International Research Handbook on Values Education and Student Wellbeing

Terence Lovat · Ron Toomey · Neville Clement
Editors

International Research Handbook on Values Education and Student Wellbeing

Preface and Introduction: Richard Pring,
University of Oxford, UK

Chief Reviewer: Nel Noddings, Stanford University,
CA, USA

Springer

Editors
Prof. Terence Lovat
Newcastle University
University Drive
Callaghan NSW 2308
Australia
terry.lovat@newcastle.edu.au

Prof. Ron Toomey
Newcastle University
University Drive
Callaghan NSW 2308
Australia
ron.toomey@acu.edu.au

Neville Clement
Newcastle University
University Drive
Callaghan NSW 2308
Australia
Neville.Clement@newcastle.edu.au

ISBN 978-90-481-8674-7 e-ISBN 978-90-481-8675-4
DOI 10.1007/978-90-481-8675-4
Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg London New York

Library of Congress Control Number: 2010924808

© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2010
No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Preface

Values education has been explicit in educational theory from Plato onwards – whether in advocating insight into the ‘form of the good’ (which only a guardian class or Coleridge’s clerisy might attain for the benefit of all) or, according to Aristotle, in arguing for the importance of good habits as an entry to the life of virtue or, according to Dewey, in promoting the social norms which constitute a democratic society. However, ‘values education’ in educational practices has more often than not been addressed only implicitly and therefore too often uncritically. The ‘disapplication’ in England of the arts and humanities from the compulsory curriculum after the age of 14 embodies a particular evaluation of those areas of thinking and feeling as a source of values; the promotion of the newly arrived subject of ‘enterprise’ does itself imply a shift in our received list of approved virtues; the direction of students through either academic or vocational pathways reflects the dominant values that are meant to shape the learning of the higher attainers.

It is only comparatively recently that the teaching of values has become widespread as an explicit focus of curriculum thinking and practising. In the last 50 years or so, prompted particularly by the work of Lawrence Kohlberg at the Centre for Moral Development at Harvard University (Kohlberg, 1976), by the Raths, Harmin, and Simon (1966) and Simon, Kirschenbaum, and Howe (1972) advocacy of ‘values clarification’ and, indeed, in the UK by the work of Wilson, Williams, and Sugarman (1967) of the Farmington Trust, the importance of *teaching* values has been seen to be paramount. Eighty percent of the States in the USA now have mandates regarding the teaching of character education, personal and social education is a requirement for all young people in English schools, the Australian Government has been prominent in its support of values education in all its schools, and ‘emotional literacy’ is now widely seen everywhere as the latest requirement in a curriculum which appears too often to be overly academic and cerebral.

Therefore, there is a range of different, but interconnected kinds of question about the meaning of values education, as well as the effectiveness of different programmes. Philosophical theory is intertwined with empirical investigation. Bewitched by the use of language, we need to understand the distinctions (if these are to be made) within values education between moral, character, social and holistic education, as well as the differences between all those and emotional literacy. Confusion reigns.

This *Handbook*, therefore, meets an urgent need. It brings together a wide range of educational thinkers – some deeply rooted in the wisdom of the past, others expertly involved in specific programmes and practices, and yet others who expound the wider social context of values education – reflected in the present international interest in citizenship education. Its value is enhanced by the international nature of the contributions. The different national contexts of the arguments do not disguise the international nature of the problems. Indeed, they indicate the universality of the issues.

Moreover, this *Handbook* is more than a collection of papers covering a range of topics. There is a distinctive story to be told throughout. That story is precisely that values education, far from being a distinct programme (as so often it has been conceived), embraces throughout the learning experiences of young people the broader view of what it means to develop as a person. Additionally, such development embraces feelings as well as thoughts, dispositions to act as well as knowledge of right actions, a sense of community as well as individual autonomy, social sensitivity as well as individual flourishing. As the editors argue, 'a values approach to learning is seen to be an indispensable artefact to any learning environment if student wellbeing, including academic success, is to be maximized'.

Oxford, UK Richard Pring

References

Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stages and moralisation: The cognitive-developmental approach. In T. Lickona (Ed.), *Moral development and behaviour* (pp. 31–35). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Raths, L. E., Harmin, M., & Simon, S. B. (1966). *Values and teaching: Working with values in the classroom*. Columbus, OH: C. E. Merrill Books.

Simon, S. B., Kirschenbaum, H., & Howe, L. W. (1972). *Values clarification: A handbook of practical strategies for teachers and students*. New York: Hart.

Wilson, J., Williams, N., & Sugarman, B. (1967). *Introduction to moral education*. Hammondsworth, UK: Penguin Books.

