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Abstract

This thesis deals with moral values in education as an important aspect of teaching alongside the subject matter and methodology. The theoretical part gives an overview of experts’ views on what values are, how they can be classified and what their role in education is. When examining this role (in other words, the role of moral education), issues are addressed such as whether values should be taught, what values are taught (or should be taught) and what strategies may be chosen in moral education. Particular attention is paid to the impact of pluralism as the currently predominant paradigm. Moral education is studied as taking place within a universalism-relativism continuum. The practical part presents findings from a questionnaire research among a sample of Czech teachers. The respondents were asked about their views on the role of values in teaching and what values they see as particularly important. The influence of several variables was examined such as the type of school (e.g. university, elementary school), the type of subject taught (sciences, humanities) as well as demographical data such as age or gender. The research revealed that the respondents attribute a great importance to values. However, they are reluctant to discuss them with their peers. The findings also suggest that teachers of humanities are more ready to acknowledge the impact of values than teachers of sciences. University teachers were found to see values as less important than teachers from lower levels of education.

Keywords: values, education, moral education, character education, pluralism
In my eight years of teaching I have taken part in many discussions on various aspects of teaching. A vast majority of them revolved around what we teach (in other words, the subject matter) or how we teach it (methodology). A striking absence was apparent in all but a rare few of those conversations – the absence of values. It seems that more often than not we fail to acknowledge that besides the subject matter we also teach values. This process, which can also be called moral education, may be conscious and planned or happening “under the surface”, but we can assume it is always present to a degree. Moreover, the importance of values education seems to have been growing, as education has long lost its monopoly on what used to be its primary goal – dissemination of information (Caine, 1997).

This thesis aims to be a contribution to the discussion of this non-negligible aspect of teaching, inquiring into what role values play in education according to both theorists and teachers. How important are they? How do we teach values (what strategies do we choose)? What values do we teach and how can values be classified? How can (or should) we approach teaching values in a pluralist society?

In the theoretical part literature is reviewed in search of what experts have to say to the aforementioned issues. The research in the practical part shows how those who deal with moral education in their day-to-day practice - teachers - view values in education and what values they possess.
Theoretical part

Before values can be discussed, it is necessary to define what we mean by the word values. It is not taken for granted that we all understand the expression in the same way. Moreover, the phrase “values in education” overlaps or is loosely synonymous with other terms, such as “moral education”, “character education” and other collocations. The following chapter attempts to synthesize definitions found in literature and establishes how different terms are to be understood for the purposes of this thesis. Theorists from diverse fields – most notably psychology, sociology and philosophy have presented their views on how values can be categorized. Several typologies or classifications are examined to provide further insight into how values may be understood and studied. Systems by thinkers such as Rokeach, Hofstede, Inglehart and Schwartz are presented.

As soon as we establish what we mean by “values”, it becomes clear that we are dealing with a very broad topic approachable in a multitude of ways. The main objective of this thesis is to examine the role of values in education and the dilemmas that teachers and theorists face when working on the fine line between pluralism and moral relativism. As it is universally accepted that we live in a post-modern pluralist society, or, as James Davison Hunter puts it, in “an age without good or evil” (Hunter, 2000, p.221-26), it is becoming increasingly difficult to decide what roles values should play in education and what values should be taught. As the idea of inclusiveness “has become a firmly established policy imperative” (Hussein, 2008, p.1), there is a growing need to identify a set of values that are universal – i.e. independent of culture, socio-economic class, race, gender, sexuality or religion. The chapter “Values and pluralism” deals with such issues in detail, examining how different education theorists and philosophers approach the conflict between relativism possibly stemming from pluralist views and the need to maintain or perhaps even reinforce
binding values in moral education. In this thesis the scope is limited to the so called “western world” – in other words, North America and Europe.

**What are values?**

Before we can investigate the role of values in education, we must make an effort to prevent ambiguity and confusion by providing a definition of the term “values” that is as clear as possible. However, once we start reviewing sources in search of such a definition, it becomes clear that no singular objective clarification can be provided, unless we resort to unhelpful circular definitions such as “something of value”. General principles of language dictate that the link between the signifier and the signified is arbitrary (Saussure, 1983). Moreover, with immaterial referents such as “values” we cannot simply point to what we mean. Therefore we are restricted to defining an abstract concept using words that are no less abstract. Consequently, there are as many explanations of what is meant by “values” as there are people using the term. Unsurprisingly, skepticism about whether values can be clearly defined is often found in researchers dealing with the subject – “it is doubtful whether a definition of values can be produced that embraces all the meanings assigned to the term and its cognates or that would be acceptable to all investigators” (Albert, 1968, p.288). Similar doubts are expressed by Deth and Scarborough in their book *The Impact of Values* (Deth and Scarborough, 1998). Let us examine definitions found in literature and make attempts at finding a common ground, thus reducing ambiguity.

Theorists who have pursued a universal definition of values that Albert finds inconceivable have arrived at very broad conceptualizations. A notable example is McLaughlin (1965, p. 266) who found three features common to all notions of values, stating that they: (i) cannot be observed directly, (ii) they have a cognitive, affective and connotative aspects and (iii) they do not operate independently from biological organisms or social
environments. According to McLaughlin, all other aspects are added arbitrarily by whoever studies values and are relevant only for the specific field of research. Deth and Scarborough criticize such approach as too broad and virtually indistinguishable from the term “attitudes”. They stress that the key question in discussing values is whether they are desires or desirabilities, where desirabilities form a subset of desires where we replace “I want” with “I ought”. In other words, this point of view sees values as prescriptive rather than descriptive, engaging moral considerations. Three criteria are presented by which we can tell that we are dealing with values:

1. Values cannot be directly observed.
2. Values engage moral considerations.
3. Values are conceptions of the desirable.

(Deth & Scarborough 1998, p.26-28)

Such definition is compatible with one of the most widely accepted ones put forward by Rokeach, who asserts that a value is “an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence”. (Rokeach, 1973, p.5) More precisely, Deth and Scarborough introduce the word “moral” into Rokeach’s “preferable”. The notion that values engage moral considerations is of a great importance for the present thesis, while we steer clear of broader characterization of values as “anything desired”. This enables us to use “values in education”, “moral education” and “character education” as synonyms.

Having made it clear what is meant by „values“, it should be specified how phrases “values in education” or “values in teaching” are understood in the present thesis. Ambiguity might occur in whether we mean values possessed by the teacher or values taught to the students. Throughout the paper, the latter meaning will have priority. However, teachers’ values will also be discussed as it could be argued that particularly in case of the hidden
curriculum where values are transmitted subconsciously, little or no difference may be observed between the two (the teacher transmits the values that he or she possesses). Therefore we can conclude that by “values in teaching/education” we mean values taught to the students, keeping in mind that in the passages related to transmission of values (and the hidden curriculum) we will also consider values possessed by the teacher.

**Classification of values**

A deeper understanding of what values are requires inquiry into how we can differentiate between various value types or singular values. The typologies and classifications coined by theorists are no less diverse than the definitions of the term. Let us examine several approaches taken by scholars studying values.

**Milton Rokeach**

Milton Rokeach has been considered a pioneer of values research and his 1973 book *The Nature of Human Values* continues to be among the most quoted in the field (Mayton, 1983, p. 1). Rokeach conceptualized values on several levels. The most basic of them is the dichotomy of values placed on an object as opposed to values possessed by a person. Rokeach realizes that objects do not have any inherent value independent of the individual, therefore both types are parts of an individual’s personality, while the former is less conscious than the latter (see also Locke, 1975 and Feather, 1995). Rokeach focuses primarily on values possessed by a person, as does this thesis.

Rokeach goes on to establish two types of values based on their relationship to the desired end-state. The first category comprises values that are the end-states themselves, called terminal values. The second type – instrumental values – describes modes of behavior that the individual believes lead to reaching terminal values. In other words, terminal values are ends, while instrumental ones are means.
Rokeach produced a list of 18 instrumental and 18 terminal values. Examples of terminal values are: true friendship, mature love, self-respect, equality, freedom, pleasure or social recognition. Instrumental values are e.g. ambition, cleanliness, self-control, honesty, imagination or obedience.

These two lists are the foundation of the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS) where respondents are asked to sort the given terms in the order of importance. The method is based on the presumption that most individuals share all the listed values, but attribute a different degree of importance to them. It could therefore be concluded that Rokeach deals with what he perceives as core values – values shared by all (to a degree). The differences in value orientations take the form of different value hierarchies, not individuals valuing different concepts altogether.

Another distinction made by Rokeach is the notion of a two-value system. He asserts that the distinction that has the strongest significance for explaining differences in individuals’ behavior is the freedom-equality continuum. He claims these two values have the strongest potential for a conflict, sometimes being in direct opposition.

Rokeach also proposes that unlike attitudes, values are relatively stable in time. They are also presented to the individual as principles we should adhere to all the time – there is a degree of dogmatism (Rokeach, 1960). He sees a causal relationship between these two attributes: "Absolute learning of values (…) more or less guarantees their endurance and stability" (Rokeach, 1973, p.6) Presumably Rokeach means that if this dogmatic teaching is successful, the values taught are so deeply rooted in the individual’s belief system that they are unlikely to be shaken.

