

1969

# A Study of the Effect the Value-Clarification Process Had on Fifth Grade Students in Auburn, Washington

Kathleen Agnes Hagen  
*Central Washington University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [Educational Methods Commons](#), and the [Elementary Education and Teaching Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Hagen, Kathleen Agnes, "A Study of the Effect the Value-Clarification Process Had on Fifth Grade Students in Auburn, Washington" (1969). *All Master's Theses*. 1104.  
<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/1104>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@cwu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@cwu.edu).

101

A STUDY OF THE EFFECT THE VALUE-CLARIFICATION PROCESS  
HAD ON FIFTH GRADE STUDENTS IN AUBURN, WASHINGTON

---

A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Graduate Faculty  
Central Washington State College

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Education

---

by  
Kathleen Agnes Hagen  
August, 1969

LD  
5771.31  
H32

SPECIAL  
COLLECTION

174473

**Library  
Central Washington  
State College  
Ellensburg, Washington**

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

---

John E. Davis, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

---

Byron DeShaw

---

James Monasmith

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Special indebtedness is extended to Dr. John Davis for his time, effort, and patience that helped make possible the preparation of this thesis. Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. James Monasmith and Dr. Byron DeShaw for their invaluable assistance.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM . . .	1
THE PROBLEM . . . . .	2
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	2
Hypothesis . . . . .	2
Importance of the Study . . . . .	3
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY . . . . .	4
DEFINITION OF THE TERMS . . . . .	5
ORGANIZATION OF THE SUCCEEDING CHAPTERS . . .	6
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	7
III. PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY . . . . .	15
PRE-TEST . . . . .	16
Rating X . . . . .	16
Rating Y . . . . .	16
VALUE-CLARIFICATION PROCESS . . . . .	17
Individual Method . . . . .	18
Group Methods . . . . .	19
POST-TEST . . . . .	20
COLLECTION AND TREATMENT OF THE DATA . . . .	21
IV. FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA GATHERED . . . . .	23
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . .	27

CHAPTER	PAGE
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	31
APPENDIXES . . . . .	35
APPENDIX: A, RATING X . . . . .	36
APPENDIX: B, RATING Y . . . . .	37
APPENDIX: C, CLASS LIST . . . . .	40
APPENDIX: D, VALUE SHEET . . . . .	41
APPENDIX: E, CONTRIVED INCIDENT . . . . .	42
APPENDIX: F, CLARIFYING-RESPONSE QUESTIONS . . . . .	43

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. RAW SCORE DATA FOR GROUP A AND GROUP B . . . . .	24
II. <u>t</u> SCORE OF SIGNIFICANCE OF GROUP A AND GROUP B FOR PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST . . . . .	25

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This age in which we live has been characterized as a perfection of means and confusion of goals. There is widespread concern that youth, and adults in some cases, do not seem to live by any consistent set of values. They act impetuously and erratically. Many people find nothing enjoyable to do with their free time. In school many children seem purposeless, listless, and motivated only by outside pressures. Our population is becoming other-directed; we guide our lives not by what we believe is right and proper, but by what others do or say (23). Does this not suggest that many persons have unclear values?

We note the wide discrepancy between what people do and what they say. Adults have been trying to set examples for years. They have carefully limited choices given to children. They have made rules and insisted on certain patterns of behavior. They have attempted to inspire identification with particular values. Does this not suggest that the approaches to values that have been so widely used in the past have been less than effective?

There is a great need to arouse in young people a concern for what they are becoming, not just what they are accumulating (7:2). Why must teachers see their role only as putting things into the mind of the child? Can a role be defined that would help a child take all the confusion that already exists in his mind, remove it, look at it, examine it, turn it around, and make some order out of it?

## I. THE PROBLEM

### Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not there was any significant difference in the behavior ratings of the two groups of fifth graders between those students who received the "value-clarification" process and those students who did not. The clarification process is an approach to clarifying the values of students. The teacher asks questions, during group or private individual sessions, of the students. This method, developed by Raths, Harmin, and Simon, is used by the teacher to help a student consider what he has chosen, what he prizes, and what he is doing (22).

### Hypothesis

The researcher assumed the null hypothesis. There will be no significant difference in the mean rating of students who received the value-clarification process and those students who did not. As students are provided value-clarifying

opportunities--the value-clarification process--, their behavior patterns will not become less frequent and/or acute.

### Importance of the Study

Emotions, intelligence quotient, and physical conditions are often used to explain behavior problems, but until recently there has been little research on the influence values might have on the behavior of the individual (22:4). There is strong support for the notion that values are possible explanations of children's behavior problems (22:4). Muller states that values are as legitimate a subject of scientific investigation as any other phenomena pertaining to human beings (17:20).

There have been relatively few studies of the value changes that occur in the secondary school and even fewer in the elementary school (22:220-229). These studies have shown that students' values aren't significantly altered by the public school. To educate at all is to educate for something. If one does not intend to change the student, why bother to teach at all? If we accept the fact that values are possible explanations of children's behavior problems, then educators cannot avoid dealing with values. This study will be helpful, primarily, to those educators who are concerned with the clarification of values.

Mere opinion based on personal judgment, however, is not enough to provide administrators and teachers with

accurate information as to the importance of value clarification in the curriculum. Such can be done only through statistical investigation as described in the above comparisons. It is hoped that substantial facts produced will prove that value clarification is a valuable and necessary part of the educational program.

## II. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

### The Subjects

The subjects were two classrooms of fifth grade students enrolled at Chinook Elementary School in Auburn, Washington, from September, 1968, through March, 1969. Sixty-two students initially started the program. Four students moved and three were transferred. One student was eliminated from the study because she suffered from a severe emotional disturbance. It was determined at the outset of this study that any student who suffered from a severe physical or emotional disturbance would be eliminated because studies have shown that these disturbances interfere with the value-clarifying process (22:182). This student was allowed to participate in the activities involved in this study; however, the results of her ratings were not recorded for the purposes of this study. The data used in this study were compiled from the remaining fifty-four students.

### III. DEFINITION OF THE TERMS

For the purposes of this study, the terms listed below were defined in the following manner:

Value. Individual beliefs, attitudes, activities, or feelings that satisfy the seven criteria of: (1) having been freely chosen, (2) having been chosen from among alternatives, (3) having been chosen after due reflection, (4) having been prized and cherished, (5) having been publicly affirmed, (6) having been incorporated into actual behavior, and (7) having been repeated in one's life (22).

Value indicator. A belief, attitude, activity, or feeling that indicates a value but does not meet all of the criteria.

Process of valuing. The procedure used to obtain a value. The seven criteria used to describe a value collectively describe the process of valuing (22).

Clarifying response. The method used by the teacher to help a student consider what he has chosen, what he prizes, and what he is doing.

Value sheet. A dittoed paper distributed to each student which has a statement and/or a series of questions which deal with values or value indicators. The students are instructed to write their reactions on this paper.

Value-clarification process. An approach to clarifying the values of students by using a specific method called the clarifying response (22).

Behavior pattern categories. This study used the suggested categories of Raths, Harmin, and Simon (22:5-7) to classify different patterns of behavior of students who exhibit a lack of clear values:

- |                      |                   |
|----------------------|-------------------|
| 1. apathetic         | 5. drifters       |
| 2. flighty           | 6. overconformers |
| 3. very uncertain    | 7. overdissenters |
| 4. very inconsistent | 8. role players   |

#### IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE SUCCEEDING CHAPTERS

Chapter II will review the literature relating to the importance of providing value clarification.

Chapter III will give the procedures involved in gathering the data.

Chapter IV will show the computation of the data gathered.

Chapter V will contain the summary and the conclusions of the study.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

At the present time there seems to be no inclusion of values in the curriculum of education; however, the importance of this field cannot be overlooked as indicated by the literature related to this topic. This chapter is divided into four main categories: (1) Man values and acts on his values, (2) Action is behavior; and man's behavior exhibits his values, (3) Man, because of his lack of clear values, is unprepared for the world in which he lives, and (4) The school cannot avoid dealing with values.

#### Man Values and Acts on His Values

There is support for the idea that man values.

John Rich expresses this when he states:

Man is a creature who values. If one is to be distinctively human rather than just a vegetable devoid of striving, searching, and choosing, he must be aware of himself in the world and make choices that shape his future. These choices are made by reflectively assessing the situations one confronts in life (24:Epilogue).

A statement by Kurt Baier further substantiates the point of view that man acts on his values:

There are present in the agent's experience a number of values. He chooses one as the basis for action. One asks if his action is consistent with the selected value. An examination is made of the factual evidence bearing on the judgment to see if the agent has collected and interpreted the facts correctly and related them to his value propositions (1:21-22).

Robert Hartman expresses his agreement that man values by his definition of man:

Our definition of man will be the time-honored: "Man is a rational being." By "rational" we mean the capacity to combine concepts with objects, which is really the capacity to find one's way in the world by representing it to oneself, that is, by giving names to material objects and interrelating the names (14:116).

There is not only support for the notion that man values and acts on his values, but that his actions are uniquely his own decisions. Carl Rogers comments:

The individual increasingly comes to feel that the locus of evaluation lies within himself. Less and less does he look to others for approval or disapproval; for standards to live by; for choices. He recognizes that it rests within himself to choose; that the only question that matters is: "Am I living in a way that is deeply satisfying to me, and which truly expresses me?" (25:119).

#### Action is Behavior; and Man's Behavior Exhibits His Values

Man's actions are sometimes referred to as his behavior. The Random House Dictionary defines behavior as being, "a manner of behaving or acting" (28:19). Webster's New World Dictionary defines behavior as being, "the plural form of action" (3:6).

If it is valid to say that man's actions are a result of his values, then it is appropriate to say that man's

behavior may be the result of his values. Gunnar Myrdal expresses his concurrence that man's behavior exhibits his values:

The whole "sphere of valuations"--by which we mean the entire aggregate of a person's numerous and conflicting valuations, as well as their expressions in thought, speech, and behavior--is thus never present in conscious apperception. Some parts of it may even be constantly suppressed from awareness. ...They ordinarily bend behavior somewhat in their direction; the reason for suppressing them from a conscious attention is that, if obeyed, they would affect behavior even more. In this treatise, therefore, behavior is conceived of as being typically the outcome of a moral compromise of heterogeneous valuations, operating on various planes of generality and rising in varying degrees and at different occasions to the level of consciousness (18:1027-31).

Emotions, intelligence quotient, and physical conditions have often been used to explain behavior problems, but until recently there has been little research on the influence values might have on the behavior of the individual (22:4). There is support for the notion that values are possible explanations of children's behavior problems (22:4). Muller states that values are as legitimate a subject of scientific investigation as any other phenomena pertaining to human beings (17:20).

Man, Because of His Lack of Clear Values,  
is Unprepared for the World in Which  
He Lives

---

According to Kenneth Boulding, we have entered an age of highly technological, developed societies (4:37). Michael Harrington elaborates on this point of view:

We have entered a century in which the West has revolutionized its social structure, economy, and technology, but without revolutions, without long-range planning. This "revolution" has caught countless people unaware and unprepared for the type of world in which they live; many are incapable of comprehending, much less controlling, the forces that shape their lives (13:Introduction).

Raths and Berelson speak of the dilemma of our time when they say that at the same time we become more skilled and proficient as to means, we have, ironically, become more uncertain as to the ends (22:15; 2:152).

A number of studies have shown that among the major problems of our time are the rise of "herd" consciousness, loss of identity, dehumanization, exploitation of others, "other-directedness", insecurity and defensiveness, and lack of direction and meaning in life (11; 23; 31). Part of the reason for this confusion is that the American industry has undergone a change in structure which contributed to a re-definition of values (11:108). The change in the industrial structure would be the post-industrial revolution--the automated age. The redefinition of values is evident by the cultural shift of the value emphasis from the Protestant Ethic to the Social Ethic. The Protestant Ethic is described by the emphasis on the individual, hard work, and frugality. The Social Ethic is characterized by the emphasis on the social group, a life of leisure, and conspicuous consumption (6:110-115; 11:95; 31:30).

John Smith speaks of the confusing aspects of re-defining values when he states:

The danger for our society is not a commitment to some clearly announced conviction, but tacit acceptance of unexamined answers to questions one is prone to avoid because they are difficult to resolve (29:5).

In reviewing the literature related to this field, it has been noted that certain factors are evident: (1) Man acts on his values, (2) Man exhibits his values by his actions, (3) Man's actions, because of his lack of clear values, indicate that he may be unprepared for the world in which he lives. This research brings us to the question of what the school's role is with respect to values.

#### The School Cannot Avoid Dealing with Values

Perry comments on the school's role when he writes:

The standing paradox of education is the comparative neglect of values in education. Its importance is pointed up by the grave crises of modern civilization. ...These things are well-known and repeatedly proclaimed. But what is done about it? Schools and colleges, designed for educational purposes, leave it to the home, the church, the Boy or Girl Scouts, or other private...organizations. But even these agencies hesitate to assume responsibility. ...Educational agencies rationalize their evasion of the task by professing their respect for the individual's personal independence. Where in the curriculum or other organized activities of secondary and higher education does training of values find a place? (21:428).

Robert Peck has a similar explanation of the school's role with respect to values:

Education in the past has not given much indication that the schools have achieved success in the area of developing clear value. Values are taught, however, whether the school consciously plans for such teaching or not. Education itself is a value-infused process, in which the teacher makes value decisions on how to relate to students, maintain classroom control, select material, evaluate results, and perform a multitude of other duties. Some values are learned through imitation and teacher influence rather than through the formal teaching act. In short, valuing is continually taking place within education. Therefore, it becomes a matter of whether we wish to plan such process reflectively in terms of desired outcomes or to let them drift (20:178).

William Stanley contributes to this idea of the school's role when he argues that:

The schools cannot ignore the confusion and conflict in society by constructing a sheltered educational environment that will shield youth from the value conflicts of our time (30:129).

Rich adds to the concept of what the school is and what it ought to be when he complains about the teacher education programs:

Teacher education programs, however, have primarily emphasized the acquisition of knowledge of one's subject, of the school system, and of teaching methodology. A school can provide an atmosphere of respect for both individual and cultural differences. It should be a center of inquiry where value conflicts are thoughtfully examined, a place where youth can learn to make intelligent value judgments. It can also show the generating force underlying much of its instructional program which consists of great moral issues that shape men and societies. These are the issues, along with others that arise in the lives of students, that are to be examined in all of their ramifications in order that reasoned judgments can be made (24:122).

Bertrand Russell speaks of the part the teacher should play in the role of the school:

The man who has reverence will not think it his duty to "mold" the young. He feels in all that lives, but especially in human beings, and most of all in children, something sacred, indefinable, unlimited, something individual and strangely precious, the growing principle of life, an embodied fragment of the dumb striving of the world. ...All this gives him a longing to help the child in its own battle; he would equip and strengthen it, not for some outside, but for the ends which the child's own spirit is obscurely seeking (26:157-158).

John Rich expresses his viewpoint of a joint responsibility that should be shared by the teacher and the student:

The teaching-learning process should be the result of combined efforts; students should be free to arrive independently at defensible positions, and teachers should see that students acquire the tools and abilities of experimental inquiry they need for making intelligent decisions (24:20).

Although many authors write that values need to be included in the curriculum, few make specific contributions as to how this might be done. Oliver and Shaver have written a book--Teaching Public Issues in the High School--which deals with standards of analysis by which the student is actively to relate the content to his own principles of conduct. They describe a framework for this analysis. Their book is an explanation of a curriculum which provides for individual choice, within a framework of societal values. It deals with the problem of how to handle values in the classroom by the use of critical thinking (19).

Raths, Harmin, and Simon have developed a method of clarifying values by using a specific technique called the "clarifying response". The clarifying response consists of

a set of questions used by the teacher which encourage the student to consider: (1) what he has chosen, (2) what he has prized, and (3) what he has done. The clarifying response is only one aspect of their process of clarifying values. Their method explains strategies to use with the "process" of valuing rather than with values themselves (22).

This chapter has attempted to provide a brief summary of literature relating to values and the purpose of values in the school curriculum. There were numerous books reviewing values per se. After a few background sources were used, further books provided only repetitious information. Through exhaustive perusal of several libraries, a very limited supply of literature was found relating directly to this study. Regarding the relationship of the effect values have on changing behavior, almost no literature was found. To the knowledge of the researcher, there have been few methods developed to clarify the values of students (22:19). Because of these facts the researcher believed this study would have great significance.

## CHAPTER III

### PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY

#### The Subjects

Two fifth grade classrooms from Chinook Elementary School in Auburn, Washington, were used in this study. Thirty-one students in each room initially started in the program in September, 1968. Four students moved and three were transferred. One student was eliminated from the study because she suffered from a severe emotional disturbance. The data used in this study were compiled from the remaining fifty-four students.

One classroom, subsequently referred to as Group A, served as the experimental group and received the clarification process. The other classroom, subsequently referred to as Group B, served as the control group and did not receive the clarification process.

In an attempt to control the "teacher" variable, the teachers of both rooms arranged their schedules to avoid having self-contained classrooms. Both Group A and Group B were combined for team-teaching two hours per week for science and social studies. The boys from both groups were taught physical education two hours per week by the teacher of Group A; while the girls from both groups were taught by

the teacher of Group B. One hour each week both teachers exchanged classrooms for special projects.

### I. PRE-TEST

After an observation period of one month, two rating devices were used to determine the amount of value-related behavior in both Group A and Group B. From these two devices the researcher was able to determine: (1) the total amount of value-related behavior for each group, and (2) the total amount of value-related behavior for each individual.

#### Rating X

All the students in Group A and Group B were rated by their respective teachers using a form developed by Rath, Harmin, and Simon (22:178). Each teacher was instructed to rate each student on the frequency and acuteness with which he exhibited each of the eight types of behaviors (See Appendix: A.) The frequency scale was from zero to ten; the acuteness scale was from zero to six.

#### Rating Y

During the same week in which the Rating X was made by the teachers, a second form--Rating Y--was used by the students. Rating Y was a sociometric rating device which described ten types of behavior. (See Appendix: B.) Two of these were non-value related types (good-looking and

well-coordinated). They were used to disguise the nature of the instrument somewhat. Rating Y is a device suggested by Raths, Harmin, and Simon (22:179-181).

A class list was passed out to each student with the names of every class member on it. (See Appendix: C.) Each student was instructed to list, by number, any or all students who were somewhat or very much like any of the behavior types. If a student was rated as being very much like a behavior type, he was credited with ten points. If a student was rated as being somewhat like a behavior type, that student was credited with five points.

A brief explanation of the behavior types and the directions for the device were put on tape to avoid any bias that the examiner might have on the students during the testing situation. The students never saw the results of either rating devices--X or Y.

## II. VALUE-CLARIFICATION PROCESS

In an attempt to clarify the values of the students in Group A, the value-clarification process developed by Raths, Harmin, and Simon was used (22). This process centered around a series of questions the teacher asked the student(s). The questions were all derivatives of the three major elements of valuing: choosing, prizing, acting, as suggested by Raths, Harmin, and Simon (22).

Appendix: F shows some sample questions which were used.

Two methods of instruction were used: individual and group.

### Individual Method

The individual method was a private conversation between the teacher and an individual student. The individual session was short, lasting from two to three minutes in length, and occurred six to ten times a day. These private conversations consisted of the teacher using questions--the clarifying response--to aid the student in considering: (1) what he has chosen, (2) what he has prized, and (3) what he has done. (See Appendix: F.) These are some of the characteristics which describe the clarifying response questions developed by Raths, Harmin, and Simon (22:51-82):

- A. It is usually not an extended discussion. The idea is for the student to think, and he usually does that best alone.
- B. Clarifying responses operate in situations in which there are no "right" answers, such as in situations involving feelings, attitudes, beliefs, or purposes.
- C. The clarifying response avoids moralizing, criticizing, giving values, or evaluating.
- D. It does not try to do big things with its small comments. Each clarifying response is only one of many; the effect is cumulative.
- E. It puts the responsibility on the student to look at his behavior or his ideas and to think and decide for himself what it is he wants.

- F. The clarifying response also entertains the possibility that the student will not look, decide, or think. In this sense, it is permissive.

### Group Methods

The group session was longer in length, lasting from ten to thirty minutes in length, and occurred one or two times each week. The teacher used a variety of methods with the entire class, as opposed to one individual, in an attempt to clarify values. Below are listed the five most often used:

- A. Value Sheet. This was a provocative statement and a series of questions duplicated on a sheet of paper and distributed to class members. The purpose of this sheet was to raise an issue which may have had value implication for the students. Each student completed the sheet by himself. Later the writing, if volunteered, was shared and used as a basis for large or small group discussion (See Appendix: D.)
- B. Contrived Incident. The teacher contrived a situation in order to get the students beyond the level of mere verbal responses (See Appendix: E.)
- C. Role-Playing. The teacher set up a role-playing situation, selected the participants and outlined the initial stances. Sometimes characters were added; and sometimes people were asked to exchange roles.

- D. Voting. The teacher posed a list of questions; students stated their position by a show of hands. Sometimes the students were asked to prepare a voting list for the rest of the class.
- E. The Public Interview. The teacher exchanged seats with a volunteer who wished to be interviewed. The student picked the topic. A list of significant value areas, such as friendship, use of time, use of money, family, etc., were put on the board as possible suggestions of topics. The public interview was a dialogue between a student volunteer and the rest of the class. The teacher asked questions to clarify the discussion to the student and to the class. The class was free to ask questions of the student. Whenever the student did not want to answer that question, he would say, "I pass". Whenever the student wished to terminate the interview, he said, "Thank you for your questions".

### III. POST-TEST

In March both teachers of Group A and Group B rated their students using Rating X and Rating Y. The same tape that had been used for the Pre-Test was used again for the Post-Test. The study was initiated the last week in September, 1968. The value-clarification process was conducted for a period of six months. The culminating activity was

the administration of the Post-Test the last week in March, 1969.

#### IV. COLLECTION AND TREATMENT OF THE DATA

Because the procedures used for the collection and tabulation of the Pre-Test data was the same as for the Post-Test data, it would be redundant to describe them both. Therefore, the researcher has included only the description of the data collection for the Pre-Test.

##### Procedures for Collection of Pre-Test Data

Rating X was tallied by adding the number of points (both frequency and acuteness) credited to each student. The names and number of every student were printed on graph paper to tally Rating Y. Any student whose number had been placed on Rating Y was credited with five or ten points, depending on whether that student had been rated as being somewhat (five points) or very much (ten points) like a behavior type. The points that each student had been credited with were added together. The points for Rating X were added to the points for Rating Y, which gave each student a total rating for his behavior on the Pre-Test. Table I shows the total number of points credited to each student in the Pre-Test and the Post-Test for Group A and Group B.

.

### Treatment of the Data

All students in these two rooms were arbitrarily placed there by the school principal and their previous fourth grade teachers. The rooms were somewhat balanced by the attempt to make equivalent rooms in terms of each student's level of achievement, intelligence quotient, and ability to exercise self-control over his behavior in the classroom situation. This information was checked and verified to be true by the researcher. In this sense, the students were randomly selected. Therefore, the Randomized Group Design was an appropriate instrument to use. The formula regarding the t test was recommended and explained to the researcher by Dr. Bergstrom, Professor at Central Washington State College. The t test was used to compare the mean scores of the Pre-Test and Post-Test of Group A with the mean scores of the Pre-Test and Post-Test of Group B to determine if there was a difference, and if this difference was significant.

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA GATHERED

The points for Rating X were added to the points for Rating Y which gave each student a total rating for his behavior on the Pre-Test and the Post-Test. Table I shows the total number of points credited to each student in the Pre-Test and Post-Test for Group A and Group B.

The ratings for each Pre-Test and Post-Test were averaged. The mean average for each Pre-Test and Post-Test for Group A and Group B was found. The last column in Table I shows the mean average of the ratings of these four tests.

After the mean average for each test was found, it was necessary to find other information needed later in the comparing of these tests and groups by the use of the  $\underline{t}$  score. The following formula was used to find the  $\underline{t}$  score for the Randomized Group Design:

$$\frac{MB - MA}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum ya^2 - \sum yb^2}{Na + Nb - 2} \left( \frac{1}{Na} + \frac{1}{Nb} \right)}}$$

TABLE I  
RAW SCORE DATA FOR GROUP A AND GROUP B

Group A Students	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Group B Students	Pre-Test	Post-Test
1.	376	383	1.	341	417
2.	229	308	2.	107	242
3.	150	218	3.	429	637
4.	313	303	4.	467	537
5.	142	152	5.	174	209
6.	196	264	6.	292	339
7.	162	158	7.	105	138
8.	151	165	8.	320	385
9.	138	172	9.	168	312
10.	301	233	10.	153	95
11.	moved	moved	11.	383	404
12.	86	353	12.	532	149
13.	132	123	13.	322	192
14.	176	245	14.	384	437
15.	159	139	15.	trans.	trans.
16.	113	117	16.	177	379
17.	260	320	17.	144	186
18.	107	133	18.	134	221
19.	87	135	19.	254	278
20.	135	161	20.	258	279
21.	177	389	21.	367	172
22.	217	360	22.	239	196
23.	120	155	23.	moved	moved
24.	124	271	24.	132	76
25.	82	49	25.	238	499
26.	moved	moved	26.	115	118
27.	249	268	27.	trans.	trans.
28.	195	168	28.	trans.	trans.
29.	elim.	elim.	29.	130	107
30.	160	184	30.	255	210
31.	moved	moved	31.	401	412
Total	4737	5926	Total	7267	7626
Mean	175.444	219.481	Mean	260.037	282.444

trans. = transferred  
elim. = eliminated

The findings of the  $t$  scores are presented in Table II. The purpose in obtaining the  $t$  score was to compare the mean averages of the Pre-Test and Post-Test for Group A and Group B to determine if there was a difference, and if this difference was significant.

TABLE II  
 $t$  SCORE OF SIGNIFICANCE OF GROUP A AND GROUP B  
 FOR PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST

Groups Compared	$t$ Scores
Group A Pre-Test to Group A Post-Test	-1.943249
Group A Pre-Test to Group B Pre-Test	-3.083824*
Group A Post-Test to Group B Post-Test	-1.885077
Group B Pre-Test to Group B Post-Test	- .608832

\*Significant at one percent level of confidence.

Table II shows that differences did exist. The  $t$  score of Group A Pre-Test compared to Group A Post-Test (-1.943249) was not significant. The  $t$  score of Group A Pre-Test compared to Group B Pre-Test (-3.1083824) was significant at the one percent level of confidence. The  $t$  score of Group A Post-Test compared to Group B Post-Test (-1.885077) was not significant. The  $t$  score of Group B

Pre-Test compared to Group B Post-Test (-.608832) was not significant.

These t score findings are a comparison of two groups of twenty-seven, for a total of fifty-four students. The formula for computing the degrees of freedom for the groups measured:  $df = ( NA + NB ) - 2$ . NA means the number of students in Group A; NB means the number of students in Group B. Therefore, fifty-four minus two equals fifty-two, for the degrees of freedom (10:106).

A t score of 2.50 or more is necessary for a five percent level of confidence, and a t score of 2.66 or more is necessary for a one percent level of confidence when fifty-two is the degree of freedom (10:330). The five percent level of confidence means that in a similar study different findings would be due to chance not more than five percent of the time. The one percent level of confidence means that in a similar study different findings would be due to chance not more than one percent of the time (10:78).

The t scores shows that both groups were significantly different at the beginning of the study; however, neither group made significant growth. By the end of the study, the two groups were no longer significantly different. Why were these two groups no longer significantly different? Information about this question is included in Chapter V.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following paragraphs contain the summary, the conclusions made by the researcher in comparing the two groups in this study, and the recommendations for further study.

#### Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to determine two things: (1) if there was a significant difference between the behavior of Group A before and after the value-clarification process, and (2) if there was a significant difference between the behavior of Group A and the behavior of Group B after the value-clarification process.

#### Conclusions

On the basis of the results of this study, the null hypothesis was accepted. There were no significant differences in the ratings of the students who received the value-clarification process and those students who did not.

One of the most important parts of this study was the t score comparisons. The Pre-Test of Group A compared to the Post-Test of Group A was not significantly different. Although the Post-Test mean was higher than the Pre-Test mean, the difference may have been due to chance.

The Pre-Test of Group B compared to the Post-Test of Group B was not significantly different. Although the Post-Test score was higher than the Pre-Test score, the difference may have been due to chance.

The Pre-Test of Group A compared to the Pre-Test of Group B was significant. This means that Group A and Group B were significantly different at the beginning of the study.

The Post-Test of Group A compared to the Post-Test of Group B was not significantly different. Both groups scored higher on their Post-Test scores than they did on their Pre-Test scores. However, Group B did not increase nearly as much as Group A. The Pre-Test scores had been significantly different; yet, the Post-Test scores were not significantly different.

A second purpose of this study was to provide administrators and teachers with valid evidence which might support the inclusion of the value-clarification process in the school curriculum. The researcher believes that the t

score findings do not provide such valid evidence. However, the t scores do provide information for further research.

### Recommendations

Perhaps one of the most fruitful findings in this study was the significant difference of the Pre-Test of Group A compared to the Pre-Test of Group B. This difference could be attributed to different interpretations of the rating scales by the two different teachers. This difference could also be attributed to the lack of equally balanced classrooms before the study began. The researcher recommends that further research conducted in this area cautiously control the "teacher" variable and the random sampling of the rooms. An objective observer might be used as a control device in rating both rooms.

There are several other variables that might have influenced the results of the study: (1) The one-month period might not have been long enough for the teachers to have become familiar with the students' problems to identify them accurately on the Pre-Test of Rating X. (2) One week was used to explain to the students the terms used in the Pre-Test of Rating Y. This period might not have been long enough to equip fifth graders with the ability to interpret the sociometric rating device, Rating Y. (3) The maturational level of fifth grade students might be such

that they are unable to identify behavior types consistently. (4) The experience of being exposed to values, the clarification of values, and behavior types might give insight to students and cause them to identify fellow students who belong to a behavior type who they might not ordinarily be able to objectively identify.

It is only suggested that these four variables might have influenced the results of the study. There is no factual evidence to support these suggests. It is hoped that any further research in this area will consider these recommendations.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Baier, Kurt. The Moral Point of View. New York: Random House, 1965.
2. Berelson, Bernard. "The Great Debate on Cultural Democracy", as quoted in Donald N. Barret, Values in America.
3. Bethel, John (ed.). Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield, Massachusetts: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1960.
4. Boulding, Kenneth. The Meaning of the Twentieth Century. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.
5. Brubacher, John (ed.). The Public Schools and Spiritual Values. Seventh Yearbook of the John Dewey Society, New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1944.
6. Carleton, Front T. "Current Trends and Tensions", Sociology and Social Research, 39, No. 2, :110-15, (November-December), 1954.
7. Corey, Fay L. Values of the Future Teachers. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1955.
8. Dahlke, H. Otto. Values in Culture and Classroom. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1958.
9. Educational Policies Commission. Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public School. Washington: National Education Association of the United States, 1951.
10. Edwards, Allen L. Statistical Analysis for Students in Psychology and Education. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1953.
11. Fitzpatrick, Joseph. "Individualism in American Industry", as quoted in Donald N. Barret, Values in America. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1961.
12. Fromm, Erich. Escape from Freedom. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1941.

13. Harrington, Michael. The Accidental Century. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1966.
14. Hartman, Robert S. The Structure of Value. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1967.
15. Kluckhohn, Clyde. "The Study of Values", as quoted in Donald N. Barret, Values in America. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1961.
16. Macmillan, C.J.B., and George F. Kneller, "Philosophy of Education", Review of Educational Research, XXXIV, No. 1, (February, 1964).
17. Muller, H. J. as quoted in Donald N. Barret, Values in America. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1961.
18. Myrdal, Gunnar. An American Dilemma. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1944.
19. Oliver, Donald and James Shaver. Teaching Public Issues in the High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.
20. Peck, Robert F. The Psychology of Character Development. New York: Wiley Science Edition, 1964.
21. Perry, Ralph B. Realms of Value. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1954.
22. Raths, Louis E., Harmin Merrill, Sidney Simon. Values and Teaching. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1966.
23. Riesman, D., N. Glazer, and R. Denny. The Lonely Crowd. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.
24. Rich, John. Education and Human Values. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1968.
25. Rogers, Carl R. On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.
26. Russell, Bertrand. Why Men Fight. New York: The Century Company, 1916.

27. Rugg, Harold O. The Great Technology. New York: John Day Company, 1933.
28. Stien, Jess (ed.). The Random House Dictionary. New York: Random House, 1967.
29. Smith, John E. Value Convictions and Higher Education. New Haven, Connecticut: The Edward W. Hazen Foundation, 1958.
30. Stanley, William O. Education and Social Integration, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953.
31. Whyte, William Hollingsworth. The Organization Man. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1956.
32. Williams, Robin M., Jr. "Values in America" as quoted in Donald N. Barret, Values in America. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1961.
33. Williams, Robin M., Jr. "Cornell Value Studies" as quoted in Donald N. Barret, Values in America. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1961.

## APPENDIXES

APPENDIX: A

RATING X

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_

Directions: Rate the above student on the frequency and acuteness with which he exhibits each of the eight types of behaviors listed below. Use the scales provided for your ratings.

1. Apathetic: frequency this student exhibits this trait. \_\_\_\_\_  
acuteness of this behavior for this student. \_\_\_\_\_

2. Flightiness: frequency \_\_\_\_\_  
acuteness \_\_\_\_\_

3. Uncertainty: frequency \_\_\_\_\_  
acuteness \_\_\_\_\_

4. Inconsistency: frequency \_\_\_\_\_  
acuteness \_\_\_\_\_

5. Drifting: frequency \_\_\_\_\_  
acuteness \_\_\_\_\_

6. Conformity: frequency \_\_\_\_\_  
acuteness \_\_\_\_\_

7. Dissension: frequency \_\_\_\_\_  
acuteness \_\_\_\_\_

8. Role-playing: frequency \_\_\_\_\_  
acuteness \_\_\_\_\_

FREQUENCY SCALE

- 0--Never
- 1--Almost never
- 2--Perhaps every few months
- 3--Monthly, on the average
- 4--Several times monthly
- 5--Weekly
- 6--Several times weekly
- 7--Daily
- 8--Several times daily
- 9--Hourly
- 10--Constantly

ACUTENESS SCALE

- 0--Not at all
- 1--Extremely mild
- 2--Mild
- 3--Medium
- 4--Relatively acute
- 5--Acute
- 6--Extremely acute

Note: This is an example of a form that was used by the teachers. The general model for this was taken from Raths, Harmin, and Simon, Values and Teaching, 1961.

APPENDIX: B

SOCIOMETRIC RATING DEVICE  
RATING Y

WHO IS LIKE THIS?

1. I do not seem to be interested in anything. I sit quietly, dully, passively, bored much of the time in school and out of school. I don't care one way or the other. I am apathetic, disinterested.
  - A. What students are VERY MUCH like this?
  - B. What students are SOMEWHAT like this?
  
2. I am flighty. I am interested in a lot of things, but only for fleeting moments, then I get interested in something entirely different. I can get started, but I don't seem to follow through. I am attracted to a million things, but I don't stick with anything long enough to do something it. I fly rapidly from this to that.
  - A. What students are VERY MUCH like this?
  - B. What students are SOMEWHAT like this?
  
3. I am considered good-looking. I look like people in movies or in pictures. Some people might call me handsome or beautiful.\*
  - A. What students are VERY MUCH like this?
  - B. What students are SOMEWHAT like this?
  
4. It's hard for me to make up my mind. I take a long time to make decisions. I am full of doubts. I am often very uncertain.
  - A. What students are VERY MUCH like this?
  - B. What students are SOMEWHAT like this?

## APPENDIX: B (cont.)

5. I am very inconsistent. Today I may be for something, but tomorrow I may be against it. It's hard to tell what side I will be on. I say this, but I do that. Or sometimes I say one thing and then, later, say just the opposite.
- A. What students are VERY MUCH like this?
  - B. What students are SOMEWHAT like this?
6. I just seem to drift. I go from here to there without having much to do with it. I don't care much. I go the way events take me, I don't struggle. Some people might call me a drifter.
- A. What students are VERY MUCH like this?
  - B. What students are SOMEWHAT like this?
7. I am well-coordinated. I may not be strong, but I can control my motions and can play sports very well. Some people say I am graceful. I am not at all clumsy.\*
- A. What students are VERY MUCH like this?
  - B. What students are SOMEWHAT like this?
8. I like to conform to what is expected of me. I may conform to what a grown-up wants. I may conform to what other kids want. I may have one person to follow and I do whatever that person wants. But I don't much want to be independent. I like to follow someone else's lead.
- A. What students are VERY MUCH like this?
  - B. What students are SOMEWHAT like this?
9. I am just the opposite of a conformer--I like to dissent, to argue with anyone and everyone, to take the opposite point of view. I seem to be against most everything. I like to argue, complain, dissent.
- A. What students are VERY MUCH like this?
  - B. What students are SOMEWHAT like this?

## APPENDIX: B (cont.)

10. I like to make believe that I am somebody else. I often play roles, pretending that I am somebody different, right in the classroom or outside. I like to act even when there is no play.
- A. What students are VERY MUCH like this?
  - B. What students are SOMEWHAT like this?

\*These were two non-value related types (good-looking and well-coordinated) used to disguise the nature of the instrument somewhat. This rating scale is a sample one which was used by the students. The model for this scale was taken from Raths, Harmin, and Simon, Values and Teaching, 1961.

APPENDIX: C

<u>BOYS</u>	<u>GIRLS</u>
1. CLARENCE	19. MARY
2. TERRY	20. SHERI
3. JOHN	21. PATTI
4. WAYNE	22. DEBBIE
5. GREGG	23. CATHY
6. JEFF	24. LISA
7. JODY	25. SCARLETT
8. FRED	26. NADINE
9. DAVID	27. LESLIE
10. BILL	28. LYNN
11. DAVID	29. PHYLLIS
12. DENNIS	30. CATHY
13. STEVE	31. HOLLY
14. BRITT	
15. STEVE	
16. DAVID	
17. JACK	
18. STEVE	

CLASS LIST

Note: This is a sample form for the class list that was used with the sociometric rating device. This class list was used with Group A.

APPENDIX: D

VALUE SHEET

FRIENDSHIP

Student's Name \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS: Please answer these questions. You may add any comments if you wish. If you would like to discuss this with others, you may join the group in the back of the room after you finish writing your thoughts down. If you would not like to discuss this, hand your paper in.

1. What does friendship mean to you? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

2. If you have friends, did you choose them or did they get to be your friends by accident? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

3. In what ways do you show friendship? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

4. How important do you think it is to develop and maintain friendships? \_\_\_\_\_

5. If you plan to make any changes in your ways, please say what changes you will make. If you do not intend to make any changes in your ways, write, "No changes". \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Note: This is a sample of a Value Sheet that was used with Group A.

## APPENDIX: E

### THE CONTRIVED INCIDENT

A discussion was brought up by the students about rigged TV quiz shows. After the class discussed this for some time, they decided that no one had really done anything wrong by giving some of the contestants the answers beforehand.

The next day the teacher concocted a very difficult test. The teacher hinted to a few of the students that she wouldn't mind if they looked at the answers at her desk. After the test, in which the students who had the answers got perfect scores and everyone else in the class did poorly, the class was told what had happened.

All the students complained bitterly about the unfairness of the situation. The teacher reopened the discussion on the quiz scandals. The students reconsidered their value indicators--beliefs, attitudes, feelings.

Note: This is a summary of what happened in a contrived incident in Group A.

APPENDIX: F

CLARIFYING-RESPONSE QUESTIONS

1. Is this something that you prize?
2. Are you glad about that?
3. Did you consider any alternatives?
4. Have you felt this way for a long time?
5. Was that something that you yourself selected or chose?
6. Did you have to choose that; was it a free choice?
7. Do you do anything about that idea?
8. Can you give me some examples of that idea?
9. Where would that idea lead; what would be its consequences?
10. What are some good things about that notion?
11. Is what you said consistent with what you just said?
12. What other possibilities are there?
13. Is that a personal preference or do you think most people should believe that?
14. How can I help you do something about your idea?
15. Is there a purpose back of this activity?
16. Is that very important to you?
17. Do you do this often?
18. Would you like to tell others about your idea?
19. Would you do the same thing over again?
20. How do you know it's right?

Note: These are examples of questions used by the teacher. Some of these questions were suggested by Raths, Harmin, and Simon, Values and Teaching, 1966.