

# VALUES IN TEACHING AND TEACHING VALUES: A REVIEW OF THEORY AND RESEARCH, INCLUDING THE CASE OF GREECE

EVANGELIA FRYDAKI

**Abstract** – *This paper brings together an overview of ideas about values in teaching from an historical, theoretical, as well as from a research-based perspective. More specifically, it aims to review: (i) the ways in which education attributed meaning to values and their teaching in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century; (ii) the relationship between values and education with respect to three educational movements of different underlying theoretical traditions; and (iii) recent research focusing on how teachers diffuse their own values during the teaching process, thus influencing the development of their students' own values. The study also intends to shed light on the terms of this pedagogical discussion of the relevant issues pertaining to Greek education, and to contribute to the diffusion and enrichment of relevant thinking. Suggestions for the education of prospective teachers are also included.*

## Introduction

**T**he discourse on educational values, and specifically in the teaching process, is not new. In each era there seems to be a renewed dialogue on this issue raising specific questions. Our late modern era expanded the relevant discussion on this matter, posing questions such as: What kind of meanings did education attribute to the concept of values in order to be treated in teaching? Have these meanings been modified? Should, nowadays, teachers infuse values in their instructional settings, or should they abstain from such a task? In addition, what kind of values should teachers infuse: the values of a shared value system or values of their own preference and belief system? Furthermore, is there a common ground on which a shared value system may rest? Is such a system desirable (Butroyd, 1997)? The different and sometimes confusing answers to these questions engender from time to time a new need for a review, particularly seeing that emerging situations create new needs, both social and educational; the current society of late modernity needs members which are able to identify and choose their values with increasing autonomy, in an increasingly complex social environment. To survive, society itself needs high degrees of tolerance, acceptance of difference (be it cultural, religious, or value-related) and, simultaneously, some sort of social commitment

from its members. As eloquently put by Bruner (1990), in a democratic culture, broadness of mind is the 'willingness to construe knowledge and values from multiple perspectives without loss of commitment to one's own values' (p. 30). Consequently, even though education's traditional socialisation role seems to be limited in an open pluralistic society, it is the position of this author that teachers ought to support the efforts of youth to develop their own values in a process which takes place in different socio-cultural contexts, and under different circumstances. In such a complex context, teachers as well as prospective teachers need updated information deriving from theoretical frameworks and research findings, which could facilitate them to broaden their concepts, expand their perspectives, strengthen their awareness, in order to gain a thoughtful sensitivity to the concrete situations of practice.

Under this perspective, the present paper aims to review: (i) the ways in which education attributed meaning to values and treated them during teaching in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, including the case of Greece; (ii) the relationship between values and education with respect to three educational movements of different underlying theoretical traditions; and (iii) recent research focusing on how teachers integrate their values in the teaching process, thus influencing the development of their students' own values. In this manner, this paper aims at shedding light on the terms of this pedagogical discourse, and to contribute to the review, diffusion, and enrichment of relevant thinking, both for education researchers and for active practitioners. Lastly, it seeks to suggest new perspectives for the education of future teachers.

## **Meanings attributed to values and instructional treatments**

In the 1950s and 1960s, western societies considered as values the socially and culturally acceptable models and behavioural norms. Not only were society's goals and needs considered more important than the individuals', but they could also determine the latter's respective goals and needs (Parsons, 1951; Whiting, 1961). Consequently, the teaching of values was the process by which students came to identify, accept, and internalise social values in their own value system. Apart from this perspective of the individual as a servant of social needs, a contrary position viewed the individual as a free participant in society, contributing only to the degree society ensured the individual's own self-fulfilment. According to the latter view, deriving from Rousseau's tradition, school curriculum should teach values like freedom to learn, human dignity, creativity, justice, self-exploration and personal development. The work of Maslow (1970, 1979) and Rogers (1983), belonging to humanistic psychology,

provided a useful starting point in the above orientation. Maslow used the popular term *self-actualisation* to describe a desire that could lead a person to realising his/her capabilities, and to reach personal growth, which takes place once lower order needs have been met. People that have reached *self-actualisation* are spontaneous, open-minded, and they accept themselves and others. Rogers (1961), like Maslow, was interested in describing the healthy person. His term is *fully-functioning*, which includes qualities such as openness to experience, trusting, responsibility for one's choices, and creativity. In the comparative overview of a survey of 26 countries concerning values education in Europe, several values emanating from the work of Maslow and Rogers were often mentioned (see Consortium of Institutions for Development and Research in Education in Europe [CIDREE], 1994, p. 41).

Another aspect of values education in the early 1980s concerned the specific ways in which the institution of education in general, and the process of teaching in particular, taught values. Values were perceived as absolute, universal, eternal entities that could be neither negotiated nor challenged. The only conceivable problem concerned the process and framework of their legitimisation; for some, values were considered theological (pre-modern discourse), for others, they were viewed as natural orders, and for others still, related to varied theories or ideologies. The above debate had little impact on the mission of teaching, which adhered to one task: to 'transmit' values via the appropriate subject matters, which in most cases included the humanities, without any discussion, critical reflection, or questioning (Huitt, 2004). During the same period, Massialas (1975) suggested a new approach to values in teaching in the framework of humanistic education. His perspective concerned 'human learning through social inquiry', which included a flexible pattern of questioning through which teachers could encourage students to clarify, support and justify with evidence their ideas, values, judgments and emotions that were relevant to the problem under examination.

