and hence also between "moral education" and "values education." He feels that values clarification fails to discriminate between "morals" and "values," and the result is that values clarification ends up in a "relativistic" posture. While moral issues concern "fairness or justice," values issues do not, and therefore Kohlberg feels that the two cannot and should not be treated in the same manner.⁸⁷

Kohlberg is correct in stating that values clarification has not distinguished between "values" and "morals." Whether or

⁸⁶Ibid., p. 4.

⁸⁵Lawrence Kohlberg, "The Relationship of Moral Education to the Broader Field of Values Education," Values Education, Theory/Practice/Problems/Prospects, ed. by John Meyer, Brian Burnham and John Cholvat (Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1975), pp. 79-82.

not this relegates values clarification to a relativistic position, as Kohlberg contends, will be discussed in the following section. The writer has, in his interviews with the various experts consulted for this study, asked each of them for their definitions of "morals" and "values," and in some cases, have asked them to respond to Kohlberg's criticism. The answers of the experts may be found in the Appendix, and are discussed in Chapter 4.

Values clarification is "relativistic." All of the critics cited thus far have either explicitly or implicitly labeled values clarification "culturally" or "ethically relativistic." Because of the apparent unanimity of this view among critics of values clarification, and because of the seriousness of the charge, this criticism is probably the most important of the seven criticisms dealt with in this chapter.

Stewart has written:

Of the criticisms made against Values Clarification, probably none is made more frequently or more loudly than the charge that it is inadequate, ineffective, and possibly even dangerous because of its basic moral relativism.⁸⁸

While not explicitly using the term "relativistic" to describe values clarification, Rokeach nonetheless implicitly agrees with Stewart.

Proponents of the values clarification movement advocate a form of value education that cannot readily be identified either as substantive value education or as the inculcation of educational values. . . . The values that they would like to help students "find" are private, subjective, and not comparable from one individual or group to another. Little or no consideration is given to the cultural, societal or

⁸⁸Stewart, "Clarifying Values Clarification," p. 686.

institutional origins that shape the values of large numbers of people in similar ways, or to the fact that a basic property of human values is that they are shared, or to the fact that there is an intimate connection between institutional and individual values.⁸⁹

Kohlberg believes that,

In the general area of values . . . I believe that we must adopt a relativistic stand about decisions, i.e., we should be engaged in developing valuing processes in some sense without worrying about what conclusions come out or what the principles used are.

But this is not the case in the area of morality.⁹⁰

Finally, Lockwood, of the four critics, has devoted the most in his writings relative to this concern about values clarification. He uses the term "ethical relativism" to describe the moral position of values clarification, and explains the term as follows:

In its simplest definition, ethical relativism holds that one person's values are as good as another's: everyone is entitled to his own opinion; and when it comes to morality, there is no way of showing one opinion is better than another.⁹¹

Lockwood believes that the charge of relativism is significant in a number of ways. First, while the values clarifiers seem to be suggesting that "tolerance" is desirable, they would also have to tolerate people who choose "intolerance." Secondly, the relativistic nature of values clarification does not allow for the constructive resolution of inter-personal value conflicts, since all values are seen as of equal worth.⁹² Lockwood concludes by writing:

⁸⁹Rokeach, op. cit., p. 122.

⁹⁰Kohlberg, op. cit., p. 80.

⁹¹Lockwood, "A Critical View of Values Clarification," p. 47.

⁹²Ibid., p. 48.

. . . a program of value education which devotes its attention to questions of personal preference and desires presents a truncated and myopic view of morality. A program which avoids the controversies associated with value conflict, conflict resolution, and moral justification trivializes the complexity of value issues in human affairs. Second, a value education program which, perhaps unwittingly, is grounded in ethical relativism must accept the possibility that its students will embrace ethical relativism as their moral point of view--clearly an achievement of dubious merit.⁹³

Kirschenbaum et al. have attempted to respond to this very serious charge of "relativism." Much of their reasoning as to why they believe values clarification is not relativistic is related to their arguments as to why values clarification is not "value-free." They feel that the values clarifying teacher accepts all viewpoints, and does not attempt to impose values, and that: "Responses are not judged as better or worse; each student's views are treated with equal respect."⁹⁴

However, they maintain that "here all relativism stops." All students are encouraged to utilize the valuing processes, and the valuing processes represent various value positions of the authors, e.g. critical thinking, considering consequences, free choice, and so forth.⁹⁵ They also write:

We can go even a step further, and we probably have erred in not making this explicit often enough. Toward what end are these valuing processes better than their counterparts? Here, again, there are certain value judgments implicit in each process. If we urge critical thinking, then we value

⁹³Ibid., p. 48.

⁹⁴Kirschenbaum, et al., "In Defense of Values Clarification," p. 4.

⁹⁵Ibid., p. 4.

rationality. If we promote divergent thinking, then we value creativity. If we support moral reasoning as Kohlberg . . . defines it, then we value justice. If we uphold free choice, then we value autonomy or freedom. If we encourage "no-lose" conflict resolution, then we value equality.⁹⁶

It seems to this writer that given such strong statements, the proponents of values clarification are not taking a relativistic stance, as has been so often charged. Values clarification is not a relativistic position, but is best described by the philosophical position of "objective relativism."

Objective relativists believe that scientific methodology should be applied when making decisions, and therefore the consequences of an act should be a major factor in determining the worth of that act. Sidney Hook has commented that:

The how of thinking is more important than the what of thinking, not because the two are separable, for the how refers to the what in a class of cases or situations, but because it stresses the habits and morals of thought upon which the quest for truth and its successive corrections depend.⁹⁷

Compare Hook's reasoning with this passage from Values and Teaching:

For us, it is less important to know that a person values something than it is to know how he arrived at that "value." Did he arrive there thoughtfully, proudly, actively, or is he thoughtlessly mimicking a current style, reacting to a momentary impulse, or whatever?⁹⁸

Thus, the process of values selection is very important to an objective relativist.

⁹⁶Ibid., p. 4.

⁹⁷Sidney Hook, Education for Modern Man (New York: Knopf, 1963), p. 168.

⁹⁸Raths, et al., Values and Teaching, p. 206.

Objective relativists reject pure relativism or subjectivism as inadequate, for such a position offers no way out of conflicts, and could possibly lead to a "might makes right" situation. On the other hand, objective relativists also reject absolutism, because such a position disregards situations and contexts, absolute values are often in conflict with one another, and there is little agreement as to what should be "absolute."

Objective relativists argue that their position allows flexibility in reacting to individual situations, and leads to conflict resolutions in which people are more likely to reach agreement since a common methodology is being used.

An extensive exploration of the claim that values clarification is objectively relativistic, and not relativistic or subjectivistic lies beyond the scope of the present study. Nevertheless, the writer feels that the similarity between methods espoused by objective relativism and values clarification's reliance on logic, weighing of consequences, consideration of alternatives, and so forth, is too clear to be denied.

RESEARCH IN VALUES CLARIFICATION

Prior to becoming identified with values clarification, Rath was perhaps best known as a researcher. His involvement with Ralph Tyler and the "Eight-Year Study," was one of his most notable research affiliations.⁹⁹ It should be of no surprise then,

⁹⁹Conducted under the auspices of the Commission on the Relation of School and College of the Progressive Education Association, the Eight Year Study is a landmark in educational research.

that Rath's interest in research would continue, even when he chose to devote much of his time and effort to the study of what many consider to be the "non-empirical" realm of values.

A number of the original research studies in values clarification were in the form of doctoral dissertations performed by Rath's students at New York University. Most of them attempted to measure the effect of values clarification upon the behavior of students. This section will attempt to summarize some of the more significant studies in the area, and also to draw some conclusions about the research which has been completed in values clarification as a whole.

1957-1965

In 1957, Albert Klevan reported the results of an experiment in which values clarification techniques were utilized with a group of students taking an education course at New York University. While the study lacked empirical purity with regard to the way in which groups were matched, it did suggest that values clarification techniques could be of help in assisting students toward greater value clarity and consistency.¹⁰⁰

The following year, Sidney B. Simon reported a study involving ten high school teachers, each of whom had been trained in the use of the values clarification process. Each teacher

¹⁰⁰ Albert Klevan, "An Investigation of a Methodology for Value Clarification: Its Relationship to Consistency on Thinking, Purposefulness, and Human Relations" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, New York University, 1957).

selected a student who was exhibiting non-valuing behaviors (apathy, flightiness, etc.), and utilized value clarifying strategies with that student. Simon reported that there was little impact on the behavior of the students, but speculated that the reason for that lay with the teachers' difficulty in learning the values clarification process, and not in the technique itself.¹⁰¹

Simon's speculations were given some credence by a study conducted by Goergia Brown. Brown utilized a research design similar to Simon's, with the major exception being that elementary level teachers and students were involved, instead of secondary teachers and students. Brown reported significant behavioral changes on the part of those children exposed to the values clarification process.¹⁰²

James Rath submitted a more carefully controlled study in 1960 on the effects of values clarification on the academic achievement of students. Rath matched six pairs of high school "under-achievers" and randomly assigned half to an experimental group and half to a control group. Within the experimental group, Rath utilized a number of value clarifying techniques. Later, Rath

¹⁰¹Sidney B. Simon, "Value Clarification: Methodology and Tests of an Hypothesis in an In-Service Program Relating to Behavioral Changes in Secondary School Students" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1958).

¹⁰²Georgia J. Brown, "An Investigation of a Methodology for Value Clarification: Its Development, Demonstration and Application for Teachers of the Elementary School" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in process, New York University), as cited by Rath, et al., Values and Teaching, p. 208.

reported that five of the six students in the experimental group performed better academically than their counterparts.¹⁰³

In 1961, Melvin Lang reported on a study conducted at the college level. Like J. Rath, he used matched pairs of students, but included "apathetic" and "nagging dissenters" as well as "underachievers." He also made provisions for something that J. Rath had ignored, and made sure that those students in the control group received an equivalent amount of attention as the experimental group, even though the qualitative nature of that attention was quite different. However, Lang's findings were not conclusive. The values clarification strategies seemed to work better with the "underachievers" than with the others.¹⁰⁴ Lang also did a follow-up study two years later, and found that there had not been any long term carry over in the gains previously made with the "underachievers."¹⁰⁵

1966-on

From about 1966 to 1970, little research about values clarification was published or reported. One can only speculate

¹⁰³James Rath, "An Application of Clarifying Techniques to Academic Underachievers in High School" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1960).

¹⁰⁴Melvin Lang, "An Investigation of the Relationship of Value Clarification to Underachievement and Certain Other Behavioral Characteristics of Selected College Students" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1961).

¹⁰⁵Cited in Rath, et al., Values and Teaching, p. 213.

as to the reason for this lack, but it is possible that the tremendous emphasis that was being placed during this time upon the implementation of values clarification may have been a contributing factor. However, beginning in 1971-72, there was a resurgence of interest in values clarification research.

For example, in 1972 Richard L. Curwin submitted a dissertation entitled: "Values Clarification Approach to Teaching Secondary English Methods." In this study, values clarification was used to inject a more "affective" base into a college course designed for preservice secondary English teachers. Curwin concluded that the revised course had been both "useful and enjoyable as perceived by the students." He recommended that more affectively oriented materials be used in the education of teachers.¹⁰⁶

In 1973, Thomas Covault completed an important dissertation involving values clarification. His study was probably the most tightly controlled up to then of all of the experiments done involving values clarification.

Covault worked with two experimental groups and two control groups consisting of fifth graders. He spent an equal amount of time with all of the groups. However, in the experimental groups where values clarification strategies were used, he found that students exhibited "valuing" behaviors more frequently in a number of ways, including self-concept, "initiation of self-direction of

¹⁰⁶Richard L. Curwin, "Values Clarification Approach to Teaching Secondary English Methods" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1972).

classroom activities," "positive attitude towards learning," and exhibited fewer of the "non-valuing behaviors."¹⁰⁷

Howard Kirschenbaum reported of a study headed by Jay Clark, performed under the auspices of "Operation Future" in Visalia, California. While the results were still being analyzed, preliminary findings showed a very high correlation between non-valuing behaviors and drug usage. In the second part of the study, the effects of values clarification on non-valuing behaviors and drug usage were scrutinized. Here is how Kirschenbaum reported the results:

The effect of the independent variable on the six traits was mixed. . . . In the area of drug use, the gains were unmistakably significant, as indicated in preliminary report. . . . Not only were these results statistically significant, in many cases the changes were dramatic in degree. . . . Its implications could be profound, both for further research and for educational practice.¹⁰⁸

In a different drug-related study, sponsored by the Florida State Department of Education, Bryan C. Smith compared two methods of teaching drug education: "the traditional teacher confined approach, and the values clarification group-centered process." The study was conducted with preservice elementary school teachers, and it was discovered that the values clarification approach was

¹⁰⁷Thomas J. Covault, "The Application of Value Clarification Teaching Strategies with Fifth Grade Students to Investigate Their Influence on Students' Self-Concept and Related Classroom Coping Behaviors" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1973).

¹⁰⁸Howard Kirschenbaum, "Recent Research in Values Clarification," Values Education, Theory, Practice/Problems/Prospects, ed. by John Meyer, Brian Burnham, and John Cholvat (Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1975), p. 73.

"superior in all ways measured." The measures used had both cognitive and affective dimensions. Smith found that members of the values clarification group "read more independently, achieved greater gain scores in affective and cognitive testing, and they developed a sense of community that brought them together to solve problems."¹⁰⁹

Finally, Jack Osman, writing in the Journal of School Health, reported a significant increase in the degree of self-actualization (as measured by Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory) in a class of future health educators, who had been taught values clarification strategies. His study lacked a control group, however, so it is impossible to draw any firm conclusions from it alone.¹¹⁰

Summary of Research on Values Clarification

There can be no doubt as to the difficulty involved in conducting research in the area of values. In many ways, research methodology in this area of education is still in its infancy, and it is not yet clear if so-called "traditional" research approaches are either applicable or appropriate in the area of values. It is possible that an entirely new formulation of research methodology may be needed in order for significant research to occur in this area.

¹⁰⁹Bryan C. Smith, "Values Clarification in Drug Education: A Comparative Study," Journal of Drug Education, 3, 4 (Winter, 1973), 369-376.

¹¹⁰Jack Osman, "The Use of Selected Values Clarifying Strategies in Health Education," Journal of School Health, 43, 10 (January, 1974), pp. 621-623.

Be that as it may, some things can be said relative to the research completed thus far in values clarification. First, one must acknowledge the inconclusiveness of the research. Some studies reveal positive effects of values clarification, others show little or no effect for values clarification. At the same time, one is struck by the multiplicity and range of dependent variables which to date have been chosen for research within values clarification. They range from "self-concept" to "academic achievement," from "interest in a class" to "drug usage," and so on.

Both of these points are, in the writer's opinion, important and deserving of further exploration. Much more intensive determinations urgently need to be made as to the effects of values clarification. There are strong indications that values clarification procedures do have effects, but it is not yet clear as to what the various effects are. Furthermore many researchers seem to think that values clarification is a panacea and are attempting to utilize it in a wide variety of settings, despite statements from the leaders of values clarification as to the limitations of the approach.

Clearly more research needs to be done in values clarification. To solicit suggestions along these lines, one of the questions put to each of the experts dealt with the nature of proposed research in values clarification. Their responses may be examined in the Appendix of this study, and are discussed in Chapter 4.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 2

The author has attempted to highlight the development of values clarification as reflected in its literature. No single chapter, however, can fully comprehend the tremendous amount that has been written about it. Kirschenbaum, et al. list one hundred and eighty-four different books, articles, and media packages produced between 1965 and 1975 which deal with values clarification. For purposes of the present study, some selecting had to be done in order to generate a representative over-view for inclusion in this review of relevant literature. The author's attempt was to present an accurate picture of values clarification, and he hopes and believes that no major aspects of current theory, practice, or criticisms of values clarification have been omitted.

The writer has attempted to show the genesis of values clarification, starting with Dewey's ideas and Raths' adaptations of them. Attention has been given to the basic theory of values clarification, to its rationale and methodology, to criticisms of it, and finally to research conducted in it.

The quantity of information currently available regarding values clarification would itself suggest that the procedures already have had a notable impact on American education. However, little or no research has been done to assess that impact. Nor have any systematic historical accounts been written relative to the phenomena of the emergence values clarification, i.e., how it grew so quickly into a national "movement." Finally, no research

has been conducted to assess the changes which have occurred in values clarification theory and practice, or with regard to where values clarification is likely to go during the coming ten years. It is these final aspects which the writer finds most interesting, and with which the remainder of this dissertation is concerned.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with the research methodology used by the writer in this dissertation. Generally speaking, two basic research questions were posed:

1. In what ways have the theory and practice of values clarification changed since 1966?
2. In what directions is values clarification likely to move during the next ten years?

To gather data relative to these two questions, the writer identified, contacted, and requested to interview fourteen experts in values education. An Interview Guide was constructed to facilitate and order the interview process. The interviews were recorded on audio tape, transcribed, and a copy of the transcript returned to each expert for editing. At this time, the writer could also ask for clarification of any ambiguous remarks made by the experts, and/or ask further questions. Finally, using the edited transcripts as a data base, the writer attempted to analyze them in such a way as to answer the two major research questions and certain sub-questions.

METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING THE EXPERTS

The writer was interested in utilizing data from both proponents and critics of values clarification. While many possibilities existed with regard to the field of experts from which to choose, two criteria were imposed arbitrarily by the writer in the selection of the experts to be contacted. The first criterion was that a ratio of approximately two proponents of values clarification to one critic was to be maintained. The rationale for this particular ratio was as follows: This dissertation is primarily focused upon theoretical and methodological issues within values clarification, and only practitioners and supporters of values clarification have the "inside" view that comes from a long term association with a particular approach. However, while such proponents are likely to have access to information that those outside of values clarification may not, their views might be "internally biased," so to speak. Therefore, critics of values clarification who are familiar with the general self-apparent, "external" aspects of it, and who also represent a different approach to values education, were also consulted and were perceived as important sources of data for identifying issues which might be obscured or distorted if seen only from an "insider's" point of view.

The second criterion imposed by the writer was that each expert be a prominent member of his field. "Prominence" in this sense, was taken to mean that the person had published in the area, and was generally considered to be a leader in the area by other

scholars. The rationale for this criterion was that prominent figures are often key figures, in terms of the directions in which movements in education have gone and will go in the future.

With these criteria in mind, the writer identified the following educators and "experts," and contacted each of them to request their participation in the study.

1. Louis E. Rath, adjunct Professor, State University College, Fredonia, New York. Dr. Rath is the senior author of Values and Teaching, as well as the author of numerous articles on values, valuing and values clarification. He is recognized by most authorities as the creator of values clarification.¹

2. Merrill Harmin, Professor, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, Illinois. Dr. Harmin is a co-author of Values and Teaching, and an author of numerous other books and articles dealing with values clarification. He has also served as a leader of many workshops on values clarification in various locations in the United States.

3. Sidney B. Simon, Professor, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts. Dr. Simon is also a co-author of Values and Teaching, and numerous other books and articles dealing with values clarification. He has also led many workshops in values clarification in different parts of the United States and abroad.

¹For a complete listing of the books and articles written by the experts in values clarification, and for a partial listing of materials by the critics of values clarification, the reader is directed to consult the bibliography of this dissertation.

4. Howard Kirschenbaum, Director, National Humanistic Education Center, Saratoga Springs, New York. Dr. Kirschenbaum is the author of numerous books and articles on values clarification. He has also worked as a leader of many workshops on values clarification, and has coordinated the dissemination of information concerning values clarification from his center.

5. Barbara Glaser-Kirschenbaum, Assistant Director, National Humanistic Education Center, Saratoga Springs, New York. Ms. Glaser-Kirschenbaum is an emerging leader in values clarification, has facilitated many workshops in values clarification, and recently has been utilizing values clarification in new and innovative ways with women and with school counselors.

6. Leland W. Howe, Associate Professor, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Dr. Howe is the author of books and articles in values clarification, and has also led many workshops on the approach.

7. Mary Martha Howe, Director, Philadelphia Humanistic Education Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Ms. Howe is the co-author of Personalizing Education: Values Clarification and Beyond, and has led many workshops in values clarification.

8. James Rath, Professor, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. Dr. Rath is the author of a number of early articles and research reports dealing with values clarification. He is the son of Louis Rath.

9. Joel Goodman, Assistant Director for Program Development and Consultation Services, National Humanistic Education

Center, Saratoga Springs, New York. Dr. Goodman is the author of numerous articles in values clarification, and has led many workshops on the subject as well.

10. Michael Scrivens, Professor, University of California, Berkley, California. Dr. Scrivens is a well-known philosopher and critic of many values education approaches, including values clarification.

11. John S. Stewart, Director of Research and Development, American Institute for Character Education, San Antonio, Texas. Dr. Stewart is the author of numerous publications on moral development, and is a well-known and ardent critic of values clarification.

12. Milton Rokeach, Professor, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington. Dr. Rokeach is the author of numerous publications on the inculcation approach to values education, and is an outspoken critic of values clarification.

13. Alan L. Lockwood, Assistant Professor, University of Wisconsin at Madison, Madison, Wisconsin. Dr. Lockwood is the author of a number of publications on moral development education, and has written extensively of his criticisms of values clarification.

14. Lawrence Metcalf, Professor, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. Dr. Metcalf served as the editor of the forty-first yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies, entitled: Values Education: Rationale, Strategies and Procedures.

Dr. Metcalf's book serves to illustrate still another approach to values education.

Of these fourteen experts, the first nine were clearly proponents of values clarification, the following four were clearly critics of values clarification, and the last one, Metcalf, was in a position which was less clearly critical of values clarification but was inferred to be so. Thus, there was an approximate ratio of two to one proponents to critics present in the original list of experts.

Of the fourteen experts contacted, five did not participate in the study. Metcalf, Scrivens, and M. Howe failed to respond to the invitation sent to them. J. Rath and L. Howe declined to participate in the study. The former indicated that he had not been involved in values clarification for some time, and that since the writer was interviewing his father (Louis Rath), he felt there was no information that would be of benefit that he could add to what his father had to say. The latter, L. Howe, indicated that he was currently re-thinking his position on values clarification, and was not ready at this time to share his views publicly.

Of the nine who did agree to participate in the study, six were clearly proponents of values clarification, and three were clearly critics of it. Hence, the ratio of two proponents to one critic was kept intact.

METHOD OF CONTACTING THE EXPERTS

Each expert was contacted initially by way of a letter from the writer. Because of the personal nature of the relationship between the writer and many of the experts, a form letter was not used. However, each letter did contain the following information: a description of the purpose of the study; an overview of the methodology to be used in the study; a specific description of the participant's role in the study; and an invitation to participate.

Upon receiving an affirmative response from an expert, the writer would then mail the expert a copy of the Interview Agreement Form (see Appendix A) and a copy of the Interview Guide (see Appendix B). A date and time for the interview would then be established, either by further correspondence or by telephone.

DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVIEW AGREEMENT FORM

An Interview Agreement Form was created by the writer and sent to each participating expert. The purpose of the form was to clearly establish the fact that the writer had secured the permission of each expert to record his or her interview, and to reproduce the transcript of that interview in this dissertation and/or possibly other works by the writer.

Several of the experts objected to the phrase "and possibly other publications," and struck it from the agreement.

The form also served as a vehicle for establishing telephone numbers, dates and times for conducting the interview. A blank

Interview Agreement Form may be examined in Appendix A. The completed Interview Agreement Forms are contained in Appendix B. The telephone numbers of the experts have been removed, since it seemed clear that the experts might desire not to have their telephone numbers publicly known.

DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVIEW GUIDE

An Interview Guide was created by the writer, and was made available to each of the experts prior to their interview. The purpose of the Interview Guide was to bring some regularity to the questions being asked of the various experts. The questions contained in the Interview Guide were primarily sub-questions of the two major research questions mentioned previously. The Interview Guide may be examined in Appendix C.

DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVIEW PROCESS

The interviews were conducted during the month of April, 1976. L. Raths, Glaser-Kirschenbaum, Kirschenbaum and Goodman were interviewed in person by the writer. Simon was interviewed both in person (an exploratory interview, in October of 1975) and by telephone (a follow up, April 1976). The remaining experts were interviewed via telephone.²

²Because of legal requirements, the writer contacted the Michigan Bell Telephone Company and consulted with them in regard to the use of tape recording equipment in conjunction with telephone conversations. The company later installed devices in the writer's home which would allow him to tape record the interviews conducted by telephone. Since permission was secured from each interviewee prior to the interview, the company waived the use of an automatic recording "beeper."

While an Interview Guide was utilized, some words as to how it was used are important. First, the Interview Guide was, as its title suggests, a "guide." At times, some questions were put to the experts by the writer in different ways than the way they appear on the guide. At other times, certain questions were omitted, and/or others added.

The rationale for this use of the Interview Guide and indeed, the entire interview process, is quite simple. The interview process was selected for use by the writer as a data gathering method because of its flexibility. In the early stages of the study (viz., in the exploratory interview with Sidney Simon) it became apparent to the writer that he would need to be able to probe the responses of the various experts in depth, and that certain questions contained on the Interview Guide were not appropriate for all of the experts. For example, in reference to the latter point, certain questions might be appropriate for Rath, since he was the founder of values clarification, but not for a person like Glaser-Kirschenbaum, who has been involved in values clarification for relatively fewer years.

Despite the flexibility of the writer's use of the Interview Guide and the interview process, the writer is persuaded that no major issues were left out of any individual's testimony, and that each expert was able to respond quite adequately to the two major research questions posed previously.

The interviews varied in length from forty-five minutes to two and one-half hours. The differentiation in time represents a

number of factors, including pauses, interruptions, or the varying loquaciousness among individual interviewees. The writer did not consciously attempt to give any one individual more time than another.

Following each interview, the writer would transcribe it, and note any points which he felt needed further clarification. Many of these points referred to "footnote information," e.g., last names of people mentioned in the interview by them, publishers for upcoming books, and so forth. Other points were of a more substantive nature, and included requests for clarification of certain passages, follow-up questions, questions which were missed the first time, etc. The interviewee was requested to respond to these points in writing, and return their answers with the transcript. John Stewart failed to return his transcript or to reply to the writer's requests for clarification.

At the same time, the interviewee had the opportunity to edit his or her remarks, and restate any items which he or she felt were ambiguous, incomplete or inaccurate. Merrill Harmin and Howard Kirschenbaum's interviews, for various reasons, are printed with their permission in their original, unedited form. A copy of the form letter sent with each of the transcripts may be examined in Appendix D.

Upon receiving the edited versions of each expert's transcript, the writer had each transcript retyped. The nine transcripts and their attached Interview Agreement Forms may be examined in Appendices E through M.

SELF-INTERVIEW

The writer also attempted to answer most of the questions contained in the Interview Guide himself. This was done during the month of March 1976 prior to any of the interviews conducted with the experts, with the one exception of the partial interview done with Simon in October of 1975. The self-interview was conducted in an effort to determine what assumptions the writer might have been making, and, once aware of these assumptions, assist the writer in helping him maintain his objectivity when questioning the experts, and to increase his awareness of the possibility of "leading" the experts. The results of this exercise are discussed in Chapter 4. The answers given by the writer to the questions contained in the self-interview may be found in Appendix N of this dissertation.

METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS

The task of analyzing the data contained in the interviews was difficult in many respects. However, the writer attempted to deal with these data in an objectively critical fashion, much as a literary critic attempts to deal objectively with a new novel, drama, collection of poems, or what have you.

The data were analyzed by comparing and contrasting the responses of the experts to the two major research questions, and to certain sub-questions which, during the course of the interview process, emerged as significant, primarily because of the importance placed upon them by the experts. The two major research questions,

and their respective sub-questions, which serve as the basis for Chapter 4, are as follows:

Major Research Question #1. In what ways have the theory and practice of values clarification changed since 1966?

Sub-Question #1a. In what ways has values clarification affected the lives of those who have used it?

Sub-Question #1b. In what ways has the theory of values clarification been modified since 1966?

Sub-Question #1c. What are the major criticisms of values clarification and how do the proponents of values clarification respond to them?

Sub-Question #1d. Is values clarification more "affective" in nature in 1976 than it was in 1966?

Sub-Question #1e. To what degree are certain key words in values education commonly defined by the experts consulted?

Sub-Question #1f. Is values clarification being misused and if so, what can be done to insure it against such misuse?

Major Research Question #2. In what directions is values clarification likely to move during the next ten years?

Sub-Question #2a. What might the future hold in regard to the widespread "popularity" of values clarification?

Sub-Question #2b. Who is likely to play key or influential roles within values clarification during the next ten years?

Sub-Question #2c. What philosophical issues and/or research issues does values clarification need to confront during the next ten years?

Sub-Question #2d. Ideally, what do the various experts hope will happen to values clarification during the next ten years?

On the basis of his intensive efforts in comparing and contrasting the responses of the experts to the various specified questions, the writer believes that he cannot fairly be charged with being arbitrary in choosing items from the data to "prove a point." Furthermore, the edited transcripts of the interviews are reproduced in the appendices in their entirety, and the reader hopefully will form his or her own conclusions from the data for comparison with those which the writer has made. The interpretations of the data are the subject of Chapter 4.

Basically, the critical procedure followed was for the writer to comb through each interview in search of comments relative to each sub-question, and summarize them for comparison with each other. At times, additional weight would be given to the testimony of some experts if they felt that they had a particularly well thought out position and/or the other experts added disclaimers about their ability to testify knowledgably on a particular subject. After weighing the evidence, the writer offers conclusions based upon his interpretation of the data, paying particular attention to both the quality of the testimony (first-hand knowledge, for example, versus unfounded speculation) and the quantity of the testimony (e.g., what does the preponderance of testimony indicate?).

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF DATA

INTRODUCTION

This chapter concerns itself with the analysis of data collected through the methodology described in Chapter 3. Generalizations, recommendations, conclusions and so forth are presented in Chapter 5.

Each sub-question identified in Chapter 3 is analyzed through the comparison and contrast of experts' responses to them, with the experts' remarks presented by direct quotation and/or summary. These various responses to each of the sub-questions are then evaluated, and conclusions drawn in regard to each sub-question. Conclusions drawn in regard to the two major research questions are discussed in Chapter 5. The chapter concludes with a comparison of the experts' responses to those of the writer through his self-interview.

MAJOR RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND THEIR RESPECTIVE SUB-QUESTIONS

Once again, here are the two major research questions (to be discussed in Chapter 5) and their respective sub-questions (to be discussed in the remainder of this chapter).

Major Research Question #1. In what ways have the theory and practice of values clarification changed since 1966?

Sub-Question #1a. In what ways has values clarification affected the lives of those who have used it?

Sub-Question #1b. In what ways has the theory of values clarification been modified since 1966?

Sub-Question #1c. What are the major criticisms of values clarification and how do the proponents of values clarification respond to them?

Sub-Question #1d. Is values clarification more "affective" in nature in 1976 than it was in 1966?

Sub-Question #1e. To what degree are certain key words in values education commonly defined by the experts consulted?

Sub-Question #1f. Is values clarification being misused and if so, what can be done to insure it against such misuse?

Major Research Question #2. In what directions is values clarification likely to move during the next ten years?

Sub-Question #2a. What might the future hold in regard to the widespread "popularity" of values clarification?

Sub-Question #2b. Who is likely to play key or influential roles within values clarification during the next ten years?

Sub-Question #2c. What philosophical issues and/or research issues does values clarification need to confront during the next ten years?

Sub-Question #2d. Ideally, what do the various experts hope will happen to values clarification during the next ten years?

Analysis and Evaluation of Sub-Question #1a. "In what ways has values clarification affected the lives of those who have used it?"

The responses to this sub-question varied greatly. In the interview process, data relative to this particular sub-question was gathered by asking the experts not only how they perceived the effect of values clarification on the lives of those trained in it, but especially in the case of those experts who were proponents of values clarification, how values clarification had affected their own lives.

Merrill Harmin's responses were somewhat atypical. Dr. Harmin felt that in terms of his own life, the major effect of values clarification was to give him "a huge exposure and advantage." For very few people, in his opinion, does values clarification in itself have that great of an impact. "For the larger proportion, it's a reaffirmation of some things they have sensed, but not been able to express." Dr. Harmin concludes by suggesting that the reason why values clarification "hasn't had much of an impact on me is because I was that way before that." In other words, Dr. Harmin felt that prior to learning of values clarification itself, he was already practicing and had already internalized many of its tenets.

Louis Rath's responded in a different fashion. He offered a number of individual cases from his many years of experience in values clarification wherein values clarification had, in his opinion, had a profound impact on the lives of others. He

summarizes them by stating: "There have been a number of cases where people have just said: 'By golly, ya know, it really shook me.'" It is this kind of effect which Dr. Rath says has the most meaning for him.

Within his own life, Dr. Rath offered a number of off-the-record anecdotes as to how values clarification had affected his own life, particularly as a professional. He ends with the following remarks:

I think that when many people remain quiet in a choice situation, it isn't so much because they are afraid to speak, as it is they don't know what they believe, not having seen clearly, through life or living and experiences and reading, where they stand. They remain mute. Now all too commonly, it is said about them that they're afraid to talk. Now the fear, as I see it, may be there, but the fear, I think, is more related to that if they talk, they wouldn't know what they were talking about. It was that they weren't clear.

Sidney Simon offered remarks similar to Rath's. He says that "I just have a file full of people who have simply said it's changed their lives." He also remarks that "I just don't imagine I can put my finger on ten or twelve other things that have made lives change that much." And in terms of his own life, Dr. Simon is equally full of praise for values clarification, and for Louis Rath's.

I think if anybody could track down the way I've lived my life for the last ten years, they would see the values work operating more and more.

 I just can't imagine anybody studying with Fritz Perls, who had more impact on their life than Louis Rath had on mine.

Howard Kirschenbaum's testimony was similar to Harmin's. In regard to his own life, he felt that values clarification

"reinforced what I was doing already, and that was: continually examining my own life--not wanting to settle for less than my dreams and the life that I prize and cherish." He does not credit values clarification with changing his life per se.

In terms of the effect of values clarification on the lives of other people, Dr. Kirschenbaum differentiates between its effects personally and professionally.

I think for many individuals, professionally it's their first jumping-off point into the whole area of humanistic education. And that really continues to evolve and grow in them, and makes considerable difference in their professional lives.

Personally, I think perhaps the effect would be the same as it was on me: that being exposed to the theory of values clarification and related approaches gives people more confidence in their own search, in their own growth--strengthens that resolve.

Barbara Glaser-Kirschenbaum stated that "I try to use the processes when I go about making decisions and dealing with my own value conflicts." Ms. Glaser-Kirschenbaum also mentions that, in her opinion, values clarification had affected the lives of others as well. Some teachers have given her feedback in regard to the effectiveness and practicality of values clarification. Furthermore, she cites continued interest in training on the part of teachers and other members of the helping professions and the proliferation of training programs utilizing values clarification, as more evidence for the positive impact values clarification has had and continues to have.

Joel Goodman offered a number of anecdotes, exemplary of the great influence he feels that values clarification has had on

his life. Like Glaser-Kirschenbaum, he too finds himself using the valuing processes:

In a specific sense, I find myself using a number of the skills really naturally: I'm compulsive about looking for alternatives; and sometimes I think about consequences to the point where I get bruises from sitting on the fence for so long. And an increasingly important area for me is the whole notion of acting on my values, and a most particular sense of that with regard to different social issues dealing with forms of oppression.

In terms of the effect of values clarification upon the lives of others, he says "that's actually been one of the things that's kept me going: the realization that it does make a difference for people to get involved in this kind of thing." Dr. Goodman then offered several illustrations of how values clarification had, indeed, affected the lives of people he had known.

Finally, John Stewart sees values clarification as having deeply affected the lives of many people who have used it, but in both positive and negative ways. On the positive side, Stewart acknowledges that:

I think that one of the main things that values clarification has brought to the field is a general opening up and warming up of the educational environment. I think that it would be difficult to be exposed to something like values clarification with the tremendous legacy of traditional education and all its rigidity and formalism without it doing a number of things.

Some of the things he refers to are an awareness of the problems of traditional education and "a general tendency to look at some of the more humanistic" aspects of education. Hence, Stewart applauds the reflection he feels values clarification encourages.

On the other hand, he believes that values clarification has had some negative impacts, especially in the area of "peer conformity and peer influence," and in "selling a totally relativistic approach to values and morality."¹

Values clarification has apparently had an impact of some sort on all people involved with it. For some, its an affirmation of some general ideas and beliefs about values education, and for others it is an entirely new concept and entrance into the broader field of "humanistic" education. Furthermore, values clarification appears to have affected lives to a degree which suggests that it is much more than a teaching methodology. It is a process for decision-making and living which tends to permeate one's life.

Based upon the evidence presented by the various experts, values clarification appears to have deeply influenced the lives of many people, often in very dramatic ways. Values clarification has impacted not only classroom teaching, but people's relationships with spouses, parents, friends, and children. Such a moving force would tend to belie the statements of those who characterize values clarification as a "fad."

Analysis and evaluation of Sub-Question #1b. "In what ways has the theory of values clarification been modified since 1966?"

To some extent, this question has been discussed in Chapter 2, in the section entitled "Kirschenbaum's Modifications." However, there is some question as to what extent Kirschenbaum's theoretical changes have been adopted by his colleagues, or are known to the critics of values clarification theory.

¹These criticisms are discussed in Chapter 2.

Both Alan Lockwood and Milton Rokeach expressed the fact that they were generally unaware of Kirschenbaum's suggestions. Of the critics, only John Stewart expresses familiarity with Kirschenbaum's efforts, yet he is unsure as to the universal acceptance of them by his colleagues, for "In none of the other literature have I seen any change."

Kirschenbaum, however, believes that his colleagues do agree with at least two of his modifications:

I think in terms of these latter two concepts: expanding the concept of the processes, and making more explicit the idea of what the outcome of values clarification might be in a social context--I think my colleagues agree with me, specifically because Simon, Harmin, Howe and I wrote a position paper in which we used that formulation, so they were all willing to have their names publicly go with that concept. But I think personally, they don't use it as much in their own work. I'd like to believe, though, that that's the direction that we're going in.

Both Simon and Harmin do admit that they do not utilize Kirschenbaum's modifications in their own work. Simon finds Rath's original theory to be "satisfactory, clear, and suitable as it is." However he does not have any great disagreements with what Kirschenbaum has proposed.

Harmin, in his workshops in values clarification, still presents the theory "as it was traditionally presented," and questions a broadening of the theory, for then values clarification "becomes something other than values clarification. . . ." He does admit, however, that in his workshops he no longer refers to "criteria" of a value, but of valuing "processes," which is one of Kirschenbaum's suggestions.

Glaser-Kirschenbaum believes that in recent years, her husband, Howard Kirschenbaum, has indeed emerged as the primary theorist. She does not speculate, however, as to the degree to which others in values clarification have assumed his reformulations.

Raths speaks only indirectly to this question, and most of his remarks are in the context of sub-question #1c, dealing with changes in the practice of values clarification, and are more appropriately discussed there. When later asked in a follow-up letter to respond to Kirschenbaum's suggested modifications, Raths stated that he did not know what they were, and could therefore not reply to my question.

Goodman credits Kirschenbaum with having generated some theoretical changes, and also with those changes as having an impact on his own thinking. Like Harmin, he cites the change from "criteria" to "processes" or "skills." He also offers a number of different interpretations to the theory himself, which tend to expand the theory, but not nearly to the extent that Kirschenbaum's efforts do. For example, he speaks of "extrapersonal skills" as one area which he feels needs to be explored in values clarification.

The above responses appear to say that the theory of values clarification is undergoing some changes by some of its proponents, but it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions as to the extent to which values clarification has changed as yet. Certainly, it would appear that most if not all of the current leaders in values clarification now speak of valuing "processes" in lieu of the

original notion of "criteria." Beyond this, while Kirschenbaum and to a lesser degree, Goodman, have in their own work modified the theory, there is no indication that they or any of the remaining leaders in values clarification have abandoned Rath's basic conceptualizations. Kirschenbaum's claim of support notwithstanding, it is the opinion of the author that from the point of view of theory, values clarification is in a somewhat ambiguous or transitional posture. There is little evidence to suggest that the forthcoming revision of Values and Teaching² will likely resolve current ambiguities or advance theoretical frameworks to new closures. Harmin, who is heading the revision efforts, has stated that the theory will be handled in Rath's way. The only tenable conclusion suggested at this point seems to be that the theory of values clarification has slightly changed in the last ten years, while several suggestions have been put forth to change the theory even more. Only the course of the next ten years will reveal to what extent the theory will continue to change, if at all.

Analysis and evaluation of Sub-Question #1c. "What are the major criticisms of values clarification, and how do the proponents of values clarification respond to them?"

In Chapter 2, the writer identified a number of major criticisms of values clarification based upon a review of related literature, and attempted to respond to them. In this section,

²Louis E. Rath, Merrill Harmin, and Sidney B. Simon, Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, Inc., 1966).

criticism of values clarification are listed by the various experts, and some responses are offered by the proponents of values clarification. Generally, the criticisms are quite similar to those identified by the writer in Chapter 2.

Milton Rokeach criticizes values clarification in a number of ways. He rejects the definition of a "value" offered by Raths, et al.,³ as too subjective, and hence joins other critics who label values clarification an "ethically relativistic" position. Dr. Rokeach further believes that values clarification is too "self-centered," to the point of failing to explore societal or institutional values. Furthermore, he says he distrusts "any approach where you can't measure that which you are talking about." Finally, Dr. Rokeach dismisses the notion of the process of valuing as "awfully vague."

Alan Lockwood admits that "I'm not real fond of it [values clarification] as an approach, for various reasons." Throughout his interview, Dr. Lockwood offers a number of criticisms of values clarification in support of his feelings about it.

Lockwood believes that values clarification is actually a form of "therapy," but that its supporters will not acknowledge that fact. As a result, values clarification, in his opinion, focuses less upon moral issues, and more upon less consequential issues of liking and disliking. Furthermore, values clarification tends to deal more with "content" than "form" or "structure" in

³Raths, et al., Ibid.

valuing. Lockwood severely criticizes the research or lack of "good, quality research," and encourages proponents of values clarification to do better, more complete research "that has got some sort of methodological integrity, according to the general canons of social science research." Like Rokeach, Lockwood criticizes values clarification as being "ethically relativistic or narcissistic or egocentric in their views." He also sees the issue of "privacy rights" being important, with the possibility of infringement upon those rights by persons using values clarification. Finally, Dr. Lockwood feels that the leaders of values clarification must become more explicit about its goals.

John Stewart reiterated some of the criticisms he had made previously about values clarification in the Phi Delta Kappan.⁴

Dr. Stewart criticizes what he sees as the "peer conformity and peer influence" which he sees as a part of the values clarification approach. He also declares that:

By forcing sensitive children and teenagers into making public claims, public statements can bring about premature foreclosure on the ideas, and can bring about people becoming committed to things that they may not be really committed to, but once having made public statements and going on record, there is an effect there and I think that is a danger.

Dr. Stewart's final major misgiving about values clarification is a reverberation of Lockwood's and Rokeach's, and that is that values clarification is ethically relativistic.

⁴John S. Stewart, "Clarifying Values Clarification: A Critique," Phi Delta Kappan, 56, 10 (June, 1975), 684-688.

Dr. Stewart also responds to Lockwood's contention with regard to the "therapeutic" purpose and method of values clarification. He first suggests that a clear definition of the word "therapy" is needed. Stewart suggests that there are at least two basic meanings applied to "therapy." One is associated with illness, and the other with change in a situation. In the latter sense, Stewart contends that all educational practices have a therapeutic element. He cites the reflection by many leaders in values clarification of the danger in utilizing the approach with emotionally or mentally disturbed children. However, he does feel that values clarification is being used by professionals in therapeutic circles, and ends up agreeing with Lockwood, but with qualifications.

Merrill Harmin states that the main negative criticism of values clarification he hears is that "people say it's 'mushy,' it's philosophically not crisp, sometimes inconsistent, and sometimes dumb." Furthermore, he believes that values clarification is criticized for being too "affective," for "giving to emotional things."

Dr. Harmin responds to the latter charge by suggesting that values clarification has three components: thought, feeling and action, and that it is supported by those who have programs with similar components, and criticized by those who capitalize on only one or two components.

Dr. Harmin's professed posture in regard to the criticism's he enumerated would be to respond by using the theory, and to take

a position of dialogue, rather than one of trying to convince the critics.

Harmin does not agree that the process of values clarification or the proponents of values clarification are value-free, but does not offer substantial support for his opinion in the interview.

Sidney Simon cites a number of criticisms of values clarification, and attempts to respond to each of them. To the charge that values clarification is "simplistic," Simon replies that he sees such a criticism as "about twenty per-cent envy, fifteen per-cent protection of something they enjoy more."

Simon acknowledges the common charge of "relativism," but feels that people fail to grasp adequately what motivated a relativistic stance: the highly moralistic atmosphere of the late fifties and early sixties. Like Lockwood and Rokeach, Simon speaks of the "inadequate research," which he feels is a "justifiable account." To those who feel that values clarification is not supported by an adequate theory, Dr. Simon offers his own opinion that, "It's been a very adequate theory for me."

Finally, Dr. Simon feels that a "menacing" criticism issues forth from "parents who feel that values clarification belongs to the home, and it shouldn't be the province of the schools." He believes that such a criticism is very difficult to deal with, because of the high emotions usually involved with such sentiments.

Howard Kirschenbaum responds to Lockwood's charge that values clarification is a form of "therapy" in a fashion similar

to Stewart. Dr. Kirschenbaum states that such a criticism depends heavily on the definition of the word "therapy" used. He states:

To the extent that therapy implies making sense and clarity out of confusion and inconsistency; to the extent that therapy implies helping people become somewhat more aware of their feelings and their hopes and their goals and some of the conflicts which are getting in the way of that, and some of the things they need to do in their lives to get where they want to go--yes, values clarification is a "therapeutic" intervention.

But to the extent you mean by "therapy" an in-depth psychological exploration, a foray into our inner world where we get in touch and deal with feelings that are fairly deep-rooted; to the extent that we mean by "therapy" dealing with significant psychological distress--no, I don't see values clarification as "therapy."

Joel Goodman believes that one of the most troublesome criticisms of values clarification deals with the issue of,

"Where do I draw the line in terms of when I 'expose' and when I 'impose,' or feel like imposing?" On a real practical, everyday level, I think that's a question that teachers face all the time. On a more long-range level, it's a question which I think is important on a society-wide level.

Dr. Goodman points to a number of moral issues, like racism, sexism and so forth, and wonders aloud as to when it is appropriate to intervene and become more directive in values areas. He admits that he is not entirely clear on this issue himself, and does not offer a firm resolution for the criticism.

Barbara Glaser-Kirschenbaum chose to respond to the notion of relativism in values clarification. She states that:

I think there are certain values perspectives that are assumed. I don't think it is totally value-free. I think we assume that thinking is better than non-thinking, that certain ways of looking at problems, taking a look at choices, are better than other ways, that acting is something that we value. I think inherent in values clarification are certain kinds of values that certain processes are better than other processes, as ways of looking at areas of confusion and conflict.

Hence, she does not see values clarification in an ethically relativistic position, as charged by so many.

Finally, Louis Rath identifies and responds to two major criticisms, both of which have been previously mentioned: that values clarification is "relativistic," and that it is a form of "therapy."

To the former charge, Rath points out the accusation that values clarifiers are ethical relativists in turn implies that "you should be cultural positivists." However, if this is the case, the accusation is "almost ridiculous," because at this point in our history there are no universal absolute cultural values.

In regard to the latter point, Rath denies strongly that values clarification is a form of therapy. He questions if giving help where it is needed automatically qualifies something as "therapy," by comparing the use of values clarification to the use of special spelling instruction for a poor speller, or to food for a hungry man. He states that:

There is something in this matter of human relations, in which the central quality is human. It isn't professional-medical, professional-legal, professional this or that. It's a sensitivity to see something missing, and to help out.

This writer is convinced that the many criticisms of values clarification identified by the experts are quite significant and will continue to be made until the proponents of values clarification sort through them more thoroughly than they have thus far. There appears to be universal agreement, for example, with regard to the importance of the issue of ethical relativism, and

yet the responses of the proponents of values clarification while perhaps profound, have not been fully expressed and explored.

Some of the proponents of values clarification appear to have an adequate grasp as to what the major criticisms are, and of the deep philosophical implications of some of them, yet none of them are "philosophers" in the usual sense of the word. The writer believes that if values clarification theory is to remain viable its proponents must be willing to explore these issues and assume similarly critical postures.

Certainly, the problems of relativism, inadequate or incomplete research, the charge that values clarification is "therapy," and other concerns should and must be dealt with. It is possible that the last ten years of values clarification, with its focus upon implementation, has seen the neglect of philosophical and theoretical issues. The time has come, in this writer's opinion, for responses to be formulated, thoughtfully and carefully.

Analysis and Evaluation of Sub-Question #1d, "Is values clarification more 'affective' in nature in 1976 than it was in 1966?"

The intent of this question is to focus primarily upon whether the practice of values clarification has grown to be more "affective" in nature during the last ten years. The question as to whether the theory of values clarification has been modified to include a more "affective" orientation, or if the theory has changed at all, is open to debate, as explained previously in the discussion of sub-question #1b.

Several of the authorities consulted responded by stating that in the hands of some practitioners, values clarification had indeed become more affective in nature. For example, Glaser-Kirschenbaum stated that, in her opinion, "I think Sid's [Simon] teaching of values clarification has become more affective." However, she felt that in her own work and in that of her husband, Howard Kirschenbaum, there was still an emphasis upon "thinking skills." She concluded by saying: ". . . I think the affective realm is an important part of the valuing process, but not exclusively so."

Harmin also suggests that any shift in emphasis within values clarification is probably the result of its use by particular individuals including himself, which is "mostly attributable to the fact that those of us who are doing it, personally are slipping into more affective interests." However, Harmin also suggests that "the population in general is getting more concerned with their feelings. I don't think values clarification strictly defined has become more affective."

Simon replies to the question of the possibility of an affective shift in values clarification by stating that "In my hands it has [become more affective]." He characterizes Rath as a "beautifully cognitive human being," and feels that Harmin is "more cognitive than I." Implicit in these statements is the opinion that the use of values clarification is highly individual, and that if it is more affective in nature, it is because its practitioners have greater affective interests themselves.

Kirschenbaum believes that while there has always been an affective aspect of values clarification as reflected in "prizing and cherishing," he thinks that "in our work over the last several years, influenced by other affective approaches, we've asked people to look more at their whole feeling realm inside." He continues by saying:

So yes, I would say that there is some evidence that we're more--there's more emphasis on the affective realm. But I wouldn't call that a major change, because it seems to me that even though sometimes in values workshops feelings play a bigger part, a lot of that might be due to the personality of the facilitator, or the fact that the facilitator just chooses to bring in some things from a different approach.

Thus, Kirschenbaum joins all of the experts mentioned previously in this section in emphasizing the importance of the individual teacher in determining the degree of affect in values clarification.

Goodman does not see where values clarification has necessarily grown to be more affective in and of itself, but again, he sees procedure as heavily influenced by the person utilizing it.

It's more "affective" in the sense that, I think, at least in my own work, I've been incorporating more and more branches of affective education or humanistic education. But I think it's always been affective, at least in terms of focusing on what people prize and cherish. So I haven't noticed many major changes in that. Not really.

Stewart acknowledges that he has only limited knowledge of the status of values clarification ten years ago, and "can really only speculate" as to whether values clarification is more affective now than it was in 1966. However, his guess is that values clarification probably is more affective now, and that it:

. . . moved more and more away from a so-called, purely "rational" and "cognitive" approach, because it came along

in that middle and late sixties when the whole thrust was away from that and against the post-Sputnik era, into a general, humanistic, affective orientation, if you recall that period. And I think values clarification came to be identified with the affective rather than the cognitive, in spite of the fact that it was designed as a rational and cognitive kind of approach to reflecting on values. . . .

Stewart refuses, however, to dichotomize affect and cognition, and would much prefer to see the situation in "organismic, integrated" terms.

Raths cited a shift in values clarification towards more affective things as one of the major changes he has observed over the last ten years. He feels that the whole area of affect was underplayed in Values and Teaching,⁵ and that while more attention is being given to feelings in the values clarification process now, that some of that is a result of certain feelings-related material being edited from the book. Raths says: "Now I may be wrong on this, but I would suggest that this is one of the things that has happened since the book was published--there's been more attention given to feelings."

In summary, the writer feels that it is difficult to declare absolutely if values clarification itself is more affective in nature in 1976 than it was in 1966. Certainly, as it is being utilized by many of the major leaders in the field, it appears that it is being wedded with other, more affective approaches.

It is safe to say that more affective things are happening within values clarification, most probably because of the personal

⁵Raths, et al., Values and Teaching.

interests of the leaders in values clarification. Kirschenbaum, for one, has attempted to emphasize affect to a greater extent in the theory, but it is not known to what degree his theoretical modifications have gained acceptance. Whether or not these affective interests will ultimately find themselves to be formally acknowledged to be a part of values clarification is one question which the leaders themselves need to deal with.

Analysis and evaluation of Sub-Question #18, "To what degree are certain key words in values education commonly defined by the experts consulted?"

The intent of this sub-question is to investigate the degree to which certain frequently used words in values education are similarly or dissimilarly defined. The writer assumes that clear communication should exist between persons engaged in various approaches within values education, and that such communication can occur only if the frequently utilized words and terms of the discipline are commonly defined and understood. While this question was originally designed to provide background data for the writer, it became increasingly apparent that the responses, while only indirectly associated with the major research questions, were important in themselves. The above sub-question is listed as a part of the first major research question because the definitions of the certain key terms inquired about provide a unique context for the assessment of the various remarks of the experts.

The writer identified the following key words for definition by some of the experts: "values," "beliefs," "attitudes,"

"feelings," "morals," and "absolutes." As stated previously, the intent of this exercise was to familiarize the writer with the meanings of these words held by each expert, especially those experts not well known by the writer.

Some experts felt that definitions of words were either unimportant in themselves, or unimportant in terms of the particular values work they are engaged in. For example, when asked to define a "value," Harmin said that he would define it through the "Seven Criteria." However, he states:

But I would probably add that it's probably not too important, how we define it. Life is a process, and what's important is what we do, how we feel, what we think. Not how we define things.

Kirschenbaum is ready to accept most any definitions for the words identified above. His advice to those looking for definitions is to "go ask Merriam Webster." However, he speculates that such an attitude might lead some people to regard him as "anti-intellectual or unscholarly." He then goes on to offer personal definitions for each of the key words.

This study is limited by the fact that not all experts were asked to define the key words, nor were all responses tape recorded when given. However, the preliminary evidence, based upon a close reading of the transcripts, suggests a wide divergence of opinion amongst the experts within the definitions themselves, and also in the importance of the definitions. Certainly, more research is needed in this area. It is possible that much of the criticism leveled by proponents of one approach against those of

another approach stems from the lack of a clear understanding of the theory, philosophy, and meanings employed.

Analysis and Evaluation of Sub-Question #1f, "Is values clarification being misused and if so, what can be done to help insure it against such misuse?"

Like any educational approach, values clarification is open to misinterpretation and possibly even misuse by some educators. The writer attempted to assess the possibility of misuse and explore some methods of quality control with each of the proponents of values clarification who are still actively involved in the dissemination of it.

Harmin sees little evidence of values clarification being misused. "The larger evidence is that people don't use it," he says. Harmin speculated that for many people, "it doesn't work for them the way it works for us," and they eventually drop the whole thing. But it shouldn't necessarily work in the same ways for everyone he says, for "We're different people. We have different audiences. We have different responsibilities."

