

I feel the need to stress that what follows is almost completely my own work. I say this because I do not want to implicate anyone else in what could well be a blind alley. I am a newcomer to P.S.E. and the job of working on values came my way through a process that I cannot clarify, something to do with handwriting I think!

Hence, what follows is highly idiosyncratic and also unedited. I simply have started from scratch, as it were (well, more accurately, thinking through the previous meeting), and let it come out. Thus, I apologise for the repetition and I guess there may only be one point in it all. I just simply did not have time to do it any other way.

Its strength may be that at least you can see what the uninitiated teacher brings to the topic of values and at least you can see what confusions there are likely to be amongst us beginners!

----

## INTRODUCTION

1. Main aims according to Atkins survey:  
"to help pupils become happy, well adjusted members of society" "to foster more favourable attitudes towards other people/groups".
2. What counts as a personally and socially educated person? key question can only be answered through exposure of values.
3. Schools start from different positions:  
doing P.S.E. and believes it is o.k. - how do they know doing P.S.E. and believes it's awful - what's wrong, how get better thinking about doing it - how to begin not considering doing it - why rejection thinking about replacing P.S.E. with something else
4. 3 hot potatoes for teachers!
  - (i) it is contentious - it should remain a taboo subject; it frightens headteachers, teachers, parents and young people; teachers part of the status quo and should not challenge it but P.S.E. could result in such a challenge;
  - (ii) it is vital - (can coexist with it); if an essential part of schooling, then cannot afford to make mistakes;
  - (iii) the school itself embodies values and P.S.E., if directed towards the school, could put pressure on the school to reform itself;
5. Any P.S.E. should involve open consideration of the values which sustain it.
6. If P.S.E. is person centred and concerned with personal roles (parent, worker, friend) and with personal definitions of role, then conflict because no one set of values which enables people to meet their own and others' expectations - so inevitable that teachers make judgements about which values are of most worth?
7. Problems still of knowing what "having values" in everyday life might mean. There can be little confidence that two authorities who discuss about how and what values are attached to young people and to teachers?
8. Values not peculiar to P.S.E. and maybe less potent vehicle for transforming students' values than other experiences in schools but assumed to be of special importance and might be, so treat as if it is.
9. At core of areas of inquiry and activity such as H.E.C., Moral Ed., Relig. Ed., Careers Ed., Pol. Ed., Environmental Ed., is/should/can be an explicit treatment of values.
10. I have concentrated on programmes rather than Guidance and Counselling but we may want to say something about values in C & G (if there are different points to make).

11. Research: limited amount on the transmission and takeup of values and what there is suggests that we should treat generalizations about the process of values transformation with great caution.
12. If P.S.E. is concerned with behaviour then it has to cope with the mysterious relationships between what people say they value and how they actually behave. Verbal expression appears to be a very poor predictor of action and schools are generally places which deny action (so there is little planned learning on-the-job).
13. "Can I suggest that the chapter makes overt references to the effect of religious bodies on values. Too often the umbrella title 'values education' or 'moral education' is presumed to include an understanding of religion, when in fact no such understanding occurs. Religion has no monopoly of values concern and moral education can stand on its own without religion, but I don't want our paper to avoid the term 'religion' as an embarrassing enthusiasm" (correspondence from Ian Wragg).
14. Can we briefly describe the main features of the treatment of values in other programmes of Moral Ed., Health Ed. (see (9) above)?
15. It is a psychological and sociological fact that teachers do reveal their values, that schools reveal their institutional values and that students reveal their values, consciously, unconsciously and inevitably. A key feature of teaching is that one authority claims the right to change the values of others. This means that teachers have made judgements about the worthwhile of alternative values and about how they can export their values to another person. Schools are involved with improvement, of the present and future so teachers do stand for certain values. All teachers are involved in values education in so far as schools are concerned with the transmission of what is thought worthwhile.  
 Values are generalised, complex terms whose meanings are not self-evident. One popular way of conceptualising values has been to distinguish them from facts along the lines that values are not something that can be disagreed with through claims to evidence but this can be done with facts. Is this now a totally discredited distinction?  
 Definition-values are the basic motivational constituents of intentional behaviour and in which of which they may be explained. If there are such things as basic values and if people share them, then values can be the basis for settling disputes because reference can be made to the shared values. In this sense education concerned explicitly with values can be seen as an attempt to reach and sustain the status quo, as a vehicle for social cohesiveness, for social control, for social change.
16. P.S.E. is the one place in school where we could predict that controversial issues are being dealt with. We don't have a major study of what in the school context, counts as "controversial" but we might want to argue that any teacher doing P.S.E. has or should have clarified their own perceptions of what counts as controversial and their justifications for including or excluding issues in the light of these perceptions.

