Terence Lovat · Kerry Dally
Neville Clement · Ron Toomey

Values Pedagogy and Student Achievement

Contemporary Research Evidence

Springer

Values Pedagogy and Student Achievement

Terence Lovat • Kerry Dally
Neville Clement • Ron Toomey

Values Pedagogy and Student Achievement

Contemporary Research Evidence

Springer

Terence Lovat
The University of Newcastle
Australia 2308
terry.lovat@newcastle.edu.au

Neville Clement
The University of Newcastle
Australia 2308
neville.clement@newcastle.edu.au

Kerry Dally
The University of Newcastle
Australia 2308
kerry.dally@newcastle.edu.au

Ron Toomey
The University of Newcastle
Australia 2308
ron.toomey@acu.edu.au

ISBN 978-94-007-1562-2 e-ISBN 978-94-007-1563-9
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-1563-9
Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg London New York

Library of Congress Control Number: 2011930399

Preface

Many of the assumptions around good practice pedagogy are being reassessed in our time. Under the weight of a combination of forces, many of the older paradigms of learning are being questioned. These forces include the greater pressure around matters of intercultural exchange and the consequent weakening of ethnocentrically determined views about knowledge, teaching and learning. Hence, in an era that sees Western education increasingly influenced by the movement of peoples from non-Western regimes, many of the philosophical assumptions that have impelled pedagogical approaches over the past century are now under scrutiny. The forces also relate to new scientific understandings about the processes of learning. In particular, emerging insights from the neurosciences cast shadows of doubt on many of the dominant twentieth-century developmental theories and allied pedagogical practices, rendering them with more than an appearance of inadequacy to the task of educating students in the twenty-first century. Furthermore, philosophical work has continued to question the increasing trend towards instrumentality in education, reducing its purpose and goals to measurable outcomes that are less suited than ever to the diverse populations being served. In spite of the pompous claims made about them, such instrumentality actually undermines student achievement and, in turn, the true power of education to transform the life chances of the populations it is meant to serve. Hence, the inevitable conclusion is drawn that failure is at least as much a systemic as a personal issue.

Among the updated research that elicits such critique is that which deals directly with effective pedagogy, clearly illustrating the enhanced effects on learning when it is dealt with as a holistic developmental enterprise rather than one concerned solely with content, technique and measurable outcomes. This research includes volumes of empirical evidence and conceptual analysis from across the globe that point to the inextricability of values as lying at the heart of those forms of good practice pedagogy that support and facilitate the species of student achievement that truly does transform the life chances of students. In this book, we will explore

and uncover those volumes of evidence and analysis, illustrating their pertinence to student achievement, the vexed issue that lies at the heart of all for which education stands.

27 July 2011
Newcastle, Australia

Terence Lovat
Kerry Dally
Neville Clement
Ron Toomey

Author Biographies

Terence Lovat is Emeritus Professor of Education, Kerry Dally is Senior Lecturer in Education, Neville Clement is Research Associate in Education and Ron Toomey is Conjoint Professor of Education at The University of Newcastle, Australia. The authors were all engaged as investigators in the federally funded Australian Values Education Program, a series of research and practical projects involving 100,000 school students, 10,000 teachers and 50 university researchers. Together with other international data, the Australian projects provide much of the empirical evidence that is drawn on in this book.

Contents

Chapter 1
Values and Good Practice Pedagogy

Overturning Old Paradigms

Educational research of the 1990s and beyond has challenged earlier conceptions concerned with the alleged incapacity of teachers, and formal education generally, to make a difference in the lives of students. Decades of experimental research simply served to confirm the view that the destiny of a student was predominantly fixed by heritage and/or environment and that what was left of mediating factors related more to peer pressure, media influence and disability constraints than to the impacting power of teachers and schools. Countless studies were conducted by eminent figures such as the revered Talcott Parsons, which merely served to reinforce the fundamental belief that families were "…factories which produce human personality" (Parsons and Bales 1955, p. 16). Against the potency of the family's formative power, all else paled to insignificance according to such research findings, leading Christopher Jencks to conclude that "…the character of a school's output depends largely on a single input, namely the characteristics of the entering children." (Jencks 1972, p. 256).

This pessimistic view about the capacity of teachers and schools to impact significantly on student achievement impelled a growing view throughout the twentieth century, albeit one largely denied by educational systems and their political masters, that the role of schooling was limited to enhancing the chances of those who already possessed social capital while minimizing the damage to those in deficit. Such a view was strengthened by research of the kind above that seemed to confirm the helplessness of teachers and schools to influence the life chances of those who came to school with existing deficits. While directed largely at academic achievement, pessimism about the potential for teachers and schools to play a larger role in building capacity in students' social, emotional and moral lives was even more profound, with the same research seeming to underline the futility of such postulations. In turn, this provided substantiation for a belief implicit in public systems that the only ethical stance for teachers and schools to take around the issue of values was one of values-neutrality, again a view fortified by research that seemed to indicate that a values-filled orientation would have been doomed anyway.

T. Lovat et al., *Values Pedagogy and Student Achievement,*
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-1563-9_1, © Springer Science+Business Media, B.V. 2011

Much of the largely replicable and descriptive research that formed this pessimistic view of student potential has been gradually supplanted by bolder and more interventionist forms of research designed to push the boundaries of earlier beliefs. Instead of setting out to 'prove' what hardly needed proving, namely that those in good health and with a heritage of achievement were in an advantaged position on entering the school, new forms of educational research set out to test the factuality of such truisms. Highly interventionist studies (cf. Newmann and Associates 1996; Darling-Hammond 1996, 1997) were conducted in the USA that tested, against virtually every category of readiness and/or disadvantage, whether a particular approach to teaching and schooling could break through the disadvantage effect. The particular approach to teaching and schooling goes by various names but is most commonly captured in the notion of 'quality teaching', a notion that encompasses both the work of individual teachers in classrooms and, ideally, the work of whole-school teaching regimes.

The results of these studies have called into question earlier conceptions relating to the alleged limitations of teacher and school potential to impact on student development. In a myriad of contexts, results showed that, where the disadvantaged cohorts were facilitated by 'quality teaching' and their non-disadvantaged equivalent cohorts were being supported by 'ineffective teaching', it was the disadvantaged who were invariably shown to achieve at a greater rate. In summary, when faced with all the 'proven' barriers to learning of heritage and/or environment, be they barriers based on gender, class, language or even disabilities of sorts, effective teaching practices had sufficient power to improve the chances of the disadvantaged and, in some instances and over time, to change the assumptions underlying the advantage/disadvantage divide altogether. While many remain sceptical, the effect is that the earlier thesis about the centrality of heritage and environment to achievement is fairly quickly being replaced as a core belief by a new optimism about the positive effects of teaching quality (Rowe 2004).

Teaching Quality and the Values Link

The Carnegie Corporation's Task Force on Learning (Carnegie Corporation 1996) was a clearly identifiable agency in spelling out the new belief and impelling the research that stands behind the modern era of quality teaching. It was, for the era, surprisingly explicit in its statement of beliefs about the power of teachers and schooling systems to effect change in student achievement. In a central tenet, the Task Force Report, titled *Every Child can Learn*, asserted:

> One of the problems that has undermined school reform efforts…is the belief that differences in the educational performance of schools are primarily the result of differences in students' inherent ability to learn (or not). This belief is wrong. Schools fail… (p. 3)

Carnegie's central challenge was to the conventional wisdom that heritage and environment were the dominant predictors of success or failure at school. It did not

deny the many research findings that seemed to point to this inevitable conclusion nor to the reality that heritage and environment were obviously influential factors in determining a student's success or failure. Nor did Carnegie set out to debunk the quality of such research or the conclusions arrived at validly within the ambit of the methodologies that drove it. The challenge was rather around the unreflective linearity that characterized such research and the unquestioning acceptance of its findings. Carnegie proffered that a different set of assumptions, based on a more far-reaching and comprehensive philosophy of the role of teaching and schooling, and the employment of less traditional research evidence, such as the findings emerging from the neurosciences (Bruer 1999), would have yielded very different results from those that earlier research had pronounced as inevitable and beyond contention.

Consistent with the tenor of the entire report, Carnegie placed the final responsibility for student achievement on the school, and especially on its teachers, to make the difference. The report redefined what was meant by achievement and identified a range of learning skills that should constitute the targets for teacher and school learning objectives. Here, also, the report challenged more limited conceptions of the role of the teacher and the school. While not underselling the centrality of intellectual development as the prime focus and objective of teaching and schooling, the report nonetheless expanded significantly on the more predictable features of intellectual development to speak explicitly of the broader learning associated with skills of communication, empathy, reflection and self-management. Intriguingly, the sections dealing with these associated skills seemed to imply a strong focus on the student self, including student self-knowing.

Hence, the notion of 'intellectual depth', so central to the regime of quality teaching, was defined not in an instrumentalist and narrow fashion but in the broadest possible way, to connote not only the depth of factual learning but, moreover, induction into the kind of profound learning that is attained through competencies such as interpretation, communication, negotiation and reflection, with a focus on self-management. In a word, the teacher's job transcended conceptions of student achievement beyond qualities that can be measured by standardized testing or simple observation to being one which engaged the students' more sophisticated skills concerned with the development of such features as 'communicative capacity', 'empathic consciousness' and 'self-reflection'. These are learning outcomes that are not so easily reduced to instrumentalist forms of measurement and outcomes that are highly pertinent to the notion that values are an inextricable factor in good practice pedagogy. It is clear for instance that notions like 'communicative capacity' and 'empathic consciousness', or being switched on to one's world and its challenges, have potential to inform the dispositions and actions necessary to global citizenry and a highly developed social conscience, while 'self-reflection', or being switched on to oneself, has similar potential as a vital tool in the development of an integrated personal development and morality. In summary, the idea of teaching quality to be found in Carnegie implied that it is not just the surface factual learning, so characteristic of education of old, that needs to be superseded, but it is surface learning, in general, that is to be surpassed in favour of an educational approach that

engages the whole person in depth of cognition, social and emotional maturity, and self-knowledge and development.

There are other criteria found commonly in the literature of quality teaching that strengthen the notion that effective teaching is inherently a values-filled enterprise (cf. Qld 1999). One of these is 'relevance'. It is said that the quality teacher is one who can find the point of relevance for students concerning any topic. In other words, quality teaching entails the art of connecting, and being seen to connect, with the real worlds of students. The quality teacher is one who is able to enter these worlds with comfort and conviction and win the trust of the students in his or her care. Hence, the relationship between teacher and student and the establishment of a teaching regime marked by trust and care are inextricable components of teaching quality. Another quality teaching criterion is 'supportiveness'. It is said that the quality teacher will construct a positive and conducive learning environment. It builds on the fundamental notion that people learn best when they feel comfortable, secure and affirmed, a notion confirmed by modern research to be fundamental to student success (Rowe 2004). Quality teaching research of the kind noted herein has alerted the educational community to the greater potential of teaching to impact on those wider dimensions of learning that pertain to holistic student development. At the heart of such research lies an inextricable values component. In other words, teaching of the kind being espoused is inherently values oriented and values filled.

Values: The Missing Link in Quality Teaching

If one could level a criticism at quality teaching as it has been implemented systemically in places, it is that it has potential to become in time as much a victim of instrumentalist thought and technical means as many of the regimes it has superseded. In other words, there is as much potential to reduce notions of intellectual depth, relevance and supportiveness to formulas that become fixed, politicized and supposedly easily observed and measured, as was the case in earlier times with notions of objectives, outcomes, competencies and indeed intellectual quotient (IQ). When this happens, the formulas and measurements of behaviour which underpin the laudable criteria of quality teaching become insular, uncritical and determined by the terms of their own making, in the way that is now generally said to have been true of IQ testing regimes of the past. The challenge for contemporary quality teaching regimes therefore is to avoid, or at least temper, the inclination towards reductionism to those formulaic devices that appeal to systems in their desire to control and standardize the products of research. A focus on the values component of quality teaching is one way in which this might be achieved, for this focus serves as a constant reminder that there is in fact no magical teaching formula and that student achievement is a complex phenomenon that defies simplistic forms of measurement, being determined rather by a wide range of factors, some measured with apparent ease but some which could never be measured by even the most sophisticated instruments.

By way of example, in an Australian Council of Educational Research study, Rowe (2004) noted that, of all the teacher qualities nominated by those students who achieve best at school, it was notions of care and trust that were paramount. While the more predictable measures of demonstrable content knowledge and stimulating technique were evident, as one would expect, they rarely stood alone and appeared to be subordinate to the greater indicator of student confidence that the teacher was trustworthy and had the students' best interests at heart. Similarly, Louden et al. (2004) concluded that it was difficult to predict likely student effects from simple observation of teacher practice. One might caricature the findings of this study as suggesting that, lying behind the relationship between practitioner and student was the far more powerful relationship between elder and younger person. In some extreme instances, the study found that superior student outcomes could actually emanate from inadequate or less than effective teacher practice as long as a positive relationship existed between teacher and student. Similarly, Hattie's (2004) appraisal of a myriad of studies around teacher expertise (normally taken to connote a set of instrumental measures) placed 'respect for students' at the top of the list of those characteristics that are always present when such claims are made. Meanwhile, Brady's (2005) work has shown 'relationship between teacher and student' to be at least as significant as technical proficiency in enhancing student performance.

These more recent findings fit well with earlier literature concerned with effective organizational change and reform where, similarly, notions of trust and care emerged as those that define much of the difference between organizations that function well and those that do not (Bryk and Schneider 1996, 2002). Anthony Bryk, himself allied with much of the work of Newmann around quality teaching, noted the following:

> Trust relations culminate in important consequences at the organizational level, including more effective decision-making, enhanced social support for innovation, more efficient social control of adults' work and an expanded moral authority to 'go the extra mile' for the children. Relational trust…is an organizational property…its presence (or absence) has important consequences for the functioning of the school and its capacity to engage fundamental change. (Bryk and Schneider 2002, p. 22)

Furthermore, Bryk and Schneider (2002, p. 23) spell out the connotations of what they describe as 'relational trust' in the "…dynamic interplay among four considerations: respect, competence, personal regard for others, and integrity." In turn, these considerations comprise the cornerstone of the 'Values School' (cf. Farrer 2000; Hawkes 2009) experimental work in the UK, reported by OfSted (2007) to have had positive impact on all educational measures, including academic achievement. It is proffered therefore that values being explicated as a component part of quality teaching has the potential to take such teaching to the seat of its own power by focussing teacher and system attention on those features of their professional practice that the research evidence identifies will have most impact. These features comprise the relationship of due care, mutual respect, fairness and positive modelling established with the student and, in turn, the network of systemic 'relational trust' that results.

One is reminded, many years on, of the caution against instrumentalist approaches to education that was provided by the eminent John Dewey in the early days of public education. He said that to depend overly on a scientific approach to education, being centrally about subject knowledge and methods would be fatal to the best interests of education. He spoke, rather, of the need to see education as a mode of life, cultivating a mindset on the part of teachers that was, at one and the same time, self-reflective and directed towards instilling reflectivity, inquiry and a capacity for moral judiciousness on the part of students (cf. Dewey 1916, 1929). Dewey would not be at all surprised with the findings of updated research noted above. We will return to Dewey and associated seminal philosophers of knowledge and education in the following chapter.

The Nexus of Values and Pedagogy

Since the early 1990s, there has been a concentration of effort aimed at maximizing student achievement in school education and rectifying the debilitating effects of failure. The Carnegie Corporation Taskforce on Student Achievement (Carnegie Corporation 1996), referred to above, drew on new research in a variety of fields to refute the narrow assumptions and findings of conventional educational research and to assert that effective learning requires a response that is as much about affect and social dynamics as about cognition. In so doing, it re-defined learning to incorporate into the notion of 'intellectual depth' matters of communicative competence, empathic character and self-reflection as being at least as significant to learning as the indisputably important technical skills of recall, description, analysis and synthesis. Carnegie represented a watershed moment that marked at least one of the beginnings of re-assessing the assumptions of good practice pedagogy.

For all its importance, Carnegie is merely representative of a number of impelling events around pedagogy. The work of Darling-Hammond (1996, 1997), an active member of the Taskforce, is especially representative of such events. Darling-Hammond's vast store of empirical data has continued to illustrate the potentially powerful effects of reassessed assumptions, and their allied and reinvigorated pedagogy, on student achievement. Her work stands as potent justification of the challenges rendered by the Taskforce to the traditional assumptions and approaches that characterized most of Western education throughout the twentieth century.

Carnegie also pre-figured the nexus between values and pedagogy by illustrating that effective learning is inherently values-filled. The fundamental difference between this new values agenda in learning and more traditional forms of moral (or 'values') education is that the latter was largely regarded as a moral imperative, and hence negotiable and subject to ideological debate, whereas the new values agenda increasingly connotes a pedagogical imperative that incorporates the moral, but also the social, emotional, physical, spiritual and intellectual aspects of human development. Herein, a values approach to learning is seen to be an indispensable artefact to any learning environment if student achievement, entailing and incorpo-

rating holistic development and wellbeing, is to be optimized. As such, it is neither negotiable nor dependent on personal or corporate ideology. The innovative and possibly revolutionary thought contained in this proposition is that, in a sense, student achievement is best understood and approached as a veritable by-product of a 'whole-person' approach to learning. This notion brings into question previous views of learning as a compartmentalised and linear process, and calls for a reassessment of the traditional assumptions and allied approaches that Carnegie implied had led too often to student failure.

Fred Newmann (Newmann and Associates 1996) is rightly regarded as an architect of modern quality teaching but could also be seen as one who, wittingly or unwittingly, contributed to the notion of there being a nexus between values and the kind of quality teaching that his work has come to represent. Newmann's work centred on identifying the 'pedagogical dynamics' required for quality teaching. These dynamics range from the instrumental (e.g. sound technique, updated professional development) to the more aesthetic and values-filled. For instance, 'catering for diversity' is quite beyond more conventional notions of addressing individual differences. When unpacked, Newmann is speaking of the centrality to effective teaching of a respectful, insightful relationship between the teacher and the student, one that ensures that the student feels accepted, understood, encouraged and valued. Similarly, Newmann's concept of 'school coherence' as a school that is committed holistically and unswervingly to the good of the student is a values-rich concept that connotes dedication, responsibility, generosity and integrity on the part of teachers, principals and stakeholders. It is a dimension of quality teaching that is effectively about the mission of the school to place student wellbeing as its highest imperative.

Above all, Newmann's notion of 'trustful, supportive ambience' is about the ethics and aesthetics of the relationships that surround the student, most centrally the relationship with the teacher(s). Although school ambience is not easily measured, Newmann suggests, it is so indispensable to the more instrumentalist and easily measured aspects of quality teaching that it will render these latter mute and futile ventures if it is not attended to. School coherence, a trustful, supportive environment and respectful student–teacher relationships are dimensions of quality teaching that are too often neglected by stakeholders who insist that the answer to student success lies in more linear instruction, more persistent testing and teachers who are content-driven rather than people-driven.

Newmann's work coincided with the work of Carnegie that, as illustrated, had drawn on research in the emerging 'new neurosciences' to show that effective learning requires a response that is as much about affect and social dynamics as about cognition. The evidence emanating from the new neurosciences on which Carnegie drew has been sharpened in the work of Damasio (2003) and Immordino-Yang and Damasio (2007), and this work will be fully unveiled, and its potential impact on values pedagogy conveyed, in Chap. 3. These research findings illustrate why it is that attending to matters of affect and sociality, such as trust, care and encouraging relationships in schools can have such a positive impact on learning in general (Bryk and Schneider 1996, 2002; Rowe 2004).

Furthermore, there is now a vast store of evidence from values education research itself that the establishment of a positive, caring and encouraging ambience of learning, together with explicit discourse about values in ways that draw on students' deeper learning and reflectivity, has power to transform the patterns of feelings, behaviour, resilience and academic diligence that might once have been the norm among students (cf. Arthur 2003, 2010; Benninga et al. 2006; Carr 2006, 2007; Lovat and Toomey 2009; Lovat et al. 2009b; Lovat et al. 2010; Noddings 2002; Nucci and Narvaez 2008). Much of this evidence has been captured in the research and practice of the projects emanating from the *National Framework in Values Education for Australian Schools* (DEST 2005). Central among these projects was the *Values Education Good Practice Schools Project* (VEGPSP) (DEST 2006; DEEWR 2008) and the *Project to Test and Measure the Impact of Values Education on Student Effects and School Ambience* (Lovat et al. 2009b). These projects and the relevance of their findings for values pedagogy will be outlined briefly below and will be referred to in greater depth in subsequent chapters. It is the findings emanating from these projects, with which the authors have been intimately engaged, that form the substance of the empirical evidence that sits behind many of the claims made in this book about the central importance of values pedagogy if all the effects connoted by student achievement are to be optimized.

Values in Australian Schooling

Since the early 1990s, each state and territory education system in Australia has been actively promoting its system and teachers as inculcators of the essential values that define being Australian and being a global citizen. The Australian Government captured this movement well, and put its own seal on it, in its 'Civics Expert Group' report in 1994 (cf. DEETYA 1994). However termed, it is now commonly accepted that an essential component of public education's responsibilities is to be found in the work of inculcating values in its students. In short, public education is now defined as a comprehensive educator, not just chartered around cognitive and practical skills but as an inculcator of personal morality and cohesive citizenry. Furthermore, curricula related to civics, citizenship and values education have been designed and trialled in a variety of forms, both free-standing and integrated into mainstream syllabuses.

The above state of affairs has not been without its critics both from within and beyond the realm of public education. Criticism has come in different forms. One criticism comes from the belief that public schooling was designed essentially as a haven of values-neutrality. In contrast and in fact, the documents of the 1870s and 1880s that contained the charters of the various state and territory systems reveal a breadth of vision about the scope of education. Beyond the standard goals of literacy and numeracy, education was said to be capable of assuring personal morality for each individual and a suitable citizenry for the soon-to-be new nation. As an instance, the New South Wales Public Instruction Act of 1880 (cf. NSW 1912)

stressed the need for students to be inculcated into the values of their society, including understanding the role that cultural and religious values had played in forming that society's legal codes and social ethics. The notion, therefore, that Australian public education is part of a deep and ancient heritage around values-neutrality is mistaken and in need of serious revision. The evidence suggests that public education's initial conception was of being the complete educator, not only of young people's minds but of their inner character as well.

If the move to values-neutrality in public education was an aberration, then the efforts of the 1990s and the early 2000s could be regarded as a corrective. Responding both to community pressure and the realization that values-neutrality is an inappropriate ethic for any agency of formation, every Australian State and Territory has re-stated the original view that public education's charter includes responsibility for personal integrity and social justice. This movement has been evident not only in government reports but in academic and professional literature. As an instance, the 2002 Yearbook of the professional body of teachers, the Australian College of Educators, was devoted to values education (cf. Pascoe and Australian College of Educators 2002). Furthermore, the Australian Government report, *Values Education Study* (DEST 2003), represented another important step in overcoming old and entrenched attitudes around the issue.

Values Education Study

In 2003, the Australian Government initiated a small-scale study, titled *Values Education Study* (DEST 2003). The Report's Executive Summary re-stated the positions of the nineteenth century charters of public education in asserting that values education "…refers to any explicit and/or implicit school-based activity to promote student understanding and knowledge of values… (and) …to inculcate the skills and dispositions of students so they can enact particular values as individuals and as members of the wider community." (DEST 2003, p. 2). The study consisted of 50 funded projects designed in part to serve as the case study data for the report. While these projects differed markedly from each other and functioned across all systems of education, most of them had in common a focus on practical behaviour change as an outcome. The report stated that, for the most part, "…the 50 final projects (which involved 69 schools) were underpinned by a clear focus on building more positive relationships within the school as a central consideration for implementing values education on a broader scale." (DEST 2003, p. 3).

The Government report was initially endorsed by the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA), a group representing all State and Territory Education ministers in association with the Federal Minister. At the meeting that endorsed its terms of reference, MCEETYA noted the following:

- that education is as much about building character as it is about equipping students with specific skills;
- that values-based education can strengthen students' self-esteem, optimism and commitment to personal fulfilment; and help students exercise ethical judgment and social responsibility; and,
- that parents expect schools to help students understand and develop personal and social responsibilities. (DEST 2003, p. 10)

With the 2003 report, the aberration of values-neutrality in public education was finally put to rest in complete fashion at the highest and most representative levels of Australian education. Appropriately, the report did not differentiate between public, private and religious systems of schooling, nor did the case study analyses find any substantial difference in the directionality or outcomes of the projects that operated across these systems. On the basis of this evidence at least, public and private education systems were as one in their charter around values education and in their capacity to implement it.

The preamble to the draft principles which were developed as a result of the study stated explicitly that "…schools are not value-free or value-neutral zones of social and educational engagement." (DEST 2003, p. 12). Among the draft principles was one that spoke of values education as part of the explicit charter of schooling, rather than in any way incidental to its goals. It also made it clear that it is not designed merely as an intellectual exercise but is aimed at changing behaviour by promoting care, respect and cooperation. Another principle spoke of the need for values education to be managed through a "…developmentally appropriate curriculum that meets the individual needs of students" (DEST 2003, p. 12), while yet another addressed the need for "…clearly defined and achievable outcomes… (being) evidence-based and… (using) evaluation to monitor outcomes." (DEST 2003, p. 13). The first principle identified above clearly re-established the charter for values education as part and parcel of all education.

With the guidance of these principles, the fullness of the potential positive effects of values education became evident for the first time. The language of the report extended traditional conceptions of values education as being marginal, to conceptions of it as mainstream and impacting on all developmental measures. Teacher testimony spoke of values education as impacting on a comprehensive array of factors, insights and behaviours, including: student welfare; social justice; community service; human rights; intercultural awareness; environmental sustainability; mutual respect; cohesion and peace; social, emotional and behavioural wellbeing; building communities; student self-discipline; student resilience; pedagogical strength; improved outcomes; student engagement; 'doing well' at school; student self-management; and, building a learning community (Lovat 2009). The modern agenda of values education as a means of instilling comprehensive forms of student wellbeing was opened up by the tenor of the report, a tenor that was then built on in the *National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools* (DEST 2005).

The National Framework

In the 2004 Federal Budget, $A 29.7 million dollars was allocated to build and develop a national values education program, guided by the *National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools* (DEST 2005). The National Framework has driven a number of important projects related to best practice in schools, teacher education, involvement of parents and other stakeholders and resources. The largest project, the VEGPSP, impacted on 316 Australian schools in 51 clusters. The schools were drawn from all sectors across all States and Territories, with many of the clusters consisting of schools from across the sectors of public, private and religious. Throughout its two stages, VEGPSP involved over 100,000 school students and over 10,000 teachers. At its core were the 51 Cluster Leaders (senior teachers) and their University Associates (academic mentors). Between these two functions, the research and practice nexus of the project was assured.

While cluster projects varied, they were all guided by the conceptual basis of the National Framework, as well as its guiding principles and core values. The guiding principles were explicitly connected with the charter for schooling explicated by Federal, State and Territory Ministers in the *National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty First Century* (MCEETYA 1999), the so called 'Adelaide Declaration'. The Adelaide Declaration represented a marked shift in educational philosophy as it had progressed in the later part of the twentieth century. The instrumentalist and reductionist nature of educational research in the second half of the twentieth century had tended to narrow the goals of schooling around job and career preparation, with similarly narrow perspectives on the kinds of competencies and outcomes required of effective learning. In contrast, the Adelaide Declaration revived the far richer vision of the nineteenth century educational foundation charters referred to above, including an emphasis on the comprehensive role for schools in matters of citizenship and the specific role of values formation as a core function of effective schooling. The Declaration also showed sensitivity to contemporary concerns around human development in specifying that "…schooling provides a foundation for young Australians' intellectual, physical, social, moral, spiritual and aesthetic development." (MCEETYA 1999).

Illustrating that the Adelaide Declaration was far from a 'one off', idiosyncratic moment in Australian education, the later 'Melbourne Declaration', *Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians* (MCEETYA 2008), reiterated this vision of a broader and more holistic charter for twenty-first century schooling. The Preamble to the Document states:

> Schools play a vital role in promoting the intellectual, physical, social, emotional, moral, spiritual and aesthetic development and wellbeing of young Australians. (p. 4)

In a word, the Adelaide and Melbourne Declarations make it plain that effective schooling connotes an environment that encourages, supports and nurtures the holistic development of its students. The challenge is always one of finding the practical structures and pedagogies that facilitate such an ambience. This is where the

National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools (DEST 2005) has been so important.

The Framework built on these broad perspectives in proffering values education as a means of facilitating the lofty and comprehensive goals for schooling envisaged by the declarations above. It spoke of values-based education as a way of addressing some of the social, emotional, moral, spiritual and aesthetic developmental issues that schooling tends to neglect. Specifically, it stated that such education has potential to strengthen students' optimism, self-esteem, sense of personal fulfilment, ethical judgment and social responsibility. Furthermore, it asserted that values education is essential to effective schooling, integral to all key learning areas, crucial to wellbeing and reflective of good practice pedagogy. The Framework rationale made explicit reference to the language of quality teaching as both supporting and being enhanced by values education. Herein, was the vital link with quality teaching, the 'double helix effect' (Lovat and Toomey 2009), that sees the resultant learning implied in quality teaching (intellectual depth, communicative competence, empathic character, self-reflection) more readily and easily achieved in the learning ambience created by values education.

Values Education Good Practice Schools Project

The Australian Government's VEGPSP has provided the opportunity for the theses and related evidence outlined above to be tested in multiple settings and using an array of values education criteria. The VEGPSP Stage 1 and 2 Final Reports (DEST 2006; DEEWR 2008) offered ample evidence that a well-constructed values education has potential for a profound effect on the whole educational system, affecting such variables as school ethos, teacher practice, classroom climate, student attitudes and behaviours, parental and community connections, as well as student attention to academic work.

Much of the language of the testimony provided by teachers and university associates in the reports captures well the intersection between matters relating to enhanced academic attainment and the depth of thinking, affirmative classroom climate and positive relationships implied in the nexus between quality teaching and values education. The Stage 1 Report (DEST 2006) speaks richly of an array of learning features that were enhanced by the various values education projects. These features included: quality teaching and pedagogy; holism in the approach to student development; quality relationships at all levels; values being both modelled and enunciated in the curriculum; enhanced intellectual depth in both teacher and student understanding; greater levels of student engagement in the mainstream curriculum; student willingness to become more involved in complex thinking across the curriculum; increased pedagogical approaches that match those espoused by quality teaching; greater student responsibility over local, national and international issues; greater student resilience and social skills; improved relationships of care and trust; measurable decline in the incidence of inappropriate behaviour; greater

student awareness of the need to be tolerant of others, to accept responsibility for their own actions and their ability to communicate; improved students' sense of belonging, connectedness, resilience and sense of self; reflective change in the participant teachers and schools; provision of the opportunity to explore from within and reflect on identity and purpose; changed approaches to curriculum and pedagogy; enhanced students' ability to articulate feelings and emotions impelling their emotional development; evident transference in all aspects of classroom teaching and in the students' ability to deal with conflict in the playground; calmer and more cohesive classroom atmosphere; creation of a comfort zone for discussing emotions; improved levels of happiness for staff and students; development of higher order thinking skills; introduction of restorative pedagogical practices; changes in the ways teachers related with students; improved engagement and commitment of pupils, teachers and parents; a greater appreciation of the need to create interpersonal intimacy and trust in the classroom; and, the 'ripple' or 'trickle-down' effect that values education had across the school.

Beyond these general sentiments, substantial testimony included the following:

> …the documented behaviour of students has improved significantly, evidenced in vastly reduced incidents and discipline reports and suspensions. The school is…a 'much better place to be'. Children are 'well behaved', demonstrate improved self-control, relate better to each other and, most significantly, share with teachers a common language of expectations…. Other evidence of this change in the social environment of the school is the significant rise in parental satisfaction. (p. 41)
>
> The way that most teachers model behaviour to the students has changed. The way many teachers speak to students has changed. It is now commonplace for teachers to speak to students in values terms,…for example, if a child has hurt another child, we would bring to the child's attention the values of 'Respect', 'Care' and 'Compassion' as well as 'Responsibility' for our actions…. As a staff we realise the importance of modelling good behaviour and the values are the basis for this. (p. 75)
>
> Everyone in the classroom exchange, teachers and students alike, became more conscious of trying to be respectful, trying to do their best, and trying to give others a fair go. We also found that by creating an environment where these values were constantly shaping classroom activity, student learning was improving, teachers and students were happier, and school was calmer. (p. 120)
>
> …has provided many benefits to the students as far as a coordinated curriculum and learning experiences that have offered a sense of belonging, connectedness, resilience and a sense of self. However, there has been none more significant than the reflective change that has occurred in the participant teachers and schools. (p. 185)

Similarly, the Stage 2 Report (DEEWR 2008) uncovered the vital link between a values approach to pedagogy and the ambience it created with the holistic effects of this approach on student behaviour and performance. In Stage 2, a number of features of the broad values approach were clarified. These included the explicitness of the pedagogy around values being seen to be determinative, a greater awareness about the crucial significance of the teacher, and the role of an experiential or 'service learning' component coming to be seen as a particularly powerful agency in values pedagogy. The following quotes are indicative of these features:

> The principle of explicitness applies more broadly and pervasively than has been previously recognised…values-based schools live and breathe a values consciousness. They

> become schools where values are thought about, talked about, taught about, reflected upon and enacted across the whole school in all school activities. (p. 37)
> We observed that those teachers whose classrooms were characterised by an inclusive culture of caring and respect and where character development played an important and quite often explicit role in the daily learning of students were those same teachers who also demonstrated a high level of personal development, self-awareness of, and commitment to their own values and beliefs. (p. 39)
> Uniformly, teachers report that doing something with and for the community increases the students' engagement in their learning. This resonates with an interesting but relatively new proposition in education: when students have opportunities to give to their community, to something beyond themselves, it changes their attitude to the learning tasks. (p. 41)
> It was…observed (within the school) that where teachers were seeing the importance of establishing relationships and of respecting their students—this was reflected in the behaviour of their students…. Where teachers are embracing values education as something that is important and to be embedded in practice—their pedagogy is enhanced. (pp. 81–82)

The evidence from VEGPSP suggests that values education has the power to produce changes in classroom ambience and to effect positive influence on school culture more generally. Values education offered a licence for engagement in dialogue around values and ultimately for a common language to develop between staff and students by which improved relationships, behaviour and the addressing of difficult issues could be brokered. The 'ripple' effect of values education, cited above, was observed across sectors, and served as a catalyst for a positive change in the demeanour of the whole school, especially cohering around factors concerned with teacher–student relationships, teacher and student wellbeing and student attention to academic responsibilities. Consistent with Newmann's thesis that the key to effective teaching was in the ambience of learning, it seemed apparent that it was in the creation of an environment where the explicated values were shaping behaviour that student learning began to improve. A quote that captured much of the comprehensiveness of the findings, and also pointed to the next logical stage of investigation, is in the following:

> …focussed classroom activity, calmer classrooms with students going about their work purposefully, and more respectful behaviour between students. Teachers and students also reported improved relationships between the two groups. Other reports included improved student attendance, fewer reportable behaviour incidents and the observation that students appeared happier. (DEEWR 2008, p. 27)

Thus, the VEGPSP Stage 1 and 2 Reports illustrate the dynamics of the reciprocal interaction between values education and quality teaching. Courtesy of their evidence, we have ample demonstration that a well-constructed, clear and intentional values education program being integrated into the fabric of the school has the potential to bring transformational changes in the ethos of the school and the learning environment of the classroom, extending to student and teacher behaviour beneficial effects on student motivation to learn and more than a hint of improved academic achievement.

As illustrated in the quote above, by the time the Stage 2 Report was compiled, there was a growing indication that the vast array of anecdotal data and teacher testimony were testable in some way. This led directly to the *Project to Test and*

Measure the Impact of Values Education on Student Effects and School Ambience (Lovat et al. 2009b).

'Testing and Measuring' the Impact of Values on Pedagogy

As asserted above, the thesis about the inextricable link between quality teaching and an integrated values orientation, as well as the particularly beneficial effects of a service learning component as part of this mix, was the subject of much anecdotal evidence and strong teacher assertion in the two stages of VEGPSP (DEST 2006; DEEWR 2008). Across the three years in which the project rolled out, the nature of the evidence shifted from being purely qualitative to having a quantitative edge, albeit lacking formal instrumentation and measurement. These latter were brought to bear in the *Project to Test and Measure the Impact of Values Education on Student Effects and School Ambience* (Lovat et al. 2009b). In this study, there was interest in all of the claims being made around student effects, with a dedicated focus on arguably the most contentious set of claims, namely those around student academic improvement. Granted the high stakes around this claim, the study was characterized by intensive quantitative as well as qualitative methods of analysis. In the end, the authors believed there was sufficient tested evidence to support the claim that a well crafted values education program, functioning as best practice pedagogy and therefore following the criteria of quality teaching and eliciting the goals implied by service learning, had potential to impact on a range of measures typically correlated with student achievement. These measures included, in turn, school ambience, student–teacher relationships, student and teacher wellbeing, and student academic diligence.

Concerning the matter of school ambience, evidence was elicited from students, teachers and parents that spoke of a "…'calmer' environment with less conflict and with a reduction in the number of referrals to the planning room" (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 8). Of student–teacher relationships, there was evidence of a "…rise in levels of politeness and courtesy, open friendliness, better manners, offers of help, and students being more kind and considerate…the main impact of values education on student–teacher relationships appeared to be a greater understanding of each other's perspective or at least to have a greater respect for each other's position" (p. 9). About student wellbeing, the report provided evidence of "…the creation of a safer and more caring school community, a greater self-awareness, a greater capacity for self-appraisal, self-regulation and enhanced self-esteem" (p. 10). Arguably, the most contentious evidence was that concerned with the factor of student academic diligence. Here, the report spoke at length about students "…putting greater effort into their work and 'striving for quality', 'striving to achieve their best' and even 'striving for perfection'": "The aspect of students taking greater pride in their work and producing quality outcomes for their own pleasure was also mentioned by both teachers and parents" (p. 6). The report continues:

> Thus, there was substantial quantitative and qualitative evidence suggesting that there were observable and measurable improvements in students' academic diligence, including increased attentiveness, a greater capacity to work independently as well as more cooperatively, greater care and effort being invested in schoolwork and students assuming more responsibility for their own learning as well as classroom 'chores'. (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 6)

The mainly quantitative data that underpin the claims above were supplemented in the study by a number of case studies drawn from primary and high schools, from across the country and across the sectors. In summarizing the effects of values education noted among the case studies, the report says:

> Overwhelmingly, the strongest inference that can be drawn from the case studies, when taken together as a collective case study, is that as schools give increasing curriculum and teaching emphasis to values education, students become more academically diligent, the school assumes a calmer, more peaceful ambience, better student-teacher relationships are forged, student and teacher wellbeing improves and parents are more engaged with the school…. Moreover, the case studies suggest that any relationship between values education programs and the quality of student attitude, parent involvement, interpersonal relations and the like is much more complicated than simply being the case that values education in and of itself produces such quality teaching effects. Rather, it seems clear that the fit between values education and quality teaching is better described not as one having an impact on the other, but rather as the two of them being in harmony. That is, values education, academic diligence, school ambience and coherence, student and teacher wellbeing, the quality of interpersonal relationships and, up to a point, parental participation harmonize in some way. The closer the attention a school gives to explicitly teaching a set of agreed values, the more the students seem to comply with their school work demands, the more conducive and coherent a place the school becomes and the better the staff and students feel. (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 12)

The Educational Troika and Values Pedagogy

Increasingly, the Australian work cited above has led to a coalescence of the educational research and practice traditions normally described as values education and quality teaching, in the first instance, and then of these two in association with service learning as a further development of thought. When dealing with the coalition of the former two, the analogy that was coined was of a 'double helix' (Lovat and Toomey 2007, 2009). By this representation, the notion of two dimensions working interdependently to achieve a common aim was promoted. In effect, values education is seen both to rely on and, in turn, enhance quality teaching and the reverse is the case as well. The convergence of research from the neurosciences, the categories of learning and pedagogy promoted by Carnegie and Newmann, together with the concerted and accumulated findings of VEGPSP, seemed to lead inescapably to the conclusion that we were dealing with a double helix effect. Moreover, as the research and practice tradition associated with service learning was drawn into the mix, the effects connoted by the 'double helix' seemed to be strengthened, especially as they became apparent in Stage 2 of VEGPSP, confirmed in the 'Testing and Measuring' study. This led to the coining of another analogy, the 'troika' (the

masterful Russian snow cart pulled by three horses whose reputation as an effective load-carrying device became a legend), in an attempt to capture the notion of three research and practice traditions converging around a common goal and common effects and, as a convergence, enhancing the effects normally associated with any of the three traditions on their own (Lovat et al. 2009a).

While quality teaching and values education, including service learning, differ in some respects, with each having its own key researchers, practice sites and ardent followers, this troika of traditions has some vital characteristics that differentiate them as new paradigms of learning. For a start, the traditions have in common a central belief in the power of pedagogy to make the difference in enhancing student participation and learning. As such, they stand in marked contrast to those many pessimistic, late twentieth century psychosocial accounts of human development and socialization that, so Carnegie Corporation (1996) had implied, left schools and teachers feeling overwhelmed with forces beyond their control. In each research and teaching regime of the troika, one can find practice impelled by belief that change is possible. Pedagogy can be transformative and can be demonstrated through good practice-based research to be so. Regardless of the barriers to easy learning implied by heritage, disadvantage and disability, barriers that are undeniably instrumental and real, nonetheless, there is evidence that, with the right sort of pedagogy, these barriers can be weakened and even overcome. The insights gained from the projects of the Australian Values Education Program, among others, have provided this evidence.

Second, each of the research and teaching regimes of the troika can be seen to be a genuine product of our own age, with its own challenges and prospects. Unlike the many deterministic psychosocial perspectives that arose in another time and yet, as proffered by Carnegie, have been imposed on contemporary educational thought, the troika of values education, quality teaching and service learning has emerged from late twentieth to twenty-first century insights, challenges and concerns. At the risk of over-simplification, quality teaching emerged from disenchantment with the impact that schools, however well resourced, were having real issues of access and equity around learning opportunities. The new impulsion around values education resulted from the failure of society's agencies generally, including often the family, to provide for the modelling of and training in matters of personal integrity, social development, self-reflection, intercultural communication, moral and spiritual awareness, and hence their catalyst value as motivators for education and wellbeing. Service learning grew out of the other components of the troika as a particular form of quality teaching in a values environment by concentrating on matters of social outreach and social justice education, training and reflection for healthy citizenship. Unlike the foundations of old that seemed to provide answers to questions that no-one was necessarily asking, the content of the troika tends immediately to engage the interest of anyone who understands the current challenges facing the world, including classroom-based learning. These challenges are very much about access and equity and how to deal with and effect fair appraisals of achievement and failure. They are about matters of personal integrity and social development in the forms of student self-esteem and behaviour. They are about conscientizing students to see that

they are part of a wider world in which they can play an important role as caring and contributing citizens. The content, focus and research and practice insights of the troika 'ring bells' with anyone interested in the business of school teaching.

Third, the insights of the research and teaching regimes of the troika do not come as a surprise to those who understand what they represent. Many of the findings of quality teaching, values education and service learning seem to surprise, if not be incredulous to, those steeped in the old foundations. Surely, it is not possible that 'chestnut' (i.e. typical and hard to overcome) barriers to learning can be overwhelmed with sound and balanced pedagogy? Surely, the relationship between teachers and students, and the nature of the discourse between them, cannot be powerful enough to resolve those issues of behaviour management and student resistance that teachers have battled with since the dawn of formal education? Surely, moving students out into their communities in ways that expand their horizons, build their self-esteem and provide them with a sense of service to that community cannot transform schools in the ways claimed?

After all, how many hours and dollars of research have gone into confirming that the 'chestnut' barriers of heritage, disadvantage and disability cannot be effectively addressed by schools and so implying, in effect, that schools primarily support those who will achieve anyway? How much research has confirmed that issues of behaviour management and student resistance are intractable, again largely because of these barriers to learning? How much research has suggested that the only possible way forward in enhancing student achievement is to stop all the extra-curricular activities and limit the role of the school and teaching to attending to basic literacies and their testing? If one's foundational creeds about teaching and schooling are around these beliefs, then one will be genuinely surprised by the findings of the troika. On the other hand, if one comes to an understanding of the human person as a being with multiple and intersecting needs, and with recognition that emotion and affective awareness are as central to cognition as reason in its classical sense, then the findings of the troika, which suggest that the most effective pedagogy is founded on the emotion formed around the relationship with the teacher, rather than on the teacher's instrumentalist technique alone, will come as no surprise.

Conclusion

This chapter has been designed as an introduction to the central notion sitting at the heart of this book, namely the essential intersection between values and good practice pedagogy. By essential intersection, we mean simply that, without explicit and implicit attention to values, the best laid plans of instrumentalist pedagogy will fail to engage the learner, and especially the learner weighed down by disability or disadvantage. By best laid plans of instrumentalist pedagogy, we mean pedagogy oriented towards content and technique primarily, no matter how relevant the content or stimulating the technique. Such a postulation is provocative only for those who have not understood the import of the kind of updated research cited herein,

research that leads inevitably to the notion of values pedagogy representing the kind of rich, complete and comprehensive teaching that stimulates the mind, the emotions and the impulses relevant to personal and social development, so to maximize the chances of effecting the reality we describe as 'student achievement'. The remainder of the book will be devoted to fleshing out this notion and identifying the various forms of research that justify and explain it. In the next two chapters, it will attempt to illustrate that, from the two ends of ancient philosophy to modern science, the postulation that values is essential to and inherent in sound education should not be seen as provocative. From either end, it makes perfect sense.

References

Arthur, J. (2003). *Education with character: The moral economy of schooling*. London: Routledge.

Arthur, J. (2010). *Of good character: Exploration of virtues and values in 3–25 year-olds*. Exeter: Imprint Academic.

Benninga, J., Berkowitz, M., Kuehn, P., & Smith, K. (2006). Character and academics: What good schools do. *Phi Delta Kappan, 87,* 448–452.

Brady, L. (2005). Dimensions of teaching. *Curriculum and Teaching, 20*(1), 5–14.

Bruer, J. (1999). In search of…brain-based education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80,* 648–657.

Bryk, A., & Schneider, B. (1996). Social trust: A moral resource for school improvement. Chicago, Consortium on Chicago School Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 412630).

Bryk, A., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. New York: Sage.

Carnegie Corporation. (1996). Years of promise: A comprehensive learning strategy for America's children. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 397995). *http://eric.ed.gov*. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Carr, D. (2006). The moral roots of citizenship: Reconciling principle and character in citizenship education. *Journal of Moral Education, 35*(4), 443–456.

Carr, D. (2007). Character in teaching. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 55*(4), 369–389.

Damasio, A. (2003). *Looking for Spinoza: Joy, sorrow and the feeling brain*. New York: Harcourt.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). What matters most: A competent teacher for every child. *Phi Delta Kappan, 78,* 193–200.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *The right to learn: A blueprint for creating schools that work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

DEETYA. (1994). *Whereas the people: Civics and citizenship education*. Canberra: Civics Expert Group.

DEEWR. (2008). At the heart of what we do: Values education at the centre of schooling. Report of the ValuesEducation Good Practice Schools Project—Stage 2. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/VEGPSP-2_final_3_execsummary.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

DEST. (2003). Values education study. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/VES_Final_Report14Nov.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

DEST. (2005). National Framework for Values Education in Australian schools. Canberra: Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Framework_PDF_version_for_the_web.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

DEST. (2006). Implementing the National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools. Report of the Values Education Good Practice Schools Project—Stage 1: Final Report, September 2006. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation.http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/VEGPS1_FINAL_REPORT_081106.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Free Press.

Dewey, J. (1929). *The sources of a science of education*. New York: Liveright.

Farrer, F. (2000). *A quiet revolution: Encouraging positive values in our children*. London: Random House.

Hattie, J. (2004). It's official: Teachers make a difference. *Educare News, 144,* 24, 26, 28–31.

Hawkes, N. (2009). Values and quality teaching at West Kidlington Primary School. In T. Lovat & R. Toomey (Eds.), *Values education and quality teaching: The double helix effect* (pp. 105–120). Dordrecht: Springer.

Immordino-Yang, M., & Damasio, A. (2007). We feel, therefore we learn: The relevance of affect and social neuroscience to education. *Mind, Brain, and Education, 1,* 3–10.

Jencks, C. (1972). *Inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books.

Louden, W., Rohl, M., Barrat Pugh, C., Brown, C., Cairney, T., Elderfield, J. et al. (2004). *In teachers' hands: Effective literacy teaching practices in the early years of schooling*. Canberra: Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training. http://inteachershands.education.ecu.edu.au/. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Lovat, T. (2009). What works: Values and wellbeing pedagogy as best practice. Keynote Address at Australian Government National Values Education Conference, Canberra, ACT, Australia (pp. 18–24). http://www.valueseducation.edu.au/verve/_resources/2009_National_Values_Education_Conference_Report_FINAL.pdf. pp. 18–24. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Lovat, T., & Toomey, R. (Eds.). (2007). *Values education and quality teaching: The double helix effect*. Sydney: Barlow.

Lovat, T., & Toomey, R. (Eds.). (2009). *Values education and quality teaching: The double helix effect*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., & Clement, N. (Eds.). (2010). *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Clement, N., Crotty, R., & Nielsen, T. (2009a). *Values education, quality teaching and service learning: A troika for effective teaching and teacher education*. Sydney: Barlow.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Dally, K., & Clement, N. (2009b). Project to test and measure the impact of values education on student effects and school ambience. Report for the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) by The University of Newcastle. Canberra: DEEWR. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Project_to_Test_and_Measure_the_Impact_of_Values_Education.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

MCEETYA. (1999). Adelaide declaration on national goals for schooling in the twenty-first century. Canberra: Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth affairs. http://www.mceecdya.edu.au/mceecdya/publications,11582.html Accessed 7 June 2011.

MCEETYA. (2008). Melbourne declaration on educational goals for young Australians. Canberra: Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs. http://www.mceecdya.edu.au/mceecdya/default.asp?id=25979. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Newmann, F., & Associates. (1996). *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Noddings, N. (2002). *Educating moral people: A caring alternative to character education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

NSW. (1912). *Public Instruction Act of 1880 and regulations*. Sydney: Gullick.

Nucci, L., & Narvaez, D. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of moral and character education*. New York: Routledge.

Ofsted. (2007). *Inspection report: West Kidlington Primary School*, 21–22 March, 2007. Manchester: Office for Standards in Education.

Parsons, T., & Bales, R. (1955). *Family, socialization and interaction process*. Glencoe: Free Press.

Pascoe, S., & Australian College of Educators. (Eds.). (2002). *Values in education: College year book 2002*. Canberra: Australian College of Educators.

Qld. (1999). *Report of the Queensland school reform longitudinal study*. Brisbane: Education Queensland.

Rowe, K.J. (2004). In good hands? The importance of teacher quality. *Educare News, 149,* 4–14.

Chapter 2
History and Philosophy of Values and Virtues

The Ancient Art

Confucius and Aristotle would both be bemused by the modern 'discovery' that good practice pedagogy possesses an inherent values dimension. Both emanating from a period approximately 500 years prior to the birth of Christianity, Confucian ethics and Aristotelian ethics sit at the heart of the Eastern and Western (including Middle Eastern) dynasties of thought that, respectively, they impelled. Confucian ethics still defines much of the idiosyncratic ways of China and the Oriental world that has spread throughout Asia and are of increasing importance to the West, the world's future generally and to educational and pedagogical thought and practice everywhere. Meanwhile, Aristotelian ethics defines much of the thought of the Middle East, especially through Islam, and the West, especially through Judaeo-Christianity. In many ways, Aristotelian ethics may hold the greatest promise for eventual understanding between the Middle East and the West, apparently torn in the modern world by what are seen to be the conflicting ideologies of Islam and Judaeo-Christianity. A clear understanding of how these ideologies share a common basis in Aristotelian ethics would show this apparent dichotomy to be false and entirely unhelpful.

Confucian Ethics

Confucian ethics focussed heavily on the centrality of trusting relations in drawing out the best and most reliable response in people (Brooks and Brooks 1998; Riegel 2011). The heart of the stable society relied on the notion and practice of *ren*, compassion towards and practical love of others. "What you do not wish for yourself, do not do to others," (Lun yu n.d., Chap. 12, line 2) was the Confucian Golden Rule that guaranteed that trusting relations would predominate in the communities making up a society such that it could function in an orderly and productive fashion. The idea that this fulcrum could be replaced or transposed with an instrumental or business-like approach, even of the most superior kind, was the most antithetical of all the notions that Confucian ethics set out to refute. Indeed, Confucius saves his

T. Lovat et al., *Values Pedagogy and Student Achievement,*
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-1563-9_2, © Springer Science+Business Media, B.V. 2011

harshest words for those he sees as having learned the art of winning over an audience through clever rhetoric and trickery, but who in fact lack the integrity of *ren*. In spite of all the political changes wrought on China since the time of Confucius, it remains one of the fundamental principles of effective political, business or other transaction with China, that the relationship of trust be established before there can be any effective exchange.

Confucian ethics is important for educators for a number of reasons. Not only is his one of the world's oldest philosophies that has influenced countless millions, but it continues to sit at the heart of one of the current world's most crucial civilizations. Moreover, his words on education, like those of just a few people through the ages, are timeless in their pertinence and value. He emphasizes the importance of careful, disciplined study if one wishes to reach the heights of the personal and social success to which he pointed.

Moreover, it was a finely crafted study about which Confucius spoke, one characterized by a balance between learning and thinking: "He who learns but does not think is lost. He who thinks but does not learn is in great danger." (Lun yu n.d., Chap. 2, line 15). In this, Confucius seemed to suggest that it is possible both to think and to learn in isolation, but that the real goal is to do both in a way that marks out the reflective learner, the one who knows, knows oneself and knows how to continue knowing.

Confucius's was a universal pedagogy. He believed in the power of all to learn, even the most disadvantaged. The key was to have a good teacher whom, above all, one could emulate. The good teacher was not one who spoke or lectured a great deal, but one who showed others how to live through modelling. The good teacher was one who asked the kinds of questions that impelled wonder, imagination and a desire to learn.

Confucius's pedagogy centred on the 'Six Arts', including a range of practical arts but, at the centre of any content, lay morality. For him, education was about facilitating ethical judgment and practical morality. The student who thinks but does not learn, or learns but does not think is the one who ends up with a store of knowledge that has no impact at the personal level. Such education is useless in Confucian terms. The great Muslim Sufi, Abu al-Ghazali, would echo these sentiments over 1000 years later in remarking that God (*Allah*) finds nothing as distasteful as the one who stores up knowledge but does nothing with it (al-Ghazali 1991). In this remonstration against shallow piety, this great mystic marked himself out as a 'practical mystic'.

Aristotelian Ethics

Al-Ghazali was a disciple of Aristotle, being one of the great Muslim minds of medieval times to whom the West owes the great debt of having preserved Aristotelian thought and applied it to a world about to embark on the advance of science. Aristotelian ethics lies at the heart of this thought. Like that of Confucius, it is replete with notions of the centrality of trust and care to all that we hold to be moral and humane. In contrast to the rather heady ethical notions to be found in the work of

his teacher, Plato, Aristotle's (1985) characterization of virtue was of someone who took practical action to put into effect one's beliefs about right and wrong. *Eudaemonia* (literally happiness) was the supreme good that could only come from practical action devoted to the issue of virtue and its promotion. Among such practical action, virtuous behaviour directed towards trusting relations and communal concern was paramount. For Aristotle, it might be said that there could be no individual happiness in, or effective functioning of, the human community in the absence of such virtuous behaviour.

This essential conjoining of intention with action would go on to constitute the heart of Christian ethics as defined by Aquinas (1936) in his notion of *synderesis*, that inborn facility that urges the Christian not only to seek truth but to express it in practical action. Aquinas saw the connection between Aristotle and the Pauline thesis (cf. I Cor. 13), that one who claimed to have faith in all its vast dimensions but failed to 'love' was no more than a 'noisy gong' who, by implication, could not be trusted to back their words with deeds. In turn, Aquinas owed much to the thinking of al-Ghazali whose life's work was concerned with salvaging Islamic Sufism from a spirituality based on exclusivity and pietism in favour of one based on inclusivity and engagement. As with Aristotle and St. Paul, so for al-Ghazali, the essential virtuous Muslim was one in whom one could place trust that what was said was what would be done. More (1989), similarly, saw education as being principally about achieving personal integrity and conforming one's actions to the common good. He contrasted this *true education* with the accumulation of facts and figures that was mere *instruction*. True education was 'transformative', bringing to life what was a hidden seed in each person.

Hence, from ancient and medieval times, a tradition was inherited that distinguished instrumentalist from holistic education. Central to the latter has been the notion that education is a moral quest in terms both of its addressing the full range of individual needs and of its role in enhancing the good of society. In that sense, values education has potential to go to the heart of the notion of education being ultimately for the common good, designed both to build individual character and enhance morality in the citizenry. The earliest forms of education in Islam were about creating this kind of positive and supportive learning environment geared towards redressing the natural inequities to be found in society. Christendom followed suit in the later Middle Ages with many of contemporary Europe's most exclusive schools and universities having their origins in learning centres for those with limited opportunities from birth. The origins of education are inevitably and irretrievably built on moral foundations.

Philosophy of Mind

Confucius, Aristotle and al-Ghazali are, among other things, early pioneers of the philosophy of mind, that branch of philosophy that focusses on the relationship between the mind and the body, and therefore on matters of cognition, emotion, intention and social behaviour, and the connections between them. Through these

pioneers, we learned early lessons about the importance of such connections to education. While it is an ancient art in some respects, philosophy of mind nonetheless developed a more analytical and critical focus with advances in science, including neuroscience (Armstrong 1968; Braddon-Mitchell and Jackson 2006; Chalmers 1997; Ryle 1949; Schopenhauer 1974). While modern philosophers and scientists often take issue with elements of the thinking of the ancients, they nonetheless confirm their essential postulations about the integral relationship of mind and body, the inherent connections between cognition, emotion, intention and social behaviour, and the importance of all of these phenomena for education.

In Schopenhauer (1974) and Ryle (1949), we find a firm refutation of Cartesian duality of mind and body. Both philosophers contended that this dualism had led to the fallacy of supposing that one's mental states (cognition and intention) were separable from one's practical actions and behaviours. Furthermore, they proffer that there is not so much a causal connection between the two, but rather that the two are one:

> But I say that between the act of will and the bodily action there is no causal connection whatever; on the contrary, the two are directly one and the same thing perceived in a double way, namely in self-consciousness or the inner sense as an act of will, and simultaneously in external spatial brain-perception, as bodily action. (Schopenhauer 1974, p. 21)

Armstrong (1968) agrees with Ryle's refutation of Cartesian dualism in showing that an 'act of will' and 'purposive activity' do not constitute two separable phenomena but two aspects of the one phenomenon: "An act is something that we do as opposed to something that merely happens. An act springs from our will." (p. 137). Furthermore, he goes beyond Ryle in eradicating any sense in which mind can be distinguished from functions of the brain and that it is the brain that drives both introspection and purposive action. Chalmers (1997) is another philosopher of mind who rejects Cartesian dualism and hence the notion that the mind is somehow superior to the brain and so constitutes the determining agent of human behaviour. For him, behaviour is entirely and best explained in terms of functions of the brain. In a similar vein, David Braddon-Mitchell and Frank Jackson (Braddon-Mitchell and Jackson 2006) argue for a 'common-sense functionalism' as the most appropriate contemporary theoretical basis for philosophy of mind, granted where modern science and neuroscience have taken us. For them, the heart of their functionalism is in a materialist theory of mind where the "… ingredients we need to understand and account for the mental list are … essentially the same, and the basic ones are the ones we need to account for the material or physical side of our natures." (p. 3).

Although the neural correlates of the mind can be mapped at a functional level, there are others who, while rejecting the substance dualism of Descartes, see a danger in reducing explanations of the mind solely to naturalistic descriptions of the biological functioning of the brain (e.g. Brothers 2001; Beauregard and O'Leary 2007; Changeux and Ricoeur 2002; Franks 2010). Franks (2010), citing notables like Damasio, Sperry and Edelman, argues that the mind–brain relationship cannot be understood solely in terms of the bottom-up descriptions of neurobiology, but that the mind can and does exert control on the brain, with the phenomenon of cognitive behaviour therapy being an example of the influence of thought on the

material brain. Damasio (1996) argues that explanation of human culture cannot be understood by biology alone, but requires the explanation of the social sciences as well. Nonetheless, there is no division between will and action.

The practical effect of the above postulations of philosophy of mind is to underline (perhaps accidentally) the central theses of the ethics of Confucius, Aristotle and Abu al-Ghazali that integrity and morality rely centrally on human will and action being seen as part of a unified whole. Hence, the notion that a caring and trusting relationship is at the heart of all human endeavour, including that related to effective learning, is an idea well rehearsed in the traditions that have emanated from such ethics. It is no less one of the sharpest and most evidently proven ideas to be found in the results of updated pedagogical research. Yet, much modern education has been subject to a very different and, in terms of values, more hostile influence wrought of developments in nineteenth and twentieth century philosophy going broadly by the name of 'empirical science'. We need to explore these developments before proceeding to outline ways in which such narrow forms of empirical science were finally superseded, so allowing for modern values pedagogy to be pursued as a central aim of education.

Empirical Science in Education

Empirical science centres on a narrow conception of what constitutes truth. Alfred J. Ayer, the British philosopher, was one of the architects of this narrow conception of knowledge. His school of thought was known as 'logical positivism', spelled out best in his famous little book, *Language, Truth and Logic* (Ayer 1936). Ayer maintained the thesis that there were only two types of genuine propositions regarding knowledge, namely, the analytic and the synthetic:

> … a proposition is analytic when its validity depends solely on the definitions of the symbols it contains, and synthetic when its validity is determined by the facts of experience. (p. 105)

Analytic propositions were deemed to be true of necessity, not owing to factual content but their being built around tautologies or necessary truths. Synthetic propositions, on the other hand, are not true of necessity. They are statements about the real world, based on experience of it. The factual truth of these can only be assured by empirical verification, that is, by being able to stand up to the test of observation and experimentation. Typically, the propositions of science can be tested in this way, whereas the propositions of the arts, humanities, religion and morality cannot be tested by observation or experiment and, therefore being non-provable, cannot be true. For Ayer, this was sufficient proof that mathematics and science represented the only assured ways of ascertaining knowledge. The propositions of other subjects could not be tested and so did not represent knowledge at all. They were empty, literally meaningless. Ayer (1936) described such knowledge claims as "pseudo-propositions." (p. 48).

Ayer was not a lone figure in the pursuit of this extreme form of empirical science. Logical positivism had been fashionable for some time and, indeed, could be traced back in part to the writings of Kant (1964). By the late nineteenth and, especially into the twentieth centuries, the impact on education of this form of science and its assumptions cannot be overstated. For a start, it promoted the notion that mathematics and science were important parts of the curriculum because they constituted 'high status knowledge' (Apple 2004), while history and the languages were of medium importance, and art, religion, moral education and personal development were of little significance owing to the fact that there was no verifiable knowledge base to any of these disciplines, according to the criteria established by Ayer for ascertaining true knowledge. These criteria became known widely in academic circles as 'The Verification Principle'.

The Verification Principle which, Ayer (1936) declared, provided "… a criterion by which it can be determined whether or not a sentence is literally meaningful," (p. 7) betrayed his dependence on a particularly narrow form of empirical science, known popularly as 'inductivism'. Inductivism, or the 'inductive method', represents a particular belief about knowledge and how it is attained. In simple terms, it is an approach that says: "If I can see, touch, smell, hear or taste it, I will believe; if I cannot, I will not." This is a method that an increasing number of scholars, including natural scientists have come to question as to its sufficiency for ascertaining all knowledge, but it nonetheless maintains a certain appeal because of its simplicity and apparent surety. It can still be seen to be the basis of many knowledge claims, not only by natural scientists but by psychologists, sociologists and even many philosophers. Every now and again, the essential naivety behind forms of blind inductivism are seen in calls for 'evidence based' practice which invariably elevate inductivist experimentation, by those far from the coal face of practice, above the practical wisdom of those who spend their lives at the coal face. Because of the persistent ease with which naïve inductivist belief is brought forward by politicians and bureaucrats seeking to control the lives of practitioners, it is worth detailing the philosophical dismantling of inductivism's claims to hold the keys to truth.

Dismantling Naïve Inductivism: The Taming of Empirical Science

Ludwig Wittgenstein was one of the first philosophers to begin the dismantling of inductivism. He believed that it was crucial for the scientist to note that people *did* find meaning in many of the propositions declared meaningless by the likes of Ayer. For him, it was an arrogant and poor form of science that took some human evidence seriously but disregarded other evidence. Indeed, Wittgenstein (1974) claimed that the verification principle was based on a misunderstanding of the nature of language. Language serves a multiplicity of purposes; what the logical positivist had done was simply to take the language which served the purposes of empirical science and give it guardianship over all language and all purposes. It would have been

as senseless to do the same with religious or moral language, so declaring scientific propositions to be invalid by their terms of reference.

For Wittgenstein, language can only make sense or have validity within the context of its peculiar purpose, or within a particular 'paradigm'. So, a language that speaks of observation and empirical verification, such as that of science, should not become the overseer of all other forms of language. For him, even those forms of language that spoke of knowledge quite beyond empirical testing, such as religious, artistic or moral language, were valid as long as one understood them for what they were. For Wittgenstein (1974), any language serves to model reality, portraying a particular viewpoint or picture. Some pictures, like that portrayed by scientific language, require empirical testing, while others do not. In other words, inductivism is a fine method for ascertaining knowledge in many of the sciences but useless for ascertaining knowledge of other realities.

Frederick Ferré continued the dismantling of inductivism by calling into question the simplified way in which the logical positivists spoke of 'facts'. For them, a fact was that which could be verified empirically. Knowledge was all about facts. Ferré (1982), however, suggests

> Facts are never 'given' apart from the minds which receive them. (p. 160)

For Ferré, it is the human mind that translates the "… blooming, buzzing confusion of bare sensation" (p. 161) into the meaningful patterns we call 'facts'. Without the intervention of the mind, the 'facts' we experience would be no more than random and unrelated happenings and sensations. It is the mind that organizes these events into apparently related and internally consistent 'facts'. The mind serves as the theorizing force that makes sense of these events, even reifying them into 'facts'. The mind perceives reality and organizes it according to patterns which make it understandable and meaningful. These understandable and meaningful patterns are enshrined in the notion of 'theories'. For Ferré (1982), what people call 'facts' are really no more than 'theories':

> The 'facts' of science are, typically, theories overwhelmingly confirmed by conceptually organized experience. (p. 761)

Ferré delivered a substantial blow to the logical positivist's claim to have a research methodology that provided assured knowledge, knowledge of the 'facts'. If the 'facts' of science are really no more than theories, confirmed not by the apparent certainties of observation, but by the conceptual organizations of the mind, then these 'facts' are no different from the 'facts' of religion, art, morality, ethics or ballet. For Ferré (1982), all 'facts' compounded in this way are really theories and, as such, meaningful, valid and 'true' within their own appropriate contexts:

> … all facts of whatever kind are relative…to the system in which they play a key role… facts…depend for their confirmation on the adequacy of the system in which they operate. (p. 161)

From the point of view of a 'systems theory' of the likes of Ferré (1982), it becomes nonsense to select the theories and methodologies of one system to stand guard over the meaningfulness of another systems' theories and methodologies. For Ferré, this is precisely what Ayer had done with the system proper to empirical science.

As philosophy began to uncover the notions of 'systems' and the 'theory-ladenness' of observation, the over-simplified claim of Ayer that the 'facts' of science could be verified by an uncomplicated set of observations began to appear naïve and unsatisfactory as a basis for knowing and, more so, what should count as more or less important in education. The complexities and degree of theorizing involved in observation were subsequently confirmed in the writings of Imre Lakatos, James Walker, Thomas Kuhn and Paul Feyerabend.

Touchstone, Paradigm and Systems Theories: The Unlocking of Science

Lakatos (1974) employed the notion of 'touchstone' to describe how it is that certain theories are coagulated to create a programme, or what we might describe as a 'discipline'. Walker (1985) also employed the notion of 'touchstone theory' to suggest that the very notion of an 'area' or 'form of knowledge' is somewhat of an illusion. For these writers, all that really holds a so-called 'discipline' together is a theory (the touchstone theory) that confirms that, among all the competing theories concerning knowledge, some are concerned with similar ideas, perspectives and methodologies, while others are different. Here, we discern a useful, though ever-tentative and changeable boundary around these ideas, perspectives and methodologies. To go further and suggest that this amounts to a 'discipline', a 'form of knowledge' different from or, worse still, superior to other 'forms' is to misunderstand the nature of knowledge and to risk retarding the progress of knowledge-gathering. Again, this is precisely what Ayer had done with the discipline and attached method of empirical science.

Similarly, from the perspective of Kuhn's (1970) notion of 'paradigm', Ayer's constraining of what should count as knowledge came to appear as a gross oversimplification. For Kuhn, a paradigm exists when a complex theory holds together sets of theories related by similar focus and interest. In the business of knowledge-gathering, the paradigm plays a far greater role than simple observation. In fact, it requires a consensus of observations from a majority of those who hold to a paradigm before the paradigm will change or be exchanged. For Kuhn, this is in fact the way all types of knowledge-gathering operates, whether it concerns empirical science, theology or moral education. Simple observation statements have little status in the face of the complex theory that holds the paradigm together, including the consensus about it from 'experts' that might well differ from the observation statements. What is especially damaging to the inductivist's claims is the obvious inference that the paradigm referred to as empirical science is really no more directly dependent on simple observation than other paradigms, including those referred to as religion and morality.

Feyerabend (1975) illustrates well the complexity and essential non-empirical basis of empirical science. He contends that anyone who wishes to be a scientist in the modern era must undergo strict training and ultimately conform to the ideas and

standards of the scientific community. He likens this control of free thought to that exercised by the church in the Middle Ages. Because of such rigid control, most major advances in empirical science, like those wrought by Darwin or Einstein, have come as 'breaks' in the highly controlling processes that safeguard scientific orthodoxy, rather than being the natural result of scientific method.

Feyerabend takes us back to the notions of 'touchstone theory' or 'paradigm' as connoting what it is that holds empirical science together, rather than the simple observation thesis proffered by Ayer's logical positivism. As such, empirical science possesses no privileged status as the guardian of all knowledge claims. Accordingly, Feyerabend (1975) was highly critical of the way in which empirical science and its methods were imposed on students at school as though they provided the most eminent and certain of all forms of discerning truth, as well as the yardstick by which all other forms of knowledge should be judged and, in the case of religious and moral education, condemned. Feyerabend's curriculum structure would be far broader and more comprehensive than has been the norm in the modern school.

Quine (1953) in many ways completed the dismantling of the simple empiricist, or inductivist approach to knowledge-gathering. The two strategies he employed in accomplishing this dismantling concerned the rejection of what he termed the 'Two Dogmas of Empiricism'. The first 'dogma' concerned the Verification Principle, which he described as "… an unempirical dogma of empiricism." (p. 37). The second 'dogma' concerned what he termed the 'dogma of reductionism'. This dogma suggested that "… each meaningful statement is equivalent to … terms which refer to immediate experience." (p. 20).

Quine (1953) proffered that, by means of the 'two dogmas', the logical positivist had contended that the relationship between a statement and the experiences that would confirm or disconfirm it was one of direct reports. According to this view, for every proposition, there is an immediate, external referent. To put it more simply, every utterance relates directly to something 'out there'. Hence, when a scientist says: "… there is a gravitational force between Neptune and the Sun," the scientist means there is something (called 'gravitational force') 'out there': it is real, observable and testable, at least in principle if not in practice. This is the relationship of direct report. For the logical positivist, the problem with so-called 'non-scientific' languages was that the 'direct report' relationship was absent. For instance, when the theologian says: "God loves all people," or the ethicist says: "Murder is wrong", there is nothing 'out there' that is scientifically real, observable or testable, even in principle. Logical positivism, in other words, placed enormous store on physical sensory human experience. It suggested that this sensory experience could be the arbiter of the validity of language and truth. It could tell us whether there is anything 'out there', or not, with regard to any statement.

For Quine (1953), this was a naïve oversimplifying of the business of knowledge-gathering. For him, experience plays only a minor part in the confirmation or disconfirmation of knowledge claims. The truly powerful forces in such confirmation are the principles, laws and beliefs of a total system of thought. These latter have been constructed over a long period of time and for a variety of reasons, only some of which are pure and unadulterated, many of which preserve vested interests:

> The 'totality' of our so-called knowledge… is a man-made fabric which impinges on experience only along the edges. (p. 42)

In other words, the scientist's claim that there is a gravitational force between Neptune and the sun' is telling us a great deal about the traditions and beliefs of the scientific community with regard to Neptune and gravitational forces. In contrast to what the logical positivist suggests, however, it is telling us nothing about human experiences, least of all of 'direct report' relationships between statements and what is 'out there'. Like any other area of knowledge, empirical science is replete with beliefs, many if not most of them untested by observation, and therefore of 'heresies', beliefs that contradict the conventional beliefs of the scientific community.

Scientists are as suspicious of individual reports that contradict their 'dogmas', even when based on observation, as are the followers of other disciplines. Through this suspicion and consequent resistance to change, so Laura (1981) charges, empirical science has imposed the sort of tyranny and suppression on contemporary thought as, it is alleged, religion did in the Middle Ages. In fact, Laura suggests, empirical science and religious belief have more in common than tends to be acknowledged, and certainly than Ayer would ever have conceded. For Ayer, empirical science was about 'facts' that were observable and testable, whereas religion was about 'myths' that were neither observable nor testable. Laura (1978), on the other hand, demonstrates that, at the bases of both areas of knowledge, there lie un-testable 'myths'. In the case of religion, the myths centre on faith in a transcendent force, a god or spirits. In the case of empirical science, it concerns faith in the uniformity of nature:

> Both beliefs are … primitive in the sense that they constitute respectively what the scientist and the theist regard as reasons for their reasoned beliefs. (p. 373)

Neither belief can satisfy the criteria for truth imposed by Ayer. According to the very logic that he applied so destructively to religion and morality, the basis of empirical science is as meaningless as the basis of religion and morality.

New Philosophies of Knowledge

Just as a narrow philosophy of knowledge, like that of Ayer, can restrict a theory of what curriculum should be and how it should function, so a broad definition can open these up. Such was the definition of Paul Hirst and Richard S. Peters. For a start, they suggested that, in the recent past, education had been conceived "… too much in terms of a set stock of information, simple skills and static conformity to a code." (Hirst and Peters 1970, p. 37).

At the same time, Hirst and Peters were not ready to advocate total experience-centred learning. They believed that creativity, autonomy and critical thought required solid grounding in the various bodies of knowledge. As they saw it, there were certain 'forms of knowledge' which underlay any learning experience, and it was vital for any learner to know well which 'form' s/he was dealing with at

any given time. As far as they were concerned, there were seven obvious forms of knowledge. These comprised Mathematics and Logic, Physical Sciences, Human Sciences, Literature and Fine Arts, History, Philosophy and Religion. Each of these forms of knowledge had an appropriate procedure, or methodology, which suited it and which would render knowledge within its domain. For instance, empirical observation was the procedure most appropriate for dealing with the knowledge involved in the Physical Sciences, while the Human Sciences demanded that the learner become more closely involved with people, their feelings and dreams. Knowledge of the Fine Arts required a 'feel' for the aesthetics and knowledge of Religion demanded familiarity with the nature of symbol and myth.

According to the 'forms' theory, the most disastrous thing a learner could do was to confuse appropriate methodologies. In other words, to expect that Art could be handled in the same way as Mathematics, or that Religion should be judged by the methodologies proper to the Physical Sciences, was bound to lead to faulty judgments about knowledge. In a sense, it can be seen that this is precisely what Ayer had done. According to the Hirst and Peters' criteria, Ayer had failed to understand the comprehensiveness of knowledge types, declaring that the first two alone comprised all of knowledge; he then went on to declare all other claims to knowledge (like Religion, the Arts, Ethics, etc.) to be meaningless because they could not conform to the methodology appropriate to his privileged two forms.

Hirst's and Peters' philosophy of knowledge is important because, in contrast to a philosophy like Ayer's, it broadens the scope of knowledge to be dealt with. This is crucial to understanding the place of ethics in education, and moral education as an educational quest. The curriculum will only be constructed to deal with knowledge which is considered to be legitimate. If Mathematics and Science are regarded as the only two authentic forms of knowledge, then the curriculum will be heavily dominated by if not exclusively given over to them. Hirst's and Peters' perspective was important historically among attempts to broaden the scope of the public curriculum, and especially important in modern attempts to inculcate a values pedagogy. Other philosophies of knowledge have variously built on, and in some cases superseded, their 'forms thesis'.

Walker (1985) is one who partly built on but also superseded the forms thesis in proposing the view that the basic units of knowledge are 'theories', rather than forms. He employed a species of Lakatosian 'touchstone theory' to explain how it is that the essential unity of knowledge can appear to be partitioned into forms. When sets of theories appear to be addressing similar problems, it can seem as though these sets of theories comprise a separate form of knowledge, as Hirst's and Peters' theory had suggested. In fact, Walker argues, the sets of theories are only sharing a common 'touchstone' related to ideas, perspectives, types of evidence and methodologies. Knowledge is in fact one. Walker's theory is reflective of arguably the most crucial of all the unity theorists in Jurgen Habermas. Habermasian theory is also arguably the most central in positing an essential morality at the heart and core of education. Habermas's contribution to educational thought is best understood however in the context of the modern drive in education to correct the overly instrumentalist effects of an exaggerated empiricism.

Ethics, Values and Education: The Modern Quest

For Dewey (1916, 1929), education was principally a means of producing moral judiciousness and, in that sense all education was effectively moral education. Hence, moral education was seen as the means by which students could engage most effectively in the business of learning itself. Dewey spoke of the innate hazards of overly instrumental forms of education and the overarching need for a way of knowing in schooling that cultivated a mindset on the part of teachers that was, at one and the same time, self-reflective and directed towards instilling reflectivity, inquiry and moral capacity in students.

Kohlberg (1963) proposed that all of human development was impelled by and rested on the moral challenges that beset all people. His six-stage theory of moral development became a popular way in which all of human development could be conceived, taking in stages of childhood motivation via punishment, reward and instrumental purpose, through conventional stages of conformity and social maintenance, and aspiring to an ideal stage where human beings could be motivated by commitment to social contracts and universal principles. Kohlberg's influence on education and teacher education was profound, leading to moral development being seen as central to all human growth, including intellectual development. For him, it was impossible to separate the skills that lay most overtly at the heart of school goals, namely academic skills, from those related to moral development.

Like Dewey, Peters (1981) was a major force in proposing that moral education lay at the heart of all authentic education. His concern was with the notion of the 'educated man' and how this might be best conceived and safeguarded in a world of competing demands and politics. The central plank of his argument for being 'educated' in the true sense was in the conjunction of what he described as the 'knowledge condition' and the 'value condition'. In a sense, he was arguing, like many of those above, for a distinction to be made between instrumentalist education (what More would call 'instruction') and holistic education, in which the distinguishing feature was around values. It was only education related to 'what is of value' that allowed education to be of value at all:

> According to R.S. Peters, education implies that something worthwhile is being intentionally transmitted in a morally acceptable manner … despite the diversity of values and the culturally dependent interpretation of well-being, some values are conducive to and deducible from the aforementioned definition of development. These values should be present in all educational practices … I agree with John Dewey that all education is, and should be, moral education. (Raulo 2002, p. 507)

Habermas's (1972, 1974) theory of knowing, on the one hand reminiscent of the core of Deweyian thought, has the added value of an attached theory of social engagement. Habermas (1984, 1987) spoke of authentic knowing leading to 'communicative capacity' and ultimately 'communicative action', a concept about personal commitment, reliability and trustworthiness that spills over into practical action that makes a difference, or what Habermas describes as *praxis*. This is the kind of education that aims to transform thought and practice and so make a difference to the way the human community coheres. It is a supremely moral education.

As with the educational theory of all the afore-mentioned scholars, Habermasian epistemology renders the notion of values neutrality in education inappropriate and non-viable. Habermasian epistemology challenges the authenticity of an education conceived of solely in instrumentalist outcomes-based or competencies terms. Habermasian epistemology impels for any legitimate education a values-laden pedagogy that saturates the learning experience in both a values-filled environment as well as in explicit teaching that engages in discourse about values-related content, transacts practical and personalized values, and in turn inducts students into personal empowerment over their own stated and lived out values. Habermasian epistemology also challenges therefore the notion that values education connotes merely a moral option among various approaches to education, perhaps more suitable to religious than to public systems of schooling. On the contrary, Habermasian epistemology confirms the views of all the scholars noted above that values education is best understood as holistic pedagogy aimed at the full range of developmental measures. Rather than connoting a mere moral or, least of all religious option, values pedagogy connotes an effective and indispensable way in which learning should proceed in any setting. In a word, Habermas offers a most comprehensive and convincing justification for values pedagogy, as we are defining it in this book.

In addressing the forms thesis, noted above, Habermas offers another explanation for apparent divisions in what is, for him, an essential unity of knowledge. He suggests that they arise as the result of human 'cognitive interests', the interests which are part and parcel of the human mind. These interests are three-fold. First, there is an interest in technical control which relates to an 'empirical-analytic' type of knowing. Second, there is an interest in understanding meanings which relates to an 'historical-hermeneutic' type of knowing. Third, there is an interest in being free which relates to a 'critical', or 'self-reflective' type of knowing. As far as Habermas is concerned, all three interests operate in any subject area. Whatever the subject matter, our interest in technical control will lead us to want to know all the facts and figures associated with the subject; this is where empirical-analytic knowing is of use. Similarly, our interest in understanding the meaning behind anything will lead us to explore the inner dimensions, to try to relate one factor to another; this is where historical-hermeneutic knowing is useful. Finally, our interest in ensuring our own autonomy will make us reflect critically on our subject matter, as well as on ourselves.

Habermas's epistemology has been crucial to much of the thought that educationists have seized on in attempting to deepen our understanding of learning and stretch conceptions of the role of the teacher. Beyond the importance of empirical-analytic knowing (the knowing of facts and figures), Habermas spoke, when it was entirely unfashionable, of the more challenging and authentic learning of what he described as historical-hermeneutic or 'communicative knowledge' (the knowing that results from engagement and interrelationship with others) and of 'self-reflectivity' (the knowledge that comes ultimately from knowing oneself). For Habermas, this latter was the supreme knowing that marked a point of one's having arrived as a human being. One might caricature him as saying "There is no knowing without knowing the knower", and the knower is oneself. In a sense, the ultimate end of learning is to be found in knowing oneself.

It is the one who knows and, in a sense, trusts oneself, who is in the strongest position to go on to what Habermas (1984, 1987) describes as 'communicative competence'. Beyond the technical and hermeneutic skills that one might expect to find enshrined in this Habermasian notion of the modern, global, communicating citizen, there lies a thesis about reliability, trustworthiness and personal commitment. These are the artefacts of effective communication that go beyond the best-laid training in technical and even interpretive competence. They can only come from the wellspring enshrined in the notion of self-reflectivity, from one who knows who they are, values the integrity of being authentic and commits themselves to establishing the kinds of caring and trusting relationships that bear the best fruits of human interactivity.

As has been well confirmed by the extent of his citations in educational material, these Habermasian perspectives possess huge potential to enlighten educational thought and practice. In light of the concerns of this chapter, these perspectives help to illuminate why it is that research of the kind cited in Chap. 1 (cf. Bryk and Schneider 2002; Louden et al. 2004; Rowe 2004) has produced the results it has, and furthermore they underline why it is that the values dimension of good practice pedagogy, as articulated in this book, must be grasped by teachers, schools and systems as being central and pivotal to their endeavours, rather than being on their margins. Again, it is worth re-stating the central proposition that the consideration and incorporation of a values approach to pedagogy has the potential to go to the very heart of what it is that teachers, schools and educational systems do best.

Values, Habermasian Epistemology and Education

Habermas's epistemology provides a particularly powerful tool for analysing the capacity of a values approach to pedagogy to transform people's beliefs and behaviours, to make the kind of difference that would seem to be its promise. Let us take a particularly contemporary values issue, one concerned with the alleged clash of values between Islam and non-Islam, as an example. If schools really can address this potentially disastrous issue in the way our politicians seem to expect, one would think values pedagogy would have to be the primary tool for doing it. Let us sharpen the example by considering the fairly common belief throughout much of the non-Muslim population that Muslims are given to troublemaking and are potential terrorists. This is a growing belief if one can judge by the amount of media that reflects it.

Employing Habermasian theory in analysing how a learner would deal with confirming or disconfirming this belief, first one would explore the level of empirical knowing or, if you like, evidence-based knowing. Here, one would be faced with an array of facts and figures, or evidence if you like, much of which might well seem to confirm the belief. As suggested, there is currently no shortage of media that would point in this direction and one could build up a sound case with an abundance of apparent evidence confirming that Muslims are indeed troublemakers with links to

radical imams sympathetic to the cause of terrorism. There is nothing inherent in this way of knowing that would force the learner to consider seriously any amount of counter-evidence that might exist. After all, no one can sift all of the evidence so one can be excused for assembling the selective evidence that happens to confirm one's beliefs. Lawyers, politicians, journalists, teachers and even researchers are doing this all the time.

At the next level, that of communicative knowing, one could similarly choose to converse and dialogue with those who simply affirm one's own beliefs or at least do not overtly challenge them. Again, one could assemble a respectable sample of evidence from conversations and interviews that simply endorse what the selective facts and figures seemed to demonstrate and that, perhaps not coincidentally, conform with one's original beliefs anyway. In other words, even respectable and apparently objective research can be skewed to simply confirm the belief that was there in the first place. In the classroom, pedagogy that appears quite sound, objective and evidence-based can function in the same way. It would be possible to have pedagogy with rigorous appearance and purportedly evidence-based that had no greater effect than to confirm the beliefs and values of the dominant class and keep the majority of staff and students well within their comfort zone. At this point, nothing has really happened to challenge the original belief about Muslims.

It is only at the level of critical or self-reflective knowing that one is forced by the very nature of this way of knowing to consider whether one has exhausted all the evidence, including opening oneself up to the possibility that one has been on a self-confirming learning path all along, selecting the evidence that fits and filtering out the evidence that does not fit, that might invade one's own comfort zones and force some re-consideration of long-held beliefs and behaviours. At the ultimate point of this way of knowing, one is finally forced to consider oneself. Could it be that all of the beliefs I hold and the behaviours that result are not really based on evidence so much as on the preferences and prejudices of my upbringing, my family, my culture and ultimately my very self? Could it be that I take comfort in expressing the belief that Muslims are troublemakers and potential terrorists because it is a safe belief; it reinforces my place in the circles in which I move and might even constitute some of my power base in those circles, be that power base wrapped around being a community spokesperson, an outspoken media commentator, or simply being a member of a family that has a tradition of beliefs around these things? Only when I come to the point of being prepared to receive some of the challenging and discomforting evidence that the majority of Muslims are actually no different from any other population, and to engage in the inevitable struggle of changing my beliefs and behaviour, can I truly claim to 'know and understand' the truth about Muslims.

While it has to be tailored to the particular age group in question, this is precisely the task of values pedagogy. The task is two-fold. First, it is to establish an environment of respect, trust and care that, before a word is said, challenges the preconceived beliefs and consequent behaviours that many will bring with them from their heritage and wider cultural 'life-world', in Habermasian phraseology. Ideally, through this process, students will see people that they might have come to regard as not worthy of respect in fact being respected by a whole school community. This

is the most powerful lesson of all. So, to further the Muslim example, a teacher and school that goes out of their way to accommodate Muslim expression, be it in terms of dress, food or prayer, not in a grudging politically correct but celebrating way, is providing an environment that makes it very difficult for anti-Muslim prejudice to go unchallenged. This is the implicit modelling, 'putting one's money where one's mouth is' dimension of an authentic values pedagogy. When a whole school embraces this modelling research suggests that transformation of belief and behaviour is most likely to occur (Lovat 2010; Lovat et al. 2010).

Beyond the implicit modelling, the task is to make explicit why the environment of respect, trust and acceptance is so vital to the human community. This is the teaching or curriculum dimension of values pedagogy. At any age or stage of education, its essential focus must be to raise those questions that characterize Habermas's critical and self-reflective way of knowing. It is to ensure that the evidence of facts and figures, as well as of human interactions and conversations, is of the broadest and most challenging kind. Ultimately, its task is to push student learning towards self-reflectivity, that knowing of self that allows one to step out of the shadow of one's upbringing and cultural heritage, to challenge not only the preconceived beliefs and behaviours of this upbringing and heritage but, more painfully, one's own deep seated comfort zone of beliefs and behaviours. The task, in other words, is to transform. It is to do the very opposite of what Jencks (1972) held to be the truth about the school. It is to take the input of the entering children and to transform the output. The importance of school-based values pedagogy in undertaking this task cannot be overstated.

Transforming beliefs and behaviour does not mean imposing a different set of beliefs and values on students from those with which they entered the school. Imposing someone else's comfort zone would be a contradiction of everything implied by critical and self-reflective knowing. It does however mean challenging students to see that whatever beliefs and values they brought with them are but one set, one life-world, and to consider the life-worlds of others and the rights of those others to their life-worlds. This is the hallmark of what Habermas (1984, 1987) describes as 'communicative capacity' and, beyond that, 'communicative action'. Communicative capacity is when the self-reflective knower comes to see his or her own life-world as just one that needs to function in a myriad of life-worlds, and so comes to possess communicative capacity. In a sense, this is a formula for the modern, globally competent, intercultural communicator. Beyond this, however, is the notion of communicative action. Here, the self-reflective knower takes a step beyond mere tolerance to take a stand both for justice and for oneself because one's new found self, one's own integrity, is at stake. This is a concept about personal commitment, reliability and trustworthiness that spills over into practical action that makes a difference, or what Habermas (1972, 1974) describes as *praxis*. It is the kind of action that can only come from the wellspring enshrined in the notion of self-reflectivity, from one who knows who they are, values the integrity of being authentic and commits oneself to establishing the kinds of caring and trusting relationships that bear the best fruits of human interactivity.

What is important to say, in many ways against the conventional wisdom, is that school is clearly the best place where this transformation can occur. While this is not to pit the school against the other social agencies of home, peers, religion, media, etc., it is to boldly assert that, for most people, these agencies tend towards a narrowing of life-worlds and towards pressure to conform to those life-worlds, to compound the sense that "we've got it right!". The school's bolder role should be to stretch the comfort implied by this and to open minds to the breadth of life-worlds. Ideally, this will be done carefully and with the support of other agencies, especially the home, but one should not be surprised if there are occasional tensions between the role of the school and the other agencies. Like the other agencies, the school's role is a distinctive one and much of the substance of this role is to be found in comprehensive and authentic values pedagogy.

Perspectives like that of Habermas help to illuminate why it is that issues of trust, care, respect and acceptance are so vital if teaching is to have its optimal effects. Furthermore, these perspectives underline just why it is that values pedagogy must be grasped by teachers, schools and systems as being central and pivotal to their endeavours, rather than being on their margins. Again, it is worth re-stating the central proposition of this book, namely that values pedagogy has the potential to go to the very heart of what it is that teachers, schools and educational systems aim to achieve.

Conclusion

As suggested in Chap. 1 and illustrated further in this chapter, the notion of the centrality of morality and its relationship to effective education is one found commonly in the thinking of a number of traditions. While roundly challenged by philosophical developments in the early part of the twentieth century, more recent epistemologies have brought us back to the essential morality that lies at the heart of education, and hence to the crucial nature of values pedagogy. In this movement, the work of Habermas is seen to be central. Furthermore, one is reminded of the strong and much heralded caution against instrumentalist approaches to education that was provided by the eminent John Dewey in the early days of public education. He said that to depend overly on subject knowledge and methods would be fatal to the best interests of education, speaking rather of the imperative for any authentic education to instil moral judiciousness on the part of students. In that sense, education was inherently moral and would lose its way and effectiveness in all domains if this were to be forgotten. Dewey, it would seem, was very much in tune with the Confucian and Aristotelian sentiments noted above, as well as with the epistemology of Habermas.

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, values education and its component forms of character education, social and emotional learning, etc. represent a unification of these ideals. As will be discussed throughout the remainder of this book, while the evidence about the effects of these forms of emancipatory education does not always meet the rigours of inductivist scientific methods, the research and en-

quiry into the inculcation of values and morals, quality teaching and the processes and contexts of learning, have yielded an abundance of 'observation statements' and theories that are coalescing to provide a defensible and indisputable paradigm, known as values pedagogy, a pedagogy that has the potential to optimize educational attainment for all students, not just those who are 'destined' to achieve.

References

al-Ghazali, A. (1991). *The book of religious learnings.* New Delhi: Islamic Book Services.

Apple, M. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum.* London: Routledge Falmer.

Aquinas, T. (1936). *Summa theologica* (trans: L. Shapcote). London: Burns & Oates.

Aristotle. (1985). *Nicomachean ethics* (trans: T. Irwin). Indianapolis: Hackett.

Armstrong, D. (1968). *A materialist theory of the mind.* London: Routledge.

Ayer, A. J. (1936). *Language, truth and logic.* London: Victor Gollancz.

Beauregard, M., & O'Leary, D. (2007). *The spiritual brain: A neuroscientist's case for the existence of the soul.* New York: HarperOne.

Braddon-Mitchell, D., & Jackson, F. (2006). *Philosophy of mind and cognition: An introduction.* Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.

Brooks, E., & Brooks, A. (1998). *The original analects.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Brothers, L. (2001). *Mistaken identity: The mind–brain problem reconsidered.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Bryk, A., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Chalmers, D. (1997). *The conscious mind.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Changeux, J. P., & Ricoeur, P. (2002). *What makes us think? A neuroscientist and a philosopher argue about ethics, human nature, and the brain* (trans: M. B. DeBevoise). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Damasio, A. R. (1996). *Descartes' error: Emotion, reason and the human brain.* London: Papermac.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education.* New York: The Free Press.

Dewey, J. (1929). *The sources of a science of education.* New York: Horace Liveright.

Ferré, F. (1982). *Language, logic and god.* New York: Harper & Row.

Feyerabend, P. (1975). *Against method: Outline of an anarchistic theory of knowledge.* London: Humanities Press.

Franks, D. D. (2010). *Neurosociology: The nexus between neuroscience and social psychology.* New York: Springer.

Habermas, J. (1972). *Knowledge and human interests* (trans: J. Shapiro). London: Heinemann.

Habermas, J. (1974). *Theory and practice* (trans: J. Viertal). London: Heinemann.

Habermas, J. (1984). *Theory of communicative action* (trans: T. McCarthy, Vol. I). Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1987). *Theory of communicative action* (trans: T. McCarthy. Vol. II). Boston: Beacon Press.

Hirst, P., & Peters, R. S. (1970). *The logic of education.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Jencks, C. (1972). *Inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America.* New York: Basic Books.

Kant, I. (1964). *Critique of pure reason* (trans: N. Kemp Smith). London: Macmillan.

Kohlberg, L. (1963). The development of children's orientation towards moral order: Sequence in the development of moral thought. *Vita Humana, 6,* 11–13.

Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed.). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
Lakatos, I. (1974). Falsification and the methodology of scientific research programs. In I. Lakatos & A. Musgrave (Eds.), *Criticism and the growth of knowledge* (pp. 91–196). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Laura, R. (1978). Philosophical foundations of religious education. *Religious Education, 28,* 309–317.
Laura, R. (1981). The philosophical foundations of science education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 13,* 1–14.
Lun yu. (n.d). The analects of Confucius. http://www.confucius.org/lunyu/lange.htm. Accessed 7 June 2011.
Louden, W., Rohl, M., Barrat Pugh, C., Brown, C., Cairney, T., Elderfield, J., et al. (2004). *In teachers' hands: Effective literacy teaching practices in the early years of schooling.* Canberra: Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training. http://inteachershands.education.ecu.edu.au/. Accessed 7 June 2011.
Lovat, T. (2010). Improving relations with Islam through religious and values education. In K. Engebretson, M. de Souza, G. Durka, & L. Gearon (Eds.), *International handbook of interreligious education* (pp. 695–708). New York: Springer.
Lovat, T., Clement, N., Dally, K., & Toomey, R. (2010). Addressing issues of religious difference through values education: An Islam instance. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 40,* 213–227.
More, T. (1989). *Utopia* (trans: R. Logan & G. Adams). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Peters, R. S. (1981). *Moral development and moral education.* London: George Allen & Unwin.
Quine, W. V. (1953). *From a logical point of view.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Raulo, M. (2002). Moral education and development. *Journal of Social Philosophy, 31,* 507–518.
Riegel, J. (2011). Confucius. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring, 2011 ed.). http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2011/entries/confucius/.
Rowe, K. J. (2004). In good hands? The importance of teacher quality. *Educare News, 149,* 4–14.
Ryle, G. (1949). *The concept of mind.* New York: Barnes & Noble.
Schopenhauer, A. (1974). *On the fourfold root of the principle of sufficient reason.* Chicago: Open Court Publishing.
Walker, J. (1985). Towards pragmatic unity in educational studies. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 19,* 181–198.
Wittgenstein, L. (1974). *Philosophical investigations* (trans: G. Anscombe). Oxford: Blackwell.

Chapter 3
Values and the Sciences

Older Paradigms of 'Educational Foundations'

Such was the sense of certainty that accompanied earlier research insights into educational foundations that its so-called 'empirical findings' became virtual canons that were beyond critique, much less refutation. This was most clearly the case in educational psychology wherein the findings of Piaget, Kohlberg, Erikson, Skinner and others provided the indisputable foundations for understanding the dynamics of teaching and therefore the goals of teacher education. In fact, in retrospect, their findings were arguably more linear, deterministic and based on more limited evidence than was often acknowledged. As such, it might be argued that they actually had a constraining effect on teaching and teacher education and contributed to some of the pessimism about the role of the teacher that Carnegie alleged had led to the persistent problem around student failure. Like so much of the social science paradigm that stemmed from the heyday of nineteenth century science, these theories might well have failed to inform teaching in the way that it requires (Jörg et al. 2007; Lovat 2008).

So, what was the problem with these older foundations of thought? Among a number of problems is that many of them were expressed as linear stage development theories, be it of maturation, socialization, motivation or learning itself. Especially in educational psychology, these were the theories that dominated much of the thinking that lay behind the practicalities of teaching and therefore the curriculum of teacher education. Interestingly, in spite of serious counter-research by the likes of Gilligan (1982), Hoffman (2000) and Zahn-Waxler et al. (1979), Freudian, Piagetian and Kohlbergian research seems often to have been presented in fairly uncritical fashion as offering the firmest and most empirically sound bases for thinking about intellectual development.

The reason for this is that arguably these latter 'giants' of psychosocial understanding relied heavily on a combination of observation and rationalistic analysis. Their slightly lesser known critics, on the other hand, rested much of their critique on recourse to the affective. Gilligan, for instance, saw Kohlberg's thesis of moral development as being biased in favour of the male disposition towards rules and

T. Lovat et al., *Values Pedagogy and Student Achievement,*
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-1563-9_3, © Springer Science+Business Media, B.V. 2011

regulations as holding sway over considerations of caring and relationships, considerations that Gilligan thought were more germane to women. In similar vein, Hoffman regarded morality as being principally emotionally rather than cognitively driven, so calling into question classical Freudian theory, and Zahn-Waxler and co. identified pro-social behaviour in children much earlier than proposed by Piaget because they concentrated on expressions of care and empathy, rather than the demonstrations of cognitive advance that lay at the centre of Piagetian theory.

The above critiques of classical developmental theory were early warning signs of the revolutionary insights about human functioning being uncovered by the new neurosciences. We will return to examine them in greater detail but, for now, suffice it to say that they are upsetting established notions that human development can be ascertained and understood purely with reference to the cognitive domain and rationalistic assumptions. The role of affect is being seen increasingly as more than an adjunct or added extra in explaining all manner of human development. It is being seen as an indispensable component of all that we have understood by the cognitive and rational. 'Cognition and affect' is a nexus and this insight has profound implications for teaching and school education.

It is worth noting, as an aside, that the narrow instrumentalism to be found in the classical cognitive theories was matched by similar paradigms of thought in socialization theories. Psychology that led to disjoined cognition theory and sociology that led to deterministic theory of socialization became the bedfellows of the foundations of teaching and teacher education. The result was an inevitable pessimism about the capacity of teaching and schooling to impact on an individual's learning potential, once impaired cognition and (almost inevitably) the allied disadvantages wrought by heritage and socio-economic environment had been demonstrated.

When one peruses the average sociology text designed to support the foundations of teaching and teacher education, one is struck by the dominance of paradigms of thought that juxtapose deterministic and conflict (or neo-Marxist) theoretical positions, perhaps softened by some Weberian moderation around the thinking of symbolic interactionism. These courses tend to give the impression that educational sociology is a fairly remote discipline that has little power other than to analyse and speculate about social phenomena as they pertain to schools, finally giving the impression that the real choices are either to become reconciled to the fact that the students in one's care as a teacher will be determined by forces beyond their own or the teacher's control, or else to form them into bands of neo-Marxist rebels who will forge their own proletarian revolution. Neither of these options really offer future teachers any hope that they will be able to make a real difference to the lives of their students, least of all for those who need intervention most because of their heritage, disadvantage or disability. While updated a little, much of the determinism of Talcott Parsons (Parsons and Bales 1956) ('Families are the factories of life') and Christopher Jencks (Jencks 1972) ('What comes out of the school is what went in') seems still to be essentially in place, with the only alternative for a teacher who wants to make a difference being in resistance if not demolition of the hegemony.

Newer Paradigms of Educational Foundations

As we have seen, it was essentially renewed thinking about the foundations of teaching and teacher education that impelled some of the revolutionary thought behind the Carnegie Report (Carnegie Corporation 1996), and some of this thinking came from the emerging neurosciences (Bruer 1999). The new neurosciences represent a set of research findings concerned with the brain, its constitution and functioning, and hence a range of related issues around cognition, thinking and learning. In turn, the new neurosciences, in contrast with many of their older forebears, move to establish contingent relationships between cognition, affect and sociality. In other words, the view that development was driven principally by cognition has yielded to the realization that cognitive, emotional and social development are in a synergistic relationship, with each contributing to the other.

As an example, Antonio Damasio's (Damasio 1996, 1999, 2003; Immordino-Yang and Damasio 2007) main interest is in the neurobiology of the mind, especially concerning those systems that underpin consciousness, memory and emotion. His work is associated with the notion of the cognition/affect/sociality nexus, a way of conceiving of emotion, feelings and social competence as not being separate so much as inherently part of all rational processes. The scientific rigour of his experimental work, together with the strength of his findings and those of others (Rose and Strangman 2007), is causing educationists to re-think many of their assumptions about a range of developmental issues, including that of learning itself. After all, if Damasio is correct, then those dominant conceptions of thinking that regard development as linear, rational and progressive, regardless of emotional and social development are turned on their heads:

> Modern biology reveals humans to be fundamentally emotional and social creatures. And yet those of us in the field of education often fail to consider that the high-level cognitive skills taught in schools, including reasoning, decision making, and processes related to language, reading, and mathematics, do not function as rational, disembodied systems, somehow influenced by but detached from emotion and the body. (Immordino-Yang and Damasio 2007, p. 3)

Furthermore, the taxonomic notion that cognitive learning outcomes can somehow be separated from affective ones comes to be seen as nonsense. For example, the idea that literacy training can be achieved through mastery instruction and testing, without reference to the physical and emotional ambience within which the learning is occurring nor moreover to the levels of confidence and self-esteem of the learner, appears to be naïve in the extreme. Above all, Damasio's work implies a refutation of the pessimism that the old foundations unwittingly imposed on the potential of teaching to break through barriers of disadvantage. Damasio's work implies optimism that, if teaching is directed to all the developmental measures, including emotion and sociality, rather than just the purely cognitive measures, then the potential to engage the interests and attention of those not normally engaged is enhanced. After all, it is the many issues of emotionality and sociality related to heritage, disadvantage and disability that serve to block the learning interest of many students in

school, rather than merely a raw and separated cognitive ability or the lack thereof. Teaching that is sensitive to and addresses these realities has been shown to be more effective in drawing in such a clientele as well as making learning more engaging for all. These claims will be confirmed with evidence below.

Another theorist whose work impinges on the new foundations is Daniel Goleman (Goleman 1995, 2001, 2006), a trained cognitive theorist who has become associated most with notions of social and emotional intelligence, and hence social and emotional learning. Goleman has demonstrated in his work that social intelligence (SQ) and emotional intelligence (EQ) are at least as vital to sound cognition as the traditional notion of intelligence quotient (IQ). Indeed, the evidence would suggest that they constitute the key to the demonstration of effects normally associated with IQ. The implications of these findings for teaching and teacher education is that IQ is not an isolated factor nor, as previously assumed, is it fixed, free-standing and determinative of student achievement. IQ in fact denotes a highly contextualized phenomenon, at least in part dependent on other aspects affecting one's current state of wellbeing of body, mind, emotion and sociality. As such, the effects normally associated with IQ are not merely the expressions of genetic and environmental advantage or disadvantage, and so unable to be impacted on by teaching intervention. Student potential and school achievement can be affected and impelled by well-informed and well-constructed teaching that addresses not only cognitive but also social and emotional development.

Like Goleman, Robert Sternberg (Sternberg 2007) is a psychologist and, in his case, psycho-metrician. Like Goleman, Sternberg's training would naturally have led to acceptance of the more linear cognitive notions of thinking identified above. Sternberg however is also a convert to seeing cognition as part of a broader mix of human factors. Sternberg refers to different forms of intelligence, namely, analytic, synthetic and practical, involving a fuller range of human capabilities than is understood by the more limited and rationalistic notions of intelligence. He was not only critical of the traditional IQ test but actually devised a more sophisticated intelligence test based on a broader theory of intelligences. Damasio, Goleman and Sternberg would seem to owe much to the foundational thought of Howard Gardner (Gardner 1983) around multiple intelligences.

Martin Seligman (Seligman 2004), also a psychologist, is one who has been especially critical of the older paradigms of thought in his own discipline. Known best for his work on positive psychology, he is heavily critical of traditional forms of psychology for their emphasis on the negative, the helpless and the pessimistic, so impelling thinking that leads to depression and feelings of hopelessness. For him, psychology must become more conscious of and adept at effecting positive thinking in order to engender feelings of optimism and control. In recent times, he has done much work in applying his theory of positive psychology to schools and education where he clearly sees the negative impact of earlier foundational thinking.

Increasingly it is being recognized that the phenomena of teaching and learning cannot be described by disciplines focussing on discrete areas such as cognition, emotion and culture (e.g. Rosiek and Beghetto 2009). The earlier expectations of

cognitive psychology that cognitive functioning could be explained by partitioning off other influences is described by Gardner (1985/1987) as follows:

> The third feature of cognitive science is the deliberate decision to de-emphasize certain factors which may be important for cognitive functioning, but whose inclusion at this point would unnecessarily complicate the cognitive-scientific enterprise. These factors include the influence of affective factors or emotions, the contribution of historical and cultural factors, and the role of the background context in which particular actions or thoughts occur. (p. 6)

The attempt to isolate cognition from affective and social factors has proven to be incapable of providing a sufficient explanation of student learning because motivation and engagement have been observed to be key indicators of student cognitive engagement in learning (Clement 2010b). The work of educational psychologists like Ainley (2006, 2007) challenges notions that cognition, affect and sociality can be considered as discrete phenomena in education because affective states such as 'enjoyment' and 'interest' have been identified as 'key variables' in motivation. Positive emotions have the propensity to focus energy towards the learning task, thereby constituting a vital state for cognitive engagement. This synergy of cognitive and non-cognitive constituents of learning has also been identified by others in the field of educational psychology. Monica Boekaerts (Boekaerts 1993) was among the first to draw attention to the fact that student wellbeing influenced learning through students' perceptions of their personal efficacy, their ability to self-manage their emotions and the level of social support provided by teachers and peers. Additionally, Richard Ryan (Ryan 2007) observed that there is an increasing recognition of the salience of motivation in light of the current interest in cultural and biological influences on behaviour and cognition. In fact, Ryan comments that cognitive interventions not addressing emotion and motivation have limited efficacy. Furthermore, Elizabeth Linnenbrink (Linnenbrink 2006) notes that a new aspect of the current research in the interaction of cognition, emotion and motivation is an interest in how affect enhances the ways that students and teachers experience learning in educational settings. This increasing recognition of the impact of emotion and motivation on cognitive performance from psychological and sociological perspectives (e.g. Schutz and Pekrun 2007; Schutz and Zembylas 2009; Zembylas 2005) has been supported by evidence from the neurosciences.

Neuroscience and the Educational Foundations

With the declaration of 'The Decade of the Brain' by the US Congress in the 1990s, the visibility of neuroscience increased appreciably (Jones and Mendell 1999), and attempts were made to apply this new knowledge to education. In general, these earlier attempts at neuroscience have now been relegated to the realm of 'neuromyths' because of misinterpretations of the findings from the neurosciences (e.g. Bruer 1999; Geake 2008; Goswami 2006; Purdy 2008; Purdy and Morrison 2009). The first decade of the twenty-first century, however, has witnessed a more disciplined

approach to the application of neuroscience to educational practice (see Clement 2010a). A new level of collaboration between neuroscientists and educators has resulted in neuroscientists themselves and/or educators conversant with neuroscience, directly contributing findings from the neurosciences that are applicable to educational practice (e.g. Blakemore and Frith 2005; Goswami 2006, 2008; Jossey-Bass Inc. 2008; Sousa 2010; Willis 2006). Goswami (2008) argues that the findings of neuroscience are important for education because neuroscience "enables a principled understanding of the mechanisms of learning and of the basic components of human performance" (p. 396). Additionally, Goswami comments that these findings may support insights already present in teaching practice, while it may challenge others, and provide a more precise and sounder evidence base for education. This collaboration between education and neuroscience is symptomatic of a general movement across the social sciences to incorporate neuroscientific explanations as another level of explanation of social and psychological phenomena (e.g. Barrett 2009; Domìnguez Duque et al. 2010; Franks 2010).

Application of the findings of neuroscience to education requires a conceptual framework that accommodates the integration of data from the biological sciences with those from the sciences. The commonality between neuroscience and the social sciences is the explanation of behaviour, the neurosciences on a biological level beginning with observation of brain activity and the social sciences beginning with the observation of individual and social activity (Howard-Jones 2008). Howard-Jones suggests that, when findings from both approaches resonate, there is a greater confidence in the validity of the findings. Similarly, Anderson and Reid (2009) suggest that there are three levels of abstraction and description that are relevant to the dialogue between education and neuroscience, namely, biological, cognitive and behavioural. Neuroscience currently straddles the biological and the cognitive, whereas educational research and practice focus on the cognitive and the behavioural.

Meanwhile, Anderson and Reid (2009) argue that educational interventions which incorporate neuroscientific findings must engage at all three levels of description, that is, the biological, cognitive and behavioural. This implies that the complexities of education and learning cannot be understood by one discipline alone and therefore they need a 'trans-disciplinary' approach (Ronstadt and Yellin 2010; Samuels 2009). Diamond (2007) holds that such collaboration among disciplines is necessary in order to understand the "complexity of human experience" and the need for collaboration between the "social, cultural, neuroscientific, biological and cognitive sciences." (p. 154). Goswami (2008) concludes:

> Biological, sensory and neurological influences on learning must become equal partners with social, emotional and cultural influences if we are to have a truly effective discipline of education. (p. 397)

The movement towards a trans-disciplinary approach is indicative of a rejection of the singular reductionism that defined the sciences in the previous century and a recognition that uni-faceted notions of learning and intelligence are no longer adequate to account for the complex nature of human experience. As Diamond (2007)

and Goswami (2008) imply, one discipline is incapable of accounting for the complexity and diversity of the dynamic and interacting components associated with learning and education. This reflects the breakdown of a singular belief in eliminative reductionism (in this case explaining everything in terms of biology alone) and the movement towards a post-reductionist view of science which recognizes that no particular discipline can satisfactorily describe or explain all facets of a particular phenomenon. Therefore, a plurality of descriptions is needed in order to adequately describe the whole (e.g. Cacioppo et al. 2007; Franks 2010; Horst 2007; Lilienfeld 2007). The general picture that emerges from this examination is that it takes many disciplines to be able to interpret what is happening in learning and education, and no one discipline can give an adequate description of what is a multi-dimensional phenomenon.

Four aspects of the findings of the neurosciences have particular pertinence for newer paradigms of educational foundations: neuroplasticity; the genetic-environment interplay; implicit and explicit learning; and, the ambience of the learning environment.

Neuroplasticity

The brain has the capacity and potential to change in response to environmental stimuli or by the activity of the mind (Doige 2008). Changes in the neural circuitry are facilitated either by changes at the biochemical level in the proteins of individual neurons or by changes in gene expression as a result of gene–environment interaction (Cicchetti and Blender 2006; Hyman and Nestler 1993). Contemporary brain-imaging techniques are able to monitor and quantify such changes (Poldrack 2000). It is the plasticity of the brain that makes learning and development possible; that is, its malleability in being able to adapt, restructure and modify itself in response to experience (Doige 2008; Galván 2010). This includes the capacity of the brain to reorganize itself in the case of injury or impairment and to overcome learning problems (Blakemore and Frith 2005; Doige 2008; Goswami 2008; Sousa 2010). Willis (2010) points out that the crucial functions of learning are dependent on the capability of the brain to reorganize itself in response to the learning experience:

> Neuroplasticity is the ability of neural networks to extend, prune, reorganize, correct or strengthen themselves based on acquiring new information, obtaining corrective feedback, and recognizing associations between new and prior knowledge. (p. 55)

Neuralplasticity involves the making of new interconnections between the neurons in the brain, or the strengthening or weakening of existing ones. In learning, new interconnections are made or existing ones strengthened, but these neuronal pathways can be pruned and eventually discarded if unused (Blakemore and Frith 2005; Doige 2008). Neuroplasticity is associated with the propensity for 'lifelong learning' extending even into late life as new neural connections can be formed in response to stimulus from the environment (Goswami 2008); however, plasticity

tends to decline with age (Blakemore and Frith 2005; Doige 2008). Doige (2008) points out that neuralplasticity is paradoxical because on the one hand a person can be flexible and adaptable throughout life while on the other hand the spontaneity and creativity of childhood can be subsumed by routine and rigidity.

A feature of neural plasticity is the ability of the brain to compensate for impaired neural structures, for instance, as in the regaining of lost functions owing to stroke (Blakemore and Frith 2005; Goswami 2008). Cognitive behaviour therapy also illustrates the power of the mind to bring about changes in brain states (Franks 2010). Further examples of functional adaptations by the brain in the case of impairment relate to the stimulation of the auditory cortex of persons who are deaf by the activities of lip-reading and signing, and the stimulation of the visual cortex of people who are blind in the reading of Braille (Blakemore and Frith 2005). A striking example of the capacity to compensate for impairment is given by Immordino-Yang (2007, 2008) in the case study of two boys who were faced with severe limitations after having one hemisphere of their brain surgically removed. In a supportive family and educational environment, they were able to develop the strengths of their remaining capacities in ways that allowed them to compensate for the social and learning disadvantages associated with the potential liabilities of their condition (cf. Fischer 2009; van Geert and Steenbeek 2008). As Diamond (2009) points out, a quality learning environment is particularly critical for students suffering brain injury early in life because their developmental outcomes are dependent on a narrower range of environmental inputs.

Genetic-environment Interplay in Learning and Development

Learning and development are interrelated phenomena, are dependent upon their interaction with the environment and are both shaped by that experience (Galván 2010). Recent discoveries in the biological and psychological sciences have challenged accepted understandings of human development. Rigid models arising from structuralist conceptions that considered development to be normative and invariant (Dai and Sternberg 2004) and driven solely by biology (Wexler 2006) have largely yielded to a view that learning and development are contingent on the interaction between characteristics of the learner and the social and physical environment. Notions of genetic determination as being the primary driver of individual or phenotypic development are being questioned by burgeoning research in epigenetics which indicates that genetic expression (individual development) is continually modified by the particular circumstances of an individual's social and physical environment and not driven by genetic endowment alone (Lickliter 2008, 2009; Robinson et al. 2008; Zhang and Kourtzi 2010). In fact, Kandel (1998) goes so far as to say:

> The capability of learning is so highly developed in humans that humankind changes more by cultural evolution than by biological evolution. (p. 461; cf. Doige 2008; Lickliter 2008, 2009)

Rather than occurring independent of the environment (a genocentric perspective), research in epigenetics suggests that development takes place through an individual's interaction with the environment (Lickliter 2009). Experience of the environment affects gene expression (which genes are 'switched on') and, in turn, the way that the environment is experienced is affected by a person's genetic make-up (Diamond 2009; cf. Fisher 2006). This suggests that individual differences in personality and brain functioning are to be understood against the gene–environment interaction (Zhang and Kourtzi 2010, p. 458). Learning itself produces changes at the epigenetic level: "Learning … produces alteration in gene expression" (Kandel 1998, p. 460; cf. Zhang and Kourtzi 2010, p. 452). In fact, long-term memory itself is dependent on gene activation in order for production of a protein that will enable alteration to the structure of the nerve-ending so that it can develop new connections with other neurons (Doige 2008; Squire and Kandel 2009; Zhang and Kourtzi 2010). Thus, development and learning have a significant impact on gene expression, and therefore on human behaviour.

The corollary of this for education, as stated by Fischer and Heikkinen (2010), is that learning occurs "through acting on the world not merely by thinking about it or hearing about it" (p. 251). This statement has Deweyian, Piagetian and Habermasian overtones (not to mention Aristotelian), but their perspective has been extended through the added insights contributed by the neurosciences into the chemical, metabolic and anatomical impact of learning on brain structure. Knowledge is best facilitated by active participation in a range of experiences, that in turn 'sculpt' the brain by causing changes in 'brain activity' and the interconnections between the neurons; passive experience appears to have a less pronounced effect (Fischer 2009, pp. 5–6). Learning and development, according to Fischer and colleagues (Fischer 2009; Fischer and Heikkinen 2010; Rose and Fischer 2009, p. 408), are dynamic and the pathways of learning are web-like rather than ladder-like, requiring both support and the opportunity to practise the necessary skills. The nature of the support provided by the socio-cultural context helps explain variation in developmental progression. The help and support provided by parents, siblings and teachers, as well as cultural artefacts, assist in the development of expertise in that culture. Learning trajectories in school contexts, according to van Geert and Steenbeck (2008), result from a dynamic interaction of student self-regulation and motivation, opportunities for practising and extending skills, and support provided by the teacher and the learning environment. Social support is also an element in the development of personal and moral qualities because social conditions, as well as maturation, contribute to the development of self-control (Sokol et al. 2010).

According to the proponents of social and emotional learning, competency in the inter and intra-personal skills which are the focus of their programmes is not only an important outcome in its own right, but the acquisition of such skills facilitates academic achievement by "strengthening students' preparedness for learning and promoting the development of prosocial skills and behaviour that mediate school performance" (Kress et al. 2004, p. 72). Elias et al. (2002) argue that schools play an essential role in promoting social and emotional skills, particularly for students from disadvantaged backgrounds, whose life circumstances might not have afforded

them with the self-regulation and relational skills necessary for effective learning and participation in the social milieu of the classroom, "Academic and social success should not be the product of good fortune or privileged upbringing" (p. 9).

As reported in Dally (2010), research on brain functioning employing neuroimaging techniques provides further support for actively promoting social–emotional competencies for all students and especially for those from dysfunctional home backgrounds. Bechara et al. (2007) describe how decision making is guided by the processing of emotional reactions. Personal and interpersonal situations are often strongly associated with positive or negative emotions, and it is the feelings emanating from these emotions that influence the selection of a particular course of action from an array of possible responses. Children who have been deprived of trusting relationships and secure and nurturing environments may have learned to distrust or fear others and thus the emotions that are triggered in benign interactions may be biased to elicit negative feelings such as anger or aggression. Bechara et al. (2007, p. 280) describe these distorted neural representations of emotional/feeling states as an "environmental abnormality" that has been caused by inefficient social learning and that can therefore be 'unlearned' if an individual is given exposure to adequate education and practice in intra- and interpersonal skills as well as favourable contingencies arising from more objective decision making.

Learning is described by Goswami (2008) as an 'incremental process' whereby abstracted concepts are derived from direct experience as the brain has capacities to "extract and represent structure that is present in the input *even when it is not taught directly*." (p. 390). Moreover, as Goswami states, the aim of learning is the abstraction of explicit concepts that are implicit within direct experience of the world. Although, students are at times capable of initiating such abstractions (Goswami 2008), at other times, as Battro (2010) suggests, there needs to be a Socratic-like pedagogical intervention that will alter the students' 'focus of attention' so they can productively engage in learning (cf. Sætrevik et al. 2006). In either case, learning is not a simple assimilation of "common experiences" but an active interpretation grounded in "previous learning and innate neuropsychological strengths" (Immordino-Yang 2007, p. 80). There have been claims that the benefits of an enriched environment on accelerating the learning of young children have been over-exaggerated (Blakemore and Frith 2005). Nonetheless, evidence indicates that the quality of care and environmental experiences in the early years of life have a longer-term impact on learning and development (e.g. Diamond 2009; Fagiolini et al. 2009; Lickliter 2008; Moulson et al. 2009).

Memory and Imitation

Neuroscience has highlighted that there are two aspects to learning, implicit, or unintentional learning, and explicit, or intentional learning. These two aspects of learning are supported by two different capacities of the brain, namely, memory and the functioning of mirror neurons.

Memory, as Squire and Stark (2008) observe, is the means by which learning persists and is made available through time:

> Experience can modify the nervous system, and as a result, organisms can learn and remember. Learning is the process by which new information is acquired about the world, and memory is the process by which this information can persist across time. (p. 242)

Squire and Kandel (2009) distinguish between implicit (non-declarative) and explicit (declarative) memory. Explicit or declarative memory (the conscious recall of events or information) is associated with conscious and controlled learning and the committal of what is learned to long-term memory. On the other hand, implicit memory (motor or cognitive habits, perceptual and motor skills, sensitization or conditioning) is associated with reflexive learning and is largely unconscious and automatic and is established through repeated observations of and interactions with others (Kandel 2006; Wilson 2009). Because implicit learning is less available to introspection, it can be a powerful mode of transmitting attitudes and patterns of behaviour because these are typically adopted and 'absorbed' without conscious scrutiny. This facet of learning is given prominence in values education, where teacher modelling of the values serves to reinforce the explicit teaching of them.

Besides being an incremental and inferential process, as described in the previous section, "learning is social", that is, learning is sensitive to the social and cultural context. Humans have the most prolonged period of dependency of any mammal and are dependent on the construction and maintenance of social networks, ranging from families and groups, to cities, civilizations and cultures, across the life-span (Dunbar and Shultz 2007; Zhou and Cacioppo 2010). According to Meltzoff et al. (2009), humans possess three social skills foundational to learning that are rare in other animals: "imitation, shared attention and empathic understanding" (p. 285). Social learning is supported by the mirror neurons in the pre-motor cortex which are said to link perception, cognition and action. These mirror neurons, which are instrumental in imitative learning, assist in the interpretation and understanding of the actions, intent and emotional states of others and thus contribute to the development of empathy (Meltzoff et al. 2009; Iacoboni 2008; Immordino-Yang 2008; Rizzolatti et al. 2001). No longer is imitation regarded as the product of associative learning (Meltzoff and Decety 2003), rather, Meltzoff and Moore (1997) claim that it is an exclusively human attribute and the means by which infants learn cultural patterns of behaviour, customs and skills (cf. Meltzoff et al. 2009; Iacoboni 2008). Although mirror neurons are involved in learning through imitation, it is likely that other neural systems are involved as well, since other primates also have mirror neurons yet do not imitate in the way that humans do (Franks 2010; Meltzoff and Decety 2003; Iacoboni 2008).

Imitation is a powerful force in learning and, as Blakemore and Firth (2005) observe, people often find it easier to learn by observation than by the provision of detailed verbal instruction. This has profound implications for teaching and learning:

> We are predisposed to imitate those around us. This echoes the belief of many educators that we should not just impart what to know but also demonstrate how to know. The teacher's values, beliefs and attitude to learning could be as important in the learning process as the material being taught. (p. 163)

Nonetheless, imitation by itself is insufficient for learning. Although imitation has an essential role in the learning of language, dance, singing, acting and sport, creativity and imagination are required as well. Blakemore and Firth point out that individuals have the capacity to filter and choose what is to be imitated, and may intentionally act in a different way.

The Ambience of the Learning Environment

Examination of the literature from the neurosciences has confirmed the trends in educational psychology noted earlier in the chapter that challenge the view that engagement in learning can be described by cognitive factors alone. Immordino-Yang and Damasio (2007) claim that appreciation of cognitive, affective and social dimensions are essential for the provision of effective learning experiences for students. The involvement of social and affective factors in promoting cognitive development means that the ambience of the learning environment is a crucial consideration.

Cognition and emotion interact and shape each other and are a seamless part of the same experience (Franks 2010; Hinton et al. 2008; OECD 2007, p. 243; Pessoa 2008; Storbeck and Clore 2007). The synergy between cognition and emotion is one that energizes interest in and motivation for learning. Emotional learning takes its place alongside cognition as an important part of the learning process in the development of intuitive judgements that guide learning and the application of knowledge in decision making (Immordino-Yang and Faeth 2010; cf. Lehrer 2009). In fact, as Immordino-Yang and Faeth (2010) point out, studies involving people with damage to the part of the brain that mediates the cognitive and emotional neural networks shows that although their intelligence is unimpaired these people appear to be unable to learn from experience. Like a rudder, emotion acts to guide and stabilize a person's behaviour and application of knowledge in decision making. Effective learning, then, results not from the setting aside of emotions, but rather from the channelling and cultivation of emotional intuition. Furthermore, Immordino-Yang and Faeth state that learning that fails to elicit an emotional response will be unlikely to have an immediate or longer-term impact on behaviour and decision making. Sousa (2010) calls attention to the fact that committal of material to long-term memory requires that learning is both meaningful and relevant to the student.

The findings of neuroscience coalesce with those from the psychological and social sciences in the conceptualization of the learning environment as an ecological system (e.g. Rosiek and Beghetto 2009; Zembylas 2007), after the manner of Bronfenbrenner (1977). Zembylas (2007) suggests that emotional knowledge is an indispensible aspect of teacher 'pedagogical knowledge' (Shulman 1986, 1987) as it enables teachers to make links between themselves, their students and the curriculum content. Not only is it important for teachers to provide appropriate cognitive challenges for their students but it is also important to provide the emotional scaffolding that nurtures student interest and engagement in learning (Zembylas

2005). Rosiek and Beghetto (2009) consider 'cognitive/affective, concept/emotion dichotomies' as being 'exogenous' to the teaching and learning process (p. 181):

> Emotional scaffolding describes a reality that is located in the encounter between the intentions of the teacher and their experience of the obdurate learning processes of students. (p. 182)

By use of emotional scaffolding and imaginative pedagogies, teachers are able to introduce students to new ways of relating to subject content (Rosiek and Beghetto 2009).

Neuroscience and Values Education

What has transpired from the examination of the implications of neuroscience for education is that development and learning cannot be reduced to an invariant linear system. Increasingly, it is recognized that learning occurs through the interaction of a complex system of factors in the ecology of the learning environment (e.g. Deakin Crick et al. 2007). Learning and development are dependent on the plasticity of the brain and its capacity to respond to experiences in the social and physical environment. Recent advances in epigenetics challenge the view that development and learning are driven by genetic endowment alone, but rather that the brain is structured through interactions with the environment. This means that the cultural environment contributes to cognitive, emotional and social development. Furthermore, learning is a combination of implicit and explicit systems, so that modelling and imitation become extremely powerful dynamics within the learning ecology. Cognitive, affective and social dimensions interact and are essential ingredients in learning and development. Attention to the ambience of the learning environment and the emotional scaffolding of learning emerge as vital for student engagement and interest. A positive emotional ambience of the learning environment is an essential ingredient of values education (Lovat and Clement 2008a, b).

Values education and the attendant notions of moral development fit extremely well with the notions of ecology of learning and especially those features outlined in the discussion of the neurosciences (e.g. Kim and Sankey, 2009; Narvaez 2010a, b; Sankey 2006). Kim and Sankey (2009), citing Yong-Lin Moon and colleagues, argue that moral development cannot be considered to be driven solely by biological determinants. On the contrary, on an individual level, moral development has been observed to be context-sensitive and variable compared with trajectories based on aggregated scores. Moral development, then, is subject to the same influences as is development in general:

> It is our thesis that moral development takes its place alongside the development of human cognition and action as a product of epigenetic emergence—assembled by the nature of the task and piggybacking on the human organisms' ability to categorise, guided by its inherent predilection to value, in response to a multitude of nuanced environmental experiences. (Kim and Sankey, 2009, p. 290)

Similarly, Narvaez (2010a, b) believes that mature moral functioning requires both the interaction of moral intuition, emotion, and cognition operating within moral imagination attendant with the capacities of self-management, self-reflection, the cultivation of empathy and the ability to dialogue with others about mutual moral concerns. As a means to develop such moral capacity, Narvaez (2010b, c) points to the crucial nature of the ambience of the learning climate as an influence on the development of the personality and dispositions of students. Positive classroom environments encourage a mastery rather than performance orientation and emphasize a moral atmosphere characterized by caring and a feeling of community, where moral development is sustained by discourse and democratic practices. Sankey (2006) likewise believes that particular attention must be given to the learning environment because of the impact of implicit learning, and the manner by which students absorb subconsciously the values that are implicit in their experience of the learning environment:

> Values and meanings encountered in the process of education not only influence the conscious choices and actions of students, they also contribute to the making of each individual brain and influence what each self will do when actions and choices are initiated subconsciously. This seems to me to put a strong case for the centrality of values in the whole educational process. … the school itself has to become a values-based learning environment. (pp. 173–174)

Implications of the New Foundations for Teaching

As noted above, the foundations of teaching and teacher education rely on more than psychology and neuroscience. Again, the work of Habermas (1972, 1974, 1984, 1987, 1990) would seem to be central to any attempt to renew and revive these foundations. Habermas's theory of knowing fits well with the neuroscientists' work on the importance of affective and social factors and, furthermore, he develops a theory of social engagement and action that justifies optimism on the part of any social agency, including teaching, to be able to make a difference as long as it goes about its central business of knowing in a comprehensive and holistic way. Habermas rests his notion of effective social action (namely, *praxis*) on people reaching the most sophisticated levels of knowing. In other words, in contrast with more dated foundational thinking about knowing as mainly a cognitive function, Habermas posits that the deepest forms of knowing actually rest on effective social and moral citizenship, rather than on raw cognition. Habermasian thought has potential to deepen profoundly not only our understanding of the full human developmental capacities that are implied in effective teaching but, by dint of inference, to stretch our conceptions of the role of the teacher as well.

The notion that teaching involves more than the promotion of academic performance and that learning is not a separable cognitive function but one that is enmeshed in a matrix of emotional and social development is well captured by Haim Ginott (1975) in his epithetic warning to teachers: "in order to think well, a child must feel well." As we have seen, it is a notion that much recent educational

research has confirmed. Rowe (2004) noted that, of all the teacher qualities nominated by those students who achieve best at school, it was their beliefs about care and trust in relation to the teacher that were paramount. Similarly, Louden et al. (2005) concluded that it was difficult to predict likely student effects from simple observation of teacher practice. It was the subtleties of the trusting relationship between elder and younger person that determined so much of the practical effects of learning.

Hence, constructing educational regimes that focus exclusively or even overly on a denuded conception of cognition, without equal and integrated attention to all the developmental measures, including emotional, social, moral and spiritual, are doomed to fail those who need them most. This is essentially what the Carnegie Report, cited in Chap. 1, concluded. After all, the achievers will probably achieve, whatever the inadequacies of formal education. If absolutely necessary, the achievers could, for the most part, receive their tuition outside of formal education. It is the portion of society for whom formal education, public or religious, was primarily formed in the nineteenth century, who have especial needs around holistic education. It is this portion of the population that has the greater need around matters of self-esteem, confidence and, often, social, emotional and moral development. Far from the popular commentary that continues to claim that the academic needs of this portion of the population (i.e. the 'failing tail') would be served by more mastery instruction and further testing around the 'basics' of learning, the research insights uncovered so far help to explain why all the mastery instruction and testing in the world will achieve nothing if the whole person, social, emotional, moral and spiritual, as well as intellectual, is not drawn into a positive, encouraging, caring and trusting learning ambience where the relationship(s) between teacher and student, and student and student, are the priority. These aspects will be further elaborated in the following chapters.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have attempted to elucidate the main features of the recently emerging neurosciences that seem most relevant to education and to values education in particular. It needs to be said that these neurosciences remain contested, in themselves and in all their applications, including to education. This is as it should be. Nonetheless, these findings cannot be summarily dismissed, either in themselves or in their application to education. Indeed, we might suggest that some of the contestation coming from education could be motivated by a sense of threat about the full ramifications for educational structures and policy, should the insights of the neurosciences continue to challenge and impact. It might also be said that we feel quite comfortable with many of the insights and ramifications. When one's vested interests are not consumed with maintaining and defending the status quo in education, but rather with pushing its edges, as values pedagogy tends to do, then we are likely to be in a more empowered position than many educators. Certainly, the insights uncovered in this chapter fit well with the philosophical and

epistemological postulations we have been dealing with, especially of scholars like Habermas whose work fundamentally challenges linear approaches to knowledge and education. These insights also offer some clues about the 'surprising' effects of values pedagogy so often reported on in its project work that, when teachers make their relationships with students a priority, begin to affirm them and build their self-esteem and engage in discourse around values, then students begin to settle down, behave better and become more engaged with their academic work. If we believe the insights of the neuroscientists herein, not to mention Habermas, perhaps this is not so surprising!

References

Ainley, M. (2006). Connecting with learning: Motivation, affect and cognition in interest processes. *Educational Psychology Review, 18,* 391–405.

Ainley, M. (2007). Being and feeling interested: Transient state, mood and disposition. In P. A. Schutz & R. Pekrun (Eds.), *Emotion in education* (pp. 147–163). Amsterdam: Academic Press.

Anderson, M., & Reid, C. (2009). Don't forget about levels of explanation. *Cortex, 45,* 560–561.

Barrett, L. F. (2009). The future of psychology: Connecting mind to brain. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 4,* 326–339.

Battro, A. M. (2010). The teaching brain. *Mind, Brain, and Education, 4,* 28–33.

Bechara, A., Damasio, A. R., & Bar-On, R. (2007). The anatomy of emotional intelligence and implications for educating people to be emotionally intelligent. In R. Bar-On, J. G. Maree, & M. J. Elias (Eds.), *Educating people to be emotionally intelligent* (pp. 273–290). Westport: Praeger.

Blakemore, S. J., & Frith, U. (2005). The learning brain: Lessons for education. Oxford: Blackwell. http://www.eblib.com/. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Boekaerts, M. (1993). Being concerned with well-being and with learning. *Educational Psychologist, 28,* 149–167.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist, 32,* 513–531.

Bruer, J. T. (1999). In search of brain-based education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80,* 648–657.

Cacioppo, J. T., Amaral, D. G., Blanchard, J. J., Cameron, J. L., Carter, C. S., Crews, D., et al. (2007). Social neuroscience: Progress and implications for mental health. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 2,* 99–123.

Carnegie Corporation. (1996). *Years of promise: A comprehensive learning strategy for America's children. The report of the Carnegie Task Force on learning in the primary grades.* Carnegie Corporation of New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED397995) New York. http://eric.ed.gov. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Cicchetti, D., & Blender, J. A. (2006). A multiple-levels-of-analysis perspective on resilience. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1094,* 248–258.

Clement, N. (2010a). The first pillar of the student wellbeing pedagogy: The neuroscience research. In R. Toomey, T. Lovat, N. Clement, and K. Dally (Eds.), *Teacher education and values pedagogy: A student wellbeing approach* (pp. 15–31). Sydney: Barlow.

Clement, N. (2010b). Student wellbeing at school: The actualization of values in education. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 19–36). Dordrecht: Springer.

Dai, D. Y., & Sternberg, R. J. (2004). Beyond cognitivism: Towards an integrated understanding of intellectual functioning and development. In D. Y. Dai & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Motivation, emotion, and cognition: Integrative perspectives on intellectual functioning and development* (pp. 3–38). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dally, K. (2010). The second pillar of the student wellbeing pedagogy: Social and emotional learning. In R. Toomey, T. Lovat, N. Clement, & K. Dally (Eds.), *Teacher education and values pedagogy: A student wellbeing approach* (pp. 32–53). Sydney: Barlow.

Damasio, A. R. (1996). *Descartes' error: Emotion, reason and the human brain*. London: Papermac.

Damasio, A. R. (1999). *The feeling of what happens: Body and emotion in the making of consciousness*. New York: Harcourt.

Damasio, A. R. (2003). *Looking for Spinoza: Joy, sorrow, and the feeling brain*. New York: Harcourt.

Deakin Crick, R., McCombs, B., Haddon, A., Broadfoot, P., & Tew, M. (2007). The ecology of learning: Factors contributing to learner-centred classroom cultures. *Research Papers in Education, 22,* 267–307.

Diamond, A. (2007). Interrelated and interdependent. *Developmental Science, 10,* 152–158.

Diamond, A. (2009). The interplay of biology and the environment broadly defined. *Developmental Psychology, 45,* 1–8.

Doige, N. (2008). *The brain that changes itself: Stories of personal triumph from the frontiersof brain science*. Melbourne: Scribe.

Domìnguez Duque, J. F., Turner, R., Lewis, E. D., & Egan, G. (2010). Neuroanthropology: A humanistic science for the study of the culture-brain nexus. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience, 5,* 138–147.

Dunbar, R., & Shultz, S. (2007). Evolution in the social brain. *Science, 317*(5843), 1344–1347.

Elias, M. J., Arnold, H., & Hussey, C. S. (2002). EQ, IQ, and effective learning and citizenship. In M. J. Elias, H. Arnold, & C. S. Hussey (Eds.), *EQ + IQ = Best leadership practices for caring and successful schools* (pp. 3–10). Thousand Oaks: Corwin.

Fagiolini, M., Jensen, C. L., & Champagne, F. A. (2009). Epigenetic influences on brain development and plasticity. *Current opinion in neurobiology, 19,* 207–212.

Fischer, K. W. (2009). Mind, brain, and education: Building a scientific groundwork for learning and teaching. *Mind, Brain, and Education, 3,* 3–16.

Fischer, K. W., & Heikkinen, K. (2010). The future of educational neuroscience. In R. De Sousa (Ed.), *Mind, brain, and education: Neuroscience implications for the classroom* (pp. 249–269). Bloomington: Solution Tree.

Fisher, S. E. (2006). Tangled webs: Tracing the connections between genes and cognition. *Cognition, 101,* 270–297.

Franks, D. D. (2010). *Neurosociology: The nexus between neuroscience and social psychology*. New York: Springer.

Galván, A. (2010). Neural plasticity of development and learning. *Human Brain Mapping, 31,* 879–890.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1985/1987). *The mind's new science: A history of the cognitive revolution*. New York: Basic Books.

Geake, J. (2008). Neuromythologies in education. *Educational Research, 50,* 123–133.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Ginott, H. G. (1975). *Teacher and child: A book for parents and teachers*. New York: Avon Books.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam.

Goleman, D. (2001). *The emotionally intelligent workplace*. San Francisco: Bass.

Goleman, D. (2006). *Social intelligence: The new science of human relationships*. London: Hutchinson.

Goswami, U. C. (2006). Neuroscience and education: From research to practice? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 7,* 406–413.

Goswami, U. C. (2008). Principles of learning, implications for teaching: A cognitive neuroscience perspective. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 42,* 381–399.

Habermas, J. (1972). *Knowledge and human interests* (trans: J. Shapiro). London: Heinemann.

Habermas, J. (1974). *Theory and practice* (trans: J. Viertal). London: Heinmann.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action:* (trans: T. McCarthy, Vol. I). Boston: Beacon.
Habermas, J. (1987). *The theory of communicative action* (trans: T. McCarthy, Vol. II). Boston: Beacon.
Habermas, J. (1990). *Moral consciousness and communicative action* (trans: C. Lenhardt & S. W. Nicholsen). Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
Hinton, C., Miyamoto, K., & Della-Chiesa, B. (2008). Brain research, learning and emotions: Implications for education research, policy and practice. *European Journal of Education, 43,* 87–103.
Hoffman, M. L. (2000). *Empathy and moral development: Implications for caring and justice*. Cambridge: Cambrdige University Press.
Horst, S. W. (2007). *Beyond reduction philosophy of mind and post-reductionist philosophy of science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/. Accessed 7 June 2011.
Howard-Jones, P. (2008). Philosophical challenges for researchers at the interface between neuroscience and education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 42,* 361–380.
Hyman, S. E., & Nestler, E. J. (1993). *The molecular foundations of psychiatry*. Washington: American Psychiatric Press.
Iacoboni, M. (2008). *Mirroring people: The new science of how we connect with others* (1st ed.). New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
Immordino-Yang, M. H. (2007). A tale of two cases: Lessons for education from the study of two boys living with half their brains. *Mind, Brain, and Education, 1,* 66–83.
Immordino-Yang, M. H. (2008). Emotions, social relationships, and the brain: Implications for the classroom. *ASCD Express, 3,* 20–22.
Immordino-Yang, M. H., & Damasio, A. R. (2007). We feel, therefore we learn: The relevance of affect and social neuroscience to education. *Mind, Brain, and Education, 1,* 3–10.
Immordino-Yang, M. H., & Faeth, M. (2010). Building smart students: A neuroscience perspective on the role of emotion and skilled intuition in learning. In D. A. Sousa (Ed.), *Mind, brain and education: Neuroscience implications for the classroom* (pp. 66–81). Bloomington: Solution Tree.
Jencks, C., et al. (1972). *Inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books.
Jones, E. G., & Mendell, L. M. (1999). Assessing the decade of the brain [Editorial]. *Science, 284*(5415), 739.
Jörg, T., Davis, B., & Nickmans, G. (2007). Towards a new, complexity science of learning and education. *Educational Research Review, 2,* 145–156.
Jossey-Bass Inc. (2008). *The Jossey-Bass reader on the brain and learning* (Foreword by Kurt Fischer and Mary Helen Immordino-Yang). San Francisco: Bass.
Kandel, E. R. (1998). A new intellectual framework for psychiatry. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 155,* 457–469.
Kandel, E. R. (2006). *In search of memory: The emergence of a new science of mind*. New York: Norton & Co.
Kim, M., & Sankey, D. (2009). Towards a dynamic systems approach to moral development and moral education: A response to the *JME* Special Issue, September 2008. *Journal of Moral Education, 38,* 283–298.
Kress, J. S., Norris, J. A., Schoenholz, D. A., Elias, M. J., & Seigle, P. (2004). Bringing together educational standards and social and emotional learning: Making the case for educators. *American Journal of Education, 111,* 68–89.
Lehrer, J. (2009). *The decisive moment: How the brain makes up its mind*. Melbourne: Text Publishing.
Lickliter, R. (2008). The growth of developmental thought: Implications for a new evolutionary psychology. *New Ideas in Psychology, 26,* 353–369.
Lickliter, R. (2009). The fallacy of partitioning: Epigenetics' validation of the organism-environment system. *Ecological Psychology, 21,* 138–146.
Lilienfeld, S. (2007). Cognitive neuroscience and depression: Legitimate versus illegitimate reductionism and five challenges. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 31,* 263–272.

Linnenbrink, E. (2006). Emotion research in education: Theoretical and methodological perspectives on the integration of affect, motivation, and cognition [Editorial]. *Educational Psychology Review, 18,* 307–314.

Louden, W., Rohl, M., Barrat Pugh, C., Brown, C., Cairney, T., Elderfield, J., et al. (2005). *In teachers' hands: Effective literacy teaching practices in the early years of schooling.* http://inteachershands.education.ecu.edu.au/. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Lovat, T. (2008). About the outdated Newtonian paradigm in education and complexity and a complexity science of learning: How far are we from a paradigm shift? [Invited response]. *Educational Research Review, 3,* 77–100.

Lovat, T., & Clement, N. (2008a). The pedagogical imperative of values education. *Journal of Beliefs & Values: Studies in Religion & Education, 29,* 273–285.

Lovat, T., & Clement, N. (2008b). Quality teaching and values education: Coalescing for effective learning. *Journal of Moral Education, 37,* 1–16.

Meltzoff, A. N., & Decety, J. (2003). What imitation tells us about social cognition: A rapprochement between developmental psychology and cognitive neuroscience. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences, 358,* 491–500.

Meltzoff, A. N., & Moore, M. K. (1997). Explaining facial imitation: A theoretical model. *Early Development and Parenting, 6,* 179–192.

Meltzoff, A. N., Kuhl, P. K., Movellan, J., & Sejnowski, T. J. (2009). Foundations for a new science of learning. *Science, 325,* 284–288.

Moulson, M. C., Fox, N. A., Zeanah, C. H., & Nelson, C. A. (2009). Early adverse experiences and the neurobiology of facial emotion processing. *Developmental Psychology, 45,* 17–30.

Narvaez, D. (2010a). Building a sustaining classroom climate for purposeful ethical citizenship. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 659–673). Dordrecht: Springer.

Narvaez, D. (2010b). The emotional foundations of high moral intelligence. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 2010,* 77–94.

Narvaez, D. (2010c). Moral complexity: The fatal attraction of truthiness and the importance of mature moral functioning. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5,* 163–181.

OECD. (2007). *Understanding the brain: The birth of a learning science*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). http://www.eblib.com/. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Parsons, T., & Bales, R. F. (1956). *Family: Socialization and interaction process*. Glencoe: Free Press.

Pessoa, L. (2008). On the relationship between emotion and cognition. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 9,* 148–158.

Poldrack, R. A. (2000). Imaging brain plasticity: Conceptual and methodological issues: A theoretical review. *NeuroImage, 12,* 1–13.

Purdy, N. (2008). Neuroscience and education: How best to filter out the neurononsense from our classrooms. *Irish Educational Studies, 27,* 197–208.

Purdy, N., & Morrison, H. (2009). Cognitive neuroscience and education: Unravelling the confusion. *Oxford Review of Education, 35,* 99–109.

Rizzolatti, G., Fogassi, L., & Gallese, V. (2001). Neurophysiological mechanisms underlying the understanding and imitation of action. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 2,* 661–670.

Robinson, G. E., Fernald, R. D., & Clayton, D. F. (2008). Genes and social behavior. *Science, 322,* 896–900.

Ronstadt, K., & Yellin, P. B. (2010). Linking mind, brain and education to clinical practice: A proposal for transdisciplinary collaboration. *Mind, Brain, and Education, 4,* 95–101.

Rose, T. L., & Fischer, K. W. (2009). Dynamic development: A Piagetian approach. In U. Müller, J. I. M. Carpendale, & L. Smith (Eds.), *The Cambridge companion to Piaget* (pp. 400–421). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, D., & Strangman, N. (2007). Universal design for learning: Meeting the challenge of individual learning differences through a neurocognitive perspective. *Universal Access in the Information Society, 5,* 381–391.

Rosiek, J., & Beghetto, R. A. (2009). Emotional scaffolding: The emotional and imaginative dimensions of teaching and learning. In P. A. Schutz & M. Zembylas (Eds.), *Advances in teacher emotion research: The impact on teachers' lives* (pp. 175–194). Dordrecht: Springer.

Rowe, K. J. (2004). In good hands? The importance of teacher quality. *Educare News, 149,* 4–14.
Ryan, R. M. (2007). Motivation and emotion: A new look and approach for two reemerging fields. *Motivation and Emotion, 31,* 1–3.
Sætrevik, B., Reber, R., & Sannum, P. (2006). The utility of implicit learning in the teaching of rules. *Learning and Instruction, 16,* 363–373.
Samuels, B. M. (2009). Can the differences between education and neuroscience be overcome by mind, brain and education? *Mind, Brain, and Education, 3,* 45–55.
Sankey, D. (2006). The neuronal, synaptic self: Having values and making choices. *Journal of Moral Education, 35,* 163–178.
Schutz, P. A., & Pekrun, R. (Eds.). (2007). *Emotion in education*. Amsterdam: Academic Press.
Schutz, P. A., & Zembylas, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Advances in teacher emotion research: The impact on teachers' lives*. Dordrecht: Springer.
Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). *Authentic happiness: Using the new positive psychology to realize your potential for lasting fulfillment*. New York: Free Press.
Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge and growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher, 15,* 4–14.
Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57,* 1–22.
Sokol, B., Hammond, S., & Berkowitz, M. W. (2010). The developmental contours of character. In T. J. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. D. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 579–603). Dordrecht: Springer.
Sousa, D. A. (2010). *Mind, brain and education: Neuroscience implications for the classroom*. Bloomington: Solution Tree.
Squire, L. R., & Kandel, E. R. (2009). *Memory: From mind to molecules* (2nd ed.). Greenwood Village: Roberts & Co.
Squire, L. R., & Stark, C. E. L. (2008). Memory systems. In J. R. Pomerantz (Ed.), *Topics in integrative neuroscience: From cells to cognition* (pp. 243–264). Leiden: Cambridge University Press.
Sternberg, R. (2007). *Wisdom, intelligence, and creativity synthesized*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Storbeck, J., & Clore, G. L. (2007). On the interdependence of cognition and emotion. *Cognition & Emotion, 21,* 1212–1237.
van Geert, P., & Steenbeek, H. (2008). Brains and the dynamics of "wants" and "cans" in learning. *Mind, Brain, and Education, 2,* 62–66.
Wexler, B. E. (2006). *Brain and culture: Neurobiology, ideology, and social change*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Willis, J. (2006). *Research-based strategies to ignite student learning: Insights from a neurologist and classroom teacher*. Alexandria: ASCD.
Willis, J. (2010). The current impact of neuroscience on teaching and learning. In R. De Sousa (Ed.), *Mind, brain and education: Neuroscience implications for the classroom* (pp. 45–66). Bloomington: Solution Tree.
Wilson, T. D. (2009). Know thyself. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 4,* 384–389.
Zahn-Waxler, C., Radke-Yarrow, M., & King, R. A. (1979). Child rearing and children's prosocial initiations toward victims of distress. *Child Development, 50,* 319–330.
Zembylas, M. (2005). *Teaching with emotion: A postmodern enactment*. Greenwich: Information Age.
Zembylas, M. (2007). Emotional ecology: The intersection of emotional knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge in teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23,* 355–367.
Zhang, J., & Kourtzi, Z. (2010). Learning-dependent plasticity with and without training in the human brain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 107,* 13503–13508.
Zhou, H., & Cacioppo, J. (2010). Culture and the brain: Opportunities and obstacles. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 13,* 59–71.

Chapter 4
Values and Wellbeing

Wellbeing

Wellbeing was once associated principally with health and affluence, and was most often coupled with the words 'physical' and/or 'material', as in physical wellbeing and material wellbeing. It referred mainly to people being free from pain and disease or adequately safeguarded against poverty and despair owing to their natural wealth, well remunerated employment and/or preparedness for their retirement and old age. In recent times, the word has come to connote a broader set of features, including but not exclusively around health and affluence. In terms of health, there has been growing consciousness of erstwhile more covert problems related to maladies including developmental delay, depression, social isolation and cultural alienation:

> Socially isolated people are two to five times more likely to die in a given year than those with strong ties to family, friends and community … wellbeing comes from being connected and engaged, from being enmeshed in a web of relationships and interests. These give meaning to our lives. We are deeply social beings. The intimacy, belonging and support provided by close personal relationships seem to matter most; and isolation exacts the highest price. (Hamilton et al. n.d.)

In terms of affluence, there has been a greater awareness that building wealth upon wealth can be a shaky foundation for wellbeing, with or without the intervention of global financial crises, and that many of the more covert health problems can actually be associated with over-reliance on such wealth accrual. Instead, the dominant advice about wellbeing is that it entails a multitude of features and rests on a balance being maintained between them:

> The evidence shows that a good marriage, the company of friends, rewarding work, sufficient money, a good diet, physical activity, sound sleep, engaging leisure and religious or spiritual belief and practice all enhance our wellbeing, and their absence diminishes it. Optimism, trust, self-respect and autonomy make us happier. Gratitude and kindness lift our spirits; indeed, giving support can be at least as beneficial as receiving it. Having clear goals that we can work towards, a 'sense of place' and belonging, a coherent and positive view of the world, and the belief that we are part of something bigger than ourselves foster wellbeing. (Hamilton et al. n.d.)

T. Lovat et al., *Values Pedagogy and Student Achievement,*
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-1563-9_4, © Springer Science+Business Media, B.V. 2011

Wellbeing and the Professions

Clearly, such broad perspectives impel each of the service professions to consider the nature of its work, its traditional priorities and the appropriateness of its practices. The message for regular health and medical practitioners is that there is more to wellbeing than standard clinical practice is likely to capture and influence and that, perhaps, the role of the affiliated professions (e.g. homeopathy, naturopathy, etc.), the aesthetics (art, music, play, etc.) and spirituality have been unduly marginalized in Western settings in terms of their capacity to contribute to physical health. Moreover, the message for psychiatry and psychology is that mental wellbeing can be sufficiently complex to defy the standard indicators that Western science will tend to apply, relying quite likely as much on the arcane as the observable, on religion, belief and even superstition rather than merely the clinical, in Western terminology.

Social work is one profession that has taken the wellbeing challenge seriously, with an updated research activity that is reviewing its traditional philosophical underpinnings, assumptions and practices in light of new challenges. From its roots in nineteenth century welfare systems, largely religious, to its twentieth century guise as part of the infrastructure of the secular welfare state, it developed a particular form of practice that, like other service professions, tended towards the linear rather than complex, and to short term reaction rather than long term remediation. Like medicine and much of the rest of health care, it addressed the immediate problem with the appropriate solution, invariably based on a scientific (or social scientific) prescription of some kind. In the case of medicine, this latter would likely take the form of a drug or surgery whereas, in the case of social work, it would most typically be in the form of counselling and referral. In neither case was the holistic wellbeing of the client a serious goal nor therefore the conception of the profession as holistic social agency seriously proposed. In a word, the typical attributes of service were limited, clearly separable from other ambits of service and tending towards the instrumental and immediate solution, rather than the matrix and comprehensiveness of measures that holistic wellbeing, as defined above, would seem to demand.

An early attempt to propose an alternative approach to social work service was seen in the work of England (1986). In attempting to capture the notion of holistic service and the kind of subjectivity that allowed for such service on the part of the social worker, England refers to the worker's 'intuitive use of self'. The phrase captures the notion of the social worker as a 'virtuoso' who instinctively knows the right and appropriate response to the issue at hand and the client in question. Such a virtuoso possesses an implicit wisdom born of experience and reflection (an 'intuition') that impels holistic action that is in tune with the deeper and more comprehensive needs of the client, rather than merely applying a standard, instrumental and short term solution. In such action, there is no standing back or carving the encounter into analyzable bits. There is rather what England refers to as a 'whole man' encounter.

Again, we turn to Habermas to make sense of the kind of service to which England refers. In the terms of Habermasian critical theory, the moral intention of the

social worker becomes the pivotal dimension of social work *praxis*, such that practical judgment, knowing what to do in the moment, is where knowing and understanding become at once an epistemological and ethical engagement:

> Herein social work becomes an art where the social worker starts with a full canvass and is able to read the dynamics of what is going on and what is demanded of her while not straying from her values. (Gray and Lovat 2008, p. 159)

Habermasian theory is appropriate to the quest in hand to find a wellbeing thesis for service professionalism that is holistic and well founded on the renewed scientific and social scientific foundations referred to in Chap. 3 because Habermas is one of the intellectual architects of such an era. As we have seen, among other challenges, Habermas (1972, 1974) has challenged the contemporary world to consider the different ways in which we claim to 'know'. Knowing facts and figures, the 'empirical-analytic', is important, he says, as is the knowing of communication and meaning-making, the 'historical-hermenutic', but the knowing that most truly marks out human intellectual endeavour and has the capacity to transform self and community is 'critical' or 'self-reflective' knowing. Ultimately, this is a critique of all knowing that renders in a profound knowing of self and issues in *praxis*, that is, practical action for change. In a word, one cannot come to *know* in this profound sense, including knowing of self, without being changed. It is through the process of coming to know self, invariably entailing an agonizing struggle, that one gradually strips away the inherited knowledge, the familial and cultural baggage, and the ignorance that is so often the source of relational misunderstanding, bigotry, hatred and violence. For Habermas, this latter was the supreme knowledge that marked a point of having arrived as a human being and *praxis* is the necessary concomitant action that results only from knowing self in this radical way.

Habermas's practical action is one that makes a difference to whatever it is directed towards. It is the action of radical, unselfish commitment to a cause, a community or an individual that brings a new force into being. As we have also seen, Habermas (1984, 1987) develops his thoughts on *praxis* in eliciting the notion of 'communicative action'. On the surface, the notion is of global communicative competence. However, at a deeper level, there lies a thesis about effective practical action being the result of the most profound knowing, especially the knowing of self. In a word, the most authentic artefacts of communicative action can only come from the wellspring enshrined in the notion of self-reflectivity, from one who knows who they are, values the integrity of being authentic and commits to the benevolent actions and positive relationships that bear the best fruits of human interactivity.

The above Habermasian perspective leads to the potential for social work practice to be applied to the goal of the holistic wellbeing of the client, rather than the more limited instrumental practice about which social workers are becoming increasingly critical, even as wider governmental regimes become more demanding of such practice:

> Despite constant pressures on social work for precise descriptions of what social workers do, the truth is that (its practice) is inherently a realm of uncertainty and unpredictability. No matter how strong the calls for evidence-led practice, it is an inescapable fact that good

> social work practice will forever rest on the ability of social workers to make sound judgments in unique situations, situations which are the complex amalgam of two individuals—the worker and client—sharing worldviews and experiences so as to address the client's problems in coping with a particular aspect of their life. In such contexts, it is well-nigh impossible to predict the consequences of our actions with any certainty, no matter how sophisticated our decision making frameworks and how valid the evidence. (Lovat and Gray 2008, pp. 1108–1109)

McBeath and Webb (2002) proffer that this holistic approach to social work practice "places emphasis upon judgment, experience, understanding, reflection and (moral) disposition. All of this adds up to what we might call the hermeneutic worker—the worker acting within a reflexive-interpretive process of self and other" (p. 1016). McBeath and Webb refer to the notion of 'virtue' as that which underpins the kind of service geared towards holistic wellbeing, as we are describing it. They refer to the judgment that underlies the practical action of such a social worker as entailing "a moral character in that it requires mental effort, commitment to thinking, and consideration of the state of affairs obtaining. Morality under virtue ethics has an intellectual and motivational content that culminates in practical action … The individual's character is the stable reference point, not the action." (p. 1026).

> There is no escaping that the 'work' of social work is rooted in the tradition of a humanist morality that requires compassion for the other and benevolence, that is to say a genuine desire to be the best that one can be in the service of others. Those who do not have this other-centred motivation will forever struggle in a human service profession such as social work. Furthermore, it is in practical action, or praxis, that the 'work' of the social worker best manifests itself … Thus, we see the pivotal 'use of self' and the connection of 'right judgement' to the critically reflective self knowledge that is so characteristic of Habermas's emancipatory way of knowing. (Lovat and Gray 2008, pp. 1109–1110)

Habermasian theory offers a way of conceiving of the virtues of professional service as "generalizable capacities of self" (McBeath and Webb 2002, p. 1026), "developed through moral interaction" (Houston 2003, p. 821), conjoined with practical reasoning involving "perception, judgment and flexibility" (McBeath and Webb 2002, p. 1027) and so underpinning practical action (*praxis*) that can impact on the comprehensive needs of the client in the way required for holistic wellbeing:

> Social workers want to do the best they can for their clients merely because this is what good social work practice is, regardless of rules, injunctions and the changing priorities of social service organizations. The constants are our values-based commitments to care for others and to respond to the call of human suffering. Every society needs its agents of compassion and, as long as social workers engage in practical action to relieve human distress, their tireless services will be needed … Habermas reminds us that virtues and ethical norms are practical and discursive, that is, they arise from and guide intersubjective communication towards cooperative action … Thus we must establish these norms through practice—through dialogue properly regulated by Habermas's principles of 'inclusivity, open communication, empathy, and impartiality' (Houston 2003, p. 823). In this way, over time, we institutionalise a moral culture through our dialogical engagements and our daily deliberations. (Lovat and Gray 2008, pp. 1110–1111)

Hence, we see the renewed vigour being undertaken in social work, as illustrative of service professions generally, to recover an essential holistic purpose seen to have been partly lost midst an era of reductionism and instrumentalism wrought

by an exaggerated secularism and denuded set of scientific and social scientific assumptions. What social work is reacting to here is, in many ways, the equivalent of what the Carnegie Task Force (Carnegie Corporation 1996), referred to in Chap. 1, reacted to in education, namely, a set of assumptions about the role of teaching and schooling that resulted in reduced service, limited goals, a belief that one professional service was entirely separable from another, a view of the client as partitioned self (in the case of education, partitioned cognitive self) and ultimately pessimism if not despair on the part of the demoralized professional. The education equivalent of the holistic service to the non-partitioned client being crafted in the social work writings above is to be found, we propose, in values pedagogy. In both cases, the goal for the client is their holistic wellbeing. Additionally, as indicated so clearly in the social work perspectives above, client wellbeing also entails and impels the wellbeing of the one providing the service. Wellbeing begets wellbeing is the thesis and, in the results to be found in the international literature and the Australian Values Education projects, there is no shortage of evidence of same.

Wellbeing Begets Wellbeing

Like social work, education is an 'interventionist' profession which intrudes in the 'natural life-stream' of its clients (Hill 2010, p. 651). As described by Hill, educators do not merely *assist* maturation and the acquisition of knowledge in their students, but they also actively *promote* the development of selected (one might say 'valued') skills and capacities. Typically, these skills and capacities have been primarily in the cognitive domain (Van Petegem et al. 2008). In recent times and across the world, however, educational systems are being asked to address a broader range of 'non-cognitive' outcomes, including the physical, social, moral, spiritual and aesthetic development of their students (Adalbjarnardottir 2010). Converging evidence from the fields of psychology, neuroscience and educational research has prompted a focus on student wellbeing as an important factor in optimizing student academic achievement and social functioning, both during the school years and beyond (Clement 2010). This focus has engendered a re-conceptualization of the role of teachers and schools to become more than mere purveyors of academic knowledge and to take greater responsibility for interceding in areas traditionally regarded as being within the domain of the family or religious and community institutions.

Debate is still being conducted over whether and how student wellbeing and teacher wellbeing can be measured (Opdenakker and Van Damme 2000), and empirical evidence about how each affects the other is far from conclusive (Van Petegem et al. 2007). Despite the variety of ways in which student wellbeing has been defined and evaluated, however, there are consistent and convergent findings to indicate that student wellbeing not only contributes to academic achievement, but is also an important educational outcome in its own right (Clement 2010). Earlier debates regarding the definition of wellbeing centred on distinguishing 'hedonic' from 'eudaimonic' wellbeing. According to Ryan and Deci (2001), the hedonic

view equates wellbeing with happiness, pleasure attainment and pain avoidance, while the eudaimonic approach focuses on self-realization and living a meaningful life. Ryff and Singer (2000) describe wellbeing as striving to realize 'one's true potential' and these researchers provide evidence that the psychological wellbeing that emanates from this lifelong quest also produces emotional and physiological benefits that contribute to 'human flourishing'. Recent definitions of student wellbeing have tended to consider this construct as a dynamic interaction between an individual and their context (Engels et al. 2004). Based on a comprehensive review of the literature on wellbeing and in recognition of the influence that thoughts, emotions and 'subjective' interpretations of events have on feelings of wellbeing, Hascher (2003) provides a comprehensive and 'context specific' definition of student wellbeing:

> Students' wellbeing in school is a cognitive-emotional experience characterized by the dominance of positive feelings towards school, persons in school and the school context in comparison to negative feelings and cognitions toward school life. (p. 129)

School effectiveness research has identified the classroom teacher as one of the most important 'context factors' that influence student achievement and wellbeing (Rowe 2004). Although the research on teacher wellbeing is limited, the wellbeing of teachers is considered to be an acceptable goal for schools, because teachers' feelings of self-efficacy influence teacher satisfaction and teacher satisfaction has a "positive influence on the wellbeing and achievement of students" (Van Petegem et al. 2007, p. 451). The remainder of this chapter explores the way in which values pedagogy creates a school climate which fosters a dynamic and reciprocal relationship between student and teacher wellbeing.

Values Pedagogy and Wellbeing

As understood in this book, values pedagogy is aimed at the development of the whole child and thereby engages a student's heart, mind and actions. According to the findings from the second stage of the Australian Government's Values Education Good Practice Schools Project [VEGPSP] (DEEWR 2008), "effective values education is not an academic exercise: it needs to be deeply personal, deeply real and deeply engaging" (p. 40). This integration of cognition, affect and behaviour is also captured in the first of the Guiding Principles underlying the *National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools* (DEST 2005) which describes values learning as not just *knowing* and *understanding* the values but also learning how to *enact* them (p. 8). The nine principles that underpin the implementation of values education in the Australian context are listed below:

1. *Use of a student-centred, inquiry-based learning model;*
2. *Provision of a safe environment;*
3. *Provision of opportunities to practice and enact the values;*
4. *Educating the whole child;*

5. *Attending to the total teaching and learning experience;*
6. *Being explicit about the values;*
7. *Developing a shared language about the values;*
8. *Consistent, congruent modelling of the values; and,*
9. *Engagement with parents and the whole school community.* (DEEWR 2009, pp. 8–9).

These principles direct teacher attention to explicitly teaching values and scaffolding children's social and emotional development while, at the same time, requiring positive modelling by teachers and the creation of safe, caring and responsive schools. This targetting of both the individual student and the broader school ecology encapsulates the optimal 'dual approach' that is recommended by proponents of character education (Cohen and Sandy 2007) and social and emotional learning (SEL) programmes (Elias et al. 2007). As noted by Flay and Allred (2010), such programmes are "most beneficial when they simultaneously improve the quality of the environments in which students are educated, as well as enhance students' personal and social assets" (p. 487). Although it is not yet clear which effect takes precedence, there is ample evidence to suggest that a caring and supportive environment begets individual wellbeing just as improvements in personal wellbeing flow over to create a more positive environment (Flay and Allred 2010). When teachers adopt a planned whole-school approach to modelling and encouraging caring and respectful behaviour and creating a nurturing and supportive environment in which these behaviours can be practised and scaffolded, then the personal wellbeing of students is positively impacted. Similarly, when individual students feel a sense of belonging and begin reciprocating these same qualities and actions, then the school climate and the 'collective' wellbeing of all members of the school community are enhanced.

Haydon (2010, p. 196) describes these two intervention foci as the 'public' and the 'personal' manifestations of values and wellbeing. According to Haydon, the public manifestation of values refers to those qualities of citizenship and aspects of moral social behaviour that contribute to the effective functioning of society. The focus on improving the school ecology by teachers espousing, modelling and reinforcing pro-social behaviours can be seen as an attempt to create, in the microcosm of the school, a kind of collective wellbeing. The notion of personal values refers to the internalization of the values and is evidenced by the students demonstrating positive behaviours through their own volition, not just because the school culture makes them feel they 'should'. As argued by numerous authors, this self-initiating and spontaneous expression of values enables people to 'flourish' because their actions are self-motivated and driven by an intrinsic desire rather than external forces, be they positive or negative (Brighouse 2006).

Haydon reiterates that values education is not an attempt to inculcate in children socially agreed standards of right and wrong in order to ensure that successive generations acquire a sense of their moral obligations to others. Rather, he sees values education as embodying a liberal ethos shared by teachers and the broader public in the twenty-first century, that is, freedom of choice. While acting according to

personal discretion is preferable to acting from a sense of 'duty', choices need to be made in the context of understanding the consequences of one's actions on one's own wellbeing and on the wellbeing of others. By giving children opportunities to practise the values and to engage in discourse and reflection about the effects of their own behaviour and the behaviour of others, values education serves to promote the capacity of the next generation to acquire and employ '*phronesis*', that is, the practical moral wisdom required to make 'informed decisions' about how to meet personal and public responsibilities in their current and future lives (Kristjánsson 2010).

The notion of enhanced wellbeing that comes from the symbiotic relationship between nurturing environments and self-growth is also evident in Narvaez's (2010) approach to values education, which is known as the Integrative Ethical Education (IEE) model. The IEE's aim is to 'foster human flourishing' by creating what Narvaez refers to as a 'sustaining climate', that is, a classroom climate that not only meets basic human needs but one which actively fosters individual resiliency and strengthens interpersonal relations. The teacher's role in creating a sustainable climate is to adopt a 'novice-to-expert pedagogy' that spans both learning outcomes and social-moral development. Teachers emphasize effort rather than performance and encourage students to identify their own strengths and weaknesses and set their own individual goals. Teachers act as 'guides' or 'mentors' and scaffold students in their pursuit of knowledge and in developing the intrapersonal and interpersonal skills required for self-actualization and effective social functioning. Sustaining classrooms allow students to have input into decisions affecting their learning environment, provide opportunities for students to make choices about what and how they learn, expect students to share responsibility for classroom tasks, and offer a range of individual and group learning activities. Osterman (2010) describes how these 'democratic' practices and personal support from teachers contribute to the creation of an optimal learning environment, that is, one which addresses the basic psychological needs that promote personal growth and adjustment. Deci and Ryan (1985) have identified these 'basic human needs' as relatedness, competence and autonomy.

Relatedness involves developing secure and satisfying connections with others in one's social context; competence involves understanding how to attain outcomes and being efficacious in performing the requisite actions; and autonomy refers to self-initiating and self-regulating one's own actions (Deci et al. 1991). While these basic needs are often considered to be 'individual' needs, Narvaez (2010) notes that, "basic needs are embedded in a relational context" (p. 665) and one's intrapersonal capacities both determine and are determined by one's immediate environment and the interactions one has with other participants in this environment. Thus, attention to developing the interpersonal skills of all members of a classroom or school community is an important endeavour in supporting individual self-actualization, since the expression of values such as care and compassion, tolerance and inclusion, respect and fairness are best fulfilled through interactions with others. If the actions and reactions of others in the environment are harsh and hostile, then it is difficult to develop understanding of values such as care and compassion, and even

more difficult to incite actions commensurate with these values. According to Narvaez (2010), the values that individuals develop and express "come from habitats in which one spends the most time" (p. 666). Therefore, as described in the previous chapter, implicit learning through daily observations of the positive expression of values in the classroom environment has the potential to reorganize the brain systems governing children's behaviour, so that they move from habitual or 'self-centred' responding to adopting a more 'reasoned' and socially conscious stance.

The IEE model invokes a caring and moral classroom rich in positive relational discourse and pro-social expectations about student behaviour. When students are engaged in discussions about how they can help others or what effect a particular kind of behaviour has on others, then both their 'self-awareness' and their 'social awareness' are being raised. Self-awareness is an important intrapersonal skill that helps individuals accurately appraise and manage their own feelings and behaviours, while 'social awareness' is an important interpersonal skill that helps individuals appreciate the feelings of others and recognize the consequences and effects of one's actions on other people (Dally 2010b). It takes imagination to understand how someone else feels and to empathize with their needs. Narvaez (2010 p. 666) proposes that children who are educated in caring and just moral habitats, where conflicts are resolved through relational mending and forgiveness, have their 'imagination ethic' stimulated. Small group or whole class discussions regarding daily issues and minor conflicts expose students to the 'multiple perspectives' of their classmates and, through these discussions, students learn how to consider and reconcile different or competing views. These teacher-scaffolded dialogues help to broaden the range of possibilities that children might consider when deciding how to act or respond in problematic interpersonal situations. Sternberg (2001) advocates that it is through teacher scaffolding and analysis of authentic and personally relevant problems that children gradually refine their reasoning processes and problem-solving skills and learn how to make 'wise decisions' "… you cannot tell someone the wise course of action that will apply under every circumstance. You can provide learning experiences that will help that person make his or her own wise decisions." (p. 230). Once again, the concept of 'informed decision-making' and the development of *phronesis* (Kristjánsson 2010) are invoked in environments that enhance feelings of relatedness and which scaffold students' competence in intrapersonal and interpersonal skills through dialogue and practice.

In summary, values pedagogy encapsulates the notion of targetting students' social and emotional development with a simultaneous focus on creating a safe, caring and responsive school environment in which students can practise and critically reflect on the values they are being taught. This dual focus precipitates changes in student self-conceptions and peer interactions, student–teacher interactions and teacher practice, culminating in enhanced student and teacher wellbeing. Using findings from empirical work conducted by the authors, the following section explores the nature of these changes and the possible pathways by which improvements in individual student wellbeing leads to changes in the 'collective wellbeing' of the entire school community, including peers and teachers.

'Testing and Measuring' Student Wellbeing

As noted in Chap. 1, the 'Testing and Measuring' project (Lovat et al. 2009a, b) was a longitudinal mixed-method study investigating the effects of values education in two groups of schools. In the eight Group A primary schools, quantitative and qualitative data were collected from student, staff and parent surveys conducted prior to, then 12 months after, the implementation of a values education programme. Included in this chapter are some of the published and unpublished teacher and student comments from the Group A schools. The unpublished material is identified by the school number. Case studies derived from staff interviews, focus groups with staff and students, and case writing comprised the data sources for the 11 Group B schools. As reported in Dally (2010a), two main findings emerged from the quantitative analyses of the staff and student surveys from the Group A schools after participation in a 12-month values education programme. The comparison of the pre- and post-implementation survey responses revealed that teachers perceived a statistically significant improvement in student academic engagement and inclusive and responsible behaviour after the programme, while student ratings of their own behaviour significantly decreased.

Instead of reporting that '*All* the time' (rating = 4), they listened to their teacher or treated others the way they would like to be treated, in the post-implementation survey, students were more likely to select an answer indicating that they demonstrated these kinds of appropriate actions '*Most* of the time' (rating = 3) or '*Some* of the time' (rating = 2). It could be the case that prior to the values education programme, the students over-estimated their 'good behaviour' and that, after exposure to clear explanations of expected standards and principles of behaviour, the students were more self-aware and could therefore distinguish a discrepancy between how they *could* and how they actually *did* behave. Across the schools, the teacher comments also indicated that student 'awareness' of their own behaviour and of the school's expectations for behaviour had been heightened [italics added]:

> *Greater awareness* of appropriate behaviour (Teacher, School 1)
>
> Children are *more aware* of telling the truth/fair play etc. (Teacher, School 4)
>
> *Class aware* of how to interact with others (Teacher, School 3)

It is also possible that the decline in students' self-ratings may reflect the fact that the students were more 'honest' about the extent to which they did or did not demonstrate the values described in the survey questions. Teachers as well as students made reference to examples of greater 'honesty' and admissions of culpability:

> Students have actually thought of a "value" and been honest enough to say e.g. they have told lies—a real breakthrough because natural instinct is to deny if they have done something wrong. (Teacher, School 4)
>
> When Nathan took my football cards he whispered, Yes, I took them. (Student, School 1)

After the programme, the majority of students certainly seemed to be in no doubt as to what the values meant and why they were important in the context of the school

and in terms of their own development. The student surveys revealed that, since learning about values, 96% of students understood why values are important and 97% of students tried ‘to be a better person’ (at least *some* of the time). Evidence that a new awareness of values was inspiring greater efforts towards ‘self-improvement’ was also apparent in the student responses to the open-ended post-implementation survey question which asked for an example of an occasion when the students had demonstrated or observed one of the values they had been learning about at school. The responses typically indicated that students were now more conscious of the way they behaved and were more aware of how their behaviour impacted on others. This insight often instigated pro-social actions:

> I have learned respect. I used respect in the playground when we were playing football—there (sic) team lose and I went over and said “good game”. (Student, School 1)

> Care: I think more about how I say things to others. (Student, School 3)

> Fairness: now when I play a game with my sisters I let them go first. (Student, School 5)

The teachers’ comments confirmed that teachers had also noticed that students were more attentive as to how their behaviour ‘measured up’ to the school’s expectations and were more alert to the consequences of their actions on their peers:

> Most students are aware of the values being taught in the school and how their own actions affect others. (Teacher, School 1)

> I think the students in my class are more aware of the impact values have on everyone’s behaviour. (Teacher, School 8)

The students’ new insights about the effect of their behaviour on others seemed to engender a re-appraisal of the extent to which their behaviour ‘matched’ the values they had been learning about. The result of these reflections sometimes led to greater efforts in self-regulation, for example, “Respect- by not yelling out like I used to” (Student, School 1). Teachers also commented that the language and understanding of values prompted student self-reflection and promoted improved behaviour. “Students use the language of values to reflect on their behaviour. Students try to model values.” While most teachers acknowledged that values education had raised student *awareness* of how their behaviour reflected the values, the teachers at one school felt that the students had learned the ‘language of values’ but were not translating this into appropriate actions:

> The children are more aware of values but don’t seem to apply them to situations. (Teacher, School 6)

> Children can discuss the values we teach in an informed way, but sometimes I feel it is just talking the talk. (Teacher, School 6)

In contrast, at this and other schools, there were numerous student comments which indicated that many students *were* paying more than lip service to the enactment of values. Some of the student comments revealed the thoughts and feelings that underlay the students’ efforts to align their actions with the values. These processes may not have been visible or obvious to teachers, but the following student comments give insight into the internal struggles that these students confronted in their endeavour to demonstrate the values they had been learning about. Acting in accor-

dance with the values was not always easy and, at times, required a 'conscious decision' to act in a manner that was contrary to first impulses or, as in the last example, contravened peer pressure:

> Honesty: I found a toy, I felt to keep it (sic) but I handed it in. (Student, School 2)
>
> Respect: I was going to take someone's pencil to use and I thought I shouldn't, I should ask. (Student, School 6)
>
> Responsibility: Jarrod, Jeremy, Callum and I open and close the library Monday to Wednesday and my friends wanted to play and not do their job. Jarrod and I said no and kept doing our job. (Student, School 2)

Knowing and Doing: From *Phronesis* to *Praxis*

The preceding comments affirm Crotty's (2010) deduction that values pedagogy cultivates in students the capacity to become self-reflective and self-determining. Self-reflection often involves judgement of past actions in light of their consequences and, as the above quotes demonstrate, once values are given prominence in the school context, students can also evaluate their past and future actions against these newly acquired or increasingly refined 'standards' of behaviour. According to Crotty, an understanding of values fosters a greater sense of responsibility and leads to more 'imaginative' decision-making when contemplating how one will act in the future. By learning how to evaluate situations with reference to a principle, rather than just adhering to a rule, children gain a deeper understanding of their 'moral agency', that is, their own power to make a choice about how to act. Access to a broader repertoire of possible actions accompanied by a heightened sense of self-awareness serves to *liberate* students from habitual or impulsive responding, thus demonstrating what Habermas calls the 'emancipatory' function of self-knowledge. The comments indicate that the students' critical self-appraisal has not only given them new moral insight (*phronesis*) but has resulted in the adoption of more appropriate and altruistic actions, thus reflecting the Habermasian notion of *praxis*, and demonstrating the kind of 'flourishing' that comes from striving to realize 'one's true potential' (Ryff and Singer 2000).

The enhanced individual wellbeing that came from student awareness and uptake of the values created a flow-on effect to enhance the 'communal wellbeing' of the school such that, as students adopted more considered and considerate behaviour, the classrooms and playgrounds became more friendly, caring and cooperative environments:

> Care: because if someone is hurt or upset someone would be straight over to the person to see if they are ok. (Student, School 2)
>
> Fairness: Since we have been learning about fairness people haven't even tried to cheat in a game. Also everyone gives everyone a chance to learn. (Student, School 1)
>
> Respect: people do not steal other people's stuff as much and we look after other people better. (Student, School 9)

Teachers also noted that children were more sensitive to the needs and feelings of their peers and were more likely to intervene to prevent bullying, "Children now speaking out when a peer isn't adhering to our values" (Teacher, School 3). This heightened understanding of self and others, combined with opportunities to practise the values and engage in discussions about them, equips students with a broader range of behaviour options as well as the empathy that is necessary to translate knowledge about values into commensurate actions (Turner and Berkowitz 2005).

When implemented in accordance with the guiding principles, values pedagogy gives children 'everyday' opportunities to practise the values and to reflect on specific situations and the extent to which values are represented in their own and others' behaviour. Kristjánsson (2010, pp. 180, 191) believes that this kind of 'agent-centred and context-sensitive hands-on approach', when conducted through 'sustained serious engagement with others', is the best way to promote self-understanding and self-efficacy. The following quote illustrates how the language and understanding of values, coupled with insight gained from self-reflection, helped these two students resolve a specific conflict situation:

> Last term, my best friend and I had an argument which turned into both of us not talking to each other. But after a few days we realised we needed each other. We talked about it and used co-operation. And we showed integrity by admitting our mistakes and saying sorry. (Student, School 2)

While the reconciliation between these two friends is likely to have occurred even in the absence of the values intervention, it appears that the shared language and understanding of values, such as co-operation and integrity, have helped these two students identify and articulate the principles and actions that facilitated their rapprochement. This communicative competence, in tandem with the process of self-reflection and dialogue, equipped the students with a communicative apparatus that they can draw upon in future situations of a similar nature. A teacher from another school also identified the language and understanding of values as a 'useful tool':

> It is a very useful tool when working through poor behaviour choices in school situations. The shared vocabulary and understandings are very helpful in assisting children to reflect on, and change their behaviour. (Teacher, School 1)

As suggested by Narvaez (2010) and Sternberg (2001), providing everyday opportunities to practise and reflect on values equips children with an increasingly sophisticated capacity for self-reflection, as well as a broader range of interpersonal and problem-solving skills. The desired result is for students to be able to apply these skills independently. Across the majority of locations, there was evidence that the values language and the accompanying shared understanding of values had empowered students to take greater responsibility for preventing and resolving conflict with minimal or no teacher intervention:

> Children are more considerate of each other. Fewer instances of students needing assistance in resolving conflicts. These conflicts are resolved more easily. (Teacher, School 5)

> I see evidence of the 'Values message' coming across in the playground. I hear the language of other children when solving conflicts etc. It is great. It is not happening all the time though! (Teacher, School 6)

The teacher's concluding caveat in the latter comment reflects some of the scepticism expressed earlier by other teachers at this same school, that is, that while some children might know what is right, they do not always choose to implement the best course of action. As discussed previously, the literature suggests that the internalization of values and the spontaneous expression of moral behaviour is an ongoing (some would say lifelong) process. Therefore, it is unsurprising that children require responsive and continued teacher scaffolding to support their acquisition of fluency and mastery in the interpersonal and intrapersonal skills necessary for negotiating complex social and emotional problems. Both Narvaez (2010) and Kristjánsson (2010) would argue that this kind of 'sustained' teacher scaffolding is essential in the provision of a 'sustaining' classroom climate. While some teachers appeared frustrated that values education was not a 'magic bullet' that immediately resolved all troublesome aspects of student behaviour, other schools noted that values education represented an 'ongoing process' and that 'it will take time to produce noticeable changes in student attitudes and behaviours'.

Despite some dissenting views, overall, the student and teacher responses suggested that a focused whole-school programme aimed at the inculcation of values enhanced the individual wellbeing of students by raising their awareness of the values that govern their own and others' behaviour. This awareness generally translated into small changes in the behaviour of individual students, such that they treated their peers with greater care and compassion and, when this was replicated and reciprocated on a school-wide basis, then the wellbeing of the entire school community, including students and teachers, was also positively impacted. If this phenomenon is considered in terms of Hascher's (2003) definition of student wellbeing as a preponderance of positive over negative aspects of school life, then it is clear that values pedagogy helps to create a school context in which *positive* feelings towards school and the people within it, gain dominance over *negative* feelings and thoughts about school.

Returning to the thesis that wellbeing begets wellbeing, the foregoing discussion indicates that values pedagogy fulfils the requirement of a dual focus on individual development in conjunction with the provision of a nurturing and supportive school environment in which values can be practised and scaffolded. The role of the teacher as a model and guide in this process not only positively impacts on *student* wellbeing, but the adoption of this role and the ensuing changes in student behaviour and school climate also impact on *teacher* wellbeing. The final section of this chapter provides a brief review of the factors affecting teacher wellbeing, followed by an examination of how the introduction of a school-wide approach to values education coupled with changes in student behaviour, academic diligence and school ambience, impact on teacher wellbeing.

'Testing and Measuring' Teacher Wellbeing

As will be discussed in Chap. 8, teacher wellbeing is closely tied to feelings of self-efficacy, that is, teachers who feel they are effective in their role have a higher level of job satisfaction and a more positive attitude towards school than those who

feel less efficacious in their role (Opdenakker and Van Damme 2000). The factors that contribute to teacher efficacy and feelings of wellbeing have been identified in school effectiveness research as the same components that constitute a ‘good school culture’ and which are best exemplified in the notion of ‘professional learning communities’ (Webb et al. 2009). A Professional Learning Community (PLC) is one “… where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free and where people are continually learning how to learn together.” (Senge 1990, p. 3). Webb et al. (2009) argue that, while the original conception of PLCs was to effect changes in teacher practice and school leadership in order to enhance student learning and attainment of academic outcomes, PLCs also have the potential to improve teacher morale and wellbeing.

Based on research in primary schools in England and Finland, Webb et al. (2009) nominate five key characteristics of schools which embody the ‘social architecture’ that serves to enhance student learning and promote teachers’ self-efficacy. These interconnected variables include “… shared values and vision, a supportive environment, reflective professional enquiry, collaboration, and collective responsibility.” (p. 406). Engels et al. (2008) produced a similar list with the addition of leadership, noting the crucial role of the principal as a motivator for change and a mediator of collegial relations among staff. Research from other countries provides insights into the effects of these characteristics on student and teacher wellbeing. In terms of the unifying and morale-boosting effects of a shared vision, an earlier and unrelated Australian study has shown that the more teachers understand their school’s mission and agree with its associated goals, the more likely they are to feel a sense of personal accomplishment and the less likely they are to suffer from emotional exhaustion and depersonalization (Dorman 2003). Research with secondary students in Belgium by Opdenakker and Van Damme (2000) has shown that a supportive school environment, reflective enquiry and collaborative teacher practice have positive effects on both pupil wellbeing and achievement as well as teacher wellbeing. These authors speculate about possible pathways which could explain why cooperation among teaching staff had such an ‘overwhelming positive effect’ on these three achievement and wellbeing indicators.

One reason for the positive impact of staff cooperation on student achievement is that the pedagogy of less effective teachers is improved through dialogue and reflective professional enquiry with more effective teachers. On the other hand, there may be a more complex and cyclical dynamic explaining the improvements in student and teacher wellbeing. Frequent discussions and cooperation between teachers are likely to create stimulating learning environments and a supportive school climate where “… pupils have the opportunities to grow intellectually, socially and emotionally.” (Opdenakker and Van Damme 2000, p. 186). The positive effects on pupils’ social and academic outcomes mean that teacher job satisfaction and wellbeing are likely to increase because teachers are feeling more efficacious in their role. Consequently, when teachers feel they are fulfilling an important role, they are more likely to invest extra time and effort in their profession, which in turn contributes to student achievement and wellbeing. Support for this hypothesis has been provided by Sherblom et al. (2006) who found that the development of a caring school-wide

community that aimed to enhance the relational and social interactions between all members of the school community improved the experience of school life for both teachers and students, while at the same time promoting greater success in student academic achievement.

This brief review shows that the ideals underlying PLCs and effective school cultures include a shared school vision, cooperation and collaboration among teachers, and a supportive environment that promotes interpersonal relationships. When these characteristics are in place, then a social dynamic is created which impacts positively on student and teacher wellbeing as well as student academic achievement. The final section of this chapter examines the parallels between these characteristics and the principles that both foster and are fostered by values pedagogy.

The results obtained from the 'Testing and Measuring' project (Lovat et al. 2009a) indicated that the schools which observed the greatest short-term effects were those in which values education was identified in the school's mission or vision statement, was embraced by the majority of teachers, and had become an integral part of the whole school's fabric. It appeared that the introduction of the values pedagogy was an important catalyst in encouraging school leaders and teachers to include students and parents in discussions about the school's philosophy and mission. As described in Lovat et al. (2009a), most of the schools selected their own list of values in consultation with parents and sometimes with the student body. The process of identifying and articulating the values that were important to the school community helped to develop a shared vision of how the school should function. The explicit teaching of these selected values then made the teachers implicit expectations about behaviour clear to the students. Even if the students at some schools were not actively involved in developing the shared vision, the students were at least given greater clarity about their role in realizing the school's mission. This, along with effective leadership and a whole school approach, led to improvements in the classroom and school climate and enhanced the collective wellbeing of both students and teachers:

> There has been a noticeable change in the school environment. Committed leadership, explicit teaching of the values and the inclusion of the entire school community has brought about a more caring and supportive environment. (Teacher, School 2)

> The school expectations/rules are based on clear values. Most students after learning about a particular value are able to display that value. Improves overall school climate. (Teacher, School 3)

When the whole school implementation of values education was given prominence in the school's policies and practices, it appeared to permeate all aspects of the classroom activities and school operations:

> In every class, the teachers aim to embed values in every aspect of their work and to role model school values of respect to the children. This approach creates a cultural continuity and coherence in the school, which is the matrix for all learning. (Lovat et al. 2009a, p. 77)

Continuity and coherence in the school culture was enhanced when all staff implemented a common set of practices regarding the teaching of values and the expression of values in the conduct of interpersonal interactions. As noted in the following

comment, the participation of all members of the school community is crucial if values pedagogy is to become a natural and self-sustaining modus operandi:

> You need whole school involvement. It becomes your lifestyle … (Teacher, School 2)

As described in Lovat et al. (2009a), values pedagogy appears to be a 'transformative' process that results in calmer and more peaceful schools, greater academic diligence, better student–student and student–teacher relationships, and improved student and teacher wellbeing. Because there were only two points of data-collection in this investigation, it was not possible to disentangle the apparently reciprocal relationships between teacher practice, student behaviour and school ambience. Furthermore, as the report concedes, in many schools there were prevailing or co-existing programmes aimed at similar aspects of promoting student resilience (e.g. *Bounce Back, You Can Do It*), student learning (*Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies*) or peer relationships (e.g. *Peer Mediation, PeaceBuilders*). Nonetheless, the majority of the participating schools acknowledged that the effects of these programmes were broadened and enhanced once they were situated within the 'far-reaching' framework of values education.

As well as the inclusion of parents and students in articulating the schools' values and defining a shared vision of how the school should function, the explicit teaching of values and the associated changes in the way that teachers interacted with students and promoted clear expectations about behaviour, were also likely catalysts in the schools' transformations. While the quantitative teacher survey results revealed that there were no significant changes in teacher beliefs or in self-reported classroom practice (see Chap. 8), analysis of the teacher comments and case-writing indicated a number of recurring themes, with many teachers describing 'new insights' about their role as models and mentors, as well as changes they had made to the ways they communicated and interacted with students.

Teachers at some schools acknowledged that values education had prompted them to become more receptive and responsive to student input:

> More aware of allowing time for two-way communication between myself and the students—listening/sharing views and ideas—making decisions based on their feelings and input as well as my own. (Teacher, School 2)

Student and teacher comments confirmed that in many cases this new awareness on the part of teachers had translated into the adoption of more democratic classroom procedures and greater efforts by teachers to elicit and act upon the opinions of students:

> Participation! In our classroom we now have a lot of discussions and our teacher believes that everyone should join in and have their say. (Student, School 9)

> Tried to incorporate learning activities that teach children co-operation as well as outcomes. Listen more to children's ideas and implement them in lessons. (Teacher, School 2)

It often seemed that, although teachers did not set out to consciously change their current pedagogy, the requirement to explicitly teach values and provide opportunities for students to practise the values, almost coincidentally caused teachers

to reflect on and sometimes change the way they designed learning activities and structured their classrooms. As indicated in the preceding teacher comment, in order to integrate values such as *responsibility* and *cooperation* in everyday classroom interactions and activities, teachers need to yield to students some control over the content and nature of the learning activities and classroom routines. This role-reconceptualization and associated changes in teacher–student relationships added to the teachers' sense of efficacy and ultimately improved both their own and their students' wellbeing. A teacher in the St Charles Borromeo case study described the 'ripple effect' on herself, her students and the classroom ambience that occurred after she realized the importance of 'listening' to students and relinquished some of the 'tension' and 'control' she had formerly held onto:

> An insight most definitely for me was I also realized that they [the children] had picked up on my 'tension' and consequently they became tense and unproductive too. When I relaxed, they relaxed also. I also laughed more, and they laughed too. It set up a ripple effect. Children who were not achieving started to really shine. The children now really do believe that they have a voice and can make a difference. I now believe that too and that if you want to genuinely change the 'culture' of your school, it is essential to listen to the children. (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 103)

While this kind of pedagogical approach might be as much a product of the teacher's beliefs and interpersonal skills as a product of the values education programme, teachers in other case studies, such as Lanyon High School, also attributed improvements in student wellbeing, student–teacher relationships and school community building to the adoption of values education:

> … teachers have uniformly reported that values education has improved student interpersonal relationships and student–teacher relationships. Teachers found, in the implementation of their units, that the values focus produced more respectful, focused and harmonious classrooms. It developed students' social skills by increasing cooperation, empathic character, self-management and self-knowledge, which in turn led to more supportive and safer learning environments. (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 71)

The findings reported here support the research cited and affirm the synchronicity between student and teacher wellbeing and the explication of a shared school vision, collaborative and supportive teacher practice, improved social relationships, more positive learning environments and enhanced student motivation and engagement (Opdenakker and Van Damme 2000; Sherblom et al. 2006). The results obtained from the 'Testing and Measuring' project (Lovat et al. 2009a) indicated that student engagement was moderately correlated with both the interpersonal and intrapersonal aspects of wellbeing. The moderate correlations between student academic engagement and student inclusive and responsible behaviour ($r = 0.34$ and $r = 0.45$, respectively) indicate that student–student relationships (inclusive behaviour) and student agency and autonomy (responsible behaviour) appear to be important factors associated with the way students apply themselves to learning. While the study could not identify whether teacher wellbeing was most affected by improved student behaviour or improved student engagement, and although teacher wellbeing was not directly evaluated, the findings indicate that the values education intervention precipitated the five characteristics that define the kind of effective school communities that enhance teacher wellbeing.

The final word goes to the Lanyon High School case study which illustrates the cyclical and mutually reinforcing nature of the relationship between student and teacher wellbeing. It makes the point that the organizational structures and leadership approaches around the 'Values' project improved staff morale dramatically. It goes on to describe how this dynamic instigated improvement in student wellbeing and school ambience, which subsequently fed back into teachers' job satisfaction and a renewed enthusiasm for their profession:

> Meeting the 'chain of needs', starting with the needs of teachers, are reported to have, in turn, improved student wellbeing and student outcomes. It was reported that now the surplus of care is 'passed on to the kids' who, in turn, 'give the teachers more of what made them want to be teachers in the first place'. (Lovat et al. 2009a, p. 83)

Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to establish the fundamental relationship between values and wellbeing that sits at the heart of the efforts by several service professions to renew their essential charters and review their practices. The chapter began by using the social work profession as an example wherein one finds recent innovative literature calling for the need for it to re-conceive itself away from its more instrumentalist roots towards holistic social agency of the kind underpinned by a focus on values. At the same time, research evidence, both conceptual and empirical, was elicited to show both the dire need for and the possible shape and direction of such a re-conceived approach.

The chapter then turned its attention to education as a service profession engaged in a similar quest to re-conceive itself as holistic social agency, proffering that values pedagogy has potential to be the practical means by which this re-conceived agency might be implemented. Evidence was drawn from an array of updated sources, representing both conceptual and empirical research, to show how values pedagogy impels and encapsulates the positive effects on student achievement and wellbeing envisaged by school effectiveness research, moral philosophy and social psychology. An additional and somewhat unexpected benefit of values pedagogy is its apparent impact on sculpting and reinvigorating teacher practice and school leadership in ways that enhance school climate and teacher wellbeing. In contrast with the deterministic theories and pessimistic educational foundations described in the previous chapter, values pedagogy presents as offering a renewed optimism for the charter of schooling in the twenty-first century.

References

Adalbjarnardottir, S. (2010). Passion and purpose: Teacher professional development and student social and civic growth. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 737–765). Dordrecht: Springer.

Brighouse, H. (2006). *On education*. London: Routledge.
Carnegie Corporation. (1996). *Years of promise: A comprehensive learning strategy for America's children*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED397995). Accessed 7 June 2011.
Clement, N. (2010). Student wellbeing at school: The actualization of values in education. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 37–62). Dordrecht: Springer.
Cohen, J., & Sandy, S. V. (2007). The social, emotional and academic education of children: Theories, goals, methods and assessments. In J. G. Reuven, M. Elias, & M. J. Elias (Eds.), *Educating people to be emotionally literate* (pp. 63–77). Westport: Praeger.
Crotty, R. (2010). Values education as an ethical dilemma about sociability. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 631–644). Dordrecht: Springer.
Dally, K. (2010a). A teacher's duty: An examination of the short-term impact of values education on Australian primary school teachers and students. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 503–520). Dordrecht: Springer.
Dally, K. (2010b). The second pillar of the student wellbeing pedagogy: Social and emotional learning. In R. Toomey, T. Lovat, N. Clement, & K. Dally (Eds.), *Teacher education and values pedagogy: A student wellbeing approach* (pp. 32–53). Sydney: David Barlow.
Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation and education: The self-determination perspective. *Educational Psychologist, 26,* 325–346.
DEEWR. (2008). *At the heart of what we do: Values education at the centre of schooling*. Report of the Values Education Good Practice Schools Project—Stage 2. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/VEGPSP-2_final_3_execsummary.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.
DEEWR. (2009). *Values for Australian schooling: Building values across the whole school-Teaching and learning units- Secondary.* Melbourne: Australian Government, Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations; Curriculum Corporation. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/values/val_values_ed_cpl_resources_1_building_values,20874.html. Accessed 7 June 2011.
DEST. (2005). *National Framework for Values Education in Australian schools*. Canberra: Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Framework_PDF_version_for_the_web.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.
Dorman, J. P. (2003). Relationship between school and classroom environment and teacher burnout: A LISREL analysis. *Social Psychology of Education, 6,* 107–127.
Elias, M. J., Parker, S. J., Kash, V. M., & Dunkeblau, E. (2007). Social-emotional learning and character and moral education in children: Synergy or fundamental divergence in our schools? *Journal of Research in Character Education, 5,* 167–181.
Engels, N., Aelterman, A., Schepens, A., & van Petegem, K. (2004). Factors which influence the well-being of pupils in Flemish secondary schools. *Educational Studies, 30,* 127–143.
Engels, N., Hotton, G., Devos, G., Bouckenooghe, D., & Aelterman, A. (2008). Principals in schools with a positive culture. *Educational Studies, 34,* 159–174.
England, H. (1986). *Social work as art: Making sense for good practice.* London: Allen & Unwin.
Flay, B. R., & Allred, C. G. (2010). The positive action program: Improving academics, behaviour, and character by teaching comprehensive skills for successful learning and living. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 471–502). Dordrecht: Springer.
Gray, M., & Lovat, T. (2008). Practical mysticism, Habermas and social work praxis. *Journal of Social Work, 8,* 149–162.
Habermas, J. (1972). *Knowledge and human interests* (trans: J. Shapiro). London: Heinemann.
Habermas, J. (1974). *Theory and practice* (trans: J. Viertal). London: Heinemann.

Habermas, J. (1984). *Theory of communicative action* (trans: T. McCarthy, Vol. I). Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1987). *Theory of communicative action* (trans: T. McCarthy, Vol. II). Boston: Beacon Press.

Hamilton, C., Eckersley, R., & Denniss, R. (n.d.). *What is wellbeing and what promotes it?* Canberra: National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, Australian National University. http://www.wellbeingmanifesto.net/wellbeing.htm. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Hascher, T. (2003). Well-being in school – Why students need social support. In P. Mayring & C. Von Rhoeneck (Eds.), *Learning emotions: The influence of affective factors on classroom learning* (pp. 127–142). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Haydon, G. (2010). Values and wellbeing in the curriculum: Personal and public dimensions. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 195–210). Dordrecht: Springer.

Hill, B. V. (2010). Values education, mental reality constructs and student wellbeing. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 645–658). Dordrecht: Springer.

Houston, S. (2003). Establishing virtue in social work: A response to McBeath and Webb. *The British Journal of Social Work, 33,* 819–824.

Kristjánsson, K. (2010). Valuing the self. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 179–194). Dordrecht: Springer.

Lovat, T., & Gray, M. (2008). Towards a proportionist social work ethics: A Habermasian perspective. *The British Journal of Social Work, 38,* 1100–1114.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Dally, K., & Clement, N. (2009a). *Project to test and measure the impact of values education on student effects and school ambience*. Final Report for the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) by The University of Newcastle. Canberra: DEEWR. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Project_to_Test_and_Measure_the_Impact_of_Values_Education.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Dally, K., & Clement, N. (2009b). *Project to test and measure the impact of values education on student effects and school ambience: Associated case study reports*. Final Report for the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) by The University of Newcastle, Australia. Canberra: DEEWR. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Project_to_Test_and_Measure_the_Impact_of_Values_Education.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

McBeath, G., & Webb, S. (2002). Virtue ethics and social work: Being lucky, realistic, and not doing one's duty. *The British Journal of Social Work, 32,* 1015–1036.

Narvaez, D. (2010). Building a sustaining classroom climate for purposeful ethical citizenship. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 659–674). Dordrecht: Springer.

Opdenakker, M. C., & van Damme, J. (2000). Effects of schools, teaching staff and classes on achievement and wellbeing in secondary education: Similarities and differences between school outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 11,* 165–196.

Osterman, K. F. (2010). Teacher practice and students' sense of belonging. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 239–260). Dordrecht: Springer.

Rowe, K. (2004). In good hands? The importance of teacher quality. *Educare News, 149*, 4–14.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52,* 41–166.

Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. (2000). Interpersonal flourishing: A positive health agenda for the new millennium. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4,* 30–44.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organisation*. New York: Doubleday.

Sherblom, S. A., Marshall, J. C., & Sherblom, J. C. (2006). The relationship between school climate and math and reading achievement. *Journal of Research in Character Education, 4,* 19–31.

Sternberg, R. J. (2001). Why schools should teach wisdom: The balance theory of wisdom in educational settings. *Educational Psychologist, 36,* 227–245.

Turner, V. D., & Berkowitz, M. W. (2005). Scaffolding morality: Positioning a socio-cultural construct. *New Ideas in Psychology, 23,* 174–184.

Van Petegem, K., Aelterman, A., Rosseel, Y., & Creemers, B. (2007). Student perception as moderator for student wellbeing. *Social Indicators Research, 83,* 447–463.

Van Petegem, K., Aelterman, A., van Keer, H., & Rosseel, Y. (2008). The influence of student characteristics and interpersonal teacher behaviour in the classroom on student's wellbeing. *Social Indicators Research, 85,* 279–291.

Webb, R., Vulliamy, G., Sarja, A., Hämäläinen, S., & Poikonen, P. L. (2009). Professional learning communities and teacher wellbeing? A comparative analysis of primary schools in England and Finland. *Oxford Review of Education, 35,* 405–422.

Chapter 5
Values and the Curriculum

Defining and Understanding Curriculum

The word 'curriculum' is used in a number of different ways in education circles. Common to the intent of all usage is the underpinning belief that curriculum connotes the practical sharp edge of learning in a school. It is literally the 'running of the course' (Lovat and Smith 2003), where the 'rubber hits the road', so to speak. It also connote the explicit learning intentions of the school, the formally endorsed set of parameters by which learning is organized and effected. If people wish to refer to some other dimension of curriculum, they will normally preface the word with an adjective like 'hidden', 'implicit' or 'informal' to denote something more subliminal than the normal bounds of the word. From a values pedagogical perspective, all connotations of curriculum are important and we will examine each of them in turn. Overarching the identification of species of curriculum however is the central intention of the chapter to enforce the view that values pedagogy is first and foremost about the formal and intended learning of the school. Its important role in uncovering and re-directing the effects of 'hidden', 'implicit' or 'informal' dimensions of curriculum is best seen in the context of its explicit and intended curriculum perspective. Pring (2010b) reminds us that "… the teaching of values has become widespread as an explicit focus of curriculum thinking and practising." (p. v). He also notes the enmeshed curriculum effect of values pedagogy in highlighting "… the many different elements entailed in personal and communal wellbeing and … the many ways in which values are embodied of curriculum, transferred and developed through the wider curriculum." (Pring 2010a, p. xviii). Pring is at pains to link the notions of curriculum and pedagogy in a way that forbids the idea of an adequate pedagogue 'delivering the curriculum'. In an understanding of curriculum that is especially pertinent to values pedagogy, Pring speaks of:

> The teacher, rooted in what Dewey referred to as 'the accumulated wisdom of the race' mediates that knowledge, understanding and capabilities, which we have inherited, to the currently limited understandings and capabilities of the learners. (2010a, p. xix)

In an age where education policy is increasingly focussed on performance management and national testing regimes are exercising more and more influence on

T. Lovat et al., *Values Pedagogy and Student Achievement,*
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-1563-9_5, © Springer Science+Business Media, B.V. 2011

curriculum matters, it is worth reminding ourselves of perspectives like those of Dewey, noted earlier, and Pring, noted above. In Australia, the United States, the United Kingdom and Japan, to name but a few of the countries where these tests are now an official part of schooling, they have been accompanied by more centralized approaches to curriculum design and development and a privileging of essentially factual, and thus readily testable, curriculum content. Notwithstanding the political reasonableness of the rationale for the policy shift to performance management, no matter whether it be a desire for improved learning outcomes, increased productivity, greater efficiency, improved international competitiveness or combinations of these, a very worrying side effect is the way curriculum designers and developers continue to revert to curriculum design and development practices that have now been shown to be moribund (Slattery 1995).

Over time, the curriculum discourse has altered. 'Objectives' have been reconceptualized as 'student outcomes'. Curriculum content has been recast as 'domains' or 'key learning areas'. 'Learning experiences' are now 'flexible and responsive classroom activities' or such like. Notwithstanding these changes to the curriculum discourse however, approaches to design remain largely unaltered from earlier times. Arguably, the performance management movement is reinvigorating the classic model of curriculum development (Tyler 1949) characterized by:

- narrow, disciplined based conceptions of knowledge;
- an emphasis on instruction as distinct from self directed and deep learning;
- a view of learning as being planned and guided;
- knowledge as a commodity to be segmented and transmitted; and,
- assessment that relies upon comparison of students and competition.