During the following years, education was dominated by technical and instrumental thinking, for a period culminating in the 1980s. Emphasis in education was given to goal oriented curriculum, skill development, and on effective teaching; values were cast aside, perhaps because it was believed that they belong to a precarious non-scientific realm, marked by normative, moralistic, or ideological perspectives. By the 1990s, a renewed interest in the ways in which values could be re-integrated in the educational process appeared again in the academic and research world. This interest is presently revamped given the social innovations and changes, the weakening of cohesive traditional value systems, the expansion of the cultural continuum to which individuals are exposed today, and the plethora of choices available in the context of a globalised society (Veugeler & Vedder, 2003).

As far as the Greek educational system is concerned, it has not set clearly its priorities regarding values in teaching due to various and often conflicting factors. At first, the turbulent history of the Greek nation state, the need for creating, or recreating, its national identity, the spiritual and moral values of Christianity, as expressed by the Greek Orthodox Church, are some of the reasons contributing to an overemphasis on nation-centred values (Flouris, 1997). Besides the fact that up to 1976 the cultivation of nation-centred and religious values constituted a crucial educational target (CIDREE, 1994). Up until the previous decade, Greek curricula were still dominated by traditional and nation-centred values, and teachers were authorised to fill the students' minds with predetermined sets of values (Massialas & Flouris, 1994; Flouris, 1995). This was the period when the teaching of any literary or Ancient Greek text should emphatically promote the text's 'eternal meanings'; Greek history was a pantheon of heroes, martyrs, and glorious achievements; finally, in Philosophy and Ancient Greek Literature, the conflict between Socrates and the sophists was only taught in order to compare the former's morality to the latter's immorality. On the other hand, as some scholars support, Greece is in a transitional stage and at a technocratic period, with a 20-year lag (Kassotakis, 2004), which brings up more the issue of effectiveness of teaching rather than its value laden aspects. In parallel, many scholars call for the ideal of an informed, active, socially responsible and probably universal civil citizen, which is also promoted by the European educational policy. This citizen is to be equipped with skills, such as literacy, technological literacy and foreign languages as well as with attitudes and values, such as the respect of human dignity and human rights, the tolerance for those from a different cultural background, etc. (Massialas & Flouris, 1994; Flouris, 1997; Koutselini, 1997; Xochellis, 2001). Hence, the Greek educational system has not demonstrated a systematic discourse either on common acceptable values to be taught in schools, which would not necessarily be the desirable orientation, or on the moral groundwork of an open, pluralistic society.

The issue of teaching values in Greece has been expanded at present, as it is supported by the Pedagogical Institute (PI), the main investigatory and advisory institute concerning educational matters, which was established in 1964 and falls directly under the aegis of the Minister of Education. The PI claims that students ought to adhere to 'a strong sense of responsibility towards the nation and the universal and multicultural perspectives of present and future' (PI, 2000, p. 162). The value-related recommendations of the current curriculum for the teaching of Literature and History cover a wide range, including both the goals of traditional humanities and postmodern objectives (respect of difference, multiple perspectives) (Frydaki & Mamoura, 2007). Furthermore, in Social Studies, objectives refer to a growth of students' awareness of the equality of persons, of

the interdependence of people in society, of the rights of family and education (Papoulia-Tzelepi, 1997). As fortunate as these may seem, they do not enjoy sufficient support by schoolbooks, teaching materials and guidelines, nor do they illuminate what actually takes place under real school conditions (Flouris, 1995). Likewise, a considerable difference has been already pointed out between the values that a school proclaims and those which in fact underpin teachers' practice (Halstead, 1996). In this slightly confused context, as already mentioned, teachers seem to need extra help to realise their own value-commitments in order to support students to develop their own values. With regard to this need, a theoretical framework, including some different perspectives on the teaching of values, is discussed in the following section of this paper. This framework is not intended to uphold some perspective against the others. Instead, it is intended to initiate a dialogue which could generate fruitful and reflective thinking about the positions and contradictions of all perspectives so that teachers can be assisted in locating themselves within value contexts and gain awareness of the essential role that their own options play in the process of value communication.

### **Three perspectives on teaching values**

Among the variety of trends on values in education, three distinct movements stand out: Value Education, Moral Development, and Critical Pedagogy (Veugelers, 2000).

The concept of Value Education or Character Education refers to the teaching of social, political, religious, cultural, aesthetic, or other types of values, predetermined as necessary for shaping the students' character (Linkona, 1993, 1997; Noddings, 1995; Wynne, 1997). Many researchers concur on the great difficulties in reaching a consensus on universal, non-relative values that transcend the needs of specific societies and constitute a multicultural world society. Thomas (1992) points out that not everyone defines the moral domain in the same way, and he substantiates the complexity of such a definition using the following three patterns that highlight three controversial dimensions of values: (i) universal versus relative moral values; (ii) permanent versus changeable values; and (iii) absolute versus conditional values (pp. 69-74). This complexity is perhaps one of the reasons why Value Education is linked with basic values, considered as non-controversial by their advocates, which ground character formation and peaceful co-existence, that is, trust, participation, care, fairness, respect and collective responsibility (Cohen, 1995). Some describe these values to be as *meta-moral* (Berkowitz, 1997), since they represent an individual's attribute supporting his/her moral functioning. Value Education programmes aim to

reinforce the teaching of such values in the educational process, not only through the curriculum (that is via direct teaching of specific subject matters), but also through the school's communication conditions and moral environment. Relevant criticism focuses on the following points: Firstly, no research so far has demonstrated direct correlations between taught values and their impact on students' behaviour. Secondly, notions such as *fairness*, *participation* and *trust* can be very controversial issues, in the sense that all these concepts may have different connotations in different contexts, that is, in an abstract humanistic framework or in a socio-political context. However, the advocates of this Value Perspective avoid highlighting this point and they present these concepts in their most abstract and normative sense. Thus, given the normative character of this approach, there seems to be a risk of becoming oppressively moralising, instead of involving students actively in meaning making, decision-making, and reflecting on their lives (Lockwood, 1997; Wardekker, 2004).