Contents

Part I Values Education: Wellbeing, Curriculum, and Pedagogy

1 The New Values Education: A Pedagogical Imperative for Student Wellbeing 3
Terence Lovat

2 Values Education, Instructional Scaffolding and Student Wellbeing 19
Ron Toomey

3 Student Wellbeing at School: The Actualization of Values in Education 37
Neville Clement

4 Personal and Professional Values in Teaching 63
David Carr

5 School Values and Effective Pedagogy: Case Studies of Two Leading Edge Schools in England 75
Wendy Robinson and Robert James Campbell

6 When Research Meets Practice in Values Education: Lessons from the American Experience 91
James S. Leming

7 Mathematics Education and Student Values: The Cultivation of Mathematical Wellbeing 111
Philip Clarkson, Alan Bishop, and Dr Wee Tiong Seah

8 Value in Shadows: A Critical Contribution to Values Education in Our Times 137
Dalene M. Swanson

9 Teacher Values Underlying Professional Ethics 153
Kirsi Tirri

10 Teachers as Key Players in Values Education: Implications for Teacher Formation 163
Adrian Gellel

11 **Valuing the Self** 179
Kristján Kristjánsson

12 **Values and Wellbeing in the Curriculum: Personal and Public Dimensions** 195
Graham Haydon

13 **Classroom-Based Practice in Values Education** 211
Laurie Brady

14 **Values Education and the National Curriculum in England** 225
Neil Hawkes

15 **Teacher Practice and Students' Sense of Belonging** 239
Karen F. Osterman

16 **Values of Problem-Based Learning: Perceptions of Facilitators in an Initial Teacher Training Program at Temasek Polytechnic, a Singapore Institution of Higher Learning** 261
Moira Lee Gek Choo

17 **Values, Wellness and the Social Sciences Curriculum** 273
Deborah Henderson

18 **Inspiration as a Thought-Provoking Concept for Values Education** 291
Theo van der Zee

19 **Values Education and the Hidden Curriculum** 303
Mark Halstead and Jiamei Xiao

20 **Towards an Ethics of Integration in Education** 319
Inna Semetsky

Part II Values Education: Wellbeing and Personal Integrity

21 **New Research Directions in Character and Values Education in the UK** 339
James Arthur and Kenneth Wilson

22 **Nurturing Teacher Wellbeing Through Values Education** 359
Nazreen Dasoo

23 **Embracing Philosophy and Raising the Standard of Pre-service Teacher Education Programs** 377
Rebecca Spooner-Lane, Elizabeth Curtis, and Amanda Mergler

24 **Re-visiting the 'Quiet Revolution'** 395
Frances Farrer

25 **Promoting Student Resilience and Wellbeing: Asia-Pacific Resilient Children and Communities Project** 409
Jing Sun and Donald E. Stewart

26 The Power of Character: Needed for, and Developed from, Teaching and Learning 427
Matthew Davidson, Vladimir Khmelkov, and Thomas Lickona

27 Facilitating Values Education Leadership Through Discovery of Personal Beliefs and Values 455
Shahida Abdul-Samad

28 The Positive Action Program: Improving Academics, Behavior, and Character by Teaching Comprehensive Skills for Successful Learning and Living 471
Brian R. Flay and Carol G. Allred

29 A Teacher's Duty: An Examination of the Short-Term Impact of Values Education on Australian Primary School Teachers and Students 503
Kerry Dally

30 Continuity and Discontinuity in Character Education 521
Jacques S. Benninga and Susan M. Tracz

31 Values Education and Whole Person Development in Ukraine: The Role of Vasyl Sukhomlinsky and Current Applications 549
Olga Sukhomlinska

32 Imaginative Education and the National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools: Practical Implementations for Promoting Ethical Understanding 559
Tim Waddington and James Johnson

33 The Developmental Contours of Character 579
Bryan W. Sokol, Stuart I. Hammond, and Marvin W. Berkowitz

34 The Unhappy Moralist Effect: A Story of Hybrid Moral Dynamics 605
Fritz Oser

Part III Values Education: Wellbeing and Social Engagement

35 Towards Pedagogy of Giving for Wellbeing and Social Engagement 617
Thomas William Nielsen

36 Values Education as an Ethical Dilemma About Sociability 631
Robert Crotty

37 Values Education, Mental Reality Constructs and Student Wellbeing 645
Brian V. Hill

38 Building a Sustaining Classroom Climate for Purposeful Ethical Citizenship 659
Darcia Narvaez

39 Valuing Social and Emotional Connectedness Among Learners at All Levels 675
Christine Brew and Brenda Beatty

40 Teach Our Children Well: A Social Work Perspective on Integrating Values Education in Schools 703
Mel Gray

41 Making Values Education Real: Exploring the Nexus Between Service Learning and Values Education 717
Judi Robinson and Kevin Kecskes

42 Passion and Purpose: Teacher Professional Development and Student Social and Civic Growth 737
Sigrun Adalbjarnardottir

43 Education and Diversity: Values Education and Cross-cultural Learning Through Socratic Dialogue and the Visual Arts 765
Adam Staples, Catherine Devine, and Judith Chapman

44 Developing Student Wellbeing Through Education for Sustainability: Learning from School Experience 779
Libby Tudball

45 Translating Values Education into Values Action: Attempts, Obstacles, and Potential for the Future 795
Jeremy Leeds

46 Active Citizenship Education and Critical Pedagogy 811
Keith Crawford

47 The Impact of Social Interdependence on Values Education and Student Wellbeing 825
David W. Johnson and Roger T. Johnson