At a time when the world is wrestling with such momentous issues as major international conflicts, human rights abuses, the ecological un-sustainability of current consumption patterns and intercultural disharmony, the classic curriculum model has little currency. A contemporary curriculum needs to be concerned with developing well rounded individuals with the dispositions, commitment and skills to address such issues. It also needs to help fashion a citizenry capable of the compassion and the cooperative, collective problem solving skills that are needed to address them. This chapter explores the role of values pedagogy in reconceptualizing curriculum in ways that reflect the perspectives of Dewey, Pring and others so that, in the hands of the effective pedagogue, the curriculum can develop a citizenry with the dispositions, commitment and skills required for the times in which we live.

Curriculum and Values

The chapter is organized in the following way. First, it traces the current rise in the interest in values education and argues that, until very recently, values education was most often seen as a technical exercise and remained tied to the idea of curriculum as 'product', wherein objectives are set, a plan drawn up and then applied, and the outcomes (products) measured. It is a way of thinking about education that

has grown again in influence since the late 1970s with the rise of vocationalism and the concern with competencies, regardless of evidence from the past that it is a moribund approach, not least for the kind of world noted above.

One of the results of this type of thinking about education has been that many of the debates about a National Curriculum for schools have been much less concerned about how the curriculum might be conceptualized and much more about what its objectives and content might be. The chapter further argues that any national curriculum needs to be framed in terms of the 'new values education' where values education is conceptualized as pedagogy and not as moral or character education. Such a curriculum would constitute a process of interaction between teacher, student and content (Stenhouse 1975). In this sense, curriculum is not a physical thing, but rather a set of principles for the interactions between teachers, students and knowledge. At its centre is *praxis*, informed and committed action (Grundy 1987). The chapter then offers a small case study of a teacher's approach to literacy education to illustrate how the curriculum can function as process and *praxis* in the context of the new values pedagogy. The case study is then examined to provide a set of alternative processes and *praxis* oriented curriculum development strategies to those employed by the classic, rational 'curriculum as product' model. The strategies include:

- First, establish the conditions for quality teaching and learning;
- Second, develop appropriate pedagogical scaffolds;
- Third, structure the pedagogical content around real-world issues; and,
- Fourth, engage in service learning.

Justification and supportive evidence for these strategies is then offered from contemporary international research literature. Finally, the chapter suggests that the 'curriculum as process and *praxis* model' provides more opportunities for *all* students to flourish, achieve their full potential and gradually become effective global citizens than the currently fashionable 'curriculum as product models' with their associated national testing regimes.

The Resurgence of Values Education

At the same time as the renewed focus on instrumentalism and basic competencies outcomes in education circles, there has also been a strong resurgence of interest in values education, variously titled. In Australia, China, including Hong Kong and Taiwan, Europe, including Russia, Ukraine and Iceland, South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, Vietnam, Malaysia and parts of Africa, values education is now either a mandated part of the curriculum, with teachers in training being required to prepare for teaching it, or is at least a focussed part of policy development. Also UNESCO's Living Values Project now operates in some 80 countries. There are over 30 States in the United States with formal Character Education programmes all of which address values education in one form or another. Moreover, accompanying these developments, there has been a burgeoning of government supported campaigns in-

cluding the likes of *Social* and *Emotional Learning* (SEL) and *Sathya Sai Education in Human Values* (SSEHV) in the United Kingdom, The *Penn Resiliency Program* in the United States and elsewhere, and a vast range of commercial material dealing with values education, such as the Australian *Bounce Back* program.

It is no coincidence that such resurgence has occurred at the same time as the world is increasingly wrestling with global issues like conflict resolution, human rights, sustainability, intercultural harmony and the like. Nor is it coincidental that it has occurred at a time when depression, mental illness, substance abuse, social conflict and bullying are increasingly challenging the social fabric. Indeed, many of the above programmes are expressly designed to redress such circumstances by promoting personal wellbeing and thereby enabling individuals, groups, communities and organizations to cope, thrive and succeed.

All of the developments in values education referred to above have several defining characteristics from a curriculum standpoint. On the one hand, they are either marginal to the school curriculum or are an added-on component, in the subject or unit sense. On the other hand, from a curriculum design perspective, they all depend heavily on the architectonic conception of disciplined subject knowledge. Thus, values education assumes guises like character education or moral education and becomes primarily preoccupied with factual knowledge around ethical or moral matters related to the personal, social and cultural challenges outlined above. From a pedagogical perspective, this conception of values education is heavily geared to effective instructional techniques designed to transmit the disciplined subject knowledge about such matters and how they might be addressed. In short, they remain captives of the 'curriculum as product' tradition.

The New Values Education Pedagogy

The research that underpins this book has led to a novel conception of values education, wherein it is not conceived of as a component part of the curriculum such as a 'values education', 'moral education' or 'character education' programme, connoting a separate school subject or area of pursuit. Rather, as described in Chap. 4, it is considered to be a principle of curriculum organization, a way of shaping the whole schooling experience, including the planning, managing and organizing of the total school curriculum, the teaching and learning opportunities within it, and the entire way in which the school functions, especially in its inter-personal relationships. It is primarily a conception of values education as pedagogy, with effective teaching and learning being enhanced by the positive human relationships and explicit values-oriented transactions that are forged within quality values-laden programmes. From a curriculum perspective it both helps to establish the ambience within which the interactions of teachers, students and knowledge are negotiated as well as the vehicle for the interaction. At its very centre is *praxis*: the informed, committed action that flows out of the negotiation. It is the very antithesis of curriculum as product.

Initially, the 'new values education' research had demonstrated that good values-laden programmes could help inject into schools calmness, confidence, mutual

respect, empathy, self management skills and other positive effects, all of which contributed significantly to the quality of teaching and learning. Said another way, there was a 'double helix effect' (cf. Lovat and Toomey 2009) between values education and quality teaching that essentially constituted the crucible within which the interactions between students, teachers and knowledge that comprise 'curriculum as process' were conducted. Most especially, it establishes a context within which those interpersonal relationships that are so vital for quality teaching and learning can flourish (Carr 2010; Kyriacou 1997; Robinson and Campbell 2010).

As we have seen, the double helix metaphor was extended to the notion of a 'troika', with the mutual support structure noted between values education and quality teaching being extended to a third modern research and practice tradition, namely, service learning. The new paradigm gives prominence to a form of values pedagogy that includes a service learning dimension, in which students not only learn about and gain confidence in expressing the values that define them and underpin their existence, but they also practise them in real-life settings where they gain confidence in applying informed, committed action to the task of practical citizenship. Thus, the service learning component of the troika adds a *praxis* dimension to the notion of curriculum as process.

The notion of curriculum as process and *praxis* implies a new paradigm for learning, one that fits better with our present social and cultural circumstances. It provides young people with the skills, knowledge and dispositions for addressing the major issues of the times outlined above. It also nurtures their holistic wellbeing (Clement 2010a), thereby fortifying their resilience and enabling them to increase their capacity and determination to continue to address such issues. Furthermore, the research suggests that this resilience and enhanced capacity encourages greater overall engagement on the part of students (Adalbjarnardottir 2010; Crawford 2010; Crotty 2010; Johnson and Johnson 2010; Nielsen 2010; Robinson and Kecskes 2010; Small 2010; Toomey 2010) and, moreover, a sense of wellbeing that encourages and impels them to strive to reach their full potential (Clement 2010a; Davidson et al. 2010; Flay and Allred 2010; Osterman 2010; Sokol et al. 2010). Indeed, values pedagogy of this sort appears to have an overall positive impact on student academic diligence and, according to the many articles of testimony from teachers and researchers, on academic performance as well (cf. especially Billig 2002).

The New Values Pedagogy in Practice

In order to give the reader insight into the practice of the new values education and to provide a basis for discussing its implications for curriculum, we outline below a vignette of practice that comprised some of the qualitative data for a study (Lovat et al. 2009a, b) funded by the Australian Government as part of its Values Education Programme, outlined in Chap. 1. The vignette presented here is an extract from Rennie and Theriot's (2010, p. 125–128) account of one teacher's approach to literacy education within the new values education paradigm.

The Teacher and the School

Christine teaches the year 4/5 group at the Lance Holt School in Fremantle in Western Australia. The school is a small community school of some 100 children from Years 1 to 7. It is very much a values driven school and has been deeply involved in the Australian Government's Values Education initiatives as well as having been, for many years, a school devoted to encouraging ethical and caring behaviour in the children who attend there. By using Y charts, drama, discussion groups and other instructional techniques Christine explicitly teaches the values like respect, responsibility and others related to ethical and caring behaviour. She is passionate about this aspect of the school's mission. Almost all of her curriculum and teaching decision making occurs within a values education framework. Her twin concerns of social justice and social action are evident in virtually all of the substance of the school work undertaken by the children in her care, as well as how the work is undertaken. Nowhere is this more evident than in her approach to literacy education. Furthermore, Christine believes that all areas of literacy, including reading, viewing, writing and speaking and listening, need to be explicitly taught and that the different modes of literacy are best taught in an integrated fashion.

Whilst Christine is passionate about values like care, compassion and empathy shaping the content and processes of her literacy programme, she is at times equally pragmatic about her approach which in many ways sits comfortably with the theoretical ideas that underpin a socio-cultural and 'multi-literacies' approach to literacy. Her approach is not influenced by the debate in relation to how best to teach literacy because Christine, like many other teachers, is eclectic and draws from a range of programmes and ideas to assist with her teaching. Christine knows that students need to be able to 'crack the code' and understand what they read. She understands that literacy is something we 'do' and children need to understand the different purposes of texts and she also is cognizant of the important role that literacy plays in our understanding of the world and others. Furthermore, she knows that literacy encompasses far more than the encoding and decoding of print. What follows illustrates how Christine's literacy programme is informed by both a multi-literacies and socio-cultural approach to literacy education as well as being driven by her belief in situating this learning within a values context.

Teaching Children to be Code Breakers and Meaning Makers

Christine uses Sandy Heldsinger and Jan Brandreth's Reading Around (Jangles Publications 2006) series in her reading programme. Christine's decision to use this series is based on a number of important considerations. First, the series assists the children in linking sounds with letters to identify unfamiliar words and supports the development of comprehension skills. Second, it serves as a quick and accessible diagnostic tool with the children's answers to questions giving her insight into each

child's level of reading comprehension. Third, there are good synergies between the format of the comprehension exercises and the ones that children are required to do as part of the National Assessment Program for Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN). Finally, but not least, Christine likes to use the series as many of the topics and stories raise contentious values based issues, thus allowing her to keep the children concentrating on thinking and acting within a values framework.

Christine also understands the importance of children having knowledge about how language works. Her approach to teaching grammar is essentially functional and she uses a text by Bill Spence and Sue Bremmer—the *Language Works: Grammar in Context* (Cambridge UP 2007) series. This series of workbooks focuses on specific grammatical concepts like similes, pronouns, combining clauses, identifying verbs and the like. It introduces the grammatical concepts, defines them and provides examples. It also provides simple activities for children to practise the concepts, presents the grammar in context in a passage, including practice for comprehension, and provides activities to reinforce sentence construction, punctuation and associated vocabulary. Her choice of these workbooks and the reading series referred to earlier allows Christine to engage in the explicit teaching of skills and knowledge associated with both 'code breaking' (recognizing unfamiliar words) and 'meaning making' (comprehension) practices. Some might describe her choice and approach in this regard as being quite prescriptive and pragmatic.

Teaching Children to be 'Text Analysts'

In addition to using these particular workbooks, Christine also exposes children to a range of other literature. Her choice of these texts is often influenced by her concern to foster in the children those empathic and caring dispositions she so values, particularly through 'critical literacy'. For instance, she recently juxtaposed Gabiann Marin's *A True Person* (New Frontier Books 2007) and Liz Lofthouse's *Ziba Came on a Boat* (Boomerang Books 2007) into an incipient critical literacy exercise for her children. In these two emotional stories about the experiences of two young girl refugees' coming to Australia, she provided her class with opportunities for analysing, critiquing and designing ways of looking at written text to question and challenge the values and beliefs that lay beneath the surface. She accomplished this by using a Venn diagram of two intersecting circles and having the children work in pairs to identify 'things that are the same' in the books and write them in the space created by the circles' intersection and, in the spaces that are not intersected, write an account of each story.

Also, there are equally emotionally charged books raising ethical issues, like Colin Thompson's *Dust* (ABC Books 2007) or Chris Van Allsburg's *The Garden of Abdul Gasazi* (Houghton, Mifflin Harcourt 1979) that are sometimes chosen for treatment in an activity called 'Three Levels of Questions'. In this activity, Christine has the children working in pairs and each pair is asked to write two to five questions for each of the three levels about the book under consideration: Literal

Questions; Inferential Questions; and, Critical Literacy Questions. Literal Questions relate to information that can be found in the text. Sometimes, this is visual information (visual literacy) rather than written. Inferential/Interpretive Questions infer or imply the answer from the text. Vocabulary questions are classified here too because they imply that you know the words or can interpret the meaning from the contextual clues in order to explain their use. Critical Questions relate to the reader's view and prior understandings. Questions could be on mood, tone, the chosen text type and the physical arrangement of the text, grammar for particular purposes and/or the attitude of the writer such as 'Is the author writing from an environmental viewpoint? How do we know?' The questions that each pair writes are then circulated for other class members to attempt to answer. The children also spend many subsequent sessions discussing and sharing the words, images and possible messages, both individually and in groups. Importantly, all of this is done with consideration and interrogation of the values underlying the emotional and ethical issues inherent in the texts.

Teaching Children to be 'Text Users'

Christine also explores the different purposes of reading in her literacy programme. Reading meaningful texts facilitates the development of reading skills by incorporating all of the associated resources that effective readers draw from, including code-breaking, meaning-making, text user and text analyst. Christine also uses reading for pleasure, reading to seek information, reading to get things done and reading to assist children in their understanding of the world, themselves and others, usually with ethical issues at the forefront.

Christine has a well organized home reading programme and children are encouraged to take books home and the checklist that accompanies the programme is designed to encourage 'independent' readers and to enlist the parents' help with beginning readers. She also regularly reads to the children in the class for pleasure. Quiet reading sessions are a regular weekly occurrence and the children have a wide range of texts from which to make their selection, including graphic novels, picture books, non-fiction texts and, of course, novels. The children share their interest in their current books and recommend books to Christine that they have read and they think others might enjoy. She continually re-stocks the class library with the latest books, particularly those that have been borrowed and not returned, and also the latest from favourite authors. The school is financially supportive of these purchases.

Reading is also used as a means to broaden the children's knowledge of themselves, the world and others. The purchase of multiple copies of novels and picture books that are used for class activities assists the children's successful learning. Again, the content of many of the books prompts class discussions concerning why and how the children might develop dispositions of care, compassion and empathy. *Boy Overboard* (Penguin 2002), written by Morris Gleitzmann, was one novel that had been read to the class. This novel provided endless opportunities for Christine to model questions based on the 3-level questions as well as pose questions that re-

quired the students to think about the author's tools, including grammar, vocabulary and punctuation, such as 'Where has he used punctuation marks?' 'Why did he use this metaphor?' and 'What effect does the choice of that word have on the reader?'

Walking the Talk

Christine also believes, as do those who advocate a multi-literacies pedagogy that learning should result in 'transformed practice' that leads to a form of 'action'. She is always on the lookout for opportunities for the children to 'walk their talk' about care, compassion and empathy. Recently, she was working with the Years 4–7 children on a project based around the book, *Dust* (ABC Books 2007), written by Colin Thompson and illustrated by a range of well-known artists. The book begins with the shocking line, 'Last night I died' and narrates the circumstances of the life and death of a poor child in drought-stricken Africa. It is the sort of story that could overwhelm children with grief or guilt if it was approached badly. On the other hand, both the school and Christine feel that they would not be offering an adequate education if they ignored global crises of justice and ecology in an effort to protect children from the knowledge of suffering and un-sustainability. So, Christine carefully scaffolded this project by fostering in the children an understanding that they are in a position to help other children and to make a difference in the world. In fact, this lesson of empowerment has consistently been part of the children's education: don't be guilty or despairing, be pro-active. Almost before Christine had finished reading the story, the students were, of their own accord, beginning to think about possible fundraisers to help.

The process in this multi-age class is important. The older children are by now familiar with the idea of organizing to be effective so, in small groups, the older children mentor the younger children on their fundraising ideas. Christine's job thereby becomes one of facilitator and guide, helping the children see their ideas through to fruition. Parents' talents were harnessed by the children to ensure the success of the events and two children were chosen to keep a written record of the budget and dispense funds when necessary for the purchase of items. Christine tries not to take over the process but to enable the children as agents of process-building. The Association of Independent Schools of Western Australia sponsored a visit by Colin Thompson to the class, which enthralled the children as they were able to ask him some of the questions they had about his text. They were also able to hear a more detailed account of the book and its production.

A Curriculum Interpretation of the Vignette

As was pointed out earlier, policy concerns about educational performance management have spawned a trend back to rational approaches to curriculum design and development in recent times. In attempts to meet those concerns, it is imagined that

there are certain skills students need to master and certain facts they need to know. Knowledge comes to be seen largely as something similar to a product that is manufactured. Within this atomistic perspective, it is further imagined that learners start by knowing nothing, are taught, and they then convert that knowledge to action. For the most part, this perspective has appeal because it allows learning to be organized quite neatly. There is a series of steps leading to the product, and curriculum can be designed accordingly. The sequential steps are as follows:

- Formulation of objectives;
- Selection of content;
- Organization of content;
- Selection of learning experiences;
- Organization of learning experiences; and,
- Assess outcomes.

Because the performance management movement places great store on measuring and comparing student performance (and then measuring and comparing school performance), this curriculum perspective has gained renewed currency. A major issue with this product orientation however is that students, and the pressing personal, social and cultural issues that dominate their present and future existences, are generally left out of the picture. The product model, by having a pre-specified plan or programme, tends to direct attention to *teaching* rather than *learning* processes, that is, the focus is on how content is dispensed, information is conveyed, assessment is conducted, and the learners are controlled in order to optimize such delivery.

By contrast, we have argued that, based on recent research insights concerning the new values pedagogy, one should look at curriculum as both 'process' and '*praxis*'. Within this perspective, the transmission of specific content is not the primary goal and learners are not objects to be acted upon. They have a clear voice in the way that the curriculum evolves, and the way the 'course is run' (Lovat and Smith 2003). As a consequence, according to Robinson and Campbell (2010) "… students take responsibility and ownership of their own learning and for ensuring that they set challenging goals for themselves" (p. 88). The focus is on interactions, rather than conveyance. Attention shifts from the technicalities of teaching, to the processes of learning and especially to creating the best possible environment in which learning can flourish. The vignette of Christine's approach to literacy education provides examples of the distinguishing features between the process and *praxis* conceptions of curriculum.

The first feature that distinguishes this dual conception from the singular, rational conception is the prominence within it of the explicit teaching of values. From a curriculum as process and *praxis* perspective, the explicit teaching of values involves three main strategies: values being formally taught using a variety of regular pedagogical techniques and including everyday opportunities for practice; the values then being embedded in learning activities that have been devised to scaffold student-centred/teacher-guided learning; and, the values then becoming the focus of a community based service learning programme, thereby enabling them

to be continuously applied and practised. The vignette makes clear that Christine formally teaches values by using Y charts and other techniques. She also devises scaffolding mechanisms in which the values are imbued and which also simultaneously serve, in an architectonic sense, as vehicles for teaching and learning about curriculum content. In her case, they are embedded in the literature within her literacy programme as well as the teaching and learning approaches she uses. There are many more possibilities for scaffolding the values in this way (see, for example, Lovat et al. 2009a, p. 32; Toomey 2010, p. 25). Finally, they are practised as part of the fund-raising activities that the students have organized as a response to studying the book titled *Dust*.

As illustrated in this book thus far, it is now well established that the routine effect of this curriculum approach on schools and classrooms is seen in increased calmness, more student confidence, greater mutual respect and empathy, improved self-management skills and other effects which contribute significantly to the quality of the learning environment and so to student attainment (see, for example, Benninga et al. 2006; Davidson et al. 2007; Hawkes 2009; Lovat et al. 2009a)

The second feature that distinguishes curriculum as process and *praxis* from the rationalist conception is in its emphasis on the affective dimension of learning. That is, from this perspective, quality teaching places more emphasis on student engagement with learning and less emphasis on linear and developmental notions of learning. Learning is conceived of as something to which students will gravitate quite naturally when the learning is meaningful and when the learning activities allow opportunities for student input, discussion or collaboration. It assumes a nexus between cognition, affect and sociality wherein, as corroborated by the neurosciences we cited in Chap. 3 (see, for example, Immordino-Yang and Damasio 2007), learning and emotion go hand in hand. Thus, it places greater emphasis on whole person learning than on 'academic performance', but not at the expense of it. In Christine's classroom, for instance, the formal teaching of the values of care, compassion and empathy is, in part, intended to establish quality relationships between the teacher and the pupils, and between pupils and pupils, thereby creating an optimal learning environment. Much of the learning is conducted in a pupil-centred, teacher-guided way with the children working in pairs or groups. Whilst technical skills, like grammar, are treated in a formal instructional way, much of the other student work is in constructing knowledge as distinct from receiving it. All of this typifies the notion of a cognition, affect and sociality nexus, in the way being proposed by the neurosciences.

The third feature that distinguishes curriculum as process and *praxis* is its emphasis on real-world learning. This form of learning emphasizes the extent to which the lesson has value and meaning beyond the instructional context and makes a connection to the wider social context within which students live. At the heart of this type of learning is the notion of connectedness (Lingard and Ladwig 2001), in the sense of connecting the student with the learning process. For instance, two areas in which students' work can exhibit a degree of this type of connectedness are, (a) real-world public problems, and (b) students' personal experiences. Students

might confront a current issue or problem, such as preparing a report on homeless people for the local council, by applying statistical analysis; or the lesson might focus directly on, or build upon, students' own experiences or situations. A high level of connectedness can be achieved when the lesson entails one or both of these approaches. Real-world learning also provides opportunities for developing in the students the capacity for commitment and action that is intended when the curriculum conception connotes both process and *praxis*. Connectedness with learning and *praxis* through real-world learning occur in a number of ways in Christine's classroom. She purposely chooses books that broaden the children's knowledge of themselves, the world and others. She also chooses books that provide insight into real-world experiences about contentious issues like dealing with refugees. From a *praxis* perspective, she encourages and enables the service learning fundraising efforts of the children in her class.

Thus, from the vignette, we can infer that curriculum can be thought of as a combination of process and *praxis* and that it can be focused more on the interactions between teachers, students and knowledge than the conception of curriculum merely as product. What we have in this new conception of curriculum are a number of elements in constant interaction. Teachers understand that the *learner*, not the content, is the focus of their attention and that their role is to provide a learning environment that encourages and scaffolds the progress of *all* students, regardless of their level of development. Furthermore, there exists a school-wide and explicit proposal for action that sets out the essential principles and features of the values that underlie the school's mission and the ways in which the values will be taught and enacted. Guided by these, teachers encourage conversations between, and with, students, colleagues and the wider community, out of which thinking, commitment and action might emerge.

We can also infer that the notion of curriculum as process and *praxis* holds that practice should not focus exclusively on individuals or the group alone, but should pay careful attention to the way in which individuals and the group create understandings and practices, as well as meaning. For example, in the sessions where Christine is seeking to explore the experiences of different cultural and racial groups in society, we can see how she could take the children beyond a focus on individual attitudes by exposing them to the opinions of others and helping them begin to see the material conditions through which their own attitudes are constituted. We can also see how she is looking for a collective commitment expressed in action through the service learning work in her class.

Therefore, unlike the rational curriculum conception's approach of identifying objectives, selecting appropriate content and instructional techniques, and then assessing student outcomes, the conception of curriculum as process and *praxis* is less linear, less content focussed, less concerned with assessment of performance and more concerned with establishing conditions for quality learning, the place of affect, whole person development and the education of conscience (Greene 1999), sometimes referred to as 'conscientization'. It concentrates on developing the personal, social and intellectual wellbeing of all students, thereby helping to fashion a

citizenry capable of the insight, compassion, commitment and cooperative, collective problem solving that is required in today's world. The principles that guide such curriculum in doing this are spelled out in a curriculum resource document allied to the Australian Values Education Program:

- Use of a student-centred, inquiry-based learning model;
- Provision of a safe environment;
- Provision of opportunities to practice and enact the values;
- Educating the whole child;
- Attending to the total teaching and learning experience;
- Being explicit about the values;
- Developing a shared language about the values;
- Consistent, congruent modelling of the values; and,
- Engagement with parents and the whole school community. (DEEWR 2008, pp. 8–9)

There is a great deal of support for these principles in international research concerned with the new values pedagogy. This is explored in the following section with reference to several of the Australian Values Education projects.

Establishing the Conditions for Quality Values Curriculum

As we have already demonstrated, a key concern for the new process and *praxis* values curriculum is in creating an environment in which interpersonal relations flourish and learning activities are engaging, meaningful and involve cooperation rather than competition among students. Both the explicit teaching of values and teacher modelling of them play an important part in establishing such conditions. The explicit teaching of a school's agreed values by the use of Y charts (how a value looks, sounds and feels), drama, artistic representations of them and other means produces two main changes in the school, namely, the formation of a common language and a greater sense of calmness in the school. These two changes produce, in turn, an ambience within the school that is more conducive to learning.

There is now an abundance of evidence that one of the effects of the explicit teaching of values is the emergence of a common language among all members of the school community to describe and analyse everyday events and feelings (see, e.g., Deakin Crick et al. 2005; DEEWR 2008; DEST 2003; Haydon 1993). Furthermore, this shared language and understanding of values has been shown to affect student behaviour: "… students were in general reported to have begun reminding each other about doing things with 'care', 'respect', 'tolerance'—such words becoming part of the daily vocabulary" (DEEWR 2008, p. 25).

In the large scale empirical study (Lovat et al. 2009a, b) referred to in earlier chapters, the researchers concluded that improved relationships meant that less time and effort were being diverted to behaviour management and more time was therefore available for the core business of education, resulting in a change in school culture (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 31). These changes were typified by "an improved

environment" (p. 89), "an increase in school cohesion" (p. 106), "greater consistency across the staff in relationships with one another and with students" (p. 106), "a clearer sense of purpose" (p. 106) and "… changes in the respect for diverse cultures and the inclusion of diversity" (p. 9). Teachers reported that classrooms became "more respectful, focused and harmonious" (p. 71), that school was "a better place to teach … a better place to learn" (p. 124) and that classrooms were therefore "more settled" (p. 25).

The study also provided confirming evidence from both the quantitative and qualitative data around the many testimonial claims that had been made in earlier studies (DEST 2003, DEEWR 2008) about the impact of values education on school ambience. For example, evidence was elicited of a "… 'calmer' environment with less conflict …" (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 8); "… rise in levels of politeness and courtesy, open friendliness, better manners, offers of help, and students being more kind and considerate … a greater respect for each other's position" (p. 9); and of "… the creation of a safer and more caring school community" (p. 10).

In the earlier VEGPSP studies, several indicators of educational impacts affected by good practice values education were identified. The study concluded that good practice values education can:

- produce calmer and more focused classroom activity;
- enable students to become better self-managers;
- help students develop greater capacities for reflection; and,
- promote positive relationships between students, as well as students and teachers. (DEST 2006, p. 2)

This is consistent with other evidence about the key role of teachers in effectively implementing and sustaining the kind of values education that brings about positive changes in classroom climate, as well as student pro-social behaviour and attitudes towards and engagement in schoolwork (e.g. Hawkes 2005, 2008, 2009; Solomon et al. 2000).

The evidence from the VEGPSP study and related Australian research suggests that the explicit teaching of values has the power to produce changes in classroom ambience and impel a more positive school culture. The VEGPSP study showed that values education enabled a common language to develop between staff and students through which improved relationships and behaviour were able to be brokered. A 'ripple' effect of such outcomes from values education served as a catalyst for positive changes in the demeanour of the whole school, and as the language 'spread' in wider circles, in extending these changes beyond the perimeter of the school so that the school's values became part of the community's dialogue (DEST 2006, p. 70). Pupil behaviour changed as the explicit teaching of values, such as respect, prompted more respectful listening on the part of students (p. 116). Explicit values education rippled out to beliefs, structures, policies and pedagogies affecting student wellbeing and learning (pp. 136–137). Observable changes occurred in student behaviour which resulted in improvements in the classroom climate, making it a more pleasant and productive environment for both students and teachers:

> We also found that by creating an environment where these values were constantly shaping classroom activity, student learning was improving, teachers and students were happier, and school was calmer. (DEST 2006, p. 120)
> The overall feeling in the class is calmer and more cohesive. (DEST 2006, p. 127)

Improvements in student behaviour as a result of increased sensitivity to values and the way these are translated into relationships meant that the playground and classroom climate improved and there was less need for interventions by teachers regarding behaviour:

> Teaching staff are reporting fewer classroom management problems as the students seem to have increased awareness of their conduct and a commitment to uphold commonly agreed values. (DEST 2006, p. 60)

By raising the levels of 'relational trust' (see, Bryk and Schneider 2002, 2003) between school staff, students and parents, values education brought changes to student behaviour:

> I have learnt the necessity of asking questions that evoke students' deep thinking, and I value the need to create interpersonal intimacy and trust within my classroom, so that it is a truth-seeking community. (DEST 2006, p. 33)

> it was decided trust would be a focus of our discussions with the students; what trust meant, looked like and felt like, and how to rebuild trust with their teachers and with their peers. (DEST 2006, p. 80)

> They were now focused on doing real work together and demonstrated a level of trust that had not been witnessed before. (DEST 2006, p. 148)

> The Teaching and Learning Team commented on the stronger and more trusting student-to-student relationships that started to be reflected. (DEST 2006, p. 208)

Changes in student attitude and behaviour also became evident in their interpersonal relationships:

> In real terms its success is there to be seen each day in the play of our students; in imaginative narratives, in turn-taking, in the willingness of "popular" children to include socially "awkward" children in their games and at their lunch table; in the "sacrifice" of playtime by senior students as they escort younger, injured children to the office for the ubiquitous ice pack and in the shared problem-solving it takes to find a lost hat, shoe or lunchbox. (Hill and Vick 2009, p. 89)

These calming effects on the classroom and the associated positive impact on student behaviour and the improved relationships between teachers and students were also evident in the follow-up VEGPSP study:

> These included focused classroom activity, calmer classrooms with students going about their work purposefully, and more respectful behaviour between students. Teachers and students also reported improved relationships between the two groups. Other reports included improved student attendance, fewer reportable behaviour incidents and the observation that students appeared happier. (DEEWR 2008, p. 27)

> Teachers reported calmer school environments, where a clear and shared set of school values, collectively developed, helped to focus teachers and students on behaviours that upheld those values. (DEEWR 2008, p. 40)

In this study, schools reported improved conflict management skills with comments such as "less fighting and bad behaviour" and "students began developing the ability to talk through their differences in a more respectful way." (DEEWR 2008, p. 77). Students had an improved ability "to discuss values" and were "empowered to behave in socially acceptable ways". As a result of a positive atmosphere filtering through the school, there was an attitudinal change in "students who previously did not believe they could achieve … with success building success" (p. 40).

From a curriculum as process and *praxis* perspective, therefore, the explicit teaching of a school's agreed values seems to have the potential effect of calming the classroom, as well as the school, and helping to form better interpersonal relationships between teachers and students. The common language that emerges from the process of explicitly teaching the values enables teachers and students to broker improved relationships. In so doing, the explicit teaching of values slowly but surely establishes conditions in which teaching and learning can more naturally and easily function effectively.

Curriculum Scaffolding in Values Pedagogy

Unlike the rational conception of curriculum's pre-occupation with easily measurable student outcomes and disciplined forms of knowledge, the curriculum as process and *praxis* conception is more concerned with fostering an intellectual depth beyond surface learning. It is also less concerned with standardized learning and more focussed on nurturing the types of skills and dispositions necessary for making the contemporary world a happier, more harmonious, productive, equitable and safer place in which all can live. A key way it seeks to promote intellectual depth and the skills and dispositions required for effective global citizenship is through scaffolding.

Within the new values curriculum, teachers devise techniques to enable their students to practise the values, thereby having the effect of maintaining the type of ambience supportive of quality teaching and learning described above, whilst simultaneously nurturing the types of interpersonal skills and intrapersonal dispositions necessary for understanding and integrating the perspectives of diverse cultures in a more globalized society and for addressing the social and environmental problems confronting the world in the twenty-first century. Research has identified an array of such scaffolds (see, for example, DEEWR 2008, pp. 28–34). In what follows, we discuss two of these scaffolds, *Socratic Circles* and *Student Action Teams*, to illustrate the potential effects of such techniques.

Socratic Circles is a systematic process for examining ideas, questions and answers that are highly values-laden. The *Socratic Circles* are made up of students grouped into two concentric circles, usually six to eight in number. The inner circle focuses through Socratic dialogue on a contentious values-based issue, such as "Is revenge a justifiable response?" on which the students have reflected after read-

ing a portfolio of material related to the issue before actually entering the circle. The students in the second, outer circle, observe the dynamics of the first group's discussion by using a rubric on which they note behaviour, such as contribution to the discussion, capacity to elaborate, respect for other viewpoints and the like. The observers then provide the first group with a commentary on the dialogue.

There is now substantial evidence that attests to the effectiveness of the *Socratic Circle* scaffold actively engaging students in learning and fostering their higher order thinking and social skills (Metzger 1998; Polite and Adams 1997; Tanner and Casados 1998; Tredway 1995). There is further evidence about this kind of scaffold contributing to reading comprehension and problem-solving skills, so connecting the seminar material and other content areas with real life, contributing to communication skills (both listening and speaking), motivating and engaging students, and developing empathy and respect towards others (Metzger 1998; Tanner and Casados 1998; Tredway 1995). Polite and Adams (1997) concluded from their qualitative research about the *Socratic Circle* scaffold that the seminars have potential to promote meta-cognition, conflict resolution and a deeper interest in learning. Because the scaffold constitutes an environment where learning and critical discourse of ideas and moral dilemmas coexist, students are facilitated in developing their emotional maturity, critical thinking, communicative competence and self-efficacy. The *Socratic Circle* scaffold also provides a context for reflective examination of the interaction between emotion and reason in decision-making and, so, contributes to the development of students' communicative competence and their cognitive and meta-cognitive development (Sylwester 1994; Tredway 1995).

Similar effects arise when teachers employ *Student Action Teams* (SAT) as a scaffold. In a SAT, a group of students identify and tackle a school or community issue which is values-laden: they research the issue, make plans and proposals about it, and take action on it. Such initiatives, as part of the formal or informal school curriculum, engage students in purposeful, authentic activities which are valued by the students, have broader community value and which meet or exceed mandated curriculum goals. This scaffold has been shown to develop students' higher order thinking (Chapman et al. 2007) and "promote significant deep learning outcomes" (DEEWR 2008, p. 112). One teacher describes the effects of using SATs as a scaffold as follows:

> I think the level of skill that we were working with yesterday far surpasses what you normally see from Grades 4 and 5. I've seen them take on quite adult roles in their interviewing skills. Things like that. I've seen them interviewing adults. They are writing notes about their interviews. All these sorts of things that children at Grade 4/5 level don't normally do. And it's making a difference. (Chapman et al. 2007, p. 324)

Finally, these scaffolds have been shown to have emotional appeal to students and teachers alike (Lovat et al. 2009a, p. 73) and, as such, provide the "emotional scaffolding" (Rosiek and Beghetto 2009) that has been shown to be a necessary part of developing high level cognitive skills (Immordino-Yang and Damasio 2007).

The Special Role of Service Learning in Values Pedagogy

The conception of curriculum as process and *praxis* is also vitally concerned with whole person development and the conscientization of students with a view to preparing good future global citizens. Its service learning dimension primarily serves these concerns.

Service learning gained prominence as an educational policy and practice in the United States in the 1970s and its philosophical heritage has been traced to John Dewey (Conrad and Hedin 1991). Definitions of service learning vary but, generally, it involves some type of practical experience by students in an activity that benefits members of the wider community beyond the classroom. Additionally, service learning is purposefully related to, and integrated with, the school curriculum and contributes to student learning and development (Billig 2000, 2002; Furco 2002). Thus, service learning is a teaching and learning approach that integrates community service with academic study. It is a teaching method which combines community service with academic instruction as it focuses on critical, reflective thinking and civic responsibility consistent with good global citizenship. Service learning programmes involve students in organized community service that addresses local needs, while developing the students' academic skills, sense of civic responsibility, and commitment to the community.

A growing body of research is pointing to high quality service learning being related to increases in student achievement, boosting school attendance, and inspiring greater interest in course material. Service learning has been linked with students being more cognitively engaged and more motivated to learn (Billig 2004). It has been linked with improved civic engagement of participants (Billig 2004). In terms of the curriculum as process and *praxis* notion, it has been linked with helping participants better understand themselves, a central aspect of whole person development. It has also been linked with the development of critical consciousness and thus the process of reflection and action that is so much part of conscientization (Center for Human Resources 1999).

Finally, Robinson and Kecskes (2010) argue that it produces the type of agency sought by the conception of curriculum as process and *praxis* claiming:

> … connectedness to school, community and society occurs as a result of greater student engagement in learning and a raised interest in civic responsibility. Service learning can assist young people to understand and believe that they can make a difference in their schools, communities, and society; it is powerful in providing an avenue for young people to participate successfully in education on a regular basis. (p. 721)

Clement (2010b) has argued that the synergy of the cognitive, the affective and the social reinforces the idea that learning is most effective in real-world situations, or at least those that simulate them, or where classroom learning can be seen as relevant, and readily and directly applied to real-world situations (cf. Newmann and Associates 1996). In his review of the findings from the neurosciences, Clement (2010b) finds much supporting evidence for values education, quality teaching and real-world experiences, especially when coupled with service learning, coalescing

in ways that enable effective learning. This seems to be supported by Evangelopoulos et al.'s (2003) study that showed how service learning promotes engagement in students by its focus on real-world issues. Finally, there is some anecdotal evidence of real-world learning having a positive impact on motivation and engagement. The final report of the study, VEGPSP—Stage 2, acknowledged the beneficial effects of values education on student learning, increased student engagement and motivation when students perceived learning to be relevant to their lives:

> Teachers reported that students connected more successfully with their learning when it was authentic and when they felt that it was relevant to their lives. (DEEWR 2008, p. 27)

Academic Improvement through Values Pedagogy

Whilst the curriculum as process and *praxis* conception is more concerned with establishing conditions for quality learning, the place of affect, whole person development and conscientization, it does not do so at the expense of student academic performance. Typically, academic performance and student engagement are mutually supportive. There is now an abundance of evidence showing that values pedagogy, and its associated curriculum as process and *praxis*, nurtures student engagement. In the 'Testing and Measuring' project, Lovat et al. (2009a) were able to show, through both the statistical and the qualitative data, that values education has the potential to impact positively on student engagement, without any other obvious factor serving as a contaminant. The results of the analysis of the teacher surveys that formed part of the study revealed that teachers perceived statistically significant improvements in students' academic engagement ($t = -3.89$, $p < 0.05$). In the teacher interview data from the study, staff members reported that students were putting greater effort into their work and 'striving for quality', 'striving to achieve their best' and even 'striving for perfection'.

Several of the school clusters in the VEGPSP—Stage 1 reported a perceived link between values education and student learning. One cluster reported that engagement in restorative practices led to improved teaching and learning (DEST 2006 p. 127). Other clusters reported an improvement in student learning as the values education programme was implemented:

> The values education programme in use has meant:
>
> - more effective cooperation among students as they go about learning or sharing learning;
> - teachers focusing more on guiding and acknowledging students' initiative—'getting kids to want to learn';
> - a safer, more secure learning environment;
> - better quality strategies used and students taught to articulate these;
> - the creation of a 'learning community' which links learning and relationships in powerful ways. (DEST 2006, p. 43)
>
> Student learning has 'shown an improvement', particularly as 'students improve their behaviour and display their values'. (DEST 2006, p. 192)

Establishing reasons, in a causal sense, for improved student performance is at best a dubious exercise. Nonetheless, in the VEGPSP—Stage 2 study, one cluster of secondary schools reported data that provided quantitative evidence of improvement in reading and writing for Years 7 to 9, with these results going against the general trend across the system:

> Performance of students on the ACT Assessment Program (ACTAP) provided quantitative evidence of improvement in literacy. One of the most difficult areas to improve student performance is from Year 7 to Year 9 yet our data for students in reading and writing shows definite improvement and is evidence of the value added that has occurred for students as they moved from Year 7 to Year 9 compared to the system data. (DEEWR 2008, p. 47)

Regardless of how difficult it is to attribute causal connection between students engaging the process and *praxis* values curriculum and improvements in student academic performance, we suggest there is nevertheless an increasing amount of research that is supporting this link. In addition to all that we have called on thus far, we add a summary of the evidence below that pertains to certain aspects of those dispositions and behaviours with which one normally associates academic achievement.

- positive academic attitudes (including motivation and/or engagement) (Billig 2000; Farrer 2000; Hawkins et al. 2001; Hawkins et al. 2004; Hawkes 2009; Solomon et al. 2000; Schaps et al. 2004);
- ownership and agency in learning (Deakin Crick 2002; Deakin Crick et al. 2004, 2005; Furco 2002);
- relating of learning to life issues (Deakin Crick 2002);
- ethical development (Endicott et al. 2003; Furco 2002);
- cognitive skills (Billig 2000; Conrad and Hedin 1991; Deakin Crick, et al. 2004, 2005; Sylwester 1994; Topping and Trickey 2007; Tredway 1995; Trickey and Topping 2004);
- critical thinking (Billig 2000; Deakin Crick 2002); and
- communicative competence through dialogue and discourse (Deakin Crick et al. 2004, 2005).

These findings are echoed in a number of other studies (e.g. Benninga et al. 2003, 2006), suggesting that the ambience, relationships and discourse associated with values education have the potential to impact positively on a range of students' academic work habits. In a study of 121 randomly selected Californian elementary schools with high, medium and low achievement, Benninga et al. (2003, 2006) examined the relationship between character education programmes and academic achievement as measured by the Californian State's Academic Performance Index (API) and percentage of students on or above the 50th percentile of the Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition (SAT9). These authors found significant correlations over four continuous years between a composite summary score of character education and the API, and the language and mathematics subscales of the SAT9.

Davidson et al. (2007) also argue that the moral character developed in values education programmes can contribute to academic improvement. Other inferences about links between values education and improved academic performance are

made in research on the West Kidlington School, UK (Farrer 2010; Hawkes 2009). Over a 3-year period in regard to the Primary Schools Performance Tables, students aged 11 years performed above the national average and above other schools in the local area in mathematics, science and English. Considering the lower than average levels of achievement of students at school entry, this strongly suggests that the school has a capacity to boost the achievement of low performing students. The school's success has led to its being sought for placement of students with special education needs and also by parents from the area because of the school's demonstrated success in promoting the academic achievement of the students (Farrer 2000; Hawkes 2005, 2009).

There are further inferences about the links between values pedagogy and improved academic performance presented in the VEGPSP research reports (DEST 2006; DEEWR 2008) and in Lovat et al. (2009a). They mainly point to quantitative and qualitative evidence about values pedagogy instigating changes in student engagement and across a range of learning dispositions and classroom behaviours. These behaviours include increased attentiveness, a greater capacity to work independently as well as more cooperatively, greater care and effort being invested in schoolwork and students assuming more responsibility for their own learning as well as classroom 'chores' (Lovat et al. 2009a, p. 6). Once again it is difficult to identify and differentiate the causal connections between these elements. Did student engagement and behaviour improve because teachers became more supportive and made the learning more meaningful, or did the explicit teaching of values cause improvement in student attitude and behaviour so that teaching and learning were less likely to be disrupted by problem behaviour (Bennett et al. 2005)? The results of the Australian studies reviewed here suggest that both of these interactions might have occurred in tandem.

Conclusion

On the basis of the research evidence presented in this chapter about the four curriculum principles underpinning the new values curriculum as process and *praxis*, it is tempting to conclude that they combine in ways that change the behaviour of both teachers and students, gradually impact positively on the ambience of the school, then on the quality of teaching and learning in the way described by Crotty (DEEWR 2008):

> The cause of values education is essential in my opinion to education. It is the ingredient that can make the difference to education. Students who attend a school where they feel secure from physical and psychological harm, who are met by teachers who model ethical behaviour and who require such behaviour from their students will achieve well in the academic sphere. Why? The answer is obvious. Because the students will be more emotionally stable; they will apply themselves with greater alacrity; they will be more at ease with school personnel; and will achieve greater self discipline. (p. 6)

References

Adalbjarnardottir, S. (2010). Passion and purpose: Teacher professional development and student social and civic growth. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 737–764). Dordrecht: Springer.

Bennett, P., Elliott, M., & Peters, D. (2005). Classroom and family effects on children's social and behavioural problems. *The Elementary School Journal, 105,* 461–480.

Benninga, J., Berkowitz, M., Kuehn, P., & Smith, K. (2003). The relationship of character education implementation and academic achievement in elementary schools. *Journal of Research in Character Education, 1,* 19–32.

Benninga, J. S., Berkowitz, M. W., Kuehn, P., & Smith, K. (2006). Character and academics: What good schools do. *Phi Delta Kappan, 87,* 448–452.

Billig, S. H. (2000). Research on K-12 school-based service learning: The evidence builds. *Phi Delta Kappan, 81,* 658–664.

Billig, S. H. (2002). Adoption, implementation, and sustainability of K-12 service-learning. In A. Furco & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *Service-learning: The essence of the pedagogy* (pp. 245–267). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Billig, S. H. (2004). *Heads, Hearts, and Hands: The Research on K-12 Service-Learning*. Denver: RMC Research Corporation. http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/Billig_Article2.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. New York: Sage.

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2003). Trust in Schools: A core resource for school reform. *Educational Leadership, 60*(6), 40–44.

Carr, D. (2010). Personal and professional values in teaching. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 63–74). Dordrecht: Springer.

Center for Human Resources. (1999). *Using evidence to make the case for service-learning as an academic achievement intervention in K-12 schools*. Denver: RMC Research Corporation. http://nslp.convio.net/site/DocServer/caseforsl.doc?docID=106. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Chapman, J. D., Toomey, R., Cahill, S., Davis, M., & Gaff, J. (2007). Clusters and learning networks: A strategy for reform in values education. In D. N. Aspin & J. D. Chapman (Eds.), *Values education and lifelong learning: Principles, policies, programmes* (pp. 315–345). Dordrecht: Springer.

Clement, N. (2010a). Student wellbeing at school: The actualization of values in education. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 19–36). Dordrecht: Springer.

Clement, N. (2010b). The first pillar of the student wellbeing pedagogy: The neuroscience research. In R. Toomey, T. Lovat, N. Clement, & K. Dally (Eds.), *Teacher education and values pedagogy: A student wellbeing approach* (pp. 15–31). Sydney: David Barlow.

Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. (1991). School-based community service: What we know from research and theory. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72,* 743–749.

Crawford, K. (2010). Active citizenship education and critical pedagogy. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 811–824). Dordrecht: Springer.

Crotty, R. (2010). Values education as an ethical dilemma about sociability. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 631–644). Dordrecht: Springer.

Davidson, M., Khmelkov, V., & Lickona, T. (2010). The power of character: Needed for, and developed from, teaching and learning. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 427–454). Dordrecht: Springer.

Davidson, M., Lickona, T., & Khmelkov, V. (2007). Smart and good schools: A paradigm shift for character education. *Education Week, 27*(12), 32–40.

Deakin Crick, R. (2002). *Transforming visions: Managing values in schools*. London: Middlesex University Press.

Deakin Crick, R., Coates, M., Taylor, M. J., & Ritchie, S. (2004). *A systematic review of the impact of citizenship education on the provision of schooling.* In *Research Evidence in Education Library.* London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education. http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/Default.aspx?tabid=127&language=en-US. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Deakin Crick, R., Taylor, M., Tew, M., Ritchie, S., Samuel, E., & Durant, K. (2005). *A systematic review of the impact of citizenship education on student learning and achievement.* In *Research Evidence in Education Library.* London: The EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London. http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=H3%2bBp1D3z7Y%3d&tabid=129&mid=950&language=en-US. Accessed 7 June 2011.

DEEWR. (2008). *At the heart of what we do: Values education at the centre of schooling*. Report of the Values Education Good Practice Schools Project—Stage 2. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/VEGPSP-2_final_3_execsummary.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

DEST. (2003). *Values education study.* Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/VES_Final_Report14Nov.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

DEST. (2006). *Implementing the National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools.* Report of the Values Education Good Practice Schools Project—Stage 1: Final Report, September 2006. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/VEGPS1_FINAL_REPORT_EXEC_SUMMARY_081106.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Endicott, L., Bock, T., & Narvaez, D. (2003). Moral reasoning, intercultural development, and multicultural experiences: Relations and cognitive underpinnings. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27,* 403–419.

Evangelopoulos, N., Sidorova, A., & Riolli, L. (2003). Can service-learning help students appreciate an unpopular course? A theoretical framework. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 9*(2), 15–24. http://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/t/text/pageviewer-idx?c=mjcsl;cc=mjcsl;rgn=full%20text;idno=3239521.0009.202;didno=3239521.0009.202;view=image;seq=00000001. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Farrer, F. (2000). *A quiet revolution: Encouraging positive values in our children*. London:Random House.

Farrer, F. (2010). Re-visiting the 'quiet revolution'. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 395–407). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Flay, B., & Allred, C. (2010). The positive action program: Improving academics, behavior, and character by teaching comprehensive skills for successful learning and living. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 471–502). Dordrecht: Springer.

Furco, A. (2002). Is service-learning really better than community service? A study of high school service programs. In A. Furco & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *Service-learning: The essence of the pedagogy* (pp. 23–50). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Greene, T. F. (1999). *Voices: The educational formation of conscience*. South Bend: Notre Dame University Press.

Grundy, S. (1987). *Curriculum: Product or praxis?* Lewes: Falmer.

Hawkes, N. (2005). *Does teaching values improve the quality of education in primary schools? A study about the impact of introducing values education in primary school.* Unpublished D Phil, University of Oxford.

Hawkes, N. (2008). The purpose of values education. *Journal of Religious Education, 56*(3), 25–31.

Hawkes, N. (2009). Values and quality teaching at West Kidlington Primary School. In T. J. Lovat & R. Toomey (Eds.), *Values education and quality teaching: The double helix effect* (pp. 105–120). Dordrecht: Springer.

Hawkins, J. D., Guo, J., Hill, K. G., Battin-Pearson, S., & Abbott, R. D. (2001). Long-term effects of the Seattle Social Development intervention on school bonding trajectories. *Applied Developmental Science, 5,* 225–236.

Hawkins, J. D., Smith, B. H., & Catalano, R. F. (2004). Social development and social and emotional learning. In J. E. Zins, R. P. Weissberg, M. C. Wang, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say?* (pp. 135–150) New York: Teachers College Press.

Haydon, G. (1993). Values education in a democratic society. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 12,* 33–44.

Hill, A., & Vick, M. (2009). Moving values beyond the half hour: Peer leadership and school vision: A case study of the Townsville cluster. In T. J. Lovat & R. Toomey (Eds.), *Values education and quality teaching: The double helix effect* (pp. 115–133). Dordrecht: Springer.

Immordino-Yang, M. H., & Damasio, A. R. (2007). We feel, therefore we learn: The relevance of affect and social neuroscience to education. *Mind, Brain, and Education, 1,* 3–10.

Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (2010). The impact of social interdependence on values education and social wellbeing. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 825–848). Dordrecht: Springer.

Kyriacou, C. (1997). *Effective teaching in schools: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Cheltenham: Stanley Thornes.

Lingard, B., & Ladwig, J. (2001). *School reform longitudinal study: Final report*, Vol. 1. Report prepared for Education Queensland by the School of Education, The University of Queensland.

Lovat, T., & Smith, D. (2003). *Curriculum: Action on reflection* (4th ed.). Melbourne: Thomson.

Lovat, T., & Toomey, R. (Eds.). (2009). *Values education and quality teaching: The double helix effect*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Dally, K., & Clement, N. (2009a). *Project to test and measure the impact of values education on student effects and school ambience*. Report for the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) by The University of Newcastle, Australia. Canberra: DEEWR. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Project_to_Test_and_Measure_the_Impact_of_Values_Education.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Dally, K., & Clement, N. (2009b). *Project to test and measure the impact of values education on student effects and school ambience: Associated case study reports.* Final Report for the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) by The University of Newcastle, Australia. Canberra: DEEWR. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Project_to_Test_and_Measure_the_Impact_of_Values_Education.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Metzger, M. (1998). Teaching reading. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80,* 240–248.

Newmann, F. M., & Associates. (1996). *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nielsen, T. (2010). Towards pedagogy of giving for wellbeing. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 617–630). Dordrecht: Springer.

Osterman, K. (2010). Teacher practice and students' sense of belonging. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 239–260). Dordrecht: Springer.

Polite, V., & Adams, A. (1997). Critical thinking and values clarification through Socratic seminars. *Urban Education, 32,* 256–278.

Pring, R. (2010a). Introduction. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. xix–xxiv). Dordrecht: Springer.

Pring, R. (2010b). Preface. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. v–vi). Dordrecht: Springer.

Rennie, J., & Theriot, S. (2010). The troika, student wellbeing and literacy education. In R. Toomey, T. Lovat, N. Clement, & K. Dally (Eds.), *Teacher education and values pedagogy: A student wellbeing approach* (pp. 121–134). Sydney: David Barlow.

Robinson, W., & Campbell, R. (2010). School values and effective pedagogy: Case studies of two leading edge schools in England. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 75–90). Dordrecht: Springer.

Robinson, J., & Kecskes, K. (2010). Making values education real: Exploring the nexus between service learning and values education. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 717–735). Dordrecht: Springer.

Rosiek, J., & Beghetto, R. (2009). Emotional scaffolding: The emotional and imaginative dimensions of teaching and learning. In P. A. Schutz & M. Zembylas (Eds.), *Advances in teacher emotion research: The impact on teachers lives* (pp. 175–194). Dordrecht: Springer.

Schaps, E., Battistich, V., & Solomon, D. (2004). Community as key to student growth: Findings from the Child Development Project. In J. E. Zins, R. P. Weissberg, M. Wang, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Building academic success on social and emotional learning* (pp. 189–205). New York: Teachers College Press.

Slattery, P. (1995). *Curriculum development in the post-modern era*. New York: Garland.

Small, T. (2010). Values in motion: From confident learners to responsible citizens. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 919–936). Dordrecht: Springer.

Sokol, B., Hammond, S., & Berkowitz, M. (2010). The developmental contours of character. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 579–604). Dordrecht: Springer.

Solomon, D., Battistich, V., Watson, M., Schaps, E., & Lewis, C. (2000). A six-district study of educational change: Direct and mediated effects of the child development project. *Social Psychology of Education, 4,* 3–51.

Stenhouse, L. (1975). *An introduction to curriculum research and development*. London: Heinemann.

Sylwester, R. (1994). How emotions affect learning. *Educational Leadership, 52*(3), 60–65.

Tanner, M. L., & Casados, L. (1998). Promoting and studying discussions in math classes. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 41,* 342–350.

Toomey, R. (2010). Values education, instructional scaffolding and student wellbeing. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 19–36). Dordrecht: Springer.

Tredway, L. (1995). Socratic seminars: Engaging students in intellectual discourse. *Educational Leadership, 53*(1), 26–29.

Topping, K. J., & Trickey, S. (2007). Collaborative philosophical inquiry for schoolchildren: Cognitive effects at 10-12 years. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 77,* 271–288.

Trickey, S., & Topping, K. J. (2004). Philosophy for children: A systematic review. *Research Papers in Education, 19*(3), 365–380.

Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chapter 6
Values and Personal Integrity

Integrity and Character

Research findings have pointed increasingly to the holistic effects of well-hewn values pedagogy on all educational measures, including academic improvement. While it is a slightly artificial exercise to attempt to separate one measure from another, nonetheless, much research work has specialized in concentrating on one or other of the many effects of such an approach. In this chapter, we focus on the importance of the development of personal integrity and character on student achievement. The Carnegie Report (Carnegie Corporation 1996) is indicative of an emerging recognition that the quality of the learning environment has far-reaching implications for student motivation and engagement in learning, including the vital aspects of personal development and the emotional self. This changing perspective and emphasis, as discussed in earlier chapters, highlights that notions of learning that are associated with the development of communicative capacity, self-reflectivity, resilience and self-management are integral to holistic student achievement. More recently, the *National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools* (DEST 2005) emphasized that good practice education is as much about the development of character as it is about the inculcation of skills. Both of these sources rely, in part, on the new insights of the neurosciences that cognition, emotion and sociality are symbiotic in human development and learning and that these are influenced by an individual's experiences in the social and physical environments (see Chap. 3). Thus, school experience is tempered by the academic, emotional and social ambience of the classroom and school, as well as the explicit and implicit elements of the intended curriculum, and the features of hidden curricula. It is within this context that students develop and refine those values and attitudes that, in turn, influence their interest and engagement in the learning process and the ways in which they behave towards others.

As has been stated on numerous occasions and in different ways, it is adults who, whether consciously or unconsciously, scaffold the school experience of students by the formal and informal learning experiences they provide, by the curriculum decisions they make, by the pedagogical strategies they employ and by the way they engage with and relate to students, especially when it comes to the way that learn-

T. Lovat et al., *Values Pedagogy and Student Achievement,*
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-1563-9_6, © Springer Science+Business Media, B.V. 2011

ing activities are conducted and discipline is administered. Dasoo (2010) highlights that teachers have an influence on student achievement and values formation and that teacher practices embody the values of the school. Furthermore, values are expressed in pedagogical content knowledge and in the teacher's interpretation of the curriculum.

This means that values pedagogy can never function effectively merely as an attachment to educational goals, but rather, as Sankey (2006) suggests, effective values education is a matter of adopting a holistic values-based strategy that sees education administration, policies and curriculum impelled by a stated and consistently applied core set of values. Sankey's assessment is based on his understanding of the role of values in shaping the human brain and the ways in which values influence subconscious thought and action. This means that educators have to attend to both the explicit and implicit aspects of the learning experience because, as was discussed in the survey of the neurosciences, learning engages both modes. A values-based approach, therefore, serves to create a learning environment that will make transparent and palpable those values that underpin the practical virtues associated with both ethical behaviour and school achievement. As before, we emphasize now that values pedagogy can never effectively function as a marginal or optional exercise in good practice education. The research findings in this chapter illustrate that it is central to all aspects of the most effective forms of education.

Recent Research

Holistic student achievement demands an educational environment that addresses each of the various developmental aspects. In Chap. 3, it was argued that an ecological or holistic approach to education was necessary in order to provide for the cognitive, emotional and social development of students. Examples of such an approach will further illustrate the desirability of providing an educational environment that caters for this broader array of developmental needs while, at the same time, promoting academic engagement and performance. Recent research also provides insight into issues related to the developmental trajectory of values formation and the role of the hidden curriculum in that development. Research indicates that factors associated with student wellbeing are also operative in values formation and personal development.

Holistic or Comprehensive Approaches to Values Education

The investigation into the nature of character and how it is fostered in an educational setting by Davidson et al. (2008, 2010) led these researchers to differentiate between two dimensions of character, namely, performance character and moral character. Performance character, or 'doing our best', has a mastery orientation as

in the pursuit of excellence and includes qualities of determination, diligence and self-discipline. These personal qualities are related to orientation to schoolwork and pertain to the psychological constructs of interest and motivation discussed elsewhere in this volume. Moral character has a relational orientation and is manifested in personal integrity, respectful and caring relationships, and compassion and justice; these moral traits relate to social behaviour. Both dimensions of character are needed for and developed through engagement in schoolwork. Values associated with performance character, namely, self-discipline, determination and doing one's best relate to the way that students engage with schoolwork. At the same time, values associated with moral character, namely, being honest and fair, working with and assisting one's peers are also developed through engagement with schoolwork. Moral values underpinning self-control and the establishment of caring and respectful relationships contribute to classroom ambience, and values like responsibility and honesty are developed through interactions with other class members (cf. Johnson and Johnson 2010). Although Davidson et al. have distinguished between performance and moral character on conceptual grounds, it is clear that, in reality, they will often overlap because the personal drives underlying performance character need to be tempered by moral considerations if moral character is to develop as well. In turn, it is through this latter development that the most effective forms of performance ensue. For instance, in the classroom, the planning and conduct of learning activities would need to take moral issues into account so that individual goals can be achieved responsibly and honestly, while simultaneously taking into account the needs of fellow students.

Davidson et al. (2008, 2010) maintain that, rather than being competing priorities, moral and performance character are synergistic and, as described in the previous chapter, are best fostered together in an intentional approach which involves all members of the school community. Therefore, a school-wide approach is advocated in order to avoid potential effects being lost through fragmented strategies. First, a values-based school culture will be supportive and challenging and, when characterized by reciprocity and accountability between all stakeholders, is understood to be fundamental to the development of performance and moral values. Within such an environment, staff have a special responsibility to model both moral and performance character in their interactions with students and colleagues. Second, to facilitate intrinsic motivation and self-management, students need to engage in 'self-study' in order to foster self-monitoring, self-reflection and strategies for self-improvement. Third, 'other-study' assists in the understanding, internalization and mastery of skills and the ability to analyse and learn from positive and negative examples of the behaviour and learning approaches of other people. Fourth, moral and performance values must be enacted or demonstrated in the presence of others; in other words, the real indication of personal acquisition of these values is their practical application in interpersonal or public settings. As Davidson et al. (2010) suggest, the creation of a learning environment that includes both 'support and challenge' facilitates the development of performance. Moreover, when combined with an environment characterized by ethical values, moral character will be facilitated and, in turn, this will strengthen performance character. Moreover, Davidson et al.

point out that the inculcation of ethical values requires as much intentionality and craft on the part of educational practitioners as creating a supportive and challenging environment.

Student resilience applies to the development of both moral and performance character and, according to Sun and Stewart (2010), a holistic or ecological approach is vital for the development of students' resilience in their personal, social and academic lives. According to Oswald et al. (2003), resilience in children is "… that capacity to successfully overcome personal vulnerabilities and environmental stressors, to be able to 'bounce back' in the face of potential risks, and to maintain well-being" (p. 50). Resilience issues need to be explicitly addressed in policies, school administration, the curriculum, extra-curricular activities, counselling services, staff development and community partnerships. Sun and Stewart (2010) point out that development of students' resilience promotes their mental health and wellbeing.

The experience of Neil Hawkes, the former head teacher of West Kidlington School, UK, illustrates the way in which a values-based approach to education and learning provides an ethos in which students develop positive qualities in their social interactions and in their engagement with their school work (Farrer 2000, 2010; Hawkes 2008, 2009, 2010a, b). As we have seen in earlier appraisals of this school's rise to prominence, rather than viewing values as an appendage to be taught alongside other subjects, values became the platform from which curricular, policy, organizational and pedagogical decisions were made. Central to this approach was the systematic introduction of a values language, in conjunction with teaching, and encouraging students to engage in reflection for periods of time in order to better understand themselves and the impact of their attitudes and behaviours on others. Introduction of this values-based pedagogy was accompanied by curricular reforms which were directed at providing learning support for each student, including students with special needs, for their personal and academic development.

The lesson is that values are developed through open, caring and supportive teacher–student relationships. At West Kidlington, the values-based approach meant that not only were values taught explicitly and systematically, but that an environment was structured so as to reflect and embody the values being proffered, not the least of which was the conscious modelling of values by staff themselves, both in their collegial relationships and their relationships with students and their parents. Flowing from a values-based incentive was a realization by students themselves that they had control over their own behaviour with attendant changes in school and classroom ambience and improved engagement and enjoyment of schoolwork. The environment created by the values-based approach was conducive not only for the personal and social development of students but also their academic diligence, as evidenced by the fact that the academic performance of the school was above the national average and well above similar cohort schools (see Hawkes 2009, p. 116).

As an observer of a values-based approach, both at West Kidlington and in other schools, Farrer (2010) sees the emotional stability of students as a principal benefit of a values-based approach to education. Students' early experience of education will inevitably shape their attitude towards learning. When students find learning to

be interesting and able to be incorporated into their imaginative and playful worlds, engagement in ongoing learning will follow. If not, then the struggle begins. Emotional stability provides students with the repose to think clearly in the midst of personal trauma; it develops empathy and gives students the space to share troubles or to offer support. Farrer has observed that values education results in improvements in student behaviour and develops their awareness of the wider community and appropriate ways to act within it. Also, it develops, in students, awareness of the consequences of their attitudes and actions on others and the capacity to listen dispassionately to others, dispositions which enable older students to mentor younger students. Periods of silent reflection in daily assemblies quietened and calmed school environments, and activities like these empowered students to resolve their own conflicts without adult intervention and mediation. A common language of shared vocabulary enabled consensus to be reached more quickly, and service-type activities provided students with opportunities to enact the values taught.

A holistic and values-based approach to education was also advocated by little-known (in the English-speaking world) Ukrainian educator, Vasily Sukhomlinsky (1918–1970). Olga Sukhomlinska (2010), his daughter and a professor at the University of Kiev, relates that Sukhomlinsky believed that, since morality was the spiritual basis of personhood, it "must constitute the basis of education" (p. 550), thereby appealing to a humanistic ideal. The formation of a caring and trusting relationship between teacher and student was fundamental, and the education of a student would be deprived without the cognitive, emotional and social support which that relationship provided (see also Sukhomlinsky 1981; cf. Cockerill 1999).

Sukhomlinska (2010) draws attention to the key principles in Sukhomlinsky's approach. First, education and child development were synonymous, with each contributing to the other, so learning could not occur apart from development and, in turn, learning contributed to development. Second, the cognitive dimension played a leading role in moral education, because moral sense was enriched through cognition and knowledge; in turn, moral education contributed to cognitive development. Third, was the recognition that moral education not only included the cognitive, but the cultivation of moral emotions in relation to empathy for others, and reciprocity between self and others; at the time, this approach was greeted with suspicion and criticism within the Soviet Union. Fourth, although Sukhomlinsky was not unique in emphasizing the practical nature of activity in education, his distinctive emphasis was in the attention to the moral dimension of such activity. As Cockerill (1999) points out, Sukhomlinsky attended to the vocational, aesthetic and civic education of his students as well as the quality of the learning environment. Fifth, moral education was to be tailored for individual needs. Sixth, values encompassed all aspects of a student's life, including personal, family, school and nation. Cockerill (1999) makes it clear that Sukhomlinsky sought to motivate students to learn by sparking their intrinsic interest in all domains of learning that encompassed the moral, spiritual, affective, academic, vocational and civic.

Flay and Allred (2010) provide additional evidence that academic achievement, development of personal and social skills and competencies, and student wellbeing generally, are interconnected in values pedagogy and that fragmented, haphazard

and inconsistent attempts do not lead to consistent overall gains. Rather than seeing moral, academic and social development as being separate trajectories to be addressed by different programmes, these need to be understood as synergistic in student development and so require an environment which addresses the cognitive, emotional and social needs of students in a school-wide comprehensive programme. Conceptually, the *Positive Action* (*PA*) programme (Flay and Allred 2010) relies on the theory that positive self-concept arises from positive and healthy actions. Positive or negative habits and character emanate from and are reinforced by a recursive thoughts-actions-feelings cycle. Positive skills over a range of academic, social and personal areas can be taught and learned and so empower students socially, emotionally and academically to translate the development of this positive character into 'active citizenship'. This approach has had demonstrated effects academically and socially with less substance abuse and violence in schools where the programme has been implemented. Positive effects were also noted in reduced absenteeism, greater gains in mathematics and reading performance, parental involvement in schools, and higher student and teacher satisfaction with school. From their experience with the implementation of *PA* over many years, Flay and Allred believe it can take 3–7 years for a comprehensive and effective programme to be adopted and fully implemented.

An evidential basis for linking academic achievement and values pedagogy is provided by the research of Benninga et al. (2003, 2006; Benninga and Tracz 2010). As we have seen, these authors found a significant correlation between the presence of quality character education and the academic achievement of students in 121 Californian elementary schools over a 3-year period (1999–2002). API (Californian Academic Performance Index) and SAT9 scores correlated with four identified indicators of character education, the first three across all years, and the fourth one in the last 2 years:

- *a school's ability to ensure a clean and safe physical environment*;
- *evidence that parents and teachers modelled and promoted good character education*;
- *quality opportunities at the school for students to contribute in meaningful ways to the school and its community*;
- *promoting a caring community and positive social relationships*. (Benninga et al. 2003, pp. 28–30).

Total character education scores positively correlated with SAT9 scores in language and mathematics for 1999–2002, and with reading for two of those years. Character education was thus positively associated with academic achievement across disciplines and over time (Benninga and Tracz 2010).

A follow-up study by Benninga and Tracz (2010) of 7 of the 121 schools in the original study examined factors affecting the continuity of character education programmes and their longer term outcomes. Indications are that longevity of character education programmes is dependent on the stability and the vision of school leadership and, in schools where this occurred, good programmes were maintained and improved whereas, in schools with a high turnover of leadership, programmes

were often discontinued. The two schools with longer serving principals improved their American Psychological Association (APA) scores, one by 95 points by 2004 and the other by 160 points by 2008 whereas, other schools varied up or sometimes down by as much as 35 points. This adds weight to the claim that continuity of programmes is an essential feature in order to maintain the momentum associated with values pedagogy that promotes student academic achievement. Benninga and Tracz conclude:

> School environments providing greater stability—through consistent leadership, mentoring support or enduring curriculum perspectives—are ones best able to support deeper and more lasting change. (p. 546)

Bryk and Schneider (2002) drew attention to the function of 'relational trust' and the role of the principal in fostering the trusting ambience in the school as having an instrumental effect in raising the academic achievement of students. Brew and Beatty (2010) demonstrate that trust in the school leadership impacts indirectly on student academic engagement mediated through teacher support, confidence by students that the school is preparing them adequately for the future, and student sense of belonging. Also, 'trust in leaders' impacts upon student 'confidence in school', both directly and also through the mediated effects of 'teacher support' and 'belonging'. Although there is no apparent direct effect of trust in leaders on student academic engagement, the perceived trustworthiness of leaders by teachers and students does mediate effects of their trust in the school leadership on the academic engagement of students. This is further evidence of the impact of educational leadership on student learning and the implicit values of the learning environment.

Values Formation

Arthur and Wilson (2010) report on a unique suite of five research projects which together give insight into the values formation of persons between the ages of 3 and 25 years. A recurring theme across the five groups is the importance that respondents ascribe to relationships with family members, particularly with the mother, in moral formation. Teachers were also perceived as being influential in character formation by 10–12-year olds, 14–16-year olds and 16–19-year olds. For 10–12-year olds, doing 'good' was seen in terms of compliance to extrinsic rules and conflicted with having fun. According to 14–16-year olds, it was important for teachers to be fair and positive towards students. In general, at this stage of early adolescence, behaviour was in accord with the perceived pressures of a particular situation, whether from peers or the fear of rejection or of being 'interfered with by others'; these were the motivators of behaviour. School success was marked by hard work and cooperating with others. Moral identity, according to 16–19-year olds, is shaped by a set of core values that display a desire for moral improvement and recognize a gap between espoused values and practice, both in themselves and, significantly, in others. The quality of the student–teacher relationship is a vital aspect of character formation. Values, learning dispositions and achievement are interrelated. Those in

tertiary education and early career graduate employment perceived a link between development of character and employability. Values were associated with the personal benefits of emotional security, self-esteem and personal skills, and were seen as potentially enhancing their university experience and work performance. Character, as Arthur and Wilson (2010) observe, does not result from mere compliance to a predetermined norm prescribed by some external authority, but involves the developing individual making moral choices. It is more than just academic and social skills, although it is likely these will be part of the coalescence of experiences that lead to effective moral decision-making. Arthur and Wilson noted that most schools lacked a language for engaging in discourse around values and virtues, so constraining the discussion and articulation of cognitive concepts related to character.

The programme, *Philosophy in the Classroom*, according to Spooner-Lane et al. (2010), has the potential to link values education with quality teaching. This occurs through connecting learning to students' lives, building intellectual capacity for lifelong learning, and teaching students to reflect and become self-regulated learners. Of primary importance is the creation of a supportive classroom environment in order to encourage respect for each others' opinions and to make it safe for students to share their thoughts and feelings. As described in Chap. 4, such a classroom environment also has benefits for teacher wellbeing as the focus is moved from management of student behaviour to student learning. For philosophy in the classroom to be effective, teachers need to articulate and model the skills and knowledge that they hope to cultivate in students. This pedagogical scaffold provides opportunities for students to develop their empathic understanding and responses as well as a context for them to refine their values language and develop communicative competence.

In exploring the psychological underpinnings of character, Sokol et al. (2010) observe that character cannot be reduced to one aspect of a developing person, but rather is dynamic and influenced by the biological, psychological and social dimensions. The 'contours of character', examined by Sokol et al., is defined as "… self-regulation, autonomy, perspective taking and moral reasoning, and, empathy and emotional competence" (p. 585). Self-regulation, or being able to consciously control actions, is basic to both performance and moral character as described by Davidson et al. (2008, 2010). It involves the ability to follow rules and to inhibit undesirable actions. Children begin to display these characteristics from the early years of elementary (primary) school, which means they more readily comply with requests made of them and are able to work with less adult supervision. Autonomous moral reasoning is developed in peer collaborative settings marked by positive relationships of reciprocity and mutual respect. Perspective taking is the ability to understand the perspective of others and so to see things as others would see them; it is necessary but not sufficient for moral development. Perspective taking is also an aspect of empathy. The two necessary dimensions of effective empathy are, first, the epistemic capacity to understand the emotions of others and, second, the moral impulse that motivates positive care and concern of others. The acquisition of these two dimensions facilitates an increase in pro-social behaviours, such as kindness and compassion, and a reduction in anti-social behaviours like bullying. Empathy is fostered by emotional literacy and self-efficacy. The analysis of the

differing aspects of character by Sokol et al. (2010) allows an understanding of the complexity of moral development and a better understanding of the environment that contributes to moral development.

The power of the hidden curriculum in the formation of students' values is explored by Halstead and Xiao (2010) in a study of the hidden curriculum in a classroom of 8–9-year olds in southern England. They define hidden curriculum in the following way:

> All the learning which occurs through the experience of attending school but which is neither authorized by the school nor intended as a means to specified educational ends. (p. 307)

The hidden curriculum may produce learning that is either positive or negative and results from interaction with students, teachers and the school's social environment. In this study, students' perceptions of the classroom differed from the adult perspective, and the students were dissatisfied because they lacked freedom in choosing with whom they could stand or sit. Also, the same event might be interpreted in different ways by different students, since students "… rarely respond uncritically to the teacher's instructions or to the expectations of the school" (p. 310). Core values that emerged from interviews with children were: friendship, fun, fairness and freedom (p. 312). These values are embedded in the descriptions and evaluations of their everyday experience of the classroom.

For many students, conflict is created between the value of fun and the demands of schoolwork. While the school teaches students to subdue their natural desires, the hidden curriculum teaches students to balance their values and the school values, and this may result in calculated judgements of resistant behaviour (see also Halstead and Xiao 2009) which can be a considered expression of the value of freedom of choice or moral autonomy. Student protestations of unfairness often arise in relation to teacher actions in discipline or sanctions. Halstead and Xiao (2010) suggest that students face moral choices in responding to a strict atmosphere, whether to choose compliant or resistant behaviour. Such choices may well be an expression and indication of moral autonomy. The actual values that students learn through reflection on their experience of the hidden curriculum may, in fact, be quite different from what is intended. In a similar vein to Arthur and Wilson (2010), Halstead and Xiao conclude that students are active rather than passive in their own values formation and moral development, and exercise judgments in accordance with their core values.

As Halstead and Xiao (2010) also point out, students learn values through reflection on their experience of the hidden curriculum; this may embody values which conflict with their own personal values. This aligns with the observations of Arthur and Wilson (2010) and means that students are active agents in their own moral development, and not passive recipients of values. This implies that educators should not lose sight of the fact that school students are developing moral agents and the discrepancies that they perceive between values espoused in the explicit curriculum and those enacted in the hidden curriculum are potential points of tension, especially when they conflict with the student's personal values. Sokol et al. (2010) indicate that self-efficacy is a factor in moral agency.

Student Wellbeing and the Development of Values and Personal Integrity

Student wellbeing is a further element of values pedagogy that cultivates personal integrity. Wellbeing indicators associated with student holistic achievement relate to the quality of the student–teacher relationship, student sense of belonging at school and the school climate (Clement 2010). The quality of the student–teacher relationship has a bearing on students' wellbeing across all school grades and contributes to motivation and engagement in their schoolwork and their personal, pro-social and academic development, as well as being supportive for those students vulnerable to at-risk behaviours. Similar effects are also reported by Osterman (2010), who notes that teacher caring refers not only to the interpersonal support afforded by teachers, but also to the academic support in helping students to learn:

> Instructional strategies that enable students to develop as capable and independent learners also convey messages of care. (p. 242)

Additionally, a positive demeanour on the part of teachers has the potential to inspire in their students a zeal for learning merely through their proficiency. Similarly, students can be inspired to cultivate moral virtues through the teacher's desire for excellence and personal qualities of care, enthusiasm, kindness and humour (van der Zee 2010). Inspiration is an aspect of the teacher's potential to scaffold emotional as well as cognitive learning (Rosiek and Beghetto 2009; Zembylas 2005, 2007). This means that attention to the personal and professional values of the teacher are of utmost importance and require personal reflection and intentional development (see Carr 2010).

A further influence on students' behaviour, motivation and pro-social development is related to their 'sense of belonging' to school and 'connectedness' with their peers (Clement 2010; Osterman 2010). Student sense of belonging in the classroom is related to the personal and academic support provided by the teacher and can be developed by the use of cooperative learning activities (Osterman 2010). Likewise, Johnson and Johnson (2010) have found that cooperative learning promotes positive values like cooperation, altruism, corporate and civic responsibility, dependability, self-worth, intrinsic motivation, valuing of differences, and respecting equality and justice. School climate is a further influence on student wellbeing as it relates to students' holistic achievement. The observed efficacy of indicators like 'relational trust' (Bryk and Schneider 2002), supportive relationships and networks, social capital (e.g. Rosenfeld et al. 2000; Malecki and Demaray 2006), school climate (Bulach et al. 1995), collective teacher efficacy and academic emphasis (e.g. Hoy et al. 2006) can be taken to support the notion that a socially and academically supportive climate is necessary in order to promote student progress in all areas of learning, including formation of values and personal integrity. The work of Brew and Beatty (2010) identifies wellbeing indicators such as the trustworthiness of leaders, teacher caring, students' sense of belonging and confidence in the school, as having direct and/or mediated effects on student academic engagement.

Additionally, behaviour management is an important consideration in relation to the development of student values and personal integrity. Osterman (2010), Nod-

dings (2008) and Watson (2008) would all agree that the primary motivation for teachers in responding to problem behaviours should be care for students. Osterman (2010) affirms that fairness and respect should characterize the teacher's demeanour and suggests that behaviour problems may be owing to a student's need for belonging rather than a lack of motivation or intentional obstructiveness. Noddings (2008) believes that one dimension of a caring relationship is in the confirming ('naming') or affirming ('discussing') of the student's intention, that is, "… the best possible motive consonant with reality" (pp. 171–172). Watson (2008) points out that how teachers respond to inappropriate behaviour serves to shape a student's moral development. In the views of Osterman, Noddings and Watson, inappropriate behaviour presents an opportunity for the teacher to better understand students and their needs, to deepen the caring relationship and to scaffold the positive moral development of students.

Aspects of Holistic Values Pedagogy

This survey of international values and values-related educational approaches suggests that those dimensions of values pedagogy that impel holistic development and achievement on the part of learners are contingent upon: (1) a values-based approach; (2) the continuity of quality educational leadership; (3) the explicit teaching of values; (4) the quality of teacher–student relationships; (5) the cultivation of self-reflectivity; and, (6) the promotion of a values discourse in the school community. These dimensions are synergistic and do not operate independently. They are identifiable only as aspects of an ecology that promotes holistic student achievement.

1) *A values-based approach:* Effective values pedagogy is contextualized within a values-based, school-wide approach to education that is comprehensive in its focus in order to facilitate student development across multiple domains. The values espoused in such an approach have a direct bearing on all areas of student achievement, including the academic and moral domains (Cockerill 1999; Davidson et al. 2010; Farrer 2010; Flay and Allred 2010; Hawkes 2010a, b; Sukhomlinska 2010; Sun and Stewart 2010).

The projects surveyed indicate that moral development should not be regarded as an independent strand of development but as part of the holistic development of students, including their academic development. As we have seen, Benninga et al. (2003) present evidence that correlates high-quality values education with academic achievement. Statistical analyses presented by Flay and Allred (2010) and the case study of West Kidlington (e.g. Hawkes 2009, 2010a) also suggest that values-based education that includes an academic emphasis provides for a highly supportive learning environment where academic performance is optimized; furthermore, and no doubt related, is that a reduction in problematic behaviours has also been observed in such environments.

2) *Continuity of quality educational leadership:* Values pedagogy requires visionary, purposeful leadership that provides programme continuity over time, even

though personnel might change (Benninga and Tracz 2010; Flay and Allred 2010; Hawkes 2009). A necessary characteristic of leadership for values pedagogy is the establishment and maintenance of trust with and among students and staff (Brew and Beatty 2010; Bryk and Schneider 2002).

3) *The explicit teaching of values:* A further feature of values pedagogy is the incorporation of both explicit values instruction (the substantive content and attendant cognitive, emotional and social skills) and the implicit aspects, such as the intentional modelling of values and attention to the physical and relational aspects of the learning environment (Arthur and Wilson 2010; Benninga et al. 2003; Benninga and Tracz 2010; Davidson et al. 2010; Flay and Allred 2010; Hawkes 2010a; Spooner-Lane et al. 2010; Sun and Stewart 2010).

4) *The quality of teacher–student relationships:* The reported improvements in the holistic achievement of students are supported by caring teacher–student relationships, and this support has two aspects. One relates to the provision of academic support, both in terms of academic emphasis and the engagement of students in helpful instruction. The other concerns affective support which not only provides the ambience for the ignition of interest and engagement in learning, but also has the quality of being a protective influence for students vulnerable to committing at-risk behaviours (Brew and Beatty 2010; Clement 2010; Cockerill 1999; Hawkes 2009, 2010a; Osterman 2010; Sukhomlinska 2010). Scaffolding of students in the learning environment by teachers is therefore multi-dimensional and includes cognitive, affective and social dimensions, as discussed in Chap. 3. An important aspect of the teacher–student relationship is the tenor and the manner in which behaviour management is conceived and administered, a feature that underlines the crucial importance of teachers practising, and not just preaching, values like fairness and respect (Noddings 2008; Osterman 2010; Watson 2008).

5) *The cultivation of self-reflectivity:* Self-reflective practices have been found to be: conducive to the development of self-management; essential for the self-discipline that is needed in order to achieve academically; supportive of the self-control needed for pro-social behaviour, as well as the development of resiliency across personal, academic and social domains (Davidson et al. 2010; Farrer 2010; Hawkes 2010b). Self-reflective practices are also positively linked with the disposition for lifelong learning (Davidson et al. 2010; Spooner-Lane et al. 2010).

6) *The promotion of a values discourse in the school community:* A further dimension of a holistic environment concerns the values discourse of the school community. As we have seen, the issue of the acquisition by students of a common language that facilitates moral discourse is discussed by Hawkes (2010a, b) and Farrer (2010) in relation to West Kidlington School, UK. Conversely, Arthur and Wilson (2010) note in their UK study the absence of values language in the vocabulary of students, and with it the lack of a conceptual framework within which to discuss values. Language is fundamental to communicative competence, which of course is sharpened through programmes like *Philosophy in the Classroom* (Spooner-Lane et al. 2010) in which students engage in dialogue around values issues and through cooperative learning activities (Johnson and Johnson 2010).

The following section describes how these aspects of holistic values pedagogy were demonstrated in the Australian Values Education Program and promoted the development of student self-management, communicative competence, self-reflectivity, resilience, character and integrity.

Australian Values Education Program

Observations from the VEGPSP, as outlined in Chap. 1, support the general conclusions derived from the international literature surveyed. A values-based approach to education has been observed to affect student values as they relate to both their social and academic dispositions. The values nominated in the *National Framework* (DEST, 2005) include moral values, such as fairness, respect, integrity, etc., as well as values like 'doing your best' and responsibility which apply not only to prosocial behaviour but also to pursuing excellence in school learning.

A Values-based, School-wide Approach

A school-wide approach to values education is one wherein values are embedded in all aspects of the policies and practices of the school. A school-wide approach is evidenced by high degrees of coherence in the school and can be recognized in various characteristics such as values assemblies, displays of values posters or artwork throughout the school, values being explicitly taught, values-laden school policies and structures, teacher modelling of values, a common values language, the adoption of school-wide educational scaffolds for teaching values, and the promotion of positive relationships (see Lovat et al. 2009a, p. 30). MacMullin and Scalfino (2009) typify a values-based approach to values education in this way:

> The core idea … is that placing values at the centre of the school and subsequently striving to live these values within the school community produces children who are highly ethical and care for those in their lives, in their local community and for the global community and environment as well. The argument … is that placing values at the centre of schooling produces quality teaching which is evidenced by intellectual depth, communicative competence, and capacity for reflection, self-management and self-knowledge. (p. 59)

In the post-implementation surveys administered to students as part of the 'Testing and Measuring' project, students indicated a variety of ways through which they learned about values. These included: teachers talking about values; peer teaching of values; presentations at school assemblies; and, discussions in classrooms, groups, and student councils and forums. Values discourse at assemblies was specifically mentioned by 11 of the 19 schools in the project, referring to a variety of activities such as: talks or discussions about values by the school principal or teachers; values awards for exemplary behaviour; singing values songs; role-plays or skits which were typically written and performed by the students; time for personal reflection;

and, posters or visual displays on the walls. These activities were also incorporated into classroom pedagogies in a variety of ways, including class discussions, creative writing, brainstorming, artwork and craft, poster-making, stories, film making, role plays, tableaux, slide shows, worksheets, writing in values books, Y-charts, journals or diaries, games, movies and peer teaching. Furthermore, schools employed a wide variety of pedagogical scaffolds that provided real world learning opportunities that fostered student agency and competence. These included: student activity teams; student forums; student representative councils; peer mentoring; and citizenship and/or service-type activities such as contact with senior citizens, concern for impoverished youth overseas and sustainability projects (Lovat et al. 2009a, b).

Engaging all the staff in values education proved to be the biggest challenge in achieving a school-wide approach (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 9). Nonetheless, it improved staff morale (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 92), increased the sense of school cohesion (pp. 105, 106; cf. 96, 113, 131) and provided for a sense of positive directionality in the school (p. 114). It was observed to have positive effects "… on the school ethos and staff morale, creating a staff that are highly focused and consistent in their practices" (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 92). Additionally, it was seen by teachers as being instrumental in a reduction in the number of student conflicts (pp. 26–27). Values became embedded in school planning and policy documents and decisions (Lovat et al. 2009a, p. 31, 2009b, pp. 5, 77, 80, 94–996, 99, 103, 131). Teachers were supported in integrating values education into their routine teaching activities so that values like respect and inclusion could be linked across the curriculum (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 5). In some schools, values education was part of a reform package and so it was difficult to draw a direct causal link between values education and the general changes in school coherence and ambience that were impelled by the reform. Nonetheless, it would appear that, at the very least, the explicit incorporation of values through the values education programme was an important component of the total reform (2009b, p. 123). The experience of a well-conducted values education programme led a number of schools to declare explicitly the need to integrate values education into their overall curriculum (e.g. Lovat et al. 2009a, p. 70, b, pp. 9, 65, 113, 118, 138, 152).

Quality Educational Leadership

A holistic, values-based approach is impelled by school leadership that has a clear vision of the way that values find expression in the school ethos, curriculum and behaviour management and of values providing the impetus and currency for change (MacMullin and Scalfino 2009). Change of school leadership, or distraction of the leadership by other matters, was associated with a waning of commitment to values education on the part of the staff, and a fragmentation of the programme to a 'class-level' approach. Strong leadership by the principal is synonymous with a school-wide approach. Reports of greater changes in student behaviour came from schools where there was a perception that its 'core business' was the promotion of

student emotional and social outcomes, together with academic progress and where there was sustained support from the school leadership. Strong leadership of values education was seen as integral for student development. The success of the values education programme was attributed in the case studies to the enthusiasm and commitment of the school leadership which affected staff and classrooms (Lovat et al. 2009a, pp. 29–30; cf. p. 27). Strong leadership by the principal is manifested in positive reinforcement (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 81), the promotion of "emotional literacy" (Roffey 2007) among students and staff (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 93), the explicit teaching of social skills (p. 7), a focus on relationships (p. 152) and the teaching of values to disadvantaged students (p. 27).

Explicit and Implicit Teaching of Values

Additionally, the case studies provided explanation and understanding of how and why the claimed effects occurred, namely through the interaction of the explicit and implicit dimensions of values education (see Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 121). A common feature of the schools observed in the Testing and Measuring project concerned the explicit teaching of values. This took diverse forms with some schools using commercially available packages and others taking more of a 'home grown' approach.

In some classrooms, values education was taught daily (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 6) while, in others, there were scheduled lessons across the school for a particular day and time (p. 94). Alternatively, particularly in the case of secondary schools, there were no formal lessons as such, with values being taught through lessons as the need arose (p. 17). Explicit teaching of values was seen to be important in order that students might understand the meaning of words like 'respect' and 'integrity', rather than those words being abstruse concepts that made it difficult for students to internalize them (pp. 6–7). Teachers identified the need to be persistent in explicit teaching through dialogue over time in order for values to be internalized, and so become personal and, in turn, affect student behaviour (p. 7).

In general, explicit teaching of values was accompanied by a conscious effort on the part of teachers to model the very values they taught. Modelling of values by teachers was seen to be integral to their role (Lovat et al. 2009b, pp. 128, cf. pp. 154–155). Teachers began to see themselves as accountable to the values they taught:

> The classroom manner of teachers themselves has improved. They now feel accountable as role models and answerable to the same values as are being commended to students. (Lovat et al. 2009b, pp. 64–65)

Modelling of values by teachers contributed to the creation of a positive learning environment (Lovat et al. 2009b, pp. 83; cf. pp. 39, 121), "positive relationships with students" (p. 121), transformation of school culture (Lovat et al. 2009a, p. 32), and the creation of "a climate of trust, fairness and justice" where the same rules applied to all students without favour (p. 52). Thus, teacher modelling of values

proved to be an essential counterpart to the explicit teaching of values in order to make them tangible for students and congruent with the explicit discourse.

School Discourse

A values-based approach means that school communities need to engage in a discourse in order to identify their core values and see how these find expression in the school ethos, curriculum and discipline. Engagement in values discourse by members of the school community enables the identification of those core community values which then motivate the implementation of policies and teaching and discipline practices which facilitate values being translated into the concrete learning experiences of students (Lovat and Clement 2008; MacMullin and Scalfino 2009; Netherwood et al. 2009).

A values-based approach to education cannot be achieved in the absence of a school-wide discourse in values. The acquisition of a common values language, or metalanguage, as a vital part of the implementation of values education, was seen in the VEGPSP—Stage 1 Report (DEST 2006). The report noted:

> Virtually all projects recount the importance of developing a 'shared language' for their values education programme—a language that is shared between all involved, teachers, parents and students. Sometimes the shared language is arrived at through good values education teaching and discussion with colleagues. At other times it comes from interrogating the National Framework so that it correlates with the language the school uses. (DEST 2006, p. 15)

In the VEGPSP—Stage 2 Report (DEEWR 2008), the development of a common values language was listed as the first of ten good practices of values education distilled from the collective experience of the schools participating in the project:

> In a values-based school the shared values language comes to inform everything that school does and says. It underpins pedagogy, leadership, planning, policy positions, curriculum practices and behavioural expectations. If there is no common values language, if the values within the school are neither owned nor shared by the school community, there can be no basis for implementing effective, planned and systematic values education. (DEEWR 2008, p. 9)

Likewise, data gathered for the 'Testing and Measuring' project confirmed the observations of the two VEGPSP reports that a common values language is both a product of and integral to effective values education:

> When values education was explicit, a common language was established among students, staff and families. This not only led to greater understanding of the targeted values but also provided a positive focus for redirecting children's inappropriate behaviour. Teachers perceived that explicitly teaching values and developing empathy in students resulted in more responsible, focused and cooperative classrooms and equipped students to strive for better learning and social outcomes. (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 88)

Toomey (2010) notes the link between the introduction of values language and student patterning of behaviour. Similarly, Dally (2010) observed that values language provides a positive focus and 'consistent expectations' when discussing appropriate

and inappropriate classroom behaviour with other teachers, students and parents (p. 514). The values discourse then was an explicit part of the values education agenda and was associated with the personal development of students and, for that matter, teachers as well.

Values Pedagogies and Personal Development

One researcher involved in the Testing and Measuring project commented that a common values language had been explicitly and intentionally nurtured "… at assembly and in interpersonal relations." (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 31). Teachers also cultivated it in conversation with students in relation to particular behaviours and by students prompting one another in classroom debates. Additionally, it was supported by teacher or principal commendation and by raising students' consciousness of the consequences of their actions on others by "… putting students into other people's shoes to make them understand the impact of being unfriendly or disrespectful" (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 101). Values were also articulated and nurtured through teachers modelling values, observing exemplars of values in student behaviour, and/or the conscious modelling of values by students themselves as they enacted them.

In accord with the articulation of a common values language, evidence of dialogical communication was provided by use of the following terms: 'talk about' 'reasoning with others', 'discussion', 'dialogue', 'debate', 'conversation', 'discourse' or 'cooperation'. Primary school students who were administered a post-implementation survey were asked to name one value they had learned about and to give a written description of one way that it was implemented. Student responses indicated that, in general, they were able to associate abstract values with concrete actions, for example:

> Responsibility, taking care of my belongings. (Student, School 6)
> Honesty. Telling about last week's behaviour to my principal. (Student, School 2)
> Tolerance. I have shown tolerance when my brother annoys me. (Student, School 8)

Being able to name values motivating action facilitates self-awareness in reflection on one's own behaviour, personal efficacy in moral action, and the dialogue characteristic of caring relationships and communicative competence.

An observed outcome of values education was increased student agency, both academically and socially, as evidenced in student behaviour and discourse. Changes in student application and engagement in schoolwork have been noted in Chaps. 5 and 9. Students had the sense that they had a voice in their own learning:

> Students feel that they have a voice in the classroom by negotiating their learning. (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 107)
> The students now generally have a greater sense of responsibility and ownership within their classrooms and within the school. (Lovat et al. 2009a, p. 15)

The acquisition of a common values language by students was accompanied by enhanced agency and autonomy on the part of students as it provided the means to

better identify and understand values, discuss them openly and express associated emotions, as indicated by teacher comment:

> Now students are able to engage in dialogue about values. In focus group discussions, students were able to clearly articulate the values that were important to them.
> When completing reflections sheets, students have the "values" language to explain their emotions e.g. “by saying XXX John was not respecting my feelings”. (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 11)

Increased student agency, afforded through the acquisition of a values language, facilitated critical reflection on values and associated behaviours, both of the students themselves and others. Values language became the means by which students could monitor their learning and behaviour, and so become instrumental in behavioural change, for example:

> Students use the values language to reflect on their own behaviour. (Teacher, School 4)

This might be explained by the way the common values language acts as a self monitoring (and peer pressure) device:

> Students now know what is expected namely respectful, tolerant behaviour and they remind each other of that regularly. (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 101)

Induction into a values language or metalanguage was reported in one case study as being pivotal to personal and pro-social development. In turn, this was evidenced in students being able to openly discuss feelings and being equipped to resolve interpersonal conflict, explore issues of friendship, and to debate issues with respect for the opinions of others. Acquisition of values language meant that students were able to evaluate their experience, whether in the classroom or beyond:

> Having a metalanguage provides a pivotal reference point from which students can explore, consolidate and build values-related knowledge, whether that be in formal learning situations or in contexts beyond the classroom. (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 66)

Values language gave students an alternative to displays of anger and paved the way for dialogue: “Instead of getting cross, students have a common language and framework with which to negotiate.” (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 29). Competence in a values language was accompanied by awareness of and an ability to interpret non-verbal communication as well:

> In the process of creating better relationships, students also gained understandings of issues such as peer pressure and the importance of body language and tone of voice in forming and maintaining friendships, as well as of how to de-escalate and resolve conflict. (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 71)

Values language facilitated improved conflict management in providing a “…framework with which to negotiate,” (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 29) and empowering students to “…communicate differences and resolve conflicts independently” (Lovat et al. 2009a, p. 133). Teachers also linked the induction of students into values language with an improved capacity to resolve conflicts for themselves. On occasions, when teachers did intervene in student conflict, the accessibility of values language made the resolution of conflict easier.

Improved student agency regarding conflict resolution was indicative of a general improvement in student-student interactions. One teacher reported students' use of "values language in the playground particularly when playing games". Another teacher commented: "I hear values language an[d] see values actions" (School 8). In a similar vein, one parent commented: "We are seeing our children use more values based language with their siblings and peers" (School 6). Conversely, some teachers questioned the extent of change in student behaviour accompanying the acquisition of values language: "It's lovely to hear values language being used in the playground but it is too early for children to internalise and therefore spontaneously use values to change behaviour." (School 6). Another teacher commented: "They sprout the language of values to get out of trouble." (School 6).

Nevertheless, the overall indications are that values education did confirm in students qualities associated with personal integrity:

> Some of the student comments indicated that this new awareness had helped them to regulate impulses, such as overcoming the desire to keep a toy or money they had found, and there was substantial evidence that students were demonstrating a range of 'values inspired' acts of kindness, honesty and responsibility towards both peers and teachers. (Dally 2010, pp. 517–518)

In summary, data from the 'Testing and Measuring' project (Lovat et al. 2009a, b) indicate that values pedagogy provided an environment for increased student agency, in both practical and ethical terms, or what Davidson et al. (2010) call 'performance character and moral character'. Induction of students into a positive values discourse is fundamental to values education and includes verbal and non-verbal aspects of communication. The data indicate that competency in values discourse is associated with enhanced student agency, both intra-personally and interpersonally. In regard to the intra-personal, values language facilitates self-reflection and the integration of 'school' values as 'personal' values. This self-evaluative capacity is an essential dimension of the self-monitoring and self-management that are foundational for establishing and maintaining caring relationships, communicative competence and the achievement of life goals. Concerning the interpersonal, the capacity to identify and name values as they are given expression in the behaviour of self and others is a prelude to effective conflict management, thus enhancing communication with peers, teachers and, in some cases, family members.

Student–Teacher Relationships

According to the 'Testing and Measuring' project, values education fostered improvement in student-teacher relationships. Improvement in these relationships is a vital aspect of the development of personal integrity on the part of students and, in turn, the learning environment became perceptibly safer and more supportive with their development (Lovat et al. 2009b, pp. 78, 81, 126). Teachers recognized the need to respect, listen to (2009a, p. 9, b, pp. 8, 102, 107), understand (2009b, p. 9) and care for students (2009b, p. 53). They became more aware of students as persons and their particular needs as they took the time to be interested and listen

to them about their lives outside of school (Lovat et al. 2009a, pp. 47, 61, b, pp. 9, 32, 82). In a reciprocal manner, student respect for teachers increased (2009a, p. 66, 2009b, pp. 51, 83). Improved student-teacher relationships led to increased student academic diligence in that students were trying harder with increased motivation and engagement (as noted above). The student–teacher relationship was recognized as an important factor in student engagement (2009b, p. 100). Stronger collegial ties between students and teachers developed (2009b, p. 13), so that there was genuine two-way communication (p. 61), and this resulted in a more positive ambience in the classroom: "the values focus produced more respectful, focused and harmonious classrooms" (p. 100). One senior student expressed it this way: "The teachers respect the kids and listen to what they have got to say" (p. 107). Teachers recognized that values education enhances "… the social relationships that underpin teaching and learning" (p. 65). Positive and respectful student–teacher relationships are part of the groundwork for learning (p. 14).

Summary of Pedagogical Dynamics

Reports of the Australian Values Education Program indicate that values pedagogy contributed to the personal integrity of students by fostering their development as moral agents. Overall, such an educational environment is characterized by a school-wide approach that takes values to the core of the mission of the school, a sustained school leadership, the explicit and implicit teaching of values that includes the intentional modelling of those values, the active engagement of the school community in values discourse and positive student–teacher relationships. Evidence of development of self-management, communicative competence, self-reflectivity, resilience, character and integrity is reported in terms of improved classroom and playground behaviour, engagement in schoolwork, students negotiating their own learning, improved conflict management, consideration of others, and increases in acts of honesty. At the same time, there were positive changes in teacher–student relationships with a more supportive learning environment and growth in mutual respect between teachers and students, and this included more positive and constructive approaches to behaviour management.

Conclusion

The examination of international research projects and the Australian projects has identified aspects of values pedagogy that provide impetus for personal development in relation to self-management, communicative competence, self-reflectivity, resilience, character and integrity as essential artefacts of holistic student achievement. Common elements emerge from the examination of the Australian and international contexts as being those components which together contribute to the for-

mation of character and personal integrity with flow-on effects for diverse aspects of learning, not the least of which is in the academic domain.

The projects surveyed illustrate the need for values pedagogy wherein values are intentionally considered when making decisions concerning administration, policy, curriculum, behaviour management, student and staff wellbeing, etc. The evidence from the research projects surveyed suggests that, in order to be effective, such pedagogy must be driven by the same core values that drive a school's total educational agenda and must have a school-wide focus. In order for values pedagogies to be embedded in the policy and curriculum of a school over time, quality and continuity of educational leadership must be maintained despite changing personnel and, at the same time, trustfulness in and between students and teachers needs to be in place. Values need to be explicitly taught and modelled, with due consideration given to conflicts or misunderstandings that can occur owing to a disparity between the values students experience at home and those embodied in their learning environment, especially those implicit within the hidden curriculum.

Effective values pedagogies support and encourage academic diligence and achievement. A values-based approach will promote those values that inspire students to do their best as well as those moral values intrinsic to harmonious social interaction. Examination of the various research projects has shown a range of positive effects on the academic domain, including increased sense of efficacy of students in directing their own learning, increased interest and engagement in schoolwork, and evidence of improved academic performance and achievement. Values pedagogies that support the holistic achievement of students are characterized by supportive teacher–student relationships, and feature academic as well as social and emotional support. When values pedagogy is taken to the heart of schooling, the demeanour of teacher–student relationships is likely to be improved, and behaviour management is handled in constructive and positive ways.

The development of the capacity for self-reflection is another essential element of values pedagogy that fosters personal integrity, and is vital in self-management and communicative competence as aspects of moral agency. Furthermore, it is important to recognize that students are active moral agents, and their experience of school and the classroom, including the hidden curricula, becomes the context and substance behind moral reflection and moral judgement. Self-reflection interacts with the moral discourse of the school community, and such discourse is fundamental in developing the conceptual understanding and language of values which, of course, are among the elements of communicative competence. Values pedagogy cannot function apart from values discourse which is understood to include both verbal and non-verbal aspects of communication. Another dynamic element of values pedagogy, namely community service, will be examined in the following chapter.

The array and interaction among the elements of values pedagogy herein described fits well with the notion of ecology of learning noted in Chap. 3. In such a conception of learning, experience of and action in the world constitute the groundwork of learning, with such intangibles as meaning, understanding and emotional engagement in learning driving the learning process. Modelling and imitation are potentially powerful modes of learning in this paradigm. Characteristic of an ecological model is that the dynamism of the system is empowered by the symbiotic

interaction among the different elements that comprise the system, and the way the system functions is a product of the balance and tension between the different elements, so it is with values pedagogy. All elements identified above, combined appropriately, are both necessary for and sufficient to the pedagogy that supports the development of character and personal integrity and, in turn, facilitates student wellbeing, including academic wellbeing.

References

Arthur, J., & Wilson, K. (2010). New research directions in character and values education in the UK. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 339–358). Dordrecht: Springer.

Benninga, J. S., Berkowitz, M. W., Kuehn, P., & Smith, K. (2003). The relationship of character education implementation and academic achievement in elementary schools. *Journal of Research in Character Education, 1,* 19–31.

Benninga, J. S., Berkowitz, M. W., Kuehn, P., & Smith, K. (2006). Character and academics: What good schools do. *Phi Delta Kappan, 87,* 448–452.

Benninga, J. S., & Tracz, S. M. (2010). Continuity and discontinuity in character educaton. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 521–548). Dordrecht: Springer.

Brew, C., & Beatty, B. (2010). Valuing social and emotional connectedness among learners at all levels. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 675–702). Dordrecht: Springer.

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bulach, C. R., Malone, B., & Castleman, C. (1995). Investigation of variables related to student achievement. *Midwestern Educational Researcher, 8*(2), 23–39. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 428905).

Carnegie Corporation. (1996). *Years of promise: A comprehensive learning strategy for America's children. The report of the Carnegie Task Force on learning in the primary grades.* Carnegie Corporation of New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED397995). New York. http://eric.ed.gov/. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Carr, D. (2010). Personal and professional values in teaching. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 63–74). Dordrecht: Springer.

Clement, N. (2010). Student wellbeing at school: The actualization of values in education. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 19–36). Dordrecht: Springer.

Cockerill, A. (1999). *Each one must shine: The educational legacy of V. A. Sukhomlinsky*. New York: Peter Lang.

Dally, K. (2010). A teacher's duty: An examination of the short-term impact of values education on Australian primary school teachers and students. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 503–520). Dordrecht: Springer.

Dasoo, N. (2010). Nurturing teacher wellbeing through values education. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 359–376). Dordrecht: Springer.

Davidson, M., Lickona, T., & Khmelkov, V. (2008). Smart & good schools: A new paradigm for high school education. In L. P. Nucci & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Handbook of moral and character education* (pp. 370–390). New York: Routledge.

Davidson, M. L., Khmelkov, V., & Lickona, T. (2010). The power of character: Needed for, and developed from, teaching and learning. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 427–454). Dordrecht: Springer.

DEEWR. (2008). *At the heart of what we do: Values education at the centre of schooling*. Report of the Values Education Good Practice Schools Project—Stage 2. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/VEGPSP-2_final_3_execsummary.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

DEST. (2005). *National Framework for Values Education in Australian schools*. Canberra: Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Framework_PDF_version_for_the_web.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

DEST. (2006). *Implementing the National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools*. Report of the Values Education Good Practice Schools Project—Stage 1: Final Report, September 2006. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/VEGPS1_FINAL_REPORT_EXEC_SUMMARY_081106.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Farrer, F. (2000). *A quiet revolution: Encouraging positive values in our children*. London: Random House.

Farrer, F. (2010). Re-visiting the 'Quiet Revolution'. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 395–407). Dordrecht: Springer.

Flay, B., & Allred, C. G. (2010). The Positive Action program: Improving academics, behavior and character by teaching comprehensive skills for successful learning and living. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 371–501). Dordrecht: Springer.

Halstead, J. M., & Xiao, J. (2009). Teachers' surveillance and children's subversion: The educational implications of non-educational activities in the classroom. *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences, 1,* 2264–2268.

Halstead, M., & Xiao, J. (2010). Values education and the hidden curriculum. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 303–317). Dordrecht: Springer.

Hawkes, N. (2008). The purpose of values education. *Journal of Religious Education, 56*(3), 25–31.

Hawkes, N. (2009). Values and quality teaching at West Kidlington Primary School. In T. Lovat & R. Toomey (Eds.), *Values education and quality teaching: The double helix effect* (pp. 105–120). Dordrecht: Springer.

Hawkes, N. (2010a). *Does teaching values improve the quality of education in primary schools? A study of the impact of values education in a primary school*. Saarbrücken: VDM Velag Dr. Müller.

Hawkes, N. (2010b). Values education and the national curriculum in England. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 225–238). Dordrecht: Springer.

Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2006). Academic optimism of schools: A force for student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 43,* 425–446.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2010). The impact of social interdependence on values education and student wellbeing. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 825–848). Dordrecht: Springer.

Lovat, T., & Clement, N. (2008). Quality teaching and values education: Coalescing for effective learning. *Journal of Moral Education, 37,* 1–16.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Dally, K., & Clement, N. (2009a). *Project to test and measure the impact of values education on student effects and school ambience*. DEEWR. Final Report for the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) by The University of Newcastle, Australia. Canberra. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Project_to_Test_and_Measure_the_Impact_of_Values_Education.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Dally, K., & Clement, N. (2009b). *Project to test and measure the impact of values education on student effects and school ambience: Associated case study reports*. DEEWR. Final Report for the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) by The University of Newcastle, Australia. Canberra. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Project_to_Test_and_Measure_the_Impact_of_Values_Education.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

MacMullin, C., & Scalfino, L. (2009). Placing values at the core of school policy and classroom practice—A case study of Modbury School, South Australia. In T. Lovat & R. Toomey (Eds.), *Values education and quality teaching: The double helix effect* (pp. 49–68). Dordrecht: Springer.

Malecki, C. K., & Demaray, M. K. (2006). Social support as a buffer in the relationship between socioeconomic status and academic performance. *School Psychology Quarterly, 21,* 375–395.

Netherwood, K., Buchanan, J., Palmer, D., Stocker, L., & Down, B. (2009). Valuing diversity in children's voice: A case study of children, stewardship and mapping the care of special places in the Western Australian Cluster. In T. Lovat & R. Toomey (Eds.), *Values education and quality teaching: The double helix effect* (pp. 83–103). Dordrecht: Springer.

Noddings, N. (2008). Caring and moral education. In L. P. Nucci & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Handbook of moral and character education* (pp. 161–174). New York: Routledge.

Osterman, K. F. (2010). Teacher practice and students' sense of belonging. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 239–260). Dordrecht: Springer.

Oswald, M., Johnson, B., & Howard, S. (2003). Quantifying and evaluating resilience-promoting factors: Teachers' beliefs and perceived roles. *Research in Education, 70,* 50–64.

Roffey, S. (2007). Transformation and emotional literacy: The role of school leaders in developing a caring community. *Leading & Managing, 13,* 16–30.

Rosenfeld, L. B., Richman, J. M., & Bowen, G. L. (2000). Social support networks and school outcomes: The centrality of the teacher. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 17,* 205–226.

Rosiek, J., & Beghetto, R. A. (2009). Emotional scaffolding: The emotional and imaginative dimensions of teaching and learning. In P. A. Schutz & M. Zembylas (Eds.), *Advances in teacher emotion research: The impact on teachers' lives* (pp. 175–194). Dordrecht: Springer.

Sankey, D. (2006). The neuronal, synaptic self: Having values and making choices. *Journal of Moral Education, 35,* 163–178.

Sokol, B., Hammond, S., & Berkowitz, M. W. (2010). The developmental contours of character. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 579–603). Dordrecht: Springer.

Spooner-Lane, R., Mergler, A., & Curtis, E. (2010). Embracing philosophy and raising the standard of pre-service teacher education programs. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 377–395). Dordrecht: Springer.

Sukhomlinska, O. (2010). Values education and whole person development in Ukraine: The role of Vasyl Sukhomlinsky and current applications. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 549–558) (addition & trans.: A. Lenchovska). Dordrecht: Springer.

Sukhomlinsky, V. A. (1981). *To children I give my heart* (trans: H. Smith). Moscow: Progress.

Sun, J., & Stewart, D. (2010). Promoting student resilience and wellbeing: Asia-Pacific Resilient Children and Communities Project. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 409–426). Dordrecht: Springer.

Toomey, R. (2010). Values education, instructional scaffolding and student wellbeing. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 19–36). Dordrecht: Springer.

Van Der Zee, T. (2010). Inspiration as a thought-provoking concept for values education. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 291–302). Dordrecht: Springer.

Watson, M. (2008). Developmental discipline and moral education. In L. P. Nucci & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Handbook of moral and character education* (pp. 175–203). New York: Routledge.

Zembylas, M. (2005). *Teaching with emotion: A postmodern enactment*. Greenwich: Information Age.

Zembylas, M. (2007). Emotional ecology: The intersection of emotional knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge in teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23,* 355–367.

Chapter 7
Values and Social Engagement

Social Engagement and Citizenship

Central to the thesis of this book is that values pedagogy is holistic and multi-faceted, and cannot be reduced to a series of separate and isolated effects. As discussed in Chap. 3, trends in the psychological and neurosciences indicated that learning and development involved a complex interaction of cognitive, social and emotional proclivities. Any overly enthusiastic attempts to separate and isolate effects, in the way of a species of empirical research, is to miss the main point arising from recent neuroscientific and educational research that the greatest effect across the educational measures occurs when they are perceived to be and trialled as a nexus of conjoined effects. That having been said, it is considered helpful to deal with elements of values pedagogical research around their particular focus and specialization in order to better understand and explain their interaction and contribution to the functioning of the system as a whole. Chap. 5 explored curriculum dimensions and Chap. 6 identified those aspects of a values pedagogy that contribute to the development of self-management, communicative competence, self-reflectivity, resilience, character and integrity. Yet, values pedagogy remains incomplete apart from consideration of those social proclivities that are part and parcel of personal integrity and which are learned and find expression through social engagement. In this chapter, we will examine the aspect of sociality that complements values pedagogy in the provision of a context and environment for the development of empathic consciousness, social awareness, pro-social behaviours, community engagement and service, all crucial elements in the ecology of learning.

Sociality, as an essential element in learning, came to the fore in the closing decades of the twentieth century. Howard Gardner, with the publication of *Frames of Mind* in 1983, was among the vanguard of those in the 1980s and 1990s who challenged the perception of intelligence as being uni-dimensional and introduced notions that personal reflectivity and sociality were among the array of intelligences exercised by individuals in their progress through life (see Gardner 1993). The notion of 'social intelligence' was picked up by notables such as Damasio (1996) and

T. Lovat et al., *Values Pedagogy and Student Achievement,*
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-1563-9_7, © Springer Science+Business Media, B.V. 2011

Goleman (1995) as part of an expanded conception in which human behaviour was interpreted and explained in multiple rather than unitary terms. Goleman argued that IQ (intelligence quotient) alone was insufficient for successful negotiation of one's progress through life and suggested that EQ (emotional intelligence) could be even more significant than IQ in determining the level of one's 'success'. As Gardner (1993) submitted, the manner and mode in which intelligence is expressed is very much the result of the interface between the individual and the society in which one is placed.

Research over recent decades indicates that social competence and academic achievement are not discrete but interrelated, as indicated by the studies of Wentzel (1991a, b, 1993), Caprara et al. (2000) and Welsh et al. (2001). Similarly, the collection of studies exploring the impact of social and emotional learning on student outcomes by Zins et al. (2004) illustrates that cognitive, emotional and social learning together contribute to holistic student achievement. Furthermore, as was pointed out in Chap. 5, real-world experiences, especially those involving a degree of community engagement, provide for potentially rich learning experiences. This is in line with the claim of Newmann et al. (1996) that authentic learning will engage students with real-life issues and so prepare them for life beyond the classroom. Thus, a frame for understanding holistic learning is projected beyond the narrow focus on the honing of cognitive capacities, as necessary as that is, to include the nurturing of personal and social dispositions that will enable individuals to negotiate their way in the world (see Lovat et al. 2009a).

Service Learning as Values Pedagogy

Furco and Billig (2002; cf. Billig et al. 2005; Furco 2008), have shown service learning to be a particularly powerful form of values pedagogy engendering a range of effects including improved academic focus. Definitions of service learning themselves are diverse (Furco 2003; Hart et al. 2008) but the main features include student involvement in a genuine need in the wider community which is purposefully linked through structured reflection to specific areas of the school curriculum (see Lovat et al. 2009a). A review of 62 peer-reviewed articles on service learning in high schools by Dymond and Renzaglia (2008) identified a number of features of service learning concerning its ideal design and implementation. Elements that were widely identified by the articles included that: the context of service learning must be authentic (87%); it is best when linked to the wider curriculum (76%); reflection is an essential feature (81%); and, students gain benefit when they participate in its planning and leadership (87%). With regard to service learning research for Years K-12, Furco and Root (2010) identify an impact on four areas, namely, academic performance, engagement in learning, civic engagement and personal development. These outcomes of service learning will be explored below.

Impact on Academic Performance

Service learning is related to improved academic performance, as measured or evaluated formally via regular academic assessment (Furco and Root 2010). Weiler et al. (1998) noted an effect on reading and language arts performance in primary and secondary students. From an analysis of the National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS 1992) for high school students, Dávila and Mora, as cited in Furco and Root (2010), found that engagement in community service was linked with small but positive gains in mathematics, science and history, but not reading, while Kraft and Wheeler (2003) found significant improvements in reading and creative writing, with grade point averages improving as service learning engagement escalated. In addition to these studies, Scales et al. (2006a) found that on the evidence of student self-reported grades, service learning involvement lessened the achievement gap between high and low socio-economic groups of students. In general, higher grades were reported by those students involved in service learning. Engagement in 'after school' service, according to Tannenbaum and Brown-Welty (2006), is also associated with improved school grades and improved behaviour at school. Furthermore, research in higher education has demonstrated that the intense reflection on service to the community that characterizes a well-structured service learning programme produces responses consistent with advanced cognitive development and improved academic awareness (Eyler 2002; Novak et al. 2007).

In addition to the studies that relate community engagement with improved academic performance, Furco and Root (2010) cite several studies that suggest that involvement in service learning increases student engagement in academic activities and promotes more positive learning dispositions. Conrad and Hedin (1981) found that involvement in community service resulted in greater student motivation and interest in schoolwork and that the involvement in experiential learning provided "…opportunities for students to act autonomously, develop collegial relationships with adults and peers, and boost their self-esteem and self-efficacy," all factors "… known to mediate academic achievement" (p. 17). Likewise, Melchior (1998) found a short-term impact on both mathematics and general engagement in school but the impact on mathematics did not endure for more than 12 months beyond the period of service involvement.

Impact on Engagement in Learning

Scales et al. (2000) reported a positive impact of service learning on motivation for and engagement in learning. Furthermore, Scales et al. (2006a) report that, after accounting for socio-economic status (SES), students with service learning involvement recorded higher levels on a range of factors associated with school success including motivation to achieve, engagement in schoolwork, bonding to school,

homework completion and reading for pleasure, as well as fewer absences from school. In addition to these studies, Root and Seum's (2010) observations regarding the influence of service learning on school engagement for elementary students suggest that this form of meaningful, community directed learning improves student engagement through meeting needs for competence, autonomy and belonging which are the three core elements of self-determination theory (e.g. Ryan and Deci 2000). Root and Seum claim that service learning supports intrinsic motivation through providing problem-solving opportunities that address issues beyond the classroom and that are important to the wider community. By working collaboratively with classmates and members of the wider community to investigate and solve authentic problems, children's sense of belonging and competence are fostered. Children's autonomy is also promoted through increased opportunities for greater student voice, especially in regard to negotiating their own learning.

Impact on Civic Engagement

In regard to civics and citizenship, Hamilton and Zeldin (1987) observed that students participating in community-based learning had higher gains in political knowledge and efficacy. Kahne and Sporte (2008) found that student commitment to civic responsibility is developed by 'classroom civic learning', service learning opportunities, discussions with parents on civics and politics, the civicality of the neighbourhood and non-sporting extra-curricular activities. Zaff and Learner (2010) add their support to the observations of Furco and Root (2010) in maintaining that service learning, when appropriately targeted to the social context and academic motivations of students, is likely to contribute to positive civic dispositions in students. Other studies have also shown that such pedagogy has a positive impact on student behaviour and moral awareness, resulting in improved student attitudes towards their social responsibilities and civic engagement (Berkowitz et al. 2008; Halfacre et al. 2006; Hart et al. 2008). Opportunities for citizenship development, according to Root and Seum (2010), is supplied through service learning activities that provide: opportunity for reflection on the reciprocal rights and responsibilities of citizens and society; information on the roles of citizens and societal institutions; historical and political information relating to law, justice and the rights of an individual; and, understanding of differences between people. Service learning also provides opportunities for breaking down intercultural barriers (e.g. Borden 2007; Goddard and Gribble 2006) and for empowering students with special needs by engaging them as active participants in the giving of care (Dymond et al. 2007).

Impact on Personal Development

Furco and Root (2010) cite studies that show a range of effects stemming from community engagement including: enhanced personal and social skills, such as leader-

ship capacity; positive effects on self-esteem and self-efficacy; prevention in regard to risk-taking sexual behaviour and substance use; and, preparation for employment (e.g. O'Donnell et al. 2002; Tebes et al. 2007; Weiler et al. 1998; Yamauchi et al. 2006; Yates and Youniss 1998). Other studies have shown that student involvement in service learning has resulted in a sense of empowerment (Furco 2002), changed behaviour at school and a reduction of health risks and at-risk behaviours (e.g. Allen et al. 1997; Billig 2000; Denner et al. 2005). Furthermore, Hart et al. (2006) point to a number of studies which indicate that community service facilitates development of moral reasoning and moral attitudes. This is particularly the case when service is combined with moral discourse (Boss 1994; Leming 2001). In line with this, the provision of opportunities for intentional reflection is considered an important aspect in providing students with the opportunity to integrate the cognitive and affective aspects of the service experience into their understanding (e.g. Dymond and Renzaglia 2008; Eyler 2002; Gibson 2009; Hart et al. 2006; Leming 2001; Nucci 2006). The quality of the reflective experience and the manner in which it is carried out might be a decisive factor in whether or not it assists in the moral development of students (Hatcher and Bringle 1997; Waldstein and Reiher 2001).

International Research

Kristjánnson (2010) highlights service learning as illustrative of the radical change in the field of values education across the past quarter century. He characterizes it as typical of the move away from cognitive developmental and values clarification types of approaches that tended towards an armchair philosophical stance on morality to approaches that are designed to engage students as active moral agents in real-world situations. Again, one cannot help but see the strong Aristotelian and Habermasian undertones in this shift.

Similarly, the challenge for education, according to Leeds (2010), is in the translation of education into action. Values pedagogy that transmutes values into action entails three prime considerations: the context through which the values are learned; the connection with the lives of the students in order to cause them to reflect on their values and the ways in which they are enacted; and, the values (themselves) that are taught. Service learning is one such pedagogy that provides the means of translating education into action. Leeds (2010) identifies the lineage of this movement with Vygotsky and Dewey; the former because of his warning that moral precepts will mean nothing to young people and not be translated into behaviour if simply enumerated and described, and the latter because of his central propositions that education must be about solving problems and building democratic citizenship within an educational context that proactively nurtures values discourse. True to these sentiments, service learning provides a context for such 'real-world' pedagogy:

> In service-learning, the school community connects with people, institutions and issues beyond the traditional school bounds and commits to shaping education to broader social imperatives. Education is about creating and using knowledge to act ethically, solve social problems and address social needs, big and small. (p. 797)

Leeds goes on to illustrate the 'powerful effects' of service learning, especially when contrasted with more traditional approaches to values education that tend to be overly cerebral: "Service-learning is a contemporary path to moral education with both uncommon influence and staying power." (p. 802).

The notion of values in action is taken further by Davidson et al. (2010) in identifying the particular kinds of pedagogies required for effecting their ideal learner product, dubbed dually as 'performance character and moral character'. One of the four pedagogies is titled 'Public Performance/Presentation':

> Public Performance involves authentic public performances that put into action one's moral and performance character and other competencies. For example, service learning provides a public performance activity that enables students to demonstrate their moral and performance character "in the real world" as they serve others. (pp. 433–434)

In related fashion, Crawford (2010) also includes service learning in his analysis of ways in which modern education is called on to 're-claim democracy' through pedagogy. He examines it in the context of what he describes as 'active citizenship education and critical pedagogy', that is, one that embodies both reflection and action. He quotes Kerr (1999) in proffering that "Education through citizenship involves students learning by doing, through active, participative experiences in the school and community: it includes service learning" (p. 12). Similarly, Tudball (2010) surveys international programmes which, when they combine knowledge from school curricula with practical knowledge gained through service learning activities, result in contributing to students' sense of wellbeing and agency.

Sukhomlinska (2010) identifies 'activity' as being intrinsic to the holistic learning philosophy and practice that were central to the educational goals of Vasyl Sukhomlinsky. He emphasized the need for engagement and encounter with the real world as part of the essential moral aim of education to prepare students for all aspects of life by actively stimulating all areas of their development (see also Cockerill 1999). Education was grounded in real-life learning:

> Elements of service learning are foundational to Sukhomlinsky's approach to education. Learning involves not only the development of intellectual skills, but also social competencies through cooperating and working with others, and engagement in the giving of practical assistance. The world of work and involvement in the wider community and society was seen as part of schooling, not as an onerous task or something to be added post-school, but as a creative way of learning and helping. The moral imperative impelling Sukhomlinsky's approach included the conviction that education should prepare students for their adult life—personally, socially and vocationally. (Sukhomlinska 2010, pp. 555–556)

Sukhomlinsky's beliefs were well founded in this regard in providing evidence that students who engage in service learning throughout the years of their formal education are more likely to continue offering community service in the years beyond schooling's formalities (Hart et al. 2006, 2007, 2008; Post and Neimark 2008).

Nielsen (2010) endorses Sukhomlinsky's intuition that service would have holistic and long-term benefits by citing research that shows the impact on one's own wellbeing that comes from the act of giving to others:

> Several studies all show that generous behaviour has a significant impact on teenagers' mental health, increasing their happiness, hopefulness and social effectiveness. (p. 623)

Among these studies are those designed specifically around measuring the effects from service learning programmes (Billig 2000, 2007; Scales et al. 2006a). This evidence confirms Nielsen's (2010) own view that giving can be seen as an educational end in itself, even when not allied necessarily to academic progress:

> … values education and service learning seem to signal a growing recognition of the power of love. In this line of thinking, giving emerges as a living principle that could underpin our educational practices, not just because we want children to do better at school, but also because we want them to live better. (p. 626)

Student agency, action and wellbeing are fostered by a "head–heart–hands" approach where the cognitive and affective find synergistic expression in action (p. 622).

Crotty (2010) observed the knowledge and deeper insights that students acquired as they engaged in service learning and ethical reflection upon their experience, arriving at answers that demonstrated knowledge beyond the expected. Utilizing a Habermasian frame of reference in order to analyse these effects, Crotty proposes that critical reflection upon experience provided the participants with emancipatory knowledge that informs human responsibility and autonomy. As a result "… habits of self-reflection have been fostered, ideologies have been recognized and higher order thinking has been taking place" (p. 636).

Robinson and Kecskes (2010) note from their work that service learning is a particularly powerful pedagogy in instilling enhanced reflectivity at the same time as it inculcates civic consciousness and builds citizenship. Reminiscent of the view expressed often in this book that values pedagogy is a way of conceiving of and implementing the entire teaching approach, Robinson and Kecskes, similarly, underline the importance of the pedagogy not being seen as additional to the mainstream curriculum but "… integrated within the formal curriculum, including the establishment of learning outcomes, specific pedagogical strategies and assessment plans directly connected to this specific teaching and learning environment" (p. 720). They also reiterate the point that:

> … when service-learning activities are explicitly linked to standards, learning objectives, and essential learnings, research shows that academic outcomes improve. (p. 721)

Robinson and Kecskes offer further case study research that illustrates how service learning can serve as values pedagogy to achieve enhanced academic outcomes. Reflecting this perspective, Berkowitz et al. (2006) reviewed service learning as part of an overall evaluation of moral activist forms of values pedagogy, concluding that the outcomes were commonly around strengthened cognition, improved attitudes and behaviour, reduction of aberrant substance abuse, moderation of at risk behaviours, enhanced self-confidence and motivation, and "… increased academic achievement and academic goal setting" (p. 696).

A revealing study on the power of a well conducted service learning experience to promote identity formation is provided by Gibson (2009). This research consisted of a 2-year study on the impact of a field trip to Sri Lanka by a group of 15 and 16 year old students from an Australian high school. From the reflections of experience of the 10 students and their teachers, Gibson identified five interdependent facets of

identify formation: *seeing a whole new world, reflecting, relationships, emotional development* and *knowledge application.* Immersion in a different environment and culture led the participants into 'seeing a whole new world' that was very different from the one to which they belonged. This growth was marked by a reorientation of focus from being largely centred on their own personal concerns to an outward orientation where they were concerned with the needs of others.

Furthermore, this reorientation was accompanied by reflection on their social standing in relation to that of others and, in turn, challenged them to re-evaluate their place in the world. These attitudinal changes developed gradually throughout the duration of the project and as a result of their reflections upon it afterwards. Reflection on the cognitive, affective and social dimensions of their experience occurred in a number of different ways. It was both structured, as in the keeping of a journal, and unstructured in terms of group discussions as they shared and supported each other through their experience. Added to this was the mentoring provided by teachers and the formal presentations and informal conversations with students on their return to Australia, as well as ongoing reflection after the intensity of the event had faded. Thus, Gibson (2009) illustrates that effective reflection is purposeful and is characterized as being multi-faceted and engaging a multiplicity of modes (cf. Boyd 2001; Hatcher and Bringle 1997).

Gibson (2009) locates the conceptual framework of service learning within the notions of experiential learning espoused by Dewey (1916/1966, 1938/1963) and, more recently, by Kolb (1984). Exponents of experiential learning emphasize the role of reflection upon experience, not only to understand experience but to impel and inform future action:

> It is that reconstruction or reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience, and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience. (Dewey 1916/1966, p. 76)

Learning is therefore a product of prolonged and disciplined reflection on the experience (Boyd 2001; Conner 2007) and does not occur instantaneously or as a result of experience alone (Dewey 1938/1963). The service learning experience described by Gibson (2009) afforded the participants agency in their own learning, as evidenced by their capacity to develop and apply their own knowledge, make links between the new learning and prior knowledge, challenge their existing preconceptions and ask their own questions. This type of knowing allows for the operation of higher order brain functions in the integration of intuition, thinking, feeling and behaviour (Conner 2007). As Gibson (2009) comments, the role of teachers in this mode of learning is to facilitate and support learners by allowing them the freedom to explore issues and find answers for themselves. It also meant that the learners had to collaborate as they discovered new knowledge and skills. Knowledge gained by the participants pertained to life issues and contributed to their growth in empathic understanding, thereby enabling them to forge relationships with others with whom they might not have done so otherwise. Participants grew in empathic consciousness as they became immersed in the lives of the people they were serving:

> With a basic understanding of their emotions, participants suggested that during the service learning experience they noticed developing empathy towards the Sri Lankan people's attitude to life. (Gibson 2009, p. 143)

As such, 'learned empathy' accompanied both the growth in the capacity of the participants to relate to others and their own emotional maturation. As a result of their experience, the participants became more confident in their communications and this suggests a link between empathic consciousness and communicative competence.

Thus, the literature surveyed indicates that service learning offers a dynamic and holistic educational experience that has the potential to strengthen students' cognitive skills and moral character in a more powerful and enduring way than can be achieved within the confines of a classroom. The following section describes the implementation and effects of the various service learning projects conducted under the Australian Values Education Program and examines how these facilitated the development of empathic consciousness, social awareness, pro-social behaviours and community engagement.

Australian Values Education Program

As discussed in Chap. 5, service learning was a constant feature of the *Values Education Good Practice Schools Project* (VEGPSP). In the report on the first phase of the project (Dest 2006), several of the cluster projects focussed explicitly on social outreach and engagement programmes that were identified increasingly with the ambience and intention of service learning. Definitions of service learning were clarified, including one that read as follows:

- service to others integrated into cross-curricular programmes;
- a learning context where the concept of service is both explicit and implicit;
- a two-way learning process—that is, there is explicit reciprocity between the school and the outside community. (p. 156)

Outreach ventures included working in aged care centres, reading programmes for people in hospitals, developing safe travel programmes for students going to and from schools, environmental projects and the development of *Student Action Teams* (SATs) linked to the work of the Red Cross. As Gibson (2009) reported, through their engagement in contexts and issues beyond the classroom and their own immediate sphere of existence, students gain a broader perspective and a deeper appreciation of the lives and circumstances of others. The reflections of students and teachers indicate that these experiences resulted in 'learned empathy', enhanced communicative competence, a greater sense of student agency and an intrinsic motivation to engage in meaningful action. Typical of the remarks of students involved were the following:

- I have learnt different values.
- I learnt about care and compassion. (Dest 2006, p. 157)

Meanwhile, one teacher made the following observation:

> The overall confidence of the students grew as they gained an understanding of the needs of the residents and they came away feeling a sense of achievement and greater understanding. This then flowed into the conversation and written responses gained after the trip. The students showed compassion to the circumstances the residents lived in and wanted to discuss other ways they could help. (Dest 2006, p. 157)

In one of the school sites where, according to best practice guidelines, reflective discussion and dialogue preceded and followed the outreach experiences, pre-service reflection with students revealed apprehensiveness about the potential for the experience to have any meaning for them. In contrast, reflection after the event illustrated the profound impact that the project had on students' self-efficacy and aspirations. In the following quote, one particularly direct and personal response illustrates how important an experience of this sort can be:

> From all of the people in the respite centre, I saw how they respected me and they tolerated how hopeless I was. They were so patient; it was unbelievable. I really respect them and I tried to do my best because it was so important to them—all of those values things really. (Dest 2006, p. 160)

In the report of the second phase of the project (DEEWR 2008), the potential of service learning as a means of achieving the holistic effects of values education was the subject of greater recognition. The Executive Summary of this project proffered the following in relation to the propensity of action-oriented pedagogies in enhancing student agency and autonomy:

> The Stage 2 cluster experiences speak convincingly of the critical importance of enabling and providing opportunities for student agency. Although present in many of the Stage 1 projects, the role of student empowerment and agency in values education practice has been significantly highlighted in Stage 2. Starting from the premise that schooling educates for the whole child and must necessarily engage a student's heart, mind and actions, effective values education empowers student decision making, fosters student action and assigns real student responsibility. Effective values education is not an academic exercise; it needs to be deeply personal, deeply real and deeply engaging. In many of the Stage 2 projects, students can be seen to move in stages from growing in knowledge and understanding of the values, to an increasing clarity and commitment to certain values, and then concerted action in living those values in their personal and community lives. (p. 11)

The report identified, for a range of cluster projects, the centrality of service learning pedagogy in achieving the project's intentions. For one cluster that took a global education focus on children's working conditions in third world countries, reflection on action resulted in enhanced empathic character as demonstrated in student initiated campaigns to alert consumers to manufactured goods that were produced by child labour. In another cluster, engagement with disadvantaged groups in their own community led to organized activities to address loneliness and deprivation, again portraying growth in empathic consciousness, an essential learning outcome related directly to the goals of enhanced citizenship capacity. Thus, community engagement provided opportunity for holistic learning that accommodates an action-oriented approach to values education as proffered in the report:

> Service learning is a pedagogy that aids the development of young people as they learn to engage in the worlds of others and then participate in civic service. It is a form of experi-

> ential learning which is integrally related to values education, and helps young people to empathise, engage and take their place as civic-minded, responsible, caring and empowered citizens in our community. (DEEWR 2008, p. 34)
>
> In an important development from the Stage 1 Final Report … the Stage 2 cluster experiences drill deeper and report on the effects on students of what was taught, and link it to increased student agency. Teachers assert that increased student agency makes schooling more meaningful, enjoyable and relevant to students' lives. Student agency refers to empowering students through curriculum approaches that:
>
> - engage them;
> - are respectful of and seek their opinions;
> - give them opportunities to feel connected to school life;
> - promote positive and caring relationships between all members of the school community;
> - promote wellbeing and focus on the whole student;
> - relate to real-life experiences;
> - are safe and supportive. (DEEWR 2008, p. 40)

In this statement, we begin to sense an awareness of and confidence in the vital links between holistic and effective student agency and the wider goals of learning inherent to the school, including its foundational charter around academic learning. Herein, we see demonstrated evidentially the postulation made at the outset of the book, namely, that values education can no longer be seen merely as a moral imperative but, moreover, as a pedagogical one as well. In light of the insights of the neurosciences regarding the nexus of cognition, affect and sociality (Immordino-Yang and Damasio 2007), this can hardly be surprising. In the second phase of VEGPSP, other connections with wider research findings were being made explicit:

> The Stage 2 cluster experiences accord with research findings in the field of social-emotional learning and its relation to building academic success. Zins et al. (2004) conclude that … socially engaging teaching strategies focus students on their learning tasks. (DEEWR 2008, p. 41)

As with all other findings of the earlier projects, claims around service learning's effects were subjected to empirical appraisal in the 'Testing and Measuring' project (Lovat et al. 2009b, c). Included in the report was considerable evidence of the role that service learning played as an element of the values pedagogy under investigation:

> The notion of service learning was implicit in many of the activities which schools introduced to develop students' responsibility and respect for others and the environment … Thus, students were able to put the values into practice in functional and purposeful ways while making a meaningful contribution to the school environment. (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 34)

The report noted that the general effects of enhanced social consciousness and empathic character, which have been identified in values education generally, were particularly strong features of the results where service learning was an explicit and intentional component of the programme:

> Service learning … engages students in action-based activities where they can apply their curriculum learning in direct service to others or their community. It combines principles of constructivist learning with a very practical manifestation of empathy and social justice in the form of giving to others or contributing to worthwhile social change. (Lovat 2009b, p. 183)

> 'service learning' allowed "head, hands and hearts" to be involved in a values based partnership. (p. 208)
>
> … service learning (means) putting what has been learned about values into active practice. (p. 227)

Furthermore, it was noted that service learning was a particularly powerful pedagogy in strengthening the oft-noted link between values education and academic achievement:

> Uniformly, teachers report that doing something with and for the community increases the students' engagement in their learning. This resonates with an interesting but relatively novel proposition in education: when students have opportunities to give to their community, to something beyond themselves, it changes their attitude to the learning tasks. (p. 183)

Participating schools realized that allied to the explicit teaching of values was the realization that values education is ultimately a practical enterprise requiring that values must be seen to be engaging with and applicable to real-world situations (Lovat et al. 2009b, pp. 72–74, 86). Community and social engagement took diverse forms. It could be in considering the issues, responsibilities and consequences associated with learning to drive a vehicle, providing drought relief to farmers or tree planting (Lovat et al. 2009c, p. 70). In another school, students did voluntary community service (p. 107). One school assisted in the construction of a community asset in the form of a garden (p. 104), while another actively cared for an ecologically sensitive area which had cultural and social significance (p. 37). Other schools sought to foster values related to civic awareness and citizenship through community partnerships (pp. 5, 82, 103–104, 144, 152). SATs provided students with opportunities to integrate cognition, affect and volition ("head, hand and heart") as they engaged with the community and enabled practical application of the school's values (pp. 95, 99, 104, 113, 114, 120). Peer support or mentoring provided the opportunity for older students to enact positive values in the offer of support and encouragement to younger students (Lovat et al. 2009c, pp. 11, 35, 42, 131). Another approach was seen in the introduction of schemes where students would take responsibility for caring for animals or plants and other functional areas of the school environment, such as litter or the neatness of the playground and paths, or conservation of water and electricity (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 34). For at least one school, real-world learning was written into the operational plan in order "…to engage students in meaningful relevant issues, and support reflective action around local concerns." (Lovat et al. 2009c, p. 82).