Simon agrees with Harmin, from the standpoint that he hears very few reports of values clarification being misused. Even when it is being misused, he doubts if it could have a greatly damaging effect on children. He says: "I think kids are so effective at turning off a teacher who is bad. I really do. Just witness how hard it is to get kids to quit chewing gum, or whatever. They're not afraid." Simon adds that in all these years, he has

never heard of a single person who has "flipped-out" as a result of values clarification.

As for how "quality control" can be built into values clarification, Simon offers this observation:

Well, it's interesting. I think to make the exercises in some ways so scary, a certain percentage in the training process, that it scares people away who should be scared away. I've never said that as clearly, but I think it would be very effective. Simply to make it menacing in their own lives, so they say that: "Well, I think values clarification doesn't work," and they'll stay away from it.

He does not think that there should be rigid controls, like being able to write a thesis on the subject or create a certain number of strategies, for example.

Glaser-Kirschenbaum believes that the majority of educators using values clarification use it wisely, "but for some people it's still very seductive to use values clarification as a means of making a point." To counteract this, she devotes a good deal of time in the workshops she conducts to the examination of how and how not to create and use values clarifying strategies. "But you can't guarantee that everyone who goes through your training program is going to practice it with the same intent as you do," she says.

Glaser-Kirschenbaum is also a certified Parent Effectiveness Trainer, and so is aware of that system, with its rigid quality controls, and values clarification, with virtually no quality controls. While she sees advantages to both approaches, in the end she concludes that she "would lean more towards the accrediting."

Goodman says that he has heard "a number of different horror stories, and that makes me all the more conscientious and

dedicated to trying to be explicit about some of the ethical issues." He does not know absolutely if these misuses are severely hurting children, but is sure that he "wouldn't want to have a kid of mine involved in that kind of setting."

Goodman feels that more work is needed in defining and exploring the ethical issues involved in values clarification, particularly by classroom practitioners.

Kirschenbaum reported that "now and then" he hears of cases where values clarification has been misused. However, he admits that he doesn't know how widespread this misuse is.

Kirschenbaum has also done a good deal of thinking about the whole area of quality control. He admits that this is an issue which has troubled many of the leaders for years. "Our behavior has always tended to be rather permissive," he says. In the early seventies, the decision was made not to attempt to copyright values clarification, and he believes that ". . . in a sense that was a decision . . . to give it away." Kirschenbaum later adds:

In hindsight, we could see how quickly it spread and people began to use it, and if we had known that then, maybe we would have done it differently. But I don't want to be too hard on us then, it seemed like the way to go.

Hence, while there have been no all out efforts at quality control, there have been some. Kirschenbaum cites the creation of an "Advanced Values Clarification Workshop" for trainers and the establishment of a Values Clarification Trainers Network, "in which we hoped people would stay in touch with each other and therefore continue to improve their work by this affiliation."

Kirschenbaum also mentions a new book which he has written, An Advanced Values Clarification Handbook for Trainers and Experienced Teachers,⁶ which he hopes will also contribute to quality control. Kirschenbaum sums up his stance and to a degree, that of his colleagues, as follows:

I think the area of quality control is something we chose not to exercise a control over. We hope to exercise some influence, but its really gotten beyond us. Values clarification now is something which I think is very much in the public domain. And fairly soon after we published the Values Clarification Handbook, within a year after we published that, I don't think we could have controlled it if we wanted to. I think that decision would have to have been made back at a time when we just had no idea of how popular values clarification was going to become.

Apparently, the vast majority of those utilizing values clarification are doing so relatively competently and ethically, though perhaps some persons are not. Whether or not any misuse could lead to situations in which severe psychological harm to children could come about is doubtful. Nevertheless the matter may be serious enough to warrant further investigation. At this time, it would be impossible to enforce strict quality controls for trainers and teachers of values clarification, yet more efforts like those of the Values Clarification Trainers Network and Kirschenbaum's new book could be undertaken to encourage voluntary quality control. Steps might include attempts to gather together persons responsible for major values clarification programs in the

⁶Howard Kirschenbaum, An Advanced Values Clarification Handbook for Trainers and Experienced Teachers (publisher and publication date to be established).

country at some type of symposia, or it might be advisable to try to engender some type of quasi-certification of trainers, perhaps through the trainers network.

The proponents of values clarification need to assess more systematically the competence of practitioners in the field, so that they can rely on more than hearsay evidence in determining the extent of misuse. Such research might be a valuable guide to the construction of future workshop models for values clarification.

Analysis and Evaluation of Sub-Question #2a, "What might the future hold in regard to the widespread "popularity" of values clarification?"

There is a wide divergence of opinion with regard to the continuing popularity of values clarification amongst educators. Some experts see values clarification as a fad and on its way out, while others see it as a viable movement which will continue to play an important role in values education.

Rokeach characterizes values clarification as a fad and something with which people eventually become disaffected.

I fear people will eventually get bored with it. I am not sure the exercises are worth all that time in the classroom, too many of them may be wasting the students' time.

Lockwood states that he has little hard data to work with regarding the future of values clarification, other than "gut reaction." However, he reports that of those people who have spoken to him of their experiences with values clarification, a

lot are saying that "It worked O.K. for a while, but the kids got tired of it."

Lockwood also speculates that the more values clarification becomes "therapy oriented," the less it will be utilized by classroom teachers and the more it will be left to school counselors. Furthermore, Lockwood sees another trend developing, involving the use of values clarification with preservice teachers, trying to help them "to figure out what they believe in in terms of education, and so on."

Stewart, like Rokeach, characterizes values clarification as a "fad," and believes that "as a 'fad,' it has already peaked, it is already over the hill." However, this does not mean, in Stewart's opinion, that values clarification will cease to have an impact upon values education.

. . . at a deeper level, a lot of the things of values clarification have probably already become an inherrent part of the behavior of teachers. I suspect that those who were most deeply affected by it, have simply incorporated it into their whole approach, . . .

.
As a matter of fact, its passing into oblivion as a fad may actually enhance its capability of becoming part of the mainstream of education, . . .

Stewart also sees the future of values clarification intimately related to the future of other humanistic educational practices. He believes a serious rift exists between those educators interested in more "affective" things, and those who are not. Such a split, Stewart contends, has led us to the point where

. . . education is in serious crisis, and within the next five to ten years, there are going to have to be either some very

dramatic changes, or a continued falling off of the credibility and importance of education or schooling as we now know it will occur.

Stewart concludes by suggesting that the present "conservative swing in the country" may cause people to reject "the positive aspects of values clarification, without even bothering to find out what it's all about."

Glaser-Kirschenbaum, to a degree, agrees with Stewart and Rokeach's contention that values clarification is somewhat of a "fad." She says ". . . to some extent, there is some fadism in values clarification. I hate to admit that. I don't like to see it." Yet despite this, values clarification will not, in her opinion, fade away.

I think the concepts, some of the basic concepts of values clarification will remain. They may become re-integrated, they may become re-defined, but I think they'll live on. I think just even the existence of values clarification helped to legitimize the considering of moral issues for classroom and public use and discussion. So it may change form, but I think it will continue to live.

Harmin assumes a position quite similar to Glaser-Kirschenbaum, and suggests that the popularity of values clarification may wane, since it appears that it "couldn't get much more popular." However, values clarification may quite possibly continue to exist, because

. . . in a funny way values clarification gets at the heart of many things that have never been crisp, such as democracy, and self-direction, and mental health. Now it's not the complete of any of those things, but since it connects to so many central and critical things, it might hang around a while in one form or another. It's hard to say. I'm not sure.

Goodman seemingly is both optimistic and pessimistic about the future of values clarification. He believes that in some schools and among some educators, values clarification has been perceived as "just another fad" and something else will take its place. Yet, Goodman also states that:

I'm surprised at how many people often find values clarification to be something new that they never heard of. I think there still is ground to be plowed in terms of introducing people to it. So I think there will probably be two conflicting and yet simultaneous directions: in some places it will die-out, phase-out, and in other places it'll grow.

Simon is quite optimistic about the future of values clarification. "There will still be places which haven't heard of it and will be as hungry for it as the people who have found it in the last ten years." Like Glaser-Kirschenbaum, he foresees the possibility of it joining with other aspects of humanistic education:

It will be joined and wedded together, just as I think T.A. is a marvelously eclectic kind of therapy--Re-Evaluation Counseling the most eclectic of them all--values clarification will be absorbed into lots of other things and it will absorb lots of other things, as I've absorbed into the Re-Evaluation Counseling work. It has, to me, enough unique theory to be able to keep its identity as its read along.

Kirschenbaum, among all of the experts, has probably done the greatest amount of thinking about the future of values clarification, as indicated by an extensive chapter on its future in a forthcoming book.⁷ Kirschenbaum maintains that "the traditional values clarification approach will remain a distinct and viable force in education." He further believes "there's every reason

⁷Howard Kirschenbaum, Ibid.

to believe that many more people will become involved in values clarification or remain in values clarification." Kirschenbaum concludes by stating that "I really do believe that it's not going to die out in the next couple of years."

Once again the writer finds it difficult to offer an unequivocal evaluation of the data and reach conclusions. From the evidence, it would appear that by some measures of popularity, such as the number of pertinent journal articles, values clarification may be declining in popularity. Yet the evidence also suggests that the leaders in values clarification are still very active in the field, as demonstrated by their continuing publications in values clarification and their belief in the existence of many untouched geographical areas. And so, on a very basic level, values clarification may well continue its level of "popularity," while losing some of its appeal to academicians.

It is apparent that in the eyes of most of the experts, values clarification is closely allied with related movements in affective and/or humanistic education. To some, this means that as the broader areas are subjected to increasing attack, values clarification may find itself rejected by many. To others, this suggests that values clarification will become integrated with other approaches, with the question as to whether or not it will eventually lose its identity in question.

The writer believes that, at least for the next ten years, values clarification will continue to exist as a separate entity, while at the same time being integrated into other approaches like

Transactional Analysis, Re-Evaluation Counseling and so forth on an experimental basis. Many of the approaches within humanistic education are quite eclectic, including values clarification itself, and ultimately, the lines separating these approaches will probably blur.

Whether or not values clarification is only a fad is something which may better be decided in 1986, than in 1976. At the present time, the writer can understand those who label it a "fad" or a "bandwagon," and as Glaser-Kirschenbaum says, there may be some of that element in the movement. Yet it is hard to believe that persons who are well acquainted with it and well trained in it could ever become "bored" with it, as Rokeach and Lockwood suggest is the experience of many educators. Perhaps values clarification is in a position similar to numerous other educational innovations from our past which have gained rapid popularity only to be forgotten a short time later. Quite possibly, the failure of these past innovations can be traced to the inability or unwillingness of many educators to fully comprehend and internalize the concepts involved in these innovations. Thus, if educators perceive values clarification as a "bag of tricks" without substance, it may well prove to be "just another fad."

Analysis and Evaluation of Sub-Question #2b, "Who is likely to play key or influential roles within values clarification during the next ten years?"

The writer believes that it is relatively safe to say that since 1966, the leadership in the values clarification movement has

rested primarily with four persons: Raths, Simon, Harmin and Kirschenbaum. Others have certainly contributed to the field, but the above four have appeared to have had a national impact and were instrumental in the vast majority of publications in the area.

To whom may values clarifiers look for leadership during the upcoming decade? The answer to this question could have important curricular ramifications.

Based upon the testimony given by the experts, it would appear that it is likely that at least three of the above four leaders will continue to have a major influence on values clarification. Raths' direct influence has declined over the years, as his age and health have unfortunately kept him from playing a more active role. However, his indirect influence is deep and permanent, and reflected in the three men who will continue to influence the values clarification movement: Simon, Harmin and Kirschenbaum.

Goodman and Glaser-Kirschenbaum, themselves emerging leaders in the area, believe that leadership may come from persons not as yet identified, primarily students of the four original leaders. Glaser-Kirschenbaum has stated:

I think it might be more likely that certain students of Raths, Harmin, Simon and Kirschenbaum, who are beginning to work in moral education and values education, may be ones who do more of the critical thinking, integrating, theorizing, and research validating, than any of the four originators will.

Two other names consistently mentioned as emerging leaders are Leland and Mary Martha Howe. Through their work with the Philadelphia Humanistic Education Center, they are contributing a

good deal to the values clarification movement, in the estimation of some experts.

Kirschenbaum believes that those who were influential during the first ten years will "continue to be thought of by the public at large as leaders in values clarification." Furthermore, he believes that leaders will emerge in special applications of values clarification. He concludes by saying:

I just don't know how exactly it's all going to evolve, and I guess what I'm saying is: I think that the people who in the past have been identified as leaders, will continue to be leaders, and others will be seen as offering some leadership in some applications of values clarification.

Simon does not believe that much will be done in the area of values clarification alone, but that it will be integrated and "somewhat synthesized" with other approaches, and cites Leland and Mary Martha Howe as persons beginning to do work in that area. He agrees with Kirschenbaum in that he, too, sees the probability of new leaders emerging within specialized applications of values clarification like alcoholics education and drug education.

Stewart sees Kirschenbaum and Goodman as potential primary leaders during the next decade. He qualifies his prediction by acknowledging that he does not frequently associate with leaders in values clarification, and hence it is difficult to speculate. Stewart also pays the writer a compliment by naming him as one person who could also contribute to the area.

As stated previously, it was the intent of this sub-question to focus on the area of leadership in values clarification during the next ten years. The writer finds it difficult to answer with

the degree of certainty he felt in the responses of most of the experts. "Values Clarification," unlike Parent Effectiveness Training," for example, is not a trademark, and is not an entity controlled by a board of directors. Values clarification has become a part of the public domain. This means that practically anyone can call anything values clarification. Thus, when speculating about the future of values clarification, it might be best to speculate about the "Raths theory and practice of values clarification" or some other distinctive descriptor to set it apart from other forms of values clarification which may possibly evolve.

The Raths version of values clarification will undoubtedly continue to be deeply influenced by Simon, Kirschenbaum, and Harmin. However, persons like the Howe's, Goodman, Glaser-Kirschenbaum and, the writer, may be among those who assume increasing responsibility also for the continuing growth of values clarification.

While there is not, in a strict sense, a national "leadership" in values clarification like that in P.E.T., this fact does not appear to represent any particular liability. The wide base of involvement has encouraged experimentation and involvement sometimes lacking in rigidly controlled systems. On the other hand, there is little evidence of any national planning in the area of values clarification, with the possible exception of an informal annual get-together amongst most of the proponents of values clarification interviewed. These people may do well to consider a more active national program in leadership within values clarification.

Analysis and Evaluation of Sub-Question #2c, "What philosophical issues and/or research issues does values clarification need to confront during the next ten years?"

This area of inquiry was essentially designed as an "agenda building" effort for values clarification. In other words, the intent was to identify both broad and specific concerns which values clarifiers need to face during the next decade. For the most part, this inquiry was limited to research issues and philosophical issues. Often, there was a good deal of similarity between "research" concerns and "philosophical" concerns.

Rokeach asks two very basic questions of the proponents of values clarification: "At what point is the student 'value-clarified?' And how do you know when you've reached that point?", and ". . . demonstrable effects of values clarification. Do they exist or do they not exist?" In regard to this latter question, Rokeach states that this "would be the foremost question I would ask of that or any other values education approach. And if there are no demonstrable effects, I have no idea what people are excited about."

Stewart identifies several issues which he feels should be addressed by values clarifiers. "One would be an integration of values clarification with the developmental approach. I see that as a must." He also sees a great need for a deeper, better conceptualized philosophical basis, which would include the resolution of the charge of ethical relativism. Stewart concludes his remarks about philosophical issues and values clarification thusly:

I think it's also going to have to come to grips with something that I peculiarly highlight in all my work, and that is the fact that the answer or the answers to this whole problem of values clarification and other forms of values and moral development are getting at, are not going to be solved by pedagogy and technology and strategies and gimmicks, and that kind of thing. . . . I think we're eventually going to have to say: "Look, technology's fine, pedagogy's fine, curriculum's fine--but we got to start doing something about changing the overall nature of education and educational environments and educational administration, and all those kinds of things," because that's where the really serious problems are, and I think that's where the mainstream of education is, and I don't think that's going to come about by constantly going on, developing strategies . . . if values clarification is going to remain around and have an enduring impact, I think it's got to move above and beyond technology, pedagogy, strategies. In other words, I guess what we need is to stop working on creating more strategies and start saying: "Hey. What does values clarification say about the whole problem?"

As for research, Stewart admits that the area of values is "a damn hard area to do research in." Nevertheless, like Rokeach, he would welcome research which "objectively" investigated the claims of values clarification "to see if there's really foundation for them." If such basic research were to be conducted, "then that research in itself would begin to be informative about what other kinds of research to conceptualize." Such research, Stewart contends, need not be done "to defend itself, but to clarify itself."

Of the three critics of values clarification interviewed, Lockwood has probably done the most thinking in this particular area of inquiry, for he is presently involved in a formal project aimed at investigating the adequacy of research completed in values clarification, and has also written an unpublished paper identifying issues values clarifiers need to confront.

In the latter area, Lockwood lists several issues which he feels should be on an "agenda" for values clarification. First, he feels that there is a problem in "their failure to distinguish between moral and non-moral value issues in their approach." Also, like Stewart, he feels the charge of ethical relativism, "The absence of social conscience in their approach . . . would be a second item." Lockwood also cites the "therapy problem," discussed previously and the problem of "privacy rights," or rather the invasion thereof, as important issues. Finally he names an issue which also has reached implications, that of the questions concerning the goal of values clarification. He says that we need "to get more coherent statements of what the leaders of the movement see as the outcomes that they're working toward."

In the line of research, Lockwood severely criticizes the methodology used in past research, and particularly the multiplicity of variables.

If you're trying to marry that approach to virtually every social problem that a researcher can think of--you know I don't know if they've done research on trying to find out if values clarification leads to greater sexual satisfaction in marriage, but I wouldn't be surprised to see that come out.

Lockwood also names small sample size, lack of adequate controls and so forth as other deficiencies which future research needs to erase.

As stated previously, Lockwood also encourages research on just what the outcomes of the values clarification approach are. Research in the area of whether or not values clarification can produce stage changes in moral reasoning are not "a high priority"

with him, even though he does have a doctoral candidate working on that very question.

Kirschenbaum believes that any future research in values clarification should focus on the area of testing the long-range hypotheses of values clarification which "suggest that confusion and conflict, when the valuing processes are applied to them, will change to clarity and commitment and . . . socially constructive behavior." To measure this, Kirschenbaum suggests that new instruments be devised or old instruments be adapted to assess "the nature of people's lack of clarity and confusion about values issues" and related areas. Like the critics of values clarification, Kirschenbaum is interested in measuring the effects of values clarification, and the reasons for those effects, if any.

Harmin takes a different stance than Kirschenbaum in regard to future research. He does not see the need for any particular research in values clarification. He adds that "I don't have much faith in the effects of research. It doesn't seem to have made a hell of a lot of difference in the field that I've done a lot of research in."

Simon frankly responds that the type of research he would like to see completed in values clarification is the type "that will call off the people who say there's not enough research." He adds that he would welcome research aimed at answering some of the following questions:

What would happen if instead of the first freshman semester courses that people take in college, they would have a program in values clarification and "education of

the self." Would that lead ultimately to greater academic adjustment, greater solid, long-range marriages and child rearing qualities?

Simon also identifies a number of issues which he feels the proponents of values clarification need to deal with. They include the issue of "quality control" (discussed previously), the adequacy of the original theory, and how to use values clarification with some sort of developmental framework. He also identifies "fundamentalist" parents as a major obstacle, and feels that that whole issue warrants further exploration.

Glaser-Kirschenbaum is of the opinion that "you can raise research questions forever." Like Stewart and Simon, she would like to see research done in the area of values clarification integrating with developmental psychology. Glaser-Kirschenbaum also believes that research is needed to explore the relationship between values clarification and self-concept. Finally, she is interested in research in the area of student retention and comprehension when "traditionally" taught and when taught with a lot of values clarifying activities added:

I'd be interested in just the basic issue of comparing the teaching of subject matter in a traditional mode, with the teaching of subject matter with a lot of third-level teaching, to see if there is any difference in student retention and comprehension, and helping students to make sense of the subject matter and how it relates to their own lives.

Glaser-Kirschenbaum sees a need to look critically at values clarification during the next decade, and "critique what needs to be changed, and then work on bringing about those changes." She admits that she sees "through a glass darkly on this one," and

cannot be more concrete as to the specific issues she feels needs to be explored.

Goodman agrees that research needs to be done, but that certain ethical issues relating to the purpose of such research need to be explored. ". . . I wouldn't want research to be done on a 'band-aid' basis." That is, he doesn't want people to see values clarification as a panacea for such problems as vandalism or drug abuse.

In regard to specific research needs, Goodman believes there are two types of research which should be conducted in values clarification. One type is an "evaluation type" of research, consisting of things like case studies, "in which people document how they've developed, implemented and evaluated a particular program." A second type of research is "traditional, hard core" research, in which the effects of values clarification are measured, in terms of self-concept and in terms of what teaching methodologies seem to be most effective.

Finally, Goodman joins a number of the other experts in expressing the hope that values clarifiers will look at how values clarification can be integrated with other values education approaches, particularly Kohlberg's developmental perspective.

Lastly, Raths tells of some things which he would like to see researched in values clarification. He states that he would like to see high school and college students exposed to a number of world problems, like poverty, religion, social class, freedom and so-forth, and see what would be the effect of all of this.

Presumably, while Rath does not explicitly state this, he would be interested primarily on the effects of this experiment on values.

Raths also feels that it is important to respond to the many charges which have emanated from the Kohlbergians, and does so himself in the interview quite frequently. Thus, many of the issues raised by persons like Stewart and Lockwood would, in Rath's estimation, be appropriate things for which to formulate coherent responses.

Based upon the evidence given, at least two major research questions emerge as of primary importance. One is the question of the effects, "demonstrable effects" to use Rokeach's language, of the values clarification approach. While research in the area of values is difficult, as Stewart acknowledges, it is not impossible, even though new techniques and instruments may have to be devised. Secondly, the area of melding together values clarification and cognitive moral developmentalism also appears to be an important thrust for the future.

There are several philosophical issues which also emerge as significant based upon the frequency of their inclusion in the expert's testimony. Certainly, the entire issue of relativism and whether or not values clarification is indeed ethically relativistic needs to be resolved and put to rest. Related to the first of two major research questions in the preceding paragraph, the philosophical goals of values clarification need to be examined and stated as clearly as possible. Both of these relate to the need for an extensive and deep explanation and exploration of the

philosophical tenets of values clarification. While needed, this area may have to wait some time before being dealt with for the values clarification experts interviewed, for all of their creativity, insights and practicality, are not professional philosophers, nor do they appear as though they wish to become so.

Analysis and Evaluation of Sub-Question #2d, "Ideally, what do the various experts consulted hope will happen to values clarification during the next ten years?"

This sub-question was designed to help focus attention on the hopes and dreams the experts have for values clarification. While the writer recognizes the differences that often exist between the "real" and the "ideal," he feels that far too often people focus on what they think will be, without consideration for what can be or should be. Somewhere it is said that ideals, like stars, are not meant to be reached but to act as our constant guides. The writer is convinced that if even half of the educational movements which have occurred in the United States since 1900 had been allowed to fully blossom into their ideals, instead of being "nipped in the bud" and permitted to wither away, our entire system of learning, teaching and schooling would look far different from and better than the way it does today.

This is not to suggest that naive adventures or ill-conceived "reforms" are desirable. What the writer does mean is that one not allow the sometimes seemingly infertile and repressive reactions of the present to pre-occupy one's thinking to the point where daily

survival becomes everything, and original goals and aspirations be forever lost.

Of the critics interviewed, only Stewart responded specifically to the question concerning an ideal future for values clarification. Rokeach and Lockwood were both asked questions of a more general nature, regarding an ideal future for the broader area of values education. While the latter two experts' remarks do not directly deal with this section's sub-question, their responses are of general interest and are briefly discussed below.

Rokeach would like to see the time come when he could say:

We've really become very sophisticated about it, and we now have reached the state of knowledge in this area so that the children that we are responsible for have a more profound insight into their own values and into the values of the significant individuals and groups that they are likely to encounter in their lives. How nice it would be to be able to say that.

However, Dr. Rokeach immediately adds that he does not see this as a likely occurrence. What is more likely, in his opinion, is that values education will end up as nothing more than a series of fads.

Lockwood hopes that values education will be "taken seriously, and not treated as just some 'fad,'" had become more sophisticated and had answered some of the research and philosophical questions he feels are important. He speaks hopefully, too, of a possible integration of "citizenship education" with developmental education, "in particular so that persons understand what it means to respect the rights of another person."

Stewart would like to see values clarification recognize its limitations and change by seeking clarification of itself and accepting criticisms. Stewart says:

I would love to be able to say . . . values clarification outgrew its infancy, survived its childhood and youth, and is now become really serious, really mature, and very deep, and now is tackling things much more profoundly and with greater depth, is able to make really significant claims about what it's doing, and it's constantly changing.

Harmin would "like to see more dialogue with Kohlberg's people." Out of this dialogue, he would hope to see some differences dissolved and cooperative efforts begun. "Other than that," he states, "I think that things will take care of themselves, somehow."

Simon hopes that values clarification will "spread widely and deeply," and that it will never be referred to as a "fad." What is important is that teachers' lives be deeply affected and changed by it, and that they in turn deeply affect and change the "lives of the children they work with." Finally, he would hope that ten years from now he would be able to say that values clarification

. . . chased out of curriculum some of the "boondogginess" and nonsense that occupies a lot of people's time, and that the results were felt across the whole nation, because more and more people who learned to look at their lives, and think about what they really wanted, and learned how to say yes and no to things, were living lives of greater beauty.

Glaser-Kirschenbaum would like to see values clarification assume a much more integrative approach to values.

Glaser-Kirschenbaum also sees an "exciting" future for women's issues in values clarification, and ideally would like to

see the values clarification approach applied more widely in this whole area.

Goodman would welcome a future wherein the research and philosophical issues of values clarification were recognized and dealt with, and wherein those who utilized values clarification came to fully understand and internalize the approach.

Furthermore, Goodman likes to dream of an ideal classroom in which values clarification had been in use, and characterizes such a classroom as a place in which the curriculum was "an emerging one," where students could get into the "real world," where there would be no "put down statements," and where students can assume responsibility for their own lives. He would hope that such a classroom would be a place where

. . . when the bell rings at 3:30 they wouldn't fold up their books and fold up their minds, and wait until 8:30 the next morning to open them both back up again, but that people would be going out really talking to one another, and trying to get each other's ideas.

Like all innovators, it is clear that the proponents of values clarification hope that their efforts will not have been for naught. Their hope is to change American education for the better, and ultimately make life better for children.

There is ample evidence as well, that there is a strong hope that values clarification will become stronger and more mature in itself, while at the same time seeing its advocates explore new relationships with other approaches, particularly Kohlberg's.

Will those who in the future attempt to utilize values clarification, utilize it wisely? Will values clarification affect their lives deeply? Will it prove to be more than a fad? It's proponents hope so, and so does the writer.

COMPARISON OF SELF-INTERVIEW DATA WITH THE PRECEDING ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF SUB-QUESTIONS

Of the ten sub-questions posed in this chapter, four were not dealt with at all by the writer in the self-interview process (1b, 1e, 1f, and 2d). The remaining sub-questions were answered by the writer at least partially, through similar questions or combinations thereof.

Generally speaking, there was a high degree of congruence between the responses of the experts, particularly the proponents of values clarification, and the responses of the writer. In retrospect, this does not seem to be especially surprising since the writer is personally acquainted with most of the proponents and indeed, was trained in the use of the values clarification process by them. Thus, there is a great deal of common data which would suggest similar conclusions.

Yet there were some differences between the writer's responses and those of the experts. For example, in regard to the point as to whether or not values clarification is more "affective" in nature now than it was in 1966, the writer definitely felt that yes, values clarification was more affective. Many of the proponents of the approach, however, felt that values clarification itself had not changed so much, but that certain practitioners

of it had incorporated more affective materials as their own personal interest in affective education had grown.

Another point of slight departure involved the future of values clarification's popularity. The author saw values clarification continuing as a very popular technique in itself. Others felt that it was more likely that values clarification will become integrated into and combined with other humanistic approaches to education.

For the most part, however, there were no significant differences between the writer's testimony and those of the experts.

As stated previously, the intent of this exercise was to help the writer identify any further assumptions he might be making besides those already listed in Chapter 1, and to help him become aware of the possibility of "leading" the experts.

No new assumptions were unearthed by the writer as a result of this exercise, but it was beneficial in reminding him of the possibility of "leading" the experts. As a result, the author made every effort to assume a non-directive and non-argumentative posture during the interview process. To a large degree, the writer believes the transcripts of the interviews will reveal that this is what in fact occurred.

The self-interview process, as perceived by the writer, was never designed to be a major part of this thesis, but served more of a "consciousness raising" function. This function was successful, in his opinion, and was a valuable aid.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This chapter includes a summary of findings as they relate to the two major research questions, and is based upon the conclusions reached about the sub-questions discussed in Chapter 4. Also included in this chapter is a summary of the thesis as a whole, general conclusions and recommendations, and finally some personal reflections about this dissertation and the process which was involved in its production.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Major Research Question #1. In what ways have the theory and practice of values clarification changed since 1966?

There is little doubt that in the last ten years, values clarification has had a major impact on education and educators. To some, the impact has not been great enough. The writer recalls vividly the moment during his interview with Rath, when Rath asked in a deliberate and almost melancholy tone: "How does it happen, do you suppose, that we haven't made more of a dent?" And it is true that most teachers do not use values clarifying techniques, and that by far the predominant mode in values education is moralizing. And yet, the writer does not feel melancholy or even

powerless by the realization that "we haven't made more of a dent." Perhaps strangely, the author feels optimistic and invigorated.

Part of this optimism is rooted in the responses to the first major research question, quoted above. As the following discussion will reveal, the writer feels that values clarification has, for the most part, had a dynamic and productive history since 1966.

In what ways has values clarification changed, theoretically and methodologically since 1966? The writer sees three major changes as having occurred: (1) the method of values clarification has increasingly become one of the most practical, usable tools in education; (2) there has been both in theory and in practice, an increasingly explicit recognition and/or affirmation of the role of affect in the process of valuing; and (3) there have been an increasing number of questions and/or criticisms leveled in regard to values clarification theory and practice, both from within and without the movement.

In 1966, Values and Teaching was the only major work completed on values clarification. In the ten years which followed, approximately two hundred other resources, books, journal articles, media packages and so forth would become available. The number of workshops offered in values clarification would grow from a dozen or so per year in 1966, to hundreds a year by 1976. Likewise, the practitioners of the approach, a very small number initially, would number in the thousands a decade later. In short, all available

evidence indicates a groundswell of enthusiasm for values clarification on the parts of educators from all parts of the country.

An examination of these publications and workshops help explain why values clarification has grown so quickly. With the exception of some work by Kirschenbaum, the overwhelming emphasis in values clarification has been in the area of implementation. Hundreds of teaching strategies have been designed for immediate use in the classroom, workshops in the subject are experiential, and persons can actually see the approach at work. It appeals to teachers because it is something they can "use on Monday morning."

The writer estimates that at least 97% of all the materials produced relative to values clarification since 1966, have had as their major focus, the utilization of approach. This certainly must represent a change from 1966, when only a few teaching strategies existed for its use.

Also occurring since 1966 has been the increasingly explicit recognition and/or affirmation of the role of affect in the valuing process. There is some question as to whether or not this represents an entirely new awareness, or is more accurately described as an expansion of the affective components in the original theory. Kirschenbaum tends to think of his changes as expansions of the theory, yet his changes may also be the product of his interest in affective aspects of education, and thus are in a sense a new recognition of the fact that our feelings do have a major part to play in our entire lives, including our values.

Nevertheless, values clarification has grown to include more "affective" strategies and theoretical considerations, and in the writer's opinion, has also grown to be considered by the public a part of affective education.

Finally, since 1966 the number of criticisms of and questions about values clarification has dramatically increased. While this does not represent a change in the theory or the practice of values clarification per se, it does indicate changes in perceptions about the theory and practice of values clarification, and may well give clues as to the future of the approach.

In the early sixties, the criticisms of values clarification were few, and when given, generally positive. In 1976, the criticisms of values clarification are many, generally negative, and often laced with passion. Not all of this criticism of the latter sort is offered entirely by opponents of values clarification either. As values clarification has grown and attracted a greater following, many of its proponents have brought fresh and questioning perspectives to the movement, and have criticized certain aspects of the theory and practice.

Thus, one change which has occurred in that the theory of values clarification is beginning to reflect some of these criticisms either by refuting earlier positions or by expanding its concepts. For example, the notion of "criteria" for a value, with the possible exception of Raths, has been practically universally modified to the notion of "processes." On the other hand, the original concept of the role of affect, represented in the Raths'

theory by "prizing and caring," has been expanded by Kirschenbaum to the general category of "openness to one's inner experiences." Kirschenbaum's further elaborations, including the shift from "public affirmation" to "appropriate sharing," the addition of "socially constructive behavior" to the outcomes of values clarification, and some other relatively minor modifications are more fully described and discussed in Chapter 2 and in Chapter 4.

What is the significance of these changes? The writer believes that the above changes are significant in the following ways:

1. As a result of both the practicality and sometimes controversial nature of values clarification, interest in the broader field of values education has been greatly increased. Stewart, in his interview with the writer said that ". . . if values clarification has had any effect and can have any effect, surely for a lot of people it has helped them become more self-reflective. If we ever needed anything in education, it certainly is that." And Rokeach, obviously not an enthusiastic proponent of the values clarification, has written:

All such reservations about values clarification notwithstanding, I believe that the values clarification movement has made an extremely important contribution to modern education. It has succeeded in getting across the proposition that beyond making students aware of facts and concepts it is also important to make them aware of their own values. Such a broadening of educational objectives now has a universal fact validity, largely because of the pioneering work of proponents of values clarification.¹

¹Milton Rokeach, "Toward a Philosophy of Value Education," Values Education, Theory/Practice/Problems/Prospects, ed. by John Meyer, Brian Burnham and John Chisolm (Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1975).

2. Related to its broadening of the interest in values education, for many people, exposure to values clarification activities serves as their first step into related areas of humanistic education, group process, interpersonal communications, and personal growth experiences. Simon believes that ". . . there is something, and probably always will be something, about values clarification, as one of the shrewdest, best places to get people drawn into humanistic education." The writer himself was motivated to investigate other areas of humanistic education, largely due to his initial involvement with values clarification, and knows dozens of people with similar backgrounds.

Again, it is the practicality of values clarification which attracts so many, and from that initial attraction, affords opportunities for exploration in other approaches in humanistic education.

3. The wide-spread acceptance of values clarification which has arisen in great part because of its usefulness and applicability, can serve as a general comment of interest to curriculum developers regardless of their special field of interest. Teachers appear to be most attracted to utilitarian concepts and teaching strategies. Thus, curriculum developers in Kohlberg's area may well take heed and attempt to meld a solid, practical and attractive classroom methodology with their already well developed theoretical base.

4. The changes which have occurred within the theory and practice of values clarification demonstrate both the dynamism and permanence of the approach. On the one hand, values clarification is a changing, evolving theory and practice. On the other hand, the

very fact that values clarification could have survived its own rapid pace, and sometimes harsh criticisms, demonstrates a strength which suggests that it is something much more than a fad, and is here to stay.

5. Finally, the changes which have occurred to this point demonstrate the need for the proponents of values clarification to continue to perform research and development tasks within the approach. Values clarification has come a long way, but must still face some unresolved questions and its own self-criticism in the future.

Major Research Question #2. In what directions is values clarification likely to move during the next ten years?

The writer believes he has demonstrated the strength and vitality possessed by values clarification during the last decade, but what of the next ten years? Will values clarification remain tremendously popular, fade into oblivion, or what? What issues and problems should the leaders of the values clarification approach grapple with in the future? What issues need to be resolved if values clarification is to grow?

The author accumulated data relevant to this question, and presents his findings below. The reader should keep in mind, however, that these predictions are all speculative in nature, and some are much more speculative than others. For example, certain individuals may decide to exercise a large amount of control and planning over their lives, and hence can rather accurately predict what they will be doing in the future. On the other hand, no one

can totally control "movements" within education, for they are the composite of many individuals, some of whom may act or react in unpredictable fashions. Furthermore, certain individuals, because of their roles as past and present leaders in the values clarification field, are more likely to influence and shape the future of the approach than other, less known persons.

After examining the data the writer feels that the following points reflect likely directions for values clarification: (1) the present level of the popularity of the values clarification approach will begin to wane, and will level off at some point, but will remain an important force in education; (2) as an approach, values clarification will become integrated with similar approaches, and experimentally linked with less similar approaches as well; (3) the leadership in values clarification will develop into at least two groups, generalists and specialists, and (4) the leaders of values clarification possess some beautiful and touching dreams for the future of values clarification, which can help focus future efforts in the area.

As previously stated, much of the appeal of values clarification lies in its utility and practicality. During the next decade, the writer believes that these qualities will not be diminished but enhanced, primarily through the further publication of books and media packages. Both Kirschenbaum and Simon are soon going to release new books dealing with applications of the approach, and Harmin is working on further developments in his media approaches. There is also evidence that other persons will contribute literature

to the field in specialized values clarification applications, like religious education or substance abuse education.

Because of its continuing practicality, the writer believes that values clarification will continue to be a popular approach. However, to paraphrase Harmin, it is difficult to see how it can become any more popular. And like Glaser-Kirschenbaum, the writer believes that there probably is some fadism involved. The net effect will be, in the writer's opinion, a slight decline in the popularity of values clarification as its fad-attracted practitioners move on to other bandwagons, but a steady and significant population of supporters will continue to play active roles in values clarification.

In addition, some of the most visible indicators of the approach's appeal may change. In the past, there has been a fantastic proliferation of books, articles, etc. dealing with values clarification. While materials will continue to be published, it seems inconceivable that the past rate of publications appearing will ever be duplicated. Instead, the writer believes that there will be increasing amounts of less formal developments, e.g. curriculum developments in highly specialized areas, with only limited public appeal. Such areas could include religious education and substance abuse education, as mentioned above, or other applications like specific subject matters, certain social problems, and so forth.

This suggests a broadening of the types of persons utilizing values clarification. In 1966, values clarification was primarily

designed for use by classroom teachers, and in 1976 the writer believes that, in the eye of the public, this is still the case. Yet there are indications that other members of the helping professions, e.g. social workers, psychologists, doctors, nurses, youth organizations and others are becoming attracted to values clarification in increasing numbers. So in some areas, there may actually be an increase in values clarification's popularity, but overall, the writer still believes that its popularity will slightly decline.

Just as values clarification will become integrated with new areas of content, it will also become integrated with new areas of process. That is, the values clarification approach will be integrated with other approaches in values education and/or humanistic education. In the writer's estimation, this will occur primarily in two ways. One will involve the expanding interests of the leaders in values clarification, and the second will involve more deliberate, experimental attempts at theoretical and methodological integration.

In regard to the first point, the writer believes that as certain key leaders within values clarification become interested in other approaches in values education and/or humanistic education, they will tend to integrate these various approaches with each other. For example, Simon believes that those in Re-Evaluation Counseling should spend more time with values clarifying activities:

I . . . wish that Re-Evaluation Counseling spent more time doing the values clarifying exercises, and I think they could get to some important material faster and in somewhat more efficient ways than the random "what's on top."

Goodman refers to himself as "eclectic," and in practice, this writer knows through observation of Goodman as a workshop leader, he does integrate values clarification with other approaches, like Self-Science Education, creative problem solving and so forth. Finally, at the two Advanced Values Clarification workshops attended by the writer, and led by Kirschenbaum, Glaser-Kirschenbaum and Harmin, there have always been opportunities for the workshop participants to explore other approaches in education, like Achievement Motivation, Re-Evaluation Counseling, and even Kohlberg's moral education. Thus, in a number of ways these integrations are already starting to occur, and the writer believes that these "personal" integrations will continue.

At a different level, some persons will strive for some theoretical and methodological integrations beyond personal interest. For example, the evidence from the transcripts overwhelmingly suggests that there will be a good deal of thinking as to how values clarification and Kohlberg's approach can be integrated. Indeed, Lockwood mentions that a graduate student of his is writing a doctoral dissertation on the effects of values clarification on stages of moral reasoning (as defined by Kohlberg). As the effects of values clarification on other areas of human experience emerge, it will likely become integrated with other educational processes, perhaps things like Parent Effectiveness Training, Gestalt

psychology and so forth. As a matter of fact, values clarification being the eclectic approach that it is, one might even be able to argue at this point that it is integrated with a number of other educational processes.

Occurring simultaneously with the above changes, the leadership of values clarification will be affected by the emergence of a new group of leaders in specialized areas of application. During the past decade, the leadership of values clarification has rested primarily with Rath, Harmin, Simon and Kirschenbaum, all generalists in the approach from the standpoint that they have worked on the concept of clarifying values in universal classroom terms. While each of them has suggested uses for values clarification in, for example, specific subject matter areas, they have not done so to any degree which approaches the general work they have done.

However, there are some indications now that, in the future, certain persons will emerge as leaders in values clarification with a more specified focus, like drug education or religious education. Kirschenbaum mentions Ronald and Doris Larson, for example, as emerging leaders in values clarification in religious education. Simon speaks of a state of New York program using values clarification in alcoholics education. Thus, it appears that while Harmin, Simon and Kirschenbaum will remain influential as generalists, they will be joined by specialists as leaders in values clarification.

The writer further believes that there is the possibility of more generalists joining in the leadership of values clarification. Goodman, for example, represents such a possibility. The writer

perceives himself as a values clarification generalist, and hopes to someday have an impact on the theory and methodology of values clarification.

The integration of values clarification with other approaches may be contingent upon the resolution of some criticisms of values clarification. The common criticism of values clarification representing an ethically relativistic approach is one which certainly must be resolved if it is to be integrated with the moral reasoning approach of Kohlberg, for example. There also is an almost universal concern over the effects of values clarification, and the lack of tightly controlled research to identify and quantify these effects. It is clear to the writer that research is one of the areas in which more work must be done in values clarification during the next ten years if it is to be integrated with some other approaches in values education.

Finally, the future holds, at the very least in potential, powerful and moving possibilities for values clarification. For example, at one point in his interview, Rokeach asks when one becomes "values-clarified." While not directly responding to Rokeach himself, Raths, in a letter to the writer, says that one should never feel that he or she has "arrived" at ultimate clarification, for clarification, like "truth," is something which one may continually seek but never find. It is the process of values clarification which is important, and it is this very process which the writer believes constitutes a portion of the powerful and moving possibilities ahead for values clarification.

Another portion of the possible future for values clarification involves visions of what a values clarifying society or school might be like. For example, Goodman envisions a values clarifying classroom of the future as one free of killer statements, engaged in "real world activities, and asking a lot of questions themselves." It's seemingly such a simple, revolutionary idea, that the students in addition to being responsible for giving answers can also ask some of the questions. Simon hopes that values clarification will ultimately lead to a society in which people "were living lives of greater beauty."

While values clarification itself is not a panacea for society's ills, nonetheless the writer believes that it could, if widely practiced, open the door and provide opportunities for solutions to our problems to emerge. Will this happen? Will values clarification lead to a better society? Cynics will say no, values clarification will not effect our society to any great extent. Idealists will say yes, and perhaps lend themselves to other possibilities. This writer assumes a third position: It is impossible to predict our future with great accuracy, and no one knows for such the fate of values clarification. Yet without dreams, without hopes, and without yearning--values clarification has no future, and has already died.

What is the significance of these predictions about the future of values clarification? The writer believes that they are significant in the following ways:

1. Values clarification is going to remain an influential and popular approach within values education, a fact which should not be ignored by the designers of curricula. Values clarification has a practicality attractive to classroom teachers, and in an age where inservice education is routinely assailed by teachers as irrelevant or too theoretical, values clarification can serve as a vehicle for introducing teachers to the broader area of values education and/or humanistic education.

2. As values clarification becomes integrated with other approaches, the need for dialogue between the proponents of values clarification and related approaches becomes increasingly vital. The writer believes that many of the experts consulted in this thesis would welcome such an opportunity to share their concerns and mutually look towards the future.

Yet while there is interest in such a "meeting of the minds," there has been little in the way of action towards this. Such a conference, symposium, convention or whatever would require a good deal of planning as well as substantial financial support. Hence, an organization of some sort rather than a given individual might best be equipped to undertake such a project. The National Humanistic Education Center or the Social Science Education Consortium are two organizations which the author feels might appropriately budget the time, energy and finances required to sponsor such an event.

3. The above two points highlight the need for the leaders of values clarification to more systematically evaluate their past,

and collectively look towards the future. The available evidence indicates that there is little mutual planning done among the proponents of values clarification consulted, except in areas like schedule planning for workshops and so on.

The writer believes that both current leaders in values clarification and emerging leaders in the field, should come together at least on an annual basis, and deal with concerns, problems and proposals relative to values clarification. One agenda item needing immediate attention would be the issue of ethical relativism, and how that could be more adequately dealt with than in the past. Another might be the insufficient research. A third could be laying the groundwork for a meeting with leaders from related educational approaches. Still another agenda item could deal with the question of how "ideal" futures become "real," and planning appropriately for such ideals.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Much has happened to values clarification and its leaders since 1966. The theory and practice of the approach has swept across the country, and has touched countless thousands of lives. It has given birth to hundreds of publications, and has brought fame and, to a degree, fortune to some of its leaders. More than any other singular factor, values clarification has contributed to the legitimacy of values as an area for educational research and development. It has prompted much controversy, from the highly scholarly criticisms of some, to the highly emotional attacks of

others. Values clarification has immeasurably contributed to the personal and professional growth of many persons, including the author. In the writer's opinion, values clarification has both directly and indirectly been one of the most impactful educational movements in the last ten years.

The writer has attempted to demonstrate that values clarification has been a dynamic yet constant force in education since 1966. Values clarification has become increasingly more practical over the years as a result of the many publications containing simple lessons or "strategies," and thus has become a very popular approach amongst teachers. Also as the years went by, the role of affect in the valuing process became more important. Finally, as the popularity and widespread availability of values clarifying materials increased, so did the criticisms of values clarification, both from advocates and opponents of the approach.

The author has also attempted to shed some light on what the future of values clarification will resemble. It appears that values clarification will remain a popular educational tool, although the popularity may be reflected in different ways than in the past. During the next ten years, attempts will be made to integrate values clarification with other methodologies both because of formal educational experimentation and informal linkages by its present leaders as their own interests expand. The leadership of values clarification will become more diversified, with generalists being joined by specialists as important figures in the movement. Finally, there are some dreams and hopes for values clarification which could lead

to a world highly different from that which exists today should they be realized. And while these dreams and hopes may be unattainable, just as absolute clarity in values may be unattainable, it does not mean that one should not make any attempt.

In order for values clarification to realize its full potential, the author believes that the following action proposals should be followed:

1. The leaders of the values clarification movement must make a concerted effort to improve communications amongst themselves in terms of future efforts to strengthen the values clarification approach.

2. The leaders of the values clarification movement must make a concerted effort to establish and maintain communications with the leaders of related movements in values education, especially the developmental approach.

3. The research base of values clarification needs to be strengthened and in the very least, the following questions need to be explored:

- A. What are the effects of values clarification on:
 - student self-concept?
 - student achievement?
 - teacher-student relations?
 - student behavior?
 - teacher behavior?
- B. Does values clarification effect stage of moral development? Stage of cognitive development?
- C. What effect, if any, does values clarification have on the affective growth of a child?

4. The philosophical base of values clarification needs to be strengthened and in the very least, the following questions need to be explored:

- A. Is values clarification ethically relativistic?
- B. What are the goals of values clarification and what justifies them?
- C. Is values clarification a form of "therapy?"
- D. How is a "value" conceived of in values clarification?

SUMMARY

This dissertation concerned itself with two basic research questions:

- 1. In what ways have the theory and practice of values clarification changed since 1966?
- 2. In what directions is values clarification likely to move during the next ten years?

To gather data relevant to these questions, the author identified and contacted fourteen leading experts in values clarification and/or values education, with an approximate ratio of two proponents of values clarification to one critic of values clarification. Of the fourteen experts contacted, nine agreed to participate in the study: Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin, Sidney B. Simon, Howard Kirschenbaum, Barbara Glaser-Kirschenbaum, Joel Goodman, John S. Stewart, Alan L. Lockwood, and Milton Rokeach. An interview guide was constructed, and the nine experts were interviewed and the interview tape recorded. Prior to the interviews of the experts, however, the writer answered most of the questions of

an argumentative nature himself in an attempt to discover any assumptions that he may have been unconsciously making and to increase his awareness of the possibility of "leading" the experts during their interviews. These interviews were then transcribed and a transcript returned to each of the experts for editing and clarification. Finally, the edited versions of the transcripts served as the data base from which the author operated.

The author also undertook a review of relevant literature, and in particular concerned himself with the evolution of values clarification practice and theory. The pioneering work of Rath was highlighted, as were the later contributions of Kirschenbaum. Special attention was also given to the major criticisms of values clarification, which were then discussed and in some instances replied to by the writer.

In analyzing the data, the author broke down both of the basic research questions into several sub-questions each, and by comparing and contrasting the responses of the various experts to the sub-questions, attempted ultimately to gather information which would yield answers to the two major research questions. The results of the analysis and evaluation of these sub-questions were then compared with the responses of the writer to his self-interview, and while the results of this exercise were mixed, by and large the writer had responded in a fashion similar to the proponents of values clarification.

In regard to the two major research questions, the author came to the following conclusions: (1) since 1966, values

clarification has become an increasingly practical and usable educational tool; (2) since 1966, there has been an increasingly more explicit role for affect in values clarification; (3) since 1966, the number of questions and concerns relative to values clarification has increased greatly; (4) values clarification will remain a popular approach in values education during the next decade; (5) values clarification will become increasingly integrated with other disciplines and educational processes during the next decade; (6) the leadership in values clarification will become more diversified during the next ten years as generalists in the approach are joined by specialists in the approach as applied to specific areas; (7) ideally, values clarification can have a great impact on American education and society, and that ideals are an important part of human experience in terms of future planning.

The significance of these conclusions was thought by the writer to be the following: (1) values clarification, at least partially, is responsible for generating increased public interest in the broader area of values education; (2) values clarification has introduced many people to humanistic educational programs and practices; (3) values clarification's popularity is partially an outgrowth of its practicality and applicability, and curriculum planners should remember this in designing new curricula; (4) values clarification has been a dynamic yet stable approach, changing over the years but also maintaining itself and not passing into ob-
 11 vion; (5) there is a need for the leaders of values clarification

to continue to perform research and development tasks; (6) values clarification is likely to remain a potent and popular approach within values education during the next decade; (7) there is a need for increased communications between the leaders of values clarification and the leaders of related approaches; (8) two major points which need to be explored by values clarifiers in the future are the charges of ethical relativism and the insufficient research as to the effects of values clarification.

The dissertation closes with some broad action proposals based upon the conclusions given above, which include the improvement of internal communications amongst the leaders in values clarification and between their leaders and leaders of related movements, and steps to strengthen the research and philosophical bases.

PERSONAL REFLECTIONS

While I do not attempt to hide the fact that values clarification has played an important role in my life, I also feel that I made every attempt to deal with the two major research questions and the data concerning them in an objectively critical manner. Yet all research, including the most empirical and tightly controlled variety, ultimately has a subjective component. What is important then, is that this subjective component be minimized if research is to be meaningful.

Yet on the other hand, as Carl Rogers has suggested, perhaps a new conception of science is needed, in which emotions join more

"objective" data as information of equal importance. Only time will tell how future research will resolve this matter.

At this point, however, I feel it is appropriate to explicitly share some feelings I have had during the process of writing this dissertation. I chose the topic area of values clarification for several reasons. First, values clarification is a process which, in many ways, has deeply moved my life and, in my hands, the lives of others. It is a part of my life which I know will stay with me forever. Secondly, I believe that the questions I have attempted to answer are of great importance to practitioners of values clarification, curriculum designers, and students of educational history. Thirdly, to borrow a phrase from my dear friend, Joel Goodman, I wanted this dissertation to be "fun, but not for fun." In other words, any subject worthy of all the time and effort of a dissertation, for me, had to have a pleasurable as well as serious side. This does not mean that there have not been painful moments--times when things appeared hopeless, problems insurmountable, or deadlines far too close--certainly there have been times when I have experienced those feelings. But by and large, there was more pleasure than pain in the composition of this thesis, more nurturance than killing, and more growth than retardation.

During the course of this study, certain "feelings" kept cropping up from time to time in me which I believe should be shared, despite the fact that I have little in the area of hard data to support them. For example, I feel that the present amounts of criticism being leveled against values clarification may have

been brought upon by its proponents past emphasis on techniques to the neglect of any great emphasis on underlying philosophy, theory, goals or objectives. While all of the advocates of the approach have stated that values clarification is more than strategies, their past behaviors, including publications, by and large offer a strong case to the contrary. In any event, I find it understandable why so many critics of the approach, who may not have access to any more data than that contained in publications or workshops, conclude that values clarification is nothing more than a "bag of tricks."

Yet on the other hand, the major proponents of values clarification (with the possible exception of Rath) are not "philosophers" in the usual sense of the word. Simon, Harmin and Kirschenbaum, for example, have shown themselves to be excellent practitioners and designers of curricula. Perhaps it is unrealistic to expect them to be excellent philosophers as well. However, if this is the case, and these men are not "philosophers," who will answer the deep philosophical questions raised by the critics of values clarification? Who will devote years of their life to the development of a clear psychophilosophical base for values clarification?

Possibly another factor which has contributed to the many criticisms of values clarification is involved in the approach itself, which is aimed at clarifying and not telling. The proponents of the approach, when asked questions, often respond in ways which are designed to help the questioner decide things for himself or herself, and not to offer concrete answers. In a recent workshop

in values clarification which I attended, for example, a person rose to ask the workshop leader as to the conception of man assumed by values clarification? Such a question would appear to be a fairly straightforward, "philosophical" query. The leader responded in a typical "clarifying" manner, and attempted to help the individual become clearer about the issue. Only when pressed did the leader answer the question directly. Such behavior was not deliberate evasiveness in my mind, but nonetheless could be perceived as such by some scholars.

Finally, some basic questions have occurred to me which I feel must be dealt with in the future in addition to those previously identified. One question deals with the fact that in values clarification, both "values" and "clarification" are always somehow connected. This may seem logical on the one hand, yet on the other it raises some interesting points. For example, is it the clarification of values that is vital in the approach, or is it clarification itself, which might include the clarification of beliefs, opinions, attitudes, feelings, or behaviors as well as values? Could it be that by limiting itself to values clarification, this particular approach is limiting itself unnecessarily or is perhaps even misrepresenting itself? Such questions are, in my opinion, worth looking into.