48 Students Leading in Investigating and Enacting Values in School Communities 849
Roger Holdsworth

49 Values Implicit in Vocational Education and Training: The Challenge for Wider Issues of Personal and Social Engagement 867
Richard G. Bagnall

50 Integrating the Personal with the Public: Values, Virtues and Learning and the Challenges of Assessment 883
Ruth Deakin Crick

51 Transmitting Social and National Values Through Education in Singapore: Tensions in a Globalized Era 897
Jasmine B.-Y. Sim and Li-Ching Ho

52 Values in Motion: From Confident Learners to Responsible Citizens 919
Tim Small

53 Using a New Body/Mind Place-Based Narrative Pedagogy to Teach Values Education in the Age of Sustainability 937
Ron Tooth

54 Facilitating a Moral Journey in a University Setting for Managing an Age-Old Conflict in the Abrahamic Holy Land 947
Zehavit Gross

55 Theorizing Social Wellbeing: Subjective Mental States, Preference Satisfaction or Mitsein? 959
Stephen Webb

Author Index 977

Subject Index 1001

Contributors

Shahida Abdul-Samad Head, IQRA International Institute, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Sigrun Adalbjarnardottir Professor of Education, University of Iceland, Reykjavík, Iceland

Carol G. Allred Developer/President, Positive Action, Inc., Twin Falls, ID, USA

James Arthur Professor of Education, The University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

Richard G. Bagnall Chair Professor of Lifelong Learning and Director of the Centre for Lifelong Learning, Hong Kong Institute of Education, Hong Kong, China

Brenda Beatty Honorary Principal Fellow, Associate Professor of Educational Leadership, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

Jacques S. Benninga Professor and Director, Bonner Center for Character Education and Citizenship, California State University, Fresno, USA

Marvin Berkowitz Sanford N. McDonell Professor of Character Education, University of Missouri, St Louis, MO, USA

Alan Bishop Emeritus Professor of Education, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

Laurie Brady Professor of Education, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia

Christine Brew Senior Lecturer in Science and Mathematics Education, LaTrobe University, Melbourne, Australia

Robert James Campbell Emeritus Professor of Education, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK

David Carr Emeritus Professor of Education, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

Judith Chapman Professor of Education, Australian Catholic University, Melbourne, Australia

Moira Lee Gek Choo Director of the Learning Academy, Temasek Polytechnic, 1 Tampines Avenue 1, Singapore 529757

Philip Clarkson Professor of Education, Australian Catholic University, Melbourne, Australia

Neville Clement Research Associate in Education, The University of Newcastle, Newcastle, NSW, Australia

Keith Crawford Professor of Education, The University of Newcastle, Newcastle, NSW, Australia

Ruth Deakin Crick Senior Research Fellow, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

Robert Crotty Emeritus Professor of Religion and Education, University of South Australia, West Campus, Australia

Elizabeth Curtis Lecturer in Education, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia

Kerry Dally Lecturer in Education, The University of Newcastle, Newcastle, NSW, Australia

Nazreen Dasoo Lecturer in Education, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa

Matthew Davidson President, Institute for Excellence & Ethics (IEE), Fayetteville, NY, USA

Catherine Devine Teacher, St Monica's College Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

Frances Farrer Freelance and Education Writer, Oxford, UK

Brian R. Flay Professor of Public Health, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA

Adrian Gellel Lecturer in Religious Education, University of Malta, Msida, MSD 2080, Malta

Mel Gray Professor of Social Work, The University of Newcastle, Newcastle, NSW, Australia

Zehavit Gross Senior Lecturer in Education, Bar Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel

Mark Halstead Professor of Education, University of Huddersfield, Huddersfield, UK

Stuart I. Hammond Doctoral Candidate, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada

Neil Hawkes International Education Consultant, UK

Graham Haydon Visiting Fellow and former Reader in Philosophy of Education, Institute of Education, University of London, London, UK

Deborah Henderson Senior Lecturer in Education, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia

Brian V. Hill Emeritus Professor, Murdoch University, Perth, Australia

Roger Holdsworth Senior Research Associate, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

James Johnson Doctoral Candidate, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada

Roger T. Johnson Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA

David W. Johnson Professor of Educational Psychology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA

Kevin Kecskes Associate Vice Provost (Engagement), Portland State University, Portland, OR, USA

Vladimir Khmelkov Vice President, Institute for Excellence & Ethics (IEE), Fayetteville, NY, USA

Kristján Kristjánsson Professor of Philosophy of Education, University of Iceland, Reykjavík, Iceland

Jeremy Leeds Teacher and Coordinator Service Learning, Horace Mann School, Riverdale, NY, USA

James S. Leming Former Professor of Education, now President, Character Evaluation Associates Briny Breezes, FL, USA

Ho Li-Ching Assistant Professor of Education, National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, 50 Nanyang Avenue, Singapore 639798