### TEACHER-STUDENT CONTEXTS

Taking Trefor Williams' advice I spent a few minutes creating a logical, simplistic sketch of the possible range of teacher- student contextual relationships in terms of sharing values. There are many more variations but the following gives the flavour of the exercise.

#### TEACHERS, STUDENTS AND VALUES - WHERE THEY STAND

##### AS PEOPLE

1. Teacher clarification of their own values.
2. Student clarification of their own values.
3. Degree to which teacher and students confident about identifying the values held by others.

##### IN THE CLASSROOM

4. Students sharing teacher values.
5. Teacher sharing student values.
6. Teacher sharing other teachers' values (in team teaching).
7. Students sharing other students' values.

##### IN THE SCHOOL

8. Teachers sharing other teachers' values.
9. Students sharing other students' values.

## IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD

10. School shares neighbourhood values.

## IN VALUES

11. Teachers and/or students promote some values rather than others.
12. Teachers and/or students are neuters (rational choice between alternatives).
13. Teachers and/or students believe in balance.
14. Teachers and/or students neglect or reject consideration of values.

Given this sketch, I have used it to make a number of points about values. This is not to say that the position of these comments under some section rather than other could be rigorously justified but that people coming to the document may be encouraged to reflect on their own values and the values of others from the context of teaching.

### 1. Teacher clarification of their own values

- (a) Is there a special obligation on teachers to make their own values known in some way to themselves? Is there a peculiarly special obligation on teachers involved in P.S.E. to do this?
- (b) Many teachers (I guess) carry around two cliches about values. The first is that the school is a powerful agent in the transmission and promotion of values and teachers are the major component of this. Second, that this learning has relevance to the wider problems of society. Each cliché is an umbrella sheltering numerous problems and there are sense in which neither, either or both seem true. The job of the P.S.E. teacher is to sort out these clichés with little other than personal judgement to fall back on (given a lack of evidence). Is the section on training for teachers going to say something about values clarification for teachers?
- (c) How can we identify values held by teachers? Number of possibilities:
  - (i) ideologically active - in school to use school for the promotion of a worthwhile society;
  - (ii) definitions of knowledge most worthwhile - selection of content;
  - (iii) definitions of teaching and learning approaches - selection of approach;
  - (iv) ethos of the school - sum of the parts?
- (d) What is values clarification? (As a teaching method). e.g. some limited situation where behaviour (decisions) are chosen which enable deductions about values? More rigorously, uses mock situations to encourage decisions about behaviour from possible choices (suggested or left open?), the decision reflecting motivations based on values?

### 2. Student clarification of their own values

- (a) Values clarification approach to P.S.E. is not value free. "Quite missionary in its zeal!" (Ian Wragg)
- (b) There has been some research done on the values clarification of Raths, Harmin and Simon (1978) by Leming and Lockwood. They found little or no support for the theory as an effective instructional technique. Remembering the earlier warning about research, and given that clarification approaches themselves are so ambiguous and hence the outcomes so difficult to delimit (e.g. behavioural outcomes have a potentially lifelong horizon), the lack of evidence is illustrative of the state of the art rather than proving failure.
- (c) By what rights do teachers compel (through a legal system?) students to make public their values? Have students a right to be quiet (at the risk of taunts of 'chicken' - from other students, and of laziness - from teachers?)
- (d) Schools are places of values education and are claimed to be more so the more they have programmes such as P.S.E. We cannot ask whether students should be involved in clarifying and changing their values since this is, in practical terms, a non-question.