Hence, the Australian research illustrates the need for good practice pedagogy to be values driven and shows that action oriented pedagogies such as those surrounding service learning provide educational experiences which enhance student agency and autonomy in learning, reflected in evidence of students' increased motivation and engagement, as well as enhanced academic performance. From the above extracts of the various reports of the VEGPSP, it can be seen that involvement in service learning provides students with rich experiences that, when coupled with reflection and values discourse, will impel the development of empathic conscious-

ness characteristic of engaged citizenship. Evidence from the Australian projects indicates that holistic values pedagogies include an element that motivates students to apply and extend their existing knowledge to effect meaningful changes in the world beyond the classroom (cf. Newmann et al. 1996).

Essential Features of Service Learning Pedagogy

From the array of literature and research projects surveyed, a number of features emerge regarding the values pedagogy that facilitates the development of empathic consciousness, social awareness, pro-social behaviours and community engagement. Consistent with the notion of ecology of learning, as discussed in Chap. 3, community engagement of this sort provides a learning environment for the nurturance of features of holistic learning through offering a dynamic social experience that cannot be replicated within the confines of a classroom. The learning philosophy that underpins such pedagogy is seen in Squire and Kandel's (2009) postulation that learning and memory have both implicit and explicit dimensions. Furthermore, as we have seen, the new neurosciences emphasize the importance of providing the learner with an environment that will offer an experience sufficiently rich that it will stimulate learning (Kolb and Kolb 2005; Zull 2004, 2006).

Service learning has its theoretical roots in experiential learning which, in turn, has a Deweyian, Vygotskian and Aristotelian heritage. As such, the richness of the experience itself and the quality of reflection on the experience are both of vital importance to its effectiveness (e.g. Gibson 2009; Leeds 2010). Billig (2006) points out that the learning context provides both the content of learning and a structure for understanding that content. She refers to research by the National Research Council (2000) which identified four mutually supportive and interacting aspects of learning environments that give rise to holistic learning. Such environments are learner centred, knowledge centred, assessment centred (with a focus on feedback and revision) and community centred (including classroom, school, and home and the wider community). Billig (2006; cf. Billig et al. 2005) believes that high quality service learning creates such an environment and reports a number of different effects of such learning on students that have a better result when certain features are present. These include the following: students had direct contact with the people they were serving and the service being provided was meeting a genuine need; students had a choice in the activity; and, students found the activity challenging. Additionally, the activity had to be of sufficient duration.

According to Billig (2000), service learning has the propensity to contribute to the academic achievement of students when it provides a means of practical application of curriculum content and when it develops student-cognitive capacities through promoting higher-order thinking. Similarly, Furco (2008) points to the direct effects of service learning on personal, social, career and values development, and, furthermore, the mediated effects on student achievement through "…engagement, motivation, self-esteem, empowerment, and pro-social behaviours" (p. 30).

In other words, service learning supplies or supplements those items of social capital that are essential components of an environment that supports holistic student learning and development (see Goddard 2003; Scales et al. 2006a, b).

With regard to the development of empathic consciousness, there is much in the literature that would suggest that service learning offers pedagogy equal to the task. Empathy is an innate quality that is fundamental to human learning (Meltzoff et al. 2009) but, as Chap. 3 explains, innate capacities require environmental stimuli for their development. For Feshbach and Feshbach (2009), empathy is an attribute that is highly relevant to the educational outcomes of students (see also Feshbach and Feshbach 1987). Empathic qualities are relevant to both the social behaviours of students as well as their academic achievement. Empathy also plays a role in mediating the cognitive and affective competencies that contribute to social behaviours:

> The scope of functions that empathy in children can mediate include social understanding, emotional competence, prosocial and moral behaviour, compassion and caring, and regulation of aggression and other antisocial behaviours. (Feshbach and Feshbach 2009, p. 86)

Feshbach and Feshbach (2009) observe that although these behaviours are important educational ends in themselves, nonetheless they have indirect effects on classroom learning. One of the pillars of values pedagogy is in the need to intentionally foster empathy in the classroom (Dally 2010; Stetson et al. 2003). Evidence of the adequacy of service learning in providing a learning environment suitable to the development of empathic consciousness is supplied in the wider-ranging report of research on service learning provided above (e.g. DEEWR 2008; Gibson 2009; Lovat et al. 2009b; Simons and Cleary 2006; Youniss and Yates 1997).

Crotty's (2010) account of the knowledge effects resulting from engagement in service learning illustrates the vital role of self-reflectivity in contributing to the awakening of the kind of empathic consciousness and generation of moral knowledge that characterizes moral development. Likewise, Gibson (2009) shows how the interaction of structured and informal reflection, together with personal and corporate reflection, is instrumental in the development of the skills and knowledge that enable effective service and that trigger volition to extend and prolong pro-social actions and activities. These include the ability to 'de-centre' and see things from another's perspective and the development of empathic consciousness of the sort that leads to deeper relationships and personal growth. Hence, reflection and empathic consciousness appear to be prelude to the kinds of social awareness, pro-social behaviours and altruism that find expression in social engagement and citizenship. Reflection of this calibre is an essential trait of the form of values pedagogy that issues in effective service learning (Crawford 2010).

Thus, critical reflection impels the agency of students in their learning and their growing moral maturity. Crotty (2010), Gibson (2009) and Crawford (2010) indicate that reflection has a dialogical element, and that community values discourse becomes a context for the refinement of the ideas emanating from personal reflection. In the previous chapter, self-reflection, moral discourse and communicative competence were identified as being among the hallmarks of holistic values pedagogy and this chapter suggests empathic consciousness needs to be added to that

list. Furthermore, the evidence and analysis in this chapter suggest that community engagement provides a context where self-reflection, empathic consciousness (and thus social awareness and pro-social behaviours), reflective moral discourse and communicative competence can develop symbiotically and flourish together in holistic learning.

Conclusion

This chapter offers evidence from the projects of the Australian Values Education Program and international research projects of the capacity of community engagement to comprise an indispensable dimension of values pedagogy that provides for holistic student achievement. One can interpret a Habermasian frame of reference in the perspective being proposed based on the research findings uncovered in this chapter. The frame of reference emanates from Habermas' (1972, 1974, 1984, 1987) 'Ways of Knowing' and 'Communicative Action' theories. In a word, it is the one who knows not only empirically-analytically and historically-hermeneutically, but also self-reflectively, who is capable of the just and empowering relationships implied in the notion of communicative action. In a sense, one finally comes truly to know when one knows oneself, and authentic knowing of self can only come through action for others, the practical action for change and betterment implied by *praxis*. Habermas provides the conceptual foundation for values pedagogy that transforms educational practice, its actors in students and teachers, and the role of the school towards holistic social agency. This view posits that the school is not merely a disjoined receptacle for isolated academic activity but one whose purpose is to serve and enrich the lives of its immediate inhabitants and its wider communities. Habermas' work provides insight into why it is that when education aims to engage students meaningfully in social agency it is so likely to have a positive impact on their maturation and, in turn, social conscience, citizenship, attitudes and behaviour as well as issuing in strengthened academic diligence.

References

Allen, J. P., Philliber, S., Herrling, S., & Kuperminc, G. P. (1997). Preventing teen pregnancy and academic failure: Experimental evaluation of a developmentally based approach. *Child Development, 68,* 729–742.

Berkowitz, M. W., Battistich, V. A., & Bier, M. C. (2008). What works in character education: What is known and needs to be known. In L. P. Nucci & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Handbook of moral and character education* (pp. 414–430). New York: Routledge.

Berkowitz, M. W., Sherblom, S., Bier, M. C., & Battistich, V. (2006). Educating for positive youth development. In M. Killen & J. Semetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (pp. 683–701). Muhwah: Erlbaum.

Billig, S. H. (2000). Research on K-12 school-based service learning: The evidence builds. *Phi Delta Kappan, 81,* 658–664.

Billig, S. H. (2006). Lessons from research on teaching and learning: Service-learning as effective instruction. In J. Kielsmeier, M. Neal, & N. Schultz (Eds.), *Growing into Greatness 2006: The state of service-learning project* (pp. 25–32). Saint Paul: National Youth Leadership Council. http://www.nylc.org/sites/nylc.org/files/files/303LessonsFrom.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Billig, S. H. (2007). Unpacking what works in service-learning: Promising research-based practices to improve student outcomes. In J. Kielsmeier, M. Neal, & N. Schultz (Eds.), *Growing into greatness 2007* (pp. 18–28). Saint Paul: National Youth Leadership Council.

Billig, S. H., Root, S., & Jesse, D. (2005). The relationship between quality indicators of service-learning and student outcomes: Testing professional wisdom. In S. Root, J. Callahan, & S. Billig (Eds.), *Improving service-learning practice: Research on models to enhance impacts* (pp. 97–115). Greenwich: Information Age.

Borden, A. W. (2007). The impact of service-learning on ethnocentrism in an intercultural communication course. *The Journal of Experiential Education, 30,* 171–183.

Boss, J. (1994). The effect of community service work on the moral development of college ethics students. *Journal of Moral Education, 23,* 183–198.

Boyd, B. (2001). Bringing leadership experiences to inner-city youth. *Journal of Extension, 39*(4), 1–5.

Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Pastorelli, C., Bandura, A., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2000). Prosocial foundations of children's academic achievement. *Psychological Science, 11,* 302–306.

Cockerill, A. (1999). *Each one must shine: The educational legacy of V. A. Sukhomlinsky.* New York: Peter Lang.

Conner, M. L. (2007). Learning from experience. *Ageless learner.* http://agelesslearner.com/intros/experiential.html. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. (1981). *National assessment of experiential education. A final report.* Center for Youth Development and Research, University of Minnesota. Saint Paul, MN.

Crawford, K. (2010). Active citizenship education and critical pedagogy. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student well-being* (pp. 811–824). Dordrecht: Springer.

Crotty, R. (2010). Values education as an ethical dilemma about sociability. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 631–644). Dordrecht: Springer.

Dally, K. (2010). The second pillar of the student wellbeing pedagogy: Social and emotional learning. In R. Toomey, T. Lovat, N. Clement, & K. Dally (Eds.), *Teacher education and values pedagogy: A student wellbeing approach* (pp. 32–53). Sydney: David Barlow.

Damasio, A. R. (1996). *Descartes' error: Emotion, reason and the human brain.* London: Papermac.

Davidson, M. L., Khmelkov, V., & Lickona, T. (2010). The power of character: Needed for, and developed from, teaching and learning. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 427–454). Dordrecht: Springer.

Dávila, A., & Mora, M. (2007). *Civic engagement and high school academic progress: An analysis using NELS data.* College Park: Centre for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.

DEEWR. (2008). *At the heart of what we do: Values education at the centre of schooling.* Report of the Values Education Good Practice Schools Project—Stage 2. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/VEGPSP-2_final_3_execsummary.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Denner, J., Coyle, K., Robin, L., & Banspach, S. (2005). Integrating service learning into a curriculum to reduce health risks at alternative high schools. *Journal of School Health, 75,* 151–156.

Dest. (2006). *Implementing the National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools.* Report of the Values Education Good Practice Schools Project—Stage 1: Final report, September 2006. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/VEGPS1_FINAL_REPORT_EXEC_SUMMARY_081106.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Dewey, J. (1916/1966). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education.* New York: Free Press.

Dewey, J. (1938/1963). *Experience and education.* New York: Collier.

Dymond, S. K., & Renzaglia, A. (2008). Elements of high school service learning programs. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 31,* 37–47.

Dymond, S. K., Renzaglia, A., & Chun, E. (2007). Elements of effective high school service learning programs that include students with and without disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education, 28,* 227–243.

Eyler, J. (2002). Reflection: Linking service and learning—linking students and communities. *Journal of Social Issues, 58,* 517–534.

Feshbach, N. D., & Feshbach, S. (1987). Affective processes and academic achievement. *Child Development, 58,* 1335–1347.

Feshbach, N. D., & Feshbach, S. (2009). Empathy and education. In J. Decety & W. J. Ickes (Eds.), *The social neuroscience of empathy* (pp. 85–97). Cambridge: MIT.

Furco, A. (2002). Is service-learning really better than community service? A study of high school service programs. In A. Furco & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *Service-learning: The essence of the pedagogy* (pp. 23–50). Greenwich: Information Age.

Furco, A. (2003). Issues of definition and program diversity in the study of service-learning. In S. H. Billig & A. S. Waterman (Eds.), *Studying service-learning: Innovation in education research methodology* (pp. 13–34). Manwah: Erlbaum.

Furco, A. (2008). *Exploring the purposes, complexities and future of values education.* Paper presented at the Keynote at the National Values Education Forum, Canberra ACT, Australia, May 30. http://www.valueseducation.edu.au/verve/_resources/2008_National_Values_Education_Forum_Report_rev.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Furco, A., & Billig, S. H. (Eds.). (2002). *Service-learning: The essence of the pedagogy* (Vol. 1). Greenwich: Information Age.

Furco, A., & Root, S. (2010). Research demonstrates the value of service learning. *Phi Delta Kappan, 91,* 16–20.

Gardner, H. (1993). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences* (2nd ed.). New York: Fontana.

Gibson, S. (2009). *Investigating student outcomes from a service learning project.* Doctor of Philosophy, University of Wollongong, Australia. http://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/820. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Goddard, R. D. (2003). Relational networks, social trust, and norms: A social capital perspective on students' chances of academic success. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 25,* 59–74.

Goddard, T., & Gribble, N. (2006). *A service learning relationship fostering cultural competency: The cultural immersion of occupational therapy students and reflective practice.* Paper presented at the Enhancing Student Learning: 2006 Evaluations and Assessment Conference, Curtin University of Technology. http://lsn.curtin.edu.au/eac2006/papers/goddardgribble.pdf.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence.* New York: Bantam Books.

Habermas, J. (1972). *Knowledge and human interests* (trans: J. Shapiro). London: Heinemann.

Habermas, J. (1974). *Theory and practice* (trans: J. Viertal). London: Heinmann.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action* (trans: T. McCarthy, Vol. I: Reason and the Rationalisation of Society). Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1987). *The theory of communicative action* (trans: T. McCarthy, Vol. II: Lifeworld and System—A Critique of Functionalist Reason). Boston: Beacon.

Halfacre, J. K., Chessin, D. A., & Chambless, M. S. (2006). Service-learning and student attitudes. *Academic Exchange Quarterly, 10,* 226–231.

Hamilton, S., & Zeldin, R. (1987). Learning civics in the community. *Curriculum Inquiry, 17,* 407–420.

Hart, D., Atkins, R., & Donnelly, T. M. (2006). Community service and moral development. In M. Killen & J. Semetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (pp. 633–656). Muhwah: Erlbaum.

Hart, D., Donnelly, T. M., Youniss, J., & Atkins, R. (2007). High school community service as a predictor of adult voting and volunteering. *American Educational Research Journal, 44,* 197–219.

Hart, D., Matsuba, M. K., & Atkins, R. (2008). The moral and civic effects of learning to serve. In L. P. Nucci & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Handbook of moral and character education* (pp. 484–499). New York: Routledge.

Hatcher, J. A., & Bringle, R. G. (1997). Reflection: Bridging the gap between service and learning. *College Teaching, 45,* 153–158.

Immordino-Yang, M. H., & Damasio, A. R. (2007). We feel, therefore we learn: The relevance of affect and social neuroscience to education. *Mind, Brain, and Education, 1,* 3–10.

Kahne, J. E., & Sporte, S. E. (2008). Developing citizens: The impact of civic learning opportunities on students' commitment to civic participation. *American Educational Research Journal, 45,* 738–766.

Kerr, D. (1999). *Citizenship education: An international comparison.* QCA: London. http://www.inca.org.uk/pdf/citizenship_no_intro.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Kolb, A. Y., & Kolb, D. A. (2005). Learning styles and learning spaces: Enhancing experiential learning in higher education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 4,* 193–212.

Kraft, N., & Wheeler, J. (2003). Service-learning and resilience in disaffected youth: A research study. In S. H. Billig & J. Eyler (Eds.), *Deconstructing service-learning: Research exploring context, participation, and impacts* (pp. 213–238). Greenwich: Information Age.

Kristjánsson, K. (2010). Valuing the self. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 179–194). Dordrecht: Springer.

Leeds, J. (2010). Translating values education into values action: Attempts, obstacles, and potential for the future. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 795–810). Dordrecht: Springer.

Leming, J. S. (2001). Integrating a structured ethical reflection curriculum into high school community service experiences: Impact on students' sociomoral development. *Adolescence, 36*(141), 33–45.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Clement, N., Crotty, R., & Nielsen, T. (2009a). *Values education, quality teaching and service learning: A troika for effective teaching and teacher education.* Sydney: David Barlow.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Dally, K., & Clement, N. (2009b). *Project to test and measure the impact of values education on student effects and school ambience.* DEEWR. Final report for the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) by The University of Newcastle, Australia. Canberra. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Project_to_Test_and_Measure_the_Impact_of_Values_Education.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Dally, K., & Clement, N. (2009c). *Project to test and measure the impact of values education on student effects and school ambience: Associated case study reports.* DEEWR. Final report for the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) by The University of Newcastle, Australia. Canberra. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Project_to_Test_and_Measure_the_Impact_of_Values_Education.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Melchior, A. (1998). *National evaluation of Learn and Serve America school and community-based programs: Final report.* Abt Associates, Inc., Cambridge, MA; Brandis University, Waltham, MA. Centre for Human Resources. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services ED 437575). http://eric.ed.gov/. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Meltzoff, A. N., Kuhl, P. K., Movellan, J., & Sejnowski, T. J. (2009). Foundations for a new science of learning. *Science, 325,* 284–288.

National Research Council. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school.* Washington: National Academy Press. http://www.netlibrary.com. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Newmann, F. M., Marks, H. M., & Gamoran, A. (1996). Authentic pedagogy and student performance. *American Journal of Education, 104,* 280–312.

Nielsen, T. W. (2010). Towards pedagogy of giving for wellbeing and social engagement. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 617–630). Dordrecht: Springer.

Novak, J. M., Markey, V., & Allen, M. (2007). Evaluating cognitive outcomes of service learning in higher education: A meta-analysis. *Communication Research Reports, 24,* 149–157.

Nucci, L. P. (2006). Education for moral development. In M. Killen & J. Semetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (pp. 657–681). Muhwah: Erlbaum.

O'Donnell, L., Stueve, A., O'Donnell, C., Duran, R., Doval, A. S., Wilson, R., et al. (2002). Long-term reductions in sexual initiation and sexual activity among urban middle schoolers in the reach for health service learning program. *The Journal of Adolescent Health, 31,* 93–100.

Post, S., & Neimark, J. (2008). *Why good things happen to good people: The exciting new research that proves the link between doing good and living a longer, healthier, happier life*. New York: Broadway Books.

Robinson, J., & Kecskes, K. (2010). Making values education real: Exploring the nexus between service learning and values education. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing.* Dordrecht: Springer.

Root, S., & Seum, N. W. (2010). Service-learning in elementary schools: What's developmentally appropriate? In J. C. Kielsmeier, S. Root, C. Pernu, & B. Lynsgtad (Eds.), *Growing into greatness: The state of service learning* (pp. 44–54). Saint Paul: National Youth Leadership Council. http://www.nylc.org/sites/nylc.org/files/G2G2010_0.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55,* 68–78.

Scales, P. C., Blyth, D. A., Berkas, T. H., & Kielsmeier, J. C. (2000). The effects of service-learning on middle school students' social responsibility and academic success. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 20,* 332–358.

Scales, P. C., Benson, P. L., Roehlkepartain, E. C., Sesma, J. A., & van Dulmen, M. (2006a). The role of developmental assets in predicting academic achievement: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Adolescence, 29,* 691–708.

Scales, P. C., Roehlkepartain, E. C., Neal, M., Kielsmeier, J. C., & Benson, P. L. (2006b). Reducing academic achievement gaps: The role of community service and service-learning. *The Journal of Experiential Education, 29,* 38–60.

Simons, L., & Cleary, B. (2006). The influence of service learning on students' personal and social development. *College Teaching, 54,* 307–319.

Squire, L. R., & Kandel, E. R. (2009). *Memory: From mind to molecules* (2nd ed.). Greenwood Village: Roberts & Co.

Stetson, E. A., Hurley, A. M., & Miller, G. E. (2003). Can universal affective education programs be used to promote empathy in elementary aged children? A review of five curricula. *Journal of Research in Character Education, 1,* 129–148.

Sukhomlinska, O. (2010). Values education and whole person development in Ukraine: The role of Vasyl Sukhomlinsky and current applications. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 549–558) (addition & trans: A. Lenchovska). Dordrecht: Springer.

Tannenbaum, S. C., & Brown-Welty, S. (2006). Tandem pedagogy: Embedding service-learning into an after-school program. *The Journal of Experiential Education, 29,* 111–125.

Tebes, J. K., Feinn, R., Vanderploeg, J. J., Chinman, M. J., Shepard, J., Brabham, T., et al. (2007). Impact of a positive youth development program in urban after-school settings on the prevention of adolescent substance use. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 41,* 239–247.

Tudball, L. (2010). Developing student wellbeing through education for sustainability: Learning from school experience. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 779–794). Dordrecht: Springer.

Waldstein, F. A., & Reiher, T. C. (2001). Service-learning and students' personal and civic development. *The Journal of Experiential Education, 24,* 7–13.

Weiler, D., LaGoy, A., Crane, E., & Rovner, A. (1998). An evaluation of K-12 service-learning in California: Executive summary. http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/sl/execsummary.asp. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Welsh, M., Parke, R. D., Widaman, K., & O'Neil, R. (2001). Linkages between children's social and academic competence: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of School Psychology, 39,* 463–482.

Wentzel, K. R. (1991a). Relations between social competence and academic achievement in early adolescence. *Child Development, 62,* 1066–1078.

Wentzel, K. R. (1991b). Social competence at school: Relation between social responsibility and academic achievement. *Review of Educational Research, 61,* 1–24.

Wentzel, K. R. (1993). Does being good make the grade? Social behaviour and academic competence in middle school. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 85,* 357–364.

Yamauchi, L. A., Billig, S. H., Meyer, S., & Hofschire, L. (2006). Student outcomes associated with service-learning in a culturally relevant high school program. In R. N. Reeb (Ed.), *Community action research: Benefits to community members and service providers* (pp. 149–164). Binghamton: Haworth Press.

Yates, M., & Youniss, J. (1998). Community service and political identity development in adolescence. *Journal of Social Issues, 54,* 495–512.

Youniss, J., & Yates, M. (1997). *Community service and social responsibility in youth.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zaff, J. F., & Lerner, R. M. (2010). Service learning promotes positive youth development in high school. *Phi Delta Kappan, 91*(5), 21–23.

Zins, J. E., Weissberg, R. P., Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (Eds.). (2004). *Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say?* New York: Teachers College Press.

Zull, J. E. (2004). The art of changing the brain. *Educational Leadership, 62*(1), 68–72.

Zull, J. E. (2006). Key aspects of how the brain learns. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 2006*(110), 3–9.

Chapter 8
Values and Behaviour

Student Behaviour, Classroom Management and Bullying

A persistent theme to be found in values pedagogical research worldwide is in the potential for a calming effect on student behaviour, brought about largely through a combination of more settled learning environments, more positive teacher–student and student–student relationships, enhanced self-esteem and a greater sense of citizenship, this latter especially when forms of service learning or other social engagement strategies are explicitly incorporated. This chapter will focus on these features in the findings of international research and explore the way in which the Australian Values Education Program produced a synergy between these basic pedagogical elements to create more harmonious and productive learning environments.

Student Behaviour

The didactic and teacher-directed practices that have often characterized what is taught in schools have tended to partition learning into stage-based cognitive activities that primarily take place within the classroom. Students are generally assigned to classes according to their chronological age, where they participate in independent or group activities which develop their thinking, conceptualizing and reasoning skills. In this kind of learning, teachers' efforts are directed towards 'presenting information' in ways that are interesting and appealing to students and in designing activities which gradually build students' understanding of specific curriculum dictated topics (Davis 2006). The teacher's focus tends to be on the individual learner's progress and how well each acquires 'mastery' over the set tasks and content as measured by cumulative assessments. In this teaching paradigm, there is little regard given to how children *feel* about what they are learning or what they *do* with their new knowledge. Thus, cognitive processes and the construction and production of *knowledge* are given precedence over the affective and behavioural domains of student development.

T. Lovat et al., *Values Pedagogy and Student Achievement,*
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-1563-9_8, © Springer Science+Business Media, B.V. 2011

Similarly, in broader terms of classroom functioning, student emotions and their social relationships are typically regarded as being outside of, or peripheral to, the teacher's role. In the classroom and the school community, self-regulation of feelings and behaviour, as well as appropriate social interactions, are 'expected' and any inadequacies in these areas are often regarded as aberrations residing within individual students. Inappropriate outbursts or inadequacies in social functioning are seen as an inherent problem of the student and an interruption to the 'real-business' of learning. Continued interruptions and distractible behaviour are typically dealt with through withdrawal or suspension of 'troublesome' students. This approach has led to a perception that the teacher's role is divided between 'teaching' and 'managing behaviour' and that the former is somehow separated from the latter. School suspension or expulsion may achieve short-term relief for an individual teacher and class, but it does not address the situation confronting the students with problem behaviours and is often detrimental to their learning and social outcomes.

Students who struggle to succeed socially or academically during their school years are at risk of becoming alienated not only from learning and mainstream education, but also from achieving a sense of inclusion and acceptance more widely in society (Staples et al. 2010). While teachers have the potential and the power to alter the negative life trajectories of disengaged students, often the accountability pressures coming from an emphasis on knowledge transmission, or discomfort in dealing with emotional issues, deter teachers from attempting to address the social, emotional and behavioural problems of students as part of their role as 'educator' (Osterman 2010). The integrated and balanced focus on the cognitive, affective and behavioural domains of human functioning that comprise the pedagogy of values education and associated approaches, such as character education (Cohen and Sandy 2007) and social and emotional learning (SEL) (Elias et al. 2007), has given new legitimacy to teachers taking a greater role in scaffolding student behaviour and promoting affective development.

As discussed in Chap. 4, the classroom ambience that is defined by the nature and quality of student–teacher and student–student interactions has been identified as an important mediating variable in the nexus between teaching and learning (Sherblom et al. 2006). Both Australian and international research have identified the positive effects of values education on promoting student academic engagement and achievement (Brew and Beatty 2010). While there has been little empirical research investigating the longitudinal effects of values education on student achievement, the impact of a whole-school approach towards the explicit teaching of values appears to be greater for students who are struggling at school (Benninga et al. 2003). This finding will come as no surprise to those teachers and researchers working in the field of special education. The establishment of a socially supportive classroom 'ecology' has also been identified as an important focus of preventative and intervention approaches specifically aimed at addressing students' behavioural difficulties (e.g. Dreikurs et al. 1998; Glasser 1998). It seems however that the education and special education research fields have travelled on parallel trajectories, albeit using slightly different modes of transport, to arrive at this common destination. The following section provides a brief review of the psycho-educational approach

to classroom management and examines the overlap between this approach and the theories and practices underlying values pedagogy.

Classroom Management

Psycho-educational approaches to classroom management are based on the theory that 'inappropriate' classroom behaviours often represent a student's attempt to fulfil a goal or an 'unmet need' (e.g. Dreikurs et al. 1998; Glasser 1998). The approach is based on the principles espoused by the German psychiatrist, Adler (1927), who believed that human beings have a strong urge to belong to a social group and to feel significant within that group. Adler suggested that human behaviour is driven by the need to establish and then maintain a sense of attachment and significance, and thus the goal of 'belonging' directs the way that individuals function within groups. According to Adler, through their social interactions during the childhood years, people develop a set of beliefs about their own unique identity and the way that others respond to them. Typically, people are motivated to adhere to social norms, because genial and gregarious behaviour generally results in acceptance by a group. It is only when people are unable to achieve the goals of belonging and significance that they act inappropriately. Although negative behaviours may result in social disapproval, they at least attract attention and satisfy the need for significance.

Glasser (1969), an American psychiatrist, applied Adler's 'individual psychology' in school contexts, initially to address issues of adolescent delinquency, and extended on Adler's theory by adding the needs of freedom, power and fun to that of belonging. Like Adler, Glasser believed that 'misbehaviour' stems from people's attempts to satisfy these goals. After extensive work in schools, Glasser (1998) came to the view that reactive behavioural interventions with individual students were not as effective as proactive approaches which promote positive behaviour through transforming school and classroom cultures so that these environments intrinsically satisfy students' needs. An important aspect of this preventative approach is the teacher's capacity to relinquish the traditional authoritarian role of being the 'boss' of the classroom who expects, or demands, obedience from the students.

Rather than teachers making efforts to 'take control' and suppress student misbehaviour through asserting authority over the students, Glasser (1990) advised teachers to examine their own behaviour and the learning context of their classroom to identify whether the four basic human psychological needs of belonging, power, freedom and fun are being met. Glasser believed that students feel a sense of belonging in classrooms where students have positive interactions with their peers and perceive their teacher as caring and supportive. Classrooms that are based on democratic principles, where students are able to influence decisions, have a choice over learning activities and pathways, and feel safe, respected and heard, meet the needs for power and freedom. Finally, the need for fun is satisfied by teachers who have a sense of humour and manage to construct learning activities that are pleasurable as well as profitable. Glasser advocated the use of cooperative learning, whereby

students work together in small groups to research an assigned topic or collaboratively solve designated problems, as a particularly effective approach that caters for the four basic needs. According to Glasser, when these needs are met, there is no 'logical reason' for misbehaviour and so students will 'naturally' be inclined to focus their efforts on learning.

The role of the teacher as a facilitator and guide, rather than an 'enforcer' of rules, is critical in creating the kind of democratic classroom that characterizes Glasser's notion of *quality schools* (www.wglasser.com). The psycho-educationists contend that autocratic classrooms, where teachers retain total control of what is taught and how the curriculum is taught and assessed, 'invite' children to defy the teacher's authority in order to satisfy their need for freedom and power (Dreikurs et al. 1998). On the other hand, democratic classrooms meet these needs because they involve children in discussions and decisions about the curriculum and learning activities, are receptive and responsive to student input, and favour self-evaluation and ongoing goal-setting over teacher assessments. Glasser (1998) maintained that the key to preventing student disillusionment and disengagement lies with structuring or restructuring the class and the whole-school ecology to ensure that: teachers care about students and communicate their caring; the curriculum is engaging and personally relevant to students; and, assessments are reconceived to demonstrate individual progress in specific skills, rather than emphasizing peer comparisons.

This dual focus on the fostering of positive interpersonal relationships in conjunction with meaningful learning experiences evokes the first three principles of the new values curriculum described in Chap. 5, that is: first, establish the conditions for quality teaching and learning; second, develop appropriate pedagogical scaffolds; and third, structure the pedagogical content around real-world issues. Indeed, a values orientation is evident in the *seven caring habits* that Glasser propounded all teachers should adopt in place of punitive and judgemental practices. These include: support, encouragement, listening, acceptance, trust, respect and negotiation of differences.

Strengthening teacher–student relationships was a key facet of Glasser's (1990) approach to reshaping inappropriate behaviour and enhancing student motivation, known as *Choice Theory*. He saw the teacher's role as leading students towards making "appropriate behavioural choices" through intrinsic volition rather than coercing students to abide by rules through external (teacher) control. Consistent with current educational theories regarding holistic learning, psycho-educational theory recognizes the interconnections between beliefs, thoughts, feelings and behaviour. Appropriate behaviour is facilitated by encouraging belief systems that are congruent with desired behaviours, raising children's awareness of their own and others' emotional reactions, and scaffolding children's naive attempts to solve problems rationally (Arthur-Kelly et al. 2007). These practices serve to make children more cognisant of and responsible for their actions and to expand the range of 'conscious choices' that they can draw upon when faced with intrapersonal or interpersonal conflict situations. Although coming from a different theoretical perspective, this approach is reminiscent of the values education focus on clearly explicating and interrogating what values are and how they can be demonstrated within the class

or school context. As discussed in Chap. 4, everyday reflections on and discussion about values alert students to consider the consequences of their actions from the perspective of others, thus supporting students' decision-making skills and broadening their repertoire of possible responses.

In summary, psycho-educational theory suggests that student 'misbehaviour' results from a classroom environment that is ineffective in meeting the basic human needs for belonging, power, freedom and fun. The best way to meet these needs is through a whole-school approach that emphasizes the provision of quality teaching conducted in democratic classrooms where cooperative learning activities are applied to an engaging and personally relevant curriculum. Crucial to the success of this approach is the role of the teacher as a caring and supportive mentor who is willing to share power with students and replace admonition with encouragement. The following section identifies how these practices, which were originally conceived of to prevent or address problem behaviour, are mirrored in values pedagogy. The impact of teachers' beliefs and sense of self-efficacy on their willingness to adopt a caring and supportive, rather than judgemental and punitive, stance is also discussed.

Democratic Classrooms and Cooperative Learning

As described in Chap. 5, values pedagogy encompasses not only the teaching of values but also the provision of opportunities for the enactment of values through the nature of the learning processes and activities. It could be argued that traditional didactic teaching methods, whereby students work independently at their own desks, engender values such as respect, through compliance with teacher requests, and responsibility, through self-regulation and task completion. At the same time, there are limited opportunities in such classrooms to practise socially oriented values such as tolerance, compassion, integrity and fairness. Almost 20 years since Glasser (1990) decried autocratic teaching practices and espoused the advantages of democratic classrooms and cooperative learning for maximizing student engagement and minimizing student misbehaviour, recent researchers have also recommended 'autonomy supportive' over 'controlling' learning environments (Leroy et al. 2007). According to Leroy et al., teachers who set up a 'controlling' climate tend to do most of the talking and allow little time for students to work collaboratively or to participate in class discussions. In these classrooms, teachers are more critical and disapproving and use more directive language and/or contingent rewards to keep students 'on-task'. Leroy et al. argue that these teaching behaviours do not address students' needs and tend to promote extrinsic (teacher enforced) rather than intrinsic (internalized) motivation. Teachers who set up autonomy supportive classrooms, on the other hand, seek input from students and pay attention to what they say, allot ample time for students to work collaboratively on problem-solving exercises, empathize with students and provide more informative feedback to support their behaviour or learning difficulties. According to Reeve and Jang (2006), these demo-

cratic or autonomy-supportive teaching practices foster intrinsic motivation through increasing students' "inner endorsement of their classroom activity." (p. 210)

Johnson and Johnson (2010) have also emphasized the importance of these practices for promoting not only intrinsic motivation and effective learning outcomes, but also the internalization of values and the development of virtuous citizens. Based on the *social interdependence theory* of Deutsch (1962), which posits that groups represent a 'dynamic whole' such that the goals and actions of one member affect all other group members, Johnson and Johnson (2010) provide empirical evidence showing how the values of self-respect, mutual respect and equality are implicit in and fostered by cooperative learning activities. Because students in cooperative learning situations are required to work together to accomplish a shared goal, they are more likely to adopt *promotive interaction* patterns, whereby individuals encourage and facilitate (i.e. *promote*) each others' efforts. Compared with competitive and independent learning situations which emphasize self-interest, individualistic effort and the irrelevance of others to one's success, cooperative learning fosters a sense of cohesion and egalitarianism among students by re-defining an individual student "… as part of a community that shares a joint identity" (Johnson and Johnson 2010, p. 838). This kind of group learning facilitates the development of positive relationships among participants and enhances psychological adjustment, including self-esteem and wellbeing. Compared with competitive and individualistic efforts, cooperative learning results in more effective performance and academic outcomes through greater effort being exerted, more frequent use of higher level reasoning, more frequent generation of new ideas and solutions, greater long-term retention of knowledge and greater transfer of what has been learned to novel situations (Johnson and Johnson 2010, p. 832). Cooperative learning also repositions the role of the teacher as a facilitator and guide who, by sharing elements of power and authority with students, creates a classroom context in which democratic participation is encouraged and fostered.

In the same vein as Narvaez's (2010) 'sustaining classrooms', this kind of socially just teaching and learning environment scaffolds students to become "… engaged, informed and active citizens." (Crawford 2010, p. 821). Crawford uses the term 'critical pedagogy' to describe the democratic teaching practices underlying values education, which encourage student empowerment by integrating cognitive processes (understanding, application, analysis and evaluation) with the affective domains of learning (the development of attitudes, beliefs, emotions and values). As described in Chaps. 5 and 7, this holistic approach needs to be embedded in learning activities that are relevant and significant to students' lives, so that they have opportunities to act in positive and principled ways to make a difference within the sphere of the school's society or the broader community.

Like Crawford, Holdsworth (2010) argues that schools can and should provide opportunities for students to participate in authentic initiatives within their local communities. Active citizenship should not be perceived as a 'distant' goal of education, and Holdsworth criticizes autocratic educational practices and teacher-controlled pedagogies for their tendency to treat students as passive recipients of knowledge that is oriented to 'future use'. When learning is detached from stu-

dents' lives and there are limited or no opportunities for students to put their new knowledge into meaningful action, then students are likely to become both restless and restive. Thus, echoing Glasser's view that student disengagement and defiance constitute reaction to the disempowerment that students feel when they are estranged from their classmates, their learning is not meaningful and their views are neither sought nor heeded. The defining features of values pedagogy, that is, the promotion of relationships with and among students, quality teaching and the provision of learning experiences which both require and promote the exercise of values, serve to create an optimal learning environment that acts as an antidote to student disengagement. In an investigation of eighth-grade students' perceptions of their classroom environment, Ryan and Patrick (2001) found that collaborative learning opportunities and supportive teacher practices were associated with positive changes in student motivation and engagement, and decreases in off-task and disruptive behaviour.

The way in which student disaffection interferes with motivation and learning has also been studied by Opdenakker and van Damme (2000) who noted the distracting effect that affective dissonance can have on pupils' coping intentions: "pupils who have negative expectations and feelings are not primarily concerned about learning, but about restoring their wellbeing." (p. 187). If the psycho-educational theorists are correct, the typical way in which students seek to satisfy their unfulfilled needs is through attention-seeking, inappropriate behaviour. As observed by Glasser, student 'misconduct' is often escalated by negative teacher attention such as threats and punishment, but can be reduced by 'caring' teachers who accept and understand their students and apply restorative practices such as positive attention and active listening, as well as modelling and promoting inclusive and supportive interaction patterns (Osterman 2010).

Osterman (2010) describes how the combination of personal and academic support from teachers can improve the social status and academic performance of students with learning and/or behavioural difficulties. Based on a review of research examining the classroom experiences of students with additional needs, or who had been identified as 'bullies' or 'victims', Osterman found that there were two crucial aspects that determined whether the students' problem behaviours increased or decreased. These two elements included the way in which the teachers structured and supported student learning (academic support) and the way in which the teachers interacted with the 'problem' students (personal support). In a study involving the classroom experiences of three middle school students who had been labelled as 'bullies', Schwamb (cited in Osterman 2010) identified two types of negative classroom situations that maintained or escalated the students' problem behaviours. In the first, the teachers either ignored the students or, during the minimal interactions that did occur, teachers generally conveyed dislike of these students through tone, facial expressions or body language. The second type of negative classroom situation was characterized by more frequent interactions with these students, but the interactions were predominantly coercive and overtly critical. Schwamb noted that the 'bullies' did make attempts to 'reach out to their peers and teachers' in appropriate ways, either to seek friendship or academic assistance; however, the peers

reacted in the same way as the teachers did, that is, they ignored the students or conveyed their dislike and disdain. Given the ostracizing nature of the classroom in which these students were operating, Glasser (1990) would interpret an escalation in problem behaviour as the students' 'best attempt' to meet their needs for belonging and significance.

Positive classroom experiences, on the other hand, were provided by teachers who encouraged and commended the students, communicated caring through words and actions, provided critical but constructive behavioural and academic feedback and who held high expectations regarding behaviour and academic performance. Under these conditions, students are given an opportunity to 'connect' with their teacher and peers while, at the same time 're-connect' with their motivation to learn and succeed. In a different study, the same powerful effects were evident for children labelled as 'victims' of bullying. Even small acts of personal attention, such as saying "hi" to a student in the hallway, were found to increase students' sense of belonging and mitigate the social, academic and emotional problems of at-risk boys (Griffin, cited in Osterman 2010). Congruent with the 'wellbeing begets wellbeing' thesis described in Chap. 4, Osterman (2010) cites a number of other studies showing how intentional change in teacher behaviour can cause positive changes in student behaviour: "Children perceived as 'problematic' began to act differently as the adults changed their own behaviour toward the students." (p. 248).

The values that influenced these changes were prominent in the teachers' discourse. Teachers described how they were now more conscious of treating all students with *respect* and of not singling out individual children for praise or punishment but "treated most situations as if all children could learn from whatever someone else was doing" (Lewis and Kim 2008, p. 8). This helped to create a 'positive group identity' and a sense of 'solidarity' among the students. These teachers had *trust* in all of their students as being capable and responsible learners and demonstrated this trust by encouraging students to work collaboratively and help each other. In the quote below, Osterman (2010) describes how this dual focus on the provision of meaningful learning activities in the context of cohesive and inclusive classrooms produced effective social and academic outcomes for students from minority backgrounds and those with special needs. Values (emphasized by italics) appear to be a prominent feature underlying the changes in teacher practice:

> By treating students with *fairness* and *respect* and by encouraging interaction with other students, the teachers conveyed messages of *acceptance*. In dealing with behavioural problems, the teachers had a deep personal and professional understanding of their students and were aware of special circumstances that affected their behaviour. When behavioural problems emerged, then, they were *tolerant*. They provided corrective feedback, but in a non-threatening and supportive manner. Because the students knew the teachers *cared* about them, they responded appropriately. Because the teachers did not label these students as problematic, neither did their peers. (Osterman 2010, p. 246)

The key to changing teacher practice was the teachers' coming to know these marginalized students as individuals. This new understanding was accompanied by the realization that the students' learning difficulties and behaviour problems were neither intentional nor intractable and could be ameliorated by teacher interventions.

The way in which teacher attitudes and practice are shaped by their underlying beliefs about human development and the causes of problem behaviour is examined in the next section.

Teacher Beliefs

Many researchers have identified that teacher beliefs have a major impact on the way that teachers respond to disengaged students. As described previously, teachers typically respond to such students in predictably negative ways, such as ignoring them, being overtly critical and controlling, or treating them with contempt or disdain (Osterman 2010). Osterman (2010, p. 247) reports that teachers often fail to recognize the social dynamics of the classroom or the nature of the learning activities as possible causes for student disengagement and problematic behaviour, and instead tend to attribute these to students' "low motivation or obstructive intent." Teachers who view problem behaviour as an intrinsic student characteristic ascribe to a 'deficit model' of student potential, and because they can then 'blame' the individual, feel less responsibility for attempting to motivate these students or modify their behaviour.

Watkins et al. (2007) found that teachers who did not attribute difficult behaviour solely to innate qualities of the students (nature) or to family circumstances tended to view problem behaviour as 'malleable' and were thus more likely to take a purposeful and proactive stance towards preventing potential difficulties. Schools and teachers with these beliefs placed a high focus on talking to students, improving social relations among students and scaffolding students to resolve their own conflicts. In these schools, teachers regarded social 'mediation' or 'facilitation' as an integral and major part of their role. Not only was there greater harmony in these schools, but student attendance and academic performance also improved.

Other researchers have investigated the impact of teacher beliefs on teaching practices and on the kind of classroom climate that teacher beliefs and corresponding teaching behaviours generate. Leroy et al. (2007) examined how teachers' implicit theories about intelligence affected their self-efficacy and the extent to which their classrooms supported student learning and autonomy. This study, involving 336 fifth-grade teachers in France, found that teachers who believed that intelligence is 'incremental', that is, a capacity that can be modified and improved with effort and perseverance (Dweck 1999) had high self-efficacy and believed in their potential to help students make progress. These teachers created classrooms which focussed on satisfying students' needs for competence, autonomy and relatedness by scaffolding group and independent learning and fostering student–student and student–teacher relationships. On the other hand, teachers who believed intelligence to be an immutable trait, that is, an 'entity', had lower self-efficacy and tended to be more directive and controlling.

The 'entity versus incremental' theories of Dweck (1999) can be likened to the nature–nurture debate that also describes human functioning in terms of 'fixed' or

'malleable' qualities. Teachers who believe that human 'nature' is determined at birth by genetic predispositions tend to undervalue the role that they can play in building resilience in students at risk of learning and behaviour difficulties (Oswald et al. 2003). Congruent with the results reported above, Oswald et al. found that a 'deterministic' view of human potential was associated with lower levels of teacher self-efficacy. These feelings of inadequacy or ineffectiveness lead teachers to adopt student-controlling and teacher-directed practices. In contrast, teachers who believe that factors external to an individual, that is, a 'nurturing' environment, can be influential in contributing to human growth at all stages of development (i.e. not just in infancy), tend to adopt a more positive view of their efficacy in supporting students at risk. Oswald et al. (2003, p. 62) found that teachers who believed in their potential to 'make a difference' in students' lives were more inclined to employ 'humanistic counselling styles', such as listening to students' concerns and communicating caring, empathy and understanding. These authors concur with Nodding's (1988) and Osterman's (2010) view that schools which are caring, which have high expectations for student learning and behaviour, and which provide meaningful opportunities for student involvement and responsibility (i.e., are autonomy supportive) not only provide an optimal learning environment for all students but are also particularly effective in promoting resilience and motivation in children who have experienced adversity or who come from disadvantaged backgrounds.

While many teachers may not be aware of the so-called nature/nurture controversy, teachers nonetheless will be situated at some point along this apparently dichotomous continuum. As such, their conscious or unconscious positioning will inevitably influence their beliefs about the potential of a student to succeed at school and about their own efficacy to support a student's learning and particularly to effect changes in students from disadvantaged backgrounds or those with chronic behaviour difficulties. For example, teachers who are situated towards the 'nature' end of the continuum would be more likely to consider that, to a large extent, a person's character or constitution is fixed at birth. Such teachers would either consciously or unconsciously regard a child as having a tendency to be either a 'good' or 'bad' individual. On the other hand, research in the neurosciences supports the idea that "there is no such thing as a bad child, only children with bad problems." (Gartrell 2004, p. 131).

Gartrell (2004) deplores the use of the term 'misbehaviour' because it invites 'moral labelling' of children as 'naughty', 'aggressive', 'selfish', etc. and "… implies wilful wrongdoing for which a child must be punished" (p. 8). Instead, Gartrell proffers the term 'mistaken behaviour' which implies that a child's 'failure' to act in socially acceptable ways may not be intentional but may represent the child's best efforts, given their life experiences and levels of social-emotional and cognitive development. In this case, the teacher's role is clearly to support children's 'learning' and, as all good educators should, help the students to 'correct their mistakes' by providing constructive feedback, guidance and additional scaffolding of the necessary skills:

> By considering behaviours as mistaken, the teacher is freed from the impediment of moral judgement about the child and empowered instead to mediate, problem-solve and guide. (Gartrell 2004, p. 10)

Once again, the theories underlying possible causes of behavioural problems in the classroom overwhelmingly endorse the adoption of supportive and non-judgemental teacher responses. It seems however that teacher practice is lagging behind the theory and research evidence, and teachers appear to be somewhat resistant to believing that it is within their power, or even within their responsibility, to attempt to engage the disengaged or re-shape entrenched problem behaviour (Osterman 2010).

Like Osterman (2010), McAuliffe et al. (2009) have also provided evidence showing that the way teachers relate and respond to students with aggressive behaviour influences whether these students are liked or disliked by their peers. These authors suggest that changing teacher attributions about the causes of student 'misbehaviour', and decreasing teachers' use of overt corrective or punitive responses towards students with aggressive or difficult behaviours, are important avenues by which peer dislike and social rejection can be reduced:

> If teachers could learn to think in more compassionate ways about their 'problem students', they might be more amenable to using corrective techniques that would support more positive peer relations for these children. (McAuliffe et al. 2009)

The next section examines the way in which values pedagogy almost coincidentally creates an environment which forces teachers to examine their often unconscious 'implicit theories' about the nature of human potential, that is, whether they ascribe to a deterministic view (nature/entity theory) or whether they hold a more positivist view (nurture/incremental theory). The classroom dynamic and school ethos which results when values are given prominence in the curriculum is antithetical to punitive and autocratic practices and compels teachers to question deterministic views and review their teaching practices. The evidence emerging from the Australian Values Education Program suggests that the explicit and implicit nature of the Australian whole-school approach to values education is incompatible with didactic and student-controlling pedagogies and impels teachers to employ more democratic classroom practices, foster relationships with and among students and scaffold student agency and autonomy.

Australian Values Education Program

As described in Chap. 1, the second phase of the *Values Education Good Practice Schools Project* involved 25 clusters of schools, representing the seven states and territories which were funded to implement or extend values education in partnership with their local school communities in ways that were custom-made to address each cluster's unique context. Despite the variability in the values that were targeted and the ways they were taught across the clusters, there was consistency in the characteristics that defined the most effective "values focussed pedagogies". In conjunction with the establishment and consistent school-wide use of a shared values language, was the employment of a curriculum that was student centred and open ended, and reflected the values the schools aimed to teach (DEEWR 2008, pp. 24, 26). Students were engaged in discussions about the meaning of the values and

reflections on the ways in which the values were evident (or not) in their own and others' behaviour. This exposure to the language of values allied with opportunities to practise values and reflect on their meaning fosters emotional literacy which, in turn, promotes empathic and pro-social behaviour:

> By having a metalanguage with which to discuss values, students were able to openly talk about their feelings, resolve quarrels and incidents of bullying, and explore issues of feeling isolated and how to make friends. It empowered them to participate in discussions that effectively became vehicles for examining their own and others' values. All of this in turn intensified the students' understanding and sense of responsibility so that they could take actions for the environment, be fair to others [and] empathise with people in need. (DEEWR 2008, p. 25)

As is evident in the last sentence in the preceding quote, application of the values to improve environmental or broader community issues is also a common feature of effective values pedagogy. In order to help students generalize and extend their understanding of values, teachers often introduced service learning projects so that students had opportunities to enact the values, either in the broader school context or in the local community. Not only does service learning motivate and engage students but, as noted by Crawford (2010) and Holdsworth (2010), linking students' learning to critical and contextually relevant 'real-world' issues empowers students to be agents of change and situates them as informed and active citizens.

Service learning in the form of a landscape gardening project was conducted in the Airds-Bradbury cluster. This project included students with emotional disturbances or intellectual disability and involved the application of higher order numeracy concepts—such as planning, measuring and design, calculating quantities and pricing—to the purchase and installation of turf and paving materials (DEEWR 2008, p. 55). Teachers reported that the landscape project resulted in reduction in suspensions and disciplinary actions for these students, as well as an increase in their engagement in other classes. The cluster coordinator highlighted the benefits from this and other service learning projects as follows:

> Student-focused cluster activities expand students' perceptions of the world outside their homogenous, (sometimes) parochial environment, develop self-confidence, provide different avenues for self-expression, widen their life experiences, provide leadership opportunities, and provide exposure to and opportunity to demonstrate, the full range of values in the National Framework. (DEEWR 2008, p. 56)

Student Action Teams (SAT) were another important scaffold for researching and taking action about values-laden issues within or beyond the school. The Darebin cluster in Victoria employed a SAT approach in order to engage and empower the significant number of children in these schools who were from minority cultural groups. The student teams were engaged in collaborative projects investigating the demonstration of values in their respective schools. The results of the students' research projects were presented at combined school forums through a range of media including art works, drama, written representations and verbal presentations. Echoing the sentiments of the cluster coordinator above, the teachers in the Darebin cluster reported high levels of student engagement in these authentic and student-directed activities with student competence, confidence and maturity cited as sig-

nificant learning outcomes (DEEWR 2008, p. 109). Consistent with the findings of Osterman (2010), reported earlier in this chapter, the importance of teachers relinquishing control and 'trusting' students to be capable and responsible learners was highlighted in the final cluster report:

> Values are inherent in the SAT approach—values such as trusting students, doing respectful things, being socially useful, making an important difference to one's community, being a responsible leader, engendering inclusion and teamwork. Moreover, enabling students to question and envision the sort of community in which they want to live is not only in itself a values journey, but the deeper, implicit intention to empower students to undertake such a task, in the first place, is pre-eminently a value statement—a commitment to valuing students as important members of our community. (DEEWR 2008, p. 27)

Implicit in both the service learning and SAT forms of values pedagogy is the notion of democratic classrooms. When teachers engage students in choosing and planning the kinds of learning that will occur, and when teachers relinquish some of the responsibility for executing the learning processes and evaluating their outcomes, then they are not only conveying a message of trust to the students and a belief in the students' integrity and autonomy, but they are also meeting the need for power and freedom, thus strengthening the students' self-efficacy and sense of competency.

Student agency and empowerment were also strong themes in the Manningham cluster case study in Victoria, which employed a range of SAT projects aimed at developing students' resilience, self-confidence and leadership skills through the enactment of values in meaningful service to the community. The research evidence also reinforces the positive effects that ensue from engaging in pro-social behaviours oriented towards the welfare of others. Johnson and Johnson (2010, p. 838) describe a number of studies reporting enduring elevations in self-esteem and moral identity that resulted from even single acts of kindness and generosity. The cumulative, ongoing and transformational benefits that accrued from service-oriented and student-directed learning were emphasized in the key messages from the Manningham cluster:

> When student action teams articulate an issue and a purpose for learning, the skills, expertise and knowledge that the students need to address that issue are actively embraced. This form of lifelong learning is transformational as students become managers and leaders of their own learning. (DEEWR 2008, p. 116)

The transformational effect of values pedagogy was also commonly mentioned in the case study reports. The key messages from the Airds-Bradbury and the Toowoomba North clusters identified that both teachers and students were affected by these transformations and the impact was particularly evident in improved relationships between teachers and students. The teachers in both of these clusters credited the values-based curriculum as being the catalyst for these improved relationships because it led teachers to adopt more democratic classroom practices and to provide both *academic* and *personal* support (Osterman 2010) to their students. *Academic* support was prominent at the Airds-Bradbury cluster, where the requirement to give disenfranchised students opportunities to practise and implement values prompted teachers to devise more meaningful and student-directed 'real-world' learning experiences:

> Teachers report transformed relationships with their students due to delivering values-based curriculum that engages students, links to their lived experiences and gives them more responsibility for their learning. This transformation is manifested as happier students who are cooperative and aware of themselves and others. (DEEWR 2008, p. 53)

At the Toowoomba North cluster, the values pedagogy promoted more *personal* support from teachers as they endeavoured to model and embody the values they were teaching the students:

> When values approaches drive pedagogy, teachers concentrate in the first instance on establishing positive and respectful relationships with their students. This transforms the teacher and the learner and contributes to more confident, trusting and caring relationships. (DEEWR 2008, p. 79)

The integral link between values education and improvements in pedagogy and student behaviour was prominent across all the sites. This is not to say that every teacher made changes to their teaching practice or that every school reported improved student behaviour. In fact, the case study reports often identified that not all teachers embraced values education or adhered to its principles and practices. It was often this contrast between those who were implementing values education and those who were not that alerted schools to the positive effects of the programme. At the Toowoomba North cluster, a pedagogical framework consisting of a shared vision (underpinned by explicit values) and a whole-school approach was adopted by the three schools. The University Advisor connected to this cluster noted the effects of the differential uptake and implementation of the values pedagogy:

> A December 2007 teacher survey indicated that not all teachers were making the link between what is in their planning document and their pedagogy. It was suggested that a teacher may include values in their planning, and in their lessons—but if they don't see the significance of this, then the students pick up the message that this is not important. It was also observed (within the school) that where teachers were seeing the importance of establishing relationships and of respecting their students—this was reflected in the behaviour of their students.
>
> In general, the teachers who were not embracing the values of 'relationships' and 'respect' were experiencing the most difficulty with their students' behaviour. Where teachers are embracing values education as something that is important and to be embedded in practice—their pedagogy is enhanced. Where teachers perceive that the problem lies with the students (a deficit approach), the quality of teaching does not improve. This was a crucial insight. (DEEWR 2008, p. 81–82)

This reflection goes to the heart of what it takes to 'transform' teachers and students. It is only when teachers see that their actions and efforts are making an impact on hard-to-reach students that they become 'reinvigorated' to address the needs of these students. As Glasser (1998) found, it is often difficult to convince teachers that students' problem behaviours can be rectified by changing the social structure of the classroom. When teachers believe that the problems are inherent in the student, then they see that interventions should be directed to, or at, the students. This kind of teacher perception has been described as an 'external locus of control' (Gibson and Dembo 1984). This means that when faced with teaching difficult and unmotivated students, teachers believe that their efforts will be undermined by forces *external* to themselves, such as the students' home and family influences, peers, the local

community culture or the media (Milson 2003). This mindset has a negative effect on teacher attitude and self-efficacy because teachers feel that there is little they can do to overcome what they regard as insurmountable barriers which are beyond their control.

As the quote above indicates, not *all* teachers involved in the *Values Education Good Practice Schools Project* changed their teaching practice or their 'deficit' view of student potential. There was evidence from other clusters showing that teacher beliefs and attitudes about chronically intransigent students *did* change when teachers adopted the values pedagogy. The Airds-Bradbury cluster of one secondary and four primary schools had a diverse student population representing 56 different cultural groups. This cluster focussed its project on building social cohesion within the schools and among their communities, and improving the engagement and 'social capital' of particularly marginalized student groups, including Aboriginal and Pacific Islander students and students with disabilities. Teachers engaged in professional learning activities aimed at raising awareness of key issues in the lives of the students, as well as exploring and adopting pedagogies and assessment practices specifically targetting the needs of these groups. Through this professional learning, teachers developed a greater understanding and a more positive view of these students and this led to new insights and optimism about ways in which the students could be supported. The University Advisor noted the change in teacher perceptions:

> The values project resulted in greater staff awareness of the issues faced by many Indigenous and Islander students and their families. The principal of one school commented that staff are 'seeing students differently, and are developing different relationships with students and families'. This principal believed that the project brought to the fore the social disadvantages faced by many Aboriginal and islander students and highlighted the importance of focusing on positive behaviours, inclusion and respect. Many staff are moving away from a deficit view of Indigenous and Islander families, where they are seen as a problem, to more of a strength-based view focused on [knowledge] and potentials. Teachers across the cluster schools are now generally more supportive of Indigenous and Islander students and are working on ways to effectively support these students. (DEEWR 2008, p. 54)

This reflection indicates the power of values pedagogy in shifting teachers' negative perceptions of disadvantaged and disengaged students. As noted by Osterman (2010), when teachers are confronted with a disengaged or hostile student, their typical response is to limit contact with the student or to become caught up in judgemental and coercive interactions. After the introduction of values education, rather than regarding the marginalized students as constituting a homogenous 'problem group', the teachers came to know the students as individuals through a greater understanding of their background and culture and the issues they confront in their daily lives. This shift, along with the requirement to embed values in the curriculum, motivated teachers to become more creative and pro-active in designing relevant, engaging and collaborative learning experiences that provided opportunities for the students to demonstrate values such as responsibility, integrity and tolerance. As the students responded favourably to this new kind of learning, the teachers not only gained greater respect for the students, but also felt more satisfied and effective in their teaching role.

The way in which the values pedagogy changes teachers' perceptions, not only of student potential but also of their own efficacy, was evident in one teacher's case writing about her long and previously unproductive struggle working with an at-risk student, 'Jane'. This teacher acknowledged that before values education was introduced in her school, she and other teachers were resistant to the idea that they could make a difference through teaching values, believing that this aspect of development was the parents' responsibility and should have been accomplished before the child started school. The teacher was surprised however to see positive changes occurring in Jane's attitude to school, her relationships with peers and her academic performance, and attributed these changes to a range of features emanating from the whole-school endorsement of values education. These features included: teachers getting to know the students better; the explicit, formal and informal teaching of values; and consistency in the way student behaviour was managed. As in the previous example, the teacher identified a shift in her belief about the degree of influence that schools and teachers can have in improving the learning outcomes and lives of children with difficult home circumstances or problematic behaviour:

> Jane's story clearly shows that what happens at school does have implications for other arenas of a child's life. There is no reason to think otherwise. We are quick to blame bad or good behaviour on home influences but consequences flow in both directions (good and bad) and making a positive difference for a child at school can be helpful in how they manage at home. (DEEWR 2008, p. 39)

In the case above, the change in teacher practice preceded the change in teacher beliefs. The 'hidden power' of values pedagogy, it seems, is that teachers do not need to believe in it to make it work. School-wide changes in teacher practice, even when implemented on 'shaky' beliefs appear to generate a momentum of their own that trigger changes in student behaviour and attitude which, in turn, cause teachers to question their prior convictions or implicit theories. In the case of Jane, the teacher reveals that the implementation of values education has given her a new insight, that is, that early disadvantage and disengagement from school need not be regarded as fixed or life-defining elements. This insight, prompted by the positive changes in the student's behaviour, brought both confirmation of the teachers' professional persona and new hope:

> Most importantly, I was reminded that, as a teacher, I can make a difference and that is rather affirming. (DEEWR 2008, p. 39)

These examples show how improved student–teacher relationships and observable changes in student behaviour increase teacher self-efficacy by moving teachers from an external to an internal locus of control (Gibson and Dembo 1984). Teachers often exhibit an external locus of control when they feel that the obstacles affecting a student's learning are too great for the teacher to overcome. This makes teachers feel powerless and they tend to disengage from the student and 'give-up' trying to teach them. Teachers exhibit an internal locus of control when they have confidence in their abilities to overcome the external influences that compromise student performance and wellbeing (Milson 2003). Researchers have shown that teachers' sense of efficacy affects their effort and enthusiasm, planning and orga-

nization, willingness to experiment with new methods, persistence in the face of obstacles, and resilience with a student who is struggling (Tschannen-Moran et al. 1998; Tschannen-Moran and Hoy 2001). By being able to 'reach' and 'reconnect' with disengaged students, teachers confirm their own importance as an influential agent in these students' lives. Thus, another important dynamic in values pedagogy is the legacy of teachers feeling an increased sense of confidence and competency which, in turn, engenders a renewed enthusiasm for their profession.

One of the key messages that came from the Toowoomba North cluster encapsulated this 'transformational' phenomenon:

> Values education acts as a change agent for teachers who feel disengaged as they can experience a renewed appreciation of the power of positive relationships. As one teacher reflected, 'Values education has resurrected my belief in why I am a teacher, the importance of being a teacher and the importance of being a good teacher.' (DEEWR 2008, p. 79)

Affirming or restoring teachers' beliefs that they can have an important influence in their students' lives is not only therapeutic for teachers but is also of crucial significance for those students who are most likely to make teachers feel inadequate or inconsequential. Research on resilience has identified that schools play an important role as an 'external protective mechanism' that can serve to counteract the potentially negative effects of deleterious home circumstances by helping to shape children's behaviour and beliefs about themselves. According to Oswald et al. (2003), "Teachers are well placed through their daily contact with children to act as influential figures and 'significant others' in children's lives and to especially help those children who find life's circumstances to be stressful and a threat to their well-being." (p. 62). Oswald et al. also note, however, that teachers typically undervalue the degree of influence and help that they are potentially able to exercise in supporting students at risk. The teacher above identifies that values education can 'resurrect' this self-belief.

Conflict Resolution and Bullying

This chapter has focussed on the theory and research evidence regarding teacher approaches towards behaviour management and how these may be influenced by teacher beliefs about student potential and the teacher's own feelings of self-efficacy. It has been argued that values pedagogy 'shifts' teacher practice through its requirement to explicitly teach and scaffold students' acquisition of values.

Using data from the 'Testing and Measuring' project (Lovat et al. 2009), the last section of this chapter explores the ways in which the school-wide implementation of values pedagogy resulted in teachers adopting a more proactive and constructive approach towards student 'misbehaviour' and in students being empowered to resolve their own conflicts. Although the issue of 'bullying' was not specifically addressed in this project, the social dynamics that values education promotes appear to be in accord with recent research on bullying prevention and intervention programmes.

In the 'Testing and Measuring' project, the effects of the values education intervention were tested by comparing teacher ratings of student behaviour, as well as teachers' self-ratings of their beliefs and practices, before and after the programme. The pre-post comparisons of teacher perceptions of student behaviour showed statistically significant improvements across the three aspects measured, that is, *Student engagement* ($t=-3.89$, $p<0.05$), *Responsible behaviour* ($t=-2.15$, $p<0.05$) and *Inclusive behaviour* ($t=-2.313$, $p<0.05$) (Lovat et al. 2009). Although the quantitative analysis of teacher self-ratings suggested there had been no significant change in their practices ($t=0.02$, $p>0.05$) or beliefs ($t=0.65$, $p>0.05$), the majority of teachers (80%) felt that teaching values had encouraged them to *reflect more* on their teaching practice. The teacher comments to the open-ended questions in the post-survey identified that the insights gained from this self-review often altered the way teachers interacted with their students. For some, this meant being more receptive to the students' points of view, being "more aware of listening to students" and "allowing time for two-way communication." Teachers also mentioned that they were more conscious of being role models for children and made greater efforts to demonstrate the values in their teaching practice and in everyday interactions and to model the kinds of behaviour they expected from their students:

> I try to model the values that I would like the students to have and use them in most teaching and learning situations.
> It (teaching values) does make me stop and think when I say/do something
> I have noticed that some staff relate to children in their class with more warmth and genuine care now. I think generally we are all trying to model the core values of the school in front of students. (Lovat et al. 2009, p. 53)

A number of comments also indicated that values education had either re-affirmed long-held beliefs or helped teachers come to new realizations about the importance of their role in nurturing and supporting students, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds:

> Reinforced to me how much these children thrive on feeling loved and cared about—it is my responsibility to make sure this happens in my role as a teacher.
> I am more aware of what some children need—as values are often absent in some households—it's now my job. (Lovat et al. 2009, p. 61)

As discussed previously, values pedagogy appears to help teachers re-appraise the way they treat students and the way they view their role as an educator. As part of the explicit teaching approach, each value was discussed at school assemblies and in class and students were encouraged to describe ways of enacting the values and to record or report instances when they had shown or seen a particular value. In addition, teachers looked for opportunities to 'notice' when values were being demonstrated:

> Teaching values gives a constant reminder to teachers to keep reinforcing appropriate behaviour in a positive manner. (Lovat et al. 2009, p. 55)

This positive attention may have been by teacher comment or by public acknowledgement and celebration through the presentation of 'values awards' at assemblies. Clear expectations about behaviour and positive reinforcement not only encouraged

appropriate behaviour but also helped students understand how they should treat each other and equipped all students with a shared language to resolve their own conflicts:

> Values 'statements' assist the children to try and solve minor problems/disputes. Values education gives all students a practical framework to follow, which is also in line with our student welfare policy. The playground is a calmer place to be.
> Less conflict with children often sorting out their own problems rather than "telling tales" or "whingeing" to the teacher on duty. (Dally 2010, p. 514)

A noticeable change was also evident in teachers' reactions towards students with recalcitrant problematic behaviour. Some teachers appeared to have adopted a more constructive and compassionate approach and reported that they now used the 'language' of values in dialogue with students as a reflection point for students to consider how they could act in accordance with the school's values. Rather than blaming students for poor behaviour, teachers were using instances of inappropriate behaviour or student–student conflict as 'real-life' problem-solving opportunities to help students think about their behaviour and its consequences in terms of values:

> Values education has given staff a common vocabulary to use with all students. Interactions can all begin positively by acknowledging values followed rather than focusing on the negative.
> Values education is a solid foundation on which to base problem-solving in the classroom. This is very evident in my classroom when we discuss issues/problems the children are experiencing with each other. (Dally 2010, p. 514)

Not only did these reflective and meaningful dialogues assist students to resolve independently minor conflicts and gain a deeper understanding of themselves and the perspectives of their peers, they also helped teachers interpret 'misbehaviour' as 'mistaken' behaviour (Gartrell 2004) and thus renewed teachers' efforts to scaffold students who were having difficulties *learning* the values that were being *taught*. The combined effects of the explicit teaching of values, student input and involvement in the learning activities, clear expectations about classroom behaviour and the acquisition of a common values language which could be used to resolve disputes, led to a greater sense of 'connection' and 'belonging.'