Rokeach’s values research has been criticized on the grounds of the lists being arbitrary and in need of expansion (Braithwaite & Law, 1985). Feather suggests that negative values
should also be included (Feather, 1987). Clawson describes three main limitations of the Rokeach paradigm, which he otherwise calls “excellent”:

One flaw is the use of rank orderings, which, for all its speed and simplicity, is less informative than interval or ratio scaling would be. Equally attractive values are forced into separate rankings. Wide gaps in preference are treated as no different from minuscule gaps. (…) A second problem is with the instructions, which bias the rankings in favor of deprived values and against satiated values. Saying to a respondent that his task is to arrange the value statements in order of their importance to him, as guiding principles in his life (Rokeach, 1973, p. 358), does not allow him to distinguish between permanent esteem of the value and situational need for the value. (…) The third drawback is that Rokeach's lists of 18 instrumental values and 18 terminal values appear to omit a substantial number of other values that are held by substantial portions of the populace. They include, for example, Life, Physical Energy, Physical Strength, Physical Attractiveness, Youthfulness, Family, Enjoyment, Power, Leadership, Courage, Individualism, Conformity, Mental Energy, Practicality, and Efficiency. (Clawson, 1978, p.1)

Schwartz (1992) criticizes the instrumental-terminal dichotomy as having little support in reality and being only applicable to some nations (partly due to linguistic limitations). Chinese, for example, renders the instrumental-terminal distinction impossible.

**Geert Hofstede**

A different classification was proposed by the Dutch social psychologist and anthropologist Geert Hofstede in his book *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (1991). He, together with Rokeach, sees values as conditioned by culture, arguing we cannot study personal values without taking cultural ones into account. He calls cultural values “mental programs” or “software of the mind”, asserting that they are the value framework we
internalize in early childhood when we are the most susceptible to learning and assimilation. It is within this framework we develop our personal values. Such mental programs are largely subconscious and must be made aware of and willingly unlearnt if an individual wishes to gain more control over his/her decisions in the value realm. For these reasons Hofstede focuses primarily on the cultural element in our modes of behavior, developing a theory of what he calls “cultural dimensions”. This approach is substantially different from Rokeach’s in that Hofstede does not rely on finite lists of values, using continuous scales instead. Consequently, an infinite amount of varying results can be achieved (while there are a limited number of permutations within a set of 36 Rokeach’s values).

Hofstede studied a large sample of IBM employees in 72 countries, arriving at 5 cultural dimensions.

Power distance describes willingness of subordinates to question authority of their superiors. In high power distance cultures, such as the majority of Asian or African countries, subordinates are obedient and afraid of their superiors. Hierarchical structures are rigid and stable. Low power-distance environment can be found in the USA or most of Europe, where a greater degree of equality is observed between superiors and their subordinates, who expect to be consulted in the decision-making process.

The second dimension describes the opposition between individualism and collectivism. Members of individualist societies are expected to take care of themselves as much as possible. Solidarity is not taken for granted and individual rights and values are seen as important. On the other side of the spectrum, collectivist cultures involve a more mechanical system of solidarity where interdependence is integral to the social system and often transcends a single human lifetime in the form of family ties. Collective interests are valued over personal ones.
Femininity versus masculinity continuum constitutes the third dimension described by Hofstede. Where feminine principles are valued, a pleasant and conflict-free social environment is pursued and cooperation is preferred over competition. A masculine culture supports competition, greater risk-taking tendencies and opportunities of advancement to a more challenging position with a higher social reward.

Uncertainty avoidance measures people’s tendency to fear the unknown. New and unexpected situations are perceived as threatening and avoided if possible. Where the uncertainty avoidance index is low, individuals are more open to risk-taking and innovation.

The final cultural dimension is the scale of long-term versus short-term orientation. A culture that focuses on long-term goals, such as China or India, exhibits a greater tendency to respect hierarchies as fixed in time. Persistence is preferred over change and innovation. In short-term oriented cultures quick results are valued and face-saving behavior is observed more frequently. It is also here that absolutes about good and evil are a fundamental part of people’s beliefs, while in long-term oriented environment good and evil are seen as more circumstantial.

Hofstede’s research has been criticized on several grounds. Robinson (1983) claims that despite the high number of respondents (circa 11600) the sample is less than representative as it was acquired in a single company with middle-class employees, which raises suspicions of the results being distorted. Robinson adds that the company is highly influenced by the US corporate culture, which deprives Hofstede’s research of much of its relevance to studying cultural values.

Further critics of Hofstede’s approach contend that due to the research team consisting exclusively of Europeans and Americans, the findings are inevitably culturally biased (Roberts & Boyacigiller, 1984).
Despite the criticism Hofstede’s system continues to be the most popular approach to studying cultural values (Rarick & Nickerson, 2008).

**Ronald F. Inglehart**

Further hypotheses regarding values were provided by Ronald Inglehart, who built upon Rokeach’s research and, similarly to Hofstede, focuses on cultural aspects of values and “value dimensions”. In 1981 Inglehart and Christian Welzel founded the non-profit organization World Values Survey that conducts world-wide research on values and beliefs, paying extra attention to mechanisms of value change and their impact on social and political behavior of individuals. Rokeach’s hypothesis that seems central to Inglehart’s approach is that of values being relatively stable within an adult’s life. They are formed in childhood and adolescence, but as a person reaches adulthood, the probability of a significant change in values is low. Therefore, he concludes, a change in value systems of individuals and cultures alike is predominantly intergenerational:

> People are most likely to adopt those values that are consistent with what they have experienced first-hand during their formative years. This implies that intergenerational value change will occur if younger generations grow up under different conditions from those that shaped earlier generations – so that the values of the entire society will gradually change through intergenerational replacement. (Inglehart, 2008, p. 132)

Inglehart uses different scales of cultural dimensions than Hofstede, attributing the greatest importance to two continua – traditionalism vs. secular rationalism and self-expression vs. survivalism. Those who value traditional values put emphasis on religion, family ties and respect towards authority. They are likely to reject divorce, abortion or
euthanasia. On the opposite pole of the spectrum, secular rationalists will more readily accept or tolerate abortion etc. Where self-expression is valued, tolerance towards minorities, stronger environmental protection and demand for civic participation are observed. In survivalist cultures the highest priorities are economic and physical security and a high degree of ethno-centrism.

Although Inglehart uses a different classification of cultural values, striking similarities can be found between his theory and Hofstede’s. A good example is the robust correlation between Hofstede’s collectivism and Inglehart’s survivalism – the societies described by Hofstede as “collectivist” rank high in Inglehart’s index of survivalism. Therefore it can be argued that these two dimensions measure the same underlying principle. Inglehart himself admitted that in his book Modernization, cultural change, and democracy: the human development sequence (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005, p.136).

One of Inglehart’s key contributions to studying values is his theory of the western world’s shift towards post-materialism, attempting to explain how values are formed and how intergenerational change occurs:

1. A scarcity hypothesis. Virtually everyone aspires to freedom and autonomy, but people tend to place the highest value on the most pressing needs. Material sustenance and physical security are immediately linked with survival, and when they are scarce people give top priority to these ‘materialistic’ goals; but under conditions of prosperity, people become more likely to emphasise ‘post-materialist’ goals such as belonging, esteem, and aesthetic and intellectual satisfaction.
2. A socialisation hypothesis. The relationship between material conditions and value priorities is not one of immediate adjustment: to a large extent, one’s basic values reflect the conditions that prevailed during one’s pre-adult years and these values change mainly through intergenerational population replacement.

(Inglehart, 2008, p. 131)

Rokeach, Hofstede and Inglehart seem to agree that values are more or less stable within the scope of a person’s life and are culturally determined. However, the area of focus appears to be different. Rokeach puts a great emphasis on dogmatism in values teaching, implying that values are predominantly taught as absolutes in a conscious and deliberate fashion (Rokeach, 1960). Hofstede and Inglehart turn their attention towards cultural values and see them as much less conscious – as a part of an environment that is taken for granted due to no apparent alternative being at hand.

Shalom H. Schwartz

The social-psychologist Shalom Schwartz developed a different classification of values – one that is of the highest significance to this thesis and serves as a basis of the list of values included in the questionnaire used in the practical part. Let us therefore examine Schwartz’s theory of values and how it is related to theories devised by Rokeach, Hofstede, Inglehart and others.

Similarly to Rokeach, Schwartz feels the necessity to come up with a fixed list of values that can be used in research. However, Schwartz’s list comprises only 10 basic values (as opposed to Rokeach’s 36 items), making it more suitable for research where brevity of questionnaires is valued. Such reduction of the number of items was achieved due to
Schwartz’s departure from Rokeach’s model of terminal and instrumental values. Instead he developed the theory of ten motivational types, under which singular values are grouped:

1. **Self-Direction.** Independent thought and action; choosing, creating, exploring.
2. **Stimulation.** Excitement, novelty, and challenge in life.
3. **Hedonism.** Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself.
4. **Achievement.** Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards.
5. **Power.** Social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources.
7. **Conformity.** Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms.
8. **Tradition.** Respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide the self.
9. **Benevolence.** Preserving and enhancing the welfare of those with whom one is in frequent personal contact (the ‘in-group’).
10. **Universalism.** Understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature. (Schwartz, 2006, p.2)

A majority of motivational types and values that represent them correspond to Rokeach’s idea of instrumental values – means to an end that are present only implicitly. However, it is difficult to ascertain which values are terminal. Is power a means or an end? The same question could be asked about other items on Schwartz’s list. Is security instrumental to reaching harmony or vice versa? It is this ambiguity that leads us to the
conclusion that the terminal-instrumental dichotomy can no longer be used universally under the Schwartz paradigm. It also suggests that Schwartz’s classification is not a mere reinterpretation of Rokeach’s categories, but an entirely different system.

Schwartz’s theory exhibits a greater degree of compatibility with systems developed by Hofstede and Inglehart. For instance, Schwartz’s conformity is closely related to Inglehart’s survivalist values, as it “was derived from the prerequisites of interaction and of group survival”. (Ibid. p.1) Self-direction, stimulation, achievement and to a degree hedonism are consistent with Inglehart’s notion of self-expression. Benevolence and universalism seem to resemble what Hofstede describes as “feminine dimensions”, while power, self-direction and achievement are “masculine”.

Schwartz’s approach is congruent with Hofstede’s and Inglehart’s on another level – aside from value types (or “motivational types”) he searches for dimensions that are more general and all-encompassing. The first step in this direction was development of the circular model of motivational types (see Fig. 1), where the values placed opposite each other are contradictory, while the adjacent ones share similar motivations and goals. (Ibid. p.3)

Fig. 1: Schwartz’s circular model (Ibid. p.4)
Within this circular model, two orthogonal binary oppositions can be observed—self-enhancement vs. self-transcendence and openness to change vs. conservation. According to Schwartz, any value can be placed on a specific point in the matrix described by the two axes.

As Schwartz’s theory of values is central to the present thesis, let us pay extra attention to his views on how values are formed and how they are related to other variables. The most general level on which Schwartz explains value formation is of utmost interest due to being radically different from Inglehart’s approach. Schwartz proposes that “people’s life circumstances provide opportunities to pursue or express some values more easily than others: For example, wealthy persons can pursue power values more easily, and people who work in the free professions can express self-direction values more easily.” (Schwartz, 2006, p.4)

Such assertion might be perceived as being incongruent with Inglehart’s scarcity hypothesis, which implies that people tend to pursue what they lack. It is unlikely that wealthy people pursue power because they lack it, just as people from free professions (presumably Schwarz means self-employed individuals or freelancers) don’t express self-direction for a lack thereof. Such incongruence of the two theories may be attributable to Inglehart using his scarcity hypothesis mainly to explain the society’s shift from materialistic to post-materialistic values. No explicit claims on universality of the hypothesis were made by Inglehart. Assuming that the two theories were devised to explain two related but distinct phenomena, they may be regarded as compatible despite their initial impression of discordance. Schwartz, his theory being more recent, possibly describes values that are mainly post-materialist and therefore disregarding material scarcity as a driving force in value formation. However, if that were the case, it would mean Schwartz’s system is biased towards western lifestyles where material well-being is more likely to be taken for granted. Perhaps we can understand the notion of “opportunities to pursue values” as complementary to the scarcity hypothesis, each
of them being more capable of explaining value formation in a different context. Combining the two approaches seems to explicate the widest spectrum of value-forming processes. Schwartz himself seems to have come to the same conclusion. Although he asserts that people “upgrade the importance they attribute to values they can readily attain and downgrade the importance of values whose pursuit is blocked “ (Schwartz & Bardi, p. 97), he goes on to admit that the reverse is true of values closely related to material well-being, claiming that “when such values are blocked, their importance increases ;when they are easily attained their importance drops”. (Schwartz, 2006, p.5)

Similarly to Hofstede and Inglehart, Schwartz puts a great emphasis on cultural determination of values. In addition to that, he studies value priorities in relation to demographic factors, most notably age, gender and education. When studying age-related phenomena influencing change of values in adulthood, he names three distinct factors: “…historical events that impact on specific age cohorts (e.g., war, depression), physical ageing (e.g., loss of strength or memory), and life stage (e.g., child rearing, widowhood).” (Ibid., p. 6) On a larger scale, however, he agrees with Inglehart’s hypothesis that the most significant value changes occur in an inter-generational fashion.

Schwartz also examined value differences related to gender. Summing up general assumptions made in literature about the psychological nature of men and women, he expects women to gravitate more towards universalism, benevolence, security and conformity, while men are thought to give higher priority to power, achievement, stimulation, self-direction and hedonism. Schwartz confirms these hypotheses in his research with one exception – conformity, which exhibits little or no relation to gender. However, he concludes, the correlations are significantly weaker than with age.

Schwartz’s research also confirms presumptions that higher education (university education in particular) correlates positively with self-direction, stimulation and achievement.
The extended capability of university graduates to cope with challenging life situations diminishes the value of security, while the environment that supports critical thinking reduces unchallenging conformity and respect towards traditions. Universalism is also observed to be higher on the list of priorities of university graduates. (Ibid., p.10)

The theories examined in this chapter provide us with tools necessary for our research. In particular, Schwartz’s classification is of great importance for this thesis. Other than being the most recent of the mentioned theories, the brevity of the list makes it most suitable in research where we might be concerned with the time demands it places on the respondents. Moreover, correlations that Schwartz observed in the general population will be compared to our findings from research among teachers. Hofstede and Inglehart’s systems provide us with additional alternatives of how research results may be examined and interpreted, although the greatest emphasis will be put on Schwarz’s framework. Many of Rokeach’s hypotheses are also valuable, specifically the notion that values are stable in time and that they are not inherent qualities of objects (upon which we place value). They are aspects of both the culture and the individual’s personality (in our case teachers).

Values in education under the pluralism paradigm

Having established how we can understand the word “values” and investigated different approaches to how values can be classified, let us move on to the area of concern that is central to this thesis – values in education. In the vast array of topics that emerge once we start investigating what has been written about values with respect to education, there is one common denominator. It is the notion that society has undergone (or is still undergoing) a paradigm change that manifests itself profoundly in value-related issues – a shift towards pluralism. The new paradigm is centered around the idea that there are multiple competing
(and often conflicting) value systems (or “moralities”) and it is difficult or impossible to claim that one value system is superior to another.

The prevailing opinion seems to be that education systems have not yet sufficiently reacted to such paradigm shift. The transformation has either been neglected or the proposed solutions are inefficient. (Leicester, 2000; Carr, 2003; Coulby, 2000; Apple, 2004; Hunter, 2000; Sandin, 1992; Sterkens, 2001) If this is true and the adaptation of education to the new paradigm, however necessary, is long overdue, we might attribute this delay to the predominantly reactive nature of education as described by Robin Joan Burns. In her view, education possesses the capacity to be pro-active in social change. However, such capability is rarely put to practice or called for. Instead, changes in society give rise to new needs that education seeks to satisfy (in other words, it is reactive). (Burns, 2002, p.21-46) Frank R. Peters goes even further and suggests that education is one of the many disciplines that are inherently behind the times: “Our perceptions are eminently qualified to describe, predict and control the world of yesterday, but they are grossly insufficient to account for the present world” (Peters, 1962, p.388) The frequent claims that education has not yet fully adapted to the pluralism paradigm might lead us to believe that we are dealing with a fairly recent phenomenon. Yet Mark Cladis argues that acknowledgements of education’s shift towards pluralism can be found as far back as in late 19th century works by Emile Durkheim. (Cladis, 1998, p.31)

If indeed it is taking education more than a century to fully adapt to pluralist values in the society, what is the reason? An explanation can be suggested: the issue is too complex and filled with ambiguity for education systems to be able to take appropriate measures. Teachers are confused and feel unprepared. (Halstead, 2000, p.87; Bailey, 2000, p.9) Several common dilemmas related to values in education arise against the backdrop of pluralism. Let us
examine the most frequently mentioned of them in attempts to establish what the role of values is in education dominated by the pluralism paradigm.

**Should values be taught at schools?**

The notion that we live in a society of plural value systems suggests that no single set of values can be proclaimed as “the right one”, rejecting all the others. If that is the case, is there room for values in education? Shouldn’t schooling strive to be as value-free as possible in order to avoid tendencies to inculcate specific value systems while not having the mandate to do so? Such questions are frequently asked by the public according to Ann Watts Pailliotet, who quotes student papers such as the following: “Education is about efficiency in delivering facts and information. Teachers have no right to impose any values on students. I argue teachers should not teach values in any way.” (Pailliottet, 1997, p.177) Robert Sandin observed similar sentiments in his university students:

I have encountered a disturbing proportion of students who declare quite vigorously that they neither expect nor want the undergraduate curriculum to be organized around the examination of basic moral and religious issues. (…)They think that their homes and their churches have given them what they need in order to form a working values perspective. (Sandin, 1992, p.22)

Pepi Leistyna describes what seems to be a lack of moral education in Harvard Graduate School of Education, claiming that the teachers "fail to name and engage in the classroom the values and beliefs that inform their locations, hiding behind the modernist notion that knowledge and research are universal and objective." (Lestyna, 1999, p. 52) Sandin explains such tendencies in university teachers by a great degree of specialization that prevents the “bigger picture” from being seen. He states that teachers are “so far gone into specialization and into the scientific understanding of their specialties that the challenges of
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bringing students into humanistic relationship with their subjects, into the area of values and choice and judgment, are beyond their interest and capacity.” (Sandin, 1992, p.18) Even in culturally specific literature examples can be found of voices speaking against the notion that values should be taught at schools. Writing about Jewish education, Michael Rosnak observes that many "insist that one cannot and should not teach values if one wishes to avoid indoctrination." (Rosenak, 1995, p.147)

One notable aspect of the mentioned arguments against teaching values is that they are almost exclusively attributed to students, parents or teachers. Once we turn our attention towards experts dealing with values in education, doubts about whether schools should teach values are all-absent. Looking for causes of such general consensus we might encounter a self-fulfilling prophecy – a person who believes values are not what schools should teach is unlikely to devote his or her life to studying values in teaching. Therefore most of the literature we are likely to find on values in education sees this aspect of teaching as desirable. Moreover, it can be argued that the question of whether or not we should teach values is of little meaning as it implies that we can simply decide not to teach values and remain value-neutral. Mark Halstead argues this is clearly not the case: “It is in fact impossible to impart knowledge without at least an implicit values framework.” (Halstead, 2000, 87) The idea that steering clear of deliberate value-teaching only leads to values being taught implicitly seems to be a prevalent one. Toni Morrison is even more specific about what can be understood under “implicit teaching of values”:

We teach values by having them. Whether or not we drive or seduce or persuade others to share them, whether or not we are indifferent to or accommodating to the ethics of others, whether we are amused by the concept of value being teachable, whether we are open to being argued into supporting values contrary to those we have held-all of these possibilities and strategies matter. (Morrison, 2000, p.1)
Accounts of value teaching in higher levels of education, some of which we have mentioned, indicate that one of two approaches is typically taken by teachers: 1) trying to avoid teaching of values for various reasons or 2) relying on the implicit value content manifesting itself in their teaching of the subject matter. The first approach can be argued against in a similar fashion as demonstrated in objections by Halstead and Morrison. The reliance on implicit values, sometimes also called “transmission” (as opposed to “teaching”) (Straughan, 1998, p.13), also has opponents, albeit mostly among theorists dealing with primary or secondary education. Halstead asserts that “Where there is no systematic discussion of values and value issues in the classroom, children may be more likely to develop values haphazardly, and indeed it is not uncommon for values which pupils develop in school to be different from those that school intends.” (Halstead, 1996, p.4) Roger Straughan describes this “transmission strategy” as often transitory – once the teacher realizes how powerful an effect the school can have on the pupil’s values, she or he moves to a more conscious approach to teaching values. Straughan seems to suggest that experienced teachers plan their value teaching to a greater degree, while the less experienced ones rely on transmission and the hidden curriculum. Attention to values typically increases with experience. (Straughan, 1998, p.15) As soon as we start investigating literature dealing with values in teaching young children, it becomes apparent that the general consensus is that a great deal of attention should be paid to values and the curriculum should reflect value-related issues in great detail. (Al-Hooli, 2009, p.3)

Summing up our findings in this chapter, we can conclude that unlike the general public, education experts are in agreement that education is an inherently value-laden discipline (i.e. it is impossible not to teach values) and that conscious dealing with value-related issues is preferable to relying on transmission of implicit values. A greater acceptance
of the transmission approach can be found in texts dealing with higher education, while experts in lower levels of education are more likely to argue in favor of a more conscious approach involving a high degree of planning. Very little support can be found for the notion that schools should “stay out of value-related issues”. Let us therefore take for granted that values are always taught, ruling out the possibility of “value-less” schooling. Let us examine the main approaches to teaching values.

**Main approaches to teaching values**

Assuming values are always taught, we are led to the inevitable question: how are they taught? What are the main approaches to value teaching? A detailed overview of the main strategies was given by Roger Straughan. As questions of how we teach values are central to this thesis, let us briefly describe all the main approaches according to Straughan’s theory.

**Value transmission**

This approach is based on the notion that everything a teacher does is inevitably value-laden and his or her values are, often without a great deal of reflection, transmitted to the students. This assists the student in developing their own values. In other words, this method relies on the hidden curriculum. Implicit in this strategy is also the notion that if the school finds the right personalities as teachers, moral education “takes care of itself”. (Straughan, 1998, p.13)

**Value neutrality**

The strategy of neutrality promotes presenting controversial issues to the students with the teacher making a conscious effort not to include his or her own view. The teacher acts as a chair in the discussion, respecting any views expressed by the students and protects divergence rather than trying to achieve consensus. (Ibid., p.15)
Values clarification

This approach is a variation of the previous one. The main goal is to focus the student’s attention on the very process of valuing, making it more conscious and promoting the student’s reflection on value-related issues. Apart from discussions, numerous games and simulation exerciser are used. The intended result of such moral education is a person with a very clear idea of what his or her values are. Again, the teacher remains neutral to a highest possible degree. (Ibid., p.17)

The development of consideration

This approach was adopted by many US schools in the 1970s. It makes no attempts at neutrality, instead it leads the students to become more sensitive to other people’s needs and emotions. Again, discussions, model situations and simulations are used. However, this time the intended outcome is not clarification but empathy and tolerance. (Ibid.)

Development of moral reasoning

This strategy is based on the work of the American psychologist Lawrence Kohlberg. Central to this theory is the notion that in any culture an individual goes through a pattern of stages in his or her moral development. (Kohlberg, 1963) This progression starts with the pre-conventional stage where immediate reward or punishment are the motivating factors and ends in the post-conventional stage where more general moral issues are taken into consideration. Kohlberg believes that this development of moral reasoning can be accelerated if the individual frequently encounters reasoning of a higher level than his or her own. It is the school’s duty to present the student with such higher moral reasoning in discussions or otherwise. The main area of concern is not which actions the “moral agent” considers “right” or “wrong”, but the reasoning behind his or her choice. (Straughan, 1998, p.19)
**Values across the curriculum**

This approach bears a resemblance to value transmission in that it does not see moral education as a distinct, separate enterprise. It is based on the idea that every subject already possesses a moral dimension. However, unlike the transmission strategy, conscious effort is made to make sure this moral dimension is seen by the students and that they are encouraged to develop their values through reflection and discussion of such moral issues. (Ibid. p. 20)

**Personal and social education**

In contrast with the previous strategy, personal and social education sees moral education as a distinct subject (while typically avoiding the words “moral” or “ethical”), taught separately from the others. In the broad scope of issues the subject deals with, emphasis is put on development of “self-awareness”, “social skills” or “life skills”. The moral dimension of the subject, however dominant, often remains implicit with no claims at finding what is “right” or “wrong”. (Ibid. p.24)

The descriptions above are provided to establish a basic terminology of approaches to value teaching. The aim is to prevent ambiguity when terms such as “values clarification” are used in the subsequent chapters. Let us now introduce pluralism as the dominant paradigm with a profound effect on moral education.

**Pluralism and plurality**

If indeed today’s world is one of plural values, it is a duty of education to reflect this state. What do we mean by “value pluralism”? It is the notion that a multitude of (possibly conflicting) value systems (in other words “moralities”) exist simultaneously in the society as a result of differences both between and within cultures and that there is no cognitive tool we could use to determine one system’s superiority over another. The concept of pluralism was
examined in detail in Isaiah Berlin’s 1958 essay *Two Concepts of Liberty*. Berlin advocates the pluralist interpretation of the world because it “recognizes the fact that human goals are many, not all of them commensurable, and in perpetual rivalry with one another. To assume that all values can be graded on one scale, so that it is a mere matter of inspection to determine the highest, seems to me to falsify our knowledge that men are free agents.” (Berlin, 2002, 216) While acknowledgment of “many goals” may be seen as a descriptive statement (there are many conflicting moralities), the concept of incommensurability (it cannot be decided which of the systems is “truer” than the others) bears characteristics of a belief and could be interpreted as a distinct philosophy. To avoid confusion or ambiguity, let us therefore distinguish between value plurality – the state of multiple coexisting value systems, and pluralism – a philosophy that believes that at least certain values are incommensurable.

Before we proceed, let us ask ourselves the question – isn’t Berlin’s attack on the idea of a “single scale” in direct opposition to all the attempts to classify values described in the chapter of this thesis dealing with classification of values? Aren’t all those theories based on the notion of a single scale? It does not seem to be the case. All of the theories we discussed – those by Schwartz, Inglehart, Rokeach and Hofstede – embrace the idea of incommensurability. These theorists attempt to develop a universal “language of values” in order to make research in the field of values possible. They make no claims on our capacity to decide which of the values are “right” or “wrong”. It could be therefore argued that there is a degree of implicit relativism present in all the classification theories. However, relativism is only one extreme end of a continuum dealt with by many scholars who discuss values, as described by Benjamin Whiteley: “The two extremes of moral relativism and abstract universalism do not exhaust the available options, but represent opposite ends of a continuum, a field of plural values, within which all moral actors must orientate themselves. The job of the theorist is therefore to describe this field of plural values, and to illuminate and clarify the
sometimes-treacherous terrain faced by the moral actor” (Whiteley, 2006) Let us examine this
continuum and attempts to find the place education should take within it.

**Finding the place on the universalism-relativism continuum**

If it is true that contemporary education takes places within the paradigm of multiple
competing value systems, the key dilemma educators will face is expressed by the question,
“Whose values should we teach”? (Nord, 1995, p. 342; Arthur, 2002, p. 7; Vitz, 1985, p. 113-
38) According to Benjamin Whiteley, attempts to resolve this dilemma, however varied they
may be, all occur within the continuum between abstract universalism and moral relativism.
(Whiteley, 2006)

Whiteley uses the term “universalism” in a similar manner as others do “prescriptivism”
(Moon, Ben-Peretz, & Brown, 2000, p. 25; Straughan, 1988, p. 71; Conroy & Davis, 2000, p.
185) or “dogmatism” ( Purpel, 1999, p. 159; Suzzallo, 1909, p. 9; Sandin, 1992, p. 5). All of
these terms describe an approach advocating the possibility to determine which values are
“right” and which are “wrong”, regardless of culture or individual belief systems. The
opposite pole – relativism – refers to the notion that values are entirely a matter of personal
opinion or preference. In such view it is impossible to claim certain values are more “right”
than others.

While agreeing with the notion of a continuum described by Whiteley, Robert Sandin is
skeptical about its possibilities being sufficiently explored in education:

> The present crisis in values is deepened by the disarray of moral education, which
> has too often been polarized between the extremes of being restrictively
> doctrinaire and being explicitly subjectivistic. (Sandin, 1992, p. 17)

What are some of the proposed solutions to the “whose values” dilemma? One of the
prominent attempts at value-neutral education, the values clarification approach suggests that
realizing what our values are is a sufficient goal of moral education (see the chapter on
strategies in moral education). Raths et. al. propose that in character education the teacher should:

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

(Raths, Harmin & Simon, 1978, p. 38)

The approach has been criticized by James D. Hunter as being based purely on psychology and the concept of self-regard, neglecting the input of other disciplines and lacking social context, thus being dangerously relativist in effect. According to Hunter, values clarification implies all values are acceptable as long as we are clear about them, failing to establish any sense of right or wrong. It reduces formation of values to a psychological process. Thus, Hunter argues, the clarification strategy produces children "living outside of history, culture, and a complex social world." (Hunter, 2000, p. 187) Sandin shares Hunter’s views, pointing out that the strategy fails to make a clear distinction between moral and non-moral valuing (e.g. “Which sweater should I wear?”), thus becoming trivialized. (Sandin, 1992, p. 59) Bill Puka also suggests that clarification without right or wrong is insufficient, adding that "Hitler was very clear about his values and about the values of non-Arians." (Puka, 2000, p. 134)

Another possible resolution of the pluralist dilemma is present in attempts to find “core values” (sometimes also called “consensus values”). This concept is based around the
belief that some values can be found in all (or nearly all) cultures, religions or social groups. The role of school is then to focus on and reinforce these values, as they are not a point of disagreement and therefore can be deemed “universal”. This approach is advocated by the Character counts! Organization (Pfeffinger, 2003).

One of the more prescriptivism theories suggests that it is not up to the teacher or the school to decide what values to teach. Instead, the values dominant in the society – those that withstood the test of time - should be passed on to the students:

The public pays teachers not to devise schemes to change the social order, but to educate the young to a much more demanding idea, to teach the young the best of the past so that they might preserve it and build on it and thus extend it and improve on it. (Ryan, 1989, p. 15)

Similar views are shared by several other moral education theorists (Kilpatrick, 1992; Wynne and Ryan, 1992; Lickona, 1993).

In direct opposition to this strategy is the idea of utopian education – the notion that social change should be one of the priorities of education. Instead of teaching for conformity, divergent thinking ought to be supported in students in hope of radical alternatives being explored and the society reformed. (Dahlberg & Moss, 2005, 176-192; Shostak, 2006) It is difficult to determine the position of the utopian approach on the relativism-universalism continuum described by Whiteley, as the utopian aspect itself does not imply what kind of social change it seeks to accomplish. Therefore it might be concluded that utopian strategies can be found anywhere on the scale, depending on their specific content.
Conclusion and hypotheses

The research in this thesis seeks to provide some ideas on the role of values in teaching. In the theoretical part we turned to theorists from various fields to provide us with terminology, classifications and several key hypotheses which our research will be compared against. Let us sum up these hypotheses:

It is impossible not to teach values.

Values are taught implicitly and explicitly. In other words, aside from planned value teaching, they are a part of the hidden curriculum – taught in an unplanned fashion, often unconsciously. Many teachers feel unprepared to teach values, which is one of the causes of frequent reliance on the hidden curriculum.

Experienced teachers plan values education to a greater degree than inexperienced ones who tend to rely on transmission. However, the transmission strategy is more common in higher levels of education, most notably universities.

Moral education in a pluralist society takes place within the continuum between moral universalism and relativism. There is little agreement as to where contemporary education stands on this scale or where it should stand. We can assume this position varies depending on a multitude of factors including culture, differences between specific schools and individual teaching styles and philosophies.

Attempts are made to identify and teach “core values” or “consensus values” – values that can be shared by everyone regardless of culture, gender, age or any other factors. There is no clear consensus among theorists on whether identification of such values is possible. Similar variance in views is expected to be found in teachers.
Values are relatively stable in an adult’s life. Changes occur intergenerationally, so the greatest differences are expected to be observed between generations. Teachers are not expected to be an exception in this.

There is disagreement as to whether educators should teach values currently dominant in society or whether drive towards social change – a utopian strategy - is desirable.

The hypotheses are based on review of literature dealing with or related to values in education. In the practical part of this thesis, we will examine how these issues are viewed by teachers (in our case Czech teachers). In addition to that, patterns will be examined with respect to age, gender, type of school and other variables. This research seeks to contribute to a greater understanding of what the role of values in education is and point to issues that may be worth further investigation and research in a greater sample.
Practical part

Objectives and goals of the research

The research in this thesis seeks to examine the role of values in teaching as seen by Czech teachers. Aside from testing the hypotheses given in the theoretical part, we strive to find out what importance Czech teachers attribute to moral values in teaching and their planning. Moreover, we attempt to find where Czech teachers stand on the universalism-relativism continuum. Specific values possessed by Czech teachers are also studied. Despite the fact that it is the role of values rather than concrete values that is at the core of interest of this thesis, it may be difficult to fully separate the two areas. Values held by teachers are expected to have a profound influence on what role teachers attribute to values in general.

Method

Data collection

An anonymous questionnaire was chosen as the research method. There were several reasons for this. Although interviewing the teachers might provide us with more particulars in teachers’ approach to values, this method might be time-consuming not only for the researcher, but for the respondent as well. There was no external funding in the research and it was not possible to compensate the respondents for their time. In addition to that, having the questionnaire be anonymous allowed the respondents to answer more freely.

Moreover, effort was made to make the responses numeric or convertible to numeric whenever possible. It is significantly easier to compare numeric responses (as opposed to verbal ones). The teachers were also asked to fill in the questionnaire online, making it easier to reach the respondents and minimizing the time and effort necessary to provide the responses and process them. The relatively low number of respondents (50) means that it is
not possible to consider the research representative of Czech teachers in general. However, the study may be seen as a pilot phase of a larger-scale research to be conducted in the future.

**Data processing**

For each item several operations were made in order to process the data and to make it possible to draw conclusions. Whenever possible, verbal items were converted to numerical ones. In Likert scale items the average value was calculated. In addition to that, correlation indexes were computed with other relevant variables. In items where respondents were asked to select from a list numerical substitution was used as well. Whenever the respondent selected an option, the value of 1 was substituted, otherwise a zero was recorded.

**Questionnaire items**

The questionnaire consists of three distinct sections.

The first section recorded the demographical data of the respondents along with information on the area of schooling the respective teacher works in and the length of the particular respondent’s experience in education (for a complete list of questionnaire items see Appendix A).

In the second section the teachers were asked to give their opinion on the issues discussed in the theoretical part of this thesis. Statements were given based on the hypotheses stated at the end of the theoretical part and the teachers were asked whether they agree or disagree with them. A 5-level Likert scale was used.
Examples of the statements:

1. My values manifest themselves in my teaching to a profound degree.
2. The values content in teaching is more important than the subject matter.
3. I incorporate values in my teaching in a conscious and planned fashion.

(The complete list of the Likert items can be found in Appendix A)

In the third section the teachers were given a list of ten specific values and were asked to select three that are the most important to them. The list is directly based on Schwartz’s classification described in the theoretical part. Each item corresponds with one value in Schwartz’s system - this will be described in greater detail in passages dealing with responses to specific items. In order to minimize the time necessary to fill in the form, each value is described by a noun phrase. In several cases a brief explanation is given in brackets. The list is as follows:

Authority
Personal success
Pleasure (enjoying your life, sensual gratification)
Innovation and challenge in life (new ideas and stimuli)
Independence of thought and action
Understanding and tolerance (to all people, not just close ones)
Well-being of close ones (and generally people with whom you are in frequent contact)
Respect towards traditions
Self-restraint and politeness
Security and stability
Data sample

Sampling

In order to collect responses, several schools were asked for help in finding respondents. Due to a lack of funding social contacts of the researcher were used. However, save for a few exceptions the respondents were not familiar to the researcher. All of the schools in questions are located in Prague except for one grammar school based in Cesky Brod – a small town near Prague. The main criterion in the sampling process was to collect responses relatively evenly distributed among the following types of schools: pre-school, lower-elementary, upper-elementary, high school and university. Heads of two pre-schools, two elementary schools, two high schools and two university departments were asked to provide respondents. Employees of the respective schools exhibited varying willingness to participate in the research, resulting in distribution that is not completely even. However, the researcher sees the numbers as sufficient for the purposes of a pilot research.