### 3. Degree to which teachers and students confident about identifying the values held by others

- (a) One way of predicting, maximising or minimising conflict is through identifying potential areas of dispute.
- (b) Teachers must get to know their students and students their teachers and each other (presumably) as part of objective of P.S.E.
- (c) Teachers can make judgements about controversy based on misconceiving the values of other teachers, the school, students, the neighbourhood, Mrs Thatcher, etc. This is particularly true in multi-cultural context. By controversy here I mean where there is strong possibility of differences of belief and action - this should be predicted (i.e. minimise uncertainty) through obligation to know oneself and others (Ian Wragg - religious dimension strong here?). Conflict here with

peoples' right to keep their values to themselves. Students e.g. could assume that teacher wants to know about them "as people" in order to use the information against them (and vice versa).

#### 4. Students sharing teachers' values

- (a) Where students (as group) share the values of the teacher (e.g. to caricature, in a Roman Catholic girls' school - on abortion, where a young sociologist shares his students' beliefs in the inevitability of juvenile crime and in its justification given youth unemployment figures, how could content be selected for P.S.E. and which teaching and learning approach should the teacher adopt ?
- (b) Notions of a generation gap appear to be prevalent again. Schools can be seen to alienate young people from adult society by denying them adult status through the over-protection of the consequences of personal actions. Can young people be taught their rights and responsibilities without allowing them to practise them? Should P.S.E. be the context where this can happen (if nowhere else in the school?)
- (c) We can make two mutually exclusive predictions about the impact of teachers on students: the more students are in school, the more they assimilate the teachers' values; or, the more students are in school, the less they assimilate the teachers' values. Which do we want?

#### 5. Teachers sharing students' values

- (a) This is rarely conceded (in my experience) but often happens (certainly to me) - that is, teachers assimilate the values of their student(s) - e.g. they are converted to worshipping Ian Dury or 'Dallas' or the Anti-Nazi League, or the Women's Movement.
- (b) Take the following values, claimed to be representative of the "new values of youth": a rejection of authority symbols, growing toleration for chaos and disorder, decline in patriotism, anti-business, a selfish trend (me, me, me), a rejection of the art of compromise, a belief that virtue is no longer a virtue unto itself, a drive for male and female equality, a more liberal sexuality and a decline in the support for organised religion. I could be persuaded to claim that many of these are goods rather than bads and if I am to be honest with my students, do I pretend and put up a counter culture (see later)?  
Take the example of pupil participation (see Jasper for this example), "Although it may not be admitted, teachers or parents may support or oppose pupil participation because of their general attitudes or because they themselves when at school approved or disapproved of the way affairs were then organised. Accordingly, pupil participation can arouse strong feelings involving substantial pre-judgements, which very possibly remain undeclared. Such a situation makes the task of successfully introducing pupil participation, already difficult enough, even more difficult" (from 'Political and Moral Education and Pupil Participation').
- (c) What if teacher and students share values and share the action consequences? If the outcome of P.S.E. is to be a confidence and willingness to act, both individually and collectively, what are the implications of this for student participation within and without the school (e.g. in attempting to redress injustice - recently, a London borough suspended youth workers for going on a protest march to the Town Hall to protest against the planned closure of an outdoor centre belonging to the Authority (young people who used the facility organised the march) - what do we think about that?
- (d) The basic point here is that any process of value transformation is at least two way, that teachers are involved in exposing their own values when engaging students in P.S.E., and should be aware that they could well be influenced by individual students or a group culture.

#### 6. Teachers sharing other teachers' values (in team teaching)

- (a) Teams of teachers who plan and implement programmes make judgements about content and teaching and learning approach and given value diversity, such P.S.E. experiences organised for students can be uneasy coalitions of competing viewpoints, of compromised, etc. Do we have any strong feelings about how this can add to or detract from the quality of P.S.E. experiences (see 13 below).

#### 7. Students sharing other students' values

- (a) In many contexts in schools, students do not know what other students think because either this does not come out in the classroom or because the issues do not enter everyday conversation. P.S.E. may or may not be like that.
- (b) Students, through dress, speech, achievement, tastes, etc. know that they are different and differ from other students - in P.S.E., these differences can be made explicit or more explicit, especially sex and social class and religious differences in so far as students are encouraged to make clear and justify their beliefs and actions.
- (c) The pedagogical difficulty arises of encouraging students to know themselves, to do this as part of a group activity, yet recognising the right to be silent (major evaluation problem obvious here

too). Do we need to make suggestions as to how teachers deal with student closure (e.g. redefining issues and silence). We could predict the conditions under which students are likely to clam up, e.g. where they stand for something no one else does, where they don't want to go against their friends, where they fear the taunt of 'extremist', and so on.

#### 8. Teachers sharing other teachers' values (in the school)!

- (a) Teachers can use P.S.E. to form a sort of collective within the school which shares values which the rest of the teaching staff do not, P.S.E. being seen to be a context in which one does "what schools should really be doing" - i.e. can be used to create a counterculture as a bulwark or as a haven or refuge. Does this happen? Is it unlikely? What do we think about it?
- (b) P.S.E. can be context where students take on the right values to support their teachers' expectations about them throughout the school. P.S.E. can then take on a corrective role, students being explicitly encouraged to transform their values because it may cut out vandalism, bad manners, etc. in the school and its neighbourhood (e.g. bus-stops and sweetshops). Values then support the acquisition of knowledge and skills elsewhere.
- (c) Extent to which teachers differ in their values partly reflected in the implied, or hidden, curriculum. Schools at any one time represent a constellation of cultures and the degree of difference between cultures is seen through deliberate attempts or inevitable results of teachers differing from one another in what they stand for and in their explicit wish to impose their values on the school. There can be tension between the public statements of the school (e.g. through the senior staff) and what other teachers stand for. This can lead to cynicism and rejection by those teachers and students who see the "real world" of values in this way.
- (d) Should teachers of P.S.E., in particular, sort out, face up to, expose, the contradictions in schools as a part of the process of respecting their fellow teachers and students? It is much easier to influence schools by tinkering with the curriculum than by confronting institutional structures. Can P.S.E. avoid being neutralised by these structures? Can it make a positive, if limited, contribution to their transformation?

#### 9. Students sharing other students' values (in the school)

- (a) Teachers can use students to propagate their views on the best possible value systems. This is usually done through the evaluation of some students above others, either as a group or through picking on individuals. As a group, I guess we think of prefects, monitors, the top academic stream in each year, etc. as positive reference groups, to emulate; the bottom academic groups, the head-shakers, the detention groups, as negative reference groups, to reject. Individuals can also be used by teachers in this way, setting up alternative role models as the situation demands (e.g. someone who always does their homework on time when the class has generally been late; someone who wears pierced earrings when this is generally discouraged and the majority of students acquiesce). Should we say something about this?
- (b) As a result (partly) of schools and their roles in P.S.E. some students may form groups within the school for action within and without the school (such as Schools against Racism), or may join groups which wish to enrol young people, such as the anti-abortionists and the Ecology Party. Some schools may include a student body who are not joiners at all. How do we expect P.S.E. to change the everyday affiliations of young people? Do we put a premium on group membership?

#### 10. School shares neighbourhood values

- (a) One reasonably non-controversial assumption underlying concepts of socialisation is that the success or failure of any attempt to transmit one specific set of values depends on the support or rejection of those values by others who we perceive as authorities. More strictly, this transmission process depends on the clarity and intensity with which salient individuals, groups or institutions, reference objects, are seen to hold consistent beliefs or engage in coherent actions. At any one time, young people may have a wide range of potential references which represent a pluralistic range. Then, presumably, we argue that the function of P.S.E. should be to use this plurality as nutriment for the development of mature, independent judgement. We use rationality as a counter to charisma and counter to contradiction. Young people may see the conflicts between values set as e.g. British or peaceful ideals, and what they see in their everyday lives. So we return to potential cynicism and disaffection, apathy and deference. Do we then counsel students towards happiness, self-adjustment, optimism, a person-centred approach to terms of correction, or a structural approach, where we correct the political system? Can we have a politicisation of the personal and a personalisation of the political in terms of treatment?
- (c) Teacher values can often conflict with parent values, given differences in the religious, cultural, racial and political antecedents which prop young people up when faced with P.S.E. We seem to find it easy to accept pluralistic arguments in this sense (of knowing and respecting students) and also to accept the monolithic and monopolistic arguments of the "needs on industry". What do we suggest that teachers should be doing in order to recognise and get beyond this conflict (is the training group going to say something about this? - it may be merely a technical problem, to be