Last but not least, while I have already acknowledged the contributions of so many of the persons who have been so helpful to me, I feel a final word of appreciation must go to Louis Rath. I will never forget my meeting with Dr. Rath in his home in Dunkirk,

New York. He immediately made me feel at ease, and soon we were talking like old friends. Yet throughout our conversation, I felt awed, as if I were in the presence of a sage. And indeed I was. For it is the brilliance, the wisdom, the intuition, the caring and the dedication of this singular man that created values clarification. Dr. Rath has been, and shall continue to be, one of the most influential teachers in my life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abramowitz, Mildred, and Macari, Claudia. "Values Clarification in Junior High School." Educational Leadership, 29, 7 (April, 1972), 621-626.
- Albert, E. M., and Kluckhohn, C. Selected Bibliography on Values, Ethics, and Aesthetics in the Behavioral Sciences and Philosophy: 1920-1958. New York: Free Press, 1959.
- Alberty, Harold Bernard. Reorganizing the High School Curriculum. New York: MacMillan Co., 1947.
- Barman, Charles R. "Integrating Value Clarification with High School Biology." The American Biology Teacher, 37, 3 (March, 1975), 150-154.
- Barman, Charles. "Value Clarification and Biology." The American Biology Teacher, 36, 4 (April, 1974), 241-242.
- Behling, Herman E., Jr. "What do we Value in Teacher Education?" The Informer, 3, 1 (February-March, 1973), 1-3.
- Berger, Bonnie; Hopp, Joyce W.; and Raettig, Velma. "Values Clarification and the Cardiac Patient." Health Education Monographs, 3, 2 (Summer, 1974), 191-199.
- Berson, Minnie B. "Valuing, Helping, Thinking, Resolving." Childhood Education, 49, 5 (February, 1973), 242-245.
- Betof, Edward, and Kirschenbaum, Howard. Teaching Health Education with a Focus on Values. Upper Jay, N.Y.: National Humanistic Education Center, 1973. (Mimeographed.)
- Blaeuwer, David A. "Student Teaching and the Valuing Process." New Directions in Teaching, 4, 4 (Winter, 1975).
- Bolton, Robert. Values Clarification for Educators. Cazenovia, N.Y.: Ridge Consultants, 1974.
- Casteel, J., et al. Value Clarification in Social Studies: Six Formats of the Values Sheet. Gainesville, Florida: Florida Educational Research and Development Council, University of Florida, 1974.
- Casteel, J. Doyle, and Stahl, Robert J. Value Clarification in the Classroom: A Primer. Pacific Palisades, Ca.: Goodyear Publishing, 1975.

- Cheney, Ruth. "Youth, Sexuality and Value Clarification." Findings, (Fall, 1970), 14-16.
- Clegg, Ambrose A., Jr., and Hills, James L. "A Strategy for Exploring Values and Valuing in the Social Studies." The College of Education Record. University of Washington (May, 1968), 67-68.
- Colby, Ann. Review of Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom, by Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin, and Sidney B. Simon, and Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students, by Sidney B. Simon, Leland W. Howe and Howard Kirschenbaum, Harvard Educational Review, 45, 1 (February, 1975), 134-143.
- Cole, Troy. "How many of You . . .?" Grade Teacher (November, 1971), pp. 28+.
- Covault, Thomas J. "The Application of Value Clarification Teaching Strategies with Fifth Grade Students to Investigate their Influence on Students' Self-Concept and Related Classroom Coping and Interacting Behaviors." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1973.
- Curwin, Geri. "Pages from my Autobiography." Trend, 8, 1 (Spring, 1972).
- Curwin, Geri, et al. Search for Values. Villa Maria, Pa.: The Center for Learning, Inc., 1972.
- Curwin, Geri, and Curwin, Richard. "Building Trust: A Starting Point for Clarifying Values." Learning, 3, 6 (February, 1975), 30-33; 36.
- Curwin, Richard L. "Values Clarification Approach to Teaching Secondary English Methods." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1972.
- Curwin, Richard; Curwin, Geri; and the editors of Learning Magazine. Developing Individual Values in the Classroom. Palo Alto, Ca.: Learning Handbooks, 1974.
- Curwin, Richard, and Fuhrmann, Barbara. Discovering Your Teaching Self. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.
- Desrosiers, Marian, and Santosuosso, John. Personalizing the Study of Foreign Cultures. Upper Jay, N.Y.: National Humanistic Education Center, 1975.
- Dewey, John. Moral Principles in Education. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959.

- Dewey, John. Theory of Valuation, Vol. II, No. 4 of the International Encyclopedia of Unified Science. Edited by Otto Neurath. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.
- Dreischmeiers, W. B. "Teaching for a change in Attitude: Values Clarification." Agricultural Education Magazine. (December, 1974), pp. 129-30.
- Evans, Clyde. "Facing Up to Values." Teacher, 92, 4 (December, 1974), 16-18; 72-73.
- Fiske, Edward. "New Techniques Help Pupils Develop Values." New York Times, April 30, 1975, p. 33.
- Foricinielli, Joseph, and Engeman, Thomas. "Value Education in the Public School." Thrust, 4, 1 (October, 1974), 13-16.
- Frick, Ralph. "Values: Games are not Enough." Teacher, 91, 4 (December, 1973), 8-9.
- Gellatt, H. B.; Varenhorst, Barbara; and Carey, Richard. Deciding: A Leaders Guide and Deciding: A Student Workbook. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1972.
- Genge, Betty Anne, and Santosuosso, John. "Values Clarification for Ecology." Science Teacher, 41, 2 (February, 1974), 37-39.
- Goodman, Joel. "An Application of Value Clarification to the Teaching of Psychology." Periodically, 2, 4 (April, 1972).
- Goodman, Joel. "Sid Simon on Values: No Moralizers or Manipulators Allowed." Nations Schools, 92, 6 (December, 1973), 39-42.
- Goodman, Joel, and Hawkins, Laurie. "Value Clarification: Meeting a Challenge in Education." Colloquy, 5, 5 (May, 1972), 15-18.
- Goodman, Joel; Simon, Sidney; and Witort, Ron. "Tackling Racism by Clarifying Values." Today's Education, 63, 1 (January, 1973), 37-38.
- Gray, Farnum. "Doing Something about Values." Learning, 1, 2 (December, 1972), 15-18.
- Gray, Farnum. "Kohlberg and Simon." Learning, 1, 2 (December, 1972), 19.

- Green, Diane; Stewart, Patricia; and Kirschenbaum, Howard.
"Training a Large Public School System in Values Clarification." Upper Jay, N.Y.: National Humanistic Education Center, 1973. (Mineographed.)
- Green, Jeffrey. "One Thing I Wish Mr. Green did More of Is . . ."
Humanistic Educators Network, 1, 2. Saratoga Springs, N.Y.:
National Humanistic Education Center, 1974.
- Green, Kathleen. "Values Clarification Theory in ESL and Bilingual Education." Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly, 9, 2 (June, 1975), 155-164.
- Greenberg, Jerrold S. "Behavior Modification and Values Clarification and Their Research Implications." Journal of School Health, 45, 2 (February, 1975), 91-95.
- Hafeman, John. "Teaching and Valuing Process." Wisconsin Education Association, 100, 10 (May, 1968), 5.
- Ha11, Brian. Values Clarification as Learning Process: A Guidebook.
New York: Paulist Press, 1973.
- Ha11, Brian. Values Clarification as Learning Process: A Sourcebook.
New York: Paulist Press, 1973.
- Ha11, Brian, and Smith, Maury. Values Clarification as Learning Process: Handbook for Christian Educators. New York: Paulist Press, 1973.
- Hardin, Joy. "Values Clarification, Micro-Counseling, Education of the Self, and Achievement Motivation Training: A Critique." Meform. (University of Massachusetts School of Education, Spring, 1975, 30-36.
- Harmin, Merrill. Making Sense of our Lives. Niles, Ill.: Argus Communications, 1973-74.
- Harmin, Merrill. People Projects. Menlo Park, Ca.: Addison-Wesley, 1973.
- Harmin, Merrill. Process Posters: Making Sense of Our Lives Series. Niles, Ill.: Argus Communications, 1974.
- Harmin, Merrill. Value Cassettes: Making Sense of Our Lives Series. Niles, Ill.: Argus Communications, 1974.
- Harmin, Merrill. "Values in the Classroom: An Alternative to Moralizing." Inservice Training for Teachers of the Gifted. Edited by William Rogge and G. Edward Stormer. Champaign, Ill.: Stipes Publishing Co., 1966.

- Harmin, Merrill, and Gregory, Tom. Teaching Is. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1974.
- Harmin, Merrill; Kirschenbaum, Howard; and Simon, Sidney B. Clarifying Values Through Subject Matter: Applications for the Classroom. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973.
- Harmin, Merrill; Kirschenbaum, Howard; and Simon, Sidney B. "The Search for Values with a Focus on Math." National Association of Elementary School Principals, Teaching Mathematics in the Elementary School. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, and the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1970.
- Harmin, Merrill; Kirschenbaum, Howard; and Simon, Sidney B. "Teaching History with a Focus on Values." Social Education, 33, 5 (May, 1969), 568-570.
- Harmin, Merrill; Kirschenbaum, Howard; and Simon, Sidney B. "Teaching Science with a Focus on Values." Science Teacher, 37, 1 (January, 1970), 16-20.
- Harmin, Merrill; Hisenholtz, Bernard; and Simon, Sidney B. "Teaching for Value Clarity." Changing Education, 4, 1 (Spring, 1969), 20-22.
- Harmin, Merrill, and Simon, Sidney B. "How to Help Students Learn . . . About Themselves." The High School Journal (March, 1972), pp. 256-264.
- Harmin, Merrill, and Simon, Sidney B. "The Subject Matter Controversy Revisited." Peabody Journal of Education, 42, 4 (January, 1965), 194-205.
- Harmin, Merrill, and Simon, Sidney B. "Using the Humanities for Value Clarification." Impact (Journal of the New York State ASCD), 8, 3 (Spring, 1968), 27-30.
- Harmin, Merrill, and Simon, Sidney B. "Values." Teachers Handbook. Edited by Dwight Allen and Eli Seifman. Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman, 1971.
- Harmin, Merrill, and Simon, Sidney B. "Values and Teaching: A Humane Process." Educational Leadership, 24, 6 (March, 1967), 517-525.
- Harmin, Merrill, and Simon, Sidney B. "Working with Values in the Classroom." Scholastic Teacher, 89, 13 (January 6, 1967), 16-17; 24.

- Hawley, Robert C. "Values and Decision Making." Independent School Bulletin, 32, 1 (October, 1972), 19-23.
- Hawley, Robert. Value Exploration through Role Playing. New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1975.
- Hawley, Robert, and Hawley, Isabel. Human Values in the Classroom: A Handbook for Teachers. New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1975.
- Hook, Sidney. Education for Modern Man. New York: Knopf, 1963.
- Hopp, Joyce. "VC for Sixth Graders." School Health Review, 5, 1 (January-February, 1974), 34-35.
- Howe, Leland, et al. "Clarifying Values through Foreign Language Study." Hispania, 56, 2 (May, 1973), 404-406.
- Howe, Leland. "Group Dynamics and Values Clarification." Forum. (J.C. Penney Company Magazine for Home Economists), Spring/Summer, 1972, p. 12.
- Howe, Leland, and Howe, Mary Martha. Personalizing Education: Values Clarification and Beyond. New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1975.
- Hoy, Trevor. A Values Clarification Design as an Organizational Development Intervention. Mount St. Alban, Washington, D.C.: Project Test Pattern, 1973.
- Huggins, Kenneth B. "Alternatives in Values Clarification." The National Elementary Principal, 54, 2 (November-December, 1974), 76-79.
- Johnson, Patricia. "Understanding and Using Values." 1975 YMCA Yearbook and Official Roster. New York: National Board of Young Men's Christian Association, 1975.
- Jones, Clayton. "Can Schools Teach Ethics?" The Christian Science Monitor, December 23, 1974, pp. 1-2.
- Kelley, Paul, and Conroy, Gladys. "A Promotive Health Plan for Preventing Alcohol and Drug Abuse in the Schools." Arizona Medicine, XXIX, No. 1 (January, 1972), pp. 54-56.
- Kingman, Barry. The Development of Value Clarification Skills: Initial Efforts in An Eight Grade Social Studies Class. Stony Brook, N.Y.: State University of New York, American Historical Association Education Project, 1974.

- Kirschenbaum, Howard. "Beyond Values Clarification." Readings in Values Clarification. Edited by Sidney B. Simon and Howard Kirschenbaum. Minneapolis: Winston Press, Inc., 1973.
- Kirschenbaum, Howard. "Clarifying Values at the Family Table." Upper Jay, N.Y.: Adirondack Mountain Humanistic Center, 1971. (Mimeographed.)
- Kirschenbaum, Howard. "Clarifying Values Clarification: Some Theoretical Issues." Upper Jay, N.Y.: National Humanistic Education Center, 1975. (Mimeographed.)
- Kirschenbaum, Howard. "Current Research in Values Clarification." Upper Jay, N.Y.: National Humanistic Education Center, November, 1975. (Mimeographed.)
- Kirschenbaum, Howard. "The Free Choice English Curriculum." Upper Jay, N.Y.: Adirondack Mountain Humanistic Education Center, 1972. (Mimeographed.)
- Kirschenbaum, Howard. "Recent Research in Values Clarification." Upper Jay, N.Y.: National Humanistic Education Center, 1974. Reprinted in John Meyer, Brian Burnham and John Cholvat, eds. Values Education: Theory/Practice/Problems/Prospects. Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1975.
- Kirschenbaum, Howard. "Sensitivity Modules." Media and Methods. (February, 1970), pp. 36+.
- Kirschenbaum, Howard. "The Listening Game." Colloquy, 3, 8 (October, 1970), 12-15.
- Kirschenbaum, Howard. "Sensitivity Modules." Media and Methods, 6, 6 (February, 1970), 36-38.
- Kirschenbaum, Howard, and Bacher, Robert. Clarifying Our Values: A Listening Post Program. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1971.
- Kirschenbaum, et al. "In Defense of Values Clarification: A Position Paper." Humanistic Educators Network. (National Humanistic Education Center, Saratoga Springs, N.Y.), 1, 7 (November, 1975). (Mimeographed.)
- Kirschenbaum, Howard; Glaser-Kirschenbaum, Barbara; and Gray, Russell Dent, III. "Values Clarification: An Annotated Bibliography, 1965-1975. Saratoga Springs, N.Y.: National Humanistic Education Center, 1976. (Mimeographed.)
- Kirschenbaum, Howard; Harmin, Merrill; Howe, Leland; and Simon, Sidney B. "In Defense of Values Clarification." Saratoga Springs, N.Y.: National Humanistic Education Center, 1975. (Mimeographed.)

Kirschenbaum, Howard, and Simon, Sidney B., eds. Readings in Values Clarification. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973.

Kirschenbaum, Howard, and Simon, Sidney B. "Teaching English with a Focus on Values." The English Journal, 58, 7 (October, 1969), 1071-1076; 1113.

Kirschenbaum, Howard, and Simon, Sidney B. "Values and the Futures Movement in Education." Learning for Tomorrow: The Role of the Future in Education. Edited by Alvin Toffler. New York: Vintage Books, 1974.

Klevan, Albert. "An Investigation of a Methodology for Values Clarification: Its Relationship to Consistency on Thinking, Purposefulness, and Human Relations." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1957.

Klevan, Albert. "Clarifying as a Teaching Process." Educational Leadership, 25, 5 (February, 1968), 454-458.

Knapp, Clifford E. "Attitudes and Values in Environmental Education." The Journal of Environmental Education, 3, 4 (Summer, 1972), 26-29.

Knapp, Clifford E. "The Environment: Children Explore Their Values." Instructor Magazine, 81, 7 (March, 1972), 116-118.

Knapp, Clifford E. "Teaching Environmental Education with a Focus on Values." Upper Jay, N.Y.: Adirondack Mountain Humanistic Education Center, 1972. (Mimeographed.)

Knapp, Clifford, and DuShane, Judith. "Clarifying Values for a Better Environment." Counseling and Values, 18, 4 (Summer, 1974), 266-271.

Knapp, Clifford, and Warren, Lynnanne. "Outdoor Environmental Values Clarification." Environmental Education Report, February, 1975, p. 8.

— Kohlberg, Lawrence. "The Relationship of Moral Education to the Broader Field of Values Education." Values Education, Theory, Practice/Problems/Prospects. Edited by John Meyer, Brian Burnham, and John Cholvat. Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1975.

Kracht, James B., and Boehm, Richard G. "Feelings About the Community: Using Value Clarification in and out of the Classroom." Journal of Geography (April, 1975), pp. 198-206.

- Lieberman, Phyllis, and Simon, Sidney B. "A School's Responsibility: Worthy Use of Leisure Time." The Clearing House (April, 1965), pp. 502-505.
- Lieberman, Phyllis, and Simon, Sidney B. "Current Events and Values." Social Education, 29, 8 (December, 1965), 523-533.
- Lieberman, Phyllis, and Simon, Sidney B. "Values and Student Writing." Educational Leadership (March, 1965), pp. 414-421+.
- Lockwood, Alan L. "A Critical View of Values Clarification." Teachers College Record, 77, 1 (September, 1975), 35-50.
- McBride, Alfred. "Values are Back in the Picture." America, 128, 15 (April, 1973), 359-361.
- Mears, Michael. "Who's Sid Simon and What is all this about Values Clarification?" Media and Methods, 9, 7 (March, 1973), 30-37.
- Michalak, Daniel A. "The Clarification of Values." Improving College and University Teaching, 18, 2 (Spring, 1970), 100-101.
- Morel, Stefano. Human Dynamics in Foreign Language Series: Human Dynamics in Italian: Teacher's Manual and Student Workbook. Upper Jay, N.Y.: National Humanistic Education Center, 1975.
- Morrison, Eleanor, and Price, Mila Underhill. Values in Sexuality: A New Approach to Sex Education. New York: Hart Publishing, 1974.
- Nash, Robert, and Shiman, David. "The English Teacher as Questioner." English Journal, 63, 9 (December, 1974), 38-44.
- Olmo, Barbara. "The Threat of New Ideas: A Values Clarification Lesson." Adolescence, X, No. 39 (Fall, 1975), pp. 456-462.
- Osman, Jack. "A Rationale for Using Value Clarification in Health Education." The Journal of School Health, XLIII, No. 10 (December, 1973), pp. 621-623.
- Osman, Jack. "Teaching Nutrition with a Focus on Values." Nutrition News, 36, 2 (April, 1973), 5.
- Osman, Jack. "The Use of Selected Values Clarifying Strategies in Health Education." Journal of School Health, 44, 1 (January, 1974), 21-25.
- Osman, Jack, and Kenny, Bonnie. "Value Growth through Drug Education." School Health Review, 5, 1 (January-February, 1974), 25-30.

Paulson, Wayne. Deciding for Myself: A Values Clarification Series. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1974.

Poetker, Joel. "A Strategy for Value Clarification." Social Science Record, 11, 1 (Autumn, 1973), 3-5.

Proudman, Colin. Values. New York: Friendship Press, 1972. (Board Game.)

Raths, James. "An Application of Clarifying Techniques to Academic Underachievers in High School." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1960.

Raths, Louis E. "Approaches to the Measurement of Values." Educational Research Bulletin, XIX, No. 10 (May 8, 1940), pp. 275-282+.

Raths, Louis E. "Clarifying Values." Curriculum for Today's Boys and Girls. Edited by R. S. Fleming. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1963.

Raths, Louis E. "How Children Build Meanings." Childhood Education, 30, 3 (December, 1954), 159-160.

Raths, Louis E. Teaching for Learning. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1969.

Raths, Louis E. "Values are Fundamental." Childhood Education, February, 1959, pp. 246-247.

Raths, Louis E. "What is Teaching?" Educational Leadership, 55, 5 (December, 1955), pp. 146-147.

Raths, Louis E.; Harmin, Merrill; and Simon, Sidney B. "Helping Children Clarify Values." NEA Journal, 56, 7 (October, 1967), 12-15. Note: NEA Journal is now titled Today's Education.

Raths, Louis E.; Harmin, Merrill; and Simon, Sidney B. Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, Publishing Co., 1966.

Rees, Floyd D. "Teaching the Valuing Process in Sex Education." School Health Review, 3, 2 (March-April, 1972), 2-4.

Rees, Floyd D. "Teaching Values Through Health Education." School Health Review, 1, 1 (February, 1970), 15-17.

Roberts, Dina Fried, and Roberts, Gilbert. "Techniques for Confronting Sex Role Stereotyping." School Psychology Digest, Summer, 1973, pp. 47-54.

- Rogers, Carl A. "A Modern Approach to the Valuing Process." Freedom to Learn. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1969.
- Rokeach, Milton. "Toward a Philosophy of Value Education." Values Education, Theory/Practice/Problems/Prospects. Edited by John Meyer, Brian Burnham and John Cholvat. Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1975.
- Sadker, David; Sadker, Myra; and Simon, Sidney B. "Clarifying Sexist Values." Social Education, 37, 8 (December, 1973), 756-760.
- Santosuosso, John. "Should Schools Deal in Values Clarification?" The Watman Educational Services Bulletin, 3, 10 (June, 1974), 2.
- Schindler-Rainman, Eva. "Are Values out of Style?" Journal of National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Fall, 1970, pp. 18-22.
- Schlaadt, Richard. "Implementing the Values Clarification Process." School Health Review, 5, 1 (January-February, 1974), 10-12.
- Shattuck, J. Bruce. "Using the Sciences for Value Clarification." Science Education, 54, 1 (January-March, 1970), 9-11.
- Simon, Sidney B. "Dinner Table Learning." Colloquy, 4, 11 (December, 1971), 34-37.
- Simon, Sidney B. "Election Year and Dinner Table Learning." Colloquy, 5, 9 (October, 1972), 23-25.
- Simon, Sidney B. Meeting Yourself Halfway. Niles, Ill.: Argus Communications, 1974.
- Simon, Sidney B. "Promoting the Search for Values." Education Opportunity Forum, 1, 4 (Fall, 1969), 75-84.
- Simon, Sidney B. "The Search for Values." Edvance, 1, 3 (May/June, 1971), 1-3; 6.
- Simon, Sidney B. "Sensitizing Modules: A Cure for 'Senioritis.'" Scholastic Teacher, September 21, 1970, pp. 28-29; 42.
- Simon, Sidney B. "Talking to Parents about Values Clarification." The Watman Education Services Bulletin, 3, 10 (June, 1974), 1-2.
- Simon, Sidney B. "The Teacher Educator in Value Development." Phi Delta Kappan, 53, 10 (June, 1972), 649-651.

- Simon, Sidney B. "Star Trek," Breaking Out. Edited by Don Briggs. New York: David McKay, 1973.
- Simon, Sidney B. "Three Ways to Teach Church School." Colloquy, 3, 1 (January, 1970), 37-38.
- Simon, Sidney B. "Two Newer Strategies for Value Clarification," Edvance, 2, 1 (September October, 1971), 6.
- Simon, Sidney B. "Value Clarification: Methodology and Tests of an Hypothesis in an In-Service Program Relating to Behavioral Changes in Secondary School Students." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1958.
- Simon, Sidney B. "Values Clarification and Shalom." Colloquy, 5, 7 (July-August, 1972), 18-21.
- Simon, Sidney B. "Value Systems Techniques." New York: Episcopal Church, 1970. (Film) Hamilton Wright, Producer. Available from ROA's Films, 1969 North Astor Street, Milwaukee, Wi.
- Simon, Sidney B. "Values and Teaching." Religious Education, 68, 2 (March-April, 1973), 183-194.
- Simon, Sidney B. "Values Clarification--a Tool for Counselors." Personnel and Guardian Journal, 51, 9 (May, 1973), 614-618.
- Simon, Sidney B. "Values Clarification vs. Indoctrination." Social Education, 35, 8 (December, 1971), 902-905; 915.
- Simon, Sidney B. "A Values Clarifier Looks at Poverty." Issues Today, 5, 14 (April 13, 1973), 1-2.
- Simon, Sidney B. Values in Teaching. Dayton, Ohio: Creative Sights and Sounds, 1974. (Cassettes.)
- Simon, Sidney B. "What Do You Value?" Forum (J. C. Penney Company Magazine for home economists), Spring/Summer, 1972, 4-5.
- Simon, Sidney B. "What Schools should be Doing about Values Clarification." NAASP Bulletin (February, 1974), pp. 54-60.
- Simon, Sidney B. "Your Values are Showing." Colloquy, 3, 1 (January, 1970), 20-32.
- Simon, Sidney B., and Bohn, Mary Bradford. "What Schools Should be Doing about Values Clarification." NAASP Bulletin, 58, 379 (February, 1974), 54-60.
- Simon, Sidney B., and Carnes, Alice. "Teaching Afro-American History with a Focus on Values." Educational Leadership, 27, 3 (December, 1969), 222-224.

- Simon, Sidney B., and Clark Jay. Beginning Values Clarification: Strategies for the Classroom. San Diego: Pennant Press, 1975. (Note: First printing was entitled More Values Clarification.)
- Simon, Sidney B.; Curwin, Geri; and Hartwell, Marie. "Teaching Values." Girl Scout Leader, 14, 4 (June, 1972), 12-13.
- Simon, Sidney B.; Daitch, Patricia; and Hartwell, Marie. "Value Clarification: New Mission for Religious Education." Catechist, 5, 1 (September, 1971), 8-9; 31.
- Simon, Sidney B.; Daitch, Patricia; and Hartwell, Marie. "Value Clarification: Part II." Catechist, 5, 2 (October, 1971), 36-38.
- Simon, Sidney B.; Daitch, Patricia; and Hartwell, Marie. "Value Clarification: Part III." Catechist, 5, 3 (November, 1971), 28-29.
- Simon, Sidney B., and de Sherbinin, Polly. "Values Clarification: It Can Start Gently and Grow Deep." Phi Delta Kappan, 56, 10 (June, 1975), 679-683.
- Simon, Sidney B., and Goodman, Joel. "Values Clarification: Focus on Work and Leisure." Today's Catholic Teacher, 7, 1 (September, 1973), 11-15.
- Simon, Sidney B., and Goodman, Joel. "Ways of Teaching/Learning." Adult Leader, 6, 1 (September-October-November, 1973).
- Simon, Sidney B., and Harmin, Merrill. "Subject Matter with a Focus on Values." Educational Leadership, 26, 1 (October, 1969), 34-39. Reprinted as "Focus on Values for More Relevant Schools." NJEA Review, 43, 2 (October, 1969).
- Simon, Sidney B., and Hart, Lois. "Values Clarification." Learning with Adults, 1, 6 (June, 1973), 15-18.
- Simon, Sidney B., and Hart, Lois. "Values Clarification: Making Your New Year Better." Cross Talk, 2, 4 (1973).
- Simon, Sidney B., and Hartwell, Marie. "Personal Growth through Advertising." Colloquy, 5, 11 (December, 1972), 12-15.
- Simon, Sidney B., and Hartwell, Marie. "Values Clarification: A Heritage of Wisdom." Curriculum Trends, January, 1973.
- Simon, Sidney B.; Hawley, Roberts; and Britton, David. Composition for Personal Growth: Values Clarification through Writing. Amherst, Ma.: Education Research Associates, 1971, and New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1973.

- Simon, Sidney B.; Howe, Leland W.; and Kirschenbaum, Howard. Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students. New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1972.
- Simon, Sidney B.; Kirschenbaum, Howard; and Fuhrmann, Barbara. An Introduction to Values Clarification. New York: J. C. Penney Co., 1972.
- Simon, Sidney B.; Kirschenbaum, Howard; and Howe, Leland. "Strategies for Value Clarification." Forum (J. C. Penney Company Magazine for home economists), Spring/Summer, 1972, 8-11.
- Simon, Sidney B., and Massey, Sara. "Values Clarification: A Strategy in the Search for Self." Educational Leadership, 30, 8 (May, 1973), 738-739.
- Simon, Sidney B., and O'Rourke, Robert. "Getting to Know You." Educational Leadership, 32, 8 (May, 1975), 524-526.
- Simon, Sidney B.; Sadker, Myra; and Sadker, David. "Where do they Stand?" Instructor, 84, 1 (August/September, 1974), 110; 112; 119.
- Simon, Sidney, and Sparago, Edi. "Values: Clarification and Action." Momentum, 2, 4 (December, 1971), 4-9.
- Smith, Bryan C. "Values Clarification in Drug Education." Journal of Drug Education, Vol. 3 & 4 (Winter, 1973).
- Smith, Maury, ed. Retreat Resources: Volume I: Retreats for Clergy and Religions. New York: Paulist Press, 1975.
- Smith, Maury. "Some Implications of Value Clarification for Organization Development." The 1973 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators. Edited by J. William Pfeiffer and John E. Jones. Iowa City, Ia.: University Associates, 1973.
- Stewart, John S. "Clarifying Values Clarification: A Critique." Phi Delta Kappan, 56, 10 (June, 1975), 684-688.
- Stoller, Phyllis, et al. Real Communication in French. Upper Jay, N.Y.: National Humanistic Education Center, 1974.
- Superka, Douglas. "Approaches to Values Education." Social Science Education Consortium Newsletter, November, 1974.
- Superka, Douglas P. "A Typology of Valuing Theories and Values Education Approaches." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkley, 1973.

- Superka, Douglas P., et al. Values Education Sourcebook, Conceptual Approaches, Materials Analyses, and an Annotated Bibliography. Boulder, Co.: Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., 1976). Also listed in Resources in Education, #50 008 489.
- Thal, Helen M., and Holcombe, Melinda. "Value Clarification: Putting Life and Work in Perspective." American Vocational Journal, 48, 9 (December, 1973), 25-27.
- Thomas, W. A Comprehensive Bibliography on the Values Concept. Grand Rapids, Mi.: Project on Student Values, 1967.
- Warren, Carrie Lee. "Value Strategies in Mental Health." School Health Review, 5, 1 (January-February, 1974), 22-24.
- "Watergate Emphasizes Need to Teach Ways of Choosing Values." Pennsylvania School Journal, September, 1973, pp. 20-22.
- Weber, Sister Helen. Value Prompters. Denver: Alternatives in Religious Education, Inc., Commission on Educational Ministries, Colorado Council of Churches, 1973.
- Westerhoff, John H., III. "How Can We Teach Values?" Colloquy, 3, 1 (January, 1970), 17-19.
- Wilkinson, Charles. "Value Learning Replaces School Religious Classes." The Calgary Herald, September 14, 1974, p. 38.
- Wilson, Virginia, and Wattenmaker, Beverly. "Can We Humanize Foreign Language Education?" Upper Jay, N.Y.: National Humanistic Education Center, 1973. (Mimeographed.)
- Wilson, Virginia, and Wattenmaker, Beverly. Real Communication in Foreign Language. Upper Jay, N.Y.: National Humanistic Education Center, 1973.
- Wilson, Virginia, and Wattenmaker, Beverly. Real Communication in Spanish. Upper Jay, N.Y.: National Humanistic Education Center, 1973.
- Wolfe, David, and Howe, Leland. "Personalizing Foreign Language Instruction." Foreign Language Annals, 7, 1 (December, 1973), 81-90.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE INTERVIEW AGREEMENT FORM

INTERVIEW AGREEMENT FORM

I, _____, hereby agree to be interviewed by Stephen J. Taffee (Interviewer), and for such an interview to be recorded upon audio tape, even if used in conjunction with a telephone interview. I understand and agree that the resulting tape recording and its transcript will become the sole property of the Interviewer, and that the transcript of the interview may be reproduced in a Thesis and possibly other writings by the Interviewer. A photocopy of this Interview Agreement Form may be considered as valid as the original.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

1st Preference:

Alternate:

_____ Date

_____ Date

_____ Time

_____ Time

TELEPHONE NUMBER TO BE USED FOR INTERVIEW: A.C. _____

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM PROMPTLY--I WOULD LIKE TO INTERVIEW YOU BEFORE _____


THANK YOU
SJT

APPENDIX B

COMPLETED INTERVIEW AGREEMENT FORMS

INTERVIEW AGREEMENT FORM

I, Louis E. Rath, hereby agree to be interviewed by Stephen J. Taffee (Interviewer), and for such an interview to be recorded upon audio tape, even if used in conjunction with a telephone interview. I understand and agree that the resulting tape recording and its transcript will become the sole property of the Interviewer, and that the transcript of the interview may be reproduced in a Thesis and possibly other writings by the Interviewer. A photocopy of this Interview Agreement Form may be considered as valid as the original.

Signature: 

Date: 4/1/76

1st. Preference:

Alternate:

_____ Date

_____ Date

_____ Time

_____ Time

TELEPHONE NUMBER TO BE USED FOR INTERVIEW: A.C. _____

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM PROMPTLY--I WOULD LIKE TO INTERVIEW YOU
BEFORE _____

THANK YOU

SJT

INTERVIEW AGREEMENT FORM

I, Merrill Harmin, hereby agree to be interviewed by Stephen J. Taffee (Interviewer), and for such an interview to be recorded upon audio tape, even if used in conjunction with a telephone interview. I understand and agree that the resulting tape recording and its transcript will become the sole property of the Interviewer, and that the transcript of the interview may be reproduced in a Thesis ~~and possibly other writings~~ by the Interviewer. A photocopy of this Interview Agreement Form may be considered as valid as the original.

Signature: Date: 3/27/76

1st. Preference:

4/10 Date3 p.m. Time

Alternate:

4/11 Date3 p.m. TimeTELEPHONE NUMBER TO BE USED FOR INTERVIEW: A.C.

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM PROMPTLY--I WOULD LIKE TO INTERVIEW YOU
BEFORE April 9, 1976

THANK YOU

SJT

INTERVIEW AGREEMENT FORM

I, Howard Glaser-Kirschenbaum, hereby agree to be interviewed by Stephen J. Taffee (Interview), and for such an interview to be recorded upon audio tape, even if used in conjunction with a telephone interview. I understand and agree that the resulting tape recording and its transcript will become the sole property of the Interviewer, and that the transcript of the interview may be reproduced in a Thesis and possibly other writings by the Interviewer. A photocopy of this Interview Agreement Form may be considered as valid as the original.

Signature: Howard Glaser-Kirschenbaum
Date: 4/1/76

1st. Preference:

Alternate:

_____ Date

_____ Date

_____ Time

_____ Time

TELEPHONE NUMBER TO BE USED FOR INTERVIEW: A.C. _____

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM PROMPTLY--I WOULD LIKE TO INTERVIEW YOU
BEFORE _____

THANK YOU

SJT

INTERVIEW AGREEMENT FORM

I, Barbara Glaser-Kirschenbaum, hereby agree to be interviewed by Stephen J. Taffee (Interviewer), and for such an interview to be recorded upon audio tape, even if used in conjunction with a telephone interview. I understand and agree that the resulting tape recording and its transcript will become the sole property of the Interviewer, and that the transcript of the interview may be reproduced in a Thesis and possibly other writings by the Interviewer. A photocopy of this Interview Agreement Form may be considered as valid as the original.

Signature: B. Glaser-Kirschenbaum
 Date: 4/2/96

1st. Preference:

Alternate:

_____ Date

_____ Date

_____ Time

_____ Time

TELEPHONE NUMBER TO BE USED FOR INTERVIEW: A.C. _____

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM PROMPTLY--I WOULD LIKE TO INTERVIEW YOU
 BEFORE _____

THANK YOU

SJT

INTERVIEW AGREEMENT FORM

I, Sidney B. Simon, hereby agree to be interviewed by Stephen J. Taffee (Interviewer), and for such an interview to be recorded upon audio tape, even if used in conjunction with a telephone interview. I understand and agree that the resulting tape recording and its transcript will become the sole property of the Interviewer, and that the transcript of the interview may be reproduced in a Thesis, ~~and possibly other writings by the~~ SJT ~~Interviewer~~. A photocopy of this Interview Agreement Form may be considered as valid as the original.

Signature: Date: 4/18/76

1st. Preference:

APR 28, 29, 30 Date
12:30 PM Time

Alternate:

MAY 18, 19, 20 Date
12:30 PM Time

TELEPHONE NUMBER TO BE USED FOR INTERVIEW: A.C. _____

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM PROMPTLY--I WOULD LIKE TO INTERVIEW YOU
 BEFORE April 29, 1976

THANK YOU SJT

SJT

INTERVIEW AGREEMENT FORM

I, John S. Stewart, hereby agree to be interviewed by Stephen J. Taffee (Interviewer), and for such an interview to be recorded upon audio tape, even if used in conjunction with a telephone interview. I understand and agree that the resulting tape recording and its transcript will become the sole property of the Interviewer, and that the transcript of the interview may be reproduced in a Thesis and possibly other writings by the Interviewer. A photocopy of this Interview Agreement Form may be considered as valid as the original.

Signature: *John S. Stewart*Date: 4-1-76

1st Preference:

4-14-76 Date
1 PM (my time)
2 PM (your) Time)

Alternate:

____ Date
 ____ Time

As arranged on phone 4-6-76

TELEPHONE NUMBER TO BE USED FOR INTERVIEW: A.C. _____

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM PROMPTLY--I WOULD LIKE TO INTERVIEW YOU
 BEFORE April 9, 1976

THANK YOU

SJT

INTERVIEW AGREEMENT FORM

I, Joel Goodman, hereby agree to be interviewed by Stephen J. Taffee (Interviewer), and for such an interview to be recorded upon audio tape, even if used in conjunction with a telephone interview. I understand and agree that the resulting tape recording and its transcript will become the sole property of the Interviewer, and that the transcript of the interview may be reproduced in a Thesis and possibly other writings by the Interviewer. A photocopy of this Interview Agreement Form may be considered as valid as the original.

Signature: Joel Goodman
Date: 4-2-76

1st. Preference:

_____ Date
_____ Time

Alternate:

_____ Date
_____ Time

TELEPHONE NUMBER TO BE USED FOR INTERVIEW: A.C. _____

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM PROMPTLY--I WOULD LIKE TO INTERVIEW YOU
BEFORE _____

THANK YOU

SJT

INTERVIEW AGREEMENT FORM

I, Milton Rokeach, hereby agree to be interviewed by Stephen J. Taffee (Interviewer), and for such an interview to be recorded upon audio tape, even if used in conjunction with a telephone interview. I understand and agree that the resulting tape recording and its transcript will become the sole property of the Interviewer, and that the transcript of the interview may be reproduced in a Thesis and possibly other writings by the Interviewer. A photocopy of this Interview Agreement Form may be considered as valid as the original.

Signature: Milton Rokeach
 Date: 4/26/76

1st Preference:

Alternate:

_____ Date

_____ Date

_____ Time

_____ Time

TELEPHONE NUMBER TO BE USED FOR INTERVIEW: A.C. _____

It is understood that a transcript of the interview will be provided to Dr. Rokeach for editing prior to its inclusion in any dissertation, and that, should the Interviewer wish to include any quotation of Dr. Rokeach's comments in any article or book that results from the thesis, that he will first contact Dr. Rokeach and secure his permission to do so.

Stephen J. Taffee
 Stephen J. Taffee 4-19-76

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM PROMPTLY--I WOULD LIKE TO INTERVIEW YOU BEFORE _____

THANK YOU

SJT

INTERVIEW AGREEMENT FORM

I, Alan Lockwood, hereby agree to be interviewed by Stephen J. Taffee (Interviewer), and for such an interview to be recorded upon audio tape, even if used in conjunction with a telephone interview. I understand and agree that the resulting tape recording and its transcript will become the sole property of the Interviewer, and that the transcript of the interview may be reproduced in a Thesis and possibly other writings by the Interviewer. A photocopy of this Interview Agreement Form may be considered as valid as the original.

Signature



Date:

4/5/76

1st. Preference:

4/15/76

Date

10:30 A.M.

Time

Alternate:

4/16/76

Date

10:30 A.M.

Time

TELEPHONE NUMBER TO BE USED FOR INTERVIEW: A.C. _____

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM PROMPTLY--I WOULD LIKE TO INTERVIEW YOU
BEFORE April 21, 1976



THANK YOU

SJT

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW GUIDE

INTERVIEW GUIDE

QUESTION #1. In what ways has the theory and practice of values clarification changed since 1966?

- 1a. How did you become involved with values clarification?
- 1b. In what ways has values clarification affected your life?
- 1c. In what ways do you believe values clarification has affected the lives of others?
- 1d. What are the theoretical roots of values clarification?
- 1e. How were the original seven criteria developed?
- 1f. How was the theory received by scholars ten years ago? In 1976?
- 1g. In what ways has the theory been modified since 1966? Before 1966? Why?
- 1h. In what ways has the theory been affected by other developments in values education, e.g. Kohlberg, Rokeach, etc.?
- 1i. In what ways has the theory been affected by research that has been done within values clarification?
- 1j. In what ways has the practice of values clarification been modified since 1966?
- 1k. Are there any objections raised about values clarification which are more persistent than others? How do you deal with them?
- 1l. How would you characterize the early values clarification strategies?
- 1m. How were early efforts at clarifying values received?
- 1n. What differences are there between values clarification training conducted in 1966 and that done in 1976?
- 1o. Do you see any evidence to suggest that values clarification is more "affective" in emphasis in 1976 than it was in 1966? Why or why not?
- 1p. How was the three stage curriculum developed and why?
- 1q. How do you distinguish between the following terms: "values," "beliefs," "attitudes," "feelings," "morals," and "absolutes?"

QUESTION #2. In what directions is values clarification likely to move during the next ten years?

- 2a. What might the future hold in regard to the widespread "popularity" enjoyed by values clarification in 1976?
- 2b. How do you see yourself working with values clarification during the next ten years?
- 2c. Whom do you see as playing key or influential roles within values clarification during the next ten years?
- 2d. What sort of research in values clarification would you like to see completed by 1986?
- 2e. What sort of training models do you foresee being employed during the next ten years?
- 2f. What issues within values clarification need to be dealt with prior to 1986?
- 2g. Ideally, what do you hope will happen to values clarification and the values clarification movement during the next ten years?
- 2h. How do you see the interplay between values clarification and other movements within education, e.g. Parent Effectiveness Training, Re-Evaluation Counseling, Kohlberg's Moral Education, Transactional Analysis, et al.?
- 2i. What provisions have been made, if any, towards a plan or design for values clarification during the next ten years or so?

APPENDIX D

FORM LETTER SENT WITH EACH TRANSCRIPT

6032 Winterset Drive
Lansing, Mi. 48910
(517) 882-4653

Dear _____,

Enclosed is a transcript of our interview of _____. Please look it over carefully, and if you wish to add comments aimed at clarifying any of your points, please add them to the transcript itself, or to a separate page, making sure that you include specific instructions as to where you want the new material inserted.

If you wish to delete any material in the transcript, please note that as well. If you should decide to delete something, I would appreciate an explanation, or a new insertion which would, in your opinion, better represent your views.

Attached to this letter is a list of questions which have occurred to me since our interview, or that we did not have time for originally, to which I would like your written response.

I am sure that you can appreciate my eagerness to enter into the data analysis phase of my dissertation, and so I would deeply appreciate your responses to my requests by no later than _____. If I do not hear from you by then, I will assume that I may use the original transcript as an accurate representation of your views.

In closing, you will notice that the enclosed transcript is a rough, working copy. Hence, there will be some misspellings and punctuation errors. Do not feel compelled to correct these. In the interest of getting a transcript back to you as rapidly as possible, some sacrifices regarding technical accuracy had to be made, but you may rest assured that the final draft will be completed to the very best of my ability.

Thank you so much, for everything.

Sincerely,

Stephen J. Taffee

enc.

P.S. Please use the addressed, stamped envelope enclosed for your reply. I would appreciate it if you would return your copy of the transcript as well. As soon as I have a corrected copy available, I will mail one to you.

APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW WITH LOUIS E. RATHS

INTERVIEW WITH LOUIS E. RATHS

TAFTEE: Dr. Raths, what changes have occurred within values clarification since the publication of Values and Teaching?

RATHS: I think the book came out, when was it, in 1965--1966. Well, for about almost twenty years before that, I was around the country speaking about values and valuing and clarifying. Now, in the mimeographed materials that I used, and in the talks that I made, I had related this to some earlier writings of John Dewey, who dealt with character which he said was the interpenetration of habits. And in my effort to examine what the habits seemed to be, which are very important with respect to values, I'd put down the purposes, aspirations, attitudes, beliefs, activities as such, feelings--and there were eight such categories. Well as Sid¹ and Merrill² handled the materials for the publishers, evidently they thought there was something wrong with eight, so they reduced it to five, so far as major headings were concerned.³ And so the book was criticized, early on, as not giving enough attention to "feelings." And this was true especially of Howie.⁴ And I had written, rather indignantly,

¹Sidney B. Simon.

²Merrill Harmin.

³Dr. Raths is referring to a section of Values and Teaching entitled "Topics Ripe for Clarifying Responses," in which five of the values indicators are mentioned ("attitudes," "aspirations," "purposes," "interests," and "activities"), and three are not (worries, feelings, and beliefs).

⁴See Howard Kirschenbaum, "Beyond Values Clarification," Readings in Values Clarification, ed. by Sidney B. Simon and Howard Kirschenbaum (Minneapolis: Winston Press, Inc., 1973), pp. 92-110.

"what are you talking about? After all, there is a major heading dealing with feelings." And so, what these fellows did with those eight major categories slipped.

So it can almost be said, in one sense, that there's been much greater attention to feelings than was given to them in the book.

As a matter of fact, in the book, that was a slip. Now in the book itself, a page or two after that, after taking them out of the major headings, they put them in as part of a sentence.⁵ In the values indicators, they start out with attitudes, aspirations, purposes, interests, activities . . . then they give some examples. They have a sentence in which they bring in feelings, so it's not altogether lost, but it has lost its position as a major heading in the book. Now, what they did was to pay particular attention to the first five, and then they had, more or less, omitted "feelings" and "beliefs" as major headings. Now I may be wrong on this, but I would suggest that this is one of the things that has happened since the book was published--there's been more attention given to feelings. But this is taking the book literally, again.

Now I'd say a second thing that's taken place since the book was published was this: I had been very interested in Dewey's point that in this process of valuing, it's impossible to make of it a unique, single thing apart and different from everything else. In other words, valuing includes this business of being sensitive

⁵Dr. Rath is referring to a sentence on page 80 of Values and Teaching. "Also in this category are expressions of student feelings, beliefs, convictions, worries, and opinions."

to alternatives, weighing them in terms of the grounds on which they rest, and the further conclusions toward which they tend and the consequences that will happen. And in some of the exercises that I had worked out, and that Sid and Merrill were trying, I had, very frequently, put an emphasis upon thinking, in the writing and the talking of students. And I find that, over the years, that this has been, more or less, not discontinued entirely, but the emphasis is left out. There's the notion that the whole value-front is affective, and thinking is cognitive, and so what are you doing with cognitive things if you're talking about values? And I believe this is too bad, that these things have to be kept in harness. So I do not think that reason is preeminent, or that the emotions are, whatever they are. And that somehow or another, some kind of a balance has to be kept there, between the two things.

And those kinds of unconscious biases which lie beneath the surface in all of us, may be looked on, on the one hand, as things which do not allow reason to function. And they may be looked at in another sense as being those things which determine all of our lives. But I would like to think that those of us who have had some training in education, would be able to resist them, somewhat consciously, and look for them: and more or less, continually as we live, to see their place in our lives, and to see that they did not occupy an undue proportion. Have I made myself somewhat clear on that?

TAFFEE: Yes.

RATHS: So if I were to be in the presence of a "feeling" person, who consulted those almost to the neglect of the thinking side, it would seem to me that he would be an unbalanced person. Now similarly, if one was appealing only to the logic or the reason of something, and disdained those cries from the heart which are all around us, coming from children, and young adults . . . and old-timers, I would say that he, too, had been missing a good part of what we would call an education. So, I see, in a sense that this balance has not been kept.

Are you familiar at all with a book in the area of values by Metcalf and others?⁶

TAFEE: Yes.

RATHS: At the University of Illinois?

TAFEE: Right.

RATHS: Now there, a great emphasis is placed upon the logic of it.

I was one of the advisors to Metcalf in his dissertation. He's a heck of a nice guy. Just wonderful. With all the intergrity that you could imagine.

His emphasis is very much on the facts, and the relationship between the facts. And I think that there is a tremendously different emphasis on emtions as contrasted with the book Values and Teaching.

⁶Dr. Rath is referring to Lawrence E. Metcalf, ed., Values Education: Rationale, Strategies, and Procedures, 41st Yearbook (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1971).

In other words, if you stop to think of those categories: aspirations, purposes, attitudes, interests, and so on, nearly all of those reflect a kind of subjective relationship; something in the person and perhaps deeper than what he says at any one moment. Well, I think, I hope I don't do him an injustice, I think that the book by Metcalf and his students puts a tremendous emphasis upon the facts of the case, and a kind of splitting of a problem into its issues, and then an examination of each issue into its facts, and then a kind of choosing of that which is best.

Now three, beginning in 1968, and almost unheralded, was the work of this fellow now at Harvard in moral education: Kohlberg.⁷ Now, Kohlberg seems to have wound up in a variety of ways, not all of them consistent. In one of his talks to a Canadian group of rather distinguished people interested in moral and religious and philosophical education, he makes the statement that there are absolute moral principles and he knows what they are. That's almost a direct quote from it. I forget the title.

It's very difficult to sum up the Kohlberg business, but in the two articles which I read, both of them dealing with Canadian audiences, it seemed to be very clear that as he presented an open-ended situation to students, asking them to take a position, and then in the interviews to give their reasons, I felt that he made it very clear that the conclusion to which they came had nothing to do with what he was really concerned about, so that if they were

⁷Lawrence Kohlberg.

to recommend killing somebody, he would pay no attention to that. It was the reasons that they gave that were important.

I think this split of either-or is unfortunate. It seems to me that if they're going to kill somebody, that this must be a terribly important issue in morals. But in those writings, no.

As a matter of fact, in one of those books, he makes the statement that there were situations in which killing was alright. But in the back of the book, where these gentlemen were given a chance to raise questions with him, one or two of them were strangely hurt by that statement in the presentation. And as he reexamined his position, he said no, he would disavow it after hearing the objections. But the principle remains however.

One of the open-ended incidents that he quotes very often deals with the mother or the father that needs a certain kind of medicine very badly.⁸ And the pharmacist or the druggist or the storekeeper has it, but is charging a tremendous price, and the young fellow doesn't have that money. And the question is: what should you do? And Kohlberg makes it clear in the discussion of that situation that, whatever one does isn't to be evaluated as part of the moral argument. It's the reasons that are given that are. Now, that seems strange to me.

⁸Dr. Rath is referring to the famous "Heinz Dilemma," wherein the wife of a man named Heinz is dying, but could be saved if given a certain drug. The local pharmacist has the drug, but is asking a tremendously unfair price, which Heinz cannot afford. The question is; should Heinz steal the drug?

He says, in one place or another, that very often people have very different conclusions, but use the same reasons. Well, in the Eight Year Study,⁹ we had some value-type problems, that were open-ended like Dr. Kohlberg's and, by the way, like the whole book Values and Teaching is open-ended. And we used to state one of these problems, something like the storekeeper thing, and down below it we would state maybe three or four different conclusions. But we would always have a last conclusion, which they, the students, could write. In other words, if we had four, there would be a place for a fifth one, and so on. If you have a conclusion different from these, write it here. Then down below that, there was an essay type of exam. It was: Give reasons for this. Now, we often found that if a person chose conclusion number one, that he would give reasons which supported conclusion number three! In other words, the thinking was very fuzzy. But we thought that was very significant, in terms of paying attention to both. But I gather from the presentation by Dr. Kohlberg himself, that he isn't interested in that.

Now finally I think, on this Kohlberg thing, without getting into it at all deeply, although one should, I think, this: His colleague, writing in the Phi Delta Kappan, John Stewart, seemed to think that the values clarifying group were cultural relativists.¹⁰

⁹The Eight Year Study was conducted under the auspices of the Commission on the Relation of School and College, Progressive Education Association, during the 1930's.

¹⁰John S. Stewart, "Clarifying Values Clarification: A Critique," Phi Delta Kappan, 56, 10 (June, 1975), pp. 684-688.

And the term was used in a sentence which would suggest that's bad, you shouldn't be. Which would suggest as one alternative that you should be cultural positivists. Now it's always difficult to interpret, truly and accurately, what's meant by these kinds of charges. Does it mean that we should all be absolutists? If it does, it's almost ridiculous, because we could be absolutist about values only in the sense that maybe five hundred years from now there will be a universal agreement on values.

Certainly if one looks at the area of religion, and sees the differences--even here the differences are extreme and violent. If we were to look at the laws that are in the books of the world. . . . Kohlberg says that there is an increasing tendency to respect the law, and he seems to think that this tendency is one that, in the long run, supports an absolute idea of justice. But he doesn't get into the business that the laws can be very different. For instance; if you were to examine a series of Russian arithmetic books, you would find, and perhaps to your surprise, that there's not one example in an elementary school arithmetic book--I haven't looked at the high school book--where a man bought something for ten cents and sold it for fifteen cents. There's no such thing. The reason I cite it, is it's against the law to do that! In other words, that's unjust.

Well, it just seems to me that in our age of pluralism, where we are trying to respect much more than we ever did minority groups of all kinds, and even majority groups in terms of yellow color and brown color, the idea of universals is a beckoning light

from a far distance, and nothing that is really right around the corner in the sense that: "I know the universal values, and I'll tell them to you," or "There are absolute moral principles, and I know them." It seems to me that it's a claim that's not far short of preposterous. I wish he were here, I'd like to hear him talk about it.

Now, there is another point about the Kohlberg thing which I have never written about at great length, but have indicated my own bias, I suppose, in the book and elsewhere. If you were to write in many different papers, and if you were to speak before a tape recorder, and if I were able to read carefully what you have said, and maybe to value-analyze what you have said--I, personally at that time, would not feel at all sure that I knew your values. Now the major point of the book, Values and Teaching, is that I should ask you. That you said this and this and this, does this mean that this probably expresses your point of view? And then you say it, I don't. I may ask you.

Now secondly, if you were to say: "Yeah, that's it," I myself might not feel too sure that that was it. Because words are very difficult things with which to describe so complicated a thing as a mesh of thinking, feeling, purpose, attitude. . . . But it does seem to me that the burden is on each of us to try to become more clear about what it is we believe, and the meanings we have of the world. And so for a teacher to have reached the point, say such as you have, where you can listen and help the other person on that path, it seems to me that that's a wonderful position to

have arrived at, especially if you could qualify it by saying: "Regardless of my clarifying operations, the person who's really going to know if he has clarified something, is the person to whom I am talking. And I can't say positively whether he has or not. Nor can I say with great precision just what his value is. I could repeat some of the conversation, but if I were to try to say that you value such and such, I would hem that sentence in with qualifications that were far from an absolute." In other words, I think this process is the very important thing that's going on.

I find it very hard to categorize some things, and when I do, it seems to me that I do with the idea that it takes us forward some steps. If we will listen to a conversation for statements which suggest purpose, aspirations, attitudes. . . . I think it helps us to push forward the discussion. Now, my assumption has been also that if we take it very seriously, we'll get to the point where we'll listen to somebody. And after listening, we will interact in some way, supporting, questioning or something. And it seems to me this process again, that this process of listening, supporting, directing--is tremendous.

And I would say that Sid's work, your work, and my work, has all been in this direction, and yet it hasn't accomplished a whole lot, in terms of what I hear and see for instance, at the university level, the college level. The instructors aren't doing much listening. I walk down the halls, and there's this fellow up in front of the class--Is it true at Michigan State too?

TAFFEE: Sure.

RATHS: How does it happen do you suppose, that we haven't made more of a dent?

TAFFEE: I wish I knew the answer. Do you have any ideas about that? Do you have some ideas about why values clarification hasn't had more of an impact?

RATHS: Oh, yes. For quite a few years I was very much concerned with the question: "What do you do when you 'teach'? What is teaching?"¹¹ In other words, if we had here a table, and on it a typewriter, and a young lady sitting there at it, and you saw her hitting the keys, and if you looked over her shoulder and saw meaningful material emerging on the paper--you could say she's typing.

Well, if you were to go to a classroom and open the door, what do you think should be going on if you're going to say: "I won't go in now. She's teaching." What would that be?

Well, one of the points I had been working at at Ohio State and elsewhere, was the business of values and valuing, and concluded that one of the functions of teaching was to assist in clarifying. And, on a two year stretch I spoke in forty states, and in many places I spoke to college faculties. I can't tell you how many people, both in the meeting and in luncheons and bull sessions

¹¹Dr. Rath's has written an article on the subject. See: Louis E. Rath's, "What is Teaching?" Educational Leadership, 55, 3 (December, 1955), 146-147.

afterwards, would say to me: "You know, Raths, if I'm able to bring before one or more students some piece of knowledge with which he was unacquainted before my presentation of it, I see myself really as teaching. But if I'm going to ask some kid a question, and he's going to tell me what he feels about it, and I'm to listen to such crap as that and respond to it--I don't think that's teaching."

Good, clear statement. In his own mind, that's out. And as I would then reflect it back to him he'd say: "That's it! That's what I'm trying to say!"

In other words, I think one of the reasons why we haven't made any headway is that the concept of teaching excludes this in general; in terms of the way we've been taught, the way the universities now operate, the way schools of education prepare teachers. So here are some poor souls out there, and I have an idea that they are pretty well set in other directions.

Now secondly, it seems to me that, across the country--and here I would be saying the same thing to Sid--suppose that you wanted to teach some people about this, and have them arrive at the point at which you have arrived. You know, they can't go to a workshop for one or two days and be there. Is that right?

TAFTEE: That's right.

RATHS: You have to have some kind of commitment, where there is almost daily or at least several times weekly interactions on this stuff, and over a period of time. So the "clinical" professor of values would have some students, and he would be maybe visiting pupils with them that they're teaching. . . . We don't do that.

And in many ways I think that we do not give students the responsibility for making value judgments, as let us say, in a dissertation. Suppose, for example that in a dissertation we had a young man take the position I had just described: you know, that teaching has really nothing to do with this whole notion of values. I have an idea what we're trying to do is get the man to change that, before it comes up for discussion on the part of those who are going to read it. We don't say, or try to make it clear to him: "Say now. Look, is this the position you're taking? Is that right? And it's your right to take it. Now in your final oral this is really going to be debated. You're going to be asked to defend yourself. But let me say again, it's your dissertation, your decision, you're to make it." I don't think we do that. I think most chairmen tell them: "Take that out of there! No, I'll never sign it if that's there. You've got to re-write that part, or. . . ."

As I see it anyway, we don't give the student, even at the graduate level, the responsibility for doing his own thinking and his own valuing, you know, and his own translation of his inner world onto the paper which he is to present.

Finally, I'd say in this general response to a nice question, there is an approach to clarifying that I've hinted at so far, which would be something like what scholars say about the search for truth. And that is--does the word "asymptotic" mean something to you?

TAFEE: No.

RATHS: It's a mathematical term which describes a curve, and this curve approaches a line but never reaches it. And they say it's "asymptotic" to that line, an "asymptote." It seems to me, that as I took over fifty or sixty years, in ever so many areas, I've been groping for clarity; and that this years' clarity is more clear than last years' clarity, in many places. But it seems to me that I don't reach it, and I'm reaching out for it, so that it's something like the search for truth.

When we say we're trying to help a student clarify, I don't think we are saying we are clarifying it for the student. I think we say: "Here are some hints for how you go about the thing." And who will be the judge of this? Obviously, I think it has to be the person with whom we're working. And very often he'll say: "I see it much more clearly now. I didn't know I was saying things like that. Yes, that's what I meant, that's really what I believe."

And yet in all these ways, these are temporary, or tentative, or contemporary positions. And if he's alive and human, you would expect him to, as he has experiences and reads, and so on, that these positions themselves will become modified.

So I think that clarification is not an absolute. It is part of a process of living with people. Often it seems to pay-off. Does this seem something different from the book to you?

TAFEE: Yes. I think there are some definite points which you have stated which would not be apparent by just reading the book alone.

RATHS: Do you think they should be included in the book?

TAFFEE: Yes. Many times critics, like John Stewart and Alan Lockwood¹² for example, use Values and Teaching, a book which is now ten years old, as a statement of the current state of the art, and I think that many of the points to which you have spoken are not clear in the book, and that they might have reached different conclusions if they were included.

Sid, when I saw him last fall, indicated that you, he, and Merrill were considering a revised edition of Values and Teaching.

RATHS: Yes. It's in the works now.

TAFFEE: Probably some of the points to which you have spoken will be included, like the disdain for either-or reasoning, which I think further reflects your interest in Dewey; feelings or thinking, structure or content, for example. Now those might be two things which could be included in a revision. Are there any other things which might be included in a revision?

RATHS: Yes. Lockwood made the point, or was it one of the letter writers,¹³ that the book did not recognize that it was taking value positions. Well--maybe. It's hard to tell what people interpret the book to mean. And if they interpret it that way, well they

¹²See Stewart, op. cit. and Alan L. Lockwood, "A Critical View of Values Clarification," Teachers College Record, 71, 7 (September, 1975), 35-50.

¹³Dr. Rath is referring to persons who wrote letters to the Phi Delta Kappan following its June, 1975 issue.

did. But stop and think for a minute. First of all, there is a place in the book, and by the way they criticized the book for that, which suggested to teachers that there were places where they might run into trouble if they were to open-up clarifying procedures. One of these dealt with so-called "hot issues" in the community. And you and I probably could think of many examples of them.¹⁴

Let us say, for example, that if one is teaching in a Catholic school, or where the parents are almost altogether Catholic, to open up the abortion issue, and to open up various kinds of religious issues, and so on, and especially if something is being voted on just at the time, the entire institution of the school might be placed in jeopardy. My notion was that if a person has a very large field open to him, on many occasions it would be senseless to lose his job, and lose his opportunity to clarify, let's say, a hundred things, just because he insists on clarifying the hundred and first, which is taboo. Now I can see that there would be times when the hundred and first is so critical to a person's own life that he might say: "If I can't do this, I'm not going to teach here." I can see that as a possibility. But I think it would be rare. If we were to get one thousand teachers, it might happen to ten. But nine hundred ninety, I think would say: "Look at the freedom we do have here. And for us to choose those freedoms, and to act upon them would be much better than for us to precipitate a community battle here."

¹⁴See Values and Teaching, p. 35.

Now the other issue that I suggested they might very well stop on, is the one of vulgarity in the classroom. I heard a story the other day that I thought was funny. Of course you couldn't tell it in a classroom:

The story was of a sixth grade teacher who was working with her students in the area of history. And she said to them: "I am going to say something that a famous man said at one time." And she said: "I am going to ask you who said it, and when he said it." So, after a pause she said, "Give me liberty, or give me death." And there wasn't a hand up. Nobody raised a hand. But finally a new kid, a kid who had just arrived from Mexico, raised his hand. And she said: "Yes, Tomas." And he stated: "Patrick Henry, 1775." And she said "That's very good." She turned around and started to ball out the kids because they didn't know, and here's a boy from Mexico--who had been here just a little while, and he had the right answer. It took a boy from Mexico to do it! And while she was looking at the kids, someone from the back of the room shouted: "Fuck Mexico!" She turned and said: "Who said that?" And someone answered, "Sam Houston, 1844."

Well, it does seem to me that there is something called decorum.

I remember once going to church with an Antioch student. We were in a little town of six hundred population, and the minister was one of those fellows who's an uneducated person, and was as evangelistic as probably one could get. And all of a sudden, this friend of mine from Antioch, burst-out laughing in the church!

Well, I tell you, you know, I could have sunk right through the floor. You don't do that!

Now, that's a far cry from vulgarity in one sense, but in another sense, our institutions do have certain requirements. And if one is in a courtroom, and there is a judge, he imposes a sort of courtroom standard on the behavior of the people who are there. It seems to me that one of the standards associated with classrooms in our elementary schools in our country, and our secondary schools, is one which eschews vulgarity.

Well, one of the writers in that magazine thought that was awful, that I was acting as censor to value-type expressions.

You can certainly go on in here if that's your choice, but it seems to us that this is something you should think about before you do it.

Now I had a third one that I was much concerned with, and that was that a teacher should positively not allow things to go on which would endanger the health of the children.

In Columbus, Ohio, one time, in a place I believe that was called North High School, there was a window open on the third floor. And it was one of those windows with a low bottom to it. And a girl, probably a tenth grade girl, went over there, and some people started fooling around with her there. And it came out in the hearings in the court that the teacher didn't interfere with what was going on, and the girl fell out of the window and was killed. Now, it would be my position today, as it was then, that the teacher should have gone down there and pulled them right out

of there. If no other thing, she has a responsibility in this sense to protect the life and health in that room. And under circumstances where that's threatened, your professional duty is to carry on. It doesn't seem to me that she could say to the girl's father: "Well, she wanted to wrestle with the fellow." In other words, to clarify that situation is not enough.

There's an obligation which goes beyond clarification, in three of the places as I saw it. One of them dealt with vulgarity, one dealt with life itself or threats to it, and one dealt with the impact on the whole school system. It seems to me that a person should be very wary about them. I was criticized for that in somebody's letter.

But now to get back to another point. If you were to listen to a large number of people talking about education, or curriculum, values or whatnot, including Dr. Kohlberg, just think of the freedom that is involved in asking people what they think, and how they feel, and what their purposes are, and what they are doing to further them, and how could I as the teacher help you with that. This is a value position of the greatest moment. And we just said a few minutes ago: "Why the heck doesn't it go farther? And why aren't more people taking it?" And one reason is ever so many people don't even announce that they would take that value stance. But that is taken all the way through the book. And yet, there are people who read it and say: "You don't announce your values. You masquerade as if you had none." How could one

say that? Or does one have to stop every once-in-a-while and say: "This is a value of ours?"

To give situation after situation where students may be able to tell how they feel, what they think, what they want, where they've been disappointed, where they've been glad, where they've been happy, and so on and so forth--to give them an opportunity to talk about their lives, and to listen to a thoughtful teacher ask meaningful questions about that life--this is a value position of great significance. And for these people to overlook it, seems to me to be very poor reading, or am I putting too high a standard for them in terms of reading? Isn't that apparent as you read the book?

TAFEE: It was apparent to me. Maybe some of the statements like the ones contained in the short paper by Sid, Howie, Merrill and Lee Howe, "In Defense of Values Clarification,"¹⁵ where they say, for example, that they feel that choosing from among alternatives is better than not having any alternatives from which to choose.

. . .

RATHS: Yeah, and even looking for alternatives is, to be free to look. . . .

TAFEE: Maybe a statement like that in the revision would once and for all clear up any ambiguity.

¹⁵Howard Kirschenbaum, Merrill Harmin, Leland Howe, and Sidney B. Simon, "In Defense of Values Clarification: A Position Paper," Humanistic Educators Network, 1, 7 (Saratoga Springs, N.Y.: National Humanistic Education Center, November, 1975). (Mimeographed).

RATHS: Huh. I doubt it.

By the way, the book has had a phenomenal sale, did you know that?

TAFFEE: No, I didn't.

RATHS: It has sold over 200,000 copies.

TAFFEE: That is remarkable, especially for a book in education.

RATHS: Several publishers refused it.

TAFFEE: Will the revision be coming out through Charles Merrill again?

RATHS: Yes. And Merrill Harmin is taking the major responsibility for putting the comments together this time.

TAFFEE: I'd like to return for a moment to a point in which you were talking about three different areas of concern in relation to clarifying: hot issues, vulgarity, and the physical health of children. Is there a mental health aspect, whereby, just as that child fell out of a third story window to her death,--is there a mental health area into which the teacher should intervene?

RATHS: This is interesting, because of this author, Lockwood, who suggests that we are engaged in therapy, and that we know it.¹⁶ Now this is interesting because I've disavowed that point of view in those talks I was telling you about across the country.

¹⁶Lockwood, op. cit.

Suppose, for example, we were to say of a person, "Here is a history lesson, and it was assigned to you yesterday, and you came in and you didn't have it today. Are you sick? Could we make the inference you were sick?"

Well, let's see. Maybe we could. You're going to help him with this. And you are going to see that he gets to know it. Now you wouldn't do that unless he was sick, would you? Heck, it's just that he hasn't arrived at some objective of some kind. And to think that that person's sick!

Well, suppose we were to say some person who, let's say, flies from one thing to another--you know, it's hard for me to think of that person as ill. I'd say: "He has probably missed a number of things in his growing-up and that we could supply, which might help him." But you know, I would think of it almost as, a person who is professionally trained as a teacher, recognizes this as some sort of learning, growing problem. And I don't think the person will have to have a medical degree. And it seems to me that he wouldn't have to make the judgment that he's making a diagnosis of illness.

If the fellow was a very poor speller, and one noted a pattern in his spelling, would the diagnosis be a medical one and would it be therapy--Gee, not as I see it.

Let's take another, more extreme case. You come to me, wan and pale. And you begin to tell me of the experiences you've had during these last three days, in which each of the twenty-four hours has been filled. And there has been no mention of food, you

haven't had a chance to eat. And I say: "Would you like something to eat?" Is this a medical diagnosis I am making now? For goodness sake! Suppose I were to offer you food, and you were hungry. Am I practicing "therapy" now?

There is something in this matter of human relations, in which the central quality is human. It isn't professional-medical, professional-legal, professional this or that. It's a sensitivity to see something missing, and to help out. So that, was that Lockwood who said this?--I would have to say that I do not agree with his point.

And yet there might be many who are teachers, and who have come into the field of values clarification, and who say to themselves: "Well, didn't Raths point out certain kinds of cases, like those who are apathetic, and listless, and those who are flighty? And didn't he say that if you were to do these kinds of things with them, there was a strong possibility that they themselves would change their own behavior?" I'd say, "Yeah. That's right." And it would be true that if Raths had noticed something about spelling, and had said here are some things you could do and the student would become a better speller, if he makes that decision to learn something. In other words, I see the role here of probable diagnosis, but I don't see this "medical," I don't see this "therapeutic."

Well now, that takes care of two of those things: one, that we don't have values, and the other is that we have become therapists, in a psychomedical sense.

In fact, in a book I have written which deals with the emotional needs of children,¹⁷ I have indicated that if a teacher should come to the conclusion that a child is really emotionally a problem, that she should do everything she can to get this kid and the kid's parents to a physician.

I don't know whether Lockwood knows this, but in the state of Ohio, as a teacher, you can't even say to a child: "You have a bad cold. You should go home." You can say to him: "You've told me that you're ill, and I think you ought to go home." But if you diagnosis it, and say it's a cold, you have gone beyond the law, and the parents can raise cane with you. Now that's what it was thirty years ago. You couldn't do it!

Anyway, as an aside, Plato said lawyers and doctors were not good for a society.

(Pause)

All over the country there are people stirring like us. Thus far, not much has happened. But you know, it could. And here in you they've got another one, huh? I have an idea you're going to make it.

(Pause)

The breakdown in morals that is occurring in almost every profession, and in the government, is running its course--tends to

¹⁷Louis E. Rath and Anna Porter Burrell, Understanding the Problem Child (Fairfield, N.J.: Economics Press, Inc., 1963).

be getting worse as I see it. So you have, as it was announced here on T.V. last night, carpenters in San Francisco getting \$21,000 a year, and going to strike for more money, and tying-up the construction industry; and truckers, and as I understand it, an average salary of \$18,000, going out on strike and tying it up. Now my point now is not about the money. My point is about the wishes of individuals as against the wishes of a society, and whether or not that these kinds of things can be settled in some other way than by bottling up the highways, and shutting down the construction industry, and so forth. All around the ring, there seems to be too many--I don't know what that phrase means--instances of corruption in the administration of unions, in the government, in business, in doctors and so forth.

About ten years ago I was in the hospital on two occasions, right close to each other, and in each case a doctor came to visit me, after the operations, and he would sit and would be writing something about that case that he had seen an hour ago. And he would say: "How are ya, Mr. Raths?" And I'd say "Fine." And he would, in a couple of minutes, get up and go. Now, on Medicare, he charged thirty-five dollars for that as a medical visit. Now he must know in his heart that that's just cheating. Now as he goes through, he could, say, visit ten such patients there . . . get three hundred fifty dollars for the afternoon, and do it every day that persons are in the hospital.

You may have heard recently that there's a committee on ethics in the Congress, and various small groups have found out

that certain members of Congress, Congressmen and Senators, have been most unethical. And they've got the data! And they have gone to the ethics committee, and the ethics committee has done nothing. Now it does seem to me that, as these things become more clear to people, and as these things get clarified in terms of outside, a democratic society I think cannot allow this. It will lose its democracy involved. It will lose its freedom involved.

I think what I am trying to say is that one of the great values is truth. And if you lie, and are covered-up by others in your lying, speech then no longer becomes a communications medium. I wouldn't want to be misunderstood. There are people who have lied, you know, before biblical times. But through the medium of communication, and the enhancement of money as the value in life, it seems to me that there is a higher and higher percentage of people given over to this thing.

Will clarifying help the situation? I don't know.

(pause)

Now, where will it go? Where the whole thing will go in terms of clarification depends, it seems to me, on several focal points.

As I watch what Sid and Merrill and that group is doing, they seem to have an idea that you should have hundreds of different examples of clarification possibilities. On several occasions, I have written to Sid and to Merrill, and suggested. I thought that this was not the way to go. That if one were to look down from a

vantage point up in the air somewhere, at their publications and their work, and say: "What assumptions seem to be operating here, in multiplying the number and the variety of situations in which students will be asked how they feel, what they like, and what they hate and so on?" One answer could be: it makes for a diversion, and it's a very diverting curriculum. And after a while, if you're teaching a forty-five minute class, you could find that by having five different ones of these examples in one forty-five minute period, everyone would be paying attention, perhaps, and could go away "liking" it, perhaps--saying: "Wasn't that fun!"

Now as a contrast, I suggested to Sid and to Merrill several times, that it seemed to me that it would be better if they were to spend their time making, let us say, twenty-five situations, for example, in the area of race, and having those situations bear upon eight important issues in which race is involved. Let us say "employment" might be one; "transportation" might be one; and "religion," my "church attendance" might be one; and so on. And that each of them would have repeats, so that at the end of some time, there would have occurred perhaps, an opportunity for students to see this whole thing of race in a great variety of situations, and in a great variety of functional relations: The Blacks have to ride, and they have to walk, so transportation is here; the Blacks want to go to church, and they want this, and they want that; the Blacks want to work, Blacks want to live in a house. But as I have watched what they have done, neither of them has been attracted to the position. I wonder if I've made myself clear on that point. Have I?

TAFFEE: Let me try to tell you what I heard you say: That instead of creating hundreds of divergent strategies, volumes one through eight, perhaps, of the values clarification handbook, perhaps it might be more appropriate to focus on particular broad issues, like race, perhaps sexual stereotyping, maybe even religion, despite the fact that it might be a hotbed in some areas--identify sub-points or sub-issues within a large, umbrella issue, and invent or evolve twenty-five or thirty strategies to focus on that.

RATHS: Right. Now a second alternative, is one which I've believed most of my life, but I have been in a minority position most of my life on it.

Have you ever heard of the name Alberty? He wrote a book in the thirties, which had a title something like "Reorganizing the Secondary School Curriculum."¹⁸ Now he was the man, I think, who introduced the term "resource units." Have you heard of a resource unit? Now a resource unit--what did you teach, by the way, in high school?

TAFFEE: English.

RATHS: Now a resource unit in English might deal, let us say, with the "Frontier." Alberty would say: there might be some big generalizations that you were interested in getting across: that emigration in general went from east to west, and has been from Europe to here, and here to the Mississippi, and the Mississippi . . . , and so on. Now he thought that if you wanted to get into

¹⁸Harold Bernard Alberty, Reorganizing the High School Curriculum (New York: MacMillan Co., 1974).

any kinds of things that dealt with life, he didn't use the term values very much--but he used it, you had to get a whole group of teachers together. Let's say the art teacher, the science teacher, and others--and they would suggest all kinds of things that would make a good curriculum for a big unit like this.

Magazines would be consulted about slides, movies, field trips . . . the art teacher would come in with what would be appropriate here in terms of the art of the westward movement . . . music would come in.

Now all of this would be brought together as a great string of possible resources to be used during the teaching of this material in English. Now the teacher would have this, let us say, in his right hand as a resource. And he would say to the students: "We're going to be studying the frontier movement in American life." He decided that, and, you know, it was approved by the curriculum committee, and the board, and so forth. And he would then begin to ask the students what they were interested in about this whole thing. Now he, in the meantime, was familiar with this whole resource unit, and as they began to ask questions about it, say what they were interested in, maybe the blackboard would be covered with their suggestions. Then they'd classify a whole lot of these into areas. Students would be asked then, in terms of committees, to take over segments of this. Out of materials of the resource unit, the students and teachers had made a learning unit.

Now back of this, is the idea that an English teacher, or a math teacher, or a science teacher, or a foreign language teacher--doesn't have the educational background to recognize the value opportunities in the field in which he's teaching. And there has to be some movement put on, and those materials put in his hands.

Now, I thought that this general position was not sound. I thought: "Suppose you have a high school teacher. He's a graduate of a liberal arts college. He ought to recognize the places where values have a place." Many kinds of engineering problems involve ecology, terrain and the use of it. . . . Many kinds of commercial problems involve profits and motives and how they're arrived at and so forth.

Now it seems to me that Merrill and Sid, and their colleagues, are saying: "You can't do it that way. You can't expect that a teacher will be an educated person, a sensitive person. You can't do that. You have to write this out for them." So that you'd have to have, maybe ultimately they're heading towards, books about "Values Situations in Mathematics," or in "Algebra." They aren't mathematicians. But it seems to me that this is where that thing is going.

And it seems to me that there must be some way of appealing to the nature of a human being, to help him become sensitive to what we call values, issues, morals, ethics, aesthetics. . . . I bet, as I see it, the better way of doing this would be to try to get back into those colleges, and have experiences there that would

really be educative, in the sense that the total life--the arts, the dance, the music, the religion, the issues--that a person would see more clearly what life is, and death, and illness.

I know that from the beginning of time that people in their old-age have looked back and have told about: how useless their so-called "formal" education has been. Montaigne wrote a lot about it. Scores of more people have written about it in terms of the British public schools. So many people are saying that that a fixed curriculum of credit points, does not really result in the education of a person. You wonder why it's so fixed, and cannot be changed.

So that if you look at the two alternatives or three, will the production of eight volumes of the situations bring about a great change in the teaching of mathematics, physics, biology and foreign language? Will a kind of drastic reorganization of the college, in terms of what we call an education, help?

Well, nearly all of the people concerned deeply with the curricula of a secondary school tend to feel that the resource unit, and the Sid and Merrill way, is most convenient--that you just can't get another kind of education into these colleges. And I would agree that it's the most convenient, but what I would say now is: "I don't see any great things coming."

In other words, I see a great need in the college to understand something about the emotional needs of people in their work, in their play, in their government, in their relations. I see a great need for an emphasis in the colleges on the role that health

plays in the life of a person. It's terrific. It seems to me that there is a great need for people to learn what social class means in their lives.

I would like to see a confederation of colleges develop a series of movies, for example. One series would deal with poverty all over the world. How does poverty look in Moscow? How does it look in London and New York? What's rural poverty in India and in China and in Japan, and in the United States, and develop people with sensitivities to these great big things.

Now besides sensitivity, of course, they all need a "hearing-aid," you know. Some of them need new "glasses" or "seeing-eye dogs" to help them see what's going on around them, and help them to hear. And then maybe some kinds of "radar" equipment, associated with their nerves and muscles, that might suggest that they get into action on some of the things they'd seen and heard.

I see that as a more promising future in the long, long run. It wouldn't surprise me if, in let's say ten years, this whole thing might have been regarded as a fad, and the whole educational field will be turned to something else. But it seems to me that if we can get a foot into the high school and the college, that would deal with as I've said, poverty, and war, and the emotional needs of people, and with values, and with beauty, and with truth--and we would get movies, and we would get statements from rather great people--and it would be on a seminar basis--and we would have these many, many issues relating to it brought up--I think that is a better way to go. Now, it takes young people like yourself. . . .

Young people talked to the Rockefeller General Educational Board in 1930, 31 and 32. And they secured enough money to carry on what was called the "Eight Year Study."¹⁹ You've probably not read about that. .

TAFTEE: Oh! I certainly have!

RATHS: You have? Now, I can't tell you how many people asked me, when I was in my late sixties, to start another one. But this thing can't be started, you know, by people my age, because as the next hour or two will determine,²⁰ you know people like me might die next week. It's got to be manned by young people. Now when I was in it, I was thirty-three, thirty-four, thirty-five. These are the people with the bounce, and the rigor, the stick-to-itiveness, to keep pumping away at it.

So I believe that what we have to do is to have a different kind of education. And I don't think that these books to be used in a social studies class, or in a literature class--I don't think they do it well. They make some contribution, but it isn't enough. (At this point we got onto the subject of the Eight Year Study for a while. I asked Dr. Rath's why he felt the Eight Year Study had not had a greater impact. He replied that there were several

¹⁹The Eight Year Study was conducted under the auspices of the Commission on the Relation of School and College, Progressive Education Association, during the 1930's.

²⁰Dr. Rath's is referring to a funeral which he was to attend shortly after our interview was concluded.

reasons: (1) teachers and administrators in the high schools involved, because of the notoriety brought to them by the study, were often offered lucrative positions in other school systems. In these new situations, these people had to start from scratch without colleagues with similar experiences. (2) A conservative climate in the late forties, much like the trend in operation today, but stronger, made people wary of anything with the label "progressive" or "innovative." (3) An illogical and irrational change by the five hundred or so colleges and universities involved in the study, reverting back to pre-study requirements, study programs, etc. Dr. Rath's noted that no concerted effort was made to work with the colleges and universities to help them look at their own data, which showed rather dramatic results for those students who were part of the experimental group. (4) A great short coming of the Eight Year Study was its neglect of the parents of the students, and its neglect of the community in which the schools were located. This, coupled with the general conservative climate of the country, led many colleges to reinstate certain procedures.

Dr. Rath's went on to criticize admissions tests as "exclusions" tests, citing correlations of .25 and less at the graduate level. He wondered aloud as to the possibility that such tests were given because they tend to select white, upper or middle-class students.

We then returned to the subject at hand, the future of values clarification.)

RATHS: You know, I wanted to say one other thing about the future of this thing if I may.

Suppose we look at Kohlberg's package. We see the possibility that Kohlberg, a group of assistants and his trained colleagues, will come to a school, and take a systematic, and fairly representative sample of the student body, give them various kinds of open situations, read the results and score them. This would be step one in which, saying for example: "In terms of moral character, this school's at Stage Three."

Now he isn't going to be able to tell them much more than that. But as this begins to go around, the question will be: "What stage are you at?" So what we will be doing is developing something like the I.Q. And you will be hearing an English teacher say to you: "Boy, you know out of thirty students, I have twenty-eight who are Three or Two or One. I don't have one in this group who has reached the stage of so-called Social Contract!"

Now my reason for saying that is I do not see any emphasis upon teaching in the Kohlberg thing. I do not see any indication of continuous interaction with the students, or the moral issues around them. I do not see anything in the Kohlberg business which deals with whether or not, oh to take a simple thing: Suppose I were to do something according to my sense of duty, which is the Social Contract stage in, let us say, one issue. Now suppose we have over here, a group of people who are decent to other people because they saw it as their duty. And over here, we had a group of people who were decent to other people because they liked living

that way. Which group would we want to be with, for goodness' sake? We'd like to be with these people, I think. [Indicating the latter group.] I would anyway.

Now, nowhere in the Kohlberg's set up, is there something about: do you prize the moral value that you have chosen? Does it give you a feeling of achievement or satisfaction, and so on? So that the prizing in the values clarification thing, seems to me, to be a great thing which separates the two.

In Kohlberg, you might do any number of things, oh, because of conscience, and hate to do them. It's a rather big issue: there's total neglect, almost, of this emotional component in valuing and thinking. And I have an idea myself that that stage thing is going to get mixed-up there, so that it becomes very prominent in the so-called moral position.

Now one of his closest collaborators, who will remain anonymous in this situation, has said that Kohlberg is lousy at analyzing papers of the students, or in the tapes that are transcribed. My gosh, if that's true, and if the man with whom he has worked most closely would say this, what does it mean? Does it mean that there are absolute moral principles and he knows them? Well--that's a possibility, isn't it? That we'll get into *this* counting game with it. You'll be less concerned with what you say than is it above a hundred? Are you at one hundred fifty? Or stage 4, or stage 5?

Now he has also said that they rarely get any group that is at Five or Six. This means that he has a four point scale for

distributing results. Now if you look at how he talks about the first stages as dealing with fear, and with power of adults--my gosh! As I look at it from a distance of many years, those first three stages are just so obvious. And, of course, as they progress there, they get to the place of deference to peers. . . .

(Mrs. Raths interrupts gently with some messages for Dr. Raths, and with some coffee and a delicious coffee-cake.

We talked, sometimes with our mouths full, about Kohlberg a little more. I commented on my concern that moral reasoning may not necessarily correlate with moral behavior. At this point, Dr. Raths and I continued the interview.)

RATHS: Moreover, as you stay at that level of the game, you're not interacting with the life of a person. Now if you and I were talking in class, and you say something about this novel we're reading, it's coming from you, and I respond to your utterance. I recognize it as a feeling, or a purpose, or an attitudinal statement--and we can get at it. But the other way, it's over with, isn't it? They're trying to find-out what stage it is.

TAFEE: Do you foresee any possibility of a marriage between Kohlberg's ideas and values clarification?

RATHS: I can see where people like you or some others will pick-up a relationship. But I don't see Kohlberg, let us say, wanting to share this field with any wave of values clarification. And yet, I'm bound to say that if he's going to get anywhere with it at all,

he's got to get to the stage of having people interact with the students. He's got to get there or there's nothing. In other words, if he stays with that stage thing, as Stewart probably sensed, it's something like waving a thermometer over this room, and finding out it's a little higher over here than it is over there. I don't know what you do when you've found that out.

In this whole field, there is a great danger that was present in the Phi Delta Kappan articles, and that deals with the attributions which one group of people will make about another group of people in the field.²¹ I've hedged here, by saying such words as "probably," and "maybe" and so forth. And I would say I don't see that there will be much of a coming together of these. But to attribute to, ah, let's say to the values clarification people: who "know" values, and our "cultural relativism" in the sense that we tolerate everything. . . .

Now let me speak about that for a minute. It might be worthwhile. If you were to tell me that Christ will be at stage Seven, you know, I might say something like: "Well, what is stage 'Seven?'" And you would say: "Gee, I don't know exactly, but it's higher than Six." And I would say, "Let's imagine together what could be higher than Six." We'd stumble around that for a while, and say: "Well, you know, if you believe that it's going to be higher than Six, and yet we don't know what Seven would be about, why would you seek-out this honor for him in this particular view?" And then you would tell me that he is "perfect" and so on, and so

²¹See the June, 1975 issue of the Phi Delta Kappan.

on. Well, I don't think that my willingness to talk with you about this, and not to reject you, is evidence that I have accepted your values. There is a difference between accepting you as a human being and respecting you and agreeing with your value-type statements. And because I'm listening to you, somebody else says: "He doesn't have any values of his own! He tolerates everything!" Now that's cultural relativism again. How do they get a basis for making that attribution? Here I am, trying to respect twenty-five kids in the room. Twenty-five kids with maybe twenty-five different backgrounds. Maybe some of them with traumatic experiences in one or another of those areas. And when a person says he hates so and so, and I find out that he's had some very unhappy experiences with a particular group, I think "Gee, if they had done that to me, I might hate them too." And somebody listening on the side says: "My God, listen to him! He doesn't have any values!" And what I am doing is to try to see why this person holds them, and as I get the evidence for it, I try to make some kind of supporting statement to him. I don't think that it means I am value-less in this area. But the attributions keep being made, and the people in so-called v.c. or the value clarifying area are like this, or are like that, or something. . . . And I don't see where they get the evidence to say this.

Now you have been very kind today in listening to me. Now I don't make the assumption that you've agreed with everything I said, or that you have no values in this whole field. I couldn't do that, could I, without just rank attributing? Attributions are

all right if accompanying them are such words as: "It seemed to me when I was talking with him he appeared to me . . ." or "There is a likelihood that this is . . ." but, for goodness' sake, to make rather positive statements and generalizations about this. . . .

TAFFEE: In the few minutes that we have left, Dr. Raths, tell me please, in what ways has values clarification touched or changed your life?

RATHS: I think there's been one very dramatic thing which has operated in my life: I would say as many as perhaps twenty times in my lifetime, people have come up to me and spoken to me about something. I'm going to give you maybe one or two examples.

One of the examples that I used throughout the forties and fifties was the business of saying to a small group of people: "Would you write down on a piece of paper some of the things that you're going to be doing this weekend?" I'd give them three or four minutes. And then I would say to them: "Now I'm going to ask you to do something about your own paper. Put an "X" in front of every statement in which you can't wait for Saturday and Sunday to come." Well, over and over again, there were no X's. And I would take the ball and say: "Whose life are you leading? Is it possible for you to make decisions, or would you say you can't?" Pretty soon it would be "Aren't there some things you really want to do, or have wanted to do, or something?"

Well, I remember rather distinctly for instance, one fellow. And about a month after that little meeting he said:

"You know. I have I really changed my life." And I said, "tell me about it." And he said, "Well, you know, ever since I really have been going to college and have worked, and I am now a teacher, I've wanted to play some musical instrument. And see now, I would always have some reasons for putting it off. You know, 'my wife needs this, the kids need that, the car needs this.' You know, after that session I went home and talked with my wife for a long time, and I began to tell her how much I really wanted to play a musical instrument. And as soon as she heard it, she marched me downtown and, by golly, I bought one! And I've been playing it, and it's been wonderful!" Well. . . .

I remember being in a very upward middle class neighborhood in Westchester county, and I had agreed to go there, something like ten times, to talk about values. And it got near the end of those lessons and I said: "You know, this week and next week, I'm going to ask each of you to tell me about some student that you have been working with a little more than with some other student, and what has happened with respect to clarifying as you see it." So I just happened to say, "Joe, will you start us off?"

And Joe got up, and began to talk about himself, and I interrupted him and said: "You know, Joe, this is very interesting and I know talking about yourself is good, and yet my immediate concern is your contacts with the students, and not what's happened to you." And he said: "You just let me go ahead." And you know, this fellow told some really heart-throbbing things about things that were happening to him, his wife, and his older daughter. It

came out so nicely. And he went on to say that at first he thought this whole thing was crap, that we were doing, but he began to relate it to his family situation. And he began to ask his wife and his older daughter the questions that we thought he was asking of his students in his class. And he described this whole thing, and the resolutions that had happened. . . .

I remember a boy, who was about 6'2". You could tell by his whole disposition that he was probably from a working class family. And I had agreed to take a group of seniors and talk have a dozen times. No credit for them. No credit for me. Well, this fellow was in this group, and I noticed his face light up a number of times. Well, it was over with, and a year went by, and I looked up in my office one day, and there he stood, with a naval uniform on. And I got up and held out my hand, and said: "Hi." And he said: "You remember?" And I said "yeah." He said "I just want to tell you that, you know those meetings? That was the most important thing that happened to me in my college education." So I said, of course: "Sit down and tell me about it." Well he said, "You know, I was over there in Brooklyn. I didn't know a heck of a lot about life. I got on a ship, and as somebody began telling me about a grip that he had, I would start asking some of these questions. In three or four months I had a dozen people coming to me, and after they left they would say 'thanks.' Honestly, that's all I did was to ask them." After a while he said, "Gee,

I want to thank you." I replied: "You didn't see the connection here at that time, did you? That's all I did, was to ask you."

Well, one night Anna Burrell and I were going home from the Navy district in Brooklyn. We just got out of a school in which we had been working with a small group of teachers, and a man accosted us, a very good-looking, nicely dressed fellow. It turned out that he was the husband of one of the teachers in this little group we were working with. And he said: "Man I'm lucky. I came here to meet with you people," and he said, "I evidently just made it. Would you go over and have a drink with me some place before you go home?" So we said yes. He said: "I'm going to tell you some things, and I just hope they're confidential." And he went on to say how he and his wife were just about to break-up, and how this woman had changed during that semester. He said: "I don't know what the heck you people do, but honestly, she's a different woman. Both of us are much happier, and we're just getting along. She seems to be able to listen to me, and I think she's taught me to listen to her."

Well now, what am I saying to you in answer to your question? Is it the audience approval? No. It isn't a questionnaire type of response that I'm talking about, or having a student tell you before the grades are given how much she enjoyed the course. There have been a number of cases where people have just said: "By golly, ya know, it really shook me." I think this is what has had the most meaning for me: that the process could have such an impact.

Now, on my own life? I'll give you an example from two weeks ago or three. . . .

(At this point, Dr. Raths asked that the recorder be turned off, so he could relate a confidential incident, which dealt with a professional situation in which he took a particular value stance. Due to its sensitive nature, he thought it best that, at this time, it not become a public issue, not because of any unwillingness to "publicly affirm" his stance, but to protect the privacy of others involved. We resumed taping at a later point.)

RATHS: I think that when many people remain quiet in a choice situation, it isn't so much because they are afraid to speak, as it is they don't know what they believe, not having seen clearly, through life or living and experiences and reading, where they stand. They remain mute. Now all too commonly, it is said about them that they're afraid to talk. Now the fear, as I see it, may be there, but the fear, I think, is more related to that if they talk, they wouldn't know what they were talking about. It was that they weren't clear.

(For some unexplainable reason, the last two minutes or so of our conversation was inaudible on the recording. What Dr. Raths said may be summarized as follows: In a number of situations during his lifetime, he has been able to speak-out on certain issues, many of them controversial, not because he was particularly brave, but because he had become clearer about what it was that he believed and was willing to take action on it.

Our interview was terminated at that point, so that Dr. Raths could keep a pressing engagement.)

APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW WITH MERRILL HARMIN

INTERVIEW WITH MERRILL HARMIN

TAFTEE: How was it that you became involved with values clarification?

HARMIN: Simple. Raths had been a teacher of mine and Sid's, and he wanted to write a book about values but wanted some help with it.¹ And he spoke to Sid, Sid spoke to me, and then we--Sid and I--agreed to help him, and the three of us did it. And although I had been using it--let's see, this was written. . . . Sid and I had both been conducting values workshops, as a matter of fact, before that. Now, where am I? What was your question? You want a chronology of it?

TAFTEE: Sure, if you'd like.

HARMIN: Sid and I both were graduate students of his in the late fifties, and then he went to work in some small college in New Jersey and I went to work at Rutgers. And Rutgers had some human relations workshops which at that time were concerned mostly with inter-group relations, inter-religious problems, inter-racial problems and such. And I took over those human relations workshops and tried to make them practical as opposed to just "talking about." And one of the things we included was a whole series of Rath's theories on values, on emotions, and on thinking--somewhat, plus some group dynamics type of things. So Sid and I started

¹The book that resulted was Values and Teaching by Louis E. Rath, Merrill Harmin & Sidney B. Simon.

teaching these human relations workshops in 1962-63. And then Rath asked us to help with the book. So that's how it started.

TAFFEE: I see. Since those late fifties and early sixties, in what ways have you noticed values clarification enter and affect your own life?

HARMIN: Not much at all. Except that professionally giving me a huge exposure and advantage. But practically speaking, in terms of my own life, it hasn't. That is, if I had gotten well known through group dynamics, it would have had the same impact.

TAFFEE: I see. In many cases, I guess I have seen people who attribute to values clarification, sort of a "shaft of light" that came upon them and has pointed them in all sorts of different directions. . . .

HARIM: Not me. Mine was purely professional.

TAFFEE: Well then, as a leader in different workshops about the country, I'm sure that you get some inkling as to whether it is affecting the lives of those people in the workshops.

HARMIN: Yes, it is. As you said, that "shaft of light" impact on some, but that's not only rare, I mean that's like, maybe, oh, I would say less than ten per cent. For the larger proportion it's a reaffirmation of some things that they have sensed, but not been able to express. Reaffirmation of the connection between thought, and feeling and actions essentially. It's an occasion to look at

themselves in a safe, comfortable way, and the ability to look at issues in a moderately relaxed, open-minded fashion. So it's a freeing and a supporting and an encouraging thing for the majority I suspect.

TAFTEE: Is that how it is for you?

HARMIN: No. Why it hasn't had much of an impact on me is because I was that way before that. I was comfortable with the theory because it fit me, personally. It didn't help me too much, but it suited the way I happened to be at the outset, I think, would be more accurate. Maybe reaffirm and strengthen, but I would say that was a minor role.

TAFTEE: Back in those early sixties days, and sixty-six when the book came out, how were you, and Sid, and Raths being received by various scholars in the community, and critics?

HARMIN: Scholars by and large ignored us. It didn't seem like a scholarly work. Critics essentially ignored us, because in the early days it wasn't significant. So it wasn't worth attending to.

We were first noticed by teachers, for when we offered help: practical, classroom-type help.

TAFTEE: How is that different than 1976?

HARMIN: Well now we're very well known, so that we attract anybody who teaches the area, and feels then they have to react to us. That's reasonable enough. So we get a lot of criticism, a lot of

attention. Some of it positive, some of it negative. I'm not sure what you want.

TAFFEE: Could you maybe list some of the positive criticisms that you hear?

HARMIN: Positive reactions we get have to do with our practicality: that we offer workable methods for teachers in the moral domain, practical benefits.

TAFFEE: How about the other side of the coin? How about the negative stuff?

HARMIN: The negative stuff is that people say it's "mushy," it's philosophically not crisp, sometimes inconsistent, and sometimes dumb. But generally, philosophically they say it doesn't hold together.

It also is criticized a fair amount for giving to emotional things. See, we tend to . . . values clarification as you know, is three areas: thought, feeling and actions. We tend to get criticized by persons who are in one or another of those camps. Very few people are in all three. People who are in all three tend to be supportive, by and large.

If you get a guy who's a philosopher, who's intellectual, he has a hard time relating to the other two components. So that's where a lot of that "mushiness" comes from, because we get into gray, feelings type things that are hard to deal with in clear, crisp terms.

TAFFEE: How do you respond to those who say that values clarification is "mushy," or deals too much with emotionality?

HARMIN: Oh, I would use the theories. Matter of fact, I would probably talk to them about: "What are the alternatives? How else can we approach this in a helpful way?" And I would hope to not take a position of convincing them. As a matter of fact I would take a position of dialogue: "Let's see, and maybe you can help me sharpen the theory, and maybe I can help you understand it better." So I would want to dialogue about it, ruminate about it. I wouldn't take the position of convincing.

TAFFEE: What about the oft heard criticisms that values clarification is a "relativistic" animal? Is that fair? Unfair?

HARMIN: Well, I suppose. If someone said that to me I would say: "What do you mean by it?"

TAFFEE: OK, well the common descriptor I hear attached with that is that values clarification people don't have any values of their own, and are willing to accept anything, and so forth.

HARMIN: Well that isn't true, I would say. I would ask them to show me somebody in the movement who has no values. I would acknowledge that some people may have picked-up the theory and run with it in a value-less frame, but none of the people I know are that way.

Incidentally, on that question, Steve, I'd like to tell people that it's not inconsistent to take a values clarifying position and

have clear values. I would want to make that clear. In one sense you could posit values, in another you could help someone else clarify his own values. That's sometimes helpful.

TAFFEE: Do you see any possibility of something happening between values clarification theory and practice, and the theory and practice of Kohlberg and others?

HARMIN: Yes, in fact, I do. I've lately been incorporating in my writing Kohlberg's findings, and I think they overlap. And to the extent that Kohlberg and values clarification approach the same question and find truths, they'll just be talking about the same thing, perhaps in a different language. I think they do overlap.

TAFFEE: Getting back to the sixties again, how were the workshops that you and Sid were doing generally received by teachers?

HARMIN: Very positively. We almost never had an unhappy workshop, from the very first.

TAFFEE: Is that still true today?

HARMIN: Yeh, I'd say so. I'd say so, yes.

TAFFEE: If you had to take a look back at that 1960's style of workshop, and then take a look at the type of workshop you're conducting now, are there some essential differences? Are they essentially the same?

HARMIN: No, the workshops in the beginning were not focused on values clarification. So the very first ones were three weeks long, and had a much different climate. Later ones came to be much shorter.

But the first values workshop, pure values workshop . . . that was in Rochester, New York. I suppose 1965, 66--something like that. Sixty-four? Sixty-three? Not an awful lot different. Not an awful lot different.

TAFFEE: Do you ever find yourself longing for those days of the week long workshops as opposed to the weekend workshops now?

HARMIN: No. We still have the week long workshop. It's just so much more time consuming, that we don't have as many.

TAFFEE: Do you ever wonder if those being trained at the workshop can grasp enough of the theory, and some of the underlying philosophy, and I guess some of the subtleties that go into utilizing and putting values clarification into practice?

HARMIN: Not much. I focus mostly on doing a good job myself, and doing the best I can with it. And I trust people will do the best they can with it too. And I don't worry too much about the misuse.

TAFFEE: Do you have any evidence that crops up from time to time, that perhaps it is being misused?

HARMIN: Not so much. The larger evidence is that people don't use it. That is, it doesn't work for them the way it works for us

certainly, as they anticipated. So they just don't continue its use. That's the larger negative impact. Very few people misuse it, I think.

TAFFEE: What do you think is behind statements from those types of people that say it doesn't work?

HARMIN: Oh, the fact that it doesn't work.

TAFFEE: I mean, are they looking for different products? Is it supposed to work differently in their classroom?

HARMIN: Yeah, I think they see some of us doing it with splash and drama, and they see that they can't replicate that exactly, so it doesn't seem to work.

But there's a lot of difference between what we're doing and what they do. We're different people. We have different audiences. We have different responsibilities.

I think also that in a sense that the claims here tend to get inflated, plus it's excitement. It has an inherent excitability. People don't look critically at what it's supposed to accomplish, but rather assume that what it did for them it will do for others, and that's what they measure it against, whereas that never was its real intent. Its real intent is, as Values and Teaching makes clear, a slow, increasing ability to govern one's self in a self-directing way.²

²Louis E. Rath, Merrill Harmin and Sidney B. Simon, Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1966).

TAFFEE: Do you see any evidence to suggest that values clarification is more "affective" in emphasis in 1976 than it was in 1966 or the early sixties?

HARMIN: Probably. A little bit. But that's mostly attributable to the fact that those of us who are doing it, personally are slipping into some more affective interests. Sid, especially, perhaps.

And also, I think, the nation, I mean the population in general is getting more concerned with their feelings. I don't think values clarification defined strictly has become more affective.

In large part, it's represented best by Values and Teaching, everything else is kind of a partial offshoot, in the sense they reflect our current interests and such.³ We don't present it, you couldn't in a pure form, present it in a week. The workshop is more to excite people so that they get into the literature. Of course, a lot of people get into the literature on the "technique" level.

TAFFEE: Any feelings about the recommendations or suggestions that Howie made in his essay, "Beyond Values Clarification," as to how the theory might be better represented schematically?⁴

³Raths, Harmin and Simon, Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom.

⁴Howard Kirschenbaum, "Beyond Values Clarification," Readings in Values Clarification, ed. by Sidney B. Simon and Howard Kirschenbaum (Minneapolis: Winston Press, Inc., 1973).

HARMIN: Not particularly. I think that's useful. Myself, I'm not moving in that direction.

TAFFEE: How do you present the theory in the workshops you're doing now?

HARMIN: More as it was traditionally presented. I think that when we extend it far beyond its boundaries, it becomes something other than values clarification--more like life skill development. So I don't so much spread values clarification, as incorporate other theories of something larger.

TAFFEE: Do you still tend to talk about "criteria?"

HARMIN: Oh, no. And that's a good point. I talk only about "processes." I shouldn't say "only," but mainly about processes, and use criteria only when I get with philosophers who want definitions for words. I find practitioners don't need definitions, so it's not useful, talking about criteria.

TAFFEE: Practitioners aside for the moment, how would you define a value?

HARMIN: I would say, "by the Seven Criteria." But I would probably add that it's probably not too important, how we define it. Life is a process, and what's important is what we do, how we feel, what we think. Not how we define things.

TAFFEE: How is it that the "three level curriculum" came to be developed?

HARMIN: That's an invention of Sid's. He taught it to me. Turned out that Howie said that he, independently, thought of it. But I'm not sure about that. I learned it from Sid.

TAFFEE: Does that remain to be a useful tool, in your mind?

HARMIN: Yeah. Not all-fired useful, not one of the most useful things, but it's useful. For some people it seems to be helpful. I don't know how helpful, though.

TAFFEE: As I kind of look back to 1966, and certainly I wasn't involved in values clarification then, so a lot of my looking has been back through the literature and through other people's eyes, it seems to me that two major methodologies that have been used to sort of get the word out to the teachers around the United States, have been to great amount of publications--a number of different books on how it can be put into practice--and also the use of the weekend, week-long workshop in various locations around the country. Now maybe with the exception of what you're doing at Edwardsville, there hasn't been, at least from what I've seen, there hasn't been a whole lot of infusion of values clarification into pre-service teacher training programs. Is that the result of a conscious decision that the other way was a better way to go?

HARMIN: No, but I don't think your hypothesis is accurate. I see a lot of pre-service people using our publications, and becoming familiar with it in methods courses and what-not.

In any case, it was not a conscious decision on our part to choose one over the other. We thought rather, through writing and workshops we were spreading the word. We just stopped there. We didn't exclude anything, so much as decide as that was a good thing to do.

TAFEE: What do you think the future might hold in regard to the widespread popularity that values clarification has enjoyed in the last ten years?

HARMIN: I'm not sure, Steve. I really am not. It would seem that we couldn't get much more popular, we must be peaking, reaching the maximum in that. And that suggests, just historically, that it will slough off a little bit. Just become another thing in the literature, something like the "project method"--at one time was popular and now is just another theory.

But, eh, in a funny way values clarification gets at the heart of many things that have never been crisp, such as democracy, and self-direction, and mental health. Now it's not the complete of any of those things, but since it connects to so many central and critical things, it might hang around a while in one form or another. It's hard to say. I'm not sure. I see other things developing, so I'm not sure what will happen with values clarification.

TAFEE: Would you like to give a "for example" of the other things you see developing?

HARMIN: Yeah, one of the newer things is the increased interest in "non-rational phenomena." I think that will play a larger role. Meditation, ESP, and things like that. And that's exactly where I'm doing a lot of my work in recent weeks too, by the way.

TAFFEE: How would something like that, and I guess I am keying off the word "non-rational," fit in with what many people see as a very rational theory of weighing, picking and choosing orientation of values clarification?

HARMIN: Well, it's a complex issue. But essentially, we have a lot of ways of knowing, and the non-rational approaches, intuition and so forth, merely have a way of infusing awareness of alternatives and consequences, so our decisions actually become that much wiser.

TAFFEE: How do you see yourself working with values clarification during the next ten years?

HARMIN: Oh, I don't know. I don't plan that far ahead. I kind of live project by project. I'm a pretty current oriented guy. So I don't really think much ahead that way. I couldn't answer that.

TAFFEE: One of the projects that I guess you are probably involved with, at least Rath says you are, is a revised edition of Values and Teaching.⁵ What are some of the things you're going to see changed in that?

⁵Raths, Harmin and Simon, Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom.

HARMIN: As a matter of fact I see very little change. I can see it as being essentially the same, but just more clear, more pointed, better written--something like that. I don't think it will change much. I may be wrong, by the way. I haven't started writing on it, just kind of been corresponding and thinking about it. But I don't think it will change much.

TAFFEE: Will others be involved, besides Sid and Rath?

HARMIN: No, the three of us will be handling it. Howie is going to help to the extent that he's been keeping up to date on the current research, and that will be fed into the new book, but that's all.

TAFFEE: Whom do you see as playing or continuing to play some influential roles within values clarification?

HARMIN: It seems to me that Sid and Howie, I, are still, somehow, playing the major roles.

Raths acts as a kind of a keel for us, to keep us in balance. We have a tendency to go a little off, and he kind of reminds us. I'd say Howie, Sid and I.

TAFFEE: Can you give some examples of when Rath has acted as a keel?

HARMIN: Yes. We, for a while, had focused an awful lot on personal problems: clarifying what you want to do with your life, how you

want to relate with others, and things like that. And Rath was very firm in reminding us that we should also clarify such things as: what racial prejudice should or should not be, what we should do about poverty and war, and the larger social issues. That's one example.

Raths still feels keenly about the use of the seven elements as criteria, not as processes.

TAFFEE: How is that going to be handled in the revision?

HARMIN: It will be handled in his style. It's essentially his representation of his theory, so it will be written from his point of view.

TAFFEE: Do you see any possibility of perhaps referring to it as the "Raths Theory of Values Clarification?"

HARMIN: Yes. I think it might even be nice to do that. He has been kind of pushed, somewhat, into the background because of all the workshops and writings that we've done without him. So it might be nice to do that. He would like that, I'm sure. And it is his theory, so it's very accurate. Sid and I have really only augmented it and colored it, but hardly changed it at all.

TAFFEE: Is there any research that you think needs to be done or should be done in values clarification?

HARMIN: Oh, I don't think so. But I don't think much about it. I don't have much faith in the effects of research. It doesn't

seem to have made a hell of a lot of difference in the field that I've done a lot of research in. And I don't know of any questions that I have that need research to answer them, so I don't think about it.

But I don't think about it so if somebody raised an issue, I might agree that it would be well to research.

TAFFEE: What sort of training models do you foresee being used? Will the weekend workshop continue to be a mainstay of values clarification training?

HARMIN: I would predict so. It's really nice and efficient.

I'm reducing it to one day workshops more, just in terms of efficiency. Not much is lost, because there's so much literature that people can use to expand on it. So that the function of the workshop being mainly to give a taste and a spirit, is accomplished almost as well in one day as in two.

TAFFEE: If you could paint an ideal picture of what values clarification might have happen to it during the next few years, do you have an idea as to how that might look?

HARMIN: What will happen?

TAFFEE: Ideally, what you'd like to happen.

HARMIN: What I'd like to happen. I'd like to see more dialogue with Kohlberg's people. I feel awkward about it because I've not

initiated anything that would lead to it myself, so that I'm not one to feel too strongly about that.

But I would like to see that. I would like to dissolve the notion that we're in contradiction to each other, or in competition. I would like to see built a cooperative base so that we can help each other. And I suspect that we can help each other.

Other than that, I think that things will take care of themselves, somehow.

TAFFEE: Do you think, given statements like those of Stewart in the Phi Delta Kappan, that it's likely that Kohlberg and Stewart, and people of the moral development area are going to seek out, or even be amenable to, dialogue with values clarification people?⁶

HARMIN: Do I think they will?

TAFFEE: Yes.

HARMIN: Gee, I'm not sure. I don't know any of those Kohlberg people. I once got one note from one researcher, just briefly, so I don't know. I haven't data to judge.

TAFFEE: Have there been any provisions made, have you, Raths, Sid, Howie and interested others, sat down and perhaps talked about the next few years of values clarification?

⁶John S. Stewart, "Clarifying Values Clarification: A Critique," Phi Delta Kappan, LVI, No. 10 (June, 1975), pp. 684-688.

HARMIN: No. Sometimes Sid, Howie and I talk about our personal roles, only because we're friends and cooperate that way. But we don't seriously talk about where we would like it to go, that kind of thing.

TAFFEE: Is that something you think should be done, or is it not necessary?

HARMIN: Naw, remember I said I think things will take care of themselves. I don't think individuals making decisions have a large impact at all.

TAFFEE: How would you assess, in these ten years, the impact that values clarification has had on the larger field of education?

HARMIN: I think it's been very positive. I think it's supported, some unintentionally--it hasn't supported the clarification of values as it has supported an openness and a freedom, and a respect for students from themselves and from teachers. It's fed the largest stream of humanism, I think.

I think incidently, and I'm not sure if I alluded to this before, that values clarification by itself, is not so significant. It's as it blends and augments and rides into the other on-going streams of the universe that it makes sense.

TAFFEE: Are there any particular words of wisdom you think would look really neat ending up an interview with Merrill Harmin?

HARMIN: (laughs) No. Naw--I'm a little modest about the movement. I tend to be modest about my own contributions to it. I guess maybe that tone has come through, too.

My last comment about the interdependence of it with the time of the culture is the thing I would underline for a guy like you who is looking at it and its role. It is not as special as some people think it is.

APPENDIX G

INTERVIEW WITH SIDNEY B. SIMON

INTERVIEW WITH SIDNEY B. SIMON

TAFEE: What are the four or five hard questions that you think the leaders in values clarification should be asking themselves right about now?

SIMON: How to control the people who read the stuff rather than experience it. How to control them so they use it more wisely (pause). What's interesting is I'm wrestling with the "should" questions rather than the ones I really believe in.

The should questions are: Is there adequate research to support what you're now doing? Another should question is: How do you know it really works? That's another research question. Another should question is: Do you think the theory needs to be changed? Were those seven original values indicators and criteria or processes adequate?

But the real questions for me are how to disseminate it with greater care and control. How to beat off the critics who love to call it superficial? How to get more strategies developed by people who write and ask: "I've used the seventy-nine strategies, what else do you have?" How to, this is a real question, how to determine which strategies are inapplicable to younger children, and which even though they look like they are only for older children, should definitely be used for younger children? Some kind of developmental framework maybe. How to see that the people who learn it don't contaminate it out of their own rebellion from

not wanting to have to acknowledge that they learned it somewhere?
How to deal with the fundamentalist parents who feel that values clarification should be the realm of the home?

Those are the questions that interest me.

TAFEE: What was it like being in values clarification ten years ago?

SIMON: Well, it was as exciting as it is now. I truly don't think the excitement has diminished. You saw me working last night,¹ and that excitement that I felt and that intensity and interest that I had last night is no less than the interest I had ten years ago.

But yet, ten years ago was a slight feeling of a uniqueness of being there without many other people around. I really do feel sometimes that the woods are enormously crowded with values clarifiers of one stripe or another, who set themselves up in shop or business.

Ten years ago it felt intuitively right. I remember the reception I received in classes and in workshops and in inservice programs. It was very intense and very high. I would say there's more resistance now, but some of it's the culture, the culture's more resistant now. I guess we're clearly a people frightened by a lot of economics, and the collapse of our leadership nationwide.

I remember in the very beginning, Merrill and I would go off together to demonstrate for a high school group, and he would

¹Dr. Simon makes several references to a presentation made "last night." He is referring to a workshop he presented on the evening of October 22, 1975 at the Midwest Symposium on Humanistic Education, sponsored by the National Center for Grading and Learning Alternatives.

present the theory and I would do the demonstration all the time. And it was often an experience which got people enormously angry at us, or in love with us. It's as if the spread was much wider. Now there's a spread, but it's not as wide. For example, last night there were some people for whom it was the highlight of the conference, and for some it was too unnerving, they'd just as soon have gone to the bar and got drunk.

Why don't you piggy-back on anything you think about when you hear the ten year question because that's a nice question?

TAFEE: Ten years ago, Values and Teaching was published, and two of the important sections of the book were devoted to the values sheet and the clarifying response. What has happened to them?

SIMON: Hm. Well the values sheet is very much alive and well. I still make maybe one a month or something like that. Merrill makes them more often. I used a couple hours of my class a few weeks ago working with values sheets and I argued this is one of the most useful, most applicable, repeatable strategies that they'll ever find.

I do almost nothing with the clarifying response. Howie revived it in a couple of workshops. Like last year at Boston we did it together, and it was kind of fun to see what he did with it. My own experience is that's it either something that people intuitively have. . . .(interruption) Howie did this nice thing with it. My own experience was that it's either something that intuitively you have, just once you read it you say "Ah-yes!"

But if you try to teach it to people who can't use it, it is the most laborious, the most botched--it's the most head-trippy thing you can imagine. People just simply using it in the inappropriate places. So it's difficult, pedagogically, to get across. Whereas when Rath's first taught it to us, I knew it was right-on. I used it intuitively without even being conscious of "A-ha! I've used a clarifying response." You teach it to some people and they are always going "A-ha! I better use a clarifying response."

TAFEE: What are some of the significant contributions Rath's made?

SIMON: Ah. Wow! Well, the theoretical framework. The seven processes stand up so well for me. They just seem very appropriate. There's no way I see to improve them, although there is inevitably someone who says: "Well, I think we need an eighth one which would go like this," or "We need an eighth and ninth one." I find that not so. There's a clarity to them, that's almost like the power of the first person who found out a way to prune a tree, and the tree grew more powerful and gave up more apples. It's intuitively right, and I thank Rath's for that.

Other changes? I think the values indicators are as solid as they ever were. That marvelous notion that there are two categories to things and you can look at your life in terms of them, seems right-on to me, as right as it ever was.

Rath's came up with the early idea of strategies besides the theory. He's a brilliant teacher and he was enormous fun to work with. And I can remember him teaching us the "Spread of

Opinion" strategy, and just turning-on a whole class with great aliveness. A big class.

It's amazing. He almost never had any rebellions. I just marvel at how his classes just followed his magic. He was THE person to have a class with at NYU. You just couldn't get through your doctoral program without him.

So it was the theory, and the values indicators breakthrough, and the early strategies.

TAFFEE: Howie Kirschenbaum mentioned to me that last summer you and Merrill and Rath were thinking of a revision of Values and Teaching. What are some of the things that you might think need to be changed, revised, updated, added to, etc?

SIMON: Well, the values sheets brought up-to-date would be an obvious one. A new research section, better research section. Then I anticipate some arguments and fights about the theory section.

I think we've learned a little bit in ten years about the moralizing issue, the not stating your own views issue, the neutral-free issue. I think Merrill, who did a lot of that section, bent over backwards in the early book because we were fighting, really you forget, that the only approach to values at that time was to basically tell people what they should believe. And we were fighting desperately to counterbalance that. So we took a position farther to the right than I think I believe and would hold to now. And I'd want to explain that: where we were

and how we had to fight in 1966 to have people stop telling each other what to think.

Another thing that would need to be done is some kind of section telling how to present this to parents, and how to introduce it to a community. We have a section in the book on how to get started, but that's for a classroom teacher, and that could be done better, I know. We know a lot more about how to get started. But, that's where we were in 1966.

TAFEE: What about the section on values-related behaviors? You know, the notion that those with unclear values may act flighty, apathetic, uncertain, etc.?

SIMON: I find they don't interest me a whole lot at this point. I would be more apt to say that the values confusion is so universal, that you don't have to work with just those special behavior problem types. That was in some ways a research tool. There wasn't a person in that room last night who wouldn't benefit from the exercises you gave us in the afternoon and wouldn't benefit from the thing I did about shoveling sand last night.² I just know no shortage of values laden problems.

TAFEE: Based on what you just told me, would you like to see that section in Values and Teaching come out?

²Dr. Simon is referring to a presentation by the writer entitled "Clarifying the Teaching Self," at the same meeting mentioned above in footnote #1.

SIMON: Oh, I don't know if I'd pull it out, but I'd talk about it as a potential research tool. And then I'd talk about the universality that we've since learned, how everyone needs to clarify, and try to build that argument.

TAFTEE: Sid, if you could wave a magic wand in an attempt to influence what happens to values clarification when people not like yourself use it, what sort of things would you hope might be changed?

SIMON: Well, more relentless use of it. To experience it, to go through the strategies in their own lives, and see their power before they use them with other people.

Oh, I'm sure there are some other things I'd wish if I had a magic wand. That they'd listen better. That they'd get out of being a guru, and that they always put their own life on the line: admit their own frailty and fragility.

TAFTEE: (from another person in the room who had been listening to our conversation) I don't know if this is appropriate or not, but I thought of a question that I think is very appropriate to Sid's work. How would the validation work that you are doing now and the negative criticism theory fit in with what you started ten years ago? Would that be something that would be in the revisions or not?³

³Question from Pamela Goodrich, who was attending the Symposium.

SIMON: Well, I'd have to give footnote credit. It's Re-Evaluation Counseling work, mostly. I'd have to talk about that. But the validations are a part of public affirmation, a part of prizing, cherishing, and a part of acting on what it is you get clear on. It seems perfectly well-suited.

I also wish that Re-Evaluation Counseling spent more time doing the values clarifying exercises, and I think they could get to some important material faster and in somewhat more efficient ways than the random "what's on top."

TAFEE: The term "values clarification" is really a part of the public domain now, and while you, Merrill, Howie and Lee Howe may have your "corner of the market" so to speak, there are a lot of other materials being produced in the name of values clarification, some of which make no reference to your work whatsoever. Personal feelings first, but also any professional problems that you think might occur with v.c. such a public entity.

SIMON: Well, my first response is, we decided several years ago, Merrill, Howie and I, never to get involved in the franchising business. We watched what the Parent Effectiveness thing was doing, and we chose not to go that way. I have a feeling that had any of us been freer, we might have gone that way, 'cause it might have been one way to have some quality control on what's being done. We have a little four page thing we send out when we hear of anybody

doing it, particularly when we hear somebody is not doing it wisely, that asks for some quality control.⁴

I think I among the other two would have liked to have a trademark of some sort, which would have been just a chance to keep people out of it who should be kept out of it, with some kind of legal thing.

I feel enormously generous with all the people I have trained, encouraged and help set up workshops and so forth. I feel really good about that.

And I have sometimes the anxiety that there may not indeed be a place for me, but that's an irrational anxiety that comes out of being a depression kid. The uniqueness of my own contribution will always probably have an outlet. I wish I could say will always have an outlet, but it will probably always have one.

TAFTEE: What are some of the unique things you have brought to values clarification?

SIMON: I see myself as, well, two things: One of the most creative strategy inventors, and the other is I brought my quality of charisma to it. There's probably no one who goes around the country more effectively showing people what it looks like. And I'm always inventing new strategies, and always coming up with ways for building on things we've done earlier. Merrill has been among the most

⁴Reference to Howard Glaser-Kirschenbaum, Merrill Harmin and Sidney B. Simon, "Recommended Qualifications for Values Clarification Trainers," National Humanistic Education Center, Upper Jay, New York (Mimeographed letter).

creative. A lot of the early strategies were Merrill's little things. And they were just intuitively right.

So those were my two contributions, the major ones. Oh, going around the country has also been popularizing--the spreading, the disseminating.

TAFEE: When some critics, like John Stewart, refer to values clarification as being superficial, a bag of tricks, games, something which deals only with content, not structure, etc., what would you like to say to them?⁵

SIMON: Oh, I would say, as gently as I could, although there would be some anger underneath it: I hope you'll come to a workshop sometime and watch how it enters your life. I don't know what else to say to them.

Ideas are one thing that teachers desperately need more of. Call them tricks. Call them recipes. I like to think of them as alternatives. That thing I said last night: If you want people to change, nourishment is one of them, alternatives is the other.

There is a structure. If any graduate student, which would be a fun dissertation, were to take the seventy-nine strategies in the handbook and see which of the seven criteria or processes they touched, I think Stewart would probably be impressed to see how many of them were designed to fulfill those. Or to look at the areas of confusion and conflict. Maybe we need to have made the

⁵See John S. Stewart, "Clarifying Values Clarification: A Critique," Phi Delta Kappan, 56, 10 (June, 1975), 684-688.

structure more implicit, but I just feel that teachers don't need that kind of head-tripping: the great chart with the diagram of interlapping circles, and the kind of thing that assistant professors get their kicks out of. It's just not what teachers need. They need more specific things to do with kids, that have integrity in their original design.

I have another idea. I think it would be a nice challenge to Stewart types, to say maybe they should be asked to invent ten strategies, that fit a framework which they approve of. And maybe in the process of trying to invent ten strategies they would see somewhat similar things.

TAFEE: What might values clarification look like ten years from now?

SIMON: I think it will still be around. There will still be places which haven't heard of it and will be as hungry for it as the people who have found it in the last ten years. You really do know that it's changed peoples lives. I'm sure T.A. has, and Gestalt has. But there is something, and probably always will be something, about values clarification, as one of the shrewdest, best places to get people drawn into humanistic education. Although last night was a very heavy demonstration, it generally is safer and lighter to get people to see how to begin working on their lives, in a more systematic way. So it will clearly be around. Bozeman, Montana hasn't yet found values clarification, but it will.

public affirmation, what have you done about it, what do you need to do about it, action.

I would hope that it wouldn't get overladen with what, in the hands of bad people, T.A. does. You know, "That's your child talking," or "You need to exemplify your parent more." I hope that it wouldn't get contaminated by endless amounts of entropy. You can see that to me is one of the major enemies. As I looked at the panel last night, at the eight people, I could rank order the ones who, to me, would be dangerous with values clarification, one through eight. And the enemy would always be the excess of words, the elaborate spider webs of nit-picking.

TAFTEE: What can be done towards quality control?

SIMON: Well, it's interesting. I think to make the exercises in some ways so scary, a certain percentage in the training process, that it scares people away who should be scared away. I've never said that as clearly, but I think it would be very effective. Simply to make it menacing in their own lives, so they say that: "Well, I think values clarification doesn't work," and they'll stay away from it.

What else? I don't think they should have to write a dissertation on it for quality control. I don't think they should be able to invent fifteen values sheets to show quality control. I don't think they should not read Kohlberg because if they read Kohlberg they'll be viewed as unloyal.

It will be joined and wedded together, just as I think T.A. is a marvelously eclectic kind of therapy--Re-Evaluation Counseling the most eclectic of them all--values clarification will be absorbed into lots of other things and it will absorb lots of other things, as I've absorbed into the Re-Evaluation Counseling work. It has, to me, enough unique theory to be able to keep its identity as its read along.

My own work, I sense, will become deeper, and more intense, more personal, get into scarier areas. The major anxiety I have about 1986 is that out of people's fear of their general lives they'll strike-out at anything which might be unconventional, and that there will be some parent uprisings, focused sometimes around a teacher using it badly, and sometimes just out of parents' utter frustration with their own lives, and having to slap at something that's visible.

I wouldn't be against someone who comes up with a new theory or design.

TAFFEE: If I were to go on a long trip for ten years, come back, sit in a classroom, and a teacher came in and started doing values clarification, is it likely that there would be enough similar things in it ten years from now that it would really be easy for me to say: "Hey! That's values clarification!"?

SIMON: Yeah, I think so. There would probably continue to be the consideration of alternatives, asking people to prize and cherish,

TAFTEE: Are there any questions or objections to values clarification which are consistently for you the most troublesome, hardest to deal with?

SIMON: Well, there are two different questions there. The troublesome one is the one that irritates me: that one about simplification. I just see that as about 20 per cent envy, 15 per cent protection of something they enjoy more, and therefore if someone else is enjoying something else, it must be dangerous.

The other one is that relativistic thing. It's hard because people don't understand where we came from to establish the relativism. They tend to be critical without understanding or seeing the whole picture. So I'd like to be more patient and explain to them, I think we need to do that in the revised edition. It might be useful to have a section: these are the major accusations, let's answer them. I don't particularly look forward to doing that, but it probably needs to be done. My doing that would take me away from things that I do better.

The more menacing one is the parents who feel that values clarification belongs in the home, and it shouldn't be the province of the schools. That's so hard to deal with, because it has about seven emotional layers that are away from the actual words they're saying. Guilt, for example, that they're not applying their religion as adequately as their parents applied it. It's hard to know just where they're coming from. But they come on strong, and they come on passionately.

The inadequate research, is a justifiable account. I think sometimes that Merrill should have picked up on that. It never was my cup of tea. Research just doesn't grab me, it doesn't use me well. Every time I sit on a dissertation committee, that's one of my sand shovelings. I think of how more useful I could be doing what I did last night.

Other criticisms? That it's dangerous. I have to own that it is. In the hands of bad teachers its dangerous.

"There's an inadequate theory." I would resist that one. I think the theory is more than adequate, although it may not look like other theories, like Erickson or Piaget. It's been a very adequate theory for me. I have a couple of colleagues at U. Mass who are devoting their next couple years to coming up with a developmental scheme for humanistic education. I frankly feel, yes it will be attractive and academically respectable, but it's not what the world needs.

TAFFEE: Why did you respond to John Stewart as you did?

SIMON: Because I sensed, and I probably sensed accurately, that with him it wasn't a deep concern as it was to dazzle his colleagues and to impress his mentors at how you could take a giant on and knock him down. And I just felt that that was inappropriate.

TAFFEE: Were there any criticisms within that. . . .

SIMON: Oh, come on. There probably were some; the ones we talked about that have to be answered some day: the research, the relativism, the simplisticness.

TAFFEE: Are those things that you want to answer yourself, or do you hope that others would?

SIMON: No, I would hope others would. And if I did answer it I'd like to answer it as I did last night. I'd like to answer it with the work. Then I wish Stewart had been in the room. I think it would have confused him.

TAFFEE: Is there anything I didn't ask that you expected to be asked?

SIMON: I think a nice question to ask would be: What have you felt have been peoples' benefits from the work you've done, the values clarification work? And if you'd ask that I would say I just have a file full of people who have simply said it's changed their lives. That it had given them something that they'd vaguely felt could be possible, but they never heard about it before, and their enormous gratitude for how it had changed their teaching, their personal lives. That's been consistently its impact. And something that has that impact consistently, clearly must be right. I just don't imagine I can put my finger on ten or twelve other things that have made lives change that much, and been that intuitively right.

The other thing is I think we have almost no evidence of any kind of people flipping-out over their work, or being in serious emotional trouble from the work. That's another beautiful part.

What else. What do I see myself doing? I see myself flying the country more and more, training more people, doing what I do so

well. I don't see myself setting up an elaborate network of "trainers of trainers," monitoring people who choose to do that. I've often taken enormous comfort from an idea I had many years ago, which was nobody expects Arthur Miller to write a symphony, and I truly don't expect me to have to do the research and all the other things. I write beautiful plays, as I demonstrated last night, and they deserve to be played wisely. There will be people who come to see the plays, and take part in them, take them for what they're able to take out of them.

I like the idea that I don't seem to have a lot of guru material. I like to be respected and loved and admired, but I don't seem to demand obedience, or set myself up to give out all kinds of wisdom and all kinds of proverbs. I like how cleanly I share what I do know, when I know it.

TAFFEE: How has values clarification changed YOUR life?

SIMON: Hm. What I had been doing up to that time was I had been a really creative high school teacher, but I didn't know fully what I was doing. I mean I was just flipping and balancing all over the place. The values clarification theory gave me a framework, which I just think has illuminated everything I've done since. I just became a more powerful and influential teacher. The stuff, you know it for yourself, it shows up in your life. You truly begin to evaluate more and more of your behaviors and actions. And I think if anybody could track down the way I've lived my life for the last ten years, they would see the values work operating more and more. Asking for what I want, cutting out coffee, liquor, sweets more and more, keeping my weight, holding my health, cherishing my future. Dozens of things.

It included leaving a marriage which was O.K., but for which I would not settle for once I got clear about what I could have, what I needed.

The grading battle at Temple was right out of the values work. Leaving Temple to go to U. Mass is right out of the values work. Shaping my life at U. Mass is right out of the values work. Planning my summers, how I deal with my children, and the processes about which I've chosen to write and publish, is right out of the values work.

I just can't imagine anybody studying with Fritz Perls, who had more impact on their life than Louis Rath's had on mine. I can't imagine anybody studying with Carl Rogers, his work having had an impact on their life, equal to Rath's impact on mine.

(Part 2)

TAFEE: How was it that you became involved with values clarification?

SIMON: Well, I learned it from Louis Rath's, and I was a student in one of his classes. I think I had just clumsily been doing things that seemed appropriate, because I responded a lot as a teacher. I had been teaching, oh about six years by then. I responded a lot by making sure that I didn't do things that were done to me in the high school. And the path was leading more to self-growth, personal growth work. Then Rath's gave the whole system to it. He brought the criteria, and the processes, and the framework that I never had before, and I just soared from there.

TAFEE: Back in the early sixties when you were becoming involved with it, how was the theory and the practice received by scholars and critics in the community?

SIMON: I think it was mostly ignored. I don't remember much attention being paid to it anywhere. The people who were responding weren't the scholars. The people who were reaponing to it were the classroom teachers who saw in it such excitement and possibilities.

TAFTEE: How is that different from 1976?

SIMON: Oh, well the academicians have found it. Like our friend, John Stewart. And I think some of them see that this is an attractive thing to play academic "ping-pong" with. So there's been much more written, much more response.

TAFTEE: Are there some positive things you hear from those types of people as well?

SIMON: Well, maybe the best way to say this is there's just been a lot of imitation and adaptation. And that to me, is one of the highest kinds of praise. It now is clear that values clarification is a legitimate thread in the human potential movement. And I think the most effective practitioners use it. They use Transactional Analysis, they use Gestalt, they use Reality Therapy, they use Re-Evaluation Counseling . . . values clarification is one of its threads.

So there's just been a lot of imitation, a lot of adaptation.

We get requests for reprints of our articles to appear in books of readings almost weekly. So that's another measure of it.

I think a very sweet one, was that one of the articles I wrote on values clarification for the Personnel and Guidance Journal, an issue on humanistic approaches and psychological education, received one of their "article of the year" awards.⁶

TAFFEE: What reactions do you have to the suggested modifications of the theory that Howie made in his article, "Beyond Values Clarification?"

SIMON: Well, I guess in operation, I haven't adopted them. I find the theory satisfactory, clear, and suitable as it is.

TAFFEE: Would you have any violent disagreement with what Howie's done?

SIMON: No. I don't think so.

TAFFEE: As you look back at the way you and Merrill were conducting those early workshops in the early 1960's in values clarification, and the way that they're being conducted now, what sort of changes come to mind?

SIMON: Well, that's interesting. I just did one with Howie and Barb, and I teased them a little bit about it.⁷ Howie's doing the same things you know, we did six years ago. He does them well. He does them so competently, and he feels that they're important.

⁶Sidney B. Simon, "Values Clarification: A Tool for Counselors," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 51, 9 (May, 1973), 614-618.

⁷Howard Kirschenbaum and Barbara Glaser-Kirschenbaum.

I'm always changing. No two of my workshops are ever alike. And what's coming into my work is just more and more of the human potential experiences, the personal growth experiences, that I've learned in workshops that I've taken, in my readings, and in my experience with both values clarification and Education of the Self.⁸ So, for example, I am just much more apt to use values clarification indepth, take them into a really deep experience, with many fewer strategies. In the early workshops, we didn't have any books out, we had a real need to let them have as many tools as we could get across in two days. Now I don't care if I get across four strategies.

I still have a deep need to focus on skills and concepts, but I draw those out of the four big strategies I might show them.

TAFFEE: Has the theory and practice of values clarification itself become more affective in nature over the years?

SIMON: In my hands it has. I think Rath's would have it more cognitive, because he's really a beautifully cognitive human being. Merrill's more cognitive than I. I seem to be the one who cares most about personal growth aspects.

TAFFEE: Are there any other differences between the type of training that was given to teachers in the early sixties, and the type of training they're receiving now?

⁸Reference to a course Dr. Simon teaches at the University of Massachusetts, entitled "Education of the Self."

SIMON: Well, I think in the beginning we spent a lot of time on the "clarifying response." Found it very difficult to teach, and awfully hard to get across, and you either had a flair for it, or it became a monstrosity. You know, asking questions at all the inappropriate times, confronting people when they don't need a confronter, but they need you to be tender.

So that's been one of the changes. Again, it's the idea that so much stuff is in print. Workshops are different because of that. You don't have to teach them things that they can read.

TAFEE: How was the three-level curriculum developed?

SIMON: I don't remember very clearly. It seems to me it comes out of Merrill. And yet I'm sure Howie had an impact on that, because it was something that Rogers was writing about values. . . .

I don't feel that they were Rath's ideas. As usual, what I did with it of course, was to put the flesh on it, in the sense of lots of examples. I was the one who could sit down with anything that any teacher had to do, and think up new questions, whether it be home economics or science. So in most of the articles that we did on the third level things for each of the subject matter disciplines, I was the one who had the fun thinking-up things for teachers to do.

I attribute it to Merrill with some adaptations by Howie.

TAFEE: Do you have any evidence that values clarification is being misused by some teachers in classrooms?

SIMON: Well, every now and then I get a report, you know, that some parents are aroused or up in arms over somebody using it, asking things that seem inappropriate. Not a whole lot. It's like even with the very best teachers who are doing it, there will be hysterical parents who get aroused.

TAFFEE: Do you see any possibility of kids being damaged in some way by a teacher who would flagrantly misuse it in some way?

SIMON: Well, if they don't use the safeguards, like the "right to pass," and that kind of thing. I don't know. I think kids are so effective at turning-off a teacher who is bad. I really do. Just witness how hard it is to get kids to quit chewing gum, or whatever. They're not afraid.

Certainly I've never, in all the years, had any evidence of anybody who's flipped-out from being in a values clarification program. And I'm pretty sure I would have picked that up if that should happen.

TAFFEE: How do you see yourself working with values clarification during the next ten years or so?

SIMON: Well, this June a really important book will come out for me. It's called How to Teach Your Child Right from Wrong.⁹ It's values clarification in the family setting. That's going to thrust

⁹Sidney B. Simon and Sally Olds, How to Teach Your Child Right from Wrong, in press.

me into probably doing more and more family workshops. That's exciting to me, to get a whole family together and have them begin to look at values issues in their family.

I will probably move more and more towards personal growth, and values clarification will always be a part of that. I'm not very interested in developing things like Merrill is for classroom teachers, consumable materials. That doesn't interest me right now. And I don't feel the need to carve out new areas of theory.

I want to be able to synthesize what I'm doing, with what other people are doing: T.A., Gestalt, Re-Evaluation Counseling. I feel good that values clarification is now established. It's a word. It has a parameter. I'm just going to see where it flows, and wherever it flows will be right-on for me I'm sure, because I have these skills so deeply within me.

TAFEE: Whom do you see as playing key or influential roles within values clarification during the next ten years or so?

SIMON: Well, I'm pretty sure that there won't be much more development on it alone. It will be somewhat synthesized. And I guess what Lee Howe has done, with Mary Martha, in their new book, is one of the ways that it will go.¹⁰

And then we'll begin to see people who have a rich background, say, in alcoholics education; we will see people who are beginning to use it with, well--a lot of drug programs are using

¹⁰Leland W. Howe and Mary Martha Howe, Personalizing Education: Values Clarification and Beyond (New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1975).

it. I ran into someone the other day who says that they know someone who works for the state motor vehicle bureau in New York state, and there's this program where if somebody gets picked-up drunk and driving, they make them go to a class, and the whole class is being designed around values clarification.

So that's what's going to happen to it. I frankly don't see any need for that much more to be done to it. There will be people using it for applications that they already have expertise in.

TAFEE: What sort of research, if any, would you like to see completed in values clarification?

SIMON: Well, I would like to have some research completed that will call off the people who say there's not enough research.

The specific problems somehow that excite me are things like: What would happen if instead of the first freshman semester courses that people take in college, they would have a program in values clarification and "education of the self." Would that lead ultimately to greater academic adjustment, greater solid, long-range marriages and child rearing qualities? I would like to see that those teachers who use it and use it well, demonstrate kids' growth in self-confidence and self-concept. I want to see it reduce vandalism. . . .

TAFEE: What sort of training models do you foresee being employed during the next few years? Will the weekend workshop continue to be a mainstay?

SIMON: Oh, I'm pretty sure they will. That seems to be a most effective way and special way of getting it across. But Howie is moving, and I think very effectively towards professional support groups. He just finished a manual.¹¹ Have you seen it?

TAFTEE: Yes. I saw a rough copy.

SIMON: I think it's really very useful.

So the training mode will be probably getting people into more and more communities like the Re-Evaluation Counseling thing, having them use the strategies, concepts and processes for their on-going personal and professional growth. I really think it's a good model.

TAFTEE: Do you see any possibility of values clarification beginning to interplay with people from Kohlberg's camp?

SIMON: Well, it's probably inevitable. There will be people who will see the benefits of both, and will synthesize them. I think, you know, how can they not? It's dumb for them to ignore us, and it's dumb for us to ignore them. I sure don't have any deep feeling that if something better can come out of the synthesis that I'll feel abandoned in any way. I really do, despite what may have been more hysterical prose that people might feel, that that which will help children eventually, is what I wanted to support with all my energies.

¹¹Reference to a work in-progress by Howard Kirschenbaum and Barbara Glaser-Kirschenbaum, National Humanistic Education Center, Saratoga Springs, New York.

TAFEE: Have any provisions been made amongst the various leaders in values clarification towards a plan or design for values clarification during the next few years?

SIMON: No. We have sort of an annual meeting every summer up at NHEC, but a lot of it's done for setting schedules and so forth.

It might be a really good thing to put on the agenda for this next meeting: Where do we want to be ten years from now? Where are we going? Where is it headed?

TAFEE: O.K., then if I were to call you up ten years from now and ask how things had gone with the thing called values clarification during those ten years, ideally, what would you like to be able to say?

SIMON: Well, I'd like to be able to say that it had spread widely and deeply, and that it was never called a "fad," and that more and more teachers' lives were deeply affected and changed by being exposed to it, and that they had deeply changed and affected lives of the children that they work with. And that it chased out of curriculum some of the "boondogginess" and nonsense that occupies a lot of people's time, and that the results were felt across the whole nation, because more and more people who learned to look at their lives, and think about what they really wanted, and learned how to say yes and no to things, were living lives to greater beauty.

APPENDIX H

INTERVIEW WITH HOWARD KIRSCHENBAUM

INTERVIEW WITH HOWARD KIRSCHENBAUM

TAFTEE: How did it happen that you became attracted to values clarification?¹

KIRSCHENBAUM: I had just been in the civil rights movement in the summer of 1964, and met Sid Simon in the fall of that year and learned about the values theory of Louie Rath's that he was working with. And I was very impressed by a couple of the criteria for a value, in particular the notion that something had to be freely chosen to be a value. That appealed to me as both a young man not over his teen-age rebellion, and liking the notion that kids should be given freedom, and also seeing the implications of that in the political realm: that people in general must be given freedom to guide their own lives. So that had a great deal of appeal to me, plus the notion of encouraging action: that for something to be a value, it had to be acted upon. I really saw so many people talking about how important freedom and liberty was, and other noble values, but not acting when it came to people in their own country being deprived of those rights.

So I think those two valuing processes in particular, helped me identify with this theory, and think that this is an approach I could see really getting involved with.

TAFTEE: In what ways has values clarification entered your life personally, and affected your daily living?

¹It should be noted that the following interview is reproduced verbatim. Dr. Kirschenbaum received a rough copy of the interview just before leaving on an extended trip, and did not have time to edit the transcript.

KIRSCHENBAUM: I think it reinforced what I was doing already, which was: continually examining my own life--not wanting to settle for less than my dreams and the life that I prize and cherish. And I guess I would say it reinforced that direction. It helped me understand more cognitively, and helped me feel more secure in my direction because the "seven processes" describe very much what I was trying to do myself.

I don't think it changed my life per se. I think meeting Sid Simon when I was a young man as a model had more influence on my life in terms of specific values I adopted, or behavior changes I made. But I wouldn't attribute that to values clarification per se.

TAFEE: In what ways do you think your training of other people in values clarification has affected their lives?

KIRSCHENBAUM: Well, I think it has made some differences, both personal and professional.

Professionally, I have good reason to believe that many of the people I've trained go back and start using the values clarification approach in their classes, and get reinforcement from their students, continue to use it and continue to get more interested and involved in values clarification, and then other approaches to humanistic education and personal growth. So I think for many individuals, professionally it's their first jumping-off point into the whole area of humanistic education,

and that really continues to evolve and grow in them, and makes considerable difference in their professional lives.

Personally, I think perhaps the effect would be the same as it was on me: that being exposed to the theory of values clarification and related approaches gives people more confidence in their own search, in their own growth--strengthens that resolve. And then, if they had none of that to begin with, I don't think they'd take to the values clarification.

TAFEE: In your essay, "Beyond Values Clarification," you suggest some reformulations of the basic theory.² What prompted that, and have those reformulations caught-on amongst most of the other leaders?

KIRSCHENBAUM: Well I think what prompted it was some dissatisfaction with the theory as a structure--its theoretical structure.

I wasn't satisfied with the concept of "criteria," because it seemed that if criteria were to have a meaning other than a philosophical meaning, they had to be operational. They had to be able to say: "So and so has met the criteria," and there was no way of determining how "proud" somebody had to be in order to meet the prizing criteria, and how many alternatives had to be looked at before meeting the alternative criteria, and so on. So I felt that it really wasn't a useful concept as criteria, unless one were asked: "How do you define a 'value?'" But I wasn't so interested

²Howard Kirschenbaum, "Beyond Values Clarification," in Readings in Values Clarification, ed. by Sidney B. Simon and Howard Kirschenbaum (Minneapolis: Winston Press, Inc., 1973), pp. 92-110.

in defining "value" anymore than I'm interested in defining "justice." Working with the concept is much more important to me, and its educational implications.

So I was not satisfied with the concept of criteria both conceptually, and in terms of the defensiveness it produced in people when you suggest, even obliquely, that something they believed in wasn't a value because they didn't meet this or that criteria.

And another thing that was a main misgiving: I had some misgivings about some specific processes, like "public affirmation." I didn't see that as being necessary all the time, or desirable all the time. There would be some circumstances where one would not publicly affirm a value. And just because you chose the value of "life" more than the value of the particular belief that you didn't want to affirm in some life-and-death circumstances, didn't imply to me that that, say a "political" value, wasn't a value because you didn't publicly affirm it. So I had some trouble with that criteria.

So then when I began to re-think it, I realized the importance of those seven things was not as criteria, but as "processes" we go through on the way to further developing our values.

And I guess if I--I know you're not asking this directly--but if I tried to formulate what changes I've tried to make in the theory, I would say my efforts have been one, to put a greater emphasis on the notion of "processes" and a smaller emphasis on the notion of "criteria," that would be one. And I believe my colleagues have done that. Maybe not just because I was pushing for that. They

may have in their own experience come to some similar conclusions. But I think I helped raise that in all of our minds as something worth considering.

The second change I made in the theory was to expand the concept of what the valuing process is. If we're no longer interested in values criteria, then I was asking the question: "What are all the processes which people use to help change, modify, clarify, and develop their values?" And it seemed to me the seven processes were insufficient to describe that. And so I tried to re-define it, expand the notion, creating five dimensions of valuing: "thinking," "feeling," "choosing," "communicating," and "acting," putting down sub-processes under those dimensions, and including all of the traditional valuing processes, but adding to them. So then, that was the second change in the theory I made.

And the third was to expand the notion of what the outcomes would be if one were to use the valuing processes. Rath had suggested that values clarification would lead to greater value clarity and greater personal satisfaction with one's value system, if the seven processes were used. So it was an "if-then" hypothesis. If you start here, and you apply this process, then this is the outcome: greater personal satisfaction and value clarity.

I tried to expand this by suggesting: if you start with the individual values confusion and the social values confusion, and apply the expanded processes that I'm talking about, the outcome would be to make it more likely that people would experience greater

satisfaction, value, and meaning in their own lives, but also their behavior would become more socially constructive. And I think that was a very important change in the theory, because it made explicit something that we had kind of felt was implicit all along: the idea that there would be good outcomes, and when people would call the values clarifiers "relativists" and "amoral," we would kind of feel, "Well, that's not true. We really believe in our hearts that values clarification leads to behavior that we would be pleased with in the social contract sense of the word." But we never made it explicit. We always talked about: "There are no right or wrong answers," and so on. And so I think that third modification that I made in the theory was a big jump in terms of trying to indicate all that values clarification really can accomplish.

I think in terms of these latter two concepts: expanding the concept of the processes, and making more explicit the idea of what the outcome of values clarification might be in a social context--I think my colleagues agree with me, specifically because Simon, Harmin, Howe and I wrote a position paper in which we used that formulation, so they were all willing to have their names publicly go with that concept.³ But I think personally, they don't use it as much in their own work. I'd like to believe, though, that that's the direction that we're going in; that this reformulation of what values clarification is, starting with individual

³See Howard Kirschenbaum, Merrill Harmin, Leland Howe, and Sidney B. Simon, "In Defense of Values Clarification" (Saratoga Springs, New York: National Humanistic Education Center, 1975). (Mimeographed.)

and societal confusion and conflict, applying a widely conceived or broadly conceived valuing process to it, and ending with individual lives that are more full and rich, and pleasing, and meaningful to the individual, and individual behavior that is more socially constructive. I'd like to think that that could be the unifying theory that could bring together a lot of what's going on under the name of values clarification, and other valuing approaches as well.

TAFEE: In the sense that values clarification is a type of "intervention," is it fair when other people label it as a "therapy?"⁴

KIRSCHENBAUM: Well, you'd have to have a definition of "therapy" to decide whether it's fair or not. To the extent that therapy implies making sense and clarity out of confusion and inconsistency; to the extent that therapy implies helping people become somewhat more aware of their feelings and their hopes and their goals and some of the conflicts which are getting in the way of that, and some of the things they need to do in their lives to get where they want to go--yes, values clarification is a "therapeutic" intervention.

But to the extent you mean by "therapy" an in-depth psychological exploration, a foray into our inner world where we get in touch and deal with feelings that are fairly deep-rooted; to

⁴See Alan L. Lockwood, "A Critical View of Values Clarification," Teachers College Record, Vol. 77, No. 1 (September, 1975), 35-50.

he extent that we mean by "therapy" dealing with significant psychological distress--no, I don't see values clarification as "therapy."

TAFEE: Do you see any evidence to suggest that values clarification in 1976 is more "affective" in nature that it was in 1966?

KIRSCHENBAUM: My first thought is that it is. Now I am wondering about the evidence for that.

Raths was concerned with "prizing and cherishing," that we do prize and cherish our beliefs and behaviors. And his clarifying questions and strategies would ask people to look at how much they did prize and cherish various things they said and did. I think in our work over the last several years, influenced by other affective approaches, we've asked people to look more at their whole feeling realm inside.

For example, we would ask people to do a "Here-and-Now Wheel" strategy, originally learned from Jerry Weinstein,⁵ to get in touch with what they're feeling inside and report back to the group. We'd have the "Feeling-Thought" sheet, which is more than simply a "value card." With a value card you talked about something you prized and cherished, or some things that you felt were important, but on the "Thought-Feel" sheet, you put any feelings that happen to be occurring. I would say strategies like that, and other modifications of our approach, indicate that I think almost all of us involved with values clarification, of the people I've worked with, what to do a little bit more in the area of helping people

⁵Jerry Weinstein is a professor of education at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

in general become more aware of their feelings, believing that in the long run that helps us get to what we really prize and cherish.

Incidentally, that was another dissatisfaction I had with the original values theory. I felt the process of the "prizing and cherishing" was only one small part of the whole process of learning to deal with our feelings and our inner-experience, that will ultimately lead us to know what we prize and cherish. But we have also to deal with our fears, our hopes, and our concerns--and other feelings on the way.

So yes, I would say that there is some evidence that we're more--there's more emphasis on the affective realm. But I wouldn't call that a major change, because it seems to me that even though sometimes in values workshops feelings play a bigger part, a lot of that might be due to the personality of the facilitator, or the fact that the facilitator just chooses to bring in some things from a different approach. So Sid Simon, for example, is very effective at building a climate and using certain strategies, and bringing up certain topics that generate a heck of a lot of personal feelings, and that make it much more of a "personal growth" experience than values clarification workshops used to be. But I wouldn't say that that's values clarification. I would say that's more Sid Simon's style.

Others of us from time to time might do an activity that comes out of Gestalt psychology or Re-Evaluation Counseling or something, but again that's only values clarification if you use the broader definition that I've tried to give it. But in terms

of traditional values clarification, I don't think that has changed dramatically in terms of a greater emphasis on the affective. It's just we've made some modifications, but not major ones.

TAFEE: How did the Three-Level Curriculum come to be developed?⁶

KIRSCHENBAUM: It started before I got involved in it. My first exposure to it was learning about that concept from Sid Simon and Merrill Harmin. They had written one article--maybe Louis Rath was a co-author--in which they talked of three-levels of subject matter. And I think they used an example from Macbeth and the Civil War perhaps, so it was just a concept that was introduced at that time.

When I became involved in leading workshops in 1968, I felt there was a real need for more work in the subject areas, and I pushed very strongly for more work in those areas. And consequently, Sid and Merrill invited me to be on the staff of a two-week values clarification workshop in Rochester in 1968, the second week in which Sid and I would be leading, we would focus on building curricula in the different subject areas. And that initial effort led eventually to a series of articles which Sid, Merrill and I co-authored in English, math, science and history, and then to the book, Clarifying Values through Subject Matter.⁷

⁶For an extensive description of the Three-Level Curriculum, see Merrill Harmin, Howard Kirschenbaum, and Sidney B. Simon, Clarifying Values through Subject Matter: Applications for the Classroom (Minneapolis: Winston Press, Inc., 1973).

⁷Ibid.

I don't know if, though, it was Raths' initial idea, the three levels, or Sid's or Merrill's.

TAFFEE: With the exception of your one article, "Beyond Values Clarification," the overwhelming amount of publications since 1966 have been in the area of how to implement the theory, with probably now, hundreds of different strategies having been developed for teachers to use. Does that say something in particular about what you and the other leaders in values clarification decided would be a better way to go as far as getting values clarification into the schools is concerned?

KIRSCHENBAUM: I think that happened for two reasons.

One, because it was consistent with some of our values, and secondly, because of historical circumstances.

I think all of us in values clarification have had a commitment to wanting to be of practical help to educators. Most of us were classroom teachers ourselves, recognized some of the realities of the classroom, and didn't want to be "ivory tower" theorists and researchers. That wasn't where our backgrounds were, and that wasn't where our interests lay.

And I think that's the planned part of why it happened as it did: because our main goal was to be of concrete, specific help to people working with people.

I think a second reason was more fortuitous. That was reinforced, that behavior in us. It seemed that teachers really responded to getting specific strategies. They told us: "Gee, in

all our college education courses, we never learned how to do things really, and experience them and learn how to do it by experiencing it in the laboratory setting like we do here." People come to the workshops. There was demand. We got asked to do more publications that had that bent. So I think that kind of reinforcement kept us moving in a direction that we were sympathetic with to begin with.

I don't think that's to say that we disregarded the importance of research, or further theorizing. I think we were all different in that respect, some of us have more interest in those areas and others don't.

Incidentally, I would add you said "Beyond Values Clarification" was one example of further work beyond the practical, and I guess I'd also add my attempt to keep up with the research, to summarize it, and clarify some of the research that's gone on.⁸

TAFEE: Do you feel satisfied with the amount of impact values clarification has had on the larger educational scene? Dissatisfied? Disappointed?

⁸See Howard Kirschenbaum, "Recent Research in Values Clarification" (Upper Jay, New York: National Humanistic Education Center, 1974). (Mimeographed). Reprinted in Values Education: Theory/Practice/Problems/Prospects, ed. by John Meyer, Brian Burnham, and John Cholvat (Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1975), pp. 71-78. See also, Howard Kirschenbaum, "Current Research in Values Clarification" (Saratoga Springs, New York: November, 1975) (Mimeographed).

KIRSCHENBAUM: Well, uh, both. I have felt some pride in the fact that it has become, other than the traditional approach of moralizing, probably one of the most popular, if not the most popular of the conscious values education approaches used in the country. Our values clarification handbook has sold 300,000 copies. Thousands and thousands of teachers have participated in two-day or longer workshops, and brought the approach back to their own classrooms. So I think its really had an impact on a lot of professionals' lives, and indirectly on many students' lives.

But I'm also very dissatisfied with it. I think the large majority of classrooms still can be characterized as places where students are not encouraged to think for themselves about relevant topics, and to look at their own experiences, and to act on their beliefs and their values.

So, I think we have a long way to go. I think we've got a long way to go in further developing the approach itself. I feel proud again, of all that we've done in elaborating on Rath's original work, but feel that we've got a lot more that could be done by Rath and others, to further develop the values clarification approach.

TAFEE: You mentioned that you first became involved in presenting workshops in values clarification in 1968. Do you see any differences between one, the 1968 workshop itself versus the 1976 workshop, and two, the reactions of people involved in the workshop, the "trainees?"

KIRSCHENBAUM: To be honest, I would say my own workshop leading style has not changed that much, nor has the nature of the workshops that I lead has changed that much, in that I still try to convey what I think are some of the basic values clarification strategies, try to give people practice, experiences with them, try to strike a balance between professional growth and personal growth, and I am concerned with back-home situations. So although I may have different "favorite" strategies today than I did eight years ago, I don't use the "Fall-Out Shelter Problem," for example any more it seems, but I'd say the basic kind of way I lead a workshop is fairly similar.

I think, though, there are a few changes that could be noticed in my own workshops, and those of my colleagues. And a few are due to our own changes, and most are due to changes in the whole values clarification scene since then.

I remember one thing we always would do in . . . I was going to say "in week-long workshops," that's significant to say. Until 1971, there was no such thing as a two-day values clarification workshop. All workshops were a week-long. We didn't think that there was any way of conveying the sense of what values clarification was in less than a week. So that's a significant change right there.

But in the week-long workshops, we would have teachers and participants prepare, once we taught them some of the basic strategies like "voting," "rank-orders," and "continuums," and so on, to prepare some questions. And then we'd bring in children

from the workshop area, and students, and give the teachers a chance to actually try them out with young people right there. And I can remember in Rochester, for example, if we had thirty people in the workshop, we'd get in thirty children or sixty children, and in teams of four, the teachers would each get a chance to try out their strategies they had created with eight kids or so. I remember it started to get out of hand, which is one reason that we stopped. When we had ninety people in Rochester once, and had three hundred children, it got to be such an effort to organize it that we decided we'd find another model.

But I guess that also goes hand-in-hand with what was happening outside. In '68, '69 and '70, people who would come to a values clarification workshop would experience values clarification as something totally new to them. They might express the sentiment that they've "been doing this all their lives, but never had a name for it," or they've "been looking for an approach like this for several years now and working towards it," and this really crystallized it for them.

But for the most part, people had "A-ha!" experiences, as though they were discovering a whole new way of teaching or doing what they wanted to do. And that began to change in the seventies, especially after the publication of Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students, because then, we had initially thought that handbook would be of interest and use to people who had been in a values clarification workshop,

and were quite amazed at how it began to spread.⁹ So that by 1973, you could count on the fact that in most cases, people at a values clarification workshop would have had some previous exposure to values clarification. They would have been led through a list of some "Twenty Things you Love to Do" in some college course, or they would have seen "voting," or "rank-orders," or "continuums" demonstrated somewhere.

And that made workshop leading a little bit more difficult, because the group is going to be at a more diverse point, with diverse backgrounds. Some will have had previous exposure, will have used values clarification in their classrooms--and for some others it will be their very first exposure. So I think workshops have had now to be more flexible, with team teachers, to divide into different groups the more experienced and less experienced people, to sometimes forego some of the basic strategies.

So I would say what's different about leading values clarification workshops for me, is not so much that I've changed, but the population has changed, and I find I need to be more flexible and can take less for granted now than before.

TAFFEE: I'd like to go back to the point you made about 1971 being the year in which you instituted the two-day workshop. What prompted that?

⁹Sidney B. Simon, Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum, Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students (New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1972).

KIRSCHENBAUM: I'm trying to remember what prompted it. . . .

I guess it was a feeling of: here we had these very successful summer workshops, and interest seemed to be building in them. And we just wondered whether we couldn't reach more people by having weekend workshops in different locations around the country. Because when we would do one summer workshop in Rochester, and one in Philadelphia, and maybe one other that we get invited to somewhere--we recognized that only a small number of people were going to be able to get to Rochester, New York, or Philadelphia. And by taking workshops during the school year on a weekend, to people in different parts of the country, we just thought it was logical that many more people could attend.

"Would they come on a weekend?" "Would they be able to get enough out of the workshop to justify doing it?" We weren't sure, and we tried it out with three workshops in the spring of 1971: one in Washington D.C., one in Chicago, and one in Boston. And it worked. We had, as I remember . . . seventy-seven came to the one in Washington, and a hundred to Boston, and a hundred to Chicago--and we were flabbergasted with the response, and that fall scheduled eight workshops.

Now you see organizations all over the country: education centers, and growth centers, and colleges and so on, leading weekend workshops in values clarification. I find it interesting to realize that it was only five years ago when it all began.

TAFEE: Do you feel satisfied that in a weekend workshop you can touch as many of the bases as you need to adequately?

KIRSCHENBAUM: Yes, I do. Five days is better than two days. I find even in five days I feel frustrated by the lack of time, and feel I'd like to "cover" so much more. But I think in two days one can convey the key concepts of values clarification, and demonstrate and have participants experience some fifteen basic strategies. And what with the literature that is available to them after the workshop, I do think that's enough. If they haven't had a good experience with it in two days, I sincerely doubt that five days would make that much of a difference.

TAFEE: Do you have any evidence that values clarification is being misused by teachers in schools?

KIRSCHENBAUM: Anecdotal evidence. People come to us with stories now and then.

I can recall someone telling me how somebody did an in-service program in their school, and the next day fourteen different teachers had their kids do "Twenty Things You Love to Do." And that's a misuse of values clarification, although I don't want to blame the teachers in this case.

Other times you hear about teachers who say: "O.K., everybody take out a piece of paper and make a list of one to twenty," and the kids just have no context, no understanding of "why we're doing this, what's the point of it?" And unless there's a real good relationship with the teacher to begin with, they're kind of turned-off by the whole thing.

Other teachers who use it on trivial subjects so often that it kind of comes to be seen as just "filler"--yeah, there's that kind of evidence.

I don't know how widespread it is.

TAFFEE: Have you had any thoughts in the area of "quality control?" How you could better control the quality of the people you train, so that you can in turn control the quality of the values clarifying experiences of their students?

KIRSCHENBAUM: Let me talk on that for a little length.

This has been a difficult issue, that of quality control, for us for many years. And we've gone back and forth along a continuum from the strictest kind of control of the dissemination of values clarification, to relatively no control. We've gone back and forth in terms of our thinking on it.

Our behavior has always tended to be rather permissive. I guess we made our first crucial decision when we published the Values Clarification Handbook.¹⁰ We recognized, although we thought it was a step towards quality control in the sense that those who were in our workshops would then be able to get some written materials that they could bring back home, and that would help them implement the approach more effectively, we never realized how much the materials would spread to people who had never been in a workshop, or been exposed to much of the theory. And so in

¹⁰Ibid.

a sense that was a decision, although not a fully aware decision, to give it away. And in effect, we said in the Introduction to that book: "Use the strategies, change them, adapt them, create your own." Our tone was then, and always was before and since, one of wanting to give people some tools and encourage them to go out and use them.

So I guess that tone, that publication, had the effect of unleashing to the educational public a series of strategies that looked very easy to use, and which looked attractive to use, but which were actually more difficult to use effectively. So the early work and publications were permissive in terms of: we let go of the product, and just hoped somehow, that it would turn out all right.

In hindsight, we could see how quickly it spread and people began to use it, and if we had known that then, maybe we would have done it differently. But I don't want to be too hard on us then, it seemed like the way to go.

We made some decisions in 1971, '72 and '73, not to franchise values clarification, not to certify instructors as the Parent Effectiveness Training people were doing, or as the Magic Circle people were doing. And a lot of that was for personal reasons. We just didn't want to spend our lives trying to administer a system of certification and franchising, or financial relationships. We wanted to develop new materials, new approaches. Some of us wanted to integrate values clarification with other approaches. We saw the dilemmas of maintaining an organizational

structure as being very stultifying personally and professionally for us. So we chose not to institute quality control measures that would have come out of certification.

We did begin doing "advanced" values clarification workshops, where one component was training and the quality of training, but I don't think that was ever a major effect, so I wouldn't say that was really an effective quality control measure there. I think the first concrete thing we did was, in 1973 I guess, draw-up a letter in which we listed our recommendations for values clarification trainers and formed a Values Clarification Trainers Network, in which we hoped people would stay in touch with each other and therefore continue to improve their work by this affiliation.^{11,12}

I think in a small way that's been nice and somewhat effective, but I don't really think its addressed the major problem. I think some people probably have really taken these recommendations seriously and acted on them, and the 120 members or so of the Values Clarification Trainers Network have been helped by the various materials they've received, but I think that's just scratched the surface of the people who are involved in values clarification training. And for the most part, I would venture to say most people

¹¹Howard Glaser-Kirschenbaum, Merrill Harmin, and Sidney B. Simon, "Recommended Qualifications for Values Clarification Trainers" (Upper Jay, New York: National Humanistic Education Center, August, 1975) (Mineographed letter).

¹²Information concerning the Values Clarification Trainers Network may be obtained by writing the National Humanistic Education Center, 110 Spring Street, Saratoga Springs, N.Y. 12866.

doing values clarification training now aren't even aware of a trainer's network.

So, I think the area of quality control is something we chose not to exercise a control over. We hope to exercise some influence, but its really gotten beyond us. Values clarification now is something which I think is very much in the public domain. And fairly soon after we published the Values Clarification Handbook,¹³ within a year after we published that, I don't think we could have controlled it if we wanted to. I think that decision would have to have been made back at a time when we just had no idea of how popular values clarification was going to become.

Perhaps too late, I've just written a book which I hope will be very useful in terms of quality influence, that addresses itself to training in values clarification. It's called: An Advanced Values Clarification Handbook for Trainers and Experienced Teachers.¹⁴ It has much longer sections on theory than have ever been published on values clarification; and research; and much more on principles of workshop design and different models for values clarification experiences and workshops; thoughts on integrating values clarification into curriculum; and some looks at values clarification, past, present and future; as well as an updated annotated bibliography on values clarification. That, I

¹³Sidney B. Simon, Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum, op. cit.

¹⁴Dr. Kirschenbaum has informed me that the book is still in the working stages, and no publishing house or publication date was available for notation at this time.

think, together will be the most thoughtful work on values clarification, in terms of looking at it beyond the introductory level of practical classroom strategies. So I hope that's going to have some influence on the quality of the work in the area, but I guess I don't have any real illusions about that either.

TAFEE: Have you seen a difference in 1976 as opposed to 1966, in reactions to values clarification by scholars?

KIRSCHENBAUM: Yes. I think the initial reaction was quite positive. I can recall one fellow at Temple University, who was very research oriented, who said: "Oh, yeah, Values and Teaching.¹⁵ I read that. I really liked how they looked at research at the end." And the sense that I got from him and others was that: "Hey. Here's some people who are pioneers in trying to work with values in the classroom, and not only interested in it from a classroom, "technique" point of view, but they're interested in the research that's been done and that needs to be done on it."

And I think that was Raths' influence. He was really interested in the research angle, and encouraged his students to work in that area. And I think then, that in the sixties, that was very well respected.

I think by the time the seventies hit, and people saw that values clarification workshops were being widely attended, and they imagined that people were making money on the approach, and

¹⁵Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin and Sidney B. Simon, Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom (Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1966).

they didn't see much further work in the area of research or the theory--the scholarly community began to be down on values clarification. Kohlberg's work had become more popular. Other valuing approaches were being developed. And I think they saw values clarification as superficial and without a theoretical and research base. And I think they were both right and wrong.

I think they tended to underestimate values clarification. I think if you were aware of all the work in the research and the theory that was done . . . but I think they were also right in seeing the great emphasis on techniques and classroom methods in values clarification. So that there was reasons to make some criticisms.

I think also, part of the phenomenon was the "ivory tower" criticizing the "practical field workers." So I'm trying to indicate that I think some of the criticisms was justified, other parts of it was exaggerated.

It reached its height in 1975, I think, with every educational journal coming out with some article critical of values clarification. I don't know what the effects of that were, but I also have been in touch with many of the people who have written these critical articles, and find that they're quite open to dialogue and recognize that values clarification does have something to contribute. So it seems to me that the pendulum will probably swing back a little bit now. Having unleashed that barrage of criticism of values clarification, the scholarly community will go through an indifferent period for the next few years, and await further developments.

TAFFEE: In what ways has the theory and/or the practice of values clarification been modified, enhanced or perhaps reinforced by research which has been completed in values clarification?

KIRSCHENBAUM: I don't see the theory as having been modified on the basis of the research.

I think mostly so far, the research has been used to give credibility and support to the theory. I think that may come as we have a . . . starting around now, with the existing thirty or more studies, and a half-dozen or a dozen a year that are turned out--we may start to have enough knowledge now that we can start to look at some patterns, and where values clarification seems to work and doesn't work, that would actually modify the theory.

The reason I don't think that the theory has been modified on the basis of the research, is I don't think hardly any of the research has really been basic research, in the sense of aiming at examining some major aspects of the values clarification theory. Almost all the research that has been done has taken a group of--just to characterize the research--a group of a couple hundred elementary school students, and have four teachers teach one hundred of them using values clarification, and have four teacher teach another hundred as control groups, and using fifteen hours of values clarification once a week for fifteen weeks, and see if there's any change on self-concept or academic achievement. And by and large, one study will show one change in self-concept but not academic achievement, and another will show no change in self-concept but a

benefit in academic achievement, for the values clarification groups. And so in general, the values clarification groups have done as well as or better on the various affective and cognitive criteria in these studies.

But a fifteen week study is not going to influence the basic theory. If it shows positive changes, it simply will support the theory. If it shows no significant differences between the values clarification and control groups, it's simply obvious to say that "Well, how can you expect to get a change in self-concept or cognitive achievement in fifteen weeks?" So I think that the research, while useful because it really has lent support to the theory, has not been useful in addressing major aspects of the theory.

And I don't know if that is going to change or not, because most of the people who are doing research are doing it for one of two purposes: they're either trying to get a dissertation, in which they're certainly not going to tackle one of the major questions about values clarification--they're going to take some relatively simple hypothesis that can be tested with a fairly small population in a short period of time--or they're doing it for the purposes of funding a drug education program. And there again, they're certainly not going to tackle some hypothesis that might prove to be unsubstantiated by the data. They're going to want to get some clear results on a few specific criteria so they can get re-funded.

TAFTEE: Just to follow-up on that then. What are some of the major questions that you think should be addressed during the next ten years in values clarification?

KIRSCHENBAUM: I think the central hypotheses of values clarification are long-range hypotheses. They suggest that confusion and conflict, when the valuing processes are applied to them, will change to clarity and commitment, and as I've suggested, socially constructive behavior. I think that's where the research should go, in terms of really meaningful research.

I think we should develop some new tools, or use old instruments, for assessing the nature of people's lack of clarity and confusion about value issues; about people's self-esteem; about people's style of social interaction, get a good set of instruments that we have confidence in that are relatively easy to administer, and then test large numbers of students to get a sense of where they are at the beginning. And then find some measure that would enable us to assess how much experience they've been given using the valuing processes--maybe some way of observing classroom interactions, observing parent behaviors--to see to what extent they're being asked to be aware of their feelings, to make choices, to act. And then over a period of five, ten, fifteen, twenty years, see what kinds of differences there are in the groups that have been encouraged to engage in the valuing processes to a large extent, versus the groups who have been denied the opportunities to engage in the valuing processes to much of an extent.

And if it can be shown that the group that grew-up in an environment, all other things being equal, an environment that encouraged them to utilize the valuing processes turns out to be substantially different from the group that wasn't--I think we'll have crystal clear proof that what we're talking about works. And more important than that for research purposes, we'll be able to learn a great deal more about what works and what doesn't.

For example, when we start to factor-out the different processes, we may find that encouraging students to take action through elementary and high school, really makes absolutely no difference in terms of the later outcomes. It really might be the fact that they're given choices, or the fact that they're given a climate that build their self-esteem may turn out to be the most important variable of all.

In other words, we don't know at this point. We say all these seven processes or all these five dimensions with their seventeen sub-processes are necessary conditions to achieve the desirable outcomes. The kind of broad research topic that I'm exploring might find that there's only a few variables that are really crucial. And these are the processes that we should be encouraging teachers and parents to use.

TAFFEE: What do you think the future might hold in general for values clarification?

KIRSCHENBAUM: I would forecast this as the future of values clarification:

I'd say that, number one, the traditional values clarification approach will remain a distinct and viable force in education, parenting in the helping professions for several more years to come, maybe that will be ten years.

What I mean by that is that the approach that's been associated with certain key names: Raths, Simon, et al.; certain key valuing processes; certain organizations: Values Associates, National Humanistic Education Center--the approach that's associated with these names, concepts, processes, organizations, will remain viable.¹⁶ People are still attending values clarification workshops in large numbers, the publications are still selling well, there are many people through-out the country who have not learned anything yet about values clarification.

I think there's every reason to believe that many more people will become involved in values clarification or remain in values clarification. I think as far as the evidence that the group I mentioned continue to publish and write: Raths, Simon and Harmin are working on a revision of Values and Teaching; Harmin continues to put out new values oriented audio-visual materials; Lee and Mary Martha Howe have just published their Personalizing Education: Values Clarification and Beyond;¹⁷ Sid Simon is about

¹⁶Values Associates, an organization composed of many of the leaders in values clarification, is now defunct.

¹⁷Leland Howe and Mary Martha Howe, Personalizing Education: Values Clarification and Beyond (New York: Hart Publishing Co., Inc., 1975).

to publish a book, Helping Children Learn Right from Wrong,¹⁸ and others are coming out with publications and work and films and so on, based on the initial approach. So I really do believe that it's not going to die out in the next couple of years. Its got a lot of life left in it, the traditional values clarification approach.

Then secondly, simultaneously, almost paradoxically, values clarification will take on a life of its own apart from its traditional associations as described above. By that, what I mean is, there will be many more people starting to use values clarification without reference to these individuals' previous publications. They will start to use values clarification, the term and the strategies, in all sorts of new ways.

The other day, for example, I came across a book that arrived from a publisher, and it was entitled Values Clarification. It was a whole volume of "values sheets" in such categories as: "rank-order values sheets," "forced-choice values sheets," and so on. I didn't know any of the authors, and from reading the book, I couldn't ascertain that the authors had ever heard of values clarification, although I was sure they had. There was no mention of the seven processes, or any valuing process for that matter, no mention of the values clarification literature, no mention of any of the names associated with values clarification. A lay person might think that they thought it up all by themselves.

¹⁸Sidney B. Simon and Sally Olds, Helping Students Learn Right from Wrong (in press).

And I don't say this bitterly. I say it as a recognition of the fact that values clarification is becoming something which will become part of the public domain.

I saw a phrase in a book or an article the other day, that was mentioning a sentence that was in it, the phrase: "team-teaching, individualized instruction, values clarification, role-playing, etc." And it took me back, because what I realized had happened was values clarification had been included, for this author, among the many "tried and true" techniques of education, which could be put in a series like that. And it kind of meant to me that there will be a growing trend for values clarification to be seen as an approach, as a style all by itself, not associated with its traditional roots, and for better or worse, that this will become something that will be part of the popular jargon in education; something we take for granted, that there's such a thing as values clarification, just like individualized instruction. It doesn't mean that everybody will use it, it just means that it will become part of the vernacular.

Third, I see values clarification being subjected to increasing criticism. And part of this is the result of its popularity. If something is not very popular or threatening to become more influential, then people don't bother criticizing it. Some of the criticism has come from the academic community, as I've indicated. I think that the barrage of criticism has come now, and that in the near future probably the academic community will wait

and see how the public and the values clarification leaders respond to that criticism.

But there will be increasing attack on values clarification by the public at-large. I think we see signs of that. I think certain parent groups, certain religious groups, certain political groups, are opposed to and will oppose values clarification because of their insecurity that if young people are given the opportunity to ask questions, to be exposed to alternatives--that they'd make what these parents and groups regard as "wrong" choices.

I see evidence of this in different communities where there's been a furor over values clarification. Maybe only a dozen that I could mention around the country, and that's not bad when you think of how widely it's being used. But I think that will continue to happen.

I found it interesting that in a committee of Congress, values clarification was listed along with Man: A Course of Study and other approaches that were being used as examples of immoral approaches being introduced into the schools. And legislation has been introduced in at least three different states, not aimed at values clarification per se, but aimed at approaches that ask young people to voice their opinions and get involved in discussing values, and attitudes, and controversial issues in the classroom.

So this kind of criticism will be in a political context. And it will be solved as other political issues in education are solved, whether it's school funding, or parent-community control. I think we'll see some hard times ahead for education in general,

and experimental education in particular. Values clarification will be part of that melee.

And finally, I see in the future that values clarification will be expanded and integrated with other approaches. That is a direction of my own work, and I think other people are recognizing that values clarification has a great deal in common with other approaches: to teaching communications and dealing with feelings, and so on, and other values education approaches, and that it can and should be integrated with these other approaches. I'm not sure what the result will be. It may be we won't use the phrase "values clarification" after a while, or maybe we'll use the phrase "values education," or maybe "life-skills," or maybe "affective education," or maybe a whole new term that will encompass what we presently know as values clarification and other approaches. But it seems to be that that's inevitably going to come, and I really think it should come. It's no longer useful to think of values clarification entirely different from other approaches, and that to create the most effective educational environments, we've got to start integrating the best from many different approaches.

TAFEE: What provisions have been made, if any, towards a planned future for values clarification? Getting together with the various leaders in values clarification and talking about the next three, four five or ten years for values clarification?

KIRSCHENBAUM: Not much, if any.

The only kind of planning that I'm aware of goes on, is each year, Sid Simon, Merrill Harmin, Marianne Simon, Barbara Glaser-Kirschenbaum and I get together for a few days in the Adirondack mountains, and talk about the coming year, in terms of our own efforts. A lot of that's just simply schedule planning and business. But we always stop and ask ourselves: "How has the year been? Where is values clarification going? What needs to be done?" But it's more of a discussion among friends and colleagues than an actual planning session.

The Philadelphia Humanistic Education Center, and the National Humanistic Education Center, as two key organizations in spreading values clarification, are engaged in dialogue, and from time to time we talk about a conference, or a cooperative arrangement.¹⁹ But again, it's not far reaching in its implications by any means.

So I don't see any planning going on that would suggest concrete, new directions for values clarification.

TAFEE: Do you wish there were such plans?

KIRSCHENBAUM: No. I wish there were such plans for humanistic education in general, and I hope that the National Humanistic Education Center, in the next couple of years, will be instrumental in getting groups and individuals together to do that kind of concrete, constructive planning.

¹⁹Philadelphia Humanistic Education Center, 8504 Germantown Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa. 19118 (215) CH8-0236.

But as values clarification goes, as a separate approach, I've indicated my feelings, which say that although I will continue to be involved in disseminating it as a separate approach, because there seems to be a large number of people who are eager to learn about it, I don't see, in terms of the pioneering work in education, that that's a very useful effort, and would much rather put my efforts towards integrating values clarification with other approaches, and coordinating the spread of that.

TAFEE: Much of the recent history of the last ten years of values clarification--the publications concerning values clarification--has centered about five individuals within values clarification. I'd like to know if you see those five continuing to play key and influential roles. Will others join them and diversify the leadership?

KIRSCHENBAUM: I've indicated that I think all of those individuals are still active, and I've given you a major project each is working on. I think those people will continue to be thought of by the public at large as leaders in values clarification.

I find it interesting that although many more publications have come out on values clarification, for the most part only one or two others, I think, really take a big step into new areas and applications. I think each of these other publications makes some small, new contribution, but essentially is a re-adaptation or a re-hashing of what's already been done.

So I think leadership in the eyes of the people using values clarification, will be given to those whose work is taking big steps forward. I don't know who's doing that right now. I don't know who might be involved in projects like that. So it's certainly a possibility, but of the people whose work I am aware of, I think certain individuals will be seen as leaders in certain areas.

For example, Rolly and Doris Larson are coming out with a book called Values and Faith, which is an adaptation of values clarification to religious education.²⁰ I think they'll be seen as key people who are in that field. The National YMCA is engaged in an incredibly far-reaching values education project, drawing heavily from values clarification.²¹ They'll certainly be leaders. Their work is going to touch many lives. I'm terribly pleased at what they've done and what they're doing. They're adapting values clarification for their basketball programs, their camping programs, for families . . . very far-reaching. So they deserve to take a leadership role, and they will.

Other people are applying values clarification to health education, or counseling, or special areas, and they may be seen as key people in their special areas of application.

I just don't know how exactly it's all going to evolve, and I guess what I'm saying is: I think that the people who in the

²⁰Roland Larson and Doris Larson, Values and Faith (Minneapolis: Winston Press, Inc., in press).

²¹For further information, contact Mr. Jack Cole, Mid-America Region YMCA, Hennepin Avenue, Minneapolis, Mn.

past have been identified as leaders, will continue to be leaders, and others will be seen as offering some leadership in some applications of values clarification.

Some organizations, too, like the Philadelphia Humanistic Education Center, the Institute for Personal Effectiveness that's doing workshops in values clarification all over Pennsylvania, the Ridge that's starting in New York state and starting to do them all over the state here. There will be organizations that will do a lot of values clarification workshops, not necessarily making significant contributions to the field, but carrying on training in that particular area.

TAFEE: How do you define a "value," now that the "criteria" for a "value" have been turned into "processes?"

KIRSCHENBAUM: If you were to ask me how I define a "value" now that I don't define it in terms of seven criteria, I can answer you two ways.

One answer is I don't define a value. That whatever the dictionary says, I'm willing to go with. I haven't looked lately at what the dictionary says. That to me, whether I give you three "official" definitions of it, it won't affect the nature of the work I do, or the valuing processes that I think are important, and therefore I think it's a pointless exercise to spend much energy defining a "value."

But, because I'm aware that some people are dissatisfied with that, they need a definition to begin with, they will regard

me as anti-intellectual or unscholarly if I don't have a definition of the word "value," I would say, if you need one, I would define a "value" as a "belief about what is desirable that influences us to act in a certain way."

TAFEE: Then the next question might be, "What's a 'belief?'"

KIRSCHENBAUM: And my first answer would be the same as the last one (laughs), "Go ask Merriam Webster."

But, I would say a "belief" is simply a concept of what is true. I may "believe" that the earth goes around the sun, or the sun goes around the earth, and it may or may not influence me to act in a certain way. But if I don't attach a value judgment to it, that it's a desirable state of affairs or not, then it is not a "value." A "belief" is a conception of how things are which might not have implications for behavior or a value judgment attached to it.

TAFEE: Kohlberg, in his essay in the book that came out of the Ontario conference, distinguished between "values" and "morals."²² Do you distinguish between the two?

KIRSCHENBAUM: Yes. I think that's a good distinction he makes.

He suggests that values clarification. . . . I would say that values education is a broader field than moral education,

²²Lawrence Kohlberg, "The Relationship of Moral Education to the Broader Field of Values Education," Values Education: Theory/Practice/Problems/Prospects, ed. by John Meyer, Brian Burnhan, and John Cholvat (Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1975), pp. 79-86.

that moral deals with "shoulds," "oughts," what is "right" and "wrong," what things or behaviors should be like. Values education deals with what we want, what's good or bad in terms of our desires, what kinds of food I like to eat, how I keep my room, what kind of person I want to marry . . . these are values issues. But what are the rights of my roommate? What are my obligations with respect to how I keep my room if my roommate has different values, about what is proper behavior in terms of relationships between the races or different countries, how people ought to act with one another? These are moral issues. Moral education is a part of values education, but all values education is not moral education. I think that's a useful distinction to make.

We've not made that distinction in values clarification, I guess because we've just assumed: "Yes, we're interested in moral issues as well, but we've not named them that way."

TAFEE: Where does the word "attitudes" fit in with everything else?

KIRSCHENBAUM: You're going to keep it up, are you? (laughs)

"Attitude," I guess, would be a preference for something, a feeling that something is desirable.

TAFEE: A "feeling" perhaps as opposed to a more "cognitive. . . ."

KIRSCHENBAUM: Right. That would distinguish an "attitude" from an "opinion." An "opinion" would be the cognitive position on an issue.

Ask me what the difference is between an "opinion" and a "belief" is. . . . I don't know. I use them interchangeably.
(laughs) A "belief is a strong opinion," Three-o on the Richter Scale.

TAFFEE: How about an "absolute?" Is an "absolute" a "value," an "opinion," a "belief," an "attitude," a "moral?"

KIRSCHENBAUM: Well, uh. . . .

TAFFEE: Yes or no.

KIRSCHENBAUM: Probably.

I see "absolutes" being used two ways in discussions of values. Some people are referring to "absolute" truths about the universe, like "there is a God," or "there isn't a God." And some people suggest they should not be a matter for each person to decide for himself or herself, because it's "absolutely" true. So that's one way that "absolute" is used.

Another I've heard "Absolute values," which to me, I get the feeling what that means is a value or belief or behavior that everybody should hold or follow, for reasons that transcend rationality. That is, if I believe that, let's say. . . . Some Catholics have an "absolute" value of the sanctity of human life, that has an implication about abortion. So they would say: "I don't want abortion to be a free choice for people. Whether they want to do it or not to do it, it's not up to them. It's an absolute value: there should not be abortion."

Now they may have some rational reasons for it, but then there are rational reasons why abortions are a good idea too. It's an "absolute" value to them because, when it comes down to it, it's a matter of faith: a value that transcends rationality, that ultimately decides for them that no one should have an abortion. So that's another way I see "absolutes."

TAFEE: One question that I meant to ask previously has come back to me. You were talking about teachers who might inappropriately use a values clarification strategy by springing something on the kids, which you suggest might be totally out of context. Now I don't recall anything off-hand being written about this, but do you think it's important when using values clarification with children that you do some talking about the theory?

KIRSCHENBAUM: Yes. I'm not sure if there's been anything written about it either.

I know I've heard my colleagues and I frequently say in workshops that we think young people should learn the theory itself. I would teach it when I taught high school. Because the values clarification approach is not a hidden approach, that if you knew the theory behind it it would lose its effectiveness. On the contrary, it becomes more effective if people appreciate the nature of values confusion, the different ways one can help others with values, and the nature of the valuing process. It becomes more effective because then you know the ground-rules, you know what the purpose is of any values clarifying intervention. So I

think, at every level, children and students should learn about the valuing process.

On an elementary school level, it may have to be done piece by piece: talk about prizing and do a "Proud Whip," and spend a little time on that whole concept. And then the next day talk about sharing or public affirmation, and do a strategy connected with it, and so on. With high school students, you could give a lecture and explain the whole theory and so on.

TAFTEE: Any parting "words of wisdom?"

KIRSCHENBAUM: I think somewhere, it might be good to get in some mention of Personalizing Education,²³ because I think that's one of the important new contributions in values clarification. The whole issue of "How do you sequence values clarification strategies? Do you do them in any old order, does it make a difference?" is addressed, not totally, in that book, by saying that there are four states: that in every group you can use values clarification or other strategies to build human relationships, to build a climate of trust and acceptance. And strategies that accomplish that should be the first steps in a group's life.

And then you can use values clarification strategies, or other strategies, to help people start becoming aware of establishing their goals and purposes with respect to that group: what I want to learn, what I want to get out of the group, what my expectations

²³Leland W. Howe and Mary Martha Howe, op. cit.

are, what some of the obstacles I'll experience are. . . . A lot of the values clarification strategies are ideal for both the first stage of "building climate:" "Name Tags" for example, or "setting goals and purposes."

And then a third stage, where you can utilize a lot of values clarification strategies to help the curriculum become more personal to people: both third level teaching, helping people establish what they want to learn and pursue that, and do self-contracts, that learning should be a personal thing, all through. . . .

And fourth, which is kind of done simultaneously with the others, you can use a lot of values clarification strategies to help manage the classroom: the record-keeping, the grading, the group decisions, the class meetings, and all these can utilize values clarification strategies to keep the thing going smoothly and effectively.

I think that they don't go a lot into the theory in their book. I wish they had said more about each of those four steps. But I think the message come across pretty clearly. It's a significant contribution to the development of values clarification.

TAFFEE: How would you sum up the contributions you have made to values clarification?

KIRSCHENBAUM: I would sum them up as follows: one, I have added to the theory; two, I was the chief organizer and mover behind Values Associates, which helped spread the work very effectively;

three, I have served as a clearinghouse for current research, thereby acting as a catalyst for new research, and I have also kept the bibliography up to date; four, I co-authored some key books in volumes clarification; five, I have led some two hundred or so workshops; six, I have a new publication for trainers in the works; seven, I organized the National Humanistic Education Center, and its system of materials distribution, thereby enabling thousands of teachers to get hold of books and articles they might not have otherwise obtained, and eight, I organized the Values Clarification Trainers Network.

APPENDIX I

INTERVIEW WITH BARBARA GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM

INTERVIEW WITH BARBARA GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM

TAFEE: What attracted you first to values clarification?

GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM: I was an undergraduate at the University of Minnesota, and at that point had been working in social welfare, social psychology, and education. As part of my second year at college, I had spent six weeks on the Navajo reservation in Arizona, and had become aware of very different value perspectives from mine. The whole area of values became an interest area.

Furthermore, as I went into counseling and was doing more both in social work and in psychological counseling, it became an interest for me to find out how to help people deal with values conflicts that they were confronting in their lives. That might be the disparity in values systems between two cultures, as it was in the Navajo reservation, or just trying to sort through conflict areas in people's own lives.

Having been raised in the Lutheran church in Minnesota, the predominant mode of value education that I was exposed to growing up was moralizing, and I realized how little value that had had in my life, in terms of the major decisions I made. It was not those moralizing forces that were most influential. And being aware of that, I began to look for other ways of helping people deal with value conflicts.

TAFEE: In what ways in those four or five years that you've been involved with values clarification, has it had a direct effect on your life and the way you're living?

GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM: It's interesting. It's had a very direct effect on my life. As I became more involved in values clarification, and took the training programs, I began to use the strategies not only on myself, but with the students I was teaching, clients I was counseling. . . . And then as I began to teach values clarification, it became even more important to me to verify or test out everything I was teaching, as to its merits, as to its usefulness. And so the things that I teach, are the things that have been personally useful, either to me as a counselor, when I'm working with counselors, to me as a teacher, when I'm working with teachers, or to me as a partner in a marriage, when I'm doing a "values clarification for couples" workshop.

Oftentimes when I'm sitting down and thinking about a problem, I think about alternatives, I think about consequences, I think about actions. I try to use the processes when I go about making decisions and dealing with my own value conflicts, I'm very clear that it's not "something I teach, but don't do."

Yet, I've combined it with many other skills, skills from Parent Effectiveness Training, and in particular, Re-Evaluation Counseling. So it has become one skill in a repertoire of skills that I've used.

TAFEE: What notions do you have about how it has entered the lives of those you have trained?

GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM: I have some fairly good notions. One example comes from experiential data, people saying it made a difference.

I know that's not strong research data, but people coming back and saying: "Hey, this worked! I've tried this in my classes and my kids are more interested, they're more involved. Teaching is more fun for me. I finally have a way of dealing with some issues that I was helpless to deal with before. I know now that I am at least allowed to talk about some of these values issues." That kind of feedback.

A second form of feedback has been that people have continued to be interested in training and workshops. There is some interest there, or some sense of success that encourages people to continue to come back for the values workshops, whether it be the advanced workshops, or those with a more specific focus like workshops for counselors, or women, or whatever.

Thirdly, I'm aware of a number of training programs in the country. The Y.M.C.A., for example, has seen the value of values clarification, and is using it on a wide-scale basis in their training program.¹ So other people find it useful and begin to implement it into major programs.

In more personal terms, I'm aware of the reactions of friends. I was in Minnesota recently, and we were sitting down to lunch with a friend of mine, and when we were done talking, she commented on the fact--I guess both Howie and I were there--of how unique our friendship is, and how valuable our friendship is to

¹For additional information, contact Jerry Glagschal of the Akron, Ohio, Y.M.C.A., or Jack Cole, Mid-American Region Y.M.C.A., Hennepin Ave., Minneapolis, Mn.

her, and part of that was because "we ask her good questions." That's how she put it. I questioned her further, and by that she meant questions that were not intimidating, but were evocative and provocative, that allowed her to explore things and to question things, and made our relationship a very rich learning experience. That's another form of feedback.

TAFFEE: What changes have you seen take place in the theory of values clarification since you became involved with it?

GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM: That's hard to answer. I think Rath, initially, was the "grandfather," in terms of the real thinking about theory. And he came up with the original seven processes, and tried to do and gather research which substantiated those seven processes. That research has some value, and yet in terms of traditional research, it sometimes is questioned as not being sufficient to prove the validity of the theory.

In recent years, as the theory has begun to be attacked by people in different parts of the country who are working both in values education and moral education, I think the theory is again being reconsidered. For many years, Merrill and Sid and Howie,² were involved mainly in the "spreading of the word," the adaptation, taking the theory and making it practical, applicable to classroom uses, really usable and available to teachers--and that's where most of their time and energy went.

²Merrill Harmin, Sidney B. Simon and Howard Kirschenbaum.

More recently I think Howie, of the three, has been the most interested in theoretical issues. Merrill would be next, and Sid probably least. And that seems O.K. to me. It seems that each of them have different skills and talents, and that they should use those in the way that taps their skills to the greatest extent. In the last three years, Howie has begun to do a great deal of the thinking about the theory.

I come out of a developmentalist perspective to some extent, having worked with Norm and Lois³ at the University of Minnesota. I think that my working with Kohlberg's stuff, using a developmental framework in my thesis, and sharing that with Howie, helped introduce Howie to the developmental perspective. Howie's work in the writing of Carl Roger's biography has added a perspective on moral education and values growth and development that has been useful in his thinking.⁴ And his willingness to participate in discussions and programs like the one we went to up in Ontario, has provided him with occasions to listen to other people's perspectives, and to thinking about them, and to evaluate and relate other perspectives to values clarification theory.⁵

³Drs. Norman Spinthall, and V. Lois Erickson.

⁴Howard Kirschenbaum's interest in Carl Rogers goes back many years. His doctoral dissertation "Carl R. Rogers: A Study of a Psychologist and Education," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1974, dealt with Rogers. His present manuscript on Rogers will not be ready for presentation to a publisher until approximately September of 1976. Its projected title is On Becoming Carl Rogers.

⁵This is a reference to "Values Education: Theory, Practice, Problems, Prospects," an invitational conference held in Oakville, Ontario, Canada, January 30 through February 1, 1975.

More recently, Howie has emerged as the primary theorist since Rath, with Merrill doing some of it as well. Howie seems most open to re-evaluating and thinking about the theory.

I think Howie's thinking has been primarily in the direction of expanding the theory to not only look at valuing processes, but to place these processes in the context of "life skills." We then can begin to integrate values clarification and weave together many different approaches to values and moral education, plus other approaches to humanistic education that might give us a better picture of what basic life skills are, and how they are developed.

TAFFEE: In what ways do you think the practice has changed since you became involved with it?

GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM: I think Sid's genius--he's an amazingly creative man--and a combination of his charisma and creativity, hooked together with some of Howie's and Merrill's thinking, and their creativity, has allowed values clarification to become a very useful, usable tool. The values clarification handbook, etc., are examples of creative and useful applications of the theory.⁶ These books and others, have taken what came out of the original Values and Teaching⁷ book, which was usable to some extent, and

⁶See Sidney B. Simon, Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum, Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students (New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1972).

⁷Louis E. Rath, Merrill Harmin, and Sidney B. Simon, Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1966).

helped people see how they could take the original basic theory and apply it, and change it, and play with it, and use it and create--not only strategies, but also ways of teaching on the "third level," to take the principle and the concepts, and the clarifying question and have that as a basis for a lot of teaching and subject matter applications.

So I think that was the first change it underwent: becoming more usable, practical, applicable, with subject matter applications.

And they also have some very fine training models. They not only did the writing that helps to apply it, but they went in and could both "turn-on" teachers, and effectively teach the skills of values clarification in a way that a great number of teachers were then able to go back and have something they could use to enliven their classroom, to deal with values issues, and to increase their teaching skill. So that's been a second change I've seen, a very good method of "spreading the word."

Since then, it has taken off. It has become very, very popular. I sometimes am somewhat leery of that: "the values clarification as a 'fad' phenomena," that's how it's being identified by many. And I sometimes worry about the quality of what's being taught in the name of "values clarification." Yeah, I have some concern for quality control there.

I think the third change I'm seeing in practice is that values clarification is going beyond the classroom. I've seen this in terms of the composition of our workshops, the kinds of writings that are coming out, and some of my own interests. Whereas values

clarification was predominantly taught to teachers in the first several years, a larger number of people in the counseling and helping professions are entering into training.

I just completed a "values clarification for women" workshop, which was very interesting. Women, in our culture, are dealing with a lot of role changes right now. The kind of experiences and skills that values clarification can provide are valuable to women who are attempting to sort through a lot of the issues in their lives.

We are getting more people from the ministry, youth work, drug education programs, etc. I recently have been corresponding with a doctor and two dentists who are interested in using values clarification. I've been doing more and more work with counselors who are interested in the "clarifying question" as a means of helping their own students deal with, not only vocational questions, but other questions involving school life.

TAFEE: Back to "quality control" for a minute. Do you have any evidence that values clarification is being misused, either by people purporting to be trainers, or by people in the classroom?

GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM: I think there are times when people who have had an initial workshop might go back into a classroom and use values clarification as a means of moralizing. I think we do a good job with a lot of people, but for some people it's still very seductive to use values clarification as a means of making a point: the way they structure their rank-orders, the way they ask their

questions, the context in which they ask their questions--may not be appropriate, may not be consistent with values clarification.

Whenever I do a workshop now, I really spend a lot of time working on creation of strategies, and how to and how not to create strategies. And secondly, I spend time at least talking about this issue of "intent," what the intent of values clarification is. But you can't guarantee that everyone who goes through your training program is going to practice it with the same intent that you do.

I've had some reports from people, that they had a values clarification workshop leader who didn't do a good job, or who communicated values clarification in a way that made the process seem like a "bag of tricks" or a series of "techniques." I see it as something much more than that.

TAFEE: Do you ever wish, perhaps, that values clarification had gone the route of Parent Effectiveness Training, and moved into "licensing" its trainers?

GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM: It's an interesting question. Being a P.E.T. Trainer, I'm aware of both of those systems.

This has been a question that we've debated and talked about. Do you get a copyright or a trademark for values clarification in order to have more control over it? By now, values clarification has pretty much become in the public domain, so that people can call anything "values clarification." I have some concern over that.

And yet, I do wish there was a bit more control. I think Howie and Sid and Merrill initially struggled with this issue: did they want to spend a good deal of their time on the kinds of restrictive licensing agreements and contracts that Tom Gordon⁸ has had to go into? P.E.T. has become so rigid as a result of that kind of control. And even with that, you can't insure that after your ten week or twelve week training program in P.E.T., that people are going to teach it well. But you increase the likelihood that they will. And so I'd say: "Yeah. There are times I wish there had been a bit more quality control built into the training process, so that people were either 'certified' or had demonstrated some competencies before they used it."

On the other hand, you can argue that by letting it become more free, you increase the likelihood that more people are going to be exposed to it, and have a greater influence in terms of kids' lives. So, at times, I would lean more towards the accrediting.

As a compromise, we have appealed to all those who have completed an advanced values clarification workshop, inviting them to become part of a Values Clarification Trainers Network.⁹ In so doing, they are kept up to date in theoretical issues, new teaching ideas, etc.

⁸Reference to Dr. Thomas Gordon, originator of Parent Effectiveness Training.

⁹The Values Clarification Trainers Network is operated by the National Humanistic Education Center, 110 Spring Street, Saratoga Springs, N.Y. 12866.

Secondly, Howie has drawn up a letter of "recommended criteria"¹⁰ for those training others in values clarification. It strongly urges people to do the necessary reading and get the necessary training and supervision in order to use values clarification, and specifies guidelines for adequate training.

TAFTEE: Do you see any evidence, or have any feelings about, the suggestion that values clarification has become more "affective" in recent years than it was in 1966, or the late sixties-early seventies when you began in it?

GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM: That's again a tricky question, Steve.

I think Sid's teaching of values clarification has become more effective. I think Howie and I continue to work with values clarification as predominantly thinking skills, with an awareness and explicit recognition of the importance of the affective domain.

I think we have to be careful not to make values clarification encompass everything. There's a time and a place for each. And I think the affective domain is an important part of the valuing process, but it's not primary to the process.

TAFTEE: What might the future hold in regard to the widespread popularity that values clarification has enjoyed?

GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM: O.K., Best guess: I'm guessing that to some extent, there is some fadism in values clarification. I hate to

¹⁰Howard Glaser-Kirschenbaum, Merrill Harmin and Sidney B. Simon, "Recommended Qualifications for Values Clarification Trainers," (Upper Jay, New York: National Humanistic Education Center, August, 1975) (Mimeographed letter.)

admit that. I don't like to see it. I hate to see it become a "catch-all" for everything, and everybody writes a book on values clarification. I have some concern over that. The present popularity may subside a bit.

And yet, I think the concepts, some of the basic concepts of values clarification will remain. They may become re-integrated, they may become re-defined, but I think they'll live on. I think the existence of values clarification helped to legitimize the considering of moral and value issues in classrooms and that will continue.

So it may change form, but I think it will continue to live.

TAFFEE: How do you see your own future involvement with values clarification?

GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM: Well, at the moment, my interest lies more in using v.c. as one of many different kinds of skills in working with women, and in counseling, and in teaching about death and dying, as a way of helping people explore those issues.

Further than that, in the next several years, when I go back into a doctoral program, I'm wanting to do a great deal of thinking and reading and exploring, as a way of grounding, not only values clarification, but a lot of other things, in a good theoretical and philosophical base. This will not necessarily be "cognitive-developmental," though I think the developmentalists have a lot on the ball and a lot to offer. I'd like to be a little more open to other perspectives, and to begin to work and participate

in that process of coming up with a broad and adequate theory of human growth and development that includes not only the moral dimension, and not only the cognitive dimension--which is where the developmentalists have predominantly done their work--but also includes the affective, domain, and social action.

I'm also interested in taking a look at questions like "Can we start melding the developmentalist's perspective and the values clarification perspective?" I think the developmentalists are weak, at least the cognitive developmentalists in the Kohlbergian tradition are weak, in terms of classroom applications of the developmental theory. And I'm wondering if there are not ways to meld the two and glean the benefits of both. To take some of the theory of the Kohlbergians, and use many of the strategies and awarenesses of values clarification, and put them together in a way that we might learn that certain strategies, at certain times at certain stages of development, help to move students to a different level of development.

And secondly, to recognize that when you're dealing with values issues you're not dealing totally with the cognitive domain. We have to take a look at stages in affective growth and development, self-esteem, etc.

I'd like to be involved in taking a look at human development in this more inclusive way.

TAFEE: John Stewart, writing in the Phi Delta Kappan, expressed some reservations about values clarification.¹¹ How would you respond to his criticism that values clarification (1) is a relativistic position, and (2) that it deals primarily with "content," and leaves out the whole other area of "structure," which is what Kohlberg, and associates, and Stewart, are interested in?

GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM: Well, on the issue of relativism, I think. . . . Two things: First, I think John Stewart has been a critic who has encouraged some good thinking about values. I see him as being both bright and arrogant. His questions are good. I wish he could listen as well as he could critique.

On the issue of relativism, I think there is some validity to his criticism, in terms of what has been explicitly said about and written about values clarification.

My thinking there came to be: Within values clarification, I think there are certain values perspectives that are assumed. I don't think it is totally value-free. I think we assume that thinking is better than non-thinking, that certain ways of looking at problems, e.g. taking a look at choices, are better than other ways. I think inherent in values clarification are certain kinds of values that certain processes are better than other processes, as ways of looking at areas of confusion and conflict.

¹¹John S. Stewart, "Clarifying Values Clarification: A Critique," Phi Delta Kappan, LVI, No. 10 (June, 1975), pp. 684-688.

When you start putting values clarification in a larger life-skills framework, I think that becomes even more apparent. If we look at a broader picture of values clarification, and begin to think of it in terms of basic life-skills: thinking, feeling, choosing, communicating, acting--then I think we can begin to take a more integrative look at the work of Kohlberg, at the work of Loevinger, of Erickson, of people not only in the field of developmental psychology, but social psychology, and begin to say that certain ways of thinking may be qualitatively more appropriate at certain times than others. So that within that larger picture we might find that Kohlberg may have some validity; that certain kinds of reasoning may be better than other kinds of reasoning; certain kinds of feeling skills might be better or more appropriate than others; certain ways of communicating might be better or more facilitative than others. And as the research and the findings come in from different perspectives, then I think we might be able, in the broader life-skills picture, to identify what are better ways of thinking or feeling or choosing, and that whole continuum of skills in that area. I don't know how to make it more clear than that at this point.

One other thing I'd like to mention here though, is I think there's some real questions having to do with the Kohlbergian theory, about whether Stage Six is indeed better than Stage Three or Four or whatever.

So even within the larger picture, if we begin to buy into a Kohlbergian model, I'd like to hold it as tentative, saying:

"As far as we know right now, it is our best guess in terms of our best thinking at this time, . . . we believe these things to be true." But leave it open to change, so that it doesn't become so rigidified that it becomes inflexible.

TAFTEE: Whom do you see as playing, or perhaps continuing to play, key and influential roles within values clarification during the next ten years?

GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM: That's a hard question, coming from the inside view, here.

I see Howie as having the mind to do it. I'm not sure he's willing to commit himself to wrestling with values clarification for the next ten to twenty years. Sid will keep his finger in it for awhile, but his own interests in different areas of human growth, I think, may move him into different areas. Merrill's concern about social problems may tend to bring him out of values clarification as such, and into other, new realms of thinking. So it's hard for me to know who will stick with values clarification for a long period of time.

I think it might be more likely that certain students of Raths, Harmin, Simon and Kirschenbaum, who are beginning to work in moral education and values education, may be the ones who do more of the critical thinking, integrating, theorizing, and research validating, than any of the four originators will.

Lee and Mary Martha now are doing something I think is really exciting and important for the future. Their book on

Personalizing Education,¹² which is again less theoretical and more practical, has begun to put values clarification in a more integrated look at the whole process of humanizing education. They look at curriculum and values clarification's role in it, the role of other approaches in curriculum, building learning communities, at goal structuring. In so doing, they begin to integrate values clarification with a lot of other things. And it may be those kinds of efforts that go on in the next ten years.

People like you may continue to work with it, to integrate it, to play with it, to try to reconcile your loyalty to John Stewart and the developmentalists, with your involvement in values clarification. And as you struggle with the dissonance that the controversies provide, you may do some of that good thinking and integrating.

TAFEE: Are there any particular areas of research that you think should be completed in the next ten years?

GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM: Oh yeah, you can raise research questions forever.

I'd be interested in seeing if the use of values clarification in certain ways can produce stage changes in terms of a developmental framework.

I'd be interested, and one of the things I'm more interested in now is using the life-skills that values clarification

¹²Leland W. Howe and Mary Martha Howe, Personalizing Education: Values Clarification and Beyond (New York: Hart Publishing Co., Inc., 1975).

hopefully teaches, and its effects on self-concept. To what extent, using for example, the model of Dr. Ardyth Norm-Hebeisen on self-esteem and its development, can we use a variety of the values skills and strategies, some of the theory, in helping people examine and develop various aspects and domains of the self-esteem complex. That's an interest area of mine.

I'd be interested in comparing the teaching of subject matter in a traditional mode, with the teaching of subject matter in the "third-level teaching mode" to see if there is any difference in student retention and comprehension. That would be, I think, an interesting doctoral dissertation.

TAFFEE: I think we've already hit on some of what I'm going to ask about next, but what are some of the issues to which values clarification will have to speak during the next ten years?

GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM: To not "throw out the baby with the bath water," I guess, to look critically at values clarification, but to also look at those things it does offer and does provide that have made it so popular, and made people experience it as so useful. We must look at what it has done in order to capture what's good about it. And we must critique what needs to be changed, and work on bringing about those changes.

TAFFEE: What would the ideal look like? If ten years from now I were to meet you again, and I were to ask you: "Well, how were the last ten years in values clarification?"--ideally what would you like to be able to say to me?

GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM: Hmm. Ideally I would like to be able to have a much more integrative view of human growth and development, with a good, strong theory which has integrated a lot of different independent research efforts.

For me, I was most discouraged at the Ontario conference, hearing people put-down each other, and present their own views without doing much cooperative thinking. And I would hope at some point we would get Larry Kohlberg, and Jim Rest, and Norm Spinthal--people who are both working in the university and academic sphere,--and those working in the practical, day to day, front-line sphere, together to really think cooperatively, evaluate, and work together to take what's best in each of their different perspectives. I want them to not be so protective of their own work that they can't participate in the give-and-take that allows new theories, a new ideas, and new integrations to take place.

TAFEE: What about the future of values clarification and women?

GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM: Ah, that's exciting! Again, I think there's a lot more theorizing that needs to be done. Lois Erickson, at the University of Minnesota, has been working with women in a developmental context. I think that values clarification can be a very useful tool on helping women deal with confusion and conflict. And a lot of the questions that I have revolve around: "Can values clarification be used as a tool to help women work through developmental stages, both as identified by Loevinger, in terms of ego and identity, and the Kohlbergian stages?

I think the values clarification model can provide an atmosphere that is safe enough, that people don't have to defend themselves, and therefore become rigid in their thinking because they're busy fending off others. In that context, with the safety that values clarification provides, I think they can begin to listen to alternatives, they begin to hear arguments and perspectives that are very different and maybe of a more sophisticated nature than theirs. Certain kinds of changes that the developmentalists are urging and wanting and seeking, might occur in that context.

So I'd like to continue to use values clarification with women, to begin to work on, hopefully with Lois and with others, on developing a theoretical basis for it, to see what we can do to help women in our own culture and internationally, to begin to struggle with new definitions, new roles, new concepts of who they are.

That's exciting for me. I like the idea. And so there are other approaches that I'd like to integrate too, to work on women's growth and development teaching people active listening, which demands that people take the perspective of another, and that's a high level skill.

TAFFEE: What obstacles do you think values clarification may have to overcome during the next ten years?

GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM: Fadism and a small research base, which has not always been as rigorous as the critics would like. But more good research is on the way!

TAFEE: Several times during the interview, you have spoken of "moral education" and "values education" as though they were separate entities. What distinctions do you see between the two that lead you to use the terms separately?

GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM: "Moral education" has to do with "oughts" and "shoulds," those domains where it can be said "there is a better way."

"Values education" deal more with areas of preference, where one way is not necessarily better than others.

"Values education" includes "moral education." The reverse is not always true.

TAFEE: Is values clarification "therapy?"

GLASER-KIRSCHENBAUM: No. And the book, Values and Teaching mentions that it should not be used in therapy.¹³

I imagine that question comes from my mention of using values clarification in counseling. I see a difference between "counseling" and "therapy," though the line is often fuzzy.

I use values clarification with people who are struggling to make decisions about vocations, relationships, life choices, etc. These people are functioning well in the outside world.

¹³Raths, et al., op. cit.

They are not overly distressed or incapacitated by their distress. The values clarification processes require a capacity for rational thought and "in-touchness." I don't believe it to be responsible to use the approach with people who suffer from a great deal of distress, disorientation, or lack of aware attention.

APPENDIX J

INTERVIEW WITH JOEL GOODMAN

INTERVIEW WITH JOEL GOODMAN

TAFTEE: How did it all start for you? How did you come to be attracted to values clarification?

GOODMAN: When I was eight and nine, I was editor with a friend of mine, of a neighborhood newspaper which had over two hundred subscribers. Each month, Billy and I alternated writing editorials. And the one who didn't write the editorial did a feature called: "The Inquiring Reporter." And each month the Inquiring Reporter's question was based on the editorial. When I look back, as I did just recently at some of those old issues, all of the editorials, and all of the Inquiring Reporter's questions focused on values having to do with friendship, and vacations, and things of that nature. My sense is that it goes way back to then, at the least, and I think a lot of that has to do with my family. We had an environment where we took a look at those kinds of issues and questions.

Beyond that, I think in high school--I had a chance to attend a couple of week-long, residential workshops in leadership training. A lot of the issues and the questions that we dealt with there were values questions. And they were very exciting and meaningful weeks for me. The week before my senior year in high school was, without a doubt, one of the turning points for me, in my whole life.

Farther down the road, Bailey Jackson,¹ who was doing some consultant work with our Maryland Leadership Workshop organization,² came down and introduced some of the values clarification activities to us one summer.

The next year, I entered Mass,³ and in the fall was taking Sid's course on values clarification.⁴ And I think the thing that really got my commitment in this direction was one particular activity we did during the course. It was an "Alternatives Search," and Sid had us in trios, and offered several questions, one of which was: "If a loved one of yours has been smoking, and you'd like to get that person to stop, what could you do?" And the three of us brainstormed off a number of alternatives. Then I left that class thinking about my father and the fact that he had been smoking for well over twenty-five years, and had been smoking rather heavily

¹At that time, Bailey Jackson was with the Humanistic Education Center at Albany; presently, he is an Assistant Professor at the University of Massachusetts.

²Maryland Leadership Workshops, founded in 1954 by Felix Simon, provide leadership training for junior and senior high school students as well as for faculty advisors. The staff, consisting largely of high school and college students, offers programs in small and large group processes, communications skills, conflict resolution, clarifying leadership values, goal-setting, creative problem-solving, program planning, organizational development, and team-building. Thousands of students from across Maryland have participated in MLW's local workshops and week-long summer programs. Joel Goodman has been a staff member of the organization for many years, has served as Associate Director of the program, and has co-directed its Advanced Human Relations Seminar Program (on which his dissertation is based).

³Reference to the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

⁴Reference to Sidney B. Simon.

in spite of, or maybe because of, all of our nagging efforts. He refused to quit. What I did was essentially, pick one of the ideas out of that Alternatives Search, and wrote him a letter and told him how much I loved him, and that I would do anything I could to support him if he chose to quit smoking. And to my surprise, and everyone's surprise, he got the letter and stopped smoking. It was almost an immediate thing: he went to a local hospital that had a smokers clinic--and I mean for him to even admit that he needed some help in that area was an amazing thing! And I just got in touch with the fact that I really could have some control and impact on my life, and the lives of people I love. And here was a values clarification activity that was the initial stimulus for that. So it's probably through a real personal experience that I began to get more and more interested.

TAFEE: Has it continued to enter your life since that first time? Has it entered your life in other ways as well?

GOODMAN: Yeah! It's really important for me, personally, to be congruent, in terms of the work I do and the way in which I live. For me, I found always that the values clarification approach, and humanistic education in general, has been a really natural fit with who I am, and the way I live. So, I've always felt it's been a part of me. And in a specific sense, I find myself using a number of the skills really naturally: I'm compulsive about looking for alternatives, and sometimes I think about consequences to the point where I get bruises from sitting on the fence for so

long. And an increasingly important area for me is the whole notion of acting on my values, and a most particular sense of that with regard to different social issues dealing with forms of oppression. So it's been a real constant kind of thing.

There are a couple incidents along the way that stand out. I mean they're minor again, but. . . .

One day, I was playing basketball outside, and a man and his three-year-old son came by the playground. As he came over the fence, the man threw a beer bottle behind him into the bushes. And I took note of that. He came over and joined me, and we played some basketball for about an hour. Then he and his son started to leave, and he was just about to climb back over the fence when I just made the simple statement of: "Oh, you dropped your beer bottle over there." He sort of turned around and looked at me very quizzically, and said something to the effect of: "Hey--you really feel that that's pretty important, don't you?" And I said "Yup." He then went and picked-up the beer bottle, shrugged his shoulders, and walked on home. So in a number of incidents like that, I've seen it pop-up in my life.

I think the way in which I relate with people, in terms of giving people space, and the proverbial "right to pass," really trying to respect differences in values are reflections of other ways. That vc has entered my life.

TAFEE: You've been training others in the use of values clarification for a number of years now. Do you have some notions about

how its entered their lives? Do people correspond? Do you have "harder" evidence of how its affected those people?

GOODMAN: Your question is an important one, and I have a sincere commitment to "keep in touch" with people after a workshop or course. I always encourage people to write or call me if they have any questions, concerns, and/or ideas to share. Surprisingly and pleasingly, many people do communicate with me after the workshop or course is over. In fact, this is one of the things that keeps me going--the realization that it does and has made a difference for people to get involved in using values clarification--both personally and professionally. This is one of the important issues in my own life and work now--feeling the need to make a difference.

Let me give you some examples of "differences" that have been made. Several years ago, I had a chance in a workshop to be with a person who had just graduated from high school, and was about to enter college. One day, in a very off-handed kind of way, I asked a seemingly innocuous clarifying question: "What was involved in your decision in choosing to go to college?" And this fellow looked at me as if he were in shock, and talked about never having really thought about that before. In the midst of his "aha!" experience, he realized that it hadn't been a question of "whether" to go to college, it was just a question of "which" college. It turned out that he did some more thinking, and wrote me a letter after his freshman year, and said that he was deciding to take a year off, and that he never would have considered that if

it hadn't been for that very simple, innocuous question. So I find, in terms of seed-planting, that a lot of times people will, a year later, two years later, say "Hey! That one question was really important" or "That one experience was really significant." What intrigues me is the potential in the values clarification approach for helping people to lead lives of their own choice, lives that are value-able.

Other examples of personal "benefits" of participating in values clarification programs. . . . I've had so many people tell me that a workshop or course has affected their home and family life--for the first time, they are able to communicate with their spouse, or with their children, or with their parents--they have discovered and developed some "tools" and guidelines in building the "WALAC" signs of their loved ones.⁵

On a professional level, many teachers have sent me ideas which they have created, adapted, or expanded. This certainly is a reflection of their ability to use the values clarification approach. In fact, I see this as one of values clarification's strengths--its usefulness and practicality. Teachers report that student response to the new ideas are exciting and encouraging. One example . . . Connie Morrison, who had attended a workshop I led in Michigan several years ago, adapted some of the activities we had done. It was very clear that she understood and had integrated the values clarification guidelines in her teaching.

⁵"WALAC" stands for "We Are Lovable and Capable," and refers to a specific series of values clarification activities.

One day, I received a big packet in the mail--it was from Connie. She and her students were so incredibly excited about one of the activities they had done (integrating values clarification and literature) that they sent me everyone's papers so that I could share in their excitement.

For me, the most nourishing response is from students who see themselves growing from having internalized values clarification guidelines and skills. In fact, my dissertation is an extensive case-study of a humanistic program for high school students--part of which included follow-up reports from the participants. Their insights, joy, and support in the approach have filled me with hope--that we can make a difference, that values clarification can make a difference. At the same time, I am cautious to say that values clarification is not a magic wand, a cure-all, because I really am concerned about ethical and strategic issues in the use of values clarification. But, for me, it does offer a sense of hope. And I need hope in my work and in my life.

TAFFEE: Since 1970, the time during which you began to formally act as a values clarification trainer, have you seen any shifts or any changes occur within the theory?

GOODMAN: For me there have been. And I think most particularly Howie has generated some changes.⁶

⁶Reference to Howard Kirschenbaum.

For me, I no longer talk about the Seven Criteria. I no longer focus on what is or isn't a value. I'm personally more interested in the valuing "skills." And it could be seen as a slight change from talking about seven criteria for a value to talking about seven valuing skills. But I think it's really an important shift in emphasis. For me, I think ultimately that's going to be what's most important and long lasting: focusing on the skills. To me the Seven Criteria were arbitrary in a sense. Number, first of all, of certainly not an exhaustive list of what people considered to be the criteria for a value. And I found that there's a whole lot of resistance to people in workshop settings, saying: "Well, who are you, or who is anybody else, to tell me that unless I meet all seven of these criteria, it's not a value?"

But I personally began moving away when I began asking myself those same questions, and essentially the way I look at it now is by taking a look at skills in several areas. I don't even think about seven valuing skills. I think there's a lot more interrelated skills.

Essentially, I look at valuing skills in terms of inter-personal ("thinking," "feeling," "acting"), "interpersonal," and "extrapersonal." And some of the old Seven Criteria or seven valuing skills fit into those. Under the thinking skills, I consider "choosing freely," which I've changed to "choosing with an awareness of the influences on your choices." Again, I want to get away from the whole notion of whether there is "free" choice, or "free" will. I can't answer that. I can have certain beliefs

and assumptions, but I think it is possible to talk about choosing with an awareness of the influences on our choices.

So that one, "choosing with awareness of alternatives," "choosing with awareness of the consequences," and then I see a couple others: "critical thinking skills," which include being able to make generalizations, and to take a look at cause-effect relationships and, drawing from my interest in creativity, I also add "divergent thinking skills," which ties-in with considering alternatives. I'm basically thinking that before one can consider alternatives, one may need to be able to generate the alternatives. So that's where the divergent skills would come in.

And under the feeling skills, or the affective skills, I'd include things like: legitimizing feelings, first of all; second of all, being able to focus on what one prizes and cherishes; a third skill being "tapping intuition," which is an area that I think is largely untapped in values clarification. I know for myself a lot of the important values and life choices that I've made have been based on intuition when it got down to it.

Under the acting area, I think the old criterion of acting on one's choices is an important skill, and related to that skill is being able to set goals. And I also put down the skill of being able to publicly affirm one's choices when appropriate, under the acting part, 'cause I think it's really a behavior, where it be in terms of my writing a letter to my dad about the smoking, or telling that guy about the beer bottle, that's taking an action when I publicly affirm.

And then, under the interpersonal skills, I sort of see these as the "fringe benefits" of values clarification. These are the ones that make values clarification work, so to speak, and also if values clarification is working, then these skills will be developed as well. Skills like: listening, and community building, and conflict-resolution, validation, or what I've been saying lately, value-dation: being able to focus on the value in ourselves and in others.

And then I think there's yet another skill area actually, and that would be what I would call "extrapersonal skills." And maybe this would get into where I see values clarification going in the future, but I think one important area is helping people develop skills in relating to society or to our social institutions, and skills involving organizational development, and being able to make changes in one's environment. I think these are really crucial skills.

One of the criticisms leveled at the field of humanistic education in general is what I call the "navel-watching" syndrome. In other words, people have been wondering what all this self-awareness will lead to. For me, self-awareness is a necessary, but not sufficient element. I feel very strongly that we must move beyond self-awareness to acting and impacting on our environment,

our social institutions. If humanistic education and values clarification do not address in more depth and with more commitment some of the pressing social issues and forms of oppression we face, then I think they run the risk of being branded as "irrelevant." Thus, I see the area of extrapersonal skills as a significant future direction for people in our field.

So, for me, I've sort of expanded, and I think, incorporated and gone beyond the original Seven Criteria. A real concern I have is that people might get stuck with seeing values clarification as being based on the Seven Criteria of a value. I don't think it's going to hold water for much longer. And I think that one of the biggest things that values clarification has to work against, in a sense, is some of its past history, where people get locked into thinking about: "Oh yeah, seven years ago I was in a values clarification workshop, and I know what it's about: Seven Criteria of a value"--and not being aware that there might have been some new thinking in the field.

TAFFEE: In what ways since you've been involved since 1970, do you think the practice of values clarification has changed?

GOODMAN: For me, I think any new movement, particularly movements or branches within the humanistic education field, go through a "developmental sequence."

First of all, there's the "honeymoon stage," where it's a new thing, and people are sort of: "Oh wow! Isn't this exciting

and neat!"--and both excited and, perhaps also a little wary of what it is.

Second stage, I think, is what I would call the "technique-happy stage," where essentially people see the new field as a bunch of gimmicks or neat games, and something nice to do five minutes before the bell rings because you can't do anything else, or a day-before-vacation, because you can't do anything else anyway, and really not understanding any of the theory or the guidelines.

So in terms of practice of values clarification, I think it's gone through the first two stages, for sure, and what concerns I have is that a whole lot of people are still in those two stages.

Beyond that, I think there is a growing number of people who are saying: "O.K., these activities, and exercises, and strategies are all well and good, but what do you do with them? What do I do after I've gone through the seventy-nine strategies in the book?"⁷ So I think a third stage is taking a look at how do the activities fit together. And essentially it's a "curriculum development stage"--how do people sequence activities. Within that stage, I think, is also looking at "what are some guidelines and theory underlying it?" And for me, ethically, it's just crucial that we move on to that stage. It is at this point that people begin to truly integrate the values clarification approach into their own lives and work--perhaps it could also be called "the internalization stage."