Thomas Lickona Professor of Education, State University of New York, Cortland, NY, USA

Terence Lovat Professor of Education and Pro Vice-Chancellor, The University of Newcastle, Newcastle, NSW, Australia

Amanda Mergler Lecturer in Education, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia

Darcia Narvaez Associate Professor of Psychology, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN, USA

Thomas William Nielsen Senior Lecturer in Philosophy of Education, University of Canberra, Canberra, Australia

Fritz Oser Professor of Education, University of Fribourg, Fribourg, Switzerland

Karen F. Osterman Professor of Education, Hofstra University, Hempstead, NY, USA

Wendy Robinson Professor of Education, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK

Judi Robinson Senior Officer, Department of Education, Queensland, Australia

Wee Tiong Seah Senior Lecturer in Mathematics Education, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

Inna Semetsky Research Academic in Education, The University of Newcastle, Newcastle, NSW, Australia

Jasmine B-Y Sim Assistant Professor, National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, 50 Nanyang Avenue, Singapore 639798

Tim Small Former Headmaster and Head of Research and Development for Vital Partnerships, Ahead Space, Bristol, UK

Bryan W. Sokol Assistant Professor of Psychology, Saint Louis University, St Louis, MO, USA

Rebecca Spooner-Lane Lecturer in Education, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia

Adam Staples Lecturer in Education, Australian Catholic University, Melbourne, Australia

Donald E. Stewart Professor of Public Health, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia

Olga Sukhomlinska Professor of Education and Deputy Director, Ukrainian Academy of Educational Sciences, Kiev, Ukraine

Jing Sun Lecturer in Public Health, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia

Dalene M. Swanson Adjunct Professor of Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada; University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada

Kirsi Tirri Professor of Education, University of Helsinki, Mikkeli, Finland

Ron Toomey Conjoint Professor of Education, The University of Newcastle, Newcastle, NSW, Australia

Ron Tooth Adjunct Associate Professor of Education, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

Susan M. Tracz Professor of Educational Research and Administration, California State University, Fresno, USA

Libby Tudball Senior Lecturer in Education, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

Tim Waddington Doctoral Candidate, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada

Stephen Webb Professor of Human Sciences, The University of Newcastle, Newcastle, NSW, Australia

Kenneth Wilson Visiting Research Fellow, Canterbury Christ Church University, Canterbury, UK

Jiamei Xiao Senior Lecturer in Childhood Studies, University of Huddersfield, Huddersfield, UK

Theo van der Zee Deputy Manager and Senior Researcher, Institute for Catholic Education, Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Introduction

Richard Pring

As the following contributions to this book attest and illustrate, 'values education' has assumed an importance in recent years which has spread through many countries. That importance arises from different causes, no doubt, and there are interestingly different interpretations of what 'values education' means. Those meanings overlap however, and it is useful to introduce the following papers by dwelling a little upon the notion that values (howsoever they are interpreted in different social and economic contexts) are intrinsic to those activities which we judge to be educational. Such values too often remain implicit only, unrecognized for what they are, and therefore beyond critical scrutiny. One person's values may not be another's, and therefore, similarly, one person's idea of education or 'the educated person' may not be another's.

These variations cannot be dismissed lightly because they reflect deeper philosophical differences about what it means to be and to develop as a person – and thus of personal 'wellbeing'. The revived interest in values education reflects the welcome recognition of the connection between so-called educational activities and systems, on the one hand, and the implicit conceptions of personal wellbeing, on the other hand. If the arts and humanities are central to the educational enterprise, then, implicitly, these are seen to be crucial to the ultimate wellbeing of the learners. If educational success is measured simply by individual attainment, then, implicitly, wellbeing is conceived without reference to social understanding and commitment. If the transmission of knowledge through lecturing is the dominant pedagogy, then that affects the learner's wellbeing. As Dewey (1903) argued

> The dictation, in theory at least, of the subject-matter to be taught . . . meant nothing more than the deliberate restriction of intelligence, the imprisonment of the spirit. (p. 196)

Therefore, if education is concerned with the development of persons, and such development is conceived in terms of human wellbeing, then the following would seem to be entailed.

First, at the heart of educational thinking, philosophical questions need to be raised about what it means to be a person – and to be one more fully. Jerome Bruner (1966, Chapter 4) argued that the three questions which should shape the social studies of a school were: What is human about man? How did he become so? How can he become more so? Additionally, the pedagogy which was intrinsic to helping the learners to answer these questions did itself embody the distinctive qualities of thinking, questioning and exploring in a distinctively human way.

Second, therefore, the values which are embodied in our understanding of what it means to be human (and to be so in a more fulfilled way) permeate the pedagogy (whether that be in the teaching of mathematics or of the arts), are reflected in the ways in which moral responsibility and personal integrity are enhanced, and point to the inclusion, in a broader vision of educational aims, of social engagement and citizenship. All this needs, of course, to be argued in detail and that is precisely what the different contributions to this Handbook do in the three part approach to 'wellbeing', namely, through the adoption of appropriate curriculum and pedagogy, the fostering of personal integrity and the promotion of social engagement.