- resolved in terms of teaching and learning technique).
- (c) "Values diversity - a clear reference to the multiethnic scene - needs to bring out the much closer links between religion and morality for Muslims, Sikhs, Jews, etc. than for most post-Christian Anglo-Saxons" (Ian Wragg).
  - (d) Do we wish to make reference to the 1980 Act concerned with the public statements of schools, e.g. Schools Prospectuses. The production of such could be a valuable P.S.E. experience for the whole of the school.
  - (e) Many teachers, from my experience, do not live in the neighbourhood of their school. Indeed, they may see the neighbourhood as simply "catchment", i.e. something that keeps them in jobs (with built-in interests, seen through constant jokes, about catchment birthrates!). Have teachers in P.S.E. a special obligation to know the neighbourhood of the school?
  - (f) What if they know it and don't like it. E.g. some young teachers (and not so young) dislike and dispute the military stranglehold (as they see it) which the Plymouth dockyard has on jobs. They want the refitting and commissioning on nuclear submarines to stop, yet they fear for the material conditions of their students if this were to happen. Should P.S.E. programmes engage in considerations of this local or neighbourhood type? What do we think about the use of experience-based learning? Should the school be a base for social action where social justice is seen to be denied? Is an effective programme of P.S.E. likely to be rejected as an integral part of formal education because teaching or managing it is likely to be considered a subversive activity?
  - (g) For clarification, let me put "formal" education in context. Education needs to be seen in terms of incidental, non-formal and formal. Incidental arises out of situations and is unavoidable, such as learning the meanings of symbols. Informal means the organised education that takes place in addition to the school system, through the media, the family, group participation, the Church, and so on. How should P.S.E. in formal (i.e. the school system) contexts relate to the other contexts?
  - (h) Bluntly, how do we want teachers to act when there is a conflict of values, between what they stand for and what others want? An example, say that teachers on a P.S.E. programme fiercely disliked and disapproved of the involvement of young people with ultra-right organisations. Say this involvement is seen to arise from a neglect of the young by traditional organisations of the Labour Movement so that they retreat into the politics of the peer group or the extremist groups. A socialist strategy here may then be to encourage the building of links between the Trade Union movement and community organisations (e.g. to organise for job preservation) and to involve young people in this. What would we think about that?

#### 11. Teachers and/or students promote some values rather than others

- (a) A common argument against P.S.E. with the politicisation dimension is that children may be subject to bias, prejudice and indoctrination at the hands of teachers. Given that students are open to alternative sources of values both within and without the school, is this still a problem area, or rather, should it still be conceived as such (especially by headteachers and governors)? Do political upheavals become more likely if supported by the modern equivalent of the Children's Crusade?
- (b) Should we encourage teachers to be as critically aware of the critiques of the personalisation approach, of the arguments against the social pathology of promoting certain sorts of values in order to deal with social problems?
- (c) Much policy is justified in terms of community (with major implications for values built into the meaning and uses) I think we may want to mention community as something which needs analysis rather than as a slogan for action.
- (d) This individualistic and collectivist polarity (the personal and the political) is currently manifest in notions of social control and social change. Given that we might predict that much curriculum change in P.S.E. is promoted by youth unemployment I think that we should point out this logical polarity and the possibilities of equilibriumization (the personalisation of the political and the politicisation of the personal).
- (e) It has been said that religious education can only arise out of three basic approaches: direct indoctrination into particular religious beliefs, indirect indoctrination into more general religious beliefs and teaching about religion and religions. Is this true of P.S.E.?
- (f) Who is to determine what beliefs and institutions are acceptable to P.S.E. and which are "extreme" or "unworkable"? Why should the status quo be kept together if it is so fragile as to require special pleading on its behalf within schools?
- (g) Some teachers fear P.S.E. because they doubt the possibilities of open education in schools, believe P.S.E. to be necessarily conservative (or it wouldn't exist, so the argument goes) and don't want to add an explicit form of conservative indoctrination to the existing myriad forms of implicit ones. What do we say to them?
- (h) How can P.S.E. in a democracy teach democratic values and democratic political methods and still build a critical, analytical perspective on the political system?
- (i) This is to acknowledge the supremacy of democratic values. We could also argue that P.S.E. must involve a commitment to values but not to the values of particular ideologies. How do we resolve this?