The movement of Moral Development differs from the first one in two crucial determinants: the types of values and the way they are developed. Regarding value types, this movement revolves not around personal, social, or aesthetic values, but around 'basic moral concepts' (Kohlberg, 1969, 1984), which, in Kant's tradition, morally establish any individual or collective action. They include honour, justice, equality, human dignity, responsibility and any value that directly promotes others' rights and well-being (Prencipe & Helwing, 2002). In terms of value development, this is based on the development of cognitive processes, as defined by Piaget's cognitive development stages. Cognitive development can also support the development of moral reasoning, the skill of thinking and reflecting on issues related to moral values. The ideal strategy recommended (and implemented) for developing such skills may be via small group discussion. This encourages students to take a stand on value dilemmas, as presented in real or imaginary situations and/or stories. The stories should clearly represent a main character's 'real conflict', contain a certain number of moral issues, and facilitate differentiated student reactions. The teacher should firmly guide the discussion toward the development of moral reasoning. In practice, this means encouraging students to express their views freely, urging them not only to share their views with others, but also to discuss the reasoning behind their views and choices; student discourse should be structured and based on arguments, without necessarily leading to a 'correct' or acceptable answer (Gailbraith & Jones, 1975). Relevant criticism focuses on the movement's tendency to overestimate cognitive processes and underestimate the emotional and social factors involved in the development of values (Lovat & Schofield, 1998; Wardekker, 2004). Gilligan (1977, 1982), based on her studies of women, suggested that females' moral decisions relate more to relational and affective factors rather than to abstract

principles, as Kohlberg has proposed. Hence, Gilligan (1993) developed a 'care version' of moral reasoning arguing that moral dilemmas are to be placed in a relational and emotional context.

The movement of Critical Pedagogy has had an impact on Greek educational discourse during the recent years. According to the principles of Critical Pedagogy, every form of social reproduction or reform is the result of political and cultural struggle. In education, this struggle is reflected in the curriculum, the teachers' goals, and their teaching practices (Giroux & McLaren, 1989). That is, it is reflected not only in the transfer of knowledge, but also in the development of values. Willing or not, teachers cannot retain a neutral stance toward this political and cultural struggle, nor can they remain neutral in terms of value transfer. For instance, by teaching their students on their role as citizens in a democratic society, teachers influence shifts either toward social reproduction or toward social reform. Thus, Critical Pedagogy theorists argue that teachers' involvement with values ought to correspond to their socio-political or socio-cultural practice, and the way they do it contributes to social justice (McLaren, 1994). Critical Pedagogy theorists are more explicit regarding the values they deem important: critical reinforcement, the right to difference, self-determination in political terms, and social justice. Such an orientation by the teacher could help students listen to the voices of the oppressed; understand the degree to which they themselves may be the victims of inequality, and develop a sense of justice and empowerment, which is central to becoming moral persons. However, according to relevant criticism, the rhetoric of Critical Pedagogy is hardly helpful for thinking through and planning classroom practices to support the political agenda (Ellsworth, 1989). Moreover, there is a lack of skills required by teachers to critically reflect on their values, integrating them more consciously in their socio-political or socio-cultural practices, so that their students become co-players in the pedagogical game of signification (Veugelers, 2000). Therefore, teachers seem to be allowed to deal with the topics promoted by Critical Pedagogy in any way they themselves see fit.

According to Wardekker (2004, p. 189), the first two movements seem to ignore that the individuals' (i.e., teachers' and students') values are seldom developed as product of an individual rationality, but rather tend to conform to existing rules and moral qualities of the social contexts in which individuals live. One could infer that Critical Pedagogy seems also to emphasise the individual rationality, in case it remains restricted to its political rhetoric. Moreover, teachers who implement the principles of Critical Pedagogy by confining themselves to the transmission of its rhetoric, run the risk of being considered as inculcators. On the other hand, Critical Pedagogy could highlight the relatedness between the micro and the macro, the personal and the political. That is, it could help students

develop a sense of critical and emancipatory empowerment on the understanding that it tackles topics which emerge from students' own lives as well as that teachers foster a genuine reflective dialogue about the existing societal values, possibly internalised by the students. Such reflective dialogue should relate the abstract value concepts to real students' experiences and practices in order for the students to understand that they themselves have choices that would permit them to change their own lives and social life as well (Ball, 2000).

Although the dialogue between the three perspectives on the teaching of values can generate a fruitful and reflective relevant thinking, another thing remains to be considered for the topic to be better illuminated: How do teachers deal with values within actual classrooms nowadays? What kind of values do they infuse and in what way? Thus, the following section attempts to classify some currently available research findings on how teachers themselves infuse their own values in their classrooms, including the case of Greece.

### **Indirect diffusion of values in teaching**

Despite long-standing consensus regarding the inevitable embedding of values in teaching (Dewey, 1964), there has been little research on how teachers incorporate their values in the design and practice of their teachings, their behaviour toward students, and their teaching discourse. However, significant evidence, mainly from small-scale qualitative research projects, indicates that teachers' underlying values are crucial regarding how they transform curriculum into practice in the classroom. According to Veugelers (2000), teachers cannot avoid influencing students, even if they strive to strictly confine themselves to the learning processes. For learning is a process of meaning making, of attributing a particular personal meaning to the subject matter taught and to the world in general. Inevitably, every such process involves elements of the teachers' and students' own identity, and therefore explicit or implicit value orientations.