> Classroom Y chart is set by children and based on our values program. It has set a standard to be followed and can be referred to. Values education has united the class in how we 'are' as a class and as a school. (Dally 2010, p. 514).

As described in Dally (2010), this improvement in school cohesiveness was often attributed to the whole-school approach and the greater consistency in teacher responses to both appropriate and inappropriate student behaviour.

> Numerous changes were evident in the playground where students were observed to be "more settled", "talking before fighting", "playing sensibly together", "more caring", and "more considerate of each other" with such improvements resulting in a "calmer" environment with less conflict and with a reduction in the number of referrals to the planning room…. Both teachers and students indicated that students were making efforts to be inclusive and supportive of each other and that if playground disputes did arise students were using the language of values to redirect the transgressor's behaviour. (p. 516)

Parents also commented on improvements in playground behaviour and emphasized the importance of students taking the initiative to resolve their own disputes, particularly in instances of bullying:

> He and other friends are no longer being bullied by a peer during breaks. The teacher supported a resolution to the issue. The boys seem more confident in working through situations with the student who was instigating the situations. (Lovat et al. 2009, p. 50)

These findings suggest that the values programme resulted in a receptive and facilitative school environment in which appropriate actions were generally reciprocated, but also where inappropriate actions could be shaped by peer or teacher scaffolding based on values. A socially supportive school environment in which the expectations for student behaviour are clear, where staff model appropriate behaviour and where all members of the school community treat each other with respect is precisely the kind of environment that is needed to minimize or address bullying problems. A review of school-based interventions designed to prevent bullying, recently concluded:

> In order to successfully address bullying problems, the whole school must comprise a culture of respect. Expectations for how staff and students treat one another should be clearly reflected in school policies, and the rules for classroom interaction should be consistently modeled by adults and reinforced in all school settings. (CASEL 2009, p. 6)

Moreover, Pornari and Wood (2010) emphasize the importance of teacher scaffolding in helping 'dysfunctional' students realize the nature of harmful behaviour and its negative effects on others. These authors exhort teachers to enhance children's empathy by developing their 'moral emotions', such as pride for behaving prosocially, in much the same way that 'values awards' reinforce children's expression of values-related behaviour. Finally, Kilian et al. (2010) describe how values have a motivational power, not only to incite students to behave empathically but also to engage in more productive academic learning, because values provide students with aspirational principles that influence choice and behaviour.

Conclusion

For the past 30 years, educators have typically regarded student misbehaviour and student academic achievement as two separate issues, with each presumed to require different educational approaches. Psycho-educationists, such as Glasser, advocated that the best way to prevent or minimize behaviour problems was through the establishment of democratic classrooms which provide opportunities for student input and decision making and which encourage student-directed learning through teacher scaffolded and socially meaningful, collaborative activities. Such classrooms address students' needs for belonging, power, freedom and fun, needs which are often magnified in the lives of disadvantaged, disengaged or marginalised students. At the same time, quality teaching and school effectiveness research were exploring ways in which to maximize learning outcomes for all students. This line

of research also identified that optimal learning occurs in schools which implement a holistic approach to student learning. The most effective schools are found to be those that aim to develop student understanding and enactment of values while at the same time, providing a supportive environment in which the values are modelled and reciprocated. In other words, values pedagogy has been shown to serve to unite the two parallel lines of investigation around optimal learning and best behaviour. Furthermore, what is best for disadvantaged students also appears to be best for the advantaged.

Teachers often feel compelled to adopt controlling and autocratic classroom practices in their well-intentioned efforts to provide learning activities directed at sustaining high academic outcomes. Not only are these teaching practices disempowering for students at-risk of school failure but, as will be discussed in the next chapter, such practices have also proven to be less effective in enhancing academic standards than holistic practices that aim to address students' social, emotional and cognitive development. In democratic classrooms, student input is invited and opportunities for cooperative learning are provided. As the teacher relinquishes control over the learning outcomes and activities, the students are empowered to take more responsibility for their own learning. Similarly, as the teacher scaffolds student acquisition of values as well as the language, understanding and self-awareness needed for resolving conflict, students also assume greater responsibility for regulating their own behaviour and for addressing conflict with peers, no longer relying on teacher authority and teacher judgement to determine what is 'right' and 'wrong'. What is most powerful about values pedagogy, according to the evidence, is that the implementation of a school-wide approach acts as a catalyst that consistently impels transformations in teacher practice with consequent improvements in student behaviour, including academic diligence.

When small changes in teacher practice and student behaviour are replicated across the whole-school community, it produces the kind of caring, trusting and respectful school ambience that is most effective for optimizing the social and academic potential of both engaged and disengaged students. Thus, through establishing socially harmonious and academically supportive learning environments, values pedagogy has created a confluence between the previously divergent streams of 'quality teaching' and 'special education'. The research evidence from both streams is now convergent. The challenge that remains is for schools and teachers to 'get on board'.

References

Adler, A. (1927). *The practice of individual psychology.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.

Arthur-Kelly, M., Lyons, G., Butterfield, N., & Gordon, C. (2007). *Classroom management: Creating positive learning environments* (2nd ed.). Melbourne: Thomson.

Benninga, J. S., Berkowitz, M. W., Kuehn, P., & Smith, K. (2003). The relationship of character education implementation and academic achievement in elementary schools. *Journal of Research in Character Education, 1,* 19–31.

Brew, C., & Beatty, B. (2010). Valuing social and emotional connectedness among learners at all levels. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 675–702). Dordrecht: Springer.

CASEL (Centre for the Advancement of Social and Emotional Learning). (2009). Social and emotional learning and bullying prevention. http://casel.org/publications/sel-and-bullying-prevention/. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Cohen, J., & Sandy, S. V. (2007). The social, emotional and academic education of children: Theories, goals, methods and assessments. In J. G. Reuven, M. Elias, & M. J. Elias (Eds.), *Educating people to be emotionally literate* (pp. 63–77). Westport: Praeger.

Crawford, K. (2010). Active citizenship education and critical pedagogy. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 811–824). Dordrecht: Springer.

Dally, K. (2010). A teacher's duty: An examination of the short-term impact of values education on Australian primary school teachers and students. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 503–520). Dordrecht: Springer.

Davis, H. A. (2006). Exploring the contexts of relationship quality between middle school students and teachers. *The Elementary School Journal, 106,* 193–223.

DEEWR. (2008). At the heart of what we do: Values education at the centre of schooling. Report of the Values Education Good Practice Schools Project—Stage 2. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/VEGPSP-2_final_3_execsummary.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Deutsch, M. (1962). Cooperation and trust: Some theoretical notes. In M. Jones (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation* (pp. 275–319). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Dreikurs, R., Grunwald, B., & Pepper, F. (1998). *Maintaining sanity in the classroom: Classroom management techniques* (2nd ed.). Washington: Taylor and Francis.

Dweck, C. S. (1999). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development.* Philadelphia: Taylor and Francis.

Elias, M. J., Parker, S. J., Kash, V. M., & Dunkeblau, E. (2007). Social-emotional learning and character and moral education in children: Synergy or fundamental divergence in our schools? *Journal of Research in Character Education, 5,* 167–181.

Gartrell, D. (2004). *The power of guidance: Teaching social-emotional skills in early childhood classrooms.* Washington: Thomson: Delmar Learning.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76,* 569–582.

Glasser, W. (1969). *Schools without failure.* New York: Harper & Row.

Glasser, W. (1990). *Choice theory in the classroom.* New York: Harper & Row.

Glasser, W. (1998). *Choice theory: A new psychology of personal freedom.* New York: Harper & Row.

Holdsworth, R. (2010). Students leading in investigating and enacting values in school communities. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 849–866). Dordrecht: Springer.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2010). The impact of social interdependence on values education and student wellbeing. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 825–848). Dordrecht: Springer.

Kilian, B., Hofer, M., Fries, S., & Kuhnle, C. (2010). The conflict between on-task and off-task actions in the classroom and its consequences for motivation and achievement. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 25,* 67–85.

Leroy, N., Bressoux, P., Sarrazin, P., & Trouilloud, D. (2007). Impact of teachers' implicit theories and perceived pressures on the establishment of an autonomy supportive climate. *European Journal of Education, xxii,* 529–545.

Lewis, J. L., & Kim, E. (2008). A desire to learn: African American children's positive attitudes toward learning within school cultures of low expectations. *Teachers College Record, 110,* 1304–1329.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Dally, K., & Clement, N. (2009). Project to test and measure the impact of values education on student effects and school ambience. Final Report for the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) by The University of Newcastle. Canberra: DEEWR. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Project_to_Test_and_Measure_the_Impact_of_Values_Education.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

McAuliffe, M. D., Hubbard, J. A., & Romano, L. J. (2009). The role of teacher cognition and behaviour in children's peer relations. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 37,* 665–677.

Milson, A. J. (2003). Teachers sense of efficacy for the formation of students' character. *Journal of Research in Character Education, 1,* 89–106.

Narvaez, D. (2010). Building a sustaining classroom climate for purposeful ethical citizenship. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 659–673). Dordrecht: Springer.

Noddings, N. (1988). An ethic of caring and its implications for instructional arrangements. *American Journal of Education, 96,* 215–230.

Opdenakker, M.-C., & van Damme, J. (2000). Effects of schools, teaching staff and classes on achievement and well-being in secondary education: Similarities and differences between school outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 11,* 165–196.

Osterman, K. F. (2010). Teacher practice and students' sense of belonging. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 239–260). Dordrecht: Springer.

Oswald, M., Johnson, B., & Howard, S. (2003). Quantifying and evaluating resilience-promoting factors: Teachers' beliefs and perceived roles. *Research in Education, 70,* 50–64.

Pornari, C. D., & Wood, J. (2010). Peer and cyber aggression in secondary school students: The role of moral disengagement, hostile attribution bias, and outcome expectancies. *Aggressive Behaviour, 36,* 81–94.

Reeve, J., & Jang, H. (2006). What teachers say and do to support students' autonomy during a learning activity. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 98,* 209–218.

Ryan, A. M., & Patrick, H. (2001). The classroom social environment and changes in adolescents' motivation and engagement during middle school. *American Educational Research Journal, 38,* 437–460.

Sherblom, S. A., Marshall, J. C., & Sherblom, J. C. (2006). The relationship between school climate and math and reading achievement. *Journal of Research in Character Education, 4,* 19–31.

Staples, A., Devine, C., & Chapman, J. (2010). Education and diversity: Values education and cross-cultural learning through Socratic dialogue and the visual arts. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 765–777). Dordrecht: Springer.

Tschannen-Moran, M, & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17,* 783–805.

Tschannen-Moran, M, Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(2), 202–248.

Watkins, C., Mauthner, M., Hewitt, R., Epstein, D., & Leonard, D. (2007). School violence, school differences and school discourses. *British Educational Research Journal, 33,* 61–74.

Chapter 9
Values Pedagogy and Academic Diligence

The Bold Claims of Values Pedagogy

A persistent theme to be found in values pedagogical research worldwide is in the potential for enhanced learning on the part of students to result, brought about it seems largely through a combination of more settled learning environments, more positive teacher–student and student–student relationships, enhanced self-esteem and a greater sense of citizenship, this latter especially when forms of service learning or other social engagement strategies are explicitly incorporated. Claims around enhanced learning, intellectual achievement or, as we have tended to describe it, academic diligence, are without doubt the boldest claims to be made about the effects of values pedagogy. Could this often-purported 'oppositional' thesis (e.g. there's more to learning than academic success) actually be the holy grail of academic success? Could it be that values pedagogy actually nurtures academic success in ways that seemingly more predictable and explicitly academically focussed pedagogies (e.g. mastery learning, testing regimes, etc.) persistently fail to nurture, especially with those clients less naturally or environmentally disposed to learning? Could it possibly be that academic success happens best for these clients when it is not the primary focus of their learning? Is academic success (like happiness itself) something that happens when you stop focussing on it and get everything else right?

If the answers to the above questions were to be even a tentative 'yes', then what do we say about the ways in which schools and the policies and practices that surround them, their syllabi, curricula and testing regimes, are structured? Could it be that the main reason that there seems to be such an element of surprise, if not downright denial about (not just the claims but, by now) the seemingly demonstrable effects of values pedagogy around students' improvement in academic work is that they are so threatening to educational establishments and the politics that sit behind them? What would we do with our expensive educational apparatus if we had to admit that Carnegie was right, that it fundamentally had failed in its main mission in a democracy, namely to equip an entire citizenship with the means to compete fairly in that democracy? What would our politicians be left with to say if it was

T. Lovat et al., *Values Pedagogy and Student Achievement,*
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-1563-9_9, © Springer Science+Business Media, B.V. 2011

admitted that 'tightening standards', 'toughening up curricula', 'increasing testing frequency' and then throwing schools into competition with each other around these phenomena was actually all a tragic misreading of the reality, doomed to make everything worse, especially for those clients for whom it needs to be so much better?

In short, there are many vested interests at stake that impel explaining away, talking down and outright denying the demonstrable claims being made about values pedagogy and its effects. The chorus of derision from all imaginable stakeholders that greeted the determinations of Carnegie was not idiosyncratic or accidental. There is much to be gained for politicians, bureaucrats, teachers and their unions in denying such truths and, other than for the brave, little to be gained. Grasping the truth of the central claim that academic success comes for many (and quite likely the majority) when the business of schooling is turned on its head and new priorities are forged poses a threat to systems that have become more than comfortable with the assumptions and practices that characterize them. The notion that we might have 'got it wrong' will inevitably be profoundly discomforting to those who marshal and rely on these systems, be they the politicians, bureaucrats, teachers, unions, or even those students and their parents who happen to be the lucky ones to do quite well in these systems.

We are at the point in this book where we need to carefully summon up our argument, especially around the impact of values pedagogy on academic success. Because of the high stakes implied by this claim, we need to be cautious while being bold, to define the limits while extolling the weight and virtues of the claim. What we are not saying is that we have 'proven' in some irrevocable way that values pedagogy and academic success are necessary and persistent companions, that all one has to do to transform non-achievers into achievers is to enact a values education programme. Nor are we saying that every innovation that might make use of the title 'values education' or one of its variants will work some magic around academic success or in fact work in this regard as well as another approach using the same language.

Indeed, the notion of 'proving' anything should be eschewed in favour of the notion of demonstrating, indicating or perhaps proffering. Some might of course see in this a weakness, that we are in fact not as bold or sure of ourselves as we claim. To which we say, show us then the proof that the apparatus of learning currently in place in our systems, the syllabi, curricula, testing regimes, etc. (the so-called *techne* of learning) entail academic success of all or even most of its clients. If there were such proof, why would the Carnegie Task Force have been assembled in the first place? Why would we have such persistent debate in so many countries when international test results are published? Why would we have had so many reviews and reports across so many provinces in the last few decades based on the central premise that our schools are failing to 'properly educate' such a substantial portion of their populations? If all that was needed was the *techne* of learning, we would have this education business 'sewn up'.

In fact, we claim there is less 'proof', in the sense of researched evidence, that supports the implicit assumptions and claims that sit behind the well worn *techne*

of learning to be able to properly educate whole populations than there is currently (and increasingly) available to support our claim that values pedagogy is "an indispensable artefact to any learning environment if student wellbeing, including academic success, is to be maximized." (Lovat et al. 2010, p. 31). In a word, so many of the educational phenomena we take for granted, in the sense that we assume there is some proof behind their effectiveness, are in fact devoid of such evidence. Again, this is the nub of the threat to systems, not just school systems and the politics sitting behind them, but indeed to those academic systems that have supported them, especially academic systems that have determined certain forms of teacher education, an issue we will take up in the next chapter.

So, what are we saying? We are saying, with Furco (2008) that it is not so much proof that a values approach to education necessarily and directly leads to academic success but that the conditions that result from such an approach are the conditions that research suggests are associated with academic success. Furco says of service learning, his particular form of values pedagogy:

> … service-learning impacts the mediating factors that help students do well academically; and the same case can be made for values education. (p. 30)

While seemingly a humble claim, again we say it is a more sustainable proposition than could be made about the *techne* of learning, *techne* that can be found in the best and the worst environments of learning, in those where academic success thrives and where it is sadly lacking. In other words, there must be more to it than the well worn *techne;* essential as they might be, they are not sufficient. On the other hand, it seems increasingly to be the case where the conditions associated with the learning environments that are persistently reported on in the context of research in and around values pedagogy, that is where one finds academic diligence and improvement occurring as routine items of the overall report.

In a word, it would seem that the updated research on values pedagogy at which we have laboured in this book has confirmed our earlier contentions that such pedagogy and 'quality teaching' (understood as that teaching that elicits the best forms of academic results) are 'bedfellows' or, as we put it at the time, are in a nexus relationship, forming a veritable 'double helix':

> Values education has potential to re-focus attention on the fundamental items of teaching, namely, the teacher her/himself, the quality of knowledge, content and pedagogy and, above all, the teacher's capacity to form the kinds of relationships which convey their commitment and care and which become the basis of forming personal character and tomorrow's citizenry.
>
> The innovative and possibly revolutionary thought contained in this proposition is that, in a sense, academic success becomes a by-product of a 'whole-person' approach to learning … instead of being the linear focus in learning that Carnegie implied had led too often to failure. (Lovat 2010, p. 31)

So, at this point, let us go back and summon up the evidence once again and present it as clearly and soberly as we can, before turning then to a number of practical propositions that seem to flow from it. We turn first to the Australian evidence, and then to its international equivalents.

Mining the Evidence in the Australian Programs

So, let us mine the evidence, firstly in the Australian programmes that sit at the heart of this book's intentions. In the first phase of VEGPSP (DEST 2006), much of the language of the testimony provided by teachers and university associates in the reports captured well the subtle yet hard truth of the assertion being made about the necessary link between values pedagogy and academic success. The intersection between matters relating to enhanced academic attainment and the depth of thinking that came from students being more settled and resilient in the more affirmative classroom climate created by values pedagogy was the single most common and repetitive theme in the entire report.

The report spoke richly of an array of learning features that were enhanced by the various values projects. These features included: quality teaching and pedagogy; holism in the approach to student development; quality relationships at all levels; values being both modelled and enunciated in the curriculum; enhanced intellectual depth in both teacher and student understanding; greater levels of student engagement in the mainstream curriculum; student willingness to become more involved in complex thinking across the curriculum; increased pedagogical approaches that match those espoused by quality teaching; greater student responsibility over local, national and international issues; greater student resilience and social skills; improved relationships of care and trust; measurable decline in the incidence of inappropriate behaviour; greater student awareness of the need to be tolerant of others, to accept responsibility for their own actions and their ability to communicate; improved students' sense of belonging, connectedness, resilience and sense of self; reflective change in the participant teachers and schools; provision of the opportunity to explore from within and reflect on identity and purpose; changed approaches to curriculum and pedagogy; enhanced students' ability to articulate feelings and emotions; impelling the emotional development of the students; evident transference in all aspects of classroom teaching and in the students' ability to deal with conflict in the playground; calmer and more cohesive classroom atmosphere; creation of a comfort zone for discussing emotions; improved levels of happiness for staff and students; developed higher order thinking skills; impelled restorative pedagogical practices; changed the ways teachers related with students; improved engagement and commitment of pupils, teachers and parents; valuing the need to create interpersonal intimacy and trust in the classroom; and, the 'ripple' or 'trickle-down' effect that values pedagogy had across the school.

Specific testimonial feedback that captured the central issue of a link between ambience, behaviour and academic improvement (DEST 2006) included:

> … the documented behaviour of students has improved significantly, evidenced in vastly reduced incidents and discipline reports and suspensions. The school is … a 'much better place to be'. Children are 'well behaved', demonstrate improved self-control, relate better to each other and, most significantly, share with teachers a common language of expectations … (p. 41)

> by creating an environment where these values (those that sat at the heart of the intervention) were constantly shaping classroom activity, student learning was improving, teachers and students were happier, and school was calmer. (p. 120)

> … has provided many benefits to the students as far as a coordinated curriculum and learning experiences that have offered a sense of belonging, connectedness, resilience and a sense of self. However, there has been none more significant than the reflective change that has occurred in the participant teachers and schools. (p. 185)

In the second phase (DEEWR 2008), the link between values pedagogy, the ambience it creates and the holistic impact on student behaviour and academic performance became even more stark. Stage 2 research also made much more clear the vital role that teacher modelling made in forging this link, as well as the degree to which the pedagogy was explicit in terms of infusing the discourse of the school, the mainstream curricula and even the physical appearance in terms of signage and other artefacts.

> … values-based schools live and breathe a values consciousness. They become schools where values are thought about, talked about, taught about, reflected upon and enacted across the whole school in all school activities. (p. 37)

> We observed that those teachers whose classrooms were characterised by an inclusive culture of caring and respect and where character development played an important and quite often explicit role in the daily learning of students were those same teachers who also demonstrated a high level of personal development, self-awareness of, and commitment to their own values and beliefs. (p. 39)

> … where teachers were seeing the importance of establishing relationships and of respecting their students—this was reflected in the behaviour of their students … Where teachers are embracing values education as something that is important and to be embedded in practice—their pedagogy is enhanced. (pp. 81–82)

It was in this phase that the role of service learning (the third 'horse' of the troika) as a particularly powerful part of the link became most apparent:

> … doing something with and for the community increases the students' engagement in their learning. This resonates with an interesting but relatively new proposition in education: when students have opportunities to give to their community, to something beyond themselves, it changes their attitude to the learning tasks. (DEEWR 2008, p. 41)

So the evidence seems to point to the fact that values pedagogy has the power to produce changes in classroom ambience and to effect positive influence on school cultures more generally. The 'ripple' effect was seen in the more positive demeanour of teacher–student relationships and, in turn, student attention to academic responsibilities. Consistent with Newmann's *sine qua non* pedagogical dynamic, the evidence here is that it was in the creation of an environment where the explicated values were shaping behaviour that student learning began to improve:

> … improved relationships … improved student attendance, fewer reportable behaviour incidents … students appeared happier … (order reversed) … focused classroom activity, calmer classrooms with students going about their work purposefully. (DEEWR 2008, p. 27)

Courtesy of the overwhelming evidence of this kind, VEGPSP left us feeling confident that we could begin to assert that a well-constructed, clear and intentional values pedagogy infused into the very fabric and purpose of the school has the potential to transform the learning ambience by strengthening relationships, especially between teachers and students, improving student (and teacher) behaviour and, in

turn, leading to greater motivation to learn within this ambience, the latter feature described throughout as academic diligence.

In the *Project to Test and Measure the Impact of Values Education on Student Effects and School Ambience* (Lovat et al. 2009a, b), all the earlier testimonial evidence was put under the spotlight but there was a dedicated focus on the many claims being made around enhanced academic diligence, granted the centrality of this issue to the purported business of schools. In the end, notwithstanding numerical and longitudinal limitations of the study, the consistency of responses across quantitative and qualitative instruments led us to assert confidently that the many claims made that the student effects that are common when values pedagogy is enacted wholeheartedly and well include those that research has shown are associated with those conditions where student academic progress is made. Those conditions, or ambience, included the calmer environment (p. 8), the enhanced teacher–student relationships (p. 9) and the safer, more caring community, enhancing in turn student (and teacher) self-esteem. In that sense, the many direct claims being made about the academic effect were justified indirectly through triangulation with other research findings. Furthermore, the claims being made around academic effect were grounded in indicators also associated with academic progress being made:

> Thus, there was substantial quantitative and qualitative evidence suggesting that there were observable and measurable improvements in students' academic diligence, including increased attentiveness, a greater capacity to work independently as well as more cooperatively, greater care and effort being invested in schoolwork and students assuming more responsibility for their own learning as well as classroom 'chores'. (Lovat et al. 2009a, p. 6)

The report was replete with plausible explanations and reasons why an improved school ambience would lead to enhanced academic diligence. Improved relationships meant that less time and effort were being diverted to behaviour management and more time could therefore be devoted to the core business of education, so resulting in a change in school culture (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 31). These changes were typified by "an improved environment" (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 89) "an increase in school cohesion", "greater consistency across the staff in relationships with one another and with students", "a clearer sense of purpose" (p. 106) and "… changes in the respect for diverse cultures and the inclusion of diversity." (p. 9).

Teachers reported that classrooms became "more respectful, focused and harmonious" (p. 71), that school was "a better place to teach … a better place to learn" (p. 124), that there was increased school cohesion (p. 106) and that classrooms were more settled (p. 25). Beside improvement in classroom ambience, positive changes in playground behaviour received specific comment (e.g. 2009a, pp. 31, 45, 47, 48, 51, b, pp. 25, 29, 31, 71, 98, 101, 124, 133). Improved school and classroom environments were associated with the school being a calmer place (Lovat et al. 2009b, pp. 92, 98, 102, 124) or having a more peaceful atmosphere (pp. 13, 33, 78, 106, 115, 198) where there was mutual respect (p. 102). The corollary of an improved environment was the development of the interpersonal skills essential to conflict management and resolution (Lovat et al. 2009a, pp. 41, 47, 48; 2009b, pp. 26, 31, 71, 76, 91, 101, 127, 133). Greater collegiality among the staff also contributed to

a ‘positive’, ‘kinder’, ‘happier’ and ‘more harmonious’ school ambience (2009a, p. 47). Observational reporting of improvement in students’ behaviour extended beyond the school gate into the community (2009b, pp. 27, 109).

The teachers observed that these new found skills and behaviours, together with the more positive ambience created by it resulted in students taking more control over routine tasks, so adding to their self-confidence and sense of competence and this appeared to lead to more independent learning and increased intrinsic motivation. In turn, teachers reported that students were putting greater effort into their work and trying harder, striving for quality, striving to achieve their best and even striving for ‘perfection’ (Lovat et al. 2009b, pp. 29, 78, 98, 99, 100). Students were also more engaged in learning (p. 13), taking greater responsibility for their learning and working together more co-operatively (p. 45), more willing to ‘have a go’, ask for help, and help each other (p. 100). They were also engaging at a greater intellectual depth (pp. 65, 100); taking more responsibility for their own learning and recognising the importance of respecting others’ right to learn (p. 10); and, more likely to actively participate in decision making (p. 15). In turn, changes in student attitude and application to school work led teachers to raise their own expectations for the students (p. 100).

In a carefully worded reflection that sums up the tenor of the study, including what we believe we are in a position to claim and not claim about the link between ambience and academic diligence, we had this to say:

> Overwhelmingly, the strongest inference that can be drawn from the case studies, when taken together as a collective case study, is that as schools give increasing curriculum and teaching emphasis to values education, students become more academically diligent, the school assumes a calmer, more peaceful ambience, better student-teacher relationships are forged, student and teacher wellbeing improves and parents are more engaged with the school … Moreover, the case studies suggest that any relationship between values education programs and the quality of student attitude, parent involvement, interpersonal relations and the like is much more complicated than simply being the case that values education in and of itself produces such quality teaching effects. Rather, it seems clear that the fit between values education and quality teaching is better described not as one having an impact on the other, but rather as the two of them being in harmony. That is, values education, academic diligence, school ambience and coherence, student and teacher wellbeing, the quality of interpersonal relationships and, up to a point, parental participation harmonize in some way. The closer the attention a school gives to explicitly teaching a set of agreed values, the more the students seem to comply with their school work demands, the more conducive and coherent a place the school becomes and the better the staff and students feel. (Lovat et al. 2009a, p. 12)

International Research Findings

We turn now to the plethora of updated international findings that, independently, seem to confirm the central thesis of our work that values pedagogy has potential to have a transformational effect on academic learning. Carr (2007, 2008, 2010) has persistently put forward the philosophical case that there can be no adequate

teaching without teachers who model integrity and who practise their profession in a way that entails inherently establishing sound and moral relationships with their students. In this respect, Carr follows in the tradition of Dewey (1916, 1929) and Peters (1981) in asserting the indispensable moral component of teaching and learning. For Dewey, education was principally a means of producing moral judiciousness and, in that sense all education was inherently a moral enterprise. Similarly, Peters (1981) proffered that any authentic and truly effective education must be infused with morality in teacher and system intentions, the curriculum and the kinds of relationships that students experienced in learning settings. It was only education related to 'what is of value' that allowed education to be of value at all. Such postulations explain why it is that education must proceed in certain ways in order to be effective and why it is that education that is merely experienced as competitive, intimidating or boring and morally repugnant will not achieve its central purpose of enhancing academic progress.

The philosophies of Carr, Dewey and Peters dovetail well with the updated research of the neuroscientists (Damasio 2003) that we have identified throughout this book as providing essential and confirming insights into why education must be holistic and 'values rich' in order to be successful. This work illustrates starkly how the emotional, affective and social dimensions of development cannot be separated in some artificial way from cognition without doing fundamental harm to the development potential and day to day functioning of the intellect. Failing to heed these findings is to hurl education into an abyss of intellectual stultification, rather than depth, for many of its clients. Let us repeat again a central tenet of this research to which all educators should pay some heed:

> Modern biology reveals humans to be fundamentally emotional and social creatures. And yet those of us in the field of education often fail to consider that the high-level cognitive skills taught in schools, including reasoning, decision making, and processes related to language, reading, and mathematics, do not function as rational, disembodied systems, somehow influenced by but detached from emotion and the body. (Immordino-Yang and Damasio 2007, p. 3)

Of course, educational psychologists and other hard scientists of the mind (Ainley 2006; Boekaerts 1993; Ryan 2007; Schutz and Pekrun 2007) have long recognized that motivation and engagement in schoolwork is more than a function of cognition and is dependent upon the affective dimension as well. In that sense, the work of the neuroscientists is not telling us anything we have not considered. It is simply confirming it from the point of view of an undeniably harder science than psychology. It is work whose findings are so apparent and so clearly evidenced that it makes us wonder how it is that we can tolerate for one further day the impoverished regimes that are the result when cognition is treated as separable from and somehow superior to emotional and social development. Yet they persist, and politicians, bureaucrats and unions defend them to the detriment of their prime clientele.

Continuing the theme, Robinson and Campbell (2010) offer case studies from the United Kingdom that illustrate the moral dearth of so much modern educational effectiveness research and the literature thereof, effectively confirming the postulations and findings of the philosophers, psychologists and neuroscientists above and

leaving us in little doubt why it is that modern education so often fails to achieve its central aim to provide an even chance for all comers in a democracy. Leming (2010) places this abject failure of democracy inspired schooling in the context of western society's blind faith in the means and methods of empirical measuring sciences to deliver the desired student effects. In spite of Carnegie's (Carnegie Corporation 1996) clear verdict that such means and methods had failed, Leming illustrates that society's, and especially politicians' and bureaucrats' faith in them not only persists but is again on the rise. His reference is especially to the United States but could well be extended to any number of countries where the fascination for instrumentalist approaches in curriculum, testing policies and regimes, and 'evidence-based practice' (normally meaning the 'easily measured') seems to know no bounds. It is as if none of the lessons of our distant or recent past have been heeded or even heard, be they from philosophy, psychology, neuroscience, empirical demonstration or just plain common sense. The belief in bare cognition and those effects that can be most precisely measured by even the crudest and most laughably incompetent instruments is it seems insuperable.

Tirri (2010) offers empirical work from Finland that testifies to the crucial moral dimension of teacher professionalism, pointing to an urgent need for revision by systems, including teacher education systems (Gellel 2010), to recognize and deal with this aspect of professionalism if the fullest effects of teaching are to be realized. Again, Tirri illustrates that values are not peripheral extras; they are at the centre and constitute the very lifeblood of effective pedagogical practice. In this light, Hawkes (2010) and Haydon (2010) offer cautionary tales from the United Kingdom about how 'national' curricula should but are not always instruments for personal and societal good, even in those subject areas that would seem to be indispensably about such good.

As we have seen in earlier chapters, Osterman (2010) goes to the heart of the cognition/affect/sociality nexus and the inherent relationship between learning ambience and academic diligence in providing evidence of the great learning capacity instilled by environments where students feel they belong and therefore experience strengthened emotional wellbeing. Furthermore, Osterman illustrates in this evidence the integral connection between teacher relationship and support and the nature of the pedagogy provided by that teacher. It is not the teacher who merely provides a supportive ambience or the one who merely instructs well whose practice enhances academic diligence. It is the teacher whose pedagogy is characterized by the integrity of a supportive relationship and best practice pedagogy in combination, who brings students to new levels of academic enhancement. Osterman's work is veritably another spelling out of the 'double-helix' relationship between values education and quality teaching.

In a similar unintentional reference to the 'double-helix' phenomenon, we have seen Davidson et al. (2010) characterize 'moral character' and 'performance character' as essential bedfellows that educational research, policy and practice have too rarely drawn together. The argument, with ample demonstration, is that educational effectiveness research has concentrated on performance without regard for the essential element of morality, while conversely values education research too

often focuses on the latter without attention to its bedfellow in performance. They expound on the need to combine these two aspects in their work around the *Smart and Good Schools Model of Character Education* which, they say:

> … focuses on performance character and moral character in an integrated way. The Smart & Good Schools approach seeks to maximize the power of moral and performance character by viewing character as needed for, and potentially developed from, every act of teaching and learning. Character education thus conceived stands at the very center of schooling; it is not done parallel to academic instruction, but rather in and through the teaching and learning process. (p. 428)

Sokol et al. (2010) explore the binary relationship between performance and morality in terms of a disjunction in the way that moral and developmental psychology have developed and impacted on the education profession. This account provides insight into why it is that many of the so-called 'foundations' of teaching have failed to inform and prepare teachers for the holistic approach to their work that is needed if its fullest effects are to be realized. Oser (2010), furthermore, illustrates the pitfalls associated with taking overly simplistic foundational knowledge into the practicalities of the classroom and its inherent daily dilemmas. He examines the complexity of moral decision making and the contradictory feelings, such as unhappiness or guilt that people can feel even after making a decision that is 'morally right'. Oser emphasizes that, through values education, the modern-day teacher plays a crucial role in nurturing children's wellbeing through helping them to examine moral issues and dissociate short-term 'gain' or 'pain' from the longer term feelings of satisfaction and moral righteousness that come from making decisions based on integrity and justice.

In another study that focuses on the issue of 'character', Arthur (2010) and Arthur and Wilson (2010) report on a United Kingdom study funded by the Templeton Foundation, titled *Learning for Life,* consisting of five projects aimed at different age levels, constituting between them the largest values education study of its kind conducted in the United Kingdom. The study not only concentrates on character, but on the specific virtues and values most associated with it and on the school's role in cultivating students' personal values and academic dispositions. Consistent with all the works cited above, findings from this huge, most comprehensive and exhaustive study entailing a team of Britain's top educational researchers concluded that a concentration on character by the teacher whose pedagogy models the virtues and values that underpin it has flow on effects that can transform the learning environment from one that naturally excludes those who lack dispositional readiness for learning to one that includes them.

In pursuance of the theme, Flay and Allred (2010) speak of academic performance, together with behaviour and character as the 'new basics' needed for successful living. These authors note, as do we that the research on the role that character formation plays on academic wellbeing is decisive but that education systems nonetheless persistently fail to draw these basics together despite evidence that a singular focus on academic performance is not yielding the anticipated improvements. In the United States, educational priorities have been increasingly formed around improving academic performance particularly through the employment of

'evidence-based practice', yet the results of many of these initiatives indicate that problems of behaviour have been exacerbated at the same time as academic performance has stalled. Flay and Allred propose a *Positive Action* programme as a way of redressing these multiple problems. This programme aims to address skills for learning and living as one skill set, integrally bound together. They evaluate its results, showing again that a focus on character development has clear ramifications for enhanced learning and that, equally, learning pursued in the right environment with the teacher modelling and reinforcing the values and associated actions, has positive flow on effects for character development. These two basics truly constitute a unity.

Dasoo (2010) reports on a South African programme designed to instil values pedagogy in teachers and on the major impact noted of enhanced self-esteem and wellbeing on the part of teachers as they experienced their students' improved learning responses, wrought by the approach. This work points to the circular effect, commonly found in updated literature of this kind, between student and teacher wellbeing. The focus of pedagogy is naturally on student effects, yet certain pedagogies, such as values pedagogy, as described in Chap. 4, result in positive teacher effects as well. Other approaches seem to have the opposite result. Carnegie Corporation (1996) was at pains to point out the apparently debilitating effects on teachers created by their working in an unsustainable and misdirected educational world. Carnegie illustrated well the opposite circular effect that sees student and teacher malady in an insidious relationship. This was the realization that lay behind its bold and apparently offensive assertion that it was not students failing so much as systems failing that was the real issue in the instrumentalist education form that concerns itself with academic performance in isolation from dealing with the whole person.

Benninga and Tracz (2010) offer findings that confirm the failure of systems, not only to instigate sustainable holistic learning regimes but that, even when they have been built up, to fail to maintain them and in some cases contribute to their dismantling through foolish actions. We have referred on a number of occasions to the earlier work of Benninga et al. (2006) that has provided as firm an empirical endorsement of the link between values pedagogy and academic improvement as exists in the literature. This work traced the accumulated effects of enhanced performance at Californian basic skills test results when allied with the roll-out of a values programme. In their 2010 study, Benninga and Tracz re-visit many of these schools to see how these once-measured performances are holding up. The result is mixed, with the cases where performance has fallen backwards inevitably characterized by principal turnover and unwise systemic principal selection and, as well, by the values pedagogy that had clearly been instrumental in the earlier performance measures being wound down or replaced by more standardized and instrumentalist approaches.

As we saw in Chap. 7, Crotty (2010) employs a Habermasian perspective to make sense of the improved academic focus that he saw so clearly demonstrated in the case studies he observed and reported on of students engaged in values pedagogy. This perspective enabled him to name the effect as enhanced higher order

thinking leading to emancipatory knowledge. He poses questions about the ethical nature of educating students to be emancipated when so much of schooling assumes they are being trained to conform. He concludes that this persists as an educational dilemma. It is a thesis that fits well with much that we said in the earlier part of this chapter about the threatening nature of values pedagogy's effects to the stakeholders of education's systems who, together with many in society, might well prefer 'conforming graduates' to ones emancipated in thought. It captures well the potentially disruptive nature of values pedagogy and hence why so often it is met with resistance, while preference is given to instrumentalist, easily measurable and abidingly 'safe' educational pursuits, those very pursuits with their allied pedagogy that Carnegie declared to be an abject failure for a society espousing and working for democracy's proper ends. Is not this the most repetitive theme we see in all the research cited, namely, the disposition of systems to turn away from the demonstrably inclusive pedagogies to those bound to marginalize those clients least equipped to fight their way to the centre?

In many ways, Hill (2010) takes up this theme in identifying the delusion of the past that somehow public schools were values neutral and religious schools taught merely the values proper to their particular ideology. Hill demonstrates that there is no such thing as either values neutrality or linear ideological values. Both public and religious systems were inadequately placed to deal with the far more complex world of a multicultural, multi-faith and inclusive society, such as to be found in current day Australia. He proposes that values discourse is vital in such a society but that it cannot happen without serious evaluation of the environment of the classroom in which it is happening and, in a way similar to Narvaez (2010), without recognizing the impact that such learning will have on the dynamics of the classroom. As we have seen so often, values pedagogy has potential to transform the environment, climate or ambience of learning through the kind of modelling that teachers bring to it and through the discourse that ensues. An abiding question for society is whether it truly wants these transformed environments with potential to be disruptive to the current social order, including in its inequities, inequities that provide levels of comfort for many, just as they do discomfort for others.

Webb (2010) and Deakin Crick (2010) plumb the conceptual depths of wellbeing, in terms of holistic happiness and belonging, respectively. Both scholars, in different ways, take up the Aristotelian perspective that knowing and wellbeing (happiness) cannot exist independently of each other. All effective knowing and learning is a profoundly personal exercise, drawing on all dimensions of the human in the knowing act, and challenging one to change, transform, participate and engage in ways that are different because of the knowing act. Similarly, Nielsen (2010) calls for an end to the perception of a dichotomy between knowing and wellbeing and cites the global financial crisis as an example of where systems based on economic principles and established knowledge needed to be guided "by values that serve the common good." Nielsen (2010) describes the personal and communal benefits that arise from acts of compassion and 'giving' and asserts that we are at a time in human evolution and the evolution of society where we should recognize that "… all knowledge should be *humane* knowledge." (p. 627). It is clear from these perspectives why more denuded conceptions of learning, and their allied apparatus, could

never work to provide the most effective learning for all in a democratic and global society.

If a democratic and emotionally supportive educational approach is such an obvious choice for teachers interested in the social as well as academic outcomes of their students, why is this option not universally adopted? One of the reasons that teachers may be reluctant to address students' social and emotional needs and share control of the classroom with students is because teachers primarily see their role as educating students to meet high (often externally imposed) educational standards. Pelletier and Sharp (2009) describe a number of studies which showed that teachers who felt pressured to have their students achieve high standards "… were more critical of students, used more hints, more directive language and were more controlling than teachers who did not have to face such performance standards." (p. 177).

Ironically, a study by Flink et al. (1990) found that elementary teachers who were motivated to help their students achieve high standards, and who consequently conducted their classrooms in a controlling manner by taking charge of the learning activities and materials, were actually less effective, with their students showing poorer performance on objective test-score outcomes. The inhibitory effect of teacher control on student engagement and learning was also reported by Ryan and Patrick (2001) who investigated secondary students' perceptions of teacher behaviour and the relationship of these teacher behaviours with student motivation and engagement. As expected, teacher support (care and understanding), promoting interaction (cooperative learning), and promoting mutual respect (actively building positive relationships among students) were all positively related to students' social-efficacy, self-regulated learning and academic efficacy. Students' perceptions of the teacher as promoting performance goals, however, were related to negative changes in student motivation and engagement. Moreover, teachers' promotion of performance goals was positively related to students' disruptive behaviour, confirming Glasser's (1998) theory about highly structured and outcome-oriented teaching methods being a cause of student misbehaviour. These findings indicate that a single focus on academic performance, even when well-intentioned, can be counter-productive to student achievement. As Osterman (2010) has emphasized, student achievement is best fostered when teachers combine academic support with personal support. As surmised at the beginning of this chapter, perhaps academic success is what happens best when we get everything else right.

Conclusion

As we have seen throughout this book, the research perspectives on knowing outlined above are essentially timeless ones, be they from Aristotle, Confucius, al-Ghazzali, Aquinas and More, from more recent scholars like Dewey, Peters and Habermas, or from the insights of the neuroscientists. The idea of separable cognition, of an education that focuses on the measurable response in isolation from all the responses relevant to being human is nonsense and negligence on the part of systems and politics that allow it to persist. There are no excuses any longer. The

research jury is in and such education must be dispatched along with slates and ink wells to the museums of education, to be objects of historical quaintness, to remind us how far we have come. The ambience/academic diligence nexus is no surprise at all. The surprise is that we have ever doubted it, that we could so easily forget everything we know about educability, if not being human. The surprise is that, so far on in our understanding of what works and what plainly does not work, we allow politicians and systems to continue to inflict on our populations of young people impoverished educational criteria and punishingly instrumentalist devices that we know are bound to result for many in the very opposite of what education is meant to be about. The so-called 'tail' of education will continue to fail, to spend a dozen years or more in education only to feel uneducated (and to have test results to prove it), until we come to fully understand and appreciate that ambience, not imposed content and testing, is the key to academic diligence for all participants. It is this ambience that seems to be able to be delivered so comprehensively by values pedagogy, as we have defined, described and demonstrated it herein.

References

Ainley, M. (2006). Connecting with learning: Motivation, affect and cognition in interest processes. *Educational Psychology Review, 18,* 391–405.

Arthur, J. (2010). *Of good character: Exploration of virtues and values in 3–25 year-olds*. Exeter: Imprint Academic.

Arthur, J., & Wilson, K. (2010). New research directions in character and values education in the UK. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 339–358). Dordrecht: Springer.

Benninga, J., Berkowitz, M., Kuehn, P., & Smith, K. (2006). Character and academics: What good schools do. *Phi Delta Kappan, 87,* 448–452.

Benninga, J., & Tracz, S. (2010). Continuity and discontinuity in character education. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 521–548). Dordrecht: Springer.

Boekaerts, M. (1993). Being concerned with well-being and with learning. *Educational Psychologist, 28,* 149–167.

Carnegie Corporation. (1996). *Years of promise: A comprehensive learning strategy for America's children.* New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED397995). Accessed 7 June 2011.

Carr, D. (2007). Character in teaching. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 55,* 369–389.

Carr, D. (2008). Character education as the cultivation of virtue. In L. P. Nucci & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Handbook of moral and character education* (pp. 99–116). New York: Routledge.

Carr, D. (2010). Personal and professional values in teaching. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 63–74). Dordrecht: Springer.

Crotty, R. (2010). Values education as an ethical dilemma about sociability. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 631–644). Dordrecht: Springer.

Damasio, A. R. (2003). *Looking for Spinoza: Joy, sorrow, and the feeling brain.* New York: Harcourt.

Dasoo, N. (2010). Nurturing teacher wellbeing through values education. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 359–376). Dordrecht: Springer.

Davidson, M., Khmelkov, V., & Lickona, T. (2010). The power of character: Needed for, and developed from, teaching and learning. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 427–454). Dordrecht: Springer.

Deakin Crick, R. (2010). Integrating the personal with the public: Values, virtues and learning and the challenges of assessment. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 883–896). Dordrecht: Springer.

DEEWR. (2008). *At the heart of what we do: Values education at the centre of schooling.* Report of the Values Education Good Practice Schools Project—Stage 2. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/VEGPSP-2_final_3_execsummary.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

DEST. (2006). *Implementing the National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools*. Report of the Values Education Good Practice Schools Project—Stage 1: Final report, September 2006. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/VEGPS1_FINAL_REPORT_081106.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education.* New York: The Free Press.

Dewey, J. (1929). *The sources of a science of education.* New York: Horace Liveright.

Flay, B., & Allred, C. (2010). The positive action program: Improving academics, behavior, and character by teaching comprehensive skills for successful learning and living. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 471–502). Dordrecht: Springer.

Flink, C., Boggiano, A. K., & Barrett, M. (1990). Controlling teaching strategies: Undermining children's self-determination and performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59,* 916–924.

Furco, A. (2008). Exploring the purposes, complexities and future of values education. Keynote at the National Values Education Forum, Canberra ACT Australia, May 30. http://www.valueseducation.edu.au/verve/_resources/2008_National_Values_Education_Forum_Report_rev.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Gellel, A. (2010). Teachers as key players in values education: Implications for teacher formation. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 163–178). Dordrecht: Springer.

Glasser, W. (1998). *Choice theory: A new psychology of personal freedom.* New York: Harper & Row.

Hawkes, N. (2010). Values education and the national curriculum in England. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 225–238). Dordrecht: Springer.

Haydon, G. (2010). Values and well-being in the curriculum: Personal and public dimensions. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 195–210). Dordrecht: Springer.

Hill, B. (2010). Values education, mental reality constructs and student well-being. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 645–658). Dordrecht: Springer.

Immordino-Yang, M. H., & Damasio, A. R. (2007). We feel, therefore we learn: The relevance of affect and social neuroscience to education. *Mind, Brain, and Education, 1,* 3–10.

Leming, J. (2010). When research meets practice in values education: Lessons from the American experience. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 91–110). Dordrecht: Springer.

Lovat, T. (2010). The new values education: A pedagogical imperative for student wellbeing. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 3–18). Dordrecht: Springer.

Lovat, T., Clement, N., Dally, K., & Toomey, R. (2010). Addressing issues of religious difference through values education: An Islam instance. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 40,* 213–227.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., & Clement, N. (Eds.). (2010). *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing.* Dordrecht: Springer.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Dally, K., & Clement, N. (2009a). *Project to test and measure the impact of values education on student effects and school ambience.* Report for the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) by The University of Newcastle, Australia. Canberra: DEEWR. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Project_to_Test_and_Measure_the_Impact_of_Values_Education.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Dally, K., & Clement, N. (2009b). *Project to test and measure the impact of values education on student effects and school ambience: Associated case study reports.* DEEWR. Final report for the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) by The University of Newcastle, Australia. Canberra. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Project_to_Test_and_Measure_the_Impact_of_Values_Education.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Narvaez, D. (2010). Building a sustaining classroom climate for purposeful ethical citizenship. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 659–674). Dordrecht: Springer.

Nielsen, T. W. (2010). Towards pedagogy of giving for wellbeing and social engagement. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 617–630). Dordrecht: Springer.

Oser, F. (2010). The unhappy moralist effect: A story of hybrid moral dynamics. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 605–616). Dordrecht: Springer.

Osterman, K. (2010). Teacher practice and students' sense of belonging. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 239–260). Dordrecht: Springer.

Pelletier, L. G., & Sharp, E. C. (2009). Administrative pressures and teachers' interpersonal behaviour in the classroom. *Theory and Research in Education, 7,* 174–183.

Peters, R. S. (1981). *Moral development and moral education.* London: George Allen & Unwin.

Robinson, W., & Campbell, R. (2010). School values and effective pedagogy: Case studies of two leading edge schools in England. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 75–90). Dordrecht: Springer.

Ryan, R. M. (2007). Motivation and emotion: A new look and approach for two re-emerging fields. *Motivation and Emotion, 31,* 1–3.

Ryan, A. M., & Patrick, H. (2001). The classroom social environment and changes in adolescents' motivation and engagement during middle school. *American Educational Research Journal, 38,* 437–460.

Schutz, P., & Pekrun, R. (Eds.). (2007). *Emotion in education.* Amsterdam: Academic Press.

Sokol, B., Hammond, S., & Berkowitz, M. (2010). The developmental contours of character. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 579–604). Dordrecht: Springer.

Tirri, K. (2010). Teacher values underlying professional ethics. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 153–162). Dordrecht: Springer.

Webb, S. (2010). Theorizing social well-being: Subjective mental states, preference satisfaction or *mitsein*? In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 959–976). Dordrecht: Springer.

Chapter 10
Values Pedagogy and Teacher Education

The Present Situation: A Gradual Shift?

Notwithstanding the unequivocal evidence reported in earlier chapters about the need for teachers who can enable the type of holistic education that flows from the new values education pedagogy, teacher education worldwide has traditionally given little prominence to either values education or to preparing teachers to implement it. Reasons offered for this range from there being significant philosophical obstacles to preparing teachers for such an enterprise through to the task being so complex as to make it virtually impossible. Berkowitz's (1998) research, for instance, identified six major obstacles to implementing effective pre-service teacher education for values or character education. They included disagreement on what character is; disagreement on what constitutes values or character education; perceptions of limited space in pre-service curricula; limited scientific data on which character or values education elements are effective; perceived limited relevant expertise and resources; and ambivalence amongst teacher educators about the appropriateness of educating for character. Freakley (2007), on the other hand, draws attention to the complexity of the task of having teacher education address values education. According to him there is no absolute, universal or infallible method to disentangling the moral perplexities found in relationships and connections that make up day-to-day realities. Nor is there any final or fixed solution for every moral problem. Morality can rarely be reduced to a single issue of rights, liberty or justice. From his viewpoint, this makes values education complex, because ethical competency requires more than an understanding of ethical theories or the acquisition of a set of moral algorithms. In his view, it requires a deepened understanding acquired through enacted dispositions toward critical reflection, empathy, reasonableness and the like which typically has not been the core business of teacher education.

Thus, there has been reluctance in teacher education to accommodate values pedagogy. Jones et al. (1998) found from their research that there was a significant dichotomy between expectations placed on teachers to be character educators, on the one hand, and the education that teachers actually receive, on the other hand. Lunenberg et al. (2007) found that any treatment of values pedagogy in teacher education was commonly contained within the likes of religious education compo-

T. Lovat et al., *Values Pedagogy and Student Achievement,*
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-1563-9_10, © Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2011

nents and it usually relied on the interest of individual teacher educators. Thornberg (2008) conducted qualitative interviews with 13 teachers to discover that, in their view, values education is: (a) most often reactive and unplanned; (b) embedded in everyday school life with a focus on students' everyday behaviour in school; and, (c) partly or mostly unconsciously performed. Furthermore, professional knowledge appeared to be missing in the domain of values education among these teachers. Based upon responses from 95 institutions that comprised 7% of all colleges and universities in the United States, Wakefield (1997) found that values education was not the object of direct instruction in the great majority of them.

More positively, it seems that teacher education may well be gradually changing its position regarding the incorporation of values orientation (see Toomey et al. 2010). For instance, Revell and Arthur (2007), drawing on data from over 1000 student teachers in two Australian universities indicate that the students were overwhelmingly in favour of developing their skills in the area of moral development. MacQueen (2009) provides recent accounts of how such an interest is currently being met by integrating values education into pre-service teacher education. She examines how values education has been incorporated into an authentic task for pre-service teachers, leading to its embodiment in an integrated unit of work on a Stage 3 cultural study of Bali, with a view to improving citizenship skills and attitudes for all students. The resultant teaching programme seeks to incorporate values education effectively. MacQueen argues that designing teaching programmes around a values focus is an effective method for producing quality teaching programmes, and that values education can be integrated authentically in teacher education courses.

Furthermore, others have recently described teacher education practices consonant with the new values education pedagogy (see Toomey et al. 2010). From a teacher education perspective, Rennie and Theriot (2010) discuss how the new values pedagogy can help shape a school's literacy programme and a literacy teacher education programme with a service learning dimension. Henderson (2010) describes how she incorporates a values laden Global Education perspective into her work on social science teaching method with a view of heightening her students' awareness of, and empathy for, the challenges that the world faces regarding sustainability, cultural harmony, conflict resolution, human rights and the like. She also produces data about the contribution this makes to the preparation of a 'quality teacher'. Tytler et al. (2010) show how the subject, Science, can scaffold a school's values education programme and how an appropriate teaching and learning approach, including service learning, can produce an environment where quality teaching and values acquisition are inextricably linked. They also discuss the implications of this for science teacher education. Matthews (2010) describes a course offering that he conducts within the teacher education programme at the University of Adelaide, Australia, and shows how he has reshaped the programme to bring it more into line with the new values education pedagogy. In what follows, we seek to support the views of these teacher educators and describe what needs to happen in mainstream teacher education programmes if they are to make the link between values education and quality teaching as described by those above.

Values and Teacher Education: Drawing some Necessary Distinctions

If teacher education is to make the link between values education and quality teaching, it needs to first distinguish between typical approaches to teacher education and their fit with the new values education pedagogy. As described in Chap. 5, the four principles that underlie this pedagogy are as follows:

- First, establish the conditions for quality teaching and learning;
- Second, develop appropriate pedagogical scaffolds;
- Third, structure the pedagogical content around real-world issues; and,
- Fourth, engage in service learning.

1. The first feature that distinguishes a values pedagogical approach is its emphasis on the explicit teaching of values and equal attention being given to the affective and cognitive components of student development. This means that teachers need to understand how a school-wide understanding of values impacts on the social dynamics of the classroom and the broader school community and how the kind of ambience that this creates, in conjunction with integrated academic and personal support from the teacher, optimizes student learning and wellbeing. Inherent within this approach is optimism in student potential and an emphasis on developing positive 'can do' dispositions to learning in students and teachers in the way of positive psychology.

2. and 3. Equally important to the establishment of a conducive learning environment is the nature and content of the learning activities conducted within it. The values pedagogy is characterized by democratic classrooms which encourage student input, engage students in cooperative learning activities, and are driven by a student-centred/teacher-guided approach. The content should be relevant to students' lives or address issues that impel students to apply their knowledge to meaningful problems. How this can be done is illustrated with one of a number of scaffolds, namely, *Philosophy in the Classroom*, which is increasingly being used for such learning in Australian schools. *Philosophy in the Classroom* is an exploration of an idea, or set of ideas, that leads to questioning, exploring concepts and values, and posing problems. The idea might arise from a reading excerpt, such as the *Bunyip of Berkeley Creek* (Lang 1998), which raises questions about existence and identity. During the discussion about such 'big ideas', or unanswerable questions, the focus is on listening, thinking, challenging and changing viewpoints within a safe environment in which students can take risks in their thinking. It uses a 'community of inquiry' technique by which a group of individuals engage in dialogue in order to search out the problematic borders of a puzzling concept.

The 'community of inquiry' is intended to enable thinking that is caring (each member is supported and allowed to be an integral member of the community), creative (new ideas are sought out and encouraged), critical (good reasons are expected for one's ideas and positions) and fallible (a willingness to be corrected and an acknowledgement of possible error). It promotes critical thinking and encourages

an obligation to respect one's fellow inquirers. It attempts to produce better thinkers and more caring members of society who accept differences and, at the same time, submit conflicts to reasonable scrutiny. All participants are expected to respect one another as thoughtful people who communally seek to understand better the issue at hand. In this way, the teacher not only facilitates the students' explorations of their thinking but also embeds the practice of values and valuing in the process. This thereby serves to mediate or scaffold the values that are central to the programme. Moreover, the scaffolding in and of itself provides a safe and secure learning environment because it emphasizes students respecting and listening attentively to each other which, in essence, represents true socio-constructive learning.

4. The values then become the focus of a community-based service learning programme, thereby becoming the object of continuous practice. As we have seen, it is now well established that the effect of all of this on schools and classrooms is greater calmness, increased student confidence, greater mutual respect and empathy, improved self-management skills and other effects which contribute significantly to the quality of the teaching and learning and so to student attainment (see e.g., Benninga et al. 2006; Billig 2002; Davidson et al. 2007; Hawkes 2009; Lovat et al. 2009a, b)

All of this has implications for the methodological dimension of teacher education and we have identified the following three core requirements that values pedagogy impels:

- prospective and practising teachers need to have their skills in explicitly teaching values developed;
- prospective and practising teachers need to have their skills in scaffolding values developed; and,
- prospective and practising teachers need to have their skills in managing service learning developed.

From the perspective of values pedagogy, quality teaching places more emphasis on student readiness for learning and less emphasis on the linear and developmental notions of learning that are typically conveyed in teacher education. The new values pedagogy conceives of learning as something more instinctive, something students come to quite naturally when circumstances are right, than is normally the assumption in the foundations of teacher education programmes. It involves a nexus between cognition, affect and sociality wherein, as corroborated by the neurosciences, learning and emotion go hand in hand. Thus, it places greater emphasis on whole person learning than on 'academic performance' but not at the expense of it. This has implications for the so called foundations component of teacher education.

Links with Holistic Education

For us, holistic education connotes personal and emotional resilience (personal and emotional wellbeing), a capacity to think deeply, creatively and critically (intellectual wellbeing), and a capacity to make a productive contribution to local, national

and international communities that presupposes a sense of belonging and a growing communicative competence (social wellbeing).

Personal and emotional wellbeing are natural outcomes of the explicit teaching of values and the ambience that flows from such teaching. Self esteem, for instance, has been shown to flourish in such circumstances. The self-knowledge generated in a quality teaching environment also leads to greater emotional wellbeing. When students find themselves involved in scaffolded learning like *Philosophy in the Classroom*, where tolerance, respect, cooperation, critical reflection and the like are routinely practised within the scaffold of safe and supportive classroom and school contexts, social wellbeing is enhanced.

Demonstrating how values education, quality teaching and service learning coalesce to produce holistic education, as well as provide opportunities for prospective and experienced teachers to engage practices that put it into effect, is the challenge that faces teacher educators today and into the future. Of course, providing preservice teachers with an understanding of the links between a positive classroom climate, emotionally engaged students and good pedagogy have long been aspirations for many of Australia's teacher educators. We make no claim to pre-eminence in this regard. Rather, our contribution is to show how these connections can occur more naturally and synergistically by making the explicit teaching about values a more prominent feature of teacher education. Allied to this new emphasis on values is the provision of more opportunities for beginning teachers to engage with, and practice, agreed values as part of their professional learning. As will be shown later, this can be accomplished by teacher education engaging service learning and other scaffolds for values education.

Refashioning the Foundations of Teacher Education

People often wonder why it is that, in light of the abundant evidence available around the effects of values pedagogy on student development across the measures, teacher education has not been transformed to accommodate this evidence. As we pointed out earlier, there are a few instances where this has occurred. For the most part however it must be admitted that teacher education is a conservative industry, known more for its reactivity than pro-activity, and much needs to change if the new values education pedagogy is to become a more serious and widespread part of teacher preparation and development.

Typically, teacher education reacts to what is required in schools once this has been demonstrated to be an enduring rather than fleeting requirement, and especially once the requirement has been endorsed by a teacher employment bureaucracy. It also reacts to findings from educational research, although this is itself a conservative industry bounded by guardianship and not always quick to allow findings outside the orthodoxy to be disseminated for eventual impact and transformation. Hence, there is a tendency for teacher education to function on the basis of an 'old order' of beliefs and priorities, and hence, if not studiously reflective of its

own practice, to miss what is happening in the wider world, including the schools. In a word, it tends to rely on often dated paradigms of learning, the 'chestnuts' as it were, and so the effects of new paradigms will genuinely come as a surprise to those embedded in its culture.

As we saw in Chap. 3, some of the older paradigms, or 'chestnuts', relate to linear stage development theory, be it of maturation, socialization, motivation or learning itself. Especially in educational psychology, these are the theories that have tended to dominate much of what is referred to in teacher education as the 'foundations'. As we also saw in Chap. 3, in spite of serious counter-research by the likes of Gilligan (1982), Hoffman (2000) and Zahn-Waxler et al. (1979), Freudian, Piagetian and Kohlbergian research has more often than not been presented in fairly uncritical fashion as offering the firmest and most empirically sound bases for human development. As proffered in that chapter, this is arguably because these latter 'giants' of psychosocial understanding relied heavily on a combination of observation and rationalistic analysis, whereas, their 'critics' rested much of their critique on recourse to the affective elements or domain? In that sense, the critics might well have been more in touch with the perspectives of the new neurosciences and, indeed, a values pedagogical perspective. In other words, the insights of the 'critics' of classical developmental theory were early warning signs of the revolutionary insights about human functioning being uncovered by the new neurosciences. According to them, 'cognition, affect and sociality' is a nexus and this insight has profound implications for learning and school education and, therefore, for teacher education. One might venture to say that teacher education, as it functions in most places today, does not fully reflect this perspective. We also saw in Chap. 3 that this shortcoming applies as much in other foundational areas, like sociology, as it does in developmental theory. Equally, this has fed into the limited, perhaps even pessimistic set of understandings that characterized much teacher preparation. As illustrated before in this book, such pessimism was seen in the 'families are the factories of life' (Parsons and Bales 1955) and 'what comes out of the schools is essentially what went in' (Jencks 1972) perspectives that de-valued the role that teachers and schools can play in determining students' futures.

In light of the findings from quality teaching and values education research reported earlier in the book, the above paradigm is in urgent need of revision. In contrast with the Parsons/Jencks thesis, which could only lead to school and teacher pessimism about making a difference, these new lines of research seem to suggest that schools and teachers in fact have great power to impact beneficially on the lives of their students, provided they go about their teaching in particular ways. The work of Newmann (1996) and Darling-Hammond (1996), among others, illustrated beyond doubt the effect that quality teaching could have on student achievement across the range and in spite of all the odds that Parsons and Jencks saw as determinative. Similarly, Bryk and Schneider (2002) have shown how 'trusting relations' in schools, and especially between the student and the teacher, can impact in positive ways on students. In the same vein, there is now a vast store of evidence from the broad 'Values Education' research stable that the establishment of a caring and encouraging ambience of learning, together with explicit discourse about values in a

way that draws on students' deeper learning and reflectivity, has power to positively transform the patterns of feelings, behaviour, resilience and academic diligence that might once have been the norm among students (cf. Benninga et al. 2006; Hawkes 2009; Lovat and Clement 2008; Lovat and Toomey 2007). These far more optimistic perspectives are those that need now to stand at the centre of teacher education. They are the true foundations for a profession on which so many hopes from across so many issues of personal dysfunction and social disjunction are resting.

New Foundations for Teacher Education

Understanding matters of human development and socialization, of the type that inform teacher education, is an ongoing enterprise. At no point could anyone claim to have the final word on such complexities. One of the problems for teacher education, it seems, is that the basis of its 'foundations' has rested for too long on theories and research that presented as definitive rather than exploratory and transitory. Such was the sense of certainty that accompanied much earlier social science research that its so-called 'empirical findings' became virtual canons that were beyond critique, much less refutation. Hence, the findings of Piaget, Kohlberg, Erikson, Parsons, Skinner and co., became untouchable. What they said 'went' as far as teacher education was concerned, and what they said was essentially linear and deterministic, and based on far more limited evidence than the apparent surety with which their postulations were presented. In the end, they have constrained teaching and reduced the power that should be associated with the role of the teacher far more than tends to be acknowledged. Like so much of the social science paradigm that stemmed from the heyday of nineteenth-century science, these theories have failed to inform teaching in the way that it requires (cf. Jörg et al. 2007; Lovat 2008; Lovat et al. 2011).

The new foundations for teacher education need to begin with the evidence that first impelled the revolutionary thought behind the Carnegie Report (Carnegie Corporation 1996), such as, the evidence emanating from the new neurosciences. As we have seen, especially in Chap. 3, Damasio's (cf. Damasio 2003; Immordino-Yang and Damasio 2007) work, associated with the notion of the cognition/affect nexus, was a way of conceiving of emotion and feelings as not being separate so much as inherently part of all rational processes.

If Damasio is correct, then those dominant conceptions in teacher education foundations of development as linear, rational and progressive are turned on their heads. The taxonomic notion that cognitive learning outcomes can somehow be separated from affective and social learning outcomes comes to be seen as nonsense. Above all, Damasio's work implies a refutation of the pessimism that seemed to invade teacher education unwittingly through the work of the old foundations, replacing it with optimism that, if we construct pedagogy for the whole person rather than just for the cognitive person, we have potential to engage the interests and attention of those not normally engaged, probably because of the many emotional issues related to heritage, disadvantage and disability that serve to block their interest as well as,

indeed, to make learning more engaging for all. Turning around this pessimism and fostering in future generations of teachers a sense of optimism and confidence in the power of their profession to transform life opportunities, especially for those in greatest need of school-based interventions is the most crucial and urgent challenge before teacher education today.

As we have referred to on numerous occasions in this book, in terms of sociological and philosophical foundations, the work of Jurgen Habermas (1972, 1974, 1984, 1987, 1990) would seem to be central to the concerns of teaching, and therefore teacher education in the modern age. Habermas's theory of knowing fits well with the neuroscientists' work on multiple intelligences and, furthermore, he develops a theory of social engagement and action that justifies optimism on the part of any social agency, including teaching, to be able to make a difference. Interestingly for teaching, in particular, Habermas rests his notion of effective social action (namely, *praxis*) on people reaching the most sophisticated levels of knowing. In other words, in contrast with more dated foundational thinking, effective social and moral citizenship is not only educable but there is an inherent educational component in it. Habermasian thought has potential to deepen profoundly not only our understanding of the full human developmental capacities that are implied in effective learning but, by dint of inference, to stretch our conceptions of the role of the teacher as well.

The genius of Habermas as a foundational character for teacher education is that he is, at one and the same time, a modern and an ancient character. That is, he is a modern theorist whose work speaks to his time but also rests on the scholarship of the ages. His balanced appraisal of the most sophisticated knowing being one that relies as much on human communication and knowing of self as it does on empirical facts and figures is reminiscent of the moderation of Aristotelian thought about human virtue, whereby one knew what was right, cared about one's fellows and knew how to translate this knowing and feeling into practical action. For Aristotle (1985), knowing in this way led to high levels of human happiness.

So, to be introduced to Habermas is to be introduced to Aristotle and then it is a case of where to stop as the potential to uncover all of the foundations of thought relevant to an agency of human service, like teaching, become available to the teacher educator. Be it with reference to the heritage of classical Islam, Christendom or more recent forces, courses could be constructed for the student teacher not only for induction into one's own civilization but with crucial learning points for the future teacher about the true fundamentals of the trade. For Abu al-Ghazzali (1991), for instance, the great Muslim Sufi who relied so much on Aristotelian thought, there were two fundamental beliefs above all others. First, was that knowledge and action were to be seen as a unity, not as separate. That is, true knowing led to authentic action; there was no point in claiming to know something if it made no practical difference. This would no doubt be a useful and possibly transformative criterion to apply to what passes for knowledge content in any formal education setting. Second, was that the action that mattered was defined by one's relationships, and that care and trust were the indispensable actions associated with any authentic human relationship. That is, impelled by one's belief in an active and caring God, one should take any opportunity of human engagement to make a difference for the

good. In Christendom, Thomas Aquinas (1936), whose thinking was inspired by both Aristotle and al-Ghazzali, *synderesis* was the inborn disposition given by God to the human being that allowed for authenticity in any relationship to take the form of practical action for good. So, Habermas as a foundation can lead back as far as we might wish to go in introducing students to the heritage of their thought but also in countering any of the pessimism of the 'old' social sciences that might persist in the thinking of the systems into which they will be employed.

Challenging Teacher Education's Traditional Approaches to Teaching Method

In drawing distinctions between the way pedagogy is typically treated in teacher education programmes and the new values pedagogy, at the beginning of this chapter we identified three important distinctions that have implications for the way teaching method should be approached if the new pedagogy is to be more widespread. These included:

- that prospective and practising teachers need to have their skills in explicitly teaching values developed;
- that prospective and practising teachers need to have their skills in scaffolding values developed; and,
- that prospective and practising teachers need to have their skills in managing service learning developed.

The first of these methods, the explicit teaching of values, is a complex enterprise. According to evidence provided by VEGPSP (DEEWR 2008), we saw that "… the principle of explicitness applies more broadly and pervasively than has been previously recognized. It means that values-based schools live and breathe a values consciousness. They become schools where values are thought about, talked about, reflected upon and enacted across the whole school in all activities. Values are explicitly taught across all key learning areas and are articulated in co-curricular activities." (p. 10). Moreover, teachers tend to invent creative ways of accomplishing this complex enterprise. The VEGPSP report documents some of these inventions, such as infusing the explicit teaching of values into art and story telling (DEEWR 2008, p. 30). Other techniques include the use of Y Charts and dramatisation accompanied by reflection. There is no standard technique. The challenge for teacher educators involved in teaching method programmes is to enable prospective and practising teachers to invent, practice and refine their own personalized techniques for explicitly teaching values. Freakley (2007) argues that this requires teacher educators to withdraw from the typical subject-oriented and knowledge transmission or construction-based approaches and, in their place, adopt problem-solving, collaborative methods oriented to a 'community of inquiry' approach. Gellel (2010) proposes something more elaborate in the form of a teacher education community of practice focussed on the affective aspects of teacher professional learning:

> Institutions are currently giving priority to the dimensions of skills and theory and much less, if any, to the creation of a culture that values the holistic education of the person and that offers a comprehensive values education that forms and takes care of individuals and communities. It is therefore suggested that teacher education programmes should also provide the opportunity for the formation of communities. In order to create these communities there is a specific need to focus on the affective education of the teacher. Thus, short residential periods, social activities and discussion groups could be among the techniques adopted to foster a sense of community and to help in the internalisation of values that are intrinsic for one's vocation and profession, and analyse, reflect and internalize those attitudes already present in many schools that are at the basis of the teaching vocation. Since these should essentially be communities of practice, there should be no dichotomy. (p. 173)

Scaffolding Values Pedagogy in Teacher Education

The concept of scaffolding is about values being embedded in learning activities that have not only been devised to scaffold student-centred/teacher-guided learning but also activities in which the values are imbued, thereby enabling students to continuously practice them in the learning process. The example of *Philosophy in the Classroom* was discussed in this regard earlier in the chapter. There are many other examples of such scaffolds, including *Socratic Circles*, *Student Action Teams* and others (see DEEWR 2008 pp. 26–35).

If the new values education pedagogy is to become more widespread, the second technique teacher education needs to incorporate into its programmes is an overt scaffolding of such pedagogy. The intention of doing so would be threefold: demonstrating techniques for scaffolding such as *Philosophy in the Classroom*; clarifying the contribution it makes to quality teaching by developing empathy, the capacity to build trusting relationships, the ability to reflect, intellectual depth, self knowledge and the like; and, in the process, developing these same quality-teaching skills and dispositions in the beginning teachers as they participate in the programme.

Henderson (2010) provides an example of how teacher education might accomplish this. Her approach is to situate values pedagogy as a core component of her social science pre-service teacher education programme. The programme is scheduled over ten consecutive weeks and designed so that fourth year students preparing to teach in secondary schools encounter 'first hand' a range of learning experiences that explore a values laden approach to global education within the social sciences. To enhance this process, social science curriculum classes are structured as 'lectorials' of interactive three-hourly sessions, rather than the traditional one-hour lecture and separate two-hour tutorial. Lectorials are constructed around case studies of values laden controversial issues such as the placement of children in Australian Immigration Detention Centres (IDCs) during 2002–2003. Participants 'unpacked' the 'content' of the controversies within each case study and also 'dissembled' the pedagogical processes involved in these experiences. That is, during the weekly interactive sessions, in individual, paired and small group arrangements, pre-service teachers participated in the actual learning experiences they as future teachers, in turn, could devise for their own students.

Lectorial activities also include the application of critical thinking skills to primary and secondary sources about the controversial issues involved. Critical thinking is emphasized as a core social science skill, given that, in any discussion of controversial issues, claims and assumptions need to be investigated and critiqued, with judgements based on a range of sources of evidence. Participants are encouraged to consider the ways in which different pedagogical strategies and specific procedures could be useful in teaching about controversial issues in the classroom by responding to various scenarios. Cooperative learning is employed for these scenarios through small group tasks. Human rights and social justice concerns lie at the heart of the case studies selected for the programme which aims to provide opportunities for pre-service teachers to develop an appreciation of the significance of understanding their own and other cultures and to develop intercultural awareness, as they investigate the controversial issues embedded in the case studies. The pedagogical basis for this approach draws on socio-constructivist principles.

In short, by scaffolding her values education programme in a values-based social science method programme, Henderson (2010) aimed to:

- illustrate a scaffolding technique;
- provide an opportunity for pre-service teachers to participate in an authentic values education programme; and,
- develop in the pre-service teachers some of the skills and dispositions typical of the quality teacher such as, empathic character, integrity, having high expectations about the intellectual depth of students' work, and being able to inspire and motivate students.

The extent to which this approach to social science method can produce quality teachers, or at least initiate them into quality practices, such as reflection on learning and application of knowledge to real-life issues, is reflected in the following comments by participants:

> I would never have even thought of developing activities that encourage kids to develop empathy for others, or to use reflecting at the end of an activity to unpack the values in it until this unit. I reckon it gives—I'm not sure how to explain this—a good quality to the learning. This makes me feel like a good teacher, a proper teacher. (p. 153)

> I enjoyed this because it was so real. We were investigating issues that impact on people and the values made it very realistic. (p. 151)

The pre-service teachers' comments also revealed they had confusions and an underlying sense of unease about including values in their curriculum area. However, after exposure to the values pedagogy and application of it in their own learning, the pre-service teachers recognized the potential of values pedagogy to promote higher-order thinking and engagement with learning:

> I thought teaching about values in schools was about the rules and regulations and I thought you should avoid values in the classroom, as you might get accused by a parent of trying to indoctrinate their kids. Now I hope that I can do something like this with my own classes as it is important to study the values in issues so you can develop a much deeper understanding. (p. 150)

> It worked because I got really involved in wanting to find out more. Fired up. The values made it interesting. (p. 152)
>
> For the first time I understood how you can unpack the values in issues. I always thought this was too hard and now I can see how worthwhile this is. I copied one of the activities and used it on prac [field studies] and it got the kids going. My supervising teacher was really surprised at how the kids enjoyed it. (p. 152)

The unrealized potential of values pedagogy is evident in the preceding quote and reinforced in the following, which reveal a dissatisfaction and frustration with the status quo of so many existing and entrenched teaching practices and a desire to enlist more engaging and meaningful learning experiences. As also reported in Henderson (2010):

> My supervising teacher was so straight. No group work, just worksheets and textbooks and the kids were bored out of their brains. I don't want to teach like that. I want to be involved in what I do. The values stuff helped me to know there are so many ways to make things interesting and to get kids involved. (p. 153)
>
> I wasn't allowed to do any group work or ranking activities, the only interesting stuff he let me do was to show documentaries, provided I used a question sheet so the kids would be kept busy in the lesson. I was frustrated as I thought if only he'd let me do some good activities to get to the interesting stuff, the juicy debates, unpacking the values in the issues. But I'll have to wait until I get my own classes to do this. (p. 153)

The professional optimism and enhanced sense of teacher self-efficacy that values pedagogy engenders and which we have discussed at length in Chap. 8 and elsewhere in this book was also evident in the following comments derived from the study by Henderson (2010):

> Values can be approached in so many different ways and I feel more confident now as I've gone through the paces at uni so I can see how it can be done. Why it's important. It makes me feel like I have some ideas that I can apply to things knowing that they've worked in other settings so I think I feel more confident to do interesting things, valuable things in the classroom next year. (p. 154)
>
> I didn't realise just how fascinating teaching can be and the values dimensions give it an edge I am so looking forward to having my own classes. (p. 154)

In this final comment, we can see the pre-service teacher's pragmatic realisation that the integration of the dual components of the teacher's role, that is, the provision of combined academic and personal support, can yield at least short-term if not longer-term benefits to the lives of *all* students:

> I have a better idea of how I can make a difference in the classroom. Not sure how much this will make a difference in kids' lives—but if they can be in my classroom and feel OK, feel valued and do interesting things then at least I am making this part of a school day a positive experience. (Henderson 2010, pp. 150–151)

Quality Teaching, Service Learning and Teacher Education

As has been made clear earlier in this book, service learning can serve as a key component of the new values pedagogy. Thus, if the new pedagogy is to become widespread, teacher educators need to introduce it into their courses. In our view,

they need to do so in order to introduce novice and experienced teachers not only to the rationale and practices of service learning but also, and most importantly, so they can in the process develop the attitudes and craft of quality teachers.

Participating in service learning as part of a teacher education programme has been shown to help pre-service teachers to cultivate further important attributes of the quality teacher. They can develop and practice empathy, service and leadership in different and, at times, challenging situations. In doing so, pre-service teachers can transfer these attributes and the related ability to see where a student is 'coming from' and thereby 'connect' and thus teach well. They are able to develop trustful and caring relationships, like those described by Palmer (1998) thereby setting up a quality teaching/learning environment that enables greater self knowledge. As Habermas would endorse, through this growth in self knowing, one can become a person of integrity and passion with whom students can relate and who can motivate students to learn.

Service learning can be practised in various ways in teacher education. It often involves pre-service teachers engaging with groups such as homework clubs for children who are refugees, drop-in centres for people who are homeless, rehabilitation centres for people who have an acquired brain injury, and residents in aged care facilities. Such engagement involves reciprocal relationships being established with the organizations so that the service reinforces and strengthens academic learning and the academic learning reinforces and strengthens service in the organizations. There is now an abundance of evidence testifying to the capacity of the experience to produce the qualities in participants typical of quality teaching.

In one study, for instance, Rennie and Theriot (2010) describe a teacher education service learning programme in which the pre-service teachers form dyads with at risk middle year students in a literacy programme *Novel Connections*. This programme requires the beginning teachers to select and discuss novels which contain contentious values-laden issues and typify the life experiences of the students with whom they are paired. A key finding was that the programme enabled the pre-service teachers to refine their thinking about their own views of literacy and, importantly, themselves. Four pre-service teachers who were involved in the programme commented as follows:

> I have learned that I was atypical for an adolescent. So, I must teach to my students' needs and learning styles and not to my own. But, because I am different, I will recognize and celebrate differences in my students. (p. 133)

> I have been able to recall many teenage experiences and tap into the emotions brought out by those memories. I have been able to look back and see how I have grown especially in the areas of social development. Stories are great vehicles for taking us places and the novel was a time machine back to my teen years. (p. 133)

> I have more empathy towards them (young adolescents) than I did before. I have learned how to use my past and my education to understand the children in my class and the possible situations they are going through, or will face in the future. (p. 133)

The experience also raised awareness about the conception of holistic learning that is at the heart of this book. This is reflected in the following comment by another participant in the programme:

> These experiences taught me the importance of understanding the reasons for adolescent behaviour that go beyond discipline or control issues. As a middle school teacher, I will be concerned with my students' emotional and psychological needs as well as their intellectual needs. (Rennie and Theriot 2010, p. 133)

Another example of the benefits of service learning in teacher education is seen in Carrington and Selva's (2010) study which reports on the opportunities for transformational learning experienced by a group of pre-service teachers who were engaged in service learning as a pedagogical process with a focus on reflection. Reported data provide evidence of transformational learning and highlight how the students critique their world and imagine how they could contribute to a better world in their work as a beginning teacher, thus reflecting the same sense of optimism and teacher self-efficacy that came from the incorporation of values-laden issues in social science teacher education (Henderson 2010) and that was also evident in the service learning experiences with disengaged youth provided by Rennie and Theriot (2010) for pre-service literacy teachers. Similarly, Ryan et al. (2009) report that 'real-world' service learning provides pre-service teachers with more opportunities to develop sophisticated understandings of pedagogy in diverse contexts for diverse learner and Saggers and Carrington (2008) show how service learning in teacher education can contribute to participants adopting a more inclusive approach to their teaching. Finally, Hackett and Lavery (2010a, b) report on a teacher education component designed specifically to instil and enhance empathy, character, communication skills and leadership through service learning: "…by providing service learning and leadership experiences, (the programme) not only develop(s) commitment but also empathic character, relationship building skills and an ethic of service to others." (Hackett and Lavery 2010a, p. 100).

Conclusion

If teacher education is to contribute to making the new values pedagogy a widespread approach to holistic education it will need to build on the promising signs from the few teacher educators who are currently experimenting with ways of making values education a more central aspect of teacher preparation. It will need to refashion its so called foundations by accommodating empirical evidence from the neurosciences and the theories emanating from both the traditional streams and the more progressive stance of positive psychology. It will also need to reconsider the way it treats the pedagogical aspects of teacher education by devising ways of enabling teachers to become skilful, explicit teachers of values. Also it will need to devise ways to illustrate pedagogical scaffolding techniques for values education and provide opportunities for pre-service teachers to participate in these scaffolding techniques so that they can develop the skills and dispositions typical of the quality teacher such as empathic character, integrity, having high expectations about the intellectual depth of students' work and being able to engage and inspire all students regardless of the students' cultural backgrounds or levels of disability and disad-

vantage. To some extent, as the efforts of some teacher educators show, this can be achieved by incorporating service learning as an integral part of teacher education.

In short, we would propose that firmer foundations for teacher education in the twentyfirst century are to be found in the likes of Habermas and Damasio, together with the other theorists noted in Chap. 3, including Goleman, Sternberg and Seligman. Between them, they maximize the potential for teaching to impact positively on students' cognitive, emotional and social development. As such, they provide for the kinds of optimistic perspectives on the role of teaching and the power of pedagogy to make a difference. In that sense, they explain, far better than the older foundations, why it is that values pedagogy has the effects reported on in the studies under review in this book. For them, it is no surprise that getting the ambience of learning right, together with explicit values discourse, draws students in to optimizing their learning potential and so enhancing their holistic wellbeing. It is to the ambience and discourse of values pedagogy, its veritable implicit and explicit dimensions that we turn to in the next chapter.

Acknowledgement Thanks to the editors of AJTE for permission to replicate some text and the idea from this article for expansion and elucidation in this book.

References

Al-Ghazzali, A. (1991). *The book of religious learnings.* New Delhi: Islamic Book Services.

Aquinas, T. (1936). *Summa theologica*. (trans: L. Shapcote). London: Burns & Oates.

Aristotle. (1985). *Nicomachean ethics*. (trans: T. Irwin). Indianapolis: Hackett.

Berkowitz, M. (1998). Obstacles to teacher training in character education. *Action in Teacher Education*, *20*(4)*,* 1–10.

Benninga, J., Berkowitz, M., Kuehn, P., & Smith, K. (2006). Character and academics: What good schools do. *Phi Delta Kappan, 87,* 448–452.

Billig, S.H. (2002). Support for K-12 service-learning practice: A brief review of the research. *Educational Horizons, 80,* 184–189.

Bryk, A., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Carrington, S., & Selva, G. (2010). Critical social theory and transformative learning: Evidence in pre-service teachers' service-learning reflection logs. *Higher Education Research and Development, 29,* 45–57.

Damasio, A. R. (2003). *Looking for spinoza: Joy, sorrow, and the feeling brain*. New York: Harcourt.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). What matters most: A competent teacher for every child. *Phi Delta Kappan, 78,* 193–200.

Davidson, M., Lickona, T., & Khmelkov, V. (2007). Smart and good schools: A paradigmshift for character education. *Education Week, 27*(12)*,* 32–40.

DEEWR. (2008). *At the heart of what we do: Values education at the centre of schooling*. Report of the Values Education Good Practice Schools Project—Stage 2. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/VEGPSP-2_final_3_execsummary.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Freakley, M. (2007). Ethics education with pre-service teachers. *Critical & Creative Thinking, 15*(2)*,* 3–13.

Gellel, A. (2010). Teachers as key players in values education: Implications for teacher formation. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 163–178). Dordrecht: Springer.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Habermas, J. (1972). *Knowledge and human interests*. (trans: J. Shapiro). London: Heinemann.

Habermas, J. (1974). *Theory and practice.* (trans: J. Viertal). London: Heinemann.

Habermas, J. (1984). *Theory of communicative action.* (trans: T. McCarthy, Vol. I). Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1987). *Theory of communicative action.* (trans: T. McCarthy, Vol. II). Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1990). *Moral consciousness and communicative action* (trans: C. Lenhardt & S. W. Nicholsen). Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Hackett, C., & Lavery, S. (2010a). ASPIRE: Formation of pre-service teachers through leadership, community engagement and retreat training. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 35,* 176–189.

Hackett, C., & Lavery, S. (2010b). Formation of quality pre-service teachers through leadership, service and pastoral care. In R. Toomey, T. Lovat, N. Clement, & K. Dally (Eds.), *Teacher education and values pedagogy: A student wellbeing approach* (pp. 96–107). Sydney: David Barlow.

Hawkes, N. (2009). Values and quality teaching at West Kidlington primary school. In T. Lovat & R. Toomey (Eds.), *Values education and quality teaching: The double helix effect* (pp. 105–120). Dordrecht: Springer.

Henderson, D. (2010). Embedding values through global education in social sciences pre-service teacher education: Linking the head and heart. In R. Toomey, T. Lovat, N. Clement, & K. Dally (Eds.), *Teacher education and values pedagogy: A student wellbeing approach* (pp. 135-155). Sydney: David Barlow.

Hoffman, M. L. (2000). *Empathy and moral development: Implications for caring and justice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Immordino-Yang, M. H., & Damasio, A. R. (2007). We feel, therefore we learn: The relevance of affect and social neuroscience to education. *Mind, Brain, and Education, 1,* 3–10.

Jencks, C. (1972). *Inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books.

Jones, E., Nielsen, R., & Bohlin, K. (1998). Character education and teacher education: How are prospective teachers being prepared to foster good character in students? *Action in Teacher Education*, *20*(4)*,* 11–28.

Jörg, T., Davis, B., & Nickmans, G. (2007). Towards a new, complexity science of learning and education. *Educational Research Review, 2,* 145–156.

Lovat, T. (2008). About the outdated Newtonian paradigm in education and complexity and a complexity science of learning: How far are we from a paradigm shift? [Invited response]. *Educational Research Review, 3,* 77–100.

Lovat, T., & Clement, N. (2008). Quality teaching and values education: Coalescing for effective learning. *Journal of Moral Education, 37,* 1–16.

Lovat, T., & Toomey, R. (2007). Values education: A brief history to today. In T. Lovat & R. Toomey (Eds.), *Values education and quality teaching: The double helix effect* (pp. xi–xix). Sydney: David Barlow.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Clement, N., Crotty, R., & Nielsen, T. (2009a). *Values education, quality teaching and service learning: A troika for effective teaching and teacher education.* Sydney: David Barlow.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Dally, K., & Clement, N. (2009b). *Project to test and measure the impact of values education on student effects and school ambience*. Report for the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) by The University of Newcastle. Canberra: DEEWR. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Project_to_Test_and_Measure_the_Impact_of_Values_Education.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Lovat, T., Dally, K., Clement, N., & Toomey, R. (2011). Values pedagogy and teacher education: Re-conceiving the foundations. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 36,* 30–44.

Lunenberg, M., Korthagen, F., & Willemse, M. (2007). Values-based teacher education: The role of knowledge, language and golden moments. In T. Russell & J. Loughran (Eds.), *Enacting a pedagogy of teacher education: Values, relationships and practices* (pp. 166–181). London: Routledge.

MacQueen, S. (2009). Pre-service teaching and values education: Achieving authenticity. *Social Educator, 27*(1)*,* 16–22.

Matthews, R. (2010). Reflections on a pre-service teacher education approach through the lens of the troika. In R. Toomey, T. Lovat, N. Clement, & K. Dally (Eds.), *Teacher education and values pedagogy: A student wellbeing approach* (pp. 195–207). Sydney: David Barlow.

Newmann, F., & Associates. (1996). *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Palmer, P. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Parsons, T., & Bales, R. (1955). *Family, socialization and interaction process.* Glencoe: Free Press.

Rennie, J., & Theriot, S. (2010). The troika, student wellbeing and literacy education. In R. Toomey, T. Lovat, N. Clement, & K. Dally (Eds.), *Teacher education and values pedagogy: A student wellbeing approach* (pp. 121–134). Sydney: David Barlow.

Revell, L., & Arthur, J. (2007). Character education in schools and the education of teachers. *Journal of Moral Education, 36,* 79–92.

Ryan, M., Carrington, S., Selva, G., & Healy, A. (2009). Taking a 'reality' check: Expanding preservice teachers' views on pedagogy and diversity. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 37,* 155–173.

Saggers, B., & Carrington, S. (2008). Outcomes of a service-learning program for pre-service teachers: Links to Butin's conceptual model. *Teaching Education, 19*, 57–71.

Thornberg, R. (2008). The lack of professional knowledge in values education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24,* 1791–1798.

Toomey, R., Lovat, T., Clement, N., & Dally, K. (2010). (Eds.), *Teacher education and values pedagogy: A student wellbeing approach.* Sydney: David Barlow.

Tytler, R., Barraza, L., & Paige, K. (2010). Values in science and environmental education. In R. Toomey, T. Lovat, N. Clement, & K. Dally (Eds.), *Teacher education and values pedagogy: A student wellbeing approach* (pp. 156–178). Sydney: David Barlow.

Wakefield, D. (1997). *Who's teaching teachers about character education instruction?* Atlanta: Lagrange.

Zahn-Waxler, C., Radke-Yarrow, M., & King, R. A. (1979). Child rearing and children's prosocial initiations toward victims of distress. *Child Development, 50,* 319–330.

Chapter 11
The Ambience and Discourse of Values Pedagogy

The Ambience of Values Pedagogy

It seems clear that the right ambience (what might be described as the implicitness of values pedagogy), together with explicit discourse around values, constitutes the key that unlocks the doors to improved academic diligence and learning that have been evident in the research findings uncovered in this book. In this chapter, we will define what is meant by ambience and explicitness of discourse, according to the research available to us. We will do this first around 'ambience', the implicit dimension of values pedagogy.

If 'ambience' is one of the keys to diligence, what does the research tell us about this aspect? In the 'Testing and Measuring' study, we first introduced the notion that ambience and academic diligence were related, proffering this on the basis of the persistence of claims occurring in earlier studies from the Australian Values Education Program. When compiling the outcomes of the study, we concluded that the calmer environment occasioned by values pedagogy, together with improved teacher–student relationships and students having a firmer sense of security and feeling safe and protected, seemed to be the hallmarks of the ambience that developed student (and teacher) self-esteem and impelled students towards "… putting greater effort into their work and 'striving for quality', 'striving to achieve their best' and even 'striving for perfection' … taking greater pride in their work and producing quality outcomes." (Lovat et al. 2009a, p. 6). These features would seem then to warrant further investigation regarding the precise meanings attached to them in our own and other studies.

Calm Environment

The very first of the Australian studies (DEST 2003) provided a clue to what was to come. It spoke strongly of notions of 'cohesion' and greater 'peace' developing in the schools that engaged in the study. It used this language in the wider context of referring constantly to the environment of learning as having changed for the better.

T. Lovat et al., *Values Pedagogy and Student Achievement,*
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-1563-9_11, © Springer Science+Business Media, B.V. 2011

In turn, it reflected on some of the earliest testimony associated with pilot projects (cf. Lovat and Schofield 2004) that began to build up data sets around the effects of values education. At the commencement of one of the pilot projects, a primary principal reflected on the difficulty of garnering the staff's commitment to engage in the project on the basis that they had 'no time' for anything extra. At the conclusion of the project and after having integrated a values project into the work of the school, this same principal claimed that the staff were now saying they had 'more time' because of the calmer environments in which they were working. The teachers said they had more time for teaching because of a reduction in disruptive student behaviour and the consequent distractions by the teacher.

Hence, we might say that 'calmer environment' is merely the flip side of what constitutes so many classroom dynamics, namely, environments of conflict that see teachers taken away from their primary focus for too much of the average day. If this is the case, it might be that there is no great underlying epistemological, neurological or other scientific issue at stake in the link between this aspect of ambience and improved diligence. It's all quite simple: a calmer environment results from lack of bad behaviour which in turn means teachers can teach more and, hence, students probably learn more and improve their academic focus. Quite easily done: calmer environment causes improved academic diligence!

The other possibility is that the improved academic diligence is itself part of what calms the environment. To some extent, the cause-effect gravity is reversed. This would be closer to the way the quality pedagogue might see the issue and, in all likelihood, the neuroscientist as well. By this explanation, through engaging students in deeper pedagogy, more sophisticated and challenging learning and, above all (especially for the neuroscientist), learning that engages the emotions, social needs, possibly moral, spiritual and aesthetic impulses, then learning in itself becomes a richer experience and as a result students become calmer. So, is it the chicken or the egg first or is it perhaps both taking their turns? Let us explore the evidence.

In the first phase of VEGPSP (DEST 2006), the theme of calmness related to improvement in both behaviour and learning continued strongly throughout all of the reports from across the 312 schools. The school was declared to be a 'better place' because the intervention had led to students displaying improved self-control and hence becoming better behaved, in both the classroom and the playground. In much of the testimony, it seems the better environment happened first and the improved learning followed. In other testimony, however, it seemed the reverse was the case. The improved attitudes of teachers to their teaching was often mentioned as the first change that was notable, and that when teachers were faced with the challenge of integrating values into their curriculum, they implemented more engaging learning activities and, furthermore, through using the discourse of the values programme itself learned how to deal with behaviour more effectively. In turn, students began adapting better to their learning and, in the accumulated effects of all this, a greater calmness descended:

> by creating an environment where these values were constantly shaping classroom activity, student learning was improving, teachers and students were happier, and school was calmer. (p. 120)

In the second phase of VEGPSP (DEEWR 2008), there was similar testimony that could have led to either cause-effect interpretation or indeed to simply seeing a strong linkage between calmness and effective learning environments, whichever the chicken, whichever the egg. As reported earlier, evidence from the second phase underlined the importance of explicitness ('living and breathing values') and the particularly strong effects of a community engagement (or service learning) component on both strengthening the learning environment and instilling a greater calmness, seen especially in students' more self-regulated behaviour:

> … when students have opportunities to give to their community, to something beyond themselves, it changes their attitude to the learning tasks. (p. 41)

There was also in phase 2 a repeat of the notion of cohesion accompanying calmness, as well as emphasis on growth in both student and teacher self-confidence.

In international studies, the notion of calmness as a cause of, a result of, or simply in conjunction with, improved learning regimes is also evident. Farrer (2010) refers to calmness among both students and staff as one of the features of the values pedagogy she witnessed transforming the West Kidlington, United Kingdom, school:

> Because everyone's happy and calm, they're learning more. (p. 396)

Farrer appears to see calmness as a deliberate prerogative strategy that sets the scene for effective values education of the kind that leads to enhanced learning. Hence, she sees 'a moment's silence' or imposed reflectivity as an important initial step in settling children's minds and bodies so that they will be in a relaxed and receptive state for learning. Thus, calmness is seen as a cause more than an effect.

A similar perspective is seen in Abdul-Samad (2010) who recommends the establishment of calm as a prerequisite for learning to respond well. In the specific training regime of which she is speaking, Abdul-Samad underlines the importance of the trainer (or teacher) modelling calmness in order to elicit similar calmness in trainees in order that the right learning disposition might be established. Sukhomlinska (2010) also emphasizes the crucial role for effective learning of instilling calmness among pupils and Tooth (2010) provides case study data that illustrates the importance. In turn, this calmness is something that the students then take into their learning routines.

In Nielsen (2010), the same perspective is present but, again, one gets the sense that calm is at least as much an effect as a cause. The inference in Nielsen's study about values pedagogy in the form of social engagement is that it is the positive emotions created by the experience of giving that instils the calm. The calmness comes after the actual intervention, as an inherent flow-on component of the pedagogy, not as a prerequisite to it. Furthermore, Nielsen refers to related studies that show the same effect, including clinical ones with strict scientific controls around them. Narvaez's (2010) work similarly speaks of calm as something that accompanies values-related pedagogy rather than being a condition of it. Adalbjarnardottir (2010) provides case study data that also places the notion of calmness as an accompaniment to values pedagogy and again seemingly something that follows rather than precedes the actual learning exercise.

So, there is no consensus about the precise role that calmness plays in the values pedagogy that enhances academic diligence but it seems to be an ever present feature of the ambience created by the pedagogy. Whether as cause or effect, or both, the calm classroom, characterized by a range of features including more positive and self-regulated behaviour among students, better organization of curriculum and teaching, learning activities more likely to stimulate the whole person (cognition, emotion, sociality, etc.), more explicit values discourse and ideally a component that involves social engagement, seems to be a persistent facet of the learning site where academic diligence is regularly reported.

Relationships

Again, the issue of improved relationships resulting from values infusion and intervention was apparent from the very first iteration of the Australian programmes and became an ever-recurring theme throughout their history:

> ... the 50 final projects … were underpinned by a clear focus on building more positive relationships within the school as a central consideration for implementing values education on a broader scale. (DEST 2003, p. 3)

Granted the emphasis on relationships as a key feature of trusting environments (Bryk and Schneider 2002) and of ambiences that impel quality teaching (Newmann and Associates 1996), it is hardly surprising that it became such a resounding issue across the programmes, no doubt explaining much about the 'double-helix' effect of values pedagogy:

> We observed that those teachers whose classrooms were characterised by an inclusive culture of caring and respect and where character development played an important and quite often explicit role in the daily learning of students were those same teachers who also demonstrated a high level of personal development, self-awareness of, and commitment to their own values and beliefs. (DEEWR 2008, p. 39)

> It was ... observed (within the school) that where teachers were seeing the importance of establishing relationships and of respecting their students—this was reflected in the behaviour of their students ... Where teachers are embracing values education as something that is important and to be embedded in practice—their pedagogy is enhanced. (DEEWR 2008, pp. 81–82)

The explicitness of the impact of the values intervention on the improved relationships was explained in a variety of ways but never more persistently than by reference to the 'common language' that allowed for discourse and dialogue about matters that might otherwise have proved obstructive. By means of the facility of a shared language, issues could be brokered between teachers and students, and students and students, so alleviating conflict, improving behaviour and ultimately strengthening relationships between the various stakeholders. These features then had a 'ripple effect' on the total learning environment. Hence, the issue of improved relationships was hardly ever reported as a single, isolated item. On the contrary, it was virtually always enmeshed in a matrix of related issues:

> ... focussed classroom activity, calmer classrooms with students going about their work purposefully, and more respectful behaviour between students. Teachers and students also reported improved relationships between the two groups. Other reports included improved student attendance, fewer reportable behaviour incidents and the observation that students appeared happier. (DEEWR 2008 p. 27)

In the 'Testing and Measuring' report, these various claims were put to the test and the items of measurement that sat behind them were able to be clarified. In general terms, the claims were strongly endorsed by the quantitative and qualitative instruments used in this study, with the conclusion being:

> Of student–teacher relationships, there was evidence of a '... rise in levels of politeness and courtesy, open friendliness, better manners, offers of help, and students being more kind and considerate ...' the main impact of values education on student-teacher relationships appeared to be a greater understanding of each other's perspective or at least to have a greater respect for each other's position. (Lovat et al. 2009a, p. 9)

Clement (2010) draws on a wealth of international research in demonstrating that the issue of relationships is entirely central to the flow-on effects of improved behaviour, calmer environments and enhanced academic focus: "The development of intrinsic motivation flourishes in the context of secure relationships." (p. 48).

In general terms, the findings concerning relationships were in accord with a vast array of international evidence that draw the same conclusions. Relevant research comes from a variety of methodological types, from the conceptual to empirical ends of the scale. Carr (2010) brings up the rigorously philosophical end in proposing a certain informal logic around the proposition that teaching is such an inherently relational craft that it is inconceivable that anyone could think effective teaching (and presumably learning) could proceed in the absence of an emphasis on and realization of positive and supportive relations between teachers and their students: "… teaching as both a professional role and an activity is implicated in, or impossible to conceive apart from, human qualities of an inherently 'personal' nature, or from interpersonal relationships" (p. 63). Carr goes on to argue that teaching is a profession and is therefore bound by the kinds of professional ethics that obtain in professional occupations, as against other kinds of occupations, but that, moreover, there is something in teaching that is even beyond the norm for other professions. Because teaching is such an inherently 'people profession', the kinds of relationships that characterize it are even more integral to its work and its likely success. From Carr's point of view, the teacher whose relationships with students are not characterized by fair treatment, trust and support will have little chance of producing any positive effects in their students' wellbeing or work.

Robinson and Campbell (2010) highlight two features of their analysis of the values that stand out in the effective classroom. These are the quality of the learning itself, including worthwhile content, and the climate of the classroom, especially around teacher–student relationships. It is perhaps another way of expressing the performance/moral character nexus of Davidson et al. (2010) or indeed the 'double-helix' effect, that it is the quality of the teaching and the ambience of the learning that represent the two sides of effective education. Robinson and Campbell (2010) make a further link with the notion of 'inclusiveness' as an adjunct of positive re-

lationships that allows students to feel they belong to the learning environment and the learning within it. This impels their engagement with learning and so again the likelihood that, regardless of other contaminating factors, their academic focus and diligence will improve. The same interesting debate arises about the cause and effect sequence of relationships and inclusiveness. Which comes first, or does it matter as long as the nexus is achieved?

Tirri (2010) identifies through her empirical work on professional ethics that relationships management is one of the key features that underpins effective professional work for teachers. Furthermore, a feature of effective relationships management is the capacity to deal with affect: "The skill in understanding and expressing emotions is … necessary for teachers to establish caring relationships with their students and their families" (p. 159). Granted the neuroscientific work we have laboured in this book, it is clear that the teacher who can deal with affect and facilitate student comfort with the affective side of learning is likely to impel improved cognitive effect in students as well.

Hence, we find Gellel (2010, p. 163) proffering: "teachers play a fundamental role since it is through the relationships that they establish and develop with students, colleagues and the wider community that they share and facilitate values and holistic development." Kristjannson (2010) tests this notion against the logic and evidence and Hawkes (2010) provides a case study that shows the centrality of positive relationships to achieving all the benefits of values pedagogy, including the academic effect of improved attention to student work, a view endorsed in this case by an Ofsted Report of 2007 (Ofsted 2007).

Again, Osterman (2010) ties the issue of teacher–student relationship to the overall quality of teaching. It is not just the teacher who establishes good relationships with students who facilitates greater academic impact but the teacher who does this in conjunction with good quality content and effective pedagogical strategies. She is at pains to make the point that high quality teaching has its own effect on relationships. Again, we see the debate about cause-effect and circularity between relationships and effective pedagogy. They are not separate. Establishing positive relationships is itself part of pedagogy and, from the research before us, it would seem to be an indispensable part. It is however part, not whole, as Osterman insists. Osterman also underlines the crucial nature of modelling for good relationships to ensue. It is the way students see the teacher relating to fellow students that is the great determiner of how they will relate themselves. The teacher who employs favouritism, cronyism or discrimination of any kind is modelling precisely these behaviours. Teachers must be the model they want for the class. Reminiscent of Carr's caution above, teachers who do not model positive behaviours will not enjoy the long term effects of whole class student wellbeing, including its academic effects. Osterman (2010) cites results of a study that showed that positive relationships among students were an inherent aspect of teachers achieving optimal results: "these teacher behaviours appeared to contribute to a more positive classroom environment where students were engaged in and valued learning and where relationships with peers were governed by friendship and support." (p. 247).

Arthur and Wilson (2010) report on a study from the United Kingdom that confirmed relationships as one of a number of key features of programmes that nurture student wellbeing, including in the development of character and students' overall growth in knowledge and confidence as learners:

> Above all, the quality of relationships between teachers and students is an essential aspect of character formation in schools. There is a positive relationship between character dimensions, achievement and learning dispositions. (p. 352)

Meanwhile, Dasoo's (2010) report on a South African study with a particularly disadvantaged clientele illustrates dramatically the indispensable nature of promoting and establishing the right sorts of relationships as an inherent and inextricable part of the pedagogy. In this case, it is a veritable *sine qua non* first step in effective pedagogy:

> I will present evidence of how a values education initiative has the potential to refocus and nurture the teacher's understanding of the important role he or she plays not only in imparting subject knowledge to a learner but also in creating relationships with them that are indicative of commitment to and care for the development of their character and the eventual role they will play in society. (p. 360)

In furthering the debate about cause and effect, Farrer (2010) clearly depicts the positive relationships that she saw as an effect of the kind of values pedagogy that dictated the ethos in her observational site. Sun and Stewart (2010) make the further link with 'connection', drawing on an array of research that suggests that students being connected with their learning communities results in less psychological illness, suicidal thoughts and attempts, violent behaviour and substance abuse, among other effects. Furthermore, they propose that relationships are the key to connection and that relationships are "… positively associated with students' motivation, achievement, feelings of belonging and affect in school," (p. 409) whether as cause or effect. Sun and Stewart make further links between the centrality of relationships and other features of learning sites that seem to work for their students' wellbeing, features such as 'resilience' and 'safety', that are also commonly reported on as characteristic of values pedagogical sites.

Benninga and Tracz (2010) review their empirical findings that showed a positive correlation between academic achievement and values education, and indeed that advanced work in values education had an enduring effect on academic achievement:

> They not only showed positive relationships between the extent of character education implementation and their academic indicators that same year, but also positive correlations on those measures across the next two academic years. (p. 522)

Furthermore, they specify that one of the highlighted features of the 'values' schools that had this effect was "school programmes that promoted a caring community and positive social relationships" (p. 523). In a similar vein, Sokol et al. (2010) proffer the 'contours of character' of the sort that has been found to be instrumental in holistic development:

> The bulk of children's moral growth occurs within peer settings where relationships are characterized by mutual respect and reciprocity. Research suggests that fostering positive peer relationships and collaborative opportunities promotes the development of autonomous moral reasoning. (p. 591)

Adalbjarnardottir (2010) confirms this view in her own conceptual and empirical work around a series of case studies concerned with teacher competence. Her conclusion is that a teacher's capacity to establish effective and positive relationships with students and among students is a fundamental piece in the puzzle of teacher competence. She notes furthermore that there is still insufficient work being done on the link between this aspect of teacher professional growth and student progress. No doubt, this relates to the instrumentalist demands placed on teacher education and in-service, in spite of the fact that the evidence seems to be suggesting that the key to student wellbeing, including academic achievement, lies elsewhere. Johnson and Johnson (2010) confirm this view in their work that shows the impact of values pedagogy on a range of developmental measures and effects, including strengthened relationships with peers and others. From their perspective, it seems relationships are clearly an effect as well as a pedagogical strategy.

Service Learning and Social Engagement

Service learning is a form of values education with particularly strong credentials for impacting on overall student academic success (Billig 2002). This form of values education engenders informed and effective social engagement and once again relationships are at the core of this approach. In this case, the students' relationships are not restricted to members of the school but extend to members of the wider community as the students enact their social care and responsibility. A Habermasian perspective can be used to explain and justify the particular kinds of relationships that seem to result:

> The frame of reference emanates from Habermas's 'Ways of Knowing' and 'Communicative Action' theories. In a word, it is the one who knows not only empirically analytically and historically hermeneutically, but self-reflectively who is capable of the just and empowering relationships implied in the notion of communicative action. In a sense, one finally comes truly to know when one knows oneself, and authentic knowing of self can only come through action for others, the practical action for change and betterment implied by praxis. Habermas provides the conceptual foundation for a values education that transforms educational practice, its actors in students and teachers, and the role of the school towards holistic social agency, the school that is not merely a disjoined receptacle for isolated academic activity, but one whose purpose is to serve and enrich the lives not only of its immediate inhabitants but of its community. (Lovat et al. 2010, p. 616)

Remembering that Habermas rests his notion of effective social action (namely, *praxis*) on people reaching the most sophisticated levels of knowing helps to clarify why it is that attaining such a level of knowing and then committing to concomitant action would logically have an impact on one's powers of knowing generally and so issue in the enhanced academic performance to which Billig's (2002) work testifies.

Additionally, Crotty (2010) is able to apply the Habermasian perspective specifically to making sense of the improved academic focus that he saw so clearly demonstrated in the participants in the four clusters of schools where he observed values education leading to effective social engagement. This perspective enabled him to name the effect as enhanced higher order thinking leading to emancipatory knowledge.

Crotty goes on to name the effects he observed in each of four case studies in Habermasian language. He concludes: "In short, habits of self-reflection have been fostered, ideologies have been recognized and higher order thinking has been taking place" (p. 636). Such new knowing has now reached the point where it can build new, altruistic relationships, including with those most in need and by those students who, before the programme, were often those in most need themselves.

Safer and More Secure

As with the other themes, that of safety and greater security as a result of values pedagogy showed up from the earliest of the Australian projects. It ranged from routine comments about enhanced safety in the physical environment and among relationships (DEST 2003, pp. 18, 20, 58) to more epistemologically and pedagogically loaded concepts about feelings of safety and especially commitment to the safety of others being pre-requisites for higher learning to occur (p. 63) and being associated with the kind of ambience in which all the connections for wellbeing occur (p. 78). It was noted in this very first project that the concept of safety was more than physical safety and that some of the more profound attachments concerned acceptance of difference, to create the kind of inter culturally aware and accepting environment wherein all comers, especially those representing difference, could feel secure:

> … to re-engineer a school culture' so the school could 'promote and nurture itself as a safe, compassionate, tolerant and inclusive school. (p. 96)

There were references to improved behaviour as a factor that served as both cause and effect of a "safer learning environment" (p. 124) and that this had flow on effects to student self-confidence and self-esteem (p. 124). Invariably, safety was enmeshed as a central feature of the school where holistic learning and wellbeing, including academic achievement, was seen to be developing:

> The core school values contribute towards the desirable outcomes of safety, happiness, connectedness, emotional well-being, high self-esteem, exemplary behaviour, citizenship, service, achievement and student self-confidence. (p. 131)

In later projects, the theme of safety was more persistent and the holistic connection with wellbeing emerged significantly, as did the proactive potential for students immersed in a values environment. That is, safety was not just something that students should wait for or expect to have put in place for them, but something they could build for themselves and their peers through their own greater responsibility (p. 85). Hence, it was referred to as an accompaniment of environments characterized by re-

spect and cooperation, in turn affecting the learning ambience (DEST 2006, p. 81). It was a feature of those places where students' self-esteem, confidence and commitment to personal fulfilment were being promoted and facilitated (p. 103). It was seen to be especially important for students who are more inclined to feel threatened in learning environments, so being one of the constituent reasons why values pedagogy is routinely seen to enhance the academic functioning of students less inclined towards learning:

> The atmosphere of care and safety generated in a community of inquiry provides a space in which less confident students can try out ideas with the guarantee that they will be listened to. (p. 121)

The notion of safety was also found to be essential to establishing an atmosphere of inclusion, again emphasizing its importance in overcoming issues related to intolerance of difference and the threatening environment that can result for minority groups. In VEGPSP, some of the artefacts of safety were specified more clearly, including that of a common language:

> … a shared school community language that could contribute to positive, safe and inclusive learning communities. (DEST 2006, p. 181)

The role of students in building their own safe environment in which learning can be enhanced and overall wellbeing promoted was also expressed more clearly in this project (p. 187).

As with all the common themes arising throughout the projects, the issue of safety became more sophisticated in the later projects (DEEWR 2008), being closely allied with overall pedagogical features of the ambience being referred to:

> The pedagogies engage students in real-life learning, offer opportunity for real practice, provide safe structures for taking risks, and encourage personal reflection and action. (p. 9)

> … requires students to scrutinise questions that are difficult to resolve or answer, and focus on listening, thinking, challenging and changing viewpoints within a guided and safe environment. (p. 28)

> The structured discussion and agreed values that govern the engagement provide safety and support for students as well as an expectation that correction and revision are part of the debating process. It promotes critical thinking and encourages an obligation to respect one's fellow inquirers. It attempts to produce better thinkers and more caring members of society, who accept differences and, at the same time, submit conflicts to reasonable scrutiny. All participants are expected to respect one another as thoughtful members of the group who communally seek to better understand the issue at hand. (p. 28)

> The pedagogy gives students responsibility but recognises the inherent risks of this and accordingly provides for student safety and support. (p. 32)

There was also greater prominence given to justifying the findings around safety by reference to extant research: "Zins et al. (2004) conclude that safe, caring and orderly environments are conducive to learning." (p. 41)

Also in the second phase of VEGPSP (DEEWR 2008), there was greater realization being expressed about the implications of values pedagogy for teacher practice, self-confidence and self-esteem, and one of the common facets of this was seen in reference to teacher safety. This was not so much physical safety, but a security pro-

vided by supportive colleagues that promotes the risk-taking that is necessary when embarking on new teaching approaches:

> Participation in values education projects can provide a safe learning environment for teachers to expand their repertoires of practice through the sharing of strategies and supportive debriefing. (p. 60)

> … encourage teachers to articulate their experiences and critically reflect on their pedagogy in an improvement cycle that is safe, respectful and productive. (p. 116)

The many claims around the centrality of safety and security as an indispensable feature of those learning environments wherein wellbeing flourishes, including academic progress being tangible, were endorsed and confirmed when put to the test in the empirical project designed to test all the claims of the earlier projects (Lovat et al. 2009a, b).

As is to be expected, the notion of safety and security as part of the ambience associated with strengthened learning is no less prominent in international research. Robinson and Campbell (2010) note that students report safety as a feature of those environments where values pedagogy is being implemented, as do Tirri (2010) and Haydon (2010). Osterman (2010) is one who has done intensive work on examining and appraising those features of teacher practice that enhance academic performance. In general, it is the teacher who both teaches well and establishes the right sorts of relationships with students who provides the most effective learning environment. One of the facets entailed in this latter that she specifies is the setting up of 'safe space' (p. 270) in which students feel respected and can safely practise respect for their fellows. Spooner-Lane et al. (2010) similarly note the circular effect of teachers making students feel safe and, in turn, students ensuring the safety and security of each other. Like Osterman, Spooner-Lane et al. also note safe space as one of the enmeshed features of those sites where teachers both establish the right relationships and provide overall high class pedagogy:

> … teachers must possess certain capabilities that will allow them to provide high quality instruction in a safe, supportive, and stimulating learning environment and design and manage individual and group learning experiences that are intellectually stimulating. (p. 383)

Sun and Stewart (2010) also highlight safety as a feature of the learning environment that produces the full effect of values pedagogy, as do Davidson et al. (2010), Abdul-Samed (2010), Crawford (2010), Flay and Allred (2010), Benninga and Tracz (2010) and Nielsen (2010). Narvaez (2010) cites her own earlier work in making the connection between the safety of the physical environment and the potential psychological security that is necessary to the effective learning ambience. She notes the distraction from learning that ensues when students feel unsafe and become preoccupied by their insecurity:

> When climates are unsafe to the individual, they will provoke a "security ethic" in which self-safety becomes a major focus and priority for action. (p. 667)

Brew and Beatty (2010) tie the notion of the safe environment to the overall social cohesion experienced by the student and hence the strengthening of this environment's potential to support enhanced academic success:

> Among interrelated outcomes are increases in student sense of safety and belonging, parent and community partnership involvement in school and student academic performance, along with decreases in bullying, vandalism, absenteeism and discipline problems. (p. 680)

Brew and Beatty cite a principal of one of their project schools who summarized the link between safety and academic progress in the following way:

> The biggest impact would have been respect and ultimately all schools their first priority is academics ... I think sometimes I would rather put respect first and put the academic pillar second. All the research and all the work that we have done as a staff and as a community that when kids are physically and emotionally safe the academic piece will come—so therefore that is why I look at that respect piece first before I look at the academic piece. (pp. 683–684)

Adalbjarnardottir (2010) emphasizes the importance of the safety factor in her analysis of teachers undergoing professional development in an effort to enhance their learning environments. Adalbjarnardottir provides further justification for this facility as part of the matrix that builds and sustains academic development in the following analysis:

> … as teachers create a caring and safe classroom atmosphere, students can feel free to express their ideas, feel they are heard, and feel the need to listen to each other—and feel motivated to argue, debate, and reach agreement. (p. 744)

Explicit Values Discourse

In summary, it seems the jury is well and truly in that ambience is one of the most significant keys to academic improvement. Furthermore, this ambience is characterized across vastly different research domains in a remarkably predictable way. What then is this predictable characterization? In which ambience does this improvement occur? Once again, the evidence suggests that it occurs in the ambience characterized by calmness, by positive teacher–student relationships and by safety and security in both basic and sophisticated senses. No doubt, there are other words that could be used and other emphases drawn out but we are at the point of saying that, in all likelihood, any of these characterizations would be reducible to one or all of these key features. Hence, it is clear what constitutes the main implicit aspect of values pedagogy, namely, the ambience of learning as understood above, and this all makes perfect sense. It is in accord entirely with the pedagogical work of Newmann, cited several times in this book. The ambience of support and trust is a *sine qua non* of the pedagogy that produces the best holistic results.

The issue is whether it is sufficient to have the ambience in order for the full wellbeing and academic improvement effects to be realized. This issue taps to some extent into a very old debate about whether values are caught or taught. Having been party to the research uncovered in this book, we would now say both. Values are clearly caught through being involved in wholesome environments but the values inculcation and empowerment entailed in enhanced academic engagement

requires that they be taught as well. Not taught in a haphazard way but in a way that is consistent with the calmed, relationships-rich, safe and secure ambience; in other words, taught in a way that respects individual worth, rights and capacities, challenges students' cognitive powers, recognizing that these powers entail and require affective and social engagement, and most likely aesthetic satisfaction and spiritual nurture as well. We believe we have seen values discourse imparted in these ways in the context of the wholesome ambience to have its own power in engaging learners in strengthened academic work.

While there were early indications of this link between values discourse and academic focus in the earliest of the Australian projects, it became especially apparent in the transition from phases 1 and 2 of VEGPSP. While results from this study confirmed "… the vital link between a values approach to pedagogy and the ambience it created with the holistic effects of this approach on student behaviour and performance" (Lovat et al. 2010, p. 11), it counts among a number of other features that became apparent "… the explicitness of the pedagogy around values being seen to be determinative" (p. 11):

> The principle of explicitness applies more broadly and pervasively than has been previously recognised ... values-based schools live and breathe a values consciousness. They become schools where values are thought about, talked about, taught about, reflected upon and enacted across the whole school in all school activities. (DEEWR 2008, p. 37)

Furthermore, as noted many times in this book, when the explicitness takes the form of organized curricular activities around social engagement, or what we have referred to as 'service learning', the holistic effect, including in enhanced academic focus, seems to be especially pronounced:

> Uniformly, teachers report that doing something with and for the community increases the students' engagement in their learning. (DEEWR 2008, p. 41)

The 'explicitness principle' was further confirmed in the 'Testing and Measuring' project, summarized in the following way in the report:

> The closer the attention a school gives to explicitly teaching a set of agreed values, the more the students seem to comply with their school work demands, the more conducive and coherent a place the school becomes and the better the staff and students feel. (Lovat et al. 2009a, p. 12)

Again, we need to be careful in eschewing any notion that we are suggesting there is some magic in values discourse so that all one has to do is engage in it and the effect will be felt. We have been at pains ourselves to understand what it is about the explicit transaction of values-oriented discussion that has the effect so often noted. Early clues came in the form of teacher testimony about students becoming less defensive, more open, more engaged and engaging as a result of values discussion. Teachers often reported on the 'ripple effect' of such 'warming' being in better relationships, greater understanding between teachers and students that then flowed on into other parts of the curriculum, making teaching easier and more enjoyable overall. We surmise that there is something about values discourse that students (and teachers) find more personalized than much of the regular talk of the

classroom. Such discourse then becomes disruptive of the standard regimes that too often separate teachers and students. Conversations about values are conversations worth having.

One could apply some of Carr's (2010) thinking here about the inherent 'people profession' notion of teaching and how its effectiveness stands or falls on the strength of the relationship. One could also apply some of Damasio's (2003) thoughts about the cognition/affect/sociality nexus, so that discourse that engages more of the whole person (emotion, social and moral impulses, aesthetic and spiritual inclinations) will naturally have flow on effects to enriched cognitive functioning. One might simply think of Ginott's (1995) musings that feeling well and thinking well are two sides of the educational coin and that it is mainly the teacher who will effect both by the way the relationship is forged and the curriculum unfolded. Certainly Osterman's (2010) work that provides evidence that it is the teacher who both positions well and engages in the most enriched explicit curriculum action who produces the best academic effect is hugely relevant to this issue. Similarly, Robinson and Campbell's (2010) work demonstrated the clear connection between explicit discourse about values and enhanced pedagogical engagement by teachers and students, placing it, as we noted above, in the context of 'inclusiveness'. Perhaps, well formed and effected values discourse facilitates all stakeholders, teachers and students, feeling more included and this is what leads to better behaviour, calmer environments, stronger relationships, feeling safer and, in turn, enhanced academic diligence.

Ofsted (2007), referred to above, noted the role played by the explicit values discourse at West Kidlington school, United Kingdom, as seeming to be determinative of improvement across the various quality measures, including academic performance. In detailing the features that sit behind this generalized notion of values discourse, Hawkes (2010) makes the further link with the idea of a common language:

> (values education) explicitly develops an ethical vocabulary, based on the values words, which becomes a common language accessible to both students and adults. It encourages reflective learning … (p. 234)

Furthermore, Toomey (2010) illustrated in his work the ways in which the common language about values came to shape all aspects of school life, including greater attention to academic work, citing again the testimony from VEGPSP:

> We also found that by creating an environment where these values were constantly shaping classroom activity, student learning was improving, teachers and students were happier, and school was calmer. (p. 33)

While the jury is still out on the precise nature of the connections between ambience, explicit values discourse and the academic effect, we feel fully justified in saying again that "… there is now a vast store of evidence from values education research that the establishment of a positive, caring and encouraging ambience of learning, together with explicit discourse about values in ways that draw on students' deeper learning and reflectivity, has power to transform the patterns of feelings, behaviour, resilience and academic diligence." (Lovat 2010, p. 10).

Values Pedagogy versus Political Pedagogy: A Final Word from Habermas

So what is so remarkable about these research findings? Nothing, we would say. The notion that young people at the most vulnerable points of their emotional and social lives, and as their cognitive powers are growing and being tested, would learn better in hostile than calm settings, characterized by negative relationships with elders and peers, rather than positive ones, and where they feel unsafe and insecure, rather than the opposite, and where the discourse is antiseptic and unengaging, is obviously preposterous. So what have we proven? Nothing, we say. Anyone with the barest of human instincts about the ways in which people function would know perfectly well that no one will develop or operate well in environments where they feel unsupported, uncared for and constantly being judged, where routines are characterized by being overly competitive and/or punitive, and where expectations and verbal engagement are vague, indecisive and unchallenging. We all know that. So what have we shown? Absolutely nothing, we would say, except for those who have forgotten all the lessons about human beings and effective engagement, or never knew them, and except for systems that are structured as though their architects have forgotten all these lessons or never knew them, systems better dubbed sites of political rather than values pedagogy.

In a word, there is no surprise whatever in any of these findings. The surprise rather is that in the infancy of universal education (and that is how it is best to see these first 130–150 years or so), we have allowed it to be overly subjected to alien interests and foreign forces, politicized agendas that have been insufficiently sensitized to the needs of young people and their future prospects as maximally participating citizens. These forces have had different faces at different moments of these past fifteen or so decades, be they the forces at work in the nineteenth century that simply wanted children off the street or ‘out of the mines’, those of the early twentieth century that saw schools primarily as ‘sifters and sorters’ that would ensure that the inequality essential to social stability was maintained across the generations, those of the late twentieth century that saw education being simply about career preparation or those of more recent times for whom schools have become too often pawns to be moved around and exploited in the interests of political agendas around testing and performance. These are the forces of what we are referring to as political pedagogy. As Dewey intimated, any of these forces is capable of destroying education and most of those who enter its school systems.

As we have done so often in this book, we turn to Habermas to have the final and definitive word on why it is that the effects seen in values pedagogy of enhanced wellbeing, including academic diligence, are not a surprise—indeed, they are predictable—and furthermore why the effects of political pedagogy are so pernicious. Habermas offers the comprehensive explanation and justification for the effects of holistic learning. While essentially a philosophical perspective, his insights have rare potential to straddle the various disciplines that we have seen informing the debate.

Habermas's theories of knowing and communicative action offer, between them, particularly powerful tools for analyzing the capacity of values pedagogy to transform people's beliefs and behaviours in ways that conform to the evidence we have uncovered. As we have said, they render the notion of values neutrality in education non-viable and therefore challenge the authenticity of any education conceived of solely in instrumentalist terms. In contrast, they lead naturally to the notion that any legitimate education requires a values-laden approach, in terms of both ambience and discourse. Hence, they help to explain why it is that values pedagogy's priority of saturating the learning experience with both a values-filled environment and explicit teaching that engages in discourse about values-related content tends towards such holistic effects as have been uncovered in the research. Furthermore, the Habermasian notion that critical and self-reflective knowing issues in emancipation and empowerment, so spawning communicative capacity and communicative action, both justifies and explains the effects of an approach to learning that prioritizes the transaction of values.

Habermasian epistemology therefore is able to be used to justify philosophically and explain the practical effects of an approach to learning that is aimed at the full range of developmental measures in the interests of holistic student learning and wellbeing. Rather than connoting a mere moral or, least of all religious option, values education is able to be constructed philosophically, psychologically and pedagogically as an effective way in which learning can and should proceed in any school setting.

Furthermore, because Habermas rests his notion of effective social action (namely, *praxis*) on people reaching the most sophisticated levels of knowing, in contrast with more dated thinking about values formation and the role (or lack thereof) of the teacher and formal schooling in such formation, the Habermasian emphasis on knowing as the key to values formation suggests that effective personal, social and moral citizenship is not only educable but that there is an inherent educational component in it. That is, 'values' is inherently and naturally pedagogical, in a way again reminiscent of Aristotle. As such, it is as much something educators 'are' as 'do'. Moreover, this understanding of values as inherent and natural pedagogy helps to clarify why it is that attaining such a level of knowing and then committing to concomitant action would logically have an impact on one's powers of knowing generally and so issue in enhanced academic performance.

In a word, Habermasian thought has potential to deepen profoundly not only our understanding of the full human developmental capacities that are implied in effective learning but to help us in developing the kinds of pedagogies needed to effect them. The employment of Habermas in the context of values pedagogy, especially when allied with social engagement in the form of service learning, is particularly instructive. For here we see a line of convergence opening up between his theoretical world and the pedagogy required to produce the kind of values education that leads to effective social engagement, such that new knowing is implied and deeper learning enhanced. In effect, the Habermasian theories constitute an epistemological template for social engagement that is informed by authentic human knowing, at one end, and impels altruistic action, at the other end.

In summary, Habermasian theory determines that effective education can never be focussed solely on 'the basics' of technical learning (the *techne*) if it is seriously looking to the good of its clients and society at large. In a Habermasian schema, social engagement that is aimed at developing *praxis* and communicative action is not an added extra or marginal nicety. It is at the heart of what an authentic school will be about, namely, taking a wide ranging social agency for the good of society and directly for the good of its clients, the students at hand, because it is only the school that provides these forms of pedagogy that can ultimately facilitate the kind of knowing that is most authentically human. In contrast to instrumentalist notions of schooling, a Habermasian notion will impel educational charters that deal with the intellectual, social, emotional, moral and spiritual good of their clientele. This is an education intention directed towards teachers and schools playing a role in the forming of individuals who understand integrity and apply it to their practical decision-making, and furthermore assist in the cohering of those individuals into functional and beneficent societies. An implication of this education intention is around the removal of any artificial division between knowing and values, since all knowing has an ethical component and is related in some way to human action. With this understanding, Habermas challenges contemporary education to deal with the essentials rather than mere basics of learning. He offers an epistemology that impels holistic and comprehensive pedagogy that engages with the full array of human development and social good.

The other final word on Habermas in relation to shaping education's future is in the interdisciplinary comprehensiveness of his thinking, implied above. Quite clearly and expectedly, his work entails ease of conversation with the various philosophies we have uncovered in this book, be they of Aristotle, Dewey, Carr or many others. What is less expected, however, is the apparent conversation that might ensue, first, with the psycho-educationists' theories of human behaviour and, second, with the neuroscientists' work on the inherent connectionism around the true nature of cognition, an integral troika of brain functions with tantalizing dialogical potential with Habermas's three ways of knowing theory, itself a troika around cognitive interests. It would take another book to deal adequately with this conversation, except to say briefly that the increasing probes in the neurosciences to understand the workings of the brain, to re-open debates about the nature of the 'mind' and even the 'soul', are likely to open up a raft of new conversations across disciplines, including, we suspect, between the central postulations of the neurosciences around the complex matrices of cognition and Habermas's central notion that human knowing is determined by 'cognitive interests'. In a word, be it from the philosophers, old and new, updated psychological, neuroscientific or pedagogical research, the message is clear that politically determined education that focusses overly on the *techne* is hopelessly discredited, without foundation and a menace to the prospects of our young people's future. Political pedagogies should be cast into the dustbins of history.

Conclusion

Again, we say, there is nothing remarkable about the research findings we have uncovered here, and, as such, we have neither shown nor proven anything except what none of us who care about education and our young people should ever forget. That is, that schools are places where human beings reside, where young people need to grow and develop and be encouraged to expand their cognitive capacities, think new thoughts, imagine, feel and enjoy their social relations, question and refine their own moral stances, be creative in their expression and performance and, if they so desire, explore their spiritual selves. All we have shown is the unsurprising finding that all this will happen best where they feel safe and secure, surrounded by positive relationships, enjoying the calm and settlement that comes with that sort of environment and being directed and challenged by engaging, personalized discourse.

It is not that these things militate against the *techne* of education, mastery learning, direct instruction, and standardized curricula and testing, in and of themselves. A Habermasian schema has room for these as important products of empirical-analytic knowing. It is rather that, without the ambience and discourse whose terms we have uncovered in this book, education will never go beyond the *techne.* Furthermore, even the influence of the *techne* will be reduced and minimized, reserved mainly for those whose resilience and academic surety are so strong they could probably withstand the worst of educational environments and still do well. It is those to whom the current challenge is mainly directed, regardless of the research paradigm, namely, the struggling end, the veritable 'tail' of education, who will be the victims when we do not learn the lessons that Habermas, and Dewey, Damasio, Newmann, Dreikurs and Glasser, Rowe and others have taught us. These lessons, variously expressed, are that it is in the care, the support, the trust and the inherently moral engagement, including explicit discourse about it, that most students will thrive, both those with ingrained resilience from home and those who need the school to help develop it in them, including in terms of their academic improvement. There is no surprise in any of this. The surprise is how quickly, easily and persistently we forget it, when instead we should have it always as the *sine qua non* of teaching and learning in schools and teacher education and professional development.

References

Abdul-Samad, S. (2010). Facilitating values education leadership through discovery of personal beliefs and values. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 455–470). Dordrecht: Springer.

Adalbjarnardottir, S. (2010). Passion and purpose: Teacher professional development and student social and civic growth. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 737–764). Dordrecht: Springer.

Arthur, J., & Wilson, K. (2010). New research directions in character and values education in the UK. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 339–358). Dordrecht: Springer.

Benninga, J. S., Berkowitz, M. W., Kuehn, P., & Smith, K. (2006). Character and academics: What good schools do. *Phi Delta Kappan, 87,* 448–452.

Benninga, J., & Tracz, S. (2010). Continuity and discontinuity in character education. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 521–548). Dordrecht: Springer.

Billig, S. H. (2002). Adoption, implementation, and sustainability of K-12 service-learning. In A. Furco & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *Service-learning: The essence of the pedagogy* (pp. 245–267). Greenwich: Information Age.

Brew, C., & Beatty, B. (2010). Valuing social and emotional connectedness among learners at all levels. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 675–702). Dordrecht: Springer.

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Carnegie Corporation. (1996). *Years of promise: A comprehensive learning strategy for America's children.* New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED397995). www.eric.gove.gov. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Carr, D. (2010). Personal and professional values in teaching. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 63–74). Dordrecht: Springer.

Clement, N. (2010). Student wellbeing at school: The actualisation of values in education. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 37–62). Dordrecht: Springer.

Crawford, K. (2010). Active citizenship education and critical pedagogy. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 811–824). Dordrecht: Springer.

Crotty, R. (2010). Values education as an ethical dilemma about sociability. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 631–644). Dordrecht: Springer.

Damasio, A. R. (2003). *Looking for spinoza: Joy, sorrow, and the feeling brain*. New York: Harcourt.

Dasoo, N. (2010). Nurturing teacher wellbeing through values education. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 359–376). Dordrecht: Springer.

Davidson, M., Khmelkov, V., & Lickona, T. (2010). The power of character: Needed for, and developed from, teaching and learning. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 427–454). Dordrecht: Springer.

DEEWR. (2008). *At the heart of what we do: Values education at the centre of schooling*. Report of the Values Education Good Practice Schools Project—Stage 2. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/values/val_vegps2_final_report,26142.html. Accessed 7 June 2011.

DEST. (2003). *Values education study.* Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/VES_Final_Report14Nov.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

DEST. (2006). Implementing the National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools. Report of the Values Education Good Practice Schools Project—Stage 1: Final Report, September 2006. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/VEGPS1_FINAL_REPORT_081106.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Farrer, F. (2010). Re-visiting the 'Quiet Revolution'. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 395–408). Dordrecht: Springer.

Flay, B., & Allred, C. (2010). The positive action program: Improving academics, behavior, and character by teaching comprehensive skills for successful learning and living. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 471–502). Dordrecht: Springer.

Gellel, A. (2010). Teachers as key players in values education: Implications for teacher formation. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 163–178). Dordrecht: Springer.

Ginott, H. (1995). *Teacher and child: A book for parents and teachers*: New York: Collier.

Hawkes, N. (2010). Values education and the national curriculum in England. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 225–238). Dordrecht: Springer.

Haydon, G. (2010). Values and well-being in the curriculum: Personal and public dimensions. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 195–210). Dordrecht: Springer.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2010). The impact of social interdependence on values education and student wellbeing. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 825–848). Dordrecht: Springer.

Kristjannson, K. (2010). Valuing the self. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 179–194). Dordrecht: Springer.

Lovat, T. (2010). The new values education: A pedagogical imperative for student wellbeing. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 3–18). Dordrecht: Springer.

Lovat, T. & Schofield, N. (2004). Values education for all schools and systems: A justification and experimental update. *New Horizons in Education, 111,* 4–13.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., & Clement, N. (Eds.), (2010). *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Dally, K., & Clement, N. (2009a). *Project to test and measure the impact of values education on student effects and school ambience*. Report for the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) by The University of Newcastle. Canberra: DEEWR. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Project_to_Test_and_Measure_the_Impact_of_Values_Education.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Dally, K., & Clement, N. (2009b). *Project to test and measure the impact of values education on student effects and school ambience*. Report for the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) by The University of Newcastle. Canberra: DEEWR. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Project_to_Test_and_Measure_the_Impact_of_Values_Education.pdf. Accessed 7 June 2011.

Narvaez, D. (2010). Building a sustaining classroom climate for purposeful ethical citizenship. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 659–674). Dordrecht: Springer.

Newmann, F., & Associates. (1996). *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nielsen, T. (2010). Towards pedagogy of giving for wellbeing and social engagement. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 617–630). Dordrecht: Springer.

Ofsted. (2007). *Inspection report: West Kidlington Primary School, 21–22 March, 2007*. Manchester: Office for Standards in Education.

Osterman, K. (2010). Teacher practice and students' sense of belonging. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 239–260). Dordrecht: Springer.

Robinson, W., & Campbell, R. (2010). School values and effective pedagogy: Case studies of two leading edge schools in England. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 75–90). Dordrecht: Springer.

Sokol, B., Hammond, S., & Berkowitz, M. (2010). The developmental contours of character. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 579–604). Dordrecht: Springer.

Spooner-Lane, R., Curtis, E., & Mergler, A. (2010). Embracing philosophy and raising the standard of pre-service teacher education programs. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 377–394). Dordrecht: Springer.

Sukhomlinska, O. (2010). Values education and whole person development in Ukraine: The role of Vasyl Sukhomlinsky and current applications. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 549–558) (addition & trans: A. Lenchovska). Dordrecht: Springer.

Sun, J., & Stewart, D. (2010). Promoting student resilience and wellbeing: Asia-Pacific resilient children and communities project. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 409–426). Dordrecht: Springer.

Tirri, K. (2010). Teacher values underlying professional ethics. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 153–162). Dordrecht: Springer.

Toomey, R. (2010). Values education, instructional scaffolding and student wellbeing. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 19–36). Dordrecht: Springer.

Tooth, R. (2010). Using a new body/mind place-based narrative pedagogy to teach values education in the age of sustainability. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey, & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 937–946). Dordrecht: Springer.

Zins, J., Weissberg, R., Wang, M., & Walberg, H. (2004). *Building academic success on social and emotional learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Author Index

T. Lovat et al., *Values Pedagogy and Student Achievement,*
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-1563-9, © Springer Science+Business Media, B.V. 2011

Subject Index

T. Lovat et al., *Values Pedagogy and Student Achievement,*
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-1563-9, © Springer Science+Business Media, B.V. 2011