⁷Reference to the book by Sidney B. Simon, Leland W. Howe and Howard Kirschenbaum, Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students (New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1972).

The fourth stage, I think, is when people start asking: "O.K., what's some research to back-up the fact that this stuff works or is helpful?" And that's one of the future directions, and one I think is definitely going to be needed.

And I think all four stages can probably go on at the same time, but I tend to lean towards stages three and four as having the most long-range carryover potential. If people do not move on to these stages, then they may very well see values clarification merely as a fad.

So in terms of practice, I see at least for myself and I know a number of other people, who are more and more concerned about not just coming in, in a workshop setting or a course setting, running people through eighty-three activities and saying: "O.K., fine, now go out and do it." A lot of people really sense the fact that the "back-home" environment doesn't always support these new concepts, activities, and approaches, and that there really has to be a more conscientious and conscious way of going about integrating this into one's teaching, and developing support back home for doing that.

TAFEE: Do you have any evidence or feelings that values clarification might be being misused by some folks out in the field?

GOODMAN: Yeah. Yeah, I do. You know--let me give you an example coming off the last one.

One person who was in a "technique-happy stage," did the popular "Alligator River" story.⁸ And this--I heard this through a close friend of mine--and evidently the way this person did it is: she told the story to her students, and after telling the story she told her students that Abigail stands for "infidelity," Sinbad stands for "involvement," that Greg stands for "emotionality," and that Slug stands for "violence." Then she asked her students to rank the characters on that basis.

For me, that just gives a clear indication that that person doesn't really understand--at least I don't understand what that person understands about values clarification--and my concern is that it can be misused in that kind of way.

I also heard of an instance that Margie⁹ told me about, wherein a so-called "advanced" values clarification workshop held for professionals,¹⁰ that the facilitator was putting a great deal of pressure on people to publicly disclose their values. In essence saying: "that because this is an 'advanced' values clarification workshop, you no longer have the right to pass. You should be beyond that."

So I hear a number of different horror stories, and that makes me all the more conscientious and dedicated to trying to be

⁸See Strategy #50, Ibid.

⁹Reference to Margie Ingram, staff member of the National Humanistic Education Center, Saratoga Springs, New York 12866.

¹⁰Not to be confused with Advanced Values Clarification Workshops sponsored by the National Humanistic Education Center.

explicit about some of the ethical issues. In fact, that is where some of my latest work is directed: to really being more explicit about what are some of the concerns, ethically, strategically, and implementation-wise, in using values clarification.

TAFFEE: So there's some evidence, of a sort anyway, that it's being misused. Is there any evidence that this misuse is damaging kids in some way, other than just the inferential?

GOODMAN: I don't have any direct feedback on that. But I do make inferences that I sure wouldn't want to be, or wouldn't want to have a kid of mine, involved in that kind of setting.

And I think part of it is a question about, or the notion that each one of us has values of our own, based on our own past experience, and I think it's almost unavoidable that at some point during the course of a school year, a teacher is going to act irrationally in a sense, or impose or depose students' values. Not necessarily consciously, but just because of certain experiences in the teacher's own life.

And one of the issues that was raised at this conference I was at in California,¹¹ was: it's important to look at values, but what about teachers' put-downs of kids' values? And so a real concern that I have is just helping teachers to recognize that that's a potential danger, and it's one of the ways in which values

¹¹Dr. Goodman made a presentation on "Developing Self-Awareness and Pride" at the Multi-Culture Institute's annual conference in San Francisco, April 1, 1976.

clarification can be misused, and in which students could be hurt conceivably.

And one other thought in relation to that. It's often been talked about in terms of "imposing," "exposing," and "deposing" values, and that it's O.K. that a teacher expose his or her values, but to be careful about when imposing or deposing. I think I'd like to add a fourth item: I think it's legitimate for a teacher to "suppose," to throw-out some questions, in addition to exposing.

But I know for myself it's really tricky sometimes, the line between exposing and imposing. An example from this California conference that I was just speaking at: one of the women was talking about her experiences--this is a conference on multi-cultural education--and as she's describing it, the way I was hearing her was pretty racist. And this is where I get a little confused in terms of: where does my responsibility start or end in terms of exposing or imposing? And I guess ultimately, I believe I can't impose on a person; you may walk away, you don't have to believe me, but it was important for me to at least expose and throw-out a couple of thought questions during this symposium.

TAFEE: The overall preponderance of publications since 1966, with the one exception of Howie's article on "Beyond Values Clarification,"¹² has been in the area of implementation: different strategy books, the subject matter book, and so forth. And that

¹²Howard Kirschenbaum, "Beyond Values Clarification," in Readings in Values Clarification, ed. by Sidney B. Simon and Howard Kirschenbaum (Minneapolis: Winston Press, Inc., 1973).

represents one way the major authors have decided about getting the word out to teachers in the field. While you were at U. Mass, there was another way: a college course, probably mostly for pre-service teachers, as another method for impacting schools. Between the two, is there one which you think might . . . Let me ask it a different way: their efforts have obviously gone more towards publication rather than trying to impact colleges and universities and their pre-service teacher training programs. Any thoughts about that?

GOODMAN: I think both are needed. And one of the facts of life it seems, is that one needs to establish a certain amount of credibility in any field before people who aren't familiar with the field will listen. And one of the ways of establishing credibility is through publications. So, I don't see the two as mutually exclusive, and I really see them as ultimately complementing each other.

One of the ways in which I personally work, is by integrating the two. Whenever I do a workshop, or an in-service consultation, or teach a course, I inevitably have a good number of articles and publications I make available to the participants.

I think what's going to be needed is for more people to draw on their own resources, in terms of ideas for activities, strategies, clarifying questions, third-level units. . . . I think it could best be captured by a phrase I just saw when I was out in California. I had a chance to visit a Zen farm, and they're selling,

at the farm, a book called The Tassajara Bread Book, and the saying on the inside page was: "What we need is more cooks, not more cookbooks."¹³

And I think a direction that values clarification needs to go is providing cookbooks as one possible resource, but not letting people get locked-into them. Because that's where we get stuck in the "technique-happy" stage. So I think we do need more in-service programs, and I think a lot of colleges, because of the financial setting, are going to have to start coming around and seeing what's going to attract people, and what's going to be meaningful for teachers out in the field. And some by necessity are going to swing around to looking at ways of integrating values clarification into their pre-service programs.

Ultimately, I think it's going to be the in-service that's going to be most important, especially with fewer and fewer job openings each year--that the real emphasis and impact is going to come in the in-service training as opposed to the pre-service training.

TAFTEE: Are there any objections commonly raised about values clarification, which are, for you, the most troublesome to deal with? Or perhaps have the most validity, and trouble you as well?

GOODMAN: The one that comes right to mind is one I alluded to earlier, and that's is: "Where do I draw the line in terms of

¹³Edward Brown, The Tassajara Bread Book (Berkeley: Shambhala, 1970).

when I 'expose' and when I 'impose,' or feel like imposing?" On a real practical, everyday level, I think that's a question that teachers face all the time. On a more long-range level, it's a question which I think is important on a society-wide level.

You know, issues about racism, sexism, other forms of oppression; at what point am I, as a teacher, willing to accept what a student says, if it is in fact very racist, or I perceive it to be very racist or sexist? And at what point am I going to somehow intervene and interrupt that?

So it's essentially, for me, a question of when do I accept and when do I attempt to interrupt what I consider to be destructive patterns or behaviors. Destructive either to the individual himself or herself, or to other people, or to society at large.

The issue that's often raised in connection with this is blown-up to an extreme, but I think it has some validity. It's blown-up to the extreme of: "Well, if somebody like Hitler was in your classroom, would you be accepting of his or her choices and actions?" And although I think that is an extreme, the kernel of that issue is crucial. And that's one that I'm concerned about and confused about.

On a strategic level, I think long-range change on an individual basis is most often achieved through accepting and exposing and supposing, as opposed to deposing or imposing. But I don't want to be naive to certain political realities: that we might not have the luxury of sitting back and waiting.

So that, for me, is probably the most troublesome and also valid concern.

TAFEE: Do you see any evidence to suggest that values clarification in 1976 is more "affective" in nature than it was in 1966, or 1970, when you came in?

GOODMAN: I really haven't seen that. Now it's hard for me to discern it, in that for me, I'm very eclectic in my approaches. I always incorporate some of my work in other areas of humanistic education into my so-called values clarification workshops or courses. I think it would be ludicrous to draw the line arbitrarily and say: "This is values clarification, and this is creative problem solving, and this is communications skills (now we're doing the Trumpet or Self-Science Education)"¹⁴ because I see them so closely intertwined.

So it's more "affective" in the sense that, I think, at least in my own work, I've been incorporating more and more branches of affective education or humanistic education. But I think it's always been affective, at least in terms of focusing on what people prize and cherish. So I haven't noticed many major changes in that. Not really.

TAFEE: How do you see the importance of, and perhaps the future for, the work that's gone on within the subject-matter areas, one

¹⁴Developed by Gerald Weinstein at the University of Massachusetts.

development being the use of the "three level" curriculum? Do you see other openings within subject-matter areas, continuing to use the three level curriculum model?

GOODMAN: When I think about all the values clarification activities that teachers could use in their classrooms, I almost always think of the "values sheet" as being the most practical, the one that teachers could most easily start with, and use as a transition between just dealing with subject-matter on a factual and conceptual level, to dealing with it at a values level. So for me, I think it's important in terms of getting a foot in the door, with many teachers, particularly secondary school teachers who feel a great deal of pressure, and often motivation to focus on subject-matter.

I was working with a group of teachers in Wyoming in 1971. One teacher in particular came up during one of the breaks and said: "Some teachers here teach students, and some teachers here teach subject-matter." I don't think they have to be mutually exclusive, but I think they sometimes appear that way to many teachers. And for me, the three level curriculum and concept is crucial as a way of bridging the two.

I really see down the road programs being developed--in-service programs--that will start off with teachers dealing with the subject-matter first, and looking for ways to integrate values clarification approaches into that. Simply, at the very basic level, as a way of getting their attention and interest, because

I know far too many teachers who say: "Well, this is all nice and good, but where does it fit in my curriculum? I have to get to 1850 by the end of the semester, and this ain't gonna fit!" So I see it as really important for me personally.

I see, maybe twenty years down the road, people not giving a hoot about subject-matter. Maybe I'm being preposterous in that, but I think that there are going to be certain information retrieval means, that will be even more developed than they are now, that are going to make it almost wasteful for people to spend their time memorizing certain facts. And so I think, maybe twenty years down the road, we might be able to minimize some of the third level teaching and learning, and focus more on the valuing skills and life skills.

In regard to this, I had an interesting experience. And I think it's also another direction that schools will be taking, I hope they take, and I know my own work is going to be taking, and that is focusing more on the action component of values clarification. I think if anything, the emphasis in the last six-seven years has been on the choosing component, and most of the activities focus on that. And I see some integration down the road of the action component with three level. . . . And maybe there will even be a "four level" curriculum, where students will take a look at facts, and concepts, and values--and then actions and behaviors. Because I know far too many times in my own life, there's a slight discrepancy between what I value or say I value, and the way in which I behave or would like to behave.

An experience I had in San Francisco was really spurring me on in this regard: Last week, I was looking for a shirt, a particular shirt--of course it had "Snoopy" on it--¹⁵ and essentially I was involved in a four level curriculum. I was learning a heck of a lot of facts as I was going about the city trying to track down this shirt: about clothing manufacturers. I was learning, you know, quite a number of concepts about clothing representatives, what goes into producing and selling, retailing and wholesaling a shirt. And I also dealt with a lot of values issues about materialism; do I want to buy this shirt, and how much money am I willing to spend? And I certainly acted on my choices. And for me, it was a very simple and yet meaningful learning experience. I felt like I learned an incredible amount about San Francisco, also about myself, and was out in the field doing it.

TAFEE: One of the questions that plagues me when I am doing a values clarification workshop, is from the fellow or the woman who stands up in the back of the room and says something like: "Listen, bud, before you go any further, before you utter one more thing, define what you mean by a value." And it's troublesome from one standpoint in that when Howie, and I think perhaps rightfully so, suggested changing from "criteria" to "processes," he also eliminated the criteria which had, in Values and Teaching, defined what they meant by a value. What do you consider to be a value? How would you define it?

¹⁵Dr. Goodman is an incurable devotee of Charles Schultz "Peanuts" comic strip.

GOODMAN: Let me respond to the first part of your statement first. In a way, I think it's really good that, at least in my own work, I don't tell people what a value is. Because I think that in itself is a values choice. How I define a value may be different from how you define it, or somebody else. So I think it's really a good, clarifying experience in itself to raise that issue. And, in fact, in a workshop setting, if somebody raised that kind of question, I might have people go into small groups and come up with their own definitions, either then or later on.

One of the things I've been doing in workshops is, at the end, and often times at the beginning to provide some symmetry, is I ask people to complete the sentence stem: "Values clarification is . . . ," or "A value is. . . ." And I find it really interesting and intriguing--some of the answers. I've certainly expanded my own thinking on it based on, you know, the input from others.

For me, what I've been thinking about lately, in terms of values, is going back to the book Values and Teaching, I think there's the phrase in there at some point, "guides to our lives,"¹⁶ And for me, that's essentially what my values are: guides and signposts, in the sense of helping me to move between what I'm likely to do, and what I'd like to do. So again, the action component is important to me there.

¹⁶Louis E. Rath, Merrill Harmin and Sidney B. Simon, Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, Inc., 1966).

TAFEE: The whole area of values education is, I think, in some respects in their own world of confusion and conflict over some of the words that they use. "Values," means perhaps one thing to you, one thing to other people in values clarification, and certainly something different to Kohlbergians, Rokeachians, etc. Do you see some essential differences between the words like: "values," "beliefs," "attitudes," "feelings," "morals," and "absolutes?" Or do those all run together so they're almost indistinguishable?

GOODMAN: For me, and maybe this comes from some of my initial training in values clarification back when we were focusing on the Seven Criteria of a value, I somehow give more weight to something that's a "value." It somehow encompasses for me, more of the others.

"Feelings" I see as part of the affective; "beliefs" I see as part of the cognitive; "opinions" as part of the cognitive. "Morals," I find sort of interesting. I know a lot of people interchange more often than not, morals and values. And I know for some people a moral is even stronger than a value. I guess for me, I perhaps would equate the two, although I prefer the word "value" because somehow the word "moral" conjures up issues and images of "moral-izing," and things of that nature.

In terms of "absolutes," I'm not sure there are any. And one example I give in a lot of workshops is, and maybe we could use this in terms of all those words, is the issue of murder.

In the Ten Commandments, an absolute is set forth: "Thou shalt not kill." And people would say it's morally wrong to kill.

For me, it's a little trickier than that, because I can take a look at, well, the Karen Quinlan case which is in the news yesterday and today. Is that killing? The war in Vietnam, you know, was it justified to kill? I mean it's unmistakable that killing was going on. Was "national security" a higher priority than that absolute? And for many people, many "bible abiding" people, it was. The whole issue of mercy killing, of self-defense, abortion certainly. . . . So I'm not totally clear that there are any absolutes, even though on the surface level, you know, we all might say: "Of course, killing is wrong," or "murder is wrong."

TAFEE: What do you foresee for your own role within values clarification during the next few years, or maybe to 1986?

GOODMAN: (laughs) I'm not really sure. And I guess part of that relates to what I choose to do with my own life. It could range anywhere between my continuing in education to my getting a job as a Western Union operator, which is my latest, on-going fantasy.

But even that is related to values issues. And the thing that attracts me about being a Western Union operator is that I would be part of some really important issues and messages that people would be sending to one another. And, for instance, the "'I Urge. . .' Telegram" activity--I'd be a real-live part of that, where people would be dealing with a lot of values issues through the telegram. So if I go that route, I think I'll be involved on an interpersonal level (laughs), asking clarifying questions of people sending telegrams.

If I continue the education route, in a more formal sense, I see myself doing a couple things: One is continuing to focus and raise questions, and generate ideas on some of the ethical issues and implementation issues facing values clarification and, related to that, I see myself spending more time and energy of developing some on-going programs that school systems, or schools, or faculties, or teams could use to incorporate values clarification ideas and approaches on a long-term basis, as opposed to the short term.

I have a real commitment also to the notion of developing local support groups, which N.H.E.C. is now facilitating.

And I think, for me, one of the most satisfying experiences, and meaningful, is when I have chances to work with intact systems in some sort of on-going way. Whether it be a faculty group, a school system . . . and having chances for on-going contact and really seeing some changes take place over time. So in terms of those areas, I see myself focusing on ethics, in implementation, and ways of dealing with each.

I also personally see myself doing some more writing, and trying to find ways, both in writing and in workshops, to help people tap their own resources. Part of this comes from my interest in creativity. I'm always amazed at the workshops I do, at the incredible creativity and ideas people who are participants in the workshop can offer and generate.

And again, going back to The Tassajara Bread Book, I think what we need is more cooks, and fewer cookbooks. So if it's not

hypocritical, I can envision perhaps coming up with a cookbook on how to have more cooks. And as I think about it now, one of the ways in which the old saying about: "Too many cooks will spoil the stew," won't come true, is if I also continue to focus on those ethical issues.

I think a third area is continuing my own thinking about ways of conceptualizing values clarification. The conceptualization I mentioned earlier: looking at the intra-, inter-, and extra-personal skill areas, has been more helpful for me as a handle than my previous thinking. So continuing to think about ways of having people hear what values clarification is about will remain another interest of mine.

For example, I like to play with words and letters and acronyms. Being aware of the pressure to "get back to the basics," to the three R's, one of the ways I'm thinking about that is: "Yeah, that's true, but we also have to go forward to the basics." And the basics there I'm talking about are the "three V's:" helping students to focus on value, values, and valuing. I see more and more of my energy going towards focusing on those three V's. The value part being: helping students, teachers, adults, people in general--to acknowledge the value and the worth within themselves as well as in other people. Helping them to tackle values issues, on a content level, that are of interest and concern to them. Helping them to develop the valuing skills to tackle those values issues and to focus on the value within them and others.

So continuing to think about ways of looking at the field will be important to me.

And again, within that, looking for ways of values clarification hooking up with the real world as the real world changes. Again, my interest there for the most part is with the focus on action and "how do we move from a choice and a feeling to behavior?"

TAFFEE: Whom do you see as playing key or influential roles within the leadership of values clarification during the next ten years, or who is likely to do that, or perhaps continue to do that?

GOODMAN: Well, I think one source and resource is going to be people not yet identified. I'm surprised all the time with new books and articles coming out from people that I haven't had contact with. And I really firmly believe that in the next ten years people that we don't know, and perhaps people who haven't even, in a formal way, been involved in values clarification, will be taking some leadership.

I think some of the people who have been involved certainly will continue to have an impact. Howie Kirschenbaum, you know, has done some of the newer thinking in values clarification, and I'm convinced that he'll continue to do that. Sid Simon has added the contribution of making values clarification more visible, and my hunch is he'll continue. I find Sid to be very innovative in terms of some of the ideas, activity-wise, that he comes up with. So I'm sure he'll continue in that area. Merrill Harmin, I'm convinced also will continue to stretch. Lee Howe and Mary Martha Howe, their

book, Personalizing Education,¹⁷ I think is an indication that there's some new thinking on the horizon coming from that direction as well.

TAFEE: I think this perhaps goes back to an earlier question in the interview that relates to research you'd like to see completed or undertaken during the next few years. Could you say a little more about specifics?

GOODMAN: For me, the research issue is a tricky one, in that my concern is that it could be misused. And most specifically, I've had experiences with some school districts allowing or having a values clarification course introduced as an elective, say for senior high school students, and the reason why it's allowed in, so to speak, is that there's a "drug problem," or "vandalism problem." And at the end of one semester, when that problem is still around, the principal or administrator or whoever is involved says: "Aha! It doesn't work, see?!"

So one concern I have, just on an ethical level, is how and for what reason is the research being done? And I'd caution that I wouldn't want research to be done on a "band-aid" basis, to prove that: "Aha! The drug problem has evaporated," because I think values clarification can't be the answer to that, although it can be one part of that.

¹⁷ Leland W. Howe and Mary Martha Howe, Personalizing Education: Values Clarification and Beyond (New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1975).

In terms of some of the specific questions that I think need answering, I see it falling into a couple areas: one is evaluation type research, and the other is more "traditional," hard-core research. I think there's a real crying need for evaluation research of the kind that are case studies, in which people document how they've developed, implemented, and evaluated a particular program. Again, if we are going to move away from the technique happy stage, into a more on-going, long term stage, then I think we really need to draw on the resources and experiences of people who have tried and succeeded and/or failed in those efforts. So one form, I think is just going to be crucial is the action research, the on-going case studies, if we're going to make movement away from just being stuck in techniques.

A second kind of research is going to have to tackle questions like: "What effect does values clarification have on students, in terms of, first of all, their own self-concept, and how they feel about themselves; secondly, on their skills in being able to clarify values and, related to that, what are some methods, and teaching approaches that seem to be most effective and appropriate and helpful in helping students to develop values clarifying skills?"

I think a third question or area is related to some of the other values education approaches. Kohlberg certainly has done far more in the theoretical and empirical end of values education than values clarification, and I think it's important that we not ignore some of his work and his colleagues work. So I think taking

a look at how values clarification hooks-up, relates to, agrees with, disagrees with, some of the work done by Kohlberg and associates is also going to be important.

And that reminds me of one other thing. In a book that will be coming out early next year,¹⁸ I have a chapter in it called: "Humanistic Approaches to Evaluation." And in fact, I borrowed a saying that I heard from you and one other person, "counting the apples in a seed, counting the seeds in an apple. . . ."¹⁹ Another real commitment of mine is, in terms of my work in the future, is helping people to take a look at: "What are some specific evaluation activities and tools that they can use to look at some of those questions?"

TAFEE: What sort of training models will be used during the next ten years? Will the weekend workshop continue as a major training model, or do you see something else emerging to supplant that?

GOODMAN: I think it's going to depend partly on the economic setting in our country. I think most likely, weekend workshops will continue. Whether they continue with as much frequency as they are now is another question. I think there may be some point at which the field may be saturated, over-saturated with workshops, and in some

¹⁸Tentative title: The Search for Values in Health Education, by Donald Reed, Sidney B. Simon, and Joel Goodman, Prentice Hall. Publication date to be established.

¹⁹The saying goes "you can count the number of seeds in an apple, but you can't count the number of apples in a seed."

areas that's already occurred. It's not uncommon for me to run into a teacher who says: "Oh yeah, I know what values clarification is. We had a one hour in-service on it in 1971." So, I think there is some danger of over-saturation.

If the field can continue to expand and develop and stretch, then I think the weekend workshops will continue to go on, but I think it will need to change in order for that to happen.

My sense is that, and my hope is, that two other kinds of training programs will emerge. One is an on-going program. There are several universities that are developing (e.g., Union Graduate School) graduate programs which allow people to continue working and/or to draw on their own life experiences, and not attend in a formal sense, a full-time university. I imagine that there are going to be more and more people involved in those kinds of graduate and/or undergraduate programs. And one of my hopes is that a more on-going approach to values clarification training will come out of that, where people will, perhaps, attend a workshop and then have some sort of support and follow-through in an on-going kind of way as they try out some of their ideas and skills. And I think the local support group idea hopefully will burgeon as well.

The other kind of model I think will emerge if school systems pick up some funds for in-service training to enable a more systemic or systematic approach to faculty training to come about. And it won't be just the one day a year that's the superintendent's conference day, that everyone goes to and moans and groans, but that will go beyond that and have some real serious professional development programs within the public schools.

I'm not real clear on what kind of impact universities and colleges, in a traditional sense, will be having. I think their main contribution will probably come in training the trainers of trainers, or the educators of facilitators. I balk a little bit at the word "trainers."

TAFTEE: Have any provisions been made amongst the various leaders, as far as you know, towards planning the next few years in values clarification? Collectively, sitting down and thinking about: "these are some of the things that we should be doing during the next three or four or five years?"

GOODMAN: I don't think there's been any "pow-wow," other than the informal contacts that we do have with one another. For instance, here at NHEC, Howie, Barb, Margie, and myself, a number of times have taken a look at the future of NHEC, the future of humanistic education, and we've wrestled with a number of these issues in an informal way.

One of my personal hopes, in terms of my own job in the next year, is that I can help set up some "think tanks," where people in different fields would have a chance to come together and do some thinking about future directions. And certainly one of the think tanks I have in mind is setting one up for those interested in having some experience and background in values clarification.

At some point, I can envision having a national conference on values clarification, the goal of which would be partly to take a look where values clarification has been, where it is now, and

also to take a look at what are some future directions, and how can we get the resources together to head there? Right now, that's in the idea stage.

TAFFEE: What might the next few years hold relative to the widespread popularity of values clarification, which it has assumed since 1966, but more recently in the last four to six years or so, when it's caught on like wildfire? Is that growth going to continue? Do you think it will slow a bit, perhaps be reflected in other ways?

GOODMAN: I think it will vary with the area, and perhaps even within individual schools. In some places, I think there will be a growing commitment and people will become more and more involved and integrate values clarification into their school life. In other place, I think they'll probably perceive it as just another fad as something else comes down the pike and takes its place.

I'm surprised at how many people often find values clarification to be something new that they never heard of. I think there still is ground to be plowed in terms of introducing people to it. So I think there will probably be two conflicting and yet simultaneous directions: in some places it will die-out, phase-out, and in other places it'll grow.

And I think what's really crucial here is if it can go beyond the technique stage, if people can see beyond the technique stage, then it will grow. So I think that's one of the crucial challenges facing people in the field, is to find ways of communicating that it is more than a bunch of techniques.

TAFFEE: If I were to come back, or hunt you down at the Western Union office ten years from now, or wherever you might be, and having in that time had no contact with values clarification, and ask the question: "Gee, Joel, how have things gone in values clarification during the last ten years?" What would you like to be able to say? Ideally, what would you like to rattle-out?

GOODMAN: I'd like to rattle-out that people understand some of the theory and the guidelines, and that people are doing more thinking themselves about the theory and the guidelines.

I'd like to be able to say that people have integrated it and internalized the values clarification approach in their teaching, so that it isn't: "O.K., kids. For twenty minutes now we're going to do values clarification, and then it's back to. . . ."

And I think a third thing is, you know, that hopefully some of the research and evaluation questions will have been answered, new ones will have been generated--I guess that will probably be one of the most basic things that I hope: that some new and exciting questions would have been generated in the next ten years.

TAFFEE: What might an ideal picture of a classroom look like, that has been or is now using values clarification?

GOODMAN: The first notion that comes to mind is that the curriculum would be an emerging one, where at the beginning of the year the teacher would diagnose student's interests and concerns and values areas that they would like to focus on. And that during the course

of the year, in an on-going, step-by-step way, teacher and students would take time to look at these questions.

That students would have an opportunity to engage in "Sensitizing Modules," have a chance to go out into the "real world," so to speak, and test out some of their ideas.

Where the atmosphere of the classroom would really be free of "killer statements" and "put-downs," and where people would be excited to hear of other people's ideas and perceptions.

Where students would be responsible and interested in generating a lot of the curriculum themselves. They would be the one's asking the questions that they wanted to have answered. It's seemingly such a simple, but revolutionary idea, that students in addition to being responsible for giving answers can also ask some of the questions.

And that some of the guidelines that I think are important in values clarification would be a real operational part of the day: there would be a right to pass, and that people would listen to one another.

I can envision people in small groups at different times; different interest groups; moving in and out of them. A lot of laughter in the room, a lot of intense concentration, a lot of excitement, and a lot of people going home, thinking. When the bell rings at 3:30 they wouldn't fold-up their books and fold-up their minds, and wait until 8:30 the next morning to open them both back up again, but that people would be going out really talking to one another, and trying to get each other's ideas.

TAFEE: What is the greatest obstacle you see facing values clarification?

GOODMAN: I see two, at least right off-hand.

One would be what I call, for lack of a better word right now, the "charlatans"--people who really don't have a sound grounding in the theory and the guidelines, and who haven't internalized the values clarification approach, going around and teaching others it. And somehow misrepresenting it and using it unethically, and some of the examples I gave you earlier I think reflect how it could be used unethically.

The second major obstacle I could see, is what I call the "mouth-trap." And what I mean by that is a lot of school systems can pay really fine lip service to the goals and objectives that values clarification does, in fact, point towards. You know, any school system philosophy almost inevitably has some of the valuing skills in it: "helping students develop respect for one another," "helping students to make independent decisions," "helping students to think creatively." And I see one of the greatest obstacles being really confronting school systems with the discrepancy between what their mouths say, and what they in fact, do: time-wise, energy-wise, budget-wise. So I think we're going to have to build a better mouth-trap, to get at that.

In terms of something that would help overcome those obstacles, I think the increasing emphasis on theory and research, and evaluation and ethics, and moving away from techniques is

going to help. Whether it will be enough is one of the questions we'll take a look at ten years from now.

APPENDIX K

INTERVIEW WITH JOHN S. STEWART

INTERVIEW WITH JOHN S. STEWART

TAFFEE: How did your interest in the area of values education develop?

STEWART: Ever since I can remember, going back even into my youth, I've always been a searcher, and a seeker, and a questioner. And I've always been especially interested in human relationships and the affective aspects--as you know I don't dichotomize "cognitive" and "affective" and make real things out of them--but if we use those terms loosely, I've always been interested in the emotional and personal aspects of relationships, probably growing out of the horribly deprived and traumatic kind of childhood that I lived. But that's always been important to me, and in various ways I've been involved with that. And I suppose that's what led me originally into my undergraduate work in psychology, and my graduate work in psychology. Then I have worked in numerous areas in my life with juvenile offenders and with mentally ill people, and things like that, and so that provided part of the foundation. I've also had since I was a child an interest in the whole religious and spiritual aspects of existence. All of these things relate to everything that is really underneath all the kinds of things that anything to do with values represent.

Then getting more to the specific, when I was teaching high school back in '67, 8 and 9, in that period, I had an opportunity to work with high school students in these kinds of things and these kinds of areas. And at that point I began to get tremendously

interested in the whole business of values and moral development. Now at this point I had never heard of values clarification, or cognitive developmental psychology, or any of that stuff. So then when I decided to go back to school after many years, and came to Michigan State and started to look for an area of interest, and finally settled in education, my very special interest in the whole business of values and moral education and values and moral development started to surface again. And in searching around in the varieties of literature available both in psychology, philosophy and education, throughout these things I discovered values clarification and also other approaches. And also in the process I discovered Piaget and Kohlberg.

So that's a general, overall background statement of how I got into it in the first place. Now if you have anything specific to ask about that, go ahead.

TAFEE: I was just wondering, in what context you first encountered values clarification. Was it through the literature, a workshop, or what?

STEWART: As I recall, Steve, it was, I guess. . . . It was first of all by "word-of-mouth" in talking with people, particularly Ted Ward and the people associated with him.¹ They were very aware of and had been using values clarification approaches for quite some time. In fact, Ted Ward had been associated with Sid Simon back in

¹Reference to Dr. Ted Ward, College of Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

the middle and early sixties. I guess I presumed they were friends from what he told me in the exchange of correspondence I had.

So I guess my most important introduction to values clarification came through my very early contact with Ted Ward, and at the same time then, of course, I began to explore the literature. I suppose they came together, but Ted and other people there at the College of Education discussing it came slightly prior.

TAFEE: One of the things being talked about a little bit, I don't think it's being written about too much, is the possibility of down the pike, values clarification and Kohlberg and associates and their thinking, being merged in some way. Do you see that possibility?

STEWART: Well, in certain ways I see it already happening. In fact, in certain ways they were merged from the beginning. Some significant aspects of both those orientations are rooted in the same fundamental premises: the same generalized psychological and philosophical background. But both approaches go at the whole problem, for instance, of clarification, the induction of disequilibrium and getting people to become aware of their consistencies and inconsistencies, and questions and problems, seeking to explore them, reflecting on them, and attempting to bring some equilibrium to them. So both approaches always have been rooted in that kind of process.

Now that's something I haven't really seen stated explicitly in the literature, but I don't see how they're vastly different in that respect.

I guess a major place where I see the two could be integrated would be to explore what kinds of values clarification strategies and techniques would be most appropriate at various stages of development. So one could ask the question, for example: "Alright. Granted that values clarification is valid, and granted that seeking clarification of values is valid, and granted that the stage development theory seems to have some valid things to say about the way people develop in these areas, granted those things, one could interface the two approaches by saying 'Aha! the seeking of values clarification should have some bearing to the positive affective and other aspects of people's development.'" To put it another way, the way one would apply values clarification strategies seems to me would be influenced by the age of the child, by the, you know, age range and stage and orientation of the child.

If you were to use values clarification, for instance, in the third grade, you may use in some ways things that would be the same. But there ought to be some ways things would be different than using it in the twelfth grade, for example. Now I see a real opportunity for someone to make a contribution by attempting to integrate them in that way. That, in other words, would be an attempt to make values clarification developmental. I see a tremendous opportunity for an integration there.

TAFFEE: Do you see any points between the two which, at this point, might appear to be irreconcilable?

STEWART: Yes. The most significant one is the issue of relativism. That's the point on which I see the most conflict and possibly the least basis for integration.

TAFTEE: Any others?

STEWART: Even if I named others, I think that a probing of them would show them to be fairly superficial. In other words, there are points. . . . Let me make this clear first. I don't think they have to be significantly different in this area, but I think at this point in history they are. I would say the values clarification approach largely focuses on what we call "content," whereas the cognitive developmental approach, which is the structural developmental approach, puts the greater emphasis on "structure." Now recognizing that you're familiar with those terms and what they mean technically, anyone with a reasonable amount of intelligence would immediately recognize, of course, that they're not distinct entities, and that people don't function compartmentalized, and that "content" and "structure" are intimately related to each other, and intimately related to something that most approaches consider important, and that's "processes" or "function." Now I would see that one thing that needs to be done, is that the developmentalists need to give greater recognition to the meaning and importance of "content," and the values clarification people need to give greater meaning and importance to the relationship of "content" to underlying "structure."

Now there's another opportunity for integration, too. So at the superficial level, that could look like an irreconcilable problem. But I think that's ridiculous. I think they are reconcilable, and especially at deeper levels.

However, there is a problem. Education, as we have talked about many times, seems to be characterized by an addiction to fads. Now we know that for years values clarification has been accepted by many people, partly as a fad. I don't mean all people. But, there are a lot of people who have accepted it as a fad, and don't really have any in-depth understanding of it.

The same thing, Steve, is already happening for a couple of years, but you really can't see it, with Kohlberg's theories. There are people out there accepting it, and they don't even know what it's about. They haven't explored it--just very superficial acceptance of it. So there's a tremendous ground swell of a fad already underway with the Kohlberg stuff.

Now one of the main problems is that educators by and large, unreflectively grab on to the fads, get committed to them, become defensive about them, and sometimes close off opportunities to see things at a deeper level where integrations can take place.

So the two approaches have been set-up against each other in many ways, that forces people to choose one or the other rather than saying: "what do they have to say in terms of looking at the problems of education?" That fadism orientation in education I would see as one of the main hurdles to overcome if we're ever going to make any integration of this in an in-depth way.

TAFEE: Another critic of values clarification has been Alan Lockwood. One of the points that he brings up in his criticism is that values clarification is "therapy," and Raths and others issue all sorts of disclaimers to the contrary, saying it is not "therapy."² What are your thoughts on that subject?

STEWART: O.K. That's a very good question, and I do want to respond to that. I suppose in order to respond, we must first get a handle on what we mean by "therapy."

Generally, the word "therapy" has been associated with illness. So one of the reasons why the values clarification people may reject the claim that it's therapy, is because they see therapy in that context. In fact, even in the 1966 book there are explicit disclaimers in there about not using it in cases of emotional problems and stuff.³ So there is a definite rejection of values clarification as "therapy," but within that very limited definition of "therapy."

Now if we look at "therapy" in a different way, if we look at "therapy" as anything that has to do with bringing change to a situation, with the implication that if there is change needed there is something wrong in the first place, then values clarification and other kinds of educational devices and approaches do have a therapeutic element. Now from that perspective, I don't

²Alan L. Lockwood, "A Critical View of Values Clarification," Teachers College Record, 77, 1 (September, 1975), 35-50.

³Reference to Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin, and Sidney B. Simon, Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, Inc., 1960).

see how any approach in education can fail to have "therapeutic" elements and moments when it may be more "therapy" than anything else.

So, I think the claim that values clarification does not have a "therapeutic" element, or some aspect of "therapy" contained in it, would be to not see the whole picture, and not see a deeper meaning to the concept of "therapy."

I also believe from what I've heard, that there are people in therapeutic circles who are applying values clarification. So I agree with Lockwood, but I want to qualify it with those other statements.

TAFFEE: Do you have any notions about how values clarification has affected the lives of those people who have been trained in it and use it?

STEWART: The people that are "trained in it and use it." Now, let me ask you, do you mean the professionals that make the circuit or the teachers in schools?

TAFFEE: Mostly the teachers in schools.

STEWART: Oh, alright. Because I can address myself to that very clearly.

I think that one of the main things that values clarification has brought to the field is a general opening up and warming up of the educational environment. I think that it would be difficult to be exposed to something like values clarification with the

tremendous legacy of traditional education and all its rigidity and formalism. . . . I think it would be difficult to be exposed to something like values clarification without it doing a number of things.

For instance, it opening you up to other things and beginning to help you be aware of some of the problems in traditional education, a general tendency to look more at the humanistic and some of the emotional aspects of education as opposed to just the transmission of information, and I guess, as much as anything, if values clarification has had any effect and can have any effect, surely for a lot of people it has helped them become more self-reflective. If we ever needed anything in education, it certainly is that.

So I would say that values clarification has definitely affected the lives of teachers in the field, by forcing them to look at some of those things, and forcing themselves to look at themselves, instead of just the students, in the process.

TAFEE: Do you have any evidence or feelings about whether or not values clarification might have had some detrimental effects?

STEWART: Yes. I do have some evidence, having observed it in the schools, and also talking with a lot of teachers who have used it.

I've directed myself a little bit about some of these in the article in the Kappan that I wrote, but one of the detrimental effects that I've seen is that values clarification can lead to some of the things that it actually wants not to do and claims not

to do.⁴ That is in the issue of peer conformity and peer influence. There are certain aspects of the values clarification strategies and techniques that force people to do things that can actually be for the sake of conforming, rather than for clarification.

There is another point I was going to make that I think is harmful--oh yes, I also mentioned this in the article, and I consider this very serious. By forcing sensitive children and teenagers into making public claims, public statements can bring about premature foreclosure on the ideas, and can bring about people becoming committed to things that they may not be really committed to, but once having made public statements and going on record, there is an effect there and I think that is a danger.

I also think that since most people don't reflect on deeper meanings, that values clarification can have the detrimental effect of actually selling a totally relativistic approach to values and morality. So yes, I do think there are some detrimental things in the picture.

TAFTEE: In what ways, John, do you think the theory or the representation of the theory of values clarification has changed since the publication of Values and Teaching in 1966?

STEWART: Well, to be honest with you, the only change in it that I

⁴John S. Stewart, "Clarifying Values Clarification: A Critique," Phi Delta Kappan, 56, 10 (June, 1975), 684-688.

see is what Howie Kirschenbaum has done. In none of the other literature have I seen any change.⁵

TAFTEE: Do you think what he has proposed is significant, or is it just "cosmetic?"

STEWART: Some of what he's doing I see as definitely more than "cosmetic." I see it as very significant. Let me get a point out here and I think I can illustrate what I mean.

One of the things that he, I think, has done a very good service on--he's one of the few people I've seen address himself to the problem of Raths' processes as "criteria." Howie has some of the same concerns I have. You know, if you apply those seven criteria, you have to start asking questions like: "How many times constitutes making it a 'value?' How 'proud?' How do you determine these kinds of things?" And some of his work in the area, I think is very serious. He talks of "processes" primarily as eliminates the "criteria."

But he moves, in my opinion, even more to what I call an "idiographic" or relativistic approach. In a way, he eliminates the "absolute" part of it, without moving to a "universal" orientation, but becomes purely relative. He's overwhelmingly process oriented.

Now another contribution he's made, is to move values clarification out of the peculiar conflict that it has had. In

⁵Howard Kirschenbaum, "Beyond Values Clarification," Readings in Values Clarification, ed. by Sidney B. Simon and Howard Kirschenbaum (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973).

the 1966 book, Steve, the so-called "cognitive" aspects are emphasized and values clarification is presented as a "rational" approach. But strangely enough, values clarification over the years has been far more identified with the humanistic orientation and the affective. Now that's always fascinated me.

Now Howie Kirschenbaum, in his article, in the copy that I have on page ninety-eight for instance, he moves values clarification away from a "cognitive" to an integrated "cognitive-affective" orientation.⁶ So again I would list that as a contribution that he's making.

I think he's reformulated the theory along humanistic existential lines, and has improved it. But he has not grappled with or even acknowledged the relativism or other problems. He has made values and valuing so broad and general as to not be distinctive or conceptually distinct, clear, or explicit. However, I do think that what he's doing is deep, not cosmetic, and I would love to see him go on and develop it and really wrestle with the problems.

TAFTEE: You've said that you believe that in some respects the theory of values clarification is more consistent with its affective bases, e.g., Howie Kirschenbaum's recommendations. Do you see any evidence to suggest that the practice, the strategies being used in classrooms are more affective than they were in '66?

⁶Ibid.

STEWART: Hmm. I can really only speculate since I wasn't even aware of values clarification at that point. It didn't seem used at that point.

If I were to guess, I would guess "Yes, that's probably true." My guess is that values clarification moved more and more away from a so-called, purely "rational" and "cognitive" approach, because it came along in that middle and late sixties when the whole thrust was away from that and against the post-Sputnik era, into a general, humanistic, affective orientation, if you recall that period. And I think values clarification came to be identified with the affective rather than the cognitive, in spite of the fact that it was designed as a rational and cognitive kind of approach to reflecting on values, you know, it's allegedly rooted in doing.

But you see, this really speaks seriously to that whole idiotic idea of dichotomizing these things in the first place. Because you know, human beings function as organismic, integrated wholes, and not "cognitively" and "affectively."

TAFEE: In the book by John Meyer, Brian Burnham and John Cholvat, that came out of the Canadian conference, Larry Kohlberg has an article in which he responds in part to some of what Howie Kirschenbaum had to say at that conference, and one of the things he talks about is the distinction between "morals" and "values."⁷ How do you distinguish between the two.

⁷Lawrence Kohlberg, "The Relationship of Moral Education to the Broader Field of Values Education," Values Education, Theory/Practice/Problems/Prospects, ed. by John Meyer, Brian Burnham and John Cholvat (Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1975).

STEWART: Oh, yes. If we assume that human beings--now I don't want to say, "have values," because I don't know exactly what that means--if human beings are constantly engaging in valuing processes, and every moment of our lives we are making "valuations" to use Dewey's term . . . you and I, you are probably sitting down. I am. My organism, my whole mind and everything else, is subtly and probably subconsciously evaluating the stability, for instance, of the chair I am sitting in: constantly reading the environment and evaluating it. Now we "have," if you want to use that term just for speaking purposes, let's say we have many kinds of values. We have "biological" and "physiological values;" we have "psychomotor values;" we have "cognitive" and "affective values;" all those kinds of things.

Well, in another dimension, we also have "political values," "interpersonal values," "religious values," "economic values"--these kinds of things. Now we also have "moral values." So I see the term "values" as covering a broad arena of behavior, which incorporates different kinds of values, and I see "moral values" as a subset.

In other words, when you engage in moral judgments, you are making moral valuations. If I go out, and if I decide whether one typewriter is better than another, that's a valuation that has nothing to do with morality. So you can make value judgments that are not moral value judgments, but you can't make moral value judgments that aren't value judgments. So moral values are a part of the whole, broad arena.

And that's one of the reasons why in my own writings, in the later writings, I use that little devise of "values/morals." Moral values are a subset of the larger arena of values.

TAFEE: If I recall Kohlberg's article correctly, one of the things that he was criticizing values clarification for, was that it dealt with what might be called "non-moral values" to the exclusion of "moral values." Would you agree with that criticism?

STEWART: I wouldn't phrase it that way. What I would say is that values clarification treats the whole subject indiscriminately. In other words, it approaches the whole field of values without making the distinctions of what kinds of things are what. So it isn't that it gets into "non-moral values" and excludes "moral values." I don't see anywhere in the literature where the v.c. people even make the distinction. So it really gets into all areas, including moral ones.

A lot of the strategies, for instance that strategy about the fall-out shelter, how you can see that as anything other than moral, I don't know.⁸ There are moral decisions that are being made there. The thing is that it's not explicit. It doesn't call them that. So Larry's criticism may be based on the fact that the v.c. literature doesn't explicitly deal in those terms. But it certainly gets into many realms, including morals.

⁸See Strategy #48, in Sidney B. Simon, Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum, Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students (New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1972).

TAFFEE: Do you have any notions, John, about what the next ten years might hold in regard to the widespread popularity that values clarification has enjoyed?

STEWART: Yes, I think as a "fad" it has already peaked, it is already over the hill. I've noticed in recent meetings, and if you look at the literature you will see that there's a significant drop-off in the number of articles about, by and referring to values clarification. So as a fad, it's already way over the peak, and is already dropping down.

Now at a deeper level, a lot of the things of values clarification have probably already become an inherrent part of the behavior of teachers. I suspect that those who were most deeply affected by it, have simply incorporated it into their whole approach, and it's now a part of it.

So I see two different trends: as a fad it would continue to drop-off and drop-out and level-out, and maybe even disappear. So I would predict that ten years from now, people will look back on it and talk about it the way we do other things that took place in education a long time ago. However, that won't mean that it will have dropped out of existence. If values clarification, as any other educational approach, has any enduring meaning and deep meaning, it should become a part of the everyday practice of people, rather than a special thing set-off.

So I would see that as a bad thing. As a matter of fact, its passing into oblivion as a fad may actually enhance its

capability of becoming part of the mainstream of education, which is, if I were a values clarifier, that's what I would want to see happen. But I think the tremendous amount of special attention that it has received will continue to diminish, and it will eventually not get that kind of attention.

You also, in order to see where values clarification is going to go, have to take a look where other elements of education and education in general, and our society are going. At the moment, there is a real split in the educational community. There are people reacting violently against the excesses of the late sixties and early seventies, and are swinging "back to the basics" and all this kind of stuff. There's a tremendous element of people out there that are very anti-anything that's called "affective" or identified with "affective." On the other hand, there are those who still believe as they have for the last ten years, that that's the area that requires the greatest amount of attention. I see a great split on this, and these elements moving more away from each other than together.

I think that education is in serious crisis, and within the next five to ten years, there are going to have to be either some very dramatic changes, or a continued falling off of the credibility and importance of education or schooling as we now know it will occur.

Now that has an implication for values clarification, and I feel that values clarification, at the moment, could go into oblivion along with some other so-called "humanistic" things, simply

because of the reaction against them. There's a very conservative swing in the country, and it seems very obvious in education. And that could, of course, cause people to reject the positive aspects of values clarification, without even bothering to find out what it's all about.

TAFTEE: Following up on that, what can humanistic educators or values clarifiers, or people in that general area, do to perhaps offset those types of forces?

STEWART: A number of things. First of all, they're going to have to stop talking and sounding like "whishy-washy humanists." They're going to have to start really looking at deeply what humanism is: "What does humanism mean? What are the implications of humanism?" and see that the implications of a humanistic approach have more meaning at a deeper level than they do necessarily in sticking with some of the things they make big issues out of. Humanism in general, philosophically, religiously, and other ways, is being seriously called into question. There's no question about it. In every arena that I have been reading in the last half year, humanism is on the defensive, and is being viewed as "bankrupt."

Now this means that people who are humanistically oriented are going to have to find new ways of looking at the problem, abandon some of the whishy-washy aspects, some of the superficial orientations, and abandon maybe even some of the jargon involved in it, and move it to a different and deeper level if it is to remain around.

Right now, it's a bad word. If you go into a school, or if you go among principals, parents, or some other educational circles at the moment, and identify yourself as a humanist, you might not even get to say anything. Now somehow that's got to be faced. You can't just plow your way through that kind of thing. You have to be sensitive to that.

And I guess the greatest thing that I would see necessary here then, would be for the so-called "humanistic educators" to become more reflective, more philosophical, and attempt to deepen and integrate their views, instead of being so defensive about them.

TAFEE: What sort of issues do you think values clarification should be dealing with between now and 1986?

STEWART: Oh, boy. . . . Well, some of them we've already talked about. One, we don't even need to discuss further, it's fully identified. One would be an integration of values clarification with the developmental approach. I see that as a must.

Two, the kinds of things we were just talking about: a reflection on a philosophical relativistic, humanistic base, as a way of reformulating it, strengthening it, and moving it along, instead of staying with it as it is.

I think it's also going to have to come to grips with something that I peculiarly highlight in all my work, and that is the fact that the answer or the answers to this whole problem of values clarification and other forms of values and moral development are getting at, are not going to be solved by pedagogy

and technology and strategies and gimmicks, and that kind of thing. But we're going to have to ultimately get at, Steve, and I mean all of us: the v.c.r.'s, the developmentalist's and everybody else--I think we're eventually going to have to say: "Look, technology's fine, pedagogy's fine, curriculum's fine--but we got to start doing something about changing the overall nature of education and educational environments and educational administration, and all those kinds of things," because that's where the really serious problems are, and I think that's where the mainstream of education is, and I don't think that's going to come about by constantly going on, developing strategies.

So that leads me to the main point I would make about this: if values clarification is going to remain around and have an enduring impact, I think it's got to move above and beyond the technology, pedagogy, strategies. In other words, I guess what we need, is to stop working and creating more strategies and start saying: "Hey. What does values clarification say about the whole problem? How would we bring the importance of values clarification, and the main messages of values clarification to bear on principals and teachers and parents, so that they can begin to see a deeper and more complete picture of education?"

Now this bears on what I said before then. I guess there's where values clarification will probably either rise or fall. If it continues to develop more techniques and strategies and add to what it already has, I think it will eventually die. If it moves up to a larger level, and begins to get at some of the deeper

problems, then it may be able to stay around in a reformulated way, and make a different kind of contribution.

TAFFEE: I think we've already hit on this, John, but just to shore it up and make it definite, what sort of research in values clarification would you like to see completed by 1986?

STEWART: Hmm. Well, it's a damn hard area to do research in.

I would like to see one kind of research that would try to get at, really objectively as much as possible, looking at the claims of values clarification to see if there's really foundation for them: do teachers who use these techniques and strategies and this approach really bring about any changes that are either meaningful, or wouldn't these come about otherwise? In other words, are the basic claims of the values clarification people justifiable, defensible and legitimate? That has never been done, and we really don't know. The great challenge there, of course, is how in the hell do you sort out the variables, but I suspect that some of those things can be done.

And by the way, I'm not holding now, as you know, for a hard-and-fast, so-called "scientific," "empirical" approach to that problem. You can do the kind of research I'm talking about, not necessarily from the kinds of rigid, "control groups" and stuff that has been so prevalent in education, and attempts to be looking like the natural sciences. I don't mean that. I mean research in "naturalistic" settings, using anthropological approaches: going out into the schools and devising ways of actually observing,

analyzing, and evaluating what's happening, with attempts to sort out some of the variables, knowing that you'll never be able to completely do it. But surely there must be some way to validate some of the claims.

Now if they would do that, then that research in itself would begin to be informative about what other kinds of research to conceptualize, in order to reconstruct values clarification theory and practice along the lines I mentioned before. So this would make it more powerful and more meaningful.

So that's one area of research that I guess I see as the primary thing that it needs to do, but not to defend itself, but to clarify itself. And I don't really see people doing that.

Values clarification seems to be committed at this point to classroom use, and I would like to see it branch-out and do some research, and ask the kinds of questions: "How can values clarification begin to get at the problems of the schools, as opposed to just the classroom?" In other words, "How can it contribute to looking at the problems and also at approaching them?" And that claim is made because, as you know, I claim that the overwhelming impact of the schools on the values and moral development of the children comes from the way the people live in the school. And that's what I'd like to see values clarification begin to take a look at instead of more strategies for teachers to use with kids.

Now that involves a lot of research, but I think the v.c. people could bring a perspective to that that would be extremely valuable.

TAFTEE: Whom do you see as playing key or influential roles in values clarification during the next ten years or so?

STEWART: That's difficult for me to answer, since I don't move in those circles.

With qualifications, I'd say Howie Kirschenbaum, for one. If he continues to do the kinds of things he said he was going to do last year, if he's going to continue to do that kind of stuff, I can see him emerging as a major leader.

I haven't talked with you about what you're doing. You, as far as I'm concerned, have one of the finest minds and are one of the deepest people in the whole damn field. So I would say if you decide to stay in that area, and do some of these kinds of things we've been talking about, you could make a tremendous contribution.

TAFTEE: Oh. Thank you.

STEWART: I have met, through Heidi Wilkins, Joel Goodman, and he looked like a pretty solid fellow.⁹ Now I don't know what he's doing. I don't know if he's just teaching the existing strategies or working with it. I don't know if he's working in the area of new developments.

Now I don't know if my inability to completely answer your question beyond that is because I don't move in those circles, or

⁹Heidi Wilkins is a teacher in the Walled Lake Public Schools in Michigan, Joel Goodman is on the staff of the National Humanistic Education Center, Saratoga Springs, N.Y., and was one of the other experts interviewed.

it's because it's not happening and I haven't seen it in the literature. It's possible that there's nobody taking that long-range view.

TAFFEE: As you look at yourself and your own role in values education, John, what sort of things do you see down the pike for yourself, and will any of those visions cause you to cross paths with values clarification?

STEWART: Oh, I think it's really possible. What's happened to me in the last year, Steve, is that I've delved more deeply into the whole business about this problem that I was alluding to earlier: the problem of getting at the construction and re-construction of educational environments and approaches along more, what I call "democratic, developmental" lines. I see that as a must. I've got tremendously interested in the whole exploration of the relationship between democracy and development, the relationships of democracy development, community, justice, morality, the human mind and all these kinds of things. So I see my own interests at the moment, are in making a long-range and in-depth study with other people in the field, of the nature of educational environments and approaches in terms of the massive impact they have on the development of children and the adults in the system.

So I'm trying to go at it from a different scope. In other words, I have moved even more away from being tremendously interested in--I'm not rejecting the contributions of pedagogy and technology and curriculum, they're all important--but I see more

and more the problems of our society and especially as reflected in our school systems as being as a much deeper and a much higher level than that, and I'm interested in that. I want to continue to explore those kinds of things, but particularly, how to integrate democracy and development, and how can we begin to change our educational systems into democratic, developmental systems.

Now to whatever extent values clarification people are interested in that, or are trying to get at some of those problems, I'd see a great opportunity there. I don't know.

In all frankness, the main problem I have with people who identify themselves as humanistic educators, and values clarification people, is that they're primarily in the unreflective, practical aspects of it, and don't want to look at the deeper problems, and actually reject theory and philosophy and reflection, and in many ways are rejecting the very things they claim that it is all about. So I have a hard time relating to that. I see you as somewhat of an exception in the field. I see you not only willing to look at those problems, but interested in looking at those problems. But I don't find that generally in the people from that particular orientation. They seem to not see the value of those things. They see it as abstract crap, you know, and the "ivory tower," and that's not what I'm talking about at all.

TAFEE: One last question, and that is: "If I were to call you up ten years from now, wherever you might be, and ask you what has happened, John? I've been away for the last ten years, and what

has happened in this whole area of values education, and whatever became of that thing called values clarification?" What would you like to be able to say to me?

STEWART: I'd like to be able to say that it saw its own limitations and problems, and changed, for if we keep on going this way we're going to die. How can we grow? How can we get at these questions? What will it take to do that? We've got to apply the basic principles of values clarification to ourselves and our own theories and hunches. We've got to seek clarification and be willing to accept criticism, and be willing to grow from that criticism.