In reviewing the literature on teaching values from 1990 to 2008, some studies were identified regarding the way teachers' values permeate the teaching process. Reference databases (ERIC and HEAL-LINK) were searched for potentially relevant studies published since 1990. Two groups of descriptors have been used (including synonymous and related terms). The first group of descriptors was: values, moral, ethical. These descriptors were combined with terms such as: teaching, teachers, teachers' beliefs, teachers' dispositions, subject matter, objectives, strategies, and pedagogy. The abstracts of the papers were analysed to support whether they actually highlight the dimension of hidden diffusion of teachers' personal values into instructional settings. The combination of the two

groups of descriptors guided the author of this paper to include in this review a total of 24 studies, from which the following patterns emerged: (i) values infused through teachers' beliefs on what should be taught; (ii) subject-linked values, that is, values derived from teachers' conceptions of the subject matter; (iii) values emerging from teachers' strategies, whenever they teach value-laden issues; and (iv) values resulting from teachers' character and dispositions.

The researches under examination could not be subjected to quantitative meta-analysis because of their theoretical and methodological differentiations, nor to detailed description as the latter could weaken the focus of the entire study. Hence, their results are presented in a narrative descriptive way, which is considered appropriate to highlight the emerging patterns.

### *Values infused through teachers' beliefs on what should be taught*

This pattern of values is the most easily distinguishable and recognisable. Teachers in these studies are bound to make choices regarding the emphasis placed on each aspect of the subject matter taught, as it is impossible to cover the full syllabus, not only because of its quantity, but also due to time restrictions. Such choices are implemented through their teaching goals and objectives, which, despite official guidelines for teaching each unit, often differ, even between teachers within the same school (Gudmundsdottir, 1990). Following the guidelines of the above research study, another study conducted in Greece (Frydaki & Mamoura, 2008) identified that two High School teachers taught the same novel (Stratis Tsirkas' *Ariagne*, the second volume of the trilogy *Drifting Cities*), but driven by their own personal value orientations created two different texts and instructional settings. The first one, devoted her instructional time to a socio-political perspective, and taught the text as historical evidence on the conditions of the expulsion of Greeks from Egypt. The second teacher, addressed classroom issues to her own humanitarian worldview and placed a lot more emphasis on 'the inherent tenderness and sublimeness included in the female soul' (Frydaki & Mamoura, 2008, p. 1494).

Another way in which teachers infuse their values through their beliefs on what should be taught is as follows: Despite the supposed priority of cognitive goals, some teachers have been observed to dedicate up to 50% of their instructional time to the development of social skills (Wentzel, 1991), others on democratic attitudes (Blumenfeld et al., 1979), while others on the discussion of the students' personal problems and the class's collective problems (Prawat, 1980). More recent research (Ennis, Ross & Chen, 1992; Ennis, 1994; Husu & Tirri, 2007) shows an increasing trend of academic goals giving way to social and community goals, including social responsibility, cooperation, responding to

the needs of others, respect, and participation. In support of these orientations and rationales, teachers reported the following: (i) student population becomes increasingly heterogeneous; in order to deal with academic content, students first need to obtain a relative social cohesion as members of the school community; (ii) the content of all subject matters should be connected to students' personal, social, and professional life; and (iii) students should be motivated to involve themselves more actively in the class, seeing that interesting, pleasant and meaningful education yields greater opportunities for enhanced student performance (Ennis, 1994, pp. 116-118).

In short, teachers who participated in the above research studies infuse implicitly their social, political, religious, cultural, aesthetic, or other types of values, even if these values are not predetermined as necessary for shaping the students' character. That is, they put into practice various tacit Value Education 'programmes' consistent with their beliefs. In these 'programmes', the shift from the discipline to the responsibility, participation, respect of difference and cooperation is habitually discernible. The question is whether these personal 'programmes' consider values as something to be transmitted once more or as something to be communicated involving students actively in meaning making, that is, taking into account their personal experience, commitments, worldviews and understanding of themselves.

### *Subject-linked values*

This pattern concerns values derived from teachers' conceptions of the subject matter taught. Shulman (1986) introduced the notion of pedagogical content knowledge speaking 'of the particular form of content knowledge that embodies the aspects of content most germane to its teachability [...], of the ways of representing and formulating the subject that make it comprehensible to others' (p. 9). According to Gudmundsdottir (1990), teachers transfer their values to their students neither consciously nor intentionally, but rather through their pedagogical content knowledge, that is, through the way they conceive their subject matter and plan their teaching. Indeed, academic disciplines, from which many school subjects are derived, differ in their histories, bodies of knowledge, epistemologies, sets of agreed procedures, and the degree of consensus existing within the field (Grossman & Stodolsky, 1995). Hence, they create a number of subject subcultures, and possibly different subcultures within the field of the same subject.