Further criteria were followed, although it was not possible to fully control these variables. The heads of respective schools/departments were asked to provide as much variety as possible in the following variables: age, sex, the types of subjects the respondents teach (sciences vs. humanities) and the length of experience as a teacher.

For no obvious reasons high school teachers exhibited the lowest willingness to participate, while university teachers and elementary school teachers were ready to participate to a greater degree.

The use of an online questionnaire form made it possible for the responses to be anonymous.
Data sample properties

Fifty responses were collected in the research. The age of the respondents ranged from 18 to 71 years and the average value was 39.7. The length of experience as a teacher ranged from one month to 45 years and the average value was 14.7 years. The details of the sample makeup can be found in Appendix C.

Responses to individual questionnaire items

In this section we will analyze individual questionnaire items. Each passage dealing with a particular item begins with a brief explanation of why it was included in the research, what it seeks to find and how it is related to issues discussed in the theoretical part.

In items with responses forming a linear scale the mean value (of the entire sample) is given as well as the most often selected value (mode). In addition, correlations are pointed out with relevant variables (most often age, sex, or length of experience). The alpha value was set to 0.05 (in other words we are willing to accept a 5% probability that a similar correlation coefficient may be achieved when using a set of random values). A critical value of 0.279 was calculated for a sample with fifty respondents and the alpha value 0.05. This means that for the purposes of this research we will consider correlations higher than 0.279 or lower than -0.279 conclusive of a relationship between the two variables studied. Otherwise the correlation will be considered inconclusive.

Relationships between two opinion-based items are studied only when there are specific reasons to do so.

1 My values manifest themselves in my teaching to a profound degree.

The first statement seeks to establish to what degree the teacher believes their values manifest in their teaching. In the theoretical part we established it is impossible not to teach
values and that teaching is an inherently value-laden enterprise. Do the respondents also believe this is true for them?

The mean value of the responses to item 1 was 4 and so was the mode. Only 5 teachers gave a negative response (1 or 2). This indicates that teachers agree that teaching is value-laden and that their values manifest themselves profoundly. Although positive responses were slightly more often given by women and older teachers, the correlation indexes were below the critical value and therefore inconclusive. However, a relationship was observed with the type of subjects the respondents teach – teachers in humanities responded positively more often than those in sciences (the correlation coefficient with “humanities” was 0.34). No correlation with experience was found.

2 The values content in teaching is more important than the subject matter.

The second Likert item is meant to show what importance the teacher attributes to values in teaching. In the theoretical part various views were expressed that values do not belong in teaching or are not as important as the subject matter. Do teachers in the research sample agree with this? Or, perhaps, do they believe values are more important? When the respondent answers 1 – strongly disagree, we can translate it as a statement that values are much less important than the subject matter. 5 would mean that values are significantly more important.

The mean response value was 3.4 and the mode was 4, showing that a majority of teachers attribute a higher importance to values than to the subject matter. Women responded positively more often than men (a correlation of 0.34) and so did teachers in humanities (0.31). University teachers attributed lower importance to values than teachers from other types of schools. These findings are consistent with our assertions from the theoretical part of this thesis about a lack of attention towards values in university teachers.
3 I incorporate values in my teaching in a conscious and planned fashion.  

This item is crucial to determine if teachers rely on transmission in their value-teaching or whether they plan their teaching of values as part of a curriculum. The relationship between the responses to this item and the length of experience is of great importance to this thesis as it helps in testing the hypothesis that more experienced teachers incorporate and plan values to a greater degree. In the theoretical part it was also suggested that teachers who teach young children (pre-school, lower-elementary school) tend to plan values more than teachers in higher levels of education (particularly university teachers). Does our research support this assertion?

The mean value of 3.7 and the mode of 4 indicate that a majority of teachers plan values and do not rely solely on transmission. The research also showed that teachers from lower levels of education plan values teaching more. No relationship was found between experience and planning in moral education. The hypothesis that more experienced teachers plan values more was not supported by our research.

4 I believe that an experienced teacher puts a greater emphasis on moral values in teaching than an inexperienced one.

While the previous item was included to study the relationship of planning in moral education to experience and other variables, this statement merely seeks to find what the prevailing opinion is on this subject among teachers. It is not possible to assert that a response value 1 means that the teacher believes that less experienced teachers put more emphasis on values. It can just as well mean that the respondent believes there is no relationship whatsoever between planning in moral education and experience.

The mean response value was 3.3 (with a mode of 4), indicating that the notion that there is a relationship between emphasis on values and experience has support among teachers. However, the responses were distributed relatively evenly among all available
values which shows there is little consensus on the issue. Teachers in humanities agreed slightly more often (a correlation of 0.3).

5 I believe it is possible to identify universal moral values – i.e. values that are binding for everybody at all times.

Item 5 asks the respondent where she or he believes herself/himself to be on the relativism-universalism continuum. If the teacher answers 1, it can be interpreted as the respondent identifying herself/himself as a relativist. Response value of 5 means universalism, indicating that the respondents believes that there are at least some values that are binding regardless of culture, social class or any other factors.

A mean value of 3.8 and a mode of 5 show that most teachers are closer to universalism than to relativism. A positive response was more frequent in teachers of humanities (correl. 0.4) and more experienced teachers (correl. 0.3).

6 Moral values are a matter of personal opinion only.

This statement was included to test the responses to the previous answer. It helps establish how well the respondents understood the previous item. If the same teacher gives a positive response to both this and the previous item, it may cast doubt on the relevance of the responses. In such cases it could be argued that the respondent either misunderstood the statements or did not pay appropriate attention to filling in the form. The statements 5 and 6 can be considered contradictory and therefore it is not possible to agree with both of them. However, if the respondent disagrees with both of them, it seems less conclusive. It is possible to imagine a person who sees values as unique to cultures (and therefore not entirely universal), but at the same time not purely subjective.

The mean value of responses to this item was 2.3 and the mode was 2. This further supports the notion that most teachers are universalists rather than relativists. A notable figure is the correlation with experience (0.28). Let us remember that positive responses to the
previous item also correlated positively with experience. This means that more experienced teachers gave more extreme responses – they often tended to select 1 or 5 and the response 3 (I don’t know) was less frequent than in less experienced teachers.

It is also worth mentioning that responses to items 5 and 6 exhibited inconclusive correlation (-0.23). In numerous cases the teachers responded positively to both statements, however contradictory.

7 I believe it is a duty of a teacher to teach values currently dominant in the society.

In the theoretical part we mentioned opinions that moral education should focus on values that are dominant in the society (moral education for conformity) as well as tendencies to use moral education to change the society for the better (utopian education). If the respondent gives a positive response to this item, it indicates that she believes that the role of a teacher is to educate for conformity. A negative response indicates a utopian approach as it means the respondent supports teaching values other than the dominant ones. In other words, a respondent who answered negatively believes that there are better values than those currently prevalent and that it is the duty of a teacher to promote such values.

The mean value of responses was 2.5 and the mode 2. This indicates that most teachers disagree with the notion that teachers should teach for conformity. The responses exhibited no correlation with the demographical variables.

8 I believe many of my colleagues share my values.

This item seeks to establish whether the teacher sees the teaching environment as rather homogeneous in values-related issues (a positive response) or whether the teacher is more solitary in her or his values (a negative response). A positive response suggests that the teacher sees the staff as working together to teach similar values. It is also interesting to study whether there is a relationship in responses to this item and the degree to which the teacher
believes values manifest themselves in her teaching. It might be expected that the teachers who believe their values are different from their colleagues will have a tendency to “keep their values to themselves” and incorporate or plan values less. Another question is whether the teachers who believe they are solitary in their values are also the ones with a more utopian approach. A positive correlation between items 7 and 8 may be expected.

Although the mean value of 3.4 might indicate a positive tendency, the mode was 3 – a vast majority of teachers responded “I don’t know”. There was no relationship to demographical data. However, a robust correlation of 0.42 was calculated with responses to item 7, showing that teachers who feel “solitary” in their values tend to take a more utopian approach to moral education. A correlation of 0.3 with item 1 was calculated, indicating that teachers who believe themselves to have values similar to their colleagues also believe their values manifest themselves more in their teaching.

9 I teach in an environment that is favorable for values teaching.

This item asks the teachers whether they feel supported in their efforts to teach values or whether they see their teaching environment as full of obstacles and unfavorable for values education. In this respect is the item similar to item 9 and a positive correlation is expected between items 8 and 9.

A mean value of 3.8 and a mode of 4 give a strong indication that teachers believe they teach in an environment that is favorable for moral education. A correlation coefficient of 0.4 was calculated with responses to item 8, supporting the idea that favorable environment and values shared with colleagues are related issues. The responses to statement 9 were independent of the remaining variables in our research.
**10 My values have changed significantly since I started teaching.**

In the theoretical part we quoted Rokeach’s and Inglehart’s assertions that values are relatively stable in an adult’s life. Is this different among teachers? Does the profession have a strong capacity to change one’s values? Item 10 helps us look for answers to these questions. If the capacity to change one’s values is high, it should manifest itself in a high positive correlation with age and years of experience. We can take for granted that in longer time periods the probability of any change is higher. If, on the other hand, the search for a relationship between value change and age or experience is inconclusive, we may argue that the stability hypothesis holds true for teachers. The responses to the item itself are indicative of the degree to which teachers’ values change if we assume that an individual is capable of assessing whether or not her or his values have changed.

The mean value was 2.3 and the mode was 1. This supports the notion that values are relatively stable in adults. No relationship was found to age or experience. Positive responses were more common in teachers of humanities (correl. 0.33).

**Selecting specific values from a list**

The classifications of values with which we worked in the theoretical part all see values as hierarchical in nature – rather than possessing different values altogether, most individuals (and cultures) share similar values but attribute different importance to each of them, forming a “value hierarchy”. It was this notion that allowed the theorists we mentioned to come up with lists of values that can be used in research and comparison. As mentioned earlier, Schwartz’s classification was used for the purposes of the questionnaire in this thesis. The reasons were its brevity (only 10 types of values) as well as being the most recent of the systems mentioned. It wasn’t possible or desirable to ask the respondents to spend a lot of time with the questionnaire, therefore a simple list of 10 items was used rather than longer
explanations or “value portraits” (see Schwartz, 2006). A possible drawback of this approach is that some respondents may not be able to choose between a series of abstract concepts such as “security” without additional context. In such cases the informational value of their responses may be questioned. However, it could be argued that teachers should have higher capabilities of context-free thinking than the general population.

Ten values were listed in the questionnaire, each corresponding to one of Schwartz’s ten basic human values. Where Schwartz uses terms such as “hedonism”, slightly less abstract descriptions such as “sensual gratification and enjoying one’s life” were given to make it easier for the respondent to comprehend what is meant. Rather than coming up with a priority list of the ten values given, the respondents were asked to choose three values that are most important to them. The number three was chosen arbitrarily to force the respondent to make a decision but at the same time to avoid having to compare each value against all the others, which would be necessary for a priority list and arguably time-consuming.

Specific values - responses

Each respondent selected 3 values as asked, there were no issues such as a respondent selecting 2 or 4 (although it was technically possible). Understanding and tolerance (to all people, not just close ones), which corresponds to Schwartz’s concept of “universalism” was by far the most frequently selected value – 41 teachers (82% of the sample) included it in their selection. It is worth noting that here universalism does not mean moral universalism (the belief that moral values are universal, of which we speak in the relativism-universalism continuum). It is welfare of the entire human race and nature (as described in the chapter of this thesis dealing with Schwartz’s system).

Self-restraint and politeness, corresponding to Schwartz’s „conformity“, ranked second-highest with 33 teachers (66%) mentioning it as very important.
Independence of thought and action, representing “self-direction” in Schwartz’s system, ranked third-highest with 25 mentions (50%).

Innovation and challenge (stimulation) was selected 15 times (30%), ranking fourth highest.

Four values fell into the range of 7-9 mentions (14-18%) – authority (power), well-being of close ones (benevolence), tradition and security.

Personal success (achievement) was selected by 4 respondents (8%).

Not one respondent included sensual gratification and enjoying one’s life (hedonism) in their three most important values.

**Correlations with gender**

The only case of conclusive correlation with gender in our research was that of benevolence, which correlated positively with female respondents (0.28). The correlation coefficient of female gender with achievement was negative and approached the critical value (-0.27). Out of the four respondents mentioning achievement only one was a woman. This is consistent with Schwartz’s findings in his large international sample of general population, where he measured correlations of gender (female) with benevolence and achievement of 0.18 and -0.12 respectively. (Schwartz, 2006, p.9)

**Correlations with age**

Similarly to gender, age showed only one instance of conclusive correlation with specific values. It was a negative correlation (-0.30) with innovation and challenge (stimulation). The only other instance where the critical value was approached was achievement (-0.26). Incidentally, the same value of correlation of achievement with age was measured by Schwartz. The negative correlation of age with stimulation was even stronger in his research (-0.37).
Correlations with the type of subject

Teachers of humanities exhibited a negative correlation with achievement (-0.29). Otherwise no conclusive values were recorded.

Correlations with the type of school

Teachers from higher levels of education exhibited a strong tendency to select self-direction as important (corr. 0.38). There was an even stronger negative correlation with benevolence (-0.45).

Correlations with experience

The negative correlation of experience with stimulation is to be expected, as experience is closely linked with age, which exhibited a similar relationship. However, the dependency is even stronger here (-0.33). Our research shows that experienced teachers value new stimuli or challenges less than inexperienced ones.

Correlations between individual values

A strong negative correlation (-0.48) shows that there may be a degree of opposition between security and self-direction. Stimulation and universalism show an even stronger negative relationship (-0.52). These patterns are consistent with Schwartz’s circular model. Security represents “conservation” and self-direction “openness to change” (these lie opposite to each other in the circular diagram and are therefore motivated by opposing principles). The same is true of self-enhancement (represented by stimulation) and self-transcendence (represented by universalism).
**Correlations with responses to the Likert items**

Although relationships between specific values and responses to the Likert items are by no means central to this thesis and such observations are a result of “data mining”, several of them may be worth mentioning.

There was a very strong negative relationship between responses to the Likert item 1 (values manifest themselves profoundly) and the value of achievement (-0.54).

Teachers attributing high importance to values (Likert item 2) often selected security and benevolence as important and rarely chose the value of authority (power).

Responses to Item 3 (teaching of values is planned) exhibited a similar relationship with benevolence but not with security.

Moral universalists (see item 5) showed a strong negative relationship with stimulation.

Subjectivists in the research sample value self-direction and rarely select tradition as important.

Teachers who claim their values to have changed since they started teaching strongly value authority (power).

**Discussion**

In this thesis we set out to find out more about the role of values in education. While in the theoretical part we examined views of various education experts and scholars studying values, the practical part shifted our attention to how teachers view the role of values in their occupation. Let us sum up our findings and discuss their implications.

As it is possible to argue that there is a lack of discussion of values at schools, we might be led to believe that unlike education theorists (some of whom were cited earlier in this thesis) teachers do not realize teaching is profoundly value laden. Our research does not
support this notion. Most teachers in our research sample acknowledged that teaching is value laden and that values play an important part in the occupation, often more important than the subject matter they teach. This is especially true of teachers in lower levels of education such as elementary schools or pre-schools with university teachers showing the lowest willingness to acknowledge that values are important in their courses. This leads us to an interesting conclusion that may be seen as somewhat paradoxical. Teachers realize that values are a part of their teaching and often attribute a great importance to them, yet they do not discuss them with their colleagues. The notion of absence of values in discussions is supported by our research, where most respondents stated they do not know if many of their colleagues share their values. There may be several causes of this. Still, the most plausible explanation seems to be that teachers do not know about values of their peers because they simply do not talk about them. The paradox lies in the following contradiction: we see values as something private and unsuitable as a topic of conversations with our peers, yet we realize that our values manifest themselves in our teaching to a profound degree and most of us see this as a good thing (as seen in our research in responses to the Likert item 2), hence we do not believe we can or should keep our values private. This contradiction may be specific to the Czech Republic, where reluctance to be openly political may be observed as a result of a backlash to recent historical events (the former regime asked everybody to be “political”). Many might see discussing values with peers as a manifestation of being too political and therefore would rather avoid it.

Asking teachers to what degree incorporation of values in their teaching is planned revealed that most of the respondents believe there is a great deal of planning involved. In the theoretical part we mentioned Straughan’s assertion that reliance on transmission is often transitory and that teachers plan their value teaching more later on in their careers. Our research provided no support for such claims – no relationship was found
between planning in moral education and experience. However, our research sample revealed a strong relationship between planning and the type of school. Pre-school and elementary school teachers plan values in their teaching significantly more than high school and university teachers. This supports our claim that more attention is paid to values in lower levels in education. The explanation may be that education of young learners is more closely bound to upbringing in a more general sense (as opposed to the concept of education as a mere tool to nurture skills and competencies).

One of the key objectives of our research was to find where Czech teachers stand on the relativism-universalism continuum. Do teachers believe that values are purely subjective or universal? Several theorists (Hunter, Sandin) see relativism as dominant in western moral education. However, most respondents in our survey identified themselves as universalists. This inclination was particularly apparent in teachers of humanities.

The informational value of the responses was diminished at times by the fact that several teachers responded positively to both the statement that values are subjective and that they are universal. However, even if we were to exclude these responses from the research, universalists would remain prevalent. This shows that Czech teachers see values as transcending individuals or even cultures. Related to this is the fact that values having self-transcendental motivation in Schwartz’s circular model (described in the theoretical part) were the ones most frequently selected by the teachers in our research sample (universalism, ranking highest in the research, is a self-transcendental value according to Schwartz).

These findings paint the picture of a Czech teacher as a person seeking transcendence. This may come as a surprise, remembering that the Czech Republic consistently ranks among the most atheist countries in the world. That said, the proclaimed atheism of Czechs does not necessarily have to mean rejection of transcendence as much as rejection of organized religion.
A particularly interesting result of our research is that the teachers in our sample leaned significantly more to a utopian approach in education rather than education for conformity. In terms of values they do not see reinforcement of the status quo as a desirable outcome of education. Yet the value of conformity ranked second highest when selecting specific values from a list. However striking this contradiction may seem, there may well be none. The conformity our respondents reject is not what Schwartz understands by the term. In our (and Schwartz’s) list of values conformity is represented by politeness and self-restraint. In other words, it can be understood as willingness to suppress our immediate needs or whims in favor of our functioning in the larger society. The respondents showed little appreciation of the status quo values, yet they strive to be polite and nurture politeness in their students. It is questionable that there should be any contradiction present in this approach. It is only necessary to be aware of the ambiguity in the word “conformity” and make sure it is clear in what sense we use the term.

Responses to items 8 and 9 showed us that while most respondents believe they work in an environment favorable for values teaching, it is especially true of those who see their school as relatively homogeneous in terms of values. This should not come as a surprise - it is arguably easier to teach values if we feel we are supported by our colleagues and peers. In schools where values are clearly declared – such as religious schools, the values of individual teachers can be expected to be more homogeneous, which largely prevents value conflicts. Is this the desired state that schools should aim towards? Or, perhaps, is a greater plurality in values of individual teachers beneficial for moral education? I believe this is an important question that heads of schools should ask themselves and the answer would have a great effect on how the school will be perceived by students, parents and the general public. As we live in a pluralist society, it is increasingly important for students or their parents to have as much information as possible on how the particular school approaches values. Does the school
strive for plurality and variety in values, or the opposite – homogeneity in values? Is there any attention paid to values at all and, if so, how much? I believe that answers to these questions would play (or perhaps should play) an important role when choosing a school.

When studying the influence of relevant variables on the responses, a clear pattern emerges: the type of subject (sciences vs. humanities) has the most profound effect on what role teachers attribute to values in teaching and which specific values they see as important. In the research sample more clear relationships were observed with the type of subject than with any other variable. The presumption that the type of school will have an effect was confirmed - this was apparent especially in planning and the importance the teachers ascribe to values. However, the influence of the type of subject surpasses it in several other areas (see the table of correlations in the Appendix D). Teachers of sciences attributed lower importance to values than teachers of humanities and they exhibited a lower tendency to favor universalism or self-transcendental values such as benevolence. This may seem unsurprising. After all, by definition teachers of sciences focus more on nature than on humankind (hence the lower inclination to benevolence). It is the realization that this may well be the most influential factor that invites further discussion. Should effort be made to bring values closer to the attention of teachers of sciences? Or is it a natural and desirable state of things that there is less room for values in sciences?

Similar questions could be asked in relation to the lack of attention to values at universities pointed out by Leistyna and Sandin and supported by the data in our research. If value-free teaching is impossible, shouldn’t values be taught more consciously not only in lower levels of education, but at universities as well? Before these specific questions can be answered, the first step must be made, which is to systematically engage in discussions about values in teaching. The teachers in our data sample most frequently answered “I don’t know” when asked about values of their peers, suggesting that they do not discuss values with their
colleagues. This will have to change before more specific issues can be addressed. Perhaps it is the rejection of status quo values (apparent in our sample) that makes teachers cautious and reluctant to discuss values openly. If this is true, courage is what education needs to become less haphazard when it comes to values.

**Recommendations for further research**

The research in this thesis may be seen as a pilot phase of a larger-scale study. Several weaknesses were revealed that would need to be addressed in order to maximize the informational value of the responses. The data sample in this thesis was not geographically diverse, meaning that some patterns observed might be typical of teachers in Prague or Central Bohemia and could not easily be generalized. Further research would preferably be conducted with a nation-wide or even international sample.

Other weaknesses stem from the necessity to keep the questionnaire brief as no compensation was possible for the respondents’ time. This posed a limitation not only in terms of the number of questionnaire items but also in their length. Longer explanations of what is meant may reduce ambiguity that occurs frequently when discussing issues as complex and abstract as values. This also applies to the list of values that may seem less than comprehensible to anyone not trained in abstract and context-free thinking. Here, too, more examples and explanations could be given to augment the value of the responses.

As the research in this thesis suggests a profound influence of the type of subject taught, it may be beneficial to investigate this issue further. If the sample were larger, it would be possible to distinguish not only between sciences and humanities, but specific subjects may be taken into consideration. An inter-cultural comparison would be of interest as well.
The final recommendation would be not to present the questionnaire as solely about values and include items from other areas of teaching as well. We might speculate that if we tell the respondents they should think about values, they instinctively attribute a greater importance to them in the responses (as values are all they are considering at that given time). Incorporating values-related items in a (deceptively) more general questionnaire may provide us with data that reflect reality to a greater degree.
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Appendix A – Questionnaire (English)

Gender:

Age:

Experience in education (years):

The type of school where I teach (if more options apply, select the predominant one):

The subjects I teach fall predominantly under: humanities/sciences/neither of the two applies

In the following section please evaluate the statements on the following scale: 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (I don’t know), 4 (agree), 5 (strongly agree)

1 My values manifest themselves in my teaching to a profound degree.

2 The values content in teaching is more important than the subject matter.

3 I incorporate values in my teaching in a conscious and planned fashion.

4 I believe that an experienced teacher puts a greater emphasis on moral values in teaching than an inexperienced one.

5 I believe it is possible to identify universal moral values – i.e. values that are binding for everybody at all times.

6 Moral values are a matter of personal opinion only.

7 I believe it is a duty of a teacher to teach values currently dominant in the society.

8 I believe many of my colleagues share my values.

9 I teach in an environment that is favorable for values teaching.

10 My values have changed significantly since I started teaching.

From the following list choose three values that are the most important to you. Tick three items.

- Authority
- Personal success
- Pleasure (enjoying your life, sensual gratification)
- Innovation and challenge in life (new ideas and stimuli)
- Independence of thought and action
- Understanding and tolerance (to all people, not just close ones)
- Well-being of close ones (and generally people with whom you are in frequent contact)
- Respect towards traditions
- Self-restraint and politeness
- Security and stability
Appendix B – questionnaire (Czech)

Pohlaví:

Věk:

Délka praxe ve školství (počet let):

Druh školy, na které vyučuji (Pokud spadáte pod více typů, zvolte ten, který převažuje):

Předměty, které vyučuji, spadají převážně pod: humanitní obory/přírodovědné obory/neplatí ani jedna z uvedených možností

V následující části, prosím, ohodnoťte výroky škálou -1 (nesouhlasím), 2 (spíše nesouhlasím), 3 (nevím), 4 (spíše souhlasím), 5 (zcela souhlasím)

1 Mé hodnoty se v mých hodinách projevují ve velké míře.
2 Kultivace žákových morálních hodnot je důležitější než samotná látka předmětů, které učím.
3 Hodnoty zapojuji do své výuky vědomě a plánovaně.
4 Jsem toho názoru, že zkušenější učitel klade větší důraz na hodnoty než učitel nezkušený.
5 Věřím, že je možné identifikovat univerzální hodnoty – tedy takové, které platí vždy a pro každého. Zde "pro 6 každého" znamená nezávisle na kultuře, pohlaví, rase, ekonomickém statusu apod.
6 Morální hodnoty jsou čistě věc osobního názoru.
7 Jsem toho názoru, že učitelé by měli žákům předávat hodnoty, které jsou ve společnosti většinové.
8 Mnoho mých kolegů sdílí mé hodnoty.
9 Učím v prostředí, které je pro předávání mých hodnot žákům příznivé.
10 Mé hodnoty se výrazně změnily od doby, kdy jsem začínala/a učit.

Vyberte ze seznamu právě 3 hodnoty, které jsou pro vás nejdůležitější. Zaškrtněte tři položky.

☐ Autorita
☐ Osobní úspěch
☐ Slast (užívání si života)
☐ Nové podněty a výzvy – inovace
☐ Nezávislost myšlení i konání
☐ Porozumění a tolerance vůči drugým (i cizím, ne pouze blízkým)
☐ Blaho blízkých a obecně těch, s kterými jsem v častém kontaktu
☐ Respekt k tradicím
☐ Sebekázeň a slušnost
☐ Bezpečí a stabilita
Appendix C – Summary of responses

Number of responses: 50

Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The type of school where I teach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-elementary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-elementary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither of the two applies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - My values manifest themselves in my teaching to a profound degree.

1 - 1 2%
2 - 4 8%
3 - 5 10%
4 - 23 46%
5 - 17 34%

2 - The values content in teaching is more important than the subject matter.

1 - 3 6%
2 - 5 10%
3 - 14 28%
4 - 21 42%
5 - 7 14%
3 - I incorporate values in my teaching in a conscious and planned fashion.

4 - I believe that an experienced teacher puts a greater emphasis on moral values in teaching than an inexperienced one.

5 - I believe it is possible to identify universal moral values.

6 - Moral values are a matter of personal opinion only.
7 - I believe it is a duty of a teacher to teach values currently dominant in the society.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 - I believe many of my colleagues share my values.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 - I teach in an environment that is favorable for values teaching.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 - My values have changed significantly since I started teaching.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choose three values that are the most important to you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal success</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure, sensual gratification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and challenge</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence of thought and action</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and tolerance to all people</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well being of close ones</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect towards tradition</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-restraint and politeness</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and stability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hedonism is not included as it was mentioned in no responses.

Correlation coefficients exceeding or approaching the critical value are highlighted.