Third, however, all this is an implicit criticism of the equation of values education with specific programmes – as though these broader educational concerns about curriculum and pedagogy, integrity and social engagement, which should permeate the learning experiences of the learners, were of little significance. One must be careful here. Such programmes as the many referred to in this book do have an important place in the development of wellbeing, but they are but contributions and not 'the royal road'. In this respect, one can also identify some high profile contributions, such as Kohlberg's (1976) classroom teaching of moral dilemmas, Rath's (Raths, Harmin, & Simon, 1966; Simon, Kirschenbaum, & Howe, 1972) procedures for 'values clarification', Poteet's (1974) espousal of 'behaviour modification' or Mischel and Mischel's (1976) 'cognitive social-learning approach to morality'. Even these, as prestigious as they are, do not present as sufficient within themselves to ensure wellbeing. They must all be seen in the wider context of the many different elements entailed in personal and communal wellbeing, and thus the many ways in which values are embodied, transferred and developed through the wider curriculum and pedagogy. Recognition of this perspective is what gives significance to the notion pursued in the *Handbook* of a 'new values education'.

What also is significant, and well illustrated in the *Handbook*, is that values education in this broader sense has implications not only for the skills and strategies of teaching but also for the very conception of the teacher. This point is well developed in several of the contributions, but, given the new management-speak which now dominates educational discourse, it can so easily be neglected. That language, imported from what is seen to be a science of successful business management, identifies success with the hitting of 'measurable targets', the effective relationship of 'inputs' to 'outputs' so measured, the establishment of 'performance indicators' whereby schools are judged to be satisfactory, good or failing, the regular 'audits' of those schools in terms of the indicators, the efficiency gains where the same results are obtained for less money, and finally the conception of teachers as the 'deliverers' of the curriculum.

The inappropriateness of such language, the impoverished view of education and the development of wellbeing is well illustrated by a dialogue recorded by Cuban (2004) in *The Blackboard and the Bottom Line*:

> A successful business man, dedicated to improving public schools, told an audience of teachers: ‘if I ran my business the way you people operate your schools, I wouldn’t be in business very long’. Cross-examined by a teacher, he declared that the success of his blueberry ice cream lay in the meticulous way in which he selected his blueberries, sending back those which did not meet the high quality he insisted upon. To this the teacher replied: ‘That’s right . . . and we can never send back our blueberries. We take them rich, poor, gifted, exceptional, abused, frightened . . . we take them all. Every one. And that . . . is why it is not a business. It’s a school’. (p. 4)

We need to contrast this with the conception of teaching which permeates this *Handbook* and which is intrinsic to the broader understanding of values education and human wellbeing. Unlike blueberries, children cannot (or should not) be dismissed because of particular weaknesses or disabilities or indeed behaviours. Whatever their background and whatever their different talents or lack of them, they have the potential to grow and develop as human beings – ‘to become more so’, as Bruner (1966) argued. The teacher who recognizes that and who identifies his or her teaching responsibility with the fostering of that humanity and with the enabling of the attainment of wellbeing, does not ‘deliver the curriculum’ – frequently a prescription of what to do and how to do it, prepared by government or its agencies without any acquaintance with the learners. Rather is the teacher *engaged* with the learner in a dialogue in which the learning needs and interests of the learners (their potential for wellbeing as embodied in their present understandings and concerns) are related to the understandings and expertise of the teacher. 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.

Indeed, different metaphors are needed to express this. Michael Oakeshott (1972/1989) speaks of education as an initiation of the next generation into the world of ideas. That world of ideas has evolved through the ‘conversation between the generations of mankind’, and it is the distinctive role of the teacher to enable young people to enter into that conversation, to come to understand and to appreciate the voice of poetry, the voice of science, the voice of history and the voice of philosophy. In so understanding and appreciating, they gain a wider grasp of human wellbeing and of the means by which it might be attained – especially when one extends that ‘conversation between the generations’ to the inherited traditions of the craftsman and of practical capabilities. As has been said so often, people are liberated through knowledge, whether theoretical or practical – liberated to engage in more fully human lives. How different does the role of the teacher now appear? In embracing the ‘new values education’ for their learners, they have to adopt those very values in their own teaching. To teach young people to be socially engaged, then the schools themselves have to embody a form of life which involves social engagement. To encourage young learners to embrace democratic values as an essential part of human fulfilment, those very democratic values need to inform the relationships and decision-making within the school. To facilitate students exploring what it means to be human, and how to become more so, they must be treated humanely – their thoughts and experiences must be taken seriously.