Relevant research (Gudmundsdottir, 1990; Slater, 1995; Husbands, 1996; Bills & Husbands, 2004) reveals that teachers initially claim to aim beyond the scope of their subject matter, that is, promoting critical thinking, fostering responsible citizens, etc. However, these broader aims often derive from the teachers' own

beliefs on the nature and purpose of the subject matter taught. This occurs especially in the case of secondary school teachers who teach broad, less well-defined subjects (such as Literature, History or Social Studies), as these subjects provide them with a greater flexibility and curricular autonomy than more defined school subjects (Grossman & Stodolsky, 1995, p. 6). For example, a Literature teacher who believes that Literature is important for students' self-discovery and growth may organise the class quite differently from another one who teaches a text's established interpretation, to promote the students' 'general education' or 'culture' (Muchmore, 2001; Shaw, Barry & Mahlios, 2008). The two above teachers transfer different values to their students in different ways, that is, through the types of questions asked, the way the class is managed, the points of focus, or the promotion of a single or multiple responses. In the first case, students learn the value of mental and emotional awareness toward literature, while in the second case, students learn the value of conformism, limiting themselves to verbal expressions and 'having something to say'. Other studies revealed that analogous situations seem to apply to other subject matters too. A teacher may think that history teaches us the best human achievements of the past; another one may hold that it teaches us to evaluate facts objectively, so as to reach informed conclusions; a third one may believe that history teaches us to understand the perspectives of others and develop tolerance (Akinoglu, 2004; Bills & Husbands, 2004; Frydaki & Mamoura, 2008).

It should be noted that not all possible teacher attitudes and values appear with the same frequency. Research findings have indicated that teacher beliefs on the nature and purpose of the subject matter are strongly influenced by the dominant values in the subject matter's tradition, which 'embody a notion of the perfection of the intellect' (Pring, 1996, p. 104; also Frydaki & Mamoura, 2007). Teachers' priority is to familiarise the students with the subject matter's inherent values, considered critical for their ability to think, reflect and evaluate 'the best that has been thought and said' (Pring, 1996, p. 106). This attitude is often shaped by and within a strong academic tradition of university education, usually reinforced by equally academic curricula and content- and examination-oriented bureaucratic educational systems.

In sum, teachers seem to transfer values to their students through their pedagogical content knowledge and, especially, through the way they conceive and perceive a specific subject matter. The question is: Do teachers hold to a sufficient extent conceptual frameworks and tools that enable them to broaden and critically reflect on their beliefs as a result of the nature and purpose of their subject? Or do they remain confined either to the subject matter tradition or to the prevailing subject's subculture, since these are mainly reinforced by curricula and the school culture as well?

The subjects that inherently contain value-laden issues are mainly the humanistic ones. The ways in which teachers handle these types of issues could reveal their probable orientations toward some of the three aforementioned educational movements. Recent research findings in Greece and elsewhere indicate that Literature and History teachers handle very cautiously, even tentatively, the value-laden issues, especially those that raise reactions from students, opting to maintain their neutrality. Although they reject the predetermined transfer of values and encourage students to exchange their views, teachers avoid expressing their own views, unless their relationship with the students enjoys stability and trust. Even when students express provocative views, teachers refrain from expressing their own, preferring to react more indirectly (e.g., expanding the scope of student discussion, or urging students to exchange arguments) (Frydaki & Mamoura, 2008). This situation seems to endorse other findings on the dilemma between having personal values or educational ideals and publicly expressing them in class (Boxall, 1995; Chater, 2005).

Moreover, teachers in Greece rarely bring into question, while teaching literature, the text's central values, preferring to focus on eternal humanistic values, as expressed in the great texts of literary tradition, including freedom, honour, justice, dignity, and self-sacrifice. For example, the K. Kavafis' poem *Antony's Ending* embodies the value of dignity before a defeat, a frustration, or a dead end. Given the Greek curriculum guidelines and established teaching practices, an observer would note that most Greek literature teachers avoid discussing the text's central value issue and refrain from offering alternative positions, that is, fighting all the way to the end. On the contrary, the same teachers seem to strongly defend similar values while teaching other literary texts, in which this value issue is dominant (i.e., *The Free Besieged* by D. Solomos). In brief, a great majority of Greek teachers seem to avoid either presenting different views or creating moral dilemmas through which students may be encouraged to take a stand and defend their positions.

On the other hand, research conducted by the University of Amsterdam (Veugelers, 2000) revealed that teachers handle value-laden issues by a greater variety of strategies, only the first of which coincides with the pre-mentioned Greek tendency: (i) they try to avoid expressing their personal views, remaining devoted to the 'official' interpretation; (ii) they explicitly clarify which values they find important, that is, they express and defend their position; (iii) they underline the possible views one may hold on the issue under study, avoiding to take sides; and (iv) they present different views, but also express the values they find

important. Several participants indicated that they themselves follow a linear sequence of teaching approaches i, iii, and iv; at first they are neutral, then they present a range of alternative views, while at the end they present their own view for discussion in class. On the other hand, students stated their preference for teachers who present different values and then present their own views, without emphasising them excessively. In other words, students want to know what their teachers believe, but they would not wish to be indoctrinated (Veugelers, 2000, pp. 43-44). These students seem to share Kelly's (1986) notion of 'committed impartiality' according to which the teacher attempts to provide all sides of a topic but does share his/her own views with the class.

In sum, the data at hand revealed that several Greek teachers tend to avoid indoctrinating students; but, contrary to their colleagues from the Netherlands, they tend equally to avoid involving themselves too obviously in the process of value communication either by expressing their own values or by bringing into question the text's central value. The question is whether this stance of value neutrality shows an emerging value orientation that is more critical and emancipatory, or an emerging political correctness with conservative overtones.

#### *Values resulting from the teachers' dispositions*

Richardson (1993) and Fenstermacher (1999) were among the scholars that distinguished between the three aspects of teachers' behaviour in class: method, style, and manner. Method consists of teachers' intentional actions, aiming at influencing students. Style refers to behaviour reflecting teachers' personality. Manner includes all the characteristics and dispositions that reveal teachers' moral and intellectual character. Under the same vein, Fallona (2000), for the purposes of her research, further analysed teaching manner in relation to how teachers express in class each of the 'Aristotelian moral virtues of bravery, friendliness, wit, mildness, magnificence, magnanimity, honor, generosity, temperance, truthfulness, and justice' (p. 684). Despite the difficulties inherent in observing the distinctions among the above manners, this researcher found it quite important for teachers to realise and study their own teaching manners, so as to enjoy a more fruitful interaction with their students (Fallona, 2000, p. 692).

More recently, Johnson & Reiman (2007) utilise the tradition established by Dewey and the movement of Moral Development, which holds that every action is based on an underlying moral judgment. They define dispositions 'as teacher professional judgment and professional action in the moral/ethical domain' (p. 677), that is, when confronted with situations that can be solved in more than one ways. Their qualitative research grouped teachers' values, moral judgments and actions in three distinct patterns, based on how rules are shaped in class. In

the first pattern, when confronted with a dilemma, teachers endorse the rules to maintain order, the one 'right' solution to every problem, and the need for students' obedience. In practice, they attribute themselves the role of controlling classroom relationships, and are easily disturbed by the lack of student discipline; they create and modify rules of their own, while their teaching strategies overlook students' perspectives or internal motives, paying no attention to the students' emotional needs. In the second pattern, teachers' judgments are based on rules, which guarantee protection and stability. Although teachers allow no exceptions when applying the rules, they do make an allowance for student perspectives and motives. In practice, they establish explicit and uniform rules, and follow them themselves. Teachers of the third pattern express their judgments and design their activities taking into consideration students' rights, the variety of learning styles, and the situational context; they view rules as relative and changeable, existing only to protect certain rights. In practice, they encourage students to participate in the shaping of rules and in decision-making, they choose individualised and interactive teaching strategies, they are tolerant of provocative student behaviour and committed to facilitating their students on all levels. With reference to the last two patterns, it can be claimed that the quality of teacher-student interaction would be greatly enhanced if teachers were to realise and critically analyse how they shape rules (Johnson & Reiman, 2007, p. 681).

Indeed, little is known about how teachers' dispositions influence how students learn to interact and develop their own values. Nevertheless, in both types of research, the need for the teachers to critically reflect on their manners and choices is crucial for a meaningful interaction with their students. Such meaningful interaction can represent a supportive environment of openness and trust for the students to develop their values with increasing autonomy in an increasingly complex social context.

## **Conclusions and discussion**

The meanings that education attributes to the concept of values have undoubtedly changed. Academic discourse and curricular tendencies seem to have shifted from the value of integration into the environment to the value of the autonomy of the individual, from the adherence to the past to critical thinking, from the discipline to social rules to individual responsibility, respect and cooperation.

Even though educational policies reconsider their orientations regarding values in education, the relevant movements (Value Education, Moral Development and Critical Pedagogy) do not represent integrating approaches to

the field. They seem to lack either openness (Value Education) or trust (Moral Development and Critical Pedagogy), which are needed for the development of students' values. On the other hand, the research findings, as revealed in the present study, bring to light some common issues, and draw some major conclusions: First of all, teachers do infuse their values in classrooms through a variety of ways, even if they avoid involving themselves actively in the process of values communication by expressing their own values or bringing into question some values to be taught. Secondly, they seldom have an awareness of what they do in the processes of values communication, since they are deficient in realising and critically reflecting on how they shape their own commitments, beliefs, and values. Finally, although teachers avoid indoctrination, they seem not to adequately take into consideration the need for students to develop their own values and their personal identity with increasing autonomy based on a continuing dialogue with their own experiences as well as the existing societal values. However, some teachers do involve their students in the process of value communication, allowing them to express their own experiences, emotional needs and commitments through an open, supportive and reflective interaction. In this case, the process of value communication seems to become essential and meaningful, reflecting somewhat the Habermasian notion of 'communicative ethics'.

The above point is considered crucial by the author of the present paper. Values are to be developed through an active interaction of students and teachers in meaning making. The relational context promoted by the movement of Value Education, the argument-based moral reasoning promoted by the movement of Moral Development and the emancipatory demands of Critical Pedagogy are useful but not sufficient by themselves to the task of such a development. Although it is rarely articulated as such, a basic issue emerging from most types of research is the demand for an interweaving of openness and trust. Students' value development could be based on the open expression of their own value-commitments, but furthermore it should be ensured by the teachers' self-awareness, 'committed impartiality' (Kelly, 1986), responsibility and continuous reflection on their own practical decision, so that a mutual trust could be achieved. On the other hand, teachers seem to lack the education needed for such a demand.

Bearing in mind the educational needs as set by the current socio-cultural context, the various perspectives on values in education and the research findings, I concur that it is of utmost importance to include 'teaching values' in teacher education. Of course, this does not refer to the normative transfer of any set of values. So far, there is no consensus and a common ground for a shared value system, regardless of how desirable such a system would be. Including 'teaching

values' in teacher education simply means that teachers should realise that teaching extends beyond the transmission of academic knowledge, and certainly beyond knowing how students learn. To paraphrase Dewey (1964), relying entirely, or even partly, on knowledge and the use of 'methods' is a fatal mistake for the best interests of education.

Whether teachers realise it or not, teaching is a value-laden process; consequently, they ought to learn how to identify and critically reflect on their own values, relating them to the real social contexts in which they live. This is needed specifically in Greece, where, as it has already been noted, the teaching of values 'is fragmentary and it more or less depends on the sensitivity of the educator ...' (CIDREE, 1994, p. 118). They also need to become aware of their own behaviours and choices, incorporating values in the teaching process. Prospective teachers should therefore be encouraged to discuss their experiences and practices, and be urged to identify practical examples of inconsistencies between their stated values and their behaviour or choices (Husu & Tirri, 2007). Moreover, prospective teachers as well as teacher educators need theoretical frameworks and tools, so that they would be able to deal with the issue of values in teaching. These theoretical frameworks and tools can also support them to develop the necessary skills to ensure balance between two orientations, which although seemingly contradictory are actually complementary: defending their own values honestly, without disguising them as absolute truths, and stimulating students to develop and defend their own personal values within a supportive environment of openness, flexibility and trust. If education is a game of continuous meaning making, teachers have to be simultaneously co-players and referees. Both roles call for high degrees of self-awareness, responsibility and professionalism.