So I would love to be able to say ten years from now: "Hey. Values clarification outgrew its infancy, survived its childhood and youth, and is now become really serious, really mature, and very deep, and now is tackling things much more profoundly and with greater depth, is able to make really significant claims about what it's doing, and it's constantly changing." I would like to be able to make that claim.

As it is, I see values clarification clinging too much to what it already was, as it was developed, and is going on and generating more content instead of reformulating. So ten years from now, I'd like to say: "Yeah. It grew-up. It did rebuild or reformulate and it's better than it ever was." I would not predict that that will happen.

If I had to predict, I'd predict it won't happen, and it will by and large die and be forgotten by most people, and will

have been unconsciously incorporated into the general behavior of those who have got into it more deeply.

TAFFEE: Is there anything else that you'd like to comment upon?

STEWART: Ah--yes. Let's see . . . a couple things.

I'd like to possibly see if it sheds light on some of these things by making a differentiation between two aspects of values clarification as it's presently constituted. Now just tentatively, let's differentiate between "strategies" and "process methodology."

I think the greatest emphasis has been and continues to be on the building of strategies. Now I think that what's going to be necessary is that we incorporate the general orientation of clarification into one's teaching style and process. In other words, to bring inquiry, examination and exploration into the picture. So to phrase it another way: to incorporate the general orientation of clarification into one's teaching style and process is to bring inquiry, examination, and exploration into the picture.

The kinds of clarifying responses, for example, that are contained in the v.c. literature, establish a general pattern that asks teachers and students both to engage in positive and constructive reflection. In other words, the process methodology of v.c. can be incorporated into any person's style, into any subject matter or classroom, in ways that are tremendously supportive of the kinds of educational experiences that lead to growth and development. So consequently, I would recommend a greater emphasis on this aspect, rather than on the strategies aspect.

The latter are good or can be good in certain circumstances and in the hands of competent and responsible educators. But they have problems and limitations that make them not as useful and powerful as the overall and pervasive kind of orientation on that the process methodology involves. So if that differentiation is useful, it may get at some of the kinds of things we've been talking about.

Now another thing is, and we've already talked about this, some of the leaders and others on the v.c. arena seem to resent and reject criticism, no matter how constructive it might be. Scientists and philosophers grow as people and develop their knowledge and theories partly through subjecting their ideas to vigorous professional criticism. Generally speaking, I see this dimension absent in the larger field of humanistic education, and the smaller dimension that defines values clarification.

Now I see this as a very serious problem, because values clarification by its definition and nature, should seek this kind of clarification, and in fact, if it's going to espouse the ideas contained in its framework, it has a moral and professional obligation to seek and receive professional clarification and criticism.

Sid Simon's answer to my article in the Kappan, is both manifestation and symbol of this claim.¹⁰ For some reason, which I wish I understood, Steve, too many educators and values clarifiers are incredibly defensive. Simon's brief reaction illustrates much

¹⁰See "Sidney Simon's Response," Phi Delta Kappan, 56, 10 (June, 1975), 688.

of this. Not only does it reject the substances of the criticism and questions contained in my article, it violates all the principles of humanism and values clarification. He reacts personally and defensively to the critique. He's never met me, but he jumps to all kinds of conclusions about me as a person and professional. He side-steps any attempts at clarification, and even implies that I haven't worked with teachers and children.

Now, what I think Simon needs to ask himself, and all humanists and values clarifiers need to ask, is: "How does this reconcile with the basic tenets of values clarification and humanism?" One of the things I'm leading up to, is saying: I see as a very bad sign, the fact that the values clarification people have not publicly responded to his answer to me. I see that as a bad sign. I feel that the v.c. theory would call for values clarifiers to publicly affirm their basic humanism by speaking out about the inhumane, unjust, and unclarifying manner in which Simon, the acknowledged leader of the field, reacted to that article. Now I see this as important, because many other people have given me anecdotes about the way he is out of the workshop, and the way he treats people.

Well, the deep point here is, that if the main people in v.c., the leaders and the people who are working with it everyday, don't see that as a problem, then they haven't seen all the other things that you and I have been talking about that I think are necessary if they want to stay alive.

The point of all that I've just said, was that the people in it have got to start looking at it, rather than just running away with its success.

There's no question, it has and it could continue to make a very powerful contribution. But I don't think it's going to last, unless it takes some drastic changes along the lines that we've talked about.

APPENDIX L

INTERVIEW WITH ALAN L. LOCKWOOD

INTERVIEW WITH ALAN L. LOCKWOOD

TAFFEE: I'm interested, first of all, in how did your interest in values education first develop?

LOCKWOOD: Well, it came about through my work with the Harvard Public Issues Series. I don't know if you know that curriculum. Don Oliver and Fred Newman were the main creators of it.¹

I was a high school social studies teacher before I became a doctoral student, and so the values education interest largely came about through trying to think about citizenship education. And their curriculum has this complicated view of "public policy issues," and ways of analyzing the values components in them and helping kids develop clear policy positions, which include defensible value claims; and for them to take seriously the value issues and how they come up in particular situations. And so then I was working with Oliver, and Kohlberg came to Harvard while I was there. And his psychology in particular--I hadn't thought much about the philosophical aspects of his stages--but the psychological theory, in particular, the notion that the research on "comprehension of preference:" the suggestion that kids have difficulty understanding concepts that are stages above their own, seemed to be very powerful. Because in using public policy materials, we found that kids really were having a lot of problems integrating into their own heads, the approach. They could learn specific

¹Donald W. Oliver and Fred M. Newmann, The Public Issues Series (Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press, 1967-72).

discussion techniques and so on, but the rationale for the Harvard public issues stuff is pitched at Stage Five and Six in Kohlberg terms. And a lot of the discussion operations assume that kids can think like Supreme Court judges.

And so at first, we thought Kohlberg's stuff looked real helpful to explain why so many children couldn't really get "into," if that's the right word, but fully comprehend why they were doing public issues. And then I began to work more with Kohlberg, and read more, learn more. . . .

So that's sort of, in a rough way, how I got into it.

TAFEE: I see. Within that, how did you come to an interest in values clarification?

LOCKWOOD: When I was still a doctoral student in 1968, some colleagues of mine and I were in the process of trying to get better understandings of how we wanted to treat value issues in social studies. And their book, the first book, Values and Teaching, which I think was in '66, that's when I first read it, was in '68.² And we looked up that approach and found it not very helpful. Some of the methods, techniques, and so on were O.K., but theoretically, it seemed very inadequate for what we were trying to do.

So that's when I first encountered the approach. And then it just kept being "thrown in your face" all the time as it became

²Louis E. Rath, Merrill Harmin, and Sidney B. Simon, Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1966).

increasingly popular. And "true believers" of that particular school would be making certain kinds of claims and so on.

But I think we also--I'm not sure if I could document this to myself--I think we felt that people were accepting the values clarification stuff to the exclusion of somewhat more difficult approaches, but I think more defensible. That is, that Kohlberg wasn't getting enough play in people's minds as far as I was concerned. It was as though the values clarification version of values education had driven everything else out of people's minds. And that was kind of bothersome to me as the years went along.

TAFEE: On that line, do you see any possibility in the next ten years perhaps, that people from the Kohlberg school of thought and people from the values clarification area, might work cooperatively?

LOCKWOOD: Yes, I do. I'll tell you why.

Although I don't know if you've read any of this stuff I've written, actually it's only a couple of things out, a lot of other critiques of values clarification I've done are in press, but I'm not real fond of it as an approach, for various reasons. But the virtues that it has can be blended quite nicely into the Kohlberg or the moral reasoning approach--I don't know if we want to call it just the "Kohlberg" approach, because there are a lot of things that are troublesome with his particular curricula as well.

But yes, I think so. I don't know whether Sidney Simon, if you think in terms of what is the probability of any personalities

from the two schools working together. . . . I've never met Sidney. I've written to him a few times. My impression is that he is going pretty much towards the affective education, more "therapeutic," group-interaction approach. And I know in some of the things I've read, he doesn't even seem to quite understand what this charge of "ethical relativism" is all about. So I have a feeling that there's not much chance that he, personally, will ever really try to take the Kohlberg stuff very seriously.

But on the other hand, Howard Kirschenbaum, I think is a man who can understand the Kohlberg stuff and may, although he's more research oriented in terms of developing curriculum and so on, I think he, if he develops an interest in trying to merge the two, would be able to work with Kohlberg-types.

Merrill Harmin--I've had some correspondence with him. . . . Did you read that critique I wrote of values clarification?

TAFEE: In the Teachers' College Record? Yes, I did.³

LOCKWOOD: O.K. As a result of that, Harmin--he and I have been corresponding a little bit, and in some of his letters, he is trying to tell me about this kind of "split" in the values clarification group. It's not a significant split, it's more a matter of emphasis.

In the materials that he's developing now, and the things that he does, they're more toward public policy questions, and less

³Alan L. Lockwood, "A Critical View of Values Clarification," Teachers College Record, 77, 1 (September, 1975), 35-50.

toward the kind of, what I call the "therapeutic, self-understanding, self-esteem development approach," which I think Sidney is into.

So Harmin is one who I think could work at making some merging of the Kohlberg stuff. But that's a guess.

It really requires, as far as I'm concerned, that the initiative for that merger is going to have to come from the Kohlberg people. This may sound kind of patronizing, but I think that the values clarification folk, by and large, really don't understand the Kohlberg stuff. It takes an awful, awful long time of study, and so on, to really get a good enough understanding of it to see how you work it in practice.

So my feeling would be that the Kohlberg people, like Edwin Fenton or Anne Colby--Colby has written some about how the two can be brought together--and Kohlberg certainly feels that the two can work together as well--so I think if these folks take the initiative, it's more likely to occur that curriculum materials merging the two approaches can come out.⁴

There's no motivation, really, for the values clarifiers to, as I see it anyway, try to make that merge. They're doing really well, and they're busier than hell. So. . . .

TAFEE: How about yourself? Would you be interested in working on that?

⁴See Anne Colby, Review of Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom, by Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin, and Sidney B. Simon, and Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students, by Sidney B. Simon, Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum, Harvard Educational Review, 45, 1 (February, 1975), 134-143.

LOCKWOOD: Yes, I am to an extent. I'm developing curricula.

I've written a little book called Moral Reasoning: The Value of Life, which is consistent with the Kohlberg stuff. But I'm now trying to expand my curriculum work.⁵

The things of values clarification that can be employed are a lot of the techniques of getting kids to listen to one another, to take other roles, and there's things you can take from values clarification that a lot of them are just good class-room pedagogy, and put with the Kohlberg stuff.

What is probably irreconcilable in the two approaches, is that the Kohlberg approach is trying to focus exclusively on the "moral" issues per se, and the current state of values clarification mixes "moral" and "non-moral" value considerations all in the same pile. And until the values clarification people say: "Look, there's a difference between people deciding whether they want to go to the movies or listen to a concert--there's a difference between that kind of value choice, and a value choice which deals with the question of whether 'mercy-killing' ought to be legalized," until they're willing to make that kind of distinction, say: "Look, those are both values questions but they're of a very different order," then I don't see much of a possibility of any significant merging of the two. And they don't, at the moment, really take seriously this kind of point that I've tried to make in my article and so on.

⁵Alan L. Lockwood, Moral Reasoning: The Value of Life (Columbus: Ohio: Xerox, 1972).

TAFFEE: I hear in your examples of moral and non-moral issues, implicit definitions of the word "moral," and the word "value."

LOCKWOOD: That's right.

TAFFEE: Could you just quickly "nutshell" what those two are?

LOCKWOOD: Well, yes and no. I can tell you that it's a very difficult problem to make a clear definition. I've struggled with that for a year or so. You can give examples, I think.

For example, the non-moral value realm consists of preferential decisions, which deal with, say, aesthetics: what do you like? personal career choices; instrumental value decisions usually, you know: "would it be better for me to go to college, or would it be better for me to take a few years off? Which would be best at helping me get clear about what I want to do in my life?" You know, the selection of means questions, are generally considered to be non-moral.

But moral values decisions on the other hand, are roughly those that deal with decisions that fundamentally affect the rights of other people, and certain kinds of rights that others have, like "life," "liberty," "property," "autonomy" and so on. So that the moral value realm is a subset of what you'd call the realm of "values." There are more non-moral values issues in the world than there are moral values issues in the world.

But on the other hand, while there's this select little domain of moral values issues, because the moral decisions that are

made seriously affect the rights and welfare of other people, it's very important that those be made in sort of responsible, careful, defensible ways.

In the non-moral value realm, say in the realm of aesthetics, whether you like Picasso or Mondrian or something--we don't care quite that much. You know, we sort of really don't mind if someone says: "Well, I just like it and so I'm going to buy it," or if you like chocolate ice cream as opposed to vanilla--it's hard to get really worked up about people's preferences in that domain. You don't really care if they're relativistic or subjectivistic. There's not a lot of social interest in how they make those decisions. And it's not clear that fundamental human rights are going to be violated if they prefer chocolate ice cream or vanilla, or if they'd rather want to be a doctor, an engineer, or unemployed.

TAFEE: Could you describe what, in your mind, would constitute a "responsible decision-making" mechanism for moral decisions, moral issues?

LOCKWOOD: I can't do it in a real elaborate way.

The first thing I would say is the making of defensible moral decisions, one of the things you want to have happen, or I want to have happen, is that they think seriously. They take into account in their decision-making certain, what we might call, "morally relevant considerations." So that you ask yourself such questions as: "Are fundamental rights of other people going to be affected by my decision?" You ask such questions as: "What are the

implications of my decision for similar situations, analagous situations? Is it right if I make a decision on the basis of my self-interest--am I also willing to say that other people can make their decisions that way?" So that's kind of a variation of thinking of Kant's categorical imperative. "Are you willing to, if you've made a particular decision in the moral domain, if you change roles with other persons in that situation, would you be satisfied? Would it be defensible if you're on the receiving end of the decision you made?"

You want people to think in those terms, instead of exclusively in their own egocentric welfare considerations. You want them to think of the consequences certainly. In both values clarification and in defensible moral reasoning, you want people to think of consequences. I think in the moral area you want them to think primarily of consequences in terms of influencing the rights and welfare of others, and not necessarily exclusively for your own gain. You know, we're not asking people to be martyrs and altruists, but we want them to take into account things like: consistency of reasoning, and that's related to what I said: "Are they willing to let other people think the way they are?" So that's tied up in the notion of what it means to be a principled moral reasoner, those considerations are.

TAFEE: I'd just like to poke at the whole area just one more time, I think, and ask: Is there a "list," or do you have an idea of what constitute the "fundamental human rights" that you've been referring to?

LOCKWOOD: Well, a partial identification of them can be found in the democratic tradition: rights to free expression; rights to life, and property; rights to be treated as a full human being, and not be used as means to other people's ends; rights to autonomy; rights to liberty. Mostly civil rights and civil liberties that you can identify. The usual list of things that Supreme Court cases get made of, constitute "rights" of others as far as I'm concerned.

TAFFEE: Moving into a different area, do you have any notions about how values clarification has affected the lives of the people who have assumed it, either in their classrooms, or have been trained in it?

LOCKWOOD: You mean people who have become values clarifiers?

TAFFEE: Right.

LOCKWOOD: No. I've met very few "true believers." Partly because "true believers" don't come near me, I guess. (laughs) But I've read some testimony, you know, where people really have liked workshops, and they've been real impressed. Like when Sidney does his number at conventions and so on, some people think he's terrific. Other people don't. But they're reacting more to an experience with it. As far as somebody who's really made a living at doing values clarification, I don't really know very many people like that.

The people I know who do it, do it as a unit or something like that.

TAFFEE: I'd like to talk a little bit about the terms that are used, sometimes indiscriminately I think, within the whole area of values education. You've told me how you see differences between words like "moral values" and "non-moral values." I wonder if you could talk a little bit about other words that I hear quite often, and those are: "attitudes," "absolutes," "beliefs," and "feelings." Do you distinguish between those, and if so, can you give me a few sentences perhaps, on how you do?

LOCKWOOD: Well, "beliefs" I distinguish within the domain of beliefs between "factual beliefs," beliefs about the way things are. Which would be such sentences as: "Most people believe that it's wrong to do . . . something." That's a factual belief. Or, "people in other cultures don't respect life as much as we do." That's a belief of a sort of a "quasi-factual" type.

But there are those kinds of beliefs, and there are kind of "metaphysical beliefs" about God, about whether what's "right" or "wrong," is something that's in a Platonic sense: "prior to existence," and so on.

Then there are beliefs about what counts as a "defensible way to make value decisions." So there are different kinds of "beliefs."

In terms of "feelings," I just think of them as "emotions," primarily. Aside from sensing things, of course, like "hot" and "cold." But I construe "feelings" as like: love and anger, anxiety, frustration, joy, happiness, uncertainty. . . . Things of that nature

which are ephemeral. That's another feature of feelings I think that distinguishes them from "beliefs," is that they tend to be--beliefs tend to be more enduring, more stable constructs, whereas "feelings"--they come and go.

So "feelings" seem to be less stable, unless you're really a psychopath or something like that, or depressed, or you may have five months of depressions like some unfortunate people do.

"Attitudes" in my . . . this is right off the top. I construe "attitudes" as kind of non-reflective orientations that people have towards certain things. Sort of "pro and con" answers to different kinds of questions that are posed in the worlds. But I construe "attitudes" as largely gut-reactions to things, habitual responses.

Now they may be the result of careful thought and reflection at some earlier time. Like R.S. Peters talks about "habits" as things that we shouldn't sneer at in the moral domain, because they may be "good" habits. That is they may be habits that we acquire because of past careful considerations, and so on, and not simply unreflective, ill-considered--in terms of action.

But I think of "attitudes" more as the kinds of immediate orientations we have.

TAFFEE: How about absolutes?

LOCKWOOD: Well, I haven't really got a lot of good things to say. I don't really know what. . . . I assume that "absolutes" means

certain "truths" that people have. They can be "beliefs." They can be "moral values." They can be any number of things.

But it's sort of a way of treating a "belief." An "absolute" would be a particular way of treating a belief or a moral value consideration, or an attitude, I suppose. And that would be that they are true for all time, and cannot be modified. There are "absolute" beliefs of factual types, metaphysical types, and so on. Some people talk about "moral attitudes" also, of the Ten Commandment type: "It is always wrong to do . . . 'X.'"

I am really not particularly good at thinking about what that means.

TAFEE: What sort of role within the moral reasoning domain, might you see for the affective side of life? Or is there a role?

LOCKWOOD: I think there is. It's not clear yet how the two merge.

A lot of the Piaget work, which Kohlberg hasn't integrated I don't think real well into his particular schema--but Piaget has elaborated certain stages of affective change that go along with the cognitive.

Kohlberg's also suggested that the cognitive development and the affective development are closely related. But from my standpoint, if we talk about, say "feelings" or "attitudes," we are I think, typically what people first think of when they think about "affective"--they think about "affective"--they think about "feeling" and to some extent, "attitudes." Subjective things, I guess that's what people would consider to be the affective.

The moral development area has not paid much attention to things that are affective, such as motivation, for example, or feelings about other persons. Some of Selman's work on role-taking and motivations for empathy that Moser and Spinthall treat-- that I think is an example of where affective considerations, "empathy" for example being a particularly good one. . . .^{6,7} It's pretty clear that you want moral decision makers to be more than some kind of unfeeling persons, who sit in their rooms somewhere and decide what's right on the basis of whether you can will it to the categorical.

Kohlberg tends to dismiss many of the things we'd call "affective" as a "bag of virtues," and not worth considering in development, partly because he doesn't see them connecting in any stable way, to making moral decisions. And there's certainly a lot of research evidence to support his point of view. But concern for others is certainly a rough feeling or attitude that I think you want people to have.

One other area there too, Steve, isn't exactly what we mean by "affective" I suppose. But one of the things that's left out of the Kohlberg area are lots of notions about what the "good life" would be. I'd like to relate it to "happiness" and "satisfaction," and so on. But those kinds of issues really don't get treated in the

⁶See R. Selman, The Relations of Stages of Social Role-Taking to Moral Development: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis (Cambridge, Ma.: Laboratory of Human Development, Harvard University, 1973).

⁷Dr. Norman Spinthall.

Kohlberg approach, and they do get treated, although on a somewhat individualistic basis, in the values clarification things.

But I'd like to see more attention paid to those kinds of questions in the Kohlberg system. "What is the 'good life' for persons in society?" And so on. Instead of always asking what's "right" or what's "wrong?"--another general type of question that is legitimate to raise when you talk about values, is: "What's 'good' and what's 'bad?'" Sometimes the "right" things are not "good." Like it might be "right" to shoot a person who is about to assassinate someone else, or is about to spray a crowd with a machine gun--it would be "right" to shoot that person. But it wouldn't be "good." It's not "good" to have to kill people. That kind of dialectic doesn't go on in the Kohlberg stuff. It's exclusively "right" and "wrong."

TAFEE: One of the criticisms that John Stewart mentions in his article in the Phi Delta Kappan relative to values clarification, is that he feels values clarification deals primarily with "content" to the neglect of "structure."⁸ Do you also see that, and if so, would you agree with the criticism?

LOCKWOOD: I haven't read Stewart's article in about a year, and I can't remember exactly how he uses it, how he defines those terms.

I would say that, in my view, here's one way of distinguishing between the moral development stuff and the values clarification is

⁸John S. Stewart, "Clarifying Values Clarification: A Critique," Phi Delta Kappan, 56, 10 (June, 1975), 684-688.

to say that the values clarification folks are really interested in the choices that students make, and in that sense, they are more into "content." They want people to make choices and to act on them, and so on. So they're really much more interested in that.

Now they do have a "form" and a "process" obviously, that they think you should go through. But the objective is to get people to make choices, and to be happy with those choices. And in that sense, their orientation is much more towards "content." "Are you going to try to become a doctor or aren't you?" And I don't know if that's the way Stewart was using the "form" and "content." But in that regard, yes, they are more "content" oriented.

TAFEE: To maybe put that question in a different direction: Would you think that perhaps, people in the Kohlberg tradition might deal with "structure," "form," and other aspects of moral reasoning to the neglect of the "content" of their decisions?

LOCKWOOD: Well, yes. But in a special kind of way.

That "form-content" distinction is a real sloppy one, as I'm sure you're aware of. You can't. . . . It's really very hard to make, because he's treating content all the time. Every moral dilemma has content in it.

But he defines "content" exclusively as the choice that people make. The "content" of your reasoning is just kind of either "yes" or "no" to certain kinds of basic questions. And given that limited sense of "content," if you define "content" that way, then they're not giving too little attention to "content," given the way they define "content."

But if you define "content" in another way, like "treating the factual considerations and the public policy questions," like "trying to go into some detail about the effects of the general decision, say like bussing, on kids"--kind of "factual content" as opposed to "'yes or no' content"--I think they do not pay enough attention to the former type of "content."

Secondly, I think they just don't acknowledge the amount of time that they do spend with content. They're tending to think that they're not treating content when they really are. For example, most of the dilemmas really involve one actor, one primary protagonist coming up against sort of "face-less others." Now that's a content in a sense. It's saying that this is one type of moral dilemma that people can confront.

Well, there are a lot of other contents in which moral dilemmas arise. In the "Heinz dilemma" for example, if you modified that dilemma to say that not only was Heinz' wife dying and needed this drug, but a wealthy man's wife was dying and needed this drug--and he was going to go pay for it the following day--would it be right for Heinz to steal it? Now that's a very simple modification that I think dramatically changes the kind of content that you have to take into account. "Content" in this sense meaning: "Who are the people that are going to be affected?" The kind of "factual content" that's in the dilemma.

TAFEE: Moving into a different area of questioning now, do you have any notions about what the future might hold in regard to the widespread popularity that values clarification has enjoyed?

LOCKWOOD: Well I don't really have anything, other than "gut-reaction."

But my perspective has to be kind of taken with the realization that the basis on which I'm making my answers is based on the people who talk to me. And a lot of people who talk to me are saying they don't like values clarification. It worked O.K. for a while, but the kids get tired of it.

So I hear a lot of that, but that's also as I said earlier, because people know that I'm not a real enthusiast for the approach. I don't think it's immoral in any significant way, just irresponsible in a lot of significant ways.

So my guess would be that, the more it becomes in the "therapy orientation" that the Simon group seems to be going in, the less likely it is to become a significant part of classroom curricula, and the more likely it is to be employed by counselors. We're talking about school settings, now. And the more likely it is to be employed by counselors, who are somehow assigned that task.

And I think that increasing amounts of values clarification activities will go on in teacher education, trying to help pre-service teachers in particular to figure out what they believe in, in terms of education, and so on. We're seeing some of that going on already.

And I know for a while, Sidney was kind of running values clarification weekends for businessmen and junior executive-types and so on. They also, at that humanistic center, I think that's where it is, they have. . . . I just saw their brochure for the

summer. I don't know if you took a look at that. They've got all these "therapy" orientation, family workshops and couples workshops, and so on. And that whole movement is kind of an eastern version of Esalen and pop-therapy from the California scene, as far as I see it.⁹

So that particular thrust of values clarification, to summarize I guess this babbling, is to suggest that the more it gets therapeutic, the less it's going to be used in regular classrooms, and it will more likely be employed in counseling settings in schools, and in these quasi-therapeutic settings for non-kids.

TAFFEE: What sort of research would you like to see people in the area of values clarification attempt during the next ten years?

LOCKWOOD: Good, good research. (laughs)

TAFFEE: What's that mean?

LOCKWOOD: Well, I'm currently--I've got a grant for this summer to compile . . . I'm trying to write a review of existing research on values clarification, effects of values clarification, and the effects of the Kohlberg stuff. I really haven't read a lot of it. I've read, you know, Kirschenbaum's little reviews and so on, which are a couple of paragraphs statements.¹⁰

⁹Reference to the National Humanistic Education Center, Saratoga Springs, N.Y., which conducts various workshops in education and related fields.

¹⁰See Howard Kirschenbaum, "Current Research in Values Clarification" (Upper Jay, N.Y.: National Humanistic Education Center, 1975) (Mimeographed).

And if you look at the research in the back of Values and Teaching, admittedly that's ten years old, but not very much is really good, quality research, from the standpoint of research methodology and so on.¹¹ To my knowledge, and I don't want to jump to that conclusion until I get my summers' work done, the things I've seen, by and large, have been afflicted with some very serious methodological errors: in the way that control groups are selected. You know, frequently there are no control groups selected in some of the research that Kirschenbaum reports, and he's aware of that. Very small sample size in some cases. So that's one problem.

Some of the kinds I'm talking about when I say "good" research, is research that has got some sort of methodological integrity, according to the general canons of social science research.

Even with the inadequacies from a methodological point of view, a lot of the studies that Kirschenbaum reports don't show much change in the desired direction. Now I can't spit them off to you at this point, but if you skim through his articles, and through the summaries that Howard Kirschenbaum has written, you frequently see: "Well, they got no change, or they got a little bit of a change, or something like that." A very serious question as to whether the treatment is anywhere near as potent as they claim.

A second thing that I'd like to see in terms of future research, is to get straightened out on what the dependent variable

¹¹Raths, et al., op. cit.

is. If you look at just again the Kirschenbaum summaries, it looks like there's a different dependent variable in every damn study that's done. In some of them it's "drug usage" or "non-usage." In some of them it's "attitude towards school." In some of them it's "reading ability." In some of them it's "satisfaction with school." Every damn thing under the sun. And that's a problem. A real problem.

And one of the ways it shows up in some research, is where they give multiple measures: just a ton of questionnaires or interview things that deal with self-esteem, and reading ability and drug usage--that gives, say, fifteen dependent variables or something. And then you find change in two of them, and then you report that change. Well for Pete's sake, just by law of average you're going to get change if you give a whole lot of dependent variables, "pre-and post-." You're going to get a couple that happen just by chance.

And so that's a problem with the design: getting clear about the dependent variable.

I haven't seen Clark's study, which is supposed to be complete. And they seem to be holding that up as one of the more complete or better done studies, methodologically.¹²

But I don't know. If you're trying to marry that approach to virtually every social problem that a researcher can think of--you know I don't know if they've done research on trying to find

¹²Reference to a study conducted by Jay Clark under the sponsorship of Operation Future, Visalia, California.

out if values clarification leads to greater sexual satisfaction in marriage, but I wouldn't be surprised to see that come out.

So, from the standpoint of the leaders of the movement, I think they should try to respond to that problem. Otherwise, people are treating it as though it's a panacea for every social ill that you can think of: vandalism . . . pimples . . . you know.

On the other hand, the Kohlberg stuff--it's pretty clear what the dependent variable is at the moment, in that while there's some variation, it's always the stage of moral reasoning. Whether you think it's a valid measure or not, that's what they tend to be focusing on, and with some ancillary dependent variables occasionally, like "empathy" or "role-taking ability." But those are tied so very closely to the theory.

Values clarification theory, you've got. . . . They make about--I can't even remember how many different claims in their books about what the effects of this thing are going to be.

TAFEE: I've heard suggestions from various people, some within values clarification and some in different areas, that one area of research that might be worth looking into is whether or not the values clarification process can produce stage changes in the Kohlberg sense. Is that another area you think might be worth looking into?

LOCKWOOD: Ah yes. It's not a real high priority with me. But I've got a doctoral student now who is finishing a dissertation which is going to do exactly that. So I think it's worth doing.

It's not a lot of theoretical interest to ask that question really. Stage change is not what the intervention is designed to promote. It's almost like what I was complaining about before, where, you know, you grab whatever your favorite dependent variable is and see if values clarification can promote it. That's kind of shitty science.

It's an interesting question from a standpoint of a kind of practical, pedagogical question. It's rather interesting to know. But after that, I don't see it as a real, significant kind of question.

What we've tried to do . . . you know Wilson's book on an Introduction to Moral Education?¹³ John Wilson? You know, how he has all these components, and he also has the notion of "pre-conditions." And I think establishing pre-conditions for optimal moral development--that would be a very excellent way to try to do research on the effects of values clarification regarding moral development. And by that I mean, if you use values clarification in such a way as to establish getting kids to be more comfortable in talking to one another, getting them to be more empathetic with other people's concerns; getting teachers to be less obnoxious; and getting teachers to allow kids to express themselves and so on, and so on. Then--and getting kids to be less hostilely critical to one another--you might be establishing pre-conditions, a result of which more effective moral development programs can go on.

So in that sense, that's worthwhile research, to try to find out what the pre-conditions are, or the context and the

¹³John Wilson, et al., Introduction to Moral Education (Baltimore: Penguin, 1967).

surroundings in which optimum moral development can take place. And there's something to be said for doing that kind of research with values clarification.

But I have to keep saying this, I guess because it's not always clear what values clarification is in practice. One book has got seventy-eight strategies in it, and they range from raising your hand on a "voting" thing, to better, intensive personal discussions, the "Public Interview" you know.

I've talked about, you know, the lack of clarity about what the hell the dependent variable is that the leaders of the movement are claiming is the one that they're aiming for. It's very ill-defined. But there's also this question of: how uniform is the treatment? Like, I conjure up in my head . . . I tend to conjure up the more "therapeutic" settings as to what their central treatment is. The teacher picking up those books could choose fifteen activities that would look not much different perhaps than what they already do: taking straw polls, having the kids discuss certain kinds of questions, write essays. . . . So it's really hard sometimes, to know exactly what the treatment is.

TAFEE: I'd like to ask you a "what-if" question. And the "what if" question is this: "What if you were asked to chair a meeting between values clarification people, and other people in the area of values education, and what if you were also asked to establish an agenda of issues to which you think values clarification people should speak? What sort of issues might come to mind?"

LOCKWOOD: O.K. I can give you a very coherent response to that, I think, because I've thought about that. I just have been working on a--suppose you'd call it a "paper." It's not clear whether it's going to be an article or a speech yet. And one of the things I've tried to set out is what I see as the major differences between moral reasoning and values clarification approaches, and the other thing is what I see as major difficulties with both of those approaches. And the agenda that I would set for values clarification would be the following:

One would deal with that issue of the failure to distinguish between "moral" and "non-moral" value issues in their approach. So I don't know how the item would read, but that would be an issue for them to cope with.

The second would be how they deal with the problems of being ethically relativistic or narcissistic or egocentric in their views. They have a tendency to promote that, perhaps, in persons. The absence of social conscience in their approach. So that would be a second item.

The third would be the therapy problem. They speak in Values and Teaching anyway, but not very much elsewhere, about how they're really not doing therapy, and how they're really into the intellectual area.¹⁴ And I'd like them of course to respond to my contention that that's really a "smoke screen," that they're actually doing some kind of "client-centered therapy," or Gestalt therapy. And as a consequence for that, as to kind of get clearer

¹⁴Raths, et al., op. cit.

about this therapy notion and how they would defend it as being appropriate for public schools.

Now I'm talking about public school contexts. The difference there is that teachers aren't trained to be therapists, and if they think they're not doing therapy, but what they really are is doing a lousy job of implementing client-centered therapy. Because they don't really know what they're doing. They've been told that they're doing some kind of intellectual development.

So that long-winded response would be another. I guess it's the third agenda item.

Fourth is "privacy rights." I've just written a long paper on how privacy rights are treated in values clarification, and how they're treated in the moral reasoning approach. And there's some very serious problems, as I see it, with the question of whether values clarification jeopardizes privacy rights of kids and families. And they have not responded to that.

They have, as you probably know, this little concept of "pass." That if you're asked a question, you can always pass and say: "No. I choose not to respond to that." But I suspect in practice, that that runs counter to the main thrust of the approach. And in a little book by Clark and Simon, as well as in the seventy-eight strategies book, there are a number of things that raise serious privacy questions.

For example, they have some exercises which are projective devices, in which kids are supposed to talk as to whether their parents are happy, what do their parents talk about at home, they

ask kids. . . . I mean it is pretty obvious that in the absence of prior, informed consent on the part of parents, that this kind of thing, especially with younger kids who aren't aware of the consequences of their revelations, seriously jeopardize the privacy rights of parents.

They ask kids such things as: "Are you in love right now?" and a lot of what we might call "personal" questions. So the privacy rights issue, I think, is one that I'd have on that agenda.

And then, I guess the final one I've already spoken to, and that's this: "What is the goal of values clarification?" That speaks to my reaction to the multiplicity of goals that they have, from behavior change to becoming generally happy with your life. To try to get more coherent statements of what the leaders of the movement see as the outcomes that they're working toward.

So those would be my agenda items for values clarification.

I'll give them to you for the moral reasoning one if you want.

TAFFEE: Sure.

LOCKWOOD: The main problems I see with the moral reasoning approach, on my agenda, would be it's restricted view of morality. And that relates most simply to what I was talking about much earlier: that they don't address certain kinds of questions because of the focus on "right" and "wrong." They tend to ignore questions of "good" and "bad," questions of "what is a virtuous man?" and so on, which are important moral questions. Any moral philosopher treats those kinds

of questions. He doesn't exclusively treat questions of "right" and "wrong," and forget about "goodness" and "virtue" and so on.

So, to kind of deal with the issue of whether the Kohlberg folks have a too restricted a view of what counts as morality would be one.

I'd also want them to confront kind of practical problems, one being the "intellectual inaccessibility" of the Kohlberg stuff for most teachers. There's no problem in understanding values clarification. For most teachers, reading the book or going to a workshop, and they have a very adequate grasp of the approach. But with Kohlberg you know, I spent about ten years of my life fooling around with it, and I'm just not all that clear half the time. So you have that difficulty, and it's a significant one. If people can't understand it, then it's irresponsible to try to get them to be doing something.

Another one would be to deal with the "labeling problem," which is exclusive to the Kohlberg approach, and not to values clarification. The problem of labeling kids and categorizing them as "morally immature" and so on.

TAFEE: What's your feeling on that?

LOCKWOOD: I think it can be treated, but it hasn't been adequately. I think it can. . . . In my work with teachers, I go to great lengths in trying to show what's wrong with labeling, not only in general but in labeling moral reasoning.

First of all, you don't really know what you're doing, because it takes a long time to learn the scoring system. If you make quick judgments about a stage, it's invalid most of the time. Secondly, that from a teacher's standpoint, it's of no value for you to label a "reason" as a "stage," because that doesn't communicate anything.

If you hear a kid say, for example, "I think it's wrong to have abortions, because the church--my church--is opposed to it, and I believe that my church has thought carefully about value issues. They have some kind of sacred connection with the supernatural, and so I go along with their view." Now that's, in a rough way, you'd call that a Stage Four reasoning. But as a teacher, if you happen to be treating that question, to call that a Stage Four reason, even in your head, doesn't do anything. What does it tell you to do? All it does, is you've sort of collapsed a kid's reasoning into a little category.

If your goal as a teacher is to help kids explore their reasons, then when you hear a certain kind of reason, you think up good analogies for them to test it out in, and so on and so forth, or you ask them to say more about it. But by and large the practice of labeling the reasoning when you're trying to conduct classes and so on, does more harm than good. Partly because of the "Pygmalion" effects, and so on.

And thirdly, it's also bad to do that, because people don't understand the amount of variation there is in stage of reasoning. A kid says something that is a clear Stage Two reason, let's say.

Teachers may assume since they don't understand the Kohlberg stuff because of its intellectual inaccessibility, that they have a pure Stage Two reasoner. No matter what the next issue is that comes up, they've got that kid categorized at Stage Two. But there's all kinds of variation in reasoning.

Another problem I see with the Kohlberg stuff is, and again it's not intentional in there, it's more by omission than comission, is that perhaps it may have an unintended effect of having people identify every issue as a moral issue. And there's something debilitating about construing every controversy that you encounter as a moral one, one that the decision about which carries all the heavy weight decisions of something being morally "right" or morally "wrong." And that can be devisive. And I don't think that they have taken that issue seriously. I don't think there's any research done on it either.

And the final issue toward my agenda for Kohlberg's group, of which I am one by the way--I'm more with them than not--is the, what I call the "implied panacea of principled thought." And that is the notion that if everybody could finally attain these lofty realms of principled thought, that moral problems would disappear, and if they didn't disappear, then you could solve them very quickly. And that's just foolish.

I don't know if they would . . . or Kohlberg sometimes has been in recent years, has been claiming that in Stage Six you can get determinant solutions to all moral problems if the facts are clear, the facts and definitions are agreed upon. That Stage Six

generates determinant decisions to moral issues. And that's more than just applying a panacea for principled thought. I think the busing issue, for example, cannot be solved at Stage Six in a determinant way.

So these would be the kind of major difficulties I see with both of those approaches.

TAFFEE: You also mentioned that in your paper you were dealing with the major differences, and I think that sprinkled throughout our conversation are some of those differences you see between the two, but I wonder if maybe it would be appropriate just to encapsule some of those?

LOCKWOOD: O.K. This is real shorthand language.

In terms of the general goals, the moral reasoning approaches, it seems to me, have this notion of "justice," a philosophical concept of justice that they want as their general goal. It's what they want people to get.

Values clarification, the general goal it seems to me, is more of a psychological one. And that is what you would roughly call happiness.

In terms of the content that kids deal with, moral reasoning stuff tries to identify strictly moral value issues. Values clarification stuff mixes moral and non-moral value issues together in their curriculum.

The central question of the moral reasoning approach is "What is right?" and "Why is it right?" or "What is wrong?" and

"Why is it wrong?" The central question of the values clarification approach is, as I see it, "What do you like?" and "Are you sure that you like it?"

Another central difference is in terms of the specificity of the outcome variable they are seeking: stage of moral reasoning is the variable in moral reasoning. It's pretty clear that that's the "dependent variable" if you want to use that language.

The specificity of outcome variable in values clarification is just what I said before, multiplicity of outcomes: positive, enthusiastic, purposeful, proud, reduced drug usage, improved reading, you know, that kind of outcomes. So they're different in that regard. The moral reasoning stuff getting much more discrete and clear outcomes variable.

Another difference deals with the types of conflicts that they see requiring resolution. The Kohlberg stuff or the moral reasoning approach, tends to deal with inter-personal value conflicts, and essential moral-type value conflicts: one person wants something and it's against the law, another person wants something that another person also wants. . . . But interpersonal conflicts.

Whereas in values clarification, the basic conflicts that they try to resolve are intra-personal, they're within persons trying to get some kind of consistency between behavior and belief, and so on.

The preferred mode of interaction between kids, and between teacher and kids in the moral reasoning approach is confrontational.

And that doesn't mean "hostile." But it's to say: "Look. You try to confront kids with the inadequacy of their current modes of thought."

The preferred mode of interaction in values clarification is more nurturant, non-judgmental nurturance, and so they're different in that regard.

And finally, just another central difference has to do with sort of, what the central aim of schooling is. What tradition they fall in. And the moral reasoning approach falls in the cognitive tradition of schooling, that the purpose of schooling is intellectual development. Whereas the values clarification stuff falls into a more affective tradition, where the purpose of schooling is to deal with self-esteem, and the whole child, and so on.

So those are the central differences that I've outlined.

TAFEE: One final question: If I were to call you back in ten years from now, and ask you "Well, how have things gone in the last ten years?" Ideally, how would you like to be able to answer me, as to how things have gone in the area of values education, and between maybe, values clarification and cognitive moral development?

LOCKWOOD: Well, I guess the main thing I would say is that: One, that values education has been taken seriously, and not treated as just some "fad," like career education or something. But in the course of the last ten years, that the values education movement has been taken seriously, that its matured, that its resolved or come to grips with, or become more sophisticated in dealing with

the kinds of questions that I set out back when we were talking about an agenda.

I'd like to say that, and I'd certainly like to see that moral development has been integrated into a concept of "citizenship education." Moral development is not going to solve all of our social ills, but I'd much prefer that citizenship education take on a developmental perspective, in particular so that persons understand what it means to respect the rights of another person. Now a lot of that language floats around in citizenship education curriculum, but what it actually means in practice is a lot of preaching, but just doesn't get anywhere, because of the cognitive incapacity of kids to understand how that integrates into a coherent philosophy of relating to other people.

If you call me in ten years I may not say that. But that's what I'm thinking right now.

APPENDIX M

INTERVIEW WITH MILTON ROKEACH

INTERVIEW WITH MILTON ROKEACH

TAFFEE: How is it that you became interested in values education and values?

ROKEACH: I get interested in values because I'm interested in belief systems, and in attitudes. It was in my earlier work in studying the organization of belief systems that I became persuaded that the problem of values had to be addressed. Then I became interested in the question: "How do you change values?" In the context of that question, I discovered that by making people aware of their own values, that one can expose certain contradictions in their value systems, and I began to report some pretty interesting evidence that values can be changed through processes of self-confrontation and processes of self-awareness. And when you get to the problem of self-awareness, you're getting close to the problem of values education.

TAFFEE: When was it that you first became aware of values clarification?

ROKEACH: Oh, maybe a couple years ago.

TAFFEE: What's your assessment of its contributions, if any, to the field?

ROKEACH: Well, my assessment is based on my understanding of what I've read about what it proposes to do, and, goes somewhat as follows:

1. Students, however much they get involved in interesting discussions as a result of values clarification exercises, do not become aware of their own values, because the definition that the students are taught as to whether or not they have a "value" is far too subjective. I don't think students will therefore learn about their values. They will be none the wiser when they're all through, about their own values or about the values of others, or how their own values are similar to or different from those of other people. They're not asked to read anything about the values of other people and I don't think you learn anything about your own values or about those of others merely from having a "bull session."

2. I would agree with those who have suggested that values clarification is an "ethically relativistic" approach: that anybody's values is as good as anybody else's values. But on the other hand, it isn't really relativistic, because the authors of values clarification are really pushing a set of values secretly through the back door.

For example, they say a student has no "value" unless he "publicly affirms" what he says, so "public affirmation" is a value. They say it's no "value" unless you do it "consistently," which means that "consistency" is a value.

If you advocate a philosophy of relativism are you suggesting that the values of bigots are as good as the values of tolerant people? If you believe such a relativistic position, I think you'd have to say: "Yes. That's what is being suggested." And yet I don't really believe that the values clarification proponents believe that.

3. As for those who have suggested that values clarification is a form of "therapy," I would respond by saying that only to the extent that any kind of "bull session" is a form of "therapy," would I consider values clarification "therapy." Any kind of interaction between people where people reinforce one another with "You're right!" could be considered "therapy"--if that's therapy, then so be it, and I don't have any quarrel with it. In that sense, any permissive discussion in class is "therapy."

But "therapy" for me implies gaining some deeper grasp of one's self, in addition to the creation of a condition of unconditional, positive regard.

4. Another criticism I have is that values clarification encourages the student to be too egotistical, too self-centered. It's too much focused on the questions of trying to clarify the student's own values, without helping that student clarify what are the values of other people, other groups in society, other cultures, and so forth.

5. In my own work, I define a "value" as "a belief that a certain end state of existence is desirable or undesirable, or that a certain mode of behavior is desirable or undesirable." Given such a definition, if it is not a belief about an ideal mode of behavior, or an ideal end-state of existence, I would say it's not a "value." In other words, you need a rule on when something is not a "value." To my mind, we cannot allow each student to decide that for himself or herself. In the same way that we cannot allow each person to

decide if he or she is "creative" or "prejudiced." I wouldn't want to leave that to each person to decide, but should be decided independently, objectively.

6. I distrust any approach where you can't measure that which you are talking about. There are no suggestions offered by its advocates on how to measure "values." I've never heard of a variable in education or psychology that you couldn't measure, that's either "there" or "not there."

7. I don't understand all this focus on the process of valuing--that gets awfully vague. And again each student supposedly gets clarification on his or her process of valuing, but no solid objective basis for comparison is given. How is my valuing process different from yours? Or Black Americans'? Or old Americans'? Or teachers'?

TAFFEE: Do you distinguish between "value" and what might be called "morals?"

ROKEACH: "Values" is a broader idea, and "morals" is only one kind of "value." Being "logical" is a value and if you are illogical you are not "immoral." There are competence values as well as moral values. These other "values" are not part of "morality," but are still "values."

TAFFEE: Looking ahead, would you welcome the opportunity to engage in cooperative efforts with people from the values clarification area?

ROKEACH: Of course I would welcome the possibility.

TAFFEE: Is that something you would actively seek out?

ROKEACH: These things happen spontaneously, and "actively" means to me, "aggressively," and I believe in everybody doing their own thing.

TAFFEE: Is there some research that needs to be done or should be done in values clarification?

ROKEACH: Any form of moral and ethical education that claims to be worth doing must have some kind of effects. If it hasn't got any effects, it's probably not worth the time and effort. If it has effects, it must mean that something has changed: either a "value" or a position on a social issue, or most important of all, a behavior. And I would say this for any other form, like moral education, moral development, or any other form of values education. Any kind of value education must sooner or later be shown to have demonstratable effects on values, attitudes, and behavior.

TAFFEE: Do you have any notions about what the future might hold in regard to the widespread popularity that values clarification has enjoyed during the last few years?

ROKEACH: I fear people will eventually get bored with it. I am not sure the exercises are worth all that time in the classroom, too many of them may be wasting the students' time. The question arises: "How far beyond the fourth or fifth or sixth exercise is

the student getting anything out of it? At what point is the student 'value-clarified?' How do you know this?" That's not discussed, and there's always the danger that what starts out as an innovative idea ends up becoming a fad.

TAFFEE: If you were asked to chair a meeting of values educators, the purpose of which was to focus on issues to which values clarification should speak, what would you want to have on the agenda?

ROKEACH: Well, I think it would be related to what I was just talking about: demonstrable effects. Do they or do they not exist? That would be the foremost question I would ask of that or any other values education approach. And if there are no demonstrable effects, we should be prepared to conclude that the method or the approach is invalid.

TAFFEE: What might the future hold with regard to the broader field of values education?

ROKEACH: Oh, I am sure there will be a proliferation of other proposals on how to teach value education: I've made one such proposal myself. Whether my proposal will fare any better I don't know; that remains to be seen.

TAFFEE: Could you briefly outline what your proposal consists of?

ROKEACH: Well, the proposal that I've made is, first of all, that the educational system should inculcate the student with a set of

values, unashamedly and without apology. Inculcate them with what kind of values? "Educational" values, in contrast to say, "military" or "economic," or "religious" values. The job of the educational institution is to inculcate people with a set of educational values, because that's what educators get paid to do. For this reason, any claim on the part of any educator that they are "value-free" should not be taken seriously.

So that's one form or direction that I would like the educational institution to take.

A second form is to have substantive courses in values, to engage in substantive, factual information on the values similarities and differences of different cultures, societies, institutions, groups, and various sub-groups--and how those values similarities and differences are comparable or similar to one's own values. In the same way that you can teach kids the geography of Turkey, you can teach them about the values of Turks, and how the values of Turks are different from those of Pakistanis, or hippies, or whatever. There's plenty of information in the literature, for example, about the values of Eskimos, of hippies, the values that are associated with the "generation-gap," and the values of pigots.

As far as I can tell, there's nothing said about such issues in values clarification courses. You would never be any the wiser, you would never know that people in groups and sub-groups had different values when you're all through with the various values clarification exercises because these exercises are too self-centered and not enough society-centered.

TAFFEE: How would you define these commonly used words associated with values education: "beliefs," "attitudes," "feelings," and "absolute values?"

ROKEACH: A "belief" as "any cognition or expectancy about anything under the sun that is either true or false, good or bad, desirable or undesirable."

TAFFEE: How about an "attitude?"

ROKEACH: A "set of beliefs organized around an object or situation, predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner."

TAFFEE: O.K., how about the word: "feelings?"

ROKEACH: "An emotional concomitant of a belief." For every belief there is a concomitant feeling, and for every feeling there is a concomitant belief.

TAFFEE: And the final one would be: "absolute values."

ROKEACH: Well, I can't really conceive of any "absolute values" myself. I understand that there are people who can. But I don't understand what they're talking about. For me, "value" by definition is "a desirable state of existence that you compare with some other desirable states, and you make a choice between them." So for me, "values" cannot be "absolutes," including even the value for life, as evidenced by the fact that in war we are often glad to see the enemy killed.

TAFTEE: Just one final question. If I were to call you up ten years from now, and ask you how these last ten years have gone in the area of values education, ideally, how would you like to be able to answer me?

ROKEACH: Well, I would like to be able to say to you: "We've really become very sophisticated about it, and we now have reached the state of knowledge in this area so that the children that we are responsible for have a more profound insight into their own values and into the values of the significant individuals and groups that they are likely to encounter in their lives." How nice it would be to be able to say that. Will I be able to say it? I rather doubt it.

TAFTEE: What, then, do you see as a more likely future?

ROKEACH: I think what will happen is first, one fad will catch on and then another. It seems that people in the field of education like things that aren't too complicated and reasonably simple and an approach that is fun but not too taxing on scholarship or the intellectual abilities of the student. The question of how useful it is, or how self-realizing it is, becomes rather secondary. We need a lot more research on the impact of value education techniques. Vague claims made by authors of one or another approach to value education, that you can't pin down very concretely, are simply not enough.

Now, if you think I have been unduly hard on the values clarification approach let me close by reiterating what I had said

elsewhere in discussing the positive contribution of values clarification (Rokeach, 1975), namely, that the proponents have nonetheless made an important contribution to education by stressing the importance of making students aware of their own values. Quite aside from the question as to whether or not they have succeeded, their stressing its importance is to my mind an important contribution.

APPENDIX N

SELF-INTERVIEW

SELF-INTERVIEW

The following is a result of a self-interview conducted by the author in March, 1976. The self-interview was designed to assist the author in the identification of assumptions he might be making, and to help him become more aware of the possibility of "leading" the experts to yield responses compatible with his own.

Some questions emerged as inapplicable, since they were basically informational questions aimed at gathering background data, and were not designed to gather opinions or feelings. Such questions were not answered by the writer, and are marked with an "NA" as the response.

1a. How did you become involved with values clarification?

TAFFEE: NA

1b. In what ways has values clarification affected your life?

TAFFEE: NA

1c. In what way has values clarification affected the lives of others?

TAFFEE: Values clarification has deeply affected the lives of many people both personally and professionally. It has led people to be more purposeful and proud of themselves, and has served as an introduction for many into related areas of humanistic education.

1d. What are the theoretical roots of values clarification?

TAFFEE: NA

1e. How were the original seven criteria developed?

TAFFEE: NA

1f. How was the theory received by scholars ten years ago? In 1976?

TAFFEE: Ten years ago, those scholars aware of values clarification tended to applaud it. Now, in 1976, there is heavy criticism of the theory and the practice of values clarification, and comparatively little support for it, except from those directly involved in it.

1g. In what ways has the theory been modified since 1966? Before 1966? Why?

TAFFEE: NA

1h. In what ways has the theory been affected by other developments in values education, e.g. Kohlberg, Rokeach, etc?

TAFFEE: NA

1i. In what ways has the theory been affected by research that has been done within values clarification?

TAFFEE: NA

1j. In what ways has the practice of values clarification been modified since 1966?

TAFFEE: It has become more practical as a result of the proliferation of materials available to teachers, and has increasingly become more "affective" in nature.

1k. Are there any objections which are raised about values clarification which are more persistent than others? How do you deal with them?

TAFFEE: Yes, there are several major criticisms. These are dealt with in detail in Chapter 2.

1l. How would you characterize the early values clarification strategies?

TAFFEE: NA

1m. How were early efforts at clarifying values received?

TAFFEE: NA

1n. What differences are there between values clarification training conducted in 1966 and that done in 1976?

TAFFEE: I'm sure there are some differences but I'm not sure as to what they are.

1o. Do you see any evidence to suggest that values clarification is more "affective" in emphasis in 1976 than it was in 1966? Why or why not?

TAFFEE: Yes, I think values clarification definitely is more affective now than it was in 1966. More and more "feeling" activities are being included in values clarifying materials and in the workshops conducted by the proponents of it.

1p. How was the three-stage curriculum developed and why?

TAFFEE: NA

1q. How do you distinguish between the following terms: "values," "beliefs," "attitudes," "feelings," "morals," and "absolutes?"

TAFFEE: NA

2a. What might the future hold in regard to the widespread "popularity" enjoyed by values clarification in 1976?

TAFFEE: I think to a degree, its popularity will decline, but not a great deal. I see it as continuing to play an important and influential role in values education for many years to come.

2b. How do you see yourself working with values clarification during the next ten years?

TAFFEE: NA

2c. Whom do you see as playing key or influential roles within values clarification during the next ten years?

TAFFEE: I think probably Simon, Kirschenbaum and Harmin will continue to be seen as major leaders. Leland and Mary Martha Howe could also play important roles if they are so inclined. On the horizon, I see Joel Goodman, Barbara Glaser-Kirschenbaum and myself as potential leaders. Brian Hall, while I do not know him or his work personally, is a prolific writer and is certainly influencing religious education and the role of values clarification in it.

2d. What sort of research in values clarification would you like to see completed by 1986?

TAFFEE: Basic research, empirically sound research and innovative research. That is, I think some of the basic assumptions of values clarification need to be explored in more defensible ways than in the past. Doing this may require new and innovative approaches to research.

2e. What sort of training models do you foresee being employed during the next ten years?

TAFFEE: I think the weekend workshop is going to continue to be a primary method for introducing educators and other members of the helping professions to values clarification. Increasingly I think values clarification will become a part of undergraduate and graduate teacher education programs.

2f. What issues in values clarification need to be dealt with prior to 1986?

TAFFEE: Certainly all of the major criticisms that I have mentioned in Chapter 2 need to be dealt with. Other than that, the only other major issue I see is to decide what directions values clarification should be moving in, and then plan to do it.

2g. Ideally, what do you hope will happen to values clarification and the values clarification movement during the next ten years?

TAFFEE: NA

2h. How do you see the interplay between values clarification and other movements within education; e.g. Parent Effectiveness Training, Re-Evaluation Counseling, Kohlberg's Moral Education, Transactional Analysis, and so on?

TAFFEE: NA

2i. What provisions have been made, if any, towards a plan or design for values clarification during the next ten years or so?

TAFFEE: NA