- (j) Do we see as one of the proper outcomes of P.S.E. the development of ideology? (Given the social psychological evidence, for what it is worth, that most people make do with latent ideologies.) There have been numerous research studies of the values held by adolescents and the results are very unclear. However, crudely, it seems that young people are generally anti-utopian, realistic conservatists at heart but that during adolescence social idealism can occur, characterised through law and order themes, rich-poor themes and equality themes. Can we suggest techniques whereby teachers can diagnose values in this dominant social psychological, socialisation framework (in order to avoid the catch-22 of values clarification where diagnosis seems to be an end in itself - too selfindulgent for me!).
- (k) We know that materials embody values (e.g. books). We don't know much about the way young people use books, the TV and so on in order to take on values which they otherwise would not, but we do have many content analyses. I imagine we might want to argue that teachers should be trained to be critically aware of this when choosing and creating materials, and should attempt to pass this critical faculty on to their students.
- (l) I am assuming that none of us are absolute moral relativists and neither do we want teachers or students to be so. Hence, we have views about publically acceptable and privately acceptable behaviour. I think that students come to know what teachers stand for, that their perceptions are usually accurate and they know when teachers are pretending to stand for something they do not. This they do usually as a teaching device (e.g. to create controversy or to wake the students up). The result can be confusing to the students, who resist the ploy and doubt the sanity of the teacher! This issue of teacher integrity or honesty is one where we might need to offer advice. For example, I guess that many teachers have been caught in the situation where they are trying for a "balanced" treatment of, say, using drugs and are confronted by the blunt irrepressible question - have you ever, sir?
- (m) Broadly, teachers can be put into three crude categories (in terms of the men and abuses of P.S.E.): reinforcing their perceptions of the ruling consensus; reforming this consensus through methods about which they perceive a consensus (in terms of their legitimation); and reforming through rejection of what they perceive to be the consensus values and methods of social change. What do we mean when we describe a teacher as a "radical" teacher of P.S.E.?
- (n) They can be characterised too as follows: as committed (to the export of some values rather than others); as neuters (either or both within and without the school); as jugglers, preserving and demonstrating balance through keeping two balls in the air (though there are many more sides to an issue than two).
- (o) Teachers in the U.K. are largely state employees. Is P.S.E. likely to be any different as a result of this, and if so, how? For example, when a teacher is making judgements about P.S.E. this is clearly related to judgements about the psychological and intellectual needs of children, the social and political climate and the specific directives of the teacher's employer. Where the teacher is employed by the state, the last two will be intimately connected. These mix up with what the teacher stands for and partly determines what the teacher stands for.  
It is clear (logically and in practice) that these four may not be compatible and may even be in opposition (to have more of one may mean less of another). Let's imagine a P.S.E. teacher who is in the following position: state sponsored system of schooling; the system is committed to producing students who will accept youth unemployment as a temporary phenomenon that lies within the individual's capacity to resolve this objective is explicitly recognised as a worthwhile outcome of P.S.E. (e.g. it is enshrined in a Schools Council document!), and is explicit because of the objectives it imposes on teachers. What if the teacher does not believe this position to be of worth? Can teachers still function efficiently as a teacher and to their own satisfaction if we accept that teachers have to be honest in their intellectual transactions with their students? Are these implications for teacher accountability and do we want to spell these out?
- (p) I think that indoctrination is the most prevalent form of P.S.E., hence the length of this section. School walls are often wallpapered with inspiring sayings and school rules; handbooks and guides concerned with codes of expected behaviour abound; students are admonished by those in authority for not observing codes and for failing to meet expectations about desired behaviour. These represent direct values of education and we need to consider how these more generally relate to substantive values such as honesty, respect for others and toleration.
- (q) It could be argued that the task of the teacher is to prepare students for life as it is rather than as they would prefer to see it, but that doesn't help much ("life as it is?"). What teachers do in practice is to choose a particular combination of different sorts of values (moral, aesthetic, political) that they consider appropriate to society (usually seen as pluralistic, though not always). Given this difficult task, it is even more difficult when teachers are aware they are doing it. Given the problem of unintended consequences of policies, the only consensus is likely to be seen in things as they are (the status quo). Even here there are major conflicts (e.g. sexual chastity versus sexual freedom).