---

**Evangelia Frydaki** is assistant professor of Education at the University of Athens, Greece. Dr Frydaki's cognitive subject matter is 'Teaching Theory and Practice'. Her research and writing is particularly informed by literature theory, teacher education, cognitive psychology and curriculum studies. Her current areas of research interest include topics about the purposes and methods of teaching literature as well as beliefs, knowledge, values, learning and the development of secondary school teachers. She has written books and articles that try to define the main dimensions in the teaching process. Her e-mail address is: [efrydaki@ppp.uoa.gr](mailto:efrydaki@ppp.uoa.gr)

## References

- Akinoglu, O. (2004) *History, Education and Identity*. Paper presented at the Conference History Education and Society, 12-18 July, Ambleside, England. Available online at: [www.centres.ex.ac.uk/historyresource/journal9/papers/akinoglu.pdf](http://www.centres.ex.ac.uk/historyresource/journal9/papers/akinoglu.pdf)
- Ball, A. F. (2000) Empowering pedagogies that enhance the learning of multicultural students, *Teachers College Record*, Vol. 102(6), pp. 1006-1034.
- Berkowitz, M. W. (1997) *Integrating Structure and Content in Moral Education*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 24-28 March, Chicago, USA.
- Bills, L., & Husbands, C. (2004) *Analysing 'Embedded Values' in History and Mathematics Classrooms*. Paper presented at the Conference of the British Educational Research Association, 15-19 September, Manchester, England.
- Blumenfeld, P. C., Hamilton, V. L., Wessels, K., & Falkner, D. (1979) Teaching responsibility to first graders, *Theory into Practice*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 174-180.
- Boxall, W. (1995) Making the private public. In D. Thomas (ed.) *Teachers' Stories*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Bruner, J. (1990) *Acts of Meaning*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Butroyd, B. (1997) Are the values of secondary school teachers really in decline?, *Educational Review*, Vol. 49(3), pp. 251-258.
- Chater, M. (2005) The personal and the political: notes on teachers' vocations and values, *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, Vol. 26(3), pp. 249-259.
- Cohen, P. (1995) *The Content of their Character: Educators Find New Ways to Tackle Values and Morality*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Consortium of Institutions for Development and Research in Education in Europe (CIDREE) (1994) *Values Education in Europe: A Comparative Overview of a Survey of 26 Countries in 1993*. Slough: CIDREE & UNESCO.
- Dewey, J. (1964) *John Dewey on Education: Selected Writings*. New York: Modern Library.
- Ellsworth, E. (1989) Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy, *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 59(3), pp. 297-324.
- Ennis, C. D. (1994) Urban secondary teachers' value orientations: social goals for teaching, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 10(1), pp. 109-120.
- Ennis, C. D., Ross, L., & Chen, A. (1992) The role of value orientations in curricular decision making: a rationale for teachers' goals and expectations, *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, Vol. 63, pp. 38-47.
- Fallona, C. (2000) Manner in teaching: a study in observing and interpreting teachers' moral virtues, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 16(7), pp. 681-695.
- Fenstermacher, G. D. (1999) *Method, Style, and Manner in Classroom Teaching*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 19-23 April, Montreal, Canada.
- Flouris, G. (1995) Non-alignment between educational goals, curriculum, and educational means: some aspects of educational inconsistency. In A. Kazamias & M. Kassotakis

- (eds.) *Greek Education: Perspectives of Reconstruction and Modernization* (in Greek). Athens: Seirios.
- Flouris, G. (1997) The case of Greece: human rights in the educational legislation, school curriculum, teachers manuals and textbooks. In D. Evans, H. Grassler & J. Pouwels (eds.) *Human Rights and Values Education in Europe*. Freiburg: Fillibach-Verlang.
- Frydaki, E., & Mamoura, M. (2007) Values in the planned and delivered curriculum: the case of literature and history. In N. P. Terzis (ed.) *Education and Values in the Balkan Countries*. Thessaloniki: Publishing House Kyriakidis Brothers.
- Frydaki, E., & Mamoura, M. (2008) Exploring teachers' value orientations in literature and history secondary classrooms, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 24(6), pp. 1487-1501.
- Gaillbraith, R., & Jones, T. (1975) Teaching strategies for moral dilemmas: an application of Kohlberg's theory of moral development to the social studies classroom, *Social Education*, Vol. 39, pp.16-22.
- Gilligan, C. (1977) In a different voice: women's conceptualizations of self and morality, *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 47, pp. 481-517.
- Gilligan, C. (1982) *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1993) *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Giroux, H. A., & McLaren, P. L. (1989) *Critical Pedagogy, the State and Cultural Struggle*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Grossman, P. L., & Stodolsky, S. S. (1995) Content as context: the role of school subjects in secondary school teaching, *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 24(8), pp. 5-11.
- Gudmundsdottir, S. (1990) Values in pedagogical content knowledge, *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 41(3), pp. 44-52.
- Halstead, M. J. (1996) Values and values education in schools. In M. J. Halstead & M. J. Taylor (eds.) *Values in Education and Education in Values*. London & Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.
- Huitt, W. (2004). *Values*. Available online at: <http://chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/col/affsys/values.html>
- Husbands, C. (1996) *What is History teaching? Language, Ideas and Meaning in Learning about the Past*. Great Britain: Open University Press.
- Husu, J., & Tirri, K. (2007) Developing whole school pedagogical values – a case of going through the ethos of good schooling, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 23(4), pp. 390-401.
- Johnson, L. E., & Reiman, A. (2007) Beginning teachers' disposition: examining the moral/ethical domain, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 23(5), pp. 676-687.
- Kassotakis, M. I. (2004) The curriculum reform of Greek secondary education during the period 1990-2002: attempts and problems. In T. Papakonstantinou & A. Lambraki-Paganou (eds.) *Study Programmes and Educational Work in Secondary Education* (in Greek). Athens: Athens University.
- Kelly, T. (1986) Discussing controversial issues: four perspectives on the teacher's role, *Theory and Research in Social Education*, Vol. 14, pp. 113-138.