It was in this vein that Kohlberg (Wasserman, 1976) and his team, in seeing that higher stages of moral thinking about matters of justice did not lead significantly to increased just behaviour, concluded that the ethos and context of the school were crucial. Teaching about values did not in itself lead to the embracing of those values. Hence, the importance of the 'just community school' – the school which not only taught but also practised the very virtues and principles which were being taught (Midwinter, 1972). Similarly, Stenhouse (1975) and his team, in developing the highly popular 'Humanities Curriculum Project', in which matters of deep concern to young people (for example, relations between the sexes, social injustice, poverty, misuse of authority) were subject to examination, discussion was central, albeit on the basis of evidence drawn from the sciences, religious studies, history, the arts and other disciplines of knowing and creating. Understanding, distilled through the young persons' own experiences and refined through discussion, was the aim. Values education (reflected in respect for sincerely held views even when wrong or socially unacceptable, in the response to evidence and criticism, and in support for those who felt unable to articulate their feelings and beliefs) was embedded in the very subject matter and method of teaching where, to use Stenhouse's words, the 'teacher shared his or her humanity with the learners'.

The importance of the chapters in this *Handbook* lies in the failure of so many educational initiatives to recognize, and, in not recognizing, to criticize the underlying values and the often impoverished notions of 'wellbeing' in the so-called educational experience to which many young people are subjected. The exploration of 'wellbeing' is frequently shallow – if it occurs at all. The English Government's (DCSF, 2005) White Paper on 14–19 reforms commences by saying that, through education, all young people must be enabled to realize their potential. However, a moment's glance at the daily papers is enough to make one realize that we have as much potential for doing harm as we have for doing good. Such clichés dodge the ethical questions which lie at the heart of education. What sort of experiences, practices and understandings are worthwhile and realize those potentials which enable young people to achieve a distinctively human form of life – and so achieve a sense of wellbeing and fulfilment?

Rarely is this question asked even though it ought to be the starting point of all educational deliberation – and a constant refrain during the educational encounters with young people. The Nuffield Review of 14–19 Education and Training for England and Wales (Pring et al., 2009) – the largest such review in England since the Crowther Report (1959) 50 years ago – began with the question: *What counts as an educated 19 year old in this day and age?*

In answering that question, the Review had to reflect deeply on what it means to develop as a person – on what are the distinctively human qualities which, in different ways and no doubt to different degrees, enable all young people to find fulfilment and to have a sense of wellbeing. In practice, this is so often associated with academic achievement and excellence – a state which only some can reach. Education becomes the reserve of the few. It lies at the heart of the crude distinction between the ‘academic’ and he ‘vocational’, the latter being the lot of those who lack the ability to engage in the much superior academic form of life. The Review argued however that there is much more to being a human being than academic excellence, itself often very narrowly conceived. Certainly, the acquisition of the concepts and modes of enquiry of the distinctive forms of knowledge and understanding is crucial, for how else can young people be ‘liberated through knowledge’? How else can they have a grasp of the physical, social and moral worlds they inhabit? Moreover, however, practical intelligence is also crucial – that practical capability which is at the heart of doing, making and creating. ‘Knowing how’ cannot be reduced to ‘knowing that’. Again, even this is not enough. Theoretical knowledge and practical capability are hardly sufficient. They need to be directed by the appropriate dispositions and moral judgement, and those need to be learned from the norms inherent within the social practices of family, school and society and from instruction, example and correction. ‘Moral seriousness’, through which young people address the major issues which confront society (environmental sustainability, career choices, relationships, racism, etc.) and acquire personal integrity, is part of the sense of wellbeing – an intrinsic component of the ‘new values education’, as conceived within this *Handbook*. Furthermore, as is argued in the book, these reflections on what it means to grow as a person cannot discount the essentially social nature of personhood – both the dependence upon the wider community for the quality of life and the importance of contributing to the development of that community. Social engagement, encapsulated in the many recent attempts to incorporate citizenship in the learning experiences of all young people, is an essential ingredient in the ‘wellbeing’ which defines the aims and values of education.

At the same time, seeking such wellbeing as the main aim of education is not easy. There are many forces militating against it.

First, the high-stakes testing regimes, which scourge so many educational systems, prioritize that which is easily measurable, leaving little room for the struggle to understand, the practical capabilities, the moral seriousness and the social engagement. ‘Wellbeing’ is not easy to measure! Targets dominate.

Second, social engagement is seen as risky. When the pupils of Liverpool interpreted social engagement as community projects aimed at making their environment a more civilized place to live in, their actions were perceived as threatening; politics was asserted to be something to be studied, not to be learned through practical engagement.

Third, this broader moral understanding of education and teaching is implicitly negated by the impoverished language of business management through which education is seen as a means to some further end – captured in specific targets and performance indicators, and their efficient delivery by teachers.

That is why bringing together so many chapters that tell a different story is so important. There needs to be a constant effort to illustrate and demonstrate a broader understanding of education than is commonly promoted, including the values which define it and the understanding of personal and communal wellbeing which underpins it.

References

Bruner, J. S. (1966). *Toward a theory of instruction*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Havard University.

Crowther, G. (1959). *Fiteen to eighteen* [The Crowther Report]. London: Central Advisory Council for Education; HSMO.

Cuban, L. (2004). *The blackboard and the bottom line: Why schools can't be businesses*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

DCSF. (2005). *14–19 education and skills* [White paper]. London: Department for Children, Schools and Family (DCSF), United Kingdom; H.M.S.O.

Dewey, J. (1903). Democracy in education. *The elementary school teacher, 4,* 193–204.

Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stages and moralisation: The cognitive-developmental approach. In T. Lickona (Ed.), *Moral development and behaviour: Theory, research, and social issue* (pp. 31–35). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Midwinter, E. (1972). Curriculum and the EPA school. In E. Midwinter (Ed.), *Projections: An educational priority area at work*. London: Ward Lock Educational.

Mischel, W., & Mischel, H. (1976). A cognitive social-learning approach to morality and self-regulation. In T. Lickona (Ed.), *Moral development and behavior: Theory, research, and social issues* (pp. 84–107). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Wilson.

Oakeshott, M. (1972/1989). Education: The engagement and its frustrations. In T. Fuller (Ed.), *The voice of liberal learning: Michael Oakeshott on education*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Poteet, J. A. (1974). *Behavior modification: A practical guide for teachers*. London: University of London Press.

Pring, R., Geoffery, H., Hodgson, A., Johnson, J., Keep, E., Oancea, A., et al. (2009). *Education for all: The future of education and training for 14–19 year olds*. London: Routledge.

Raths, L. E., Harmin, M., & Simon, S. B. (1966). *Values and teaching: Working with values in the classroom*. Columbus, OH: C. E. Merrill Books.

Simon, S. B., Kirschenbaum, H., & Howe, L. W. (1972). *Values clarification: A handbook of practical strategies for teachers and students*. New York: Hart.

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

Wasserman, E. R. (1976). Implementing Kohlberg's just community concept in an alternative high school. *Social Education, 20,* 203–207.

Part I
Values Education: Wellbeing, Curriculum, and Pedagogy

Introduction

Since the mid-1990s, there has been a concentration of effort aimed at maximizing student achievement in school education. In 1994, a Carnegie Corporation Taskforce on Student Achievement drew on new research in the neurosciences to show that effective learning requires a response that is as much about affect and social dynamics as about cognition. In so doing, it re-defined the notion of learning to include matters of communicative competence, empathic character, self-reflection, and self-knowing as being as central to intellectual development as the recall of facts and figures. In effect, Carnegie pre-figured the new values education agenda by illustrating that effective learning is inherently values-filled. The new values education agenda differs from the old in that the latter was largely regarded as a moral imperative, whereas the new values education agenda is increasingly seen as 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 artifact to any learning environment if student wellbeing, including academic success, is to be maximized. 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.

In the intervening years, a number of learning paradigms, incorporating research and practice, has attempted to address the challenge provided by these new insights. These have varied in their particular emphasis, but have been united by the belief that learning is holistic and that the maximum effect can only be achieved through a more comprehensive pedagogy than has been characteristic of school education in the past. These paradigms go variously by the titles of authentic pedagogy, quality teaching, service learning, and values education, to name a few. The handbook draws on all such paradigms, but will argue that all of them can be subsumed in effective and complete values education curriculum and pedagogy.

Increasingly, research findings have demonstrated the effects foreshadowed of values education on all matters pertaining to student wellbeing, including academic success. Granted the centrality of values education to the broader goals of schooling, therefore, this research handbook is unique in drawing together these findings from a range of international research from eminent and highly experienced academics, together with a sample of important emerging scholars, all aimed at demonstrating the effects of a well-hewn values education approach to learning on student wellbeing across the range of measures. In this section, we explore the relationship, increasingly seen as a nexus, between values education and good practice curriculum and pedagogy.

Chapter 1
The New Values Education: A Pedagogical Imperative for Student Wellbeing

Terence Lovat

Introduction

Values education is known internationally by a number of names, including moral education, character education and ethics education. Each variant has a slightly different meaning, pointing to one or other distinctive emphasis. Overriding these differences, however, is a common theme born of a growing belief that entering into the world of personal and societal values is a legitimate and increasingly important role for teachers and schools to play. This is not an attempt to supplant the influences of the home but rather to supplement them and, where necessary, to compensate for them. International research into teaching and schooling effects is overturning earlier beliefs that values were exclusively the preserve of families and religious bodies and that, as a result, schools function best in values-neutral mode. This research is pointing out not only the hollowness of such a belief but the potential for it to lead to diminished effects in all realms of student achievement, including academic attainment. In fact, it could be asserted that, in a sense, teaching and schooling that function in values-neutral mode actually serve to undermine the potential effects of other socialising agencies, including families.

The Values Debate in Australia

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). Be it under the aegis of civics, citizenship or plain values education, it is now commonly accepted that an essential component

---

T. Lovat (✉)
The University of Newcastle, Newcastle NSW, Australia
e-mail: Terry.Lovat@newcastle.edu.au

T. Lovat et al. (eds.), *International Research Handbook on Values Education and Student Wellbeing*, DOI 10.1007/978-90-481-8675-4_1,
© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2010

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. Another comes from scepticism about the capacity of any school to manage, and have impact in, an area that is commonly seen as being totally subjective and therefore un-testable. These are both common criticisms that need to be challenged on theoretical and empirical grounds.

In terms of the appropriateness of public schooling dealing explicitly with a values agenda, some revision of public schooling history is necessary to challenge the dominant mythology that public schools were established on the grounds of values-neutrality. In fact, those responsible for the foundations of public education in Australia were sufficiently pragmatic to know that its success relied on its charter being in accord with public sentiment. Part of the pragmatism was in convincing those whose main experience of education had been through some form of church-based education that state-based education was capable of meeting the same ends.

Hence, the documents of the 1870s and 1880s that contained the charters of the various state and territory systems witness to 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), under the rubric of 'religious teaching', stressed the need for students to be inculcated into the values of their society, including understanding the role that religious values had played in forming that society's legal codes and social ethics. The notion, therefore, that 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 early 2000s could be regarded as a corrective. Responding both to community pressure and the realisation 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 also 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, 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 that represents 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*.

The National Framework

In the 2004 Federal Budget, $A 29.7 million dollars was allocated to build and develop a national values education programme, 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, parents and other stakeholders and resources. The largest project, the *Values Education Good Practice Schools Project* (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. In contrast with the instrumentalist and reductionist tendencies of much educational research of the second half of the twentieth century and a range of late twentieth-century reports that 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, the Adelaide Declaration recovered many of the far richer vision of the nineteenth-century educational foundation charters referred to above, including being explicit about 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).

The Framework then built on the broad perspectives offered by the Adelaide Declaration in making the specific link with values education as a means of facilitating its lofty and comprehensive goals for schooling. 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 & 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.

The Nexus of Values Education and Quality Teaching

Since the early 1990s, there has been a concentration of effort aimed at maximising student achievement in school education and rectifying the debilitating effects of failure. In 1994, a Carnegie Corporation Taskforce on Student Achievement (Carnegie Corporation, 1996) drew on new research in a variety of fields, including the emerging 'new neurosciences' (Bruer, 1999) 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, in many respects, marked the true beginnings of the quality teaching movement.

Additionally, Carnegie pre-figured the new values education agenda by illustrating that effective learning is inherently values-filled. The new values education agenda differs from the old in that the latter was largely regarded as a moral imperative, and hence negotiable and subject to ideological debate, whereas the new agenda is increasingly seen as 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 wellbeing, including academic success, is to be maximised. 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, 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.

Fred Newmann (Newmann & Associates, 1996) is similarly regarded as an architect of modern quality teaching but could also be seen as one who, wittingly or unwittingly, has contributed to the notion of there being a nexus between such teaching and values education. 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 the 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 be there for student wellbeing above all its other imperatives. 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). It is one of the less instrumentalist and less easily measurable features of quality teaching that, Newmann suggests, is so indispensable to the more instrumentalist and easily measurable that it will render these latter mute and futile ventures if it is not attended to. These are the 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.

Pedagogical Dynamics and the Neurosciences

Newmann's work coincided with the work of Carnegie that, as illustrated, had drawn on new 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 Antonio Damasio (2003; Immordino-Yang & Damasio, 2007). Damasio's main interest is in the *neurobiology* of the *mind*, especially concerning those neural systems that underpin reason, memory, emotion and social interaction. His work is associated with the notion of the cognition/affect/sociality nexus, a way of conceiving of emotion and feelings as not being separate so much as inherently part of all rational processes:

> 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 & Damasio, 2007, p. 3)

The scientific rigour of Damasio's experimental work, together with the strength of his findings and those of others (Rose & Strangman, 2007), is causing educationists to re-think many of their assumptions about a range of developmental issues, including that of learning itself. The taxonomic notion that cognitive learning outcomes can somehow be separated from affective or social ones comes to be seen as nonsense. The idea that literacy training can be achieved through mastery instruction and testing, without reference to the physical, emotional and social 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 points to the need for new pedagogy that engages the whole person rather than just the cognitive person, in its narrowest sense.

Similarly, the work of Daniel Goleman (1996, 2001, 2006) is associated with notions of social and emotional intelligence, and hence social and emotional learning (SEL). Goleman has demonstrated in his work that social intelligence (SQ) and emotional intelligence (EQ) are at least as vital to sound cognition as the more familiar notion of IQ (intelligence quotient). The implication is that IQ, a notion that has been prominent in teaching, is not fixed, free-standing and determinative of student achievement as an isolated factor. It is rather highly contextualised and dependent on other factors about one's current state of wellbeing of body, mind and social being. As such, the effects normally associated with IQ can be impacted on by well-informed, well-constructed pedagogy that is designed to engage the whole person.

In like manner, Robert Sternberg (2007) was not only critical of the traditional IQ test, but actually devised a more sophisticated intelligence test based on his broader theory of intelligences. Sternberg sees cognition as part of a broader mix of human factors, involving the analytic, synthetic and practical, implying a fuller range of human capabilities than is understood by the more limited and rationalistic notions