## 12. Teachers and/or students are neuters (rational choice between alternatives)

- (a) I don't want to say much about this, though there is much to say! The emphasis of this position is tied up with notions of objectivity, of skills, of decision- making, of logic. My own experience

with political education leads me to believe that the attractiveness of the neuter arises from its public contrast with the ideologue. This is a reasonable point of departure but in practice it can mean deadly dull classrooms! It may reduce the problem (as it is seen) of indoctrination but it upgrades the chance of teacher dishonesty. In order to avoid the latter, teachers then have a vested interest in defusing the issue by delimiting the treatment to "safe" margins and ruling out student attempts to locate the issue on their terms. Crudely, I prefer McPhail to Stenhouse!

- (b) Where different values systems conflict and where values are so scrambled as to resist straightening out, all judgements about the outcomes of teaching become difficult to predict given such uncertainty. What we need is a treatise on doing P.S.E. under conditions of uncertainty, similar to Shackleton's work on the economics of uncertainty choice about goods. Can a rational rationality be taught?
- (c) It is possible (through logic!) to imagine a classroom climate scale which embodies notions of neutrality. Some U.S.A. work suggests that students rank highly those teachers who deal with P.S.E. (specifically, deal with controversial issues), in an objective and neutral way in the context of a free discussion climate; this is contrasted with a position where the classroom is not free because it is dominated by teachers' views, which suppresses student contribution. The pragmatic response, of course, is to have an armoury of alternative approaches to P.S.E., trying to intellectually clarify the relative strengths and weakness of each approach, given the situation.

### 13. Teachers and/or students believe in balance

- (a) Much is done in the name of a "balanced" approach and we could do philosophy with this. All I want to say is that it is not clear what is meant, that it would be tortuous to tease out what it means through thinking about it and I don't know of any studies of teachers' and students' perceptions of balance.
- (b) In everyday discourse, it seems that we find it useful to think of both sides of a question or issue (e.g. both sides on industry): that in the classroom it may be better to have two sides rather than one side (though not much better). It is certainly a tendency to analyse, i.e. how and why we use polarities, whether these are media products.
- (c) A major difficulty is that a teacher can plan for balance but the outcomes (what the students learn) may be to choose one position rather than another because the teacher fails to achieve balance, rather than the student choosing between two equally weighted alternatives. I have simply never seen an example of the latter and wouldn't know how to test for it (beyond a gut reaction).

### 14. Teachers and students neglect or reject consideration of values

- (a) Our system of democracy may well only survive because of apathy of the mass of citizens. We may not, in everyday affairs, feel the need to be able to give categorical replies to questions about our toleration of others, though we may be very clear about our favourite record of the moment or the football team we support, and even why we support it. Yet our values are exposed many times everyday (unless we are asleep or in recluse) and it may be this makes P.S.E. in schools different, to some degree, from other activities (do we do history and P.E. everyday, inevitably?). This is one way. I guess that people could (and may have, for all I know) argue for the primacy of P.S.E. Teachers and students are continually making judgements about good and bad, right and wrong, and P.S.E. goes on in all of the 3 contexts I outlined earlier.
- (b) This argument could be turned around a little to argue against programmes of P.S.E. because of the role of the hidden curriculum and a Headteacher, acting as a curriculum gatekeeper, may use this argument (but couldn't hold it, if pressed, I imagine).
- (c) My own preference would be for P.S.E. programmes to arise out of concerns for the political structure of education. This would counter my worry that some teachers may not realise that there is any "value stance involved in the selection and treatment of topics for study" (Rosemary Lee). I don't think that this would be a legitimate starting point for getting P.S.E. off the ground, however.
- (d) Do we need to produce a breed of super teachers in order to do P.S.E. "properly"? What do we think would make the majority of teachers engaged in P.S.E. (which means all teachers, but some more than others) a little better than they otherwise would be (at least cost!) - question for teacher training groups.