- Kohlberg, L. (1969) Stage and sequence: the cognitive developmental approach to socialization. In D. Goslin (ed.) *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984) *The Psychology of Moral Development*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
- Koutselini, M. (1997) Contemporary trends and perspectives of the curricula: towards a meta-modern paradigm for curriculum, *Curriculum Studies*, Vol. 5(1), pp. 87-101.
- Linkona, T. (1993) The return of character education (the character education partnership Inc.), *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 51(3), pp. 6-11.
- Linkona, T. (1997) Educating for character: a comprehensive approach. In A. Molnar (ed.) *The Construction of Children's Character*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lockwood, A. (1997) What is character education? In A. Molnar (ed.) *The Construction of Children's Character*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lovat, T., & Schofield, N. (1998) Values formation in citizenship education: a perspective and an empirical study, *Unicorn*, Vol. 24(1), pp. 46-53.
- Maslow A. H. (1970) *Toward a Psychology of Being*. New York: D. Van Nostrand.
- Maslow A. H. (1979) Humanistic education, *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, Vol. 19, pp. 13-27.
- Massialas, B. (1975) Inquiry into social values, feelings, and self: new helpful approaches. In B. Massialas, N. Sprague & J. Hurst (eds.) *Social Issues through Inquiry: Coping in an Age of Crises*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall & Englewood Cliffs.
- Massialas, B., & Flouris, G. (1994) *Education and the Emerging Concept of National Identity in Greece*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society, 21-24 March, San Diego, CA, USA.
- McLaren, P. L. (1994) Foreword: critical thinking as a political project. In K. S. Walters (ed.) *Re-Thinking Reason, New Perspectives in Critical Thinking*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Muchmore, J. A. (2001) The story of Anna: a life history study of the literacy beliefs and teaching practices of an urban high school English teacher, *Teacher Education Quarterly*, Vol. 28(3), pp. 89-110.
- Noddings, N. (1995) *Philosophy of Education*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Papoulia-Tzelepi, P. (1997) Human and children's rights as part of values education in Greek elementary school: the case of reading textbooks. In D. Evans, H. Grassler & J. Pouwels (eds.) *Human Rights and Values Education in Europe*. Freiburg: Fillibach-Verlang..
- Parsons, T. (1951) *The Social System*. Glenchoe, IL: Free Press.
- Pedagogical Institute (PI) (2000) *Curricula of Primary and Secondary Education, Theoretical Sciences*. Athens: Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs.
- Prawat, R. S. (1980) Teacher perceptions of student affect, *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 17, pp. 61-73.
- Prencipe, A., & Helwing, C. (2002) The development of reasoning about the teaching of values in school and family contexts, *Child Development*, Vol. 73(3), pp. 841-856.
- Pring, R. (1996) Values and education policy. In M. J. Halstead & M. J. Taylor (eds.) *Values in Education and Education in Values*. London & Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.
- Richardson, V. (1993) *Continuity and Change in Teachers' Manner*. Paper presented at the

- Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA, USA.
- Rogers, C. (1961) *On Becoming a Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy*. London: Constable.
- Rogers, C. (1983) *Freedom to Learn*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Shaw, M. D., Barry, A., & Mahlios, M. (2008) Preservice teachers' metaphors of teaching in relation to literacy beliefs, *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 14(1), pp. 35-50.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986) Those who understand: knowledge growth in teaching, *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 15(2), pp. 4-14.
- Slater, J. (1995) *Teaching History in the New Europe*. London: Cassell.
- Thomas, M. R. (1992) The moral identity development in ethnic relations. In K. Schleicher & T. Kozma (eds.) *Ethnocentrism in Education*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Veugelers, W. (2000) Different ways of teaching values, *Educational Review*, Vol. 52(1), pp. 37-46.
- Veugelers, W., & Vedder, P. (2003) Values in teaching, *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 9(4), pp. 377-389.
- Wardekker, W. (2004) Moral education and the construction of meaning, *Educational Review*, Vol. 56(2), pp. 183-192.
- Wentzel, K. R. (1991) Social competence at school: relation between social responsibility and academic achievement, *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 61, pp. 1-24.
- Whiting, J. (1961) Socialization process and personality. In F. Hsu (ed.) *Psychological Anthropology*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.
- Wynne, E. (1997) For-character education. In A. Molnar (ed.) *The Construction of Children's Character*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Xochellis, P. D. (2001) The education and in-service training of teachers in Greece: the present situation – concerns and debate – proposals. In N. P. Terzis (ed.) *Teacher Education in the Balkan Countries*. Thessaloniki: Balkan Society for Pedagogy and Education.