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This study was to determine the extent to which the use of high-level questioning, through eliciting responses to selected poems, affects children's value claims.

Twenty-seven seventh-grade boys comprised the control group, and twenty-seven eighth-grade boys comprised the experimental group. The experimental group took part in values-clarification experiences for sixteen weeks. The control group received no value instruction. The *Values Inventory* was administered to both groups at the beginning and at the end of the sixteen weeks.

Testing of the hypotheses resulted in eight of the hypotheses being significant at the .01 level, indicating that values-clarification experiences using high-level questioning and selected poems did affect children's value claims.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Children are living in a very confusing world in which they must continually make choices regarding their attitudes and actions. The importance of the early formative years of childhood has been well established by Bloom (2), Dinkmeyer and Dreikurs (9), and Kagan and Moss (15). Getzels concluded that successful growing up is concerned with having a satisfactory set of rules by which to live as well as having a stable self-identity (11). It is only in a free and relaxed atmosphere of mutual respect and acceptance that children can express themselves and think about things that influence their lives. Rogers believes that man works toward goals of growth and health and that he is quite capable of solving his own problems if he is in an unthreatening climate (31). According to Simon, "our choices will be made on the basis of the values we hold, but frequently we are not clear about our own values" (38, p. 14). That children learn values in early childhood is well-established. Trager and Yarrow concluded that in kindergarten, children have the kinds of attitudes and beliefs which make for disunity, disharmony, and unhappiness in group life (41). Based on these research findings, it seems appropriate to emphasize values during the early years while the child is impressionable and receptive.
One concern for our schools is the lack of attention being given to value formation. This contention is supported by Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia, who concluded, "What is necessary is a systematic effort to collect evidence of growth in affective objectives which is in any way parallel to the very great and systematic efforts to evaluate cognitive achievement" (20, p. 4). An argument in support of the need for our schools to provide its students with circumstances and experiences that will enhance their affective development was given by the White House Conference on Children, Report of Forum 4 (1970), which stated

Next to parents, the schools and churches are the major influences on the growing child. The teacher's values, attitudes, and prejudices, restrictiveness or permissiveness, what and how he teaches, and the strong points and the shortcomings of the school system itself profoundly affect a child's development. Our educational institutions must be examined and upgraded. Special emphasis should be placed on ethical reasoning, value formation, and individual ethical choice, rather than on teaching one specific set of values. To be able to provide this instruction teachers must be specifically trained in child development and value formation (43, p. 9).

Raths believes that people live their values. They communicate values in their relationship with people (30, p. 317). Students need experience in valuing to enable them to answer the questions that concern them. Kawin considered the individual to be the social entity through which the perpetuation of the values of a culture was accomplished; therefore, educational endeavors should be directed toward the cultivation
and enhancement of the value perceptions of young children (16). It is not the teacher's function to indoctrinate children. Rather, part of his job is to discuss the alternatives and their consequences with every child. A highly stimulating environment, rich in alternatives, is rich in potential for child growth. However, choices can be overwhelming. Through values clarification the children receive appropriate aids and reinforcement in order to help them discern what they think and how they feel and then to make some decisions on that basis. The development of values rather than teaching fixed values helps the child take the next step in a direction toward value claims, preventing the imposition of attitudes that are alien to him. According to Paschal, "values grow through prizing, cherishing, appreciating, esteeming, holding dear. Values also are learned through discrimination in the face of choices and through arriving at a generalization" (27, pp. 77-78).

An important point to consider is whether a child will alter his pattern of values through a clarification process. A more pertinent issue is that concerning the conditions under which a person can alter his values. According to Rogers, in a permissive atmosphere, the child can afford to change, to reconsider perceptions, and to integrate them. Under such conditions, he is free from having to cling to his values. The child learns to experience, fail, and try again without feeling that he is a failure (32). Effective
education is a program that emphasizes both critical thinking and affective education in a functional program. Times do occur when students are frustrated by situations and incidents in their lives. They are overwhelmed by the feeling that they do not know where to go or how to act and that they inevitably have to bow to circumstances or fight without direction or reason. It seems probable that in order to help students learn to evaluate conclusions for themselves rather than blindly to accept them, educators need to help students seek out reasons of a particular value claim. Thus, the teacher may attempt to clarify the ideas elicited from his students by asking high-level questions.

Creative thinking dies in an authoritarian atmosphere and thrives in an atmosphere of freedom and security. When one feels free to speculate, to toy with ideas, to think, and to respond to questions without the threat of lowered self-esteem, then he is free to create. According to Kirschenbaum, most people assume that thinking skills are necessary to develop clear values; but this has rarely been made explicit by humanistic educators. Both in theory and in practice, the thinking area should not be slighted (18). Bloom has emphasized the levels of thinking—memory, translation, interpretation, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation—and has encouraged teachers to help students learn higher levels of thinking (3). The choosing and communication processes of valuing, especially, are influenced by the
thinking process. According to Kohlberg, higher-level thinking should continue to be a major concern for the humanist. It is through this device that students clarify values (19).

The question arises as to whether or not it may be possible to stimulate the development of values through values-clarification processes—thinking critically in deciding what these values are. Literature exists to communicate an experience—to invite the reader's participation in it. Hence, it can both broaden and deepen the reader's experience; but poetry, by its concentrated use of all the resources of language, potentially can communicate more intensely whatever experience its creator would have the reader share. Hence, for the deepening of experience, it seems to be an appropriate tool for values-clarification strategies.

The previous comments indicate the importance of values in the educational process and support the need for research related to strategies for helping children formulate values at the elementary school level. The early adolescent years are critical ones in the process of value formation and not only guidance personnel but educators in general need to turn their attention to their importance. Because of this recognized need, this study was undertaken.
Statement of the Problem

The problem explored by this study was that of determining the extent to which the use of high-level questioning, through eliciting responses to selected poems, affected the expression of a value position.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to measure the effects that high-level questioning, through eliciting responses to selected poems, had upon the expression of value positions on (1) tolerance and worth of others, (2) persistence, (3) love and affection, (4) social egalitarianism, (5) recognition-status, (6) altruism, (7) materialism, and (8) social friendliness.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated:

I. Boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group will show significantly greater mean gains on the "tolerance and worth of others" value subscale of the Values Inventory.

II. Boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group will show significantly greater mean gains on the "persistence" subscale of the Values Inventory.

III. Boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group will show significantly greater
mean gains on the "love and affection" subscale of the Values Inventory.

IV. Boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group will show significantly greater mean gains on the "social egalitarianism" subscale of the Values Inventory.

V. Boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group will show significantly greater mean gains on the "recognition-status" subscale of the Values Inventory.

VI. Boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group will show significantly greater mean gains on the "altruism" subscale of the Values Inventory.

VII. Boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group will show significantly greater mean gains on the "materialism" subscale of the Values Inventory.

VIII. Boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group will show significantly greater mean gains on the "social friendliness" subscale of the Values Inventory.

IX. Boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group will show significantly greater mean gains on the total Values Inventory.
Significance of the Study

Concern for value orientation has significant implications for a movement to bring affective education into the schools. Because individuals are assailed by divergent value claims and because the child is confronted with an increasing number of choices, a heightened concern with values may be appropriate. Since society has changed so rapidly and since many have been unable to recognize their own values, a possible remedy to the lack of clear values has appeared in the form of values-clarification processes.

Although many have recognized and accepted the importance of values in education—Allport (1), Brameld (6), Glanz (12), Mathewson (23), Mead (24), Ohlsen (25), Spindler (39)—their study and relationship to the educational process have often been avoided or the results ignored. Bonner wrote,

It is a regrettable fact that the so-called behavioral sciences, particularly psychology, have excluded the investigation of human values for their domain . . . this is more true in view of the fact that nothing in the whole spectrum of human conduct so embodies and expresses the humanness of human nature as individual and social values (4, p. 57).

Ryan cited the need to investigate the following:

(1) Conceptualizing home and school values,
(2) Determining commonality of values across school settings, and
(3) Determining congruence of values between and within home, school, and community groups (34, p. 3).

He further concluded that,

Although a wealth of research in values has been conducted over the years, questions concerning values and the educational process have remained
largely unanswered, partly because of the changing role and nature of the school, and partly because of the dynamic nature of culture and values (34, p. 5).

Perhaps the most pertinent argument on the neglect of values by researchers was pointed out by Glanz when he stated,

The issue of individual values has long been ignored by guidance and education. The premises of education within a free society have seemingly forbidden the indoctrination of any value or set of values.

The tendency to back away from such issues has hurt the potentially productive and sensitive student who must assume a responsive role as a citizen and member of society. Education that depends upon the indoctrination of a specific set of values is certainly inimical to the traditions of a free and open society such as exists in America. Yet the controlling nature of values and their overwhelming importance in determining the nature and quality of life demands that they be examined by education and guidance (12, pp. 201-202).

Lang felt we should consider the values of our youth by creating a climate that allows them to express their values in writing and speaking (21). In his work of developing a value inventory, Prince suggested,

Although the study reported here was carried out with a secondary school population, there are implications for administrators and teachers in the elementary school. If it be true that value patterns are formed and pretty well crystallized before the student reaches the secondary school then perhaps the elementary school, beginning with the kindergarten, plays an important role in instilling values. This calls for research on the elementary school level (28, p. 384).

Hawkes tended to agree with Prince by relating that "the study of personal values in these early years is of crucial importance since, if we are to educate wisely, we must know more about the individual at an earlier age" (14, p. 665).
According to Dewey, the aim of education is growth or development, both intellectual and moral. He believed in building a free and powerful character (8). The strength of values clarification might be seen in the writings of Kohlberg, who stated that values clarification does not attempt to go further than eliciting awareness of values (19). Yarrow's study attempted to discover the origin and nature of the value systems of children:

The formation and inculcation of attitudes and values constitute a critical dimension of child development—personality, intellectual and physical development, social behavior, etc. Neither theories nor data nor methods of investigation have succeeded fully in giving understanding of this field, although it is rich in thoughtful research (44, p. 645).

Studies by Simon (37), Covault (7), Wenker, Konner, Hammon, and Egner (42) back up the contention that when children have clear values, they work more purposefully, become more productive, sharpen their thinking, and improve their relationships.

Writings of Glasser (13), Rogers (33), and Maslow (22) suggest that students must learn to correct themselves through a self-evaluation process, thus fulfilling their personal needs. Rogers feels that if a child is put into a supportive social environment and encouraged to tune into his feelings, and is given alternatives from which to choose, he will naturally tend to make wise judgments and will use experience to correct judgments that are unwise (31, p. 13). Studies by Ramirez (29), Olmo (26), Scriven (35), Stewart (40), and
Shane (36) support the belief that students need to be exposed to exercises with which students may arrive at and test conclusions about values and attitudes, believing that whether or not one can improve the human prospect hinges on the way one examines his system of beliefs, the values, and the alternatives that values open or close. Kenworthy believes that people are striving to secure peace and to live together harmoniously; therefore, education must provide classroom situations in which children can discuss and clarify what has caused conflict among individuals and groups (17). Raths suggests that education helps children discover and examine choices and make them freely and help children weigh alternatives thoughtfully, reflecting on consequences of each, intending to help children clarify for themselves what they value (37).

The previous findings reflect the importance of value study in the educational process and support the need for further research. The early developmental years of childhood are critical ones in the process of value formation; thus, educators need to turn their attention to affective education. Researchers seem to support the need for designing learning environments in which young people learn a process of clarifying and developing their own values.
Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study the following definitions were formulated:

**Value.**—"concepts in the minds of men which are reflected in specific value claims made by individuals, representing the quality of worth or merit which men place on various aspects of their experience and by which they judge that experience" (10, pp. 4-5).

**Values clarification strategy.**—"series of exercises designed to help students sort through their thoughts and make a conscious effort to determine their own values" (38, p. 336).

**Valuing question.**—encourages a person to consider alternatives and to make choices.

**High-level questioning.**—"Questions of this type call for the child to check categories of knowledge he now has and further requires that he regroup some skills and extend his ideas as he bridges gaps in his thinking process. For example, he uses the skills of classifying, comparing, contrasting, synthesizing, and substituting previously acquired ideas, as well as transforming information from one situation to another" (5, p. 99).

**Worth of others.**—"recognition of unique worth and dignity of every individual; consideration of a person as an end rather than as a means" (1, p. 4).
Persistence.—"Pursuit of an activity in spite of opposition or resistance; insistence in the repetition of a question, opinion, or activity; tenacity" (34, p. 22).

Love and affection.—"liking others and being liked; feeling love and friendship in individual and group relationships" (34, p. 64).

Social egalitarianism.—"having social concern for others; being tolerant and respecting of others" (34, p. 51).

Recognition-status.—"desiring status, importance, acknowledgment by others" (34, p. 62).

Altruism.—"desire to help others, especially those who are less fortunate; concern for others" (34, p. 23).

Materialism.—"money and material goods considered as a source of happiness" (34, p. 24).

Social friendliness.—"being able to get along with others" (34, p. 64).

Limitations of the Study
This study had the following limitations:
1. The sample was drawn from one locality.
2. The sample was comprised of all boys, since the school from which the sample was drawn was a boys' school.
3. The subjects were relatively homogeneous in intelligence and socioeconomic background.

4. The majority of the subjects were of the same religion.

5. The values clarification experiences had a short duration—four months.

Basic Assumptions

It was assumed that the instructor of the experimental group and the instructor of the control group were sufficiently objective and accepting of student responses that students were not influenced by what they might have perceived the instructors' values to be.

It was assumed that the subjects responded honestly and to the best of their ability to the instrument used to measure values.

It was assumed that seventh- and eighth-grade children are similar in their stage of development.

Procedures for Collecting Data

The study was conducted in one private Catholic school in a large metropolitan city in Texas. Twenty-seven seventh-grade boys were involved in the control group. Twenty-seven eighth-grade boys were involved in the experimental group. Both groups were self-contained classes.

The research design for the study was a Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design. The following instrument was used to determine value claims of the students:
The Values Inventory, designed by Ryan of the Hawaii University Educational Research and Development Center, was used to measure value claims in the following dimensions: (1) tolerance and worth of others, (2) persistence, (3) love and affection, (4) social egalitarianism, (5) recognition-status, (6) altruism, (7) materialism, (8) social friendliness.

The Values Inventory was administered at the beginning of the experiment and again at the end of the experiment. The teacher of the experimental group administered the pretest and posttest to his class; the teacher of the control group administered the pretest and posttest to his class.

Each of the eight subscales of the Values Inventory contained an answer sheet on which the boys responded to each item on the instrument by rating each item on a scale from 1 to 5 (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree).

**Procedures for the Analysis of Data**

Analysis of covariance with the pretest as the covariate was used to test whether the differences were significant between the mean gain of the pretest and posttest for the experimental group on each subscale of the Values Inventory and the mean gain of the pretest and posttest for the control group on each subscale of the Values Inventory.
Analysis of covariance with the pretest as the covariate was used to test whether the differences were significant between the total mean gain of the pretest and posttest for the experimental group and the total mean gain of the pretest and posttest for the control group on the complete Values Inventory.

The level of significance was set at .05 level. Computer processing at North Texas State University was used for the statistical analysis of all data. Data are entered in tables for ease of presentation.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Survey of the literature reveals that studies on values in relation to elementary school have tended to emanate from the following considerations: (1) meaning of values, (2) value acquisition, (3) stability of values, and (4) domain of values.

Meaning of Values

Researchers reveal in their studies that much difficulty exists in attempting to define values. Raths, Harmin, and Simon stated,

The meaning of the term "value" is by no means clear in the social sciences or in philosophy. One can find consensus for no definition. About the only agreement that emerges is that a value represents something important in human existence. Perhaps because it is such a pivotal term, each school of thought invents it with its own definition. For the same reason, a particular definition is so often acceptable elsewhere (80, pp. 9-10).

Krathwohl defined a value as "a thing, phenomenon, or behavior having worth" (57, p. 139). Kluckhohn defined a value as a "conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, or the desirable, which influence the selection from available modes, means, and ends of action" (52, p. 395). "Of all the variables we have dealt with so far," said Kahl, "value orientations are the most difficult to point
to in the real world" (46, p. 8). He defined values as "convictions shared by people in a given culture or sub-
culture about the things they consider good, important or beautiful" (46, p. 10). Jacob and Flink reported,
The term value is an exceedingly slippery term covering a wide range of phenomena from ideologies to habitual responses of various types of individuals, social groups, governments, private institutions and nations (43, p. 7). Winthrop saw the difficulty in the following way:

... the failure to recognize that there is no single problem of value but rather a congeries of problems referred to as the problem of value. In the existing literature the term "value" is used pluralistically for a variety of contexts and objectives, with no common semantic or syntactical referent (98, p. 175).

Katz described values as outer expressions of needs influenced by culture (49). Goldstein wrote that "the affect of values is derived from association with need gratification or deprivation with emotional arousal" (25, p. 98). Mathewson wrote,

It seems helpful to detach values somewhat distinctly from needs. And also, to consider values apart from what we have called "implemental" modes of response; for the behavior dispositions of an individual can carry him away from a path he may genuinely desire to follow in pursuit of his values. He may then remain in conflict until he either changes his values or regulates his behavior in accord with the values. Then again, a value such as "preserving maximum freedom of thought and action" might find its outlet or satisfaction in many different types of occupations requiring widely varying abilities. The task of integrating one's life and building a harmonious balance among various subjective forces, and relating these in turn to situational conditions and opportunities in a personally satisfying and socially serviceable way, is indeed the highest of all arts. That this need not be left wholly to luck or accident is a basic credo of guidance (65, pp. 25-26).
A few writers defined values in relation to satisfaction.

Value was defined by Kaplan as being

... any conceivable object ... person, event, process or relationship from the standpoint of its capacity to satisfy any particular interest and, therefore as a means to life abundant or salvation in general (48, p. 313).

This view was also shared by Sletto, who wrote,

Personal values may be defined as goals of living, the ends that an individual will endure pain or exert effort to attain or maintain, and that he considers to be essential to his happiness or well-being. . . .

These values may be those factors that give one economic security, occupational status, the good opinions of one's fellows, or the means to be continued satisfactions of one's desires. Again, they may be elements in one's philosophy of living . . . religious convictions, ethical standards, definitions, or situations (89, p. 83).

Researchers also cited many examples of values being closely associated with interests. For example, Good defined value in the following way:

A subjective-objective attitude, concern or condition involving a precept or an idea in attention and a combination of intellectual and feeling consciousness; may be temporary or permanent; based on native curiosity, conditioned by experience; and preference displayed when choices are available (26, p. 593).

Miller saw a difference between values and interests and reported,

The principal difference between interests and values involve reference to some norm or standard, while interests do not. On the subjective side, interests are likes, while values are concepts of what is felt or thought to be desirable. Both interests and values are directed toward some kind of object or activity. A person is not simply
interested, he is interested in something, and in
the case of values there must be something which
is conceived as desirable. And so we may speak of
subjective and objective aspects of both interests
and values (70, p. 176).

Some researchers considered the relationship between
beliefs and attitudes. Raths related values to individual
beliefs, attitudes, activities, or feelings that satisfy
certain criteria (80). Other researchers distinguished
between beliefs and values, such as Thomas (94) and Williams
(97). Rokeach believes that values are on a hierarchy within
each individual, some being more important than others. In
attempting to distinguish values from attitudes, he made
these distinctions.

While an attitude represents several beliefs
focused on a specific object or situation, a value
is a single belief that transcendentally guides
actions and judgments across specific objects and
situations, and beyond immediate goals to more
ultimate end-states of existence. Moreover, a
value, unlike an attitude, is imperative to action,
not only a belief about the preferable but also a
preference for the preferable. Finally, a value,
unlike an attitude, is a standard or yardstick to
guide actions, attitudes, comparisons, evaluations,
and justifications of self and others (82, p. 160).

Allport also pointed to the difference between values and
attitudes.

Since an attitude is always directed toward some
object, it may be defined as a "state of mind of an
individual toward a value." Values are usually
social in nature; that is to say, they are objects
of common regard on the part of the socialized man.
Love of money, desire for fame, hatred of foreigners,
respect for scientific doctoring are typical atti-
tudes. It follows that money, fame, foreigners, and
scientific theory are values (2, p. 802).
Conclusion

In reviewing the literature concerning the attempts to define values, it was apparent that a major difficulty in defining the term value was compounded by the fact that value is often used to mean attitudes, beliefs, desires, and preferences. From these multiple definitions, values seem to mean the placement of worth on a phenomenon, belief, or behavior, after considering alternatives and reflecting on their consequences. Values become a standard by which to guide actions and attitudes in making judgments.

Value Acquisition

Researchers seem to reflect a wide range of views concerning value acquisition. They seem to imply that children learn values in much the same way that they learn any other concept, primarily through personal experience. Kagan suggested the following ideas concerning value acquisition:

"...we speak of learning values by compliance ... by identification, and ... by internalization" (45, pp. 258-259).

Several writers indicated that value acquisition was related to culture. Mussen remarked that culture expects and trains its members to behave in ways that are acceptable to the group (74). Parsons and White wrote,

Values, we assume, are located in the first instance in the culture. The first-order differentiation of values then concerns the primary class of objects with which human action is inherently
concerned . . . the four great categories of empirical objects with which human beings are inevitably implicated, namely social systems, personalities, organisms, and the physical world (74, pp. 99-100).

Hyman (42) and Kohn (56) suggested that attitudes, values, and aspirations of lower class people do differ from those of other classes. Getzels mentioned differences in values of upper, middle, and lower class in terms of importance attached to family, property, law, education, aggression, industry, cleanliness, and sex (23). Hodge and Treiman said that "class identification rests not only upon one's own location in the status structure but upon the socioeconomic level of one's acquaintances" (37, p. 535). Studies of Havighurst and Taba, however, did not support value differences across socioeconomic levels (33).

Other researchers considered the idea of racial factors as influences in value acquisition, such as Cosby (17), Hughes and Thompson (40), Whisenton and Loree (96), and Shuster (86). Rowland and Del Campo, however, indicated that there are not great value differences between normal and educationally disadvantaged students (84).

Strong support seemed to be evident in the literature concerning the influence of religious beliefs on value acquisition. In a study by Light, it was reported that "Catholics from parochial schools perform rituals more often and are fuller members of the Catholic community, but their academic, political, and social lives are otherwise quite
similar to the lives of public school Catholics" (62, p. 3). Fichter found that Catholics in parochial schools had stronger religious backgrounds than the Catholics in the public schools; but he found little difference in the conduct, outside activities, cultural and social preferences, and values and attitudes between the Catholics who attended parochial schools and the Catholics who attended public schools (22). Rokeach tried to determine "whether those who are religious have a pattern of values that is distinctly different from those who are less religious and nonreligious" (83, p. 3). He found significant differences in value systems between the groups of adult Americans. In another study of values, religious practices, and views of race relations of 1,000 adult Americans, Rokeach found that the more frequently a person went to church the less social compassion he expressed (83). Hogan and Dickstein in a study of ninety-two male undergraduates and their moral judgments found that those males identified as mature tended to be sensitive to injustice, well-socialized, empathetic, and autonomous (38). The studies do tend to support the idea that religious experiences do affect the acquisition of values, both in children attending parochial schools and children attending public schools.

Researchers also saw the family as one of the agencies of value acquisition. Bernhardt viewed the quality of the home as the most fundamental influence in the life of the child and instrumental in providing meaning and interpretation
for his many and varied experiences (9). Stolz expressed the importance of parental values as a factor in determining child-rearing practices: "... a parent's child-rearing behavior flows from his values and beliefs, interacting with his personality characteristics in a situation involving his child" (93, p. 31). Stolz, in describing a study concerned with discovering what values actually entered into a parent's child-rearing practices, reported that one-fourth of all values are related to the role of father and mother (93). The profound effects of the parental relationship upon the child were emphasized by Merrill and Eldridge, who stated: "... the family is still considered the basic social institution, whose importance in the life of the individual still transcends that of any other" (68, p. 439). From these studies, it seems that the research findings strongly support the idea that the family is still considered to be a strong influence on the child's acquisition of values.

Researchers found that the sex role of the child is a variable in the childhood socialization process as well as an influence on the acquisition of values. Barry, Bacon, and Child, in a cross-cultural survey of certain aspects of socialization, responded that

... differentiation of the sexes is unimportant in infancy, but that in childhood there is, as in our society, a widespread pattern of greater pressure toward nurturance, obedience, and responsibility in girls, and toward self-reliance and achievement striving in boys (7, p. 345).
Biller surmised that socialization practices in the United States foster quite clear-cut sex differences (10).

Many researchers found that the process of modeling was a means through which children acquire values. Havighurst hypothesized that traits of character are learned to a large extent through these processes.

It is established that the young child probably as early as the third year of his life, forms the habit of unconscious imitation of those who are close to him emotionally. This habit extends to people who seem to him to be people of authority... It appears, also, that the child imitates a wide variety of types of behavior, from physical forms such as gait and vocal expression to language and personal habits and value preferences (34, p. 101).

Combined with this psychological principle of imitation or modeling there was that of identification. In fact, imitation and identification were often treated as synonymous since, as Bandura, Ross, and Ross explained, both encompass the same behavioral phenomenon, the tendency for a person to copy or imitate the behavior and attitudes exhibited by various models (6). Moore, in relating this process of imitation to the acquisition of values, suggested that from imitating adults whom they admire, children gradually come to identify with them and with their values. These values gradually become integrated into the child's personality to become guides for behavior and motivation toward desired ends (71, p. 32).

Researchers also related important findings concerning the interaction with age mates in value acquisition.
Campbell viewed the importance of the peer group as "a determinant of acceptance and stability in social relations, as a contributor to the child's developing self-concept and as one of the factors operating to form the child's attitudes and values concerning the world about him" (12, p. 274). It was also thought that the personality of the child was also influenced by those early experiences to which he was subjected. Gordon contended,

Environmental inputs begin at birth, and they are conveyed to the child by family or family surrogates who operate in terms of their own conditions of life, including ethnic, social class, national and cultural patterns. These inputs interact with the child's own uniqueness, develops his own interpretations, his own synthesis of the experiences, and defines his self accordingly (27, p. 11).

Some authorities considered that character and the values to which a child subscribed were a direct result of his early experiences. Bernhardt stated that early experiences are intimately related to the character development of the child and that the foundation for character development is laid in the first decade of the child's life. During these years, the child builds his knowledge of what is right and wrong, good or bad, and what society requires of him. He also acquires his basic attitudes toward others, his value system, and his guiding principles during these early years (9, p. 133).

Cultural institutions, such as the school and church, apparently exert an indirect effect upon the child in his
process of value acquisition. Thomas called attention to the role of the schools as they functioned in the socialization of the child. He contended that as society becomes increasingly complex, socialization agents, such as the family, have difficulty in dealing with the multiplicity of issues; so the schools become a primary source of cultural authority (94, p. 178). Ausubel, speaking of the impact that the school has on the development of the personality of the child, concluded,

In addition to its special function of imparting knowledge and intellectual skills, the school in our society shares in many of the socializing and enculturative responsibilities exclusively exercised by the family in other cultures. It not only participates in the transmission of our particular cultural ideology and psychological traits, but also plays an important role in development of ego status and ego maturity goals and in the acquisition of acceptable standards of social behavior (5, p. 437).

Parsons reiterated Ausubel's contention and concluded that the schools are one of the mechanisms by which fundamental character and value commitments are developed. They also serve as institutions through which the members of the oncoming generation are selectively allocated within the social structure (73, p. 277). The main concern of the church as a social institution was, of course, with the moral and ethical aspects of child development. Kagan had this to say about the purpose of religion in society: "Religion hopes to have its value system so internalized that satisfaction in it comes not from approval or conformity but from the inner content of the
experience itself" (45, p. 269). McCandless found that the church is quite successful in teaching children the verbal distinctions between "right and wrong:" but that there appears to be little internalization in the form of conscience, honesty, application of truth, freedom from race prejudice, and so on, that can be directly attributed to church membership (66).

The character traits of a child represented another important dimension relative to the values he acquired. Character was defined by Hogan as

> those dispositions and traits that are subject to moral evaluations within a society. That is, character is defined not by what a person does, but by his reasons for doing it, by the recurring motives and dispositions that give stability and coherence to his social conduct (39, p. 5).

McKown stressed the importance of viewing character as a way in which an individual responded to his environment (67). Dewey and Tufts viewed character as "... whatever lies behind an act in the way of deliberation and desire, whether these processes be near-by or remote" (20, p. 203). Hartshorne said that it is through participation in social functioning and the performance of daily activities that give meaning for the most inclusive reality of which the individual can conceive (32, pp. 249-250). Kohlberg found that the average level of moral conformity is the same in early childhood as in later life and suggested that the basic forces of moral character develop very early in life (53, p. 392). One of the strongest criticisms of our schools' inability to
incorporate humanistic aspects of education into its curriculum was voiced by Huyssen when she said,

The school, as a representative of the community, must be aware of the complexities and confusions evidenced by the society in which children are growing up. All too long has the ostrich attitude of the schools toward values left confusion to reign rampant, and children to encounter the complexities of values with no strategy to guide them. It is not a question of whether or not the school will deal with values in the classroom; they are being dealt with come what may. However, schools can choose to continue to ignore the issues and leave values to be dealt with haphazardly by teachers who all too often are ignorant that they are even dealing with value issues, or they can choose to examine their own values, create opportunities for teachers to examine theirs, and hammer out some strategies that can be used to deal creatively and constructively with values in classrooms (41, p. 27).

Piaget, in the formulation of his theories concerning the moral development of the child, concluded that through free, reciprocal relationships with his peers, the child develops a morality of mutual respect with eventually progressing toward the highest level of autonomy. Piaget concluded from experiments with small samples of children that the child up to age seven is more or less a "moral realist," having a conscious obedience to rules by those in authority. As the child matures and is subjected to many social experiences involving his peers, he becomes able to treat others as he would himself wish to be treated (78). Investigation concerning the moral judgments of children were conducted by Kohlberg, who established a hierarchy of moral thinking which was validated with samples of American children of different ages. Kohlberg suggested that the emergence of moral stages
is the product of the child's interaction with others rather than of the unfolding of biological processes or neural structures. Through many social experiences, the child gradually relates and identifies the values inherent in the culture and expressed by his parents to his own goals as a social self (53, pp. 383-432).

Conclusion

The research on value acquisition seems somewhat inconclusive in many instances, especially in the studies of race and religious factors. Some studies revealed findings which implied differences in value acquisition between lower and upper class groups while many found no significant differences. The research findings did seem to indicate that peer pressure, early childhood experiences, personality traits, cultural institutions, sex roles, modeling, and family influences were all influential in a child's value acquisition. Since findings imply that there are many variables that affect the child's acquisition of values, a highly stimulating environment which consists of alternatives would be a situation in which the child could extend his beliefs and determine his own values in a non-threatening environment. Since such experiences would encourage the child to speculate, to examine the alternatives, and to make choices about the way he feels, he is in the situation of forming values. Such a freedom to explore together with the receptiveness of early
childhood to value formation supplies a good foundation for the child's clarifying and developing his own values.

Stability of Values

In terms of values, the question arises as to whether or not values are subject to change. Kohlberg's research indicates that it may be possible to stimulate the development of moral character in the schools. He also mentions that educators have already rejected the notion of a set curriculum of instruction and exhortation in the conventional moral virtues—a conception destroyed by Hartshorne and May's earlier studies (54). Combs believes that to change behavior, it is necessary to help children change the way they see themselves and the world in which they live (16).

Studies are numerous which report positive results from values-clarification strategies. Higgins reported that students were able to express views on their values—some changing after experiencing values-clarification exercises (36). Studies by Levande (61), Crellin (18), Jonas, Machnits, and Martin (44), and Lang (59), all reported significant increases in value claims after being exposed to values-clarification strategies. Vance reported a strong support for values clarification in his study which found that values clarification assisted the students in becoming more aware of their own value priorities, more sensitive to the gaps between their words or ideals and their actions in specific situations. Students were also more able to see interrelationships among
their own diverse personality traits. Values clarification facilitated the development of self-awareness and acknowledgment of intrinsic feelings and attitudes among the students. The values emphasis influenced some students to recognize their direct relationships to others and to their society (95). Klevan (50) emphasized the idea that during the values clarification procedures, students in the experimental groups developed significantly more consistent attitudes toward personal feelings and personal spirit than did students in the control group. As a result of these studies, the values-clarification process seems to imply an effective way to change value claims.

Quist studied the crucial nature of values in the school setting by exploring the value patterns of sixth, eighth, and eleventh grade students. The main intent of the study was to see what differences, if any, occurred between grades six and eleven and to explore the relationship of these changes to the variables of sex, mental ability, socioeconomic background, occupational and educational aspiration level, school achievement and the influence of significant others. Values, it was found, are related to a variety of school-related variables. As the child moves up the educational ladder from grades six to eleven, his values become less traditional. As a result, he begins to question not only the teacher but the entire system (79). Mignogna found that moral and spiritual techniques were not utilized in cocurricular activities to the
extent that they were in other areas of the educational programs (69). Kangas studied the effectiveness of labeling a person as a technique in manipulating the expression of values. Highly significant differences were obtained between the control subjects and all subjects receiving the personality label (47). Sklare also conducted an investigation to determine the effects of the values-clarification process upon middle class suburban high school students. It was found that the values-clarification procedures did enable students to clarify their differential values (88). To support this, Statman focused upon inter-value moral dilemma situations—problems in which each choice alternative represents a different value. The results confirm the hypothesis that the subjects' decisions conformed to predictions and were congruent with the analysis of value-orientations (91). Harmin, Bernard Nisenholtz, and Simon stated,

We take issue with such indoctrinating approaches. We believe that promoting only one side of value-type conflicts often tends merely to intensify the conflict within children. We believe that teachers have to do more than add to the confusion that already rattles around inside the heads of so many young people from the slums. We believe that teachers have to help these young people take that confusion, grab it, look at it, study it, and move toward reducing it. It is this "clarifying" process that we here recommend (31, p. 21).

They also say that value clarifying is teaching at a high level because, for the student, it is productive of important personal growth. It helps students cut through the chaos surrounding value conflicts and learn to develop and trust their own intelligence and judgment. And it nourishes that
tender faith in self and others that is so crucial if the child is ever to escape to personal freedom (31).

**Conclusion**

The studies of the stability of values yield evidence to support the conclusion that values are subject to change. In an environment in which the child is encouraged to explore his feelings, he begins to clarify what he values, feeling free to examine the past, the alternatives, and his choices. Through such experiences, the child learns that values do differ among people and that he becomes more aware of the way he feels.

**Values Domain**

Another difficulty in understanding values has been the lack of agreement among authorities on how values should be categorized. Varying conceptualizations have been reported in the literature.

Allport and Vernon identified values as "theoretical," "economic," "aesthetic," "social," "political," and "religious" (2). Gorlow and Noll identified eight factors: family valuers, rugged individualism, undemanding passive, boy scout, affiliative-romantics, and Don Juan (28). Harding viewed values more in terms of being philosophical and social (30). Other theoretical work on values has been done by Perry (77), Lepley (60), Pepper (76), Maslow (64), and Catton (13). In Ryan’s study, it was reported that children placed little
emphasis on success and other success-related values, including "persistence," "competition," and "leadership." They placed higher values on "manners," "positive moral virtues," "material success," "religion," "family," and "helping others" (85). In the works of Williams (97), Kluckhohn (51), and Curti (19), the worth of the individual is seen as a guiding value in contemporary American culture, deriving from a heritage of pioneer morality. Williams observes that Americans set high value on developing individual personality, concluding that a dominant American belief is that to be a person means being independent, worthy of concern and respect in one's own right (97). Kluckhohn (51) and Williams (97) point to the value placed on "egalitarianism." They hold that equality means equality of opportunity, rather than equality of man. Guilford, Gupta, and Goldberg found that values do play a part in the adjustment of the child to school and in his achievement (29). Havighurst and Taba concluded that lower middle and upper lower classes were alike in their values, stressing "respectability," "thrift," "loyalty," "responsibility," and "fidelity" (34). Getzels differentiated values of upper, middle, and lower class in terms of meanings attached to "family property," "education," "aggression," "industry," "cleanliness," and "sex" (23). Simon found that some typical areas in which one might experience confusion and conflict in values are as follows: politics, religion, work, war, school, love, family, culture, friends, money, death, health, peace,
rules, authority, and race (87). Kohlberg's classic study, in 1958, analyzed the interrelated development of basic moral concepts and attitudes in years ten to sixteen, concepts and attitudes suggested by words, such as "good," "rights," "duties," "authority," "group norms," "ideal self," "punishment," and "justice." These were studies as they were embodied in verbal reactions to the problem of moral choice and conflict (55).

Research studies of Lambert and Klineberg (58), Henderson (35), Glasser (24), and Dunfee (21) indicate that only if the child explores and considers diverse beliefs and values and consequences can he make optimal decisions. These writers state that building self-concept helps the child gain self-worth, awareness of his own potential, and a willingness to make values known. Some social outcomes of a broader nature are evidenced in the child's greater freedom to express his values more vigorously. His awareness of the fact that his values will not correspond with those of others helps him to react and to challenge his own thoughts. Being aware of his own self, he can more accurately view others, approving or disapproving their behaviors, understanding that other people have a right for preserving their identity. Respect for oneself is a first step in respecting others. Paschal also believes that as a child undergoes new experiences and as new values are submitted, he accepts or rejects them in terms of their compatibility or incompatibility with his present
evaluation of himself. If one is to help the child in enhancing his self-image, he must be exposed to value controversies. Paschal believes that one must talk realistically with children about their purposes, feelings, and ways of thinking (75).

Opportunities are needed for students to look at friendship as something to be cultivated and cherished. Studies by Ambrose and Miel (4), Berman (8), Dunfee (21), Cherry-holmes (14), and Smith (90) indicate that if pleasant feelings do not find expression in social relationships, in activities and communication media, they may be pushed aside and fail to enhance the quality of living. Berman states,

The vision which a person creates for himself helps determine the persons, projects, and ideas to which the individual will devote his time, resources, and energy. Love is related to vision, for vision provides a basis for selection of persons with whom the individual will not only relate, but also correspond—a term denoting a more honest, mutual, and pervasive kind of relating (8, p. 65).

These writers state that values clarification-strategies help students to become successful in getting children ready to live in the world beyond their own, helping students make socially effective choices, and helping them assess alternative social features. They also state that little attention is given in the curriculum to helping students perceive themselves as potential group members and to assisting them in developing the values and skills needed to stand alone or to establish membership in a group. Only through such assistance
may the student be helped to attune himself to the world around him—to build toward becoming an adequate personality.

Because children are bombarded by a rapid upheaval in their environment, living conditions on earth are directly linked to all the values that undergird these manifestations of people. Abbott's study with students from highly divergent cultural and economic backgrounds were stimulated to recognize the feelings and emotions expressed by others engaged in aesthetic activities. Findings indicate that during participation in a program of aesthetic appreciation, attitudes toward the environment were broadened. The study was based on the belief that sensitivity to the nature of one's environment is essential to living in harmony with and maintain control over the environment. Social growth may be stimulated through the development within a group awareness of a common concern for the establishment and maintenance of an aesthetically pleasing environment (1). "The need for attention to aesthetic growth becomes more significant in recognizing that," as Herbert Read states, "aesthetic education is the education of those senses upon which consciousness, and ultimately the intelligence and judgment of human individuals are based" (81, p. 48). Writings of Combs and Snygg (15), Lowenfeld (63), and Stephens (92) reinforce the contention that there is a critical need for strengthening the individual's ability to identify and evaluate a set of well-defined values directed toward establishing and maintaining an an aesthetically pleasing environment. It is
through such manifestation of "becoming" that people are prepared to live in a society of variety and make it work, to live among people with widely differing starting points, to find joy in seeing them moving forward at their optimum pace, and to find happiness and fulfillment in helping others to find value in their lives. It seems that much disparity exists in classifying values. In some instances, there was disagreement among the authorities concerning the theoretical framework of value domain. However, it does seem that many of the studies report importance on the values of self, individual worth, friendliness, sociability, environment, and personal goals.

According to Gordon, the following are the kinds of qualities that Maslow has found are valued by those individuals who are to a high degree healthy, "self-actualizing," contributing members of society:

1. openness to experience
2. flexibility
3. objectivity
4. complexity
5. perfection
6. autonomy
7. responsibility
8. perfection
9. spontaneity
10. rationality
11. integrity
12. charity (27, pp. 32-33).

Black seemed to think that the priority of values is considered a matter too private to be touched and too intangible to be grasped by the instrumentalities available to the school.
Individuals differ in their sense of the order of the importance of values. Moreover, their evaluations of things shift with immediate needs and changing long run goals. He states that one of the most important things the school can do to meet the needs of the individual and society in the area of moral education is to stress respect for the individual. Whatever the differences of theology and politics, that is one value which can enlist the affirmative support of all men. A respect of the dignity of every human being, his potentialities, his needs, and his rights is a basic moral value. It is essential to a democratic society and a peaceful world. Unless the child can learn this respect, the teachings of religion and the teachings of American democracy will be of no avail. The child must learn to respect himself, to value himself; and he can learn this self-respect only if he feels that he is respected. Because of the very complex and changing culture of which he is such a small part, this self-evaluation is particularly important. For without it, his life and his choices and activities seem unimportant and meaningless (11, p. 505).

Chapter Conclusion

The findings of the research studies presented in the preceding paragraphs seem to indicate that there is a need for further value study in the elementary schools, especially the study of values through a values-clarification approach. Because the early years are responsive for values formation,
designing a learning environment in which young people learn a process of clarification and developing their own values seems significant in meeting future conflicts. Since children are faced with a multi-cultural environment and a number of overwhelming value differences, the child needs to be able to examine what he holds to be worthwhile after he has been presented with alternatives and the consequences. The child must make choices, striving to secure a more harmonious life with others. Through the study of the value of self and worth of others, the child may become attuned to the world around him. To live with widely differing values, the child must realize that he is a small part of a complex and changing culture. Through the clarification of values, the child begins to work toward establishing harmony and unity in his life.
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CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Description of the Population

The participants in this study were twenty-seven seventh-grade boys and twenty-seven eighth-grade boys within one private Catholic school in a large metropolitan city in Texas. The twenty-seven seventh-grade boys served as the control group and the twenty-seven eighth-grade boys served as the experimental group. Both groups were self-contained classes. The subjects were relatively homogeneous in intelligence and socioeconomic background. The majority of the subjects had the same religious background—Catholic.

Instructors

Both the instructor of the experimental group and the instructor of the control group were teachers in the Language Arts Department in the school. The instructors had each been teaching eight years, had teaching experience in fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and eleventh grades, and had similar teaching philosophies. Both instructors held a master's degree in secondary education, with minors in English. For the past six years, both instructors had been teaching language arts in the elementary and junior high school grades in the school in which the experiment was held. During these
six years, both instructors worked very closely in organizing the curriculum for the Language Arts Department. Since these instructors were the only seventh- and eighth-grade teachers in the school, they planned the program for the seventh and eighth grade, selected books, worked with seventh- and eighth-grade students together in special remedial classes, and often planned creative activities for both groups.

The Control Group's Course

The control group was involved in a regular language arts course, emphasizing grammar and reading. The textbooks used by the control group were Keys to Good English, a grammar workbook, and a collection of short stories. The instructor in the control group utilized the lecture and group assignment approach. No attempt was made to work with values.

The Experimental Group's Program

The experimental group used the same textbooks that were used in the control group. In addition to these books the experimental group participated in values-clarification experiences during two forty-five minute periods each week for sixteen weeks. These sessions consisted of values-clarification experiences using high-level questioning, through eliciting responses to selected poems. The instructor read each poem to the class, followed by class discussions concerning the meanings of the poems. After the class had heard the poem and had a chance to discuss the meaning, the high-level
questions were asked for the purpose of eliciting value responses. These questions were answered in writing, but were not graded. Thirty poems were selected to be used in the values-clarification experiences. A set of questions were written for each poem. The number of questions in a set was not the same for each poem. The total number of questions, including all the sets of questions for each of the thirty poems, was 206. A list of the poems used in the values-clarification experiences is included in Appendix A. Samples of the high-level questions are included in Appendix B.

To validate that the questions were high-level questions according to the criteria presented by Krathwohl (5), a panel of three judges was selected from experienced college professors at North Texas State University. Each panel member was furnished with a copy of the proposed high-level questions as well as Krathwohl's criteria for writing high-level questions in the affective domain. The judges were asked to respond with a "yes" if the question was a high-level question which met the criteria and a "no" if the question did not meet the criteria. If two of the three judges indicated a "yes" concerning the validity of the question, the question was used in the values-clarification experiences. Suggestions for changing or revising the questions were marked by the judges, using the material furnished them. All of the questions received "yes" markings by at least two of the three judges; therefore, all of the questions were used in the values-clarification experiences.
The poetry selected for use in this study was taken from six anthologies designed for sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade students: *Moments in Literature* (7), *Seabirds* (3), *Compass Points in Literature* (1), *Interpreting Literature* (4), *Into New Worlds* (2), *Explorations in Literature* (6), and *Selected Poems of Edwin Arlington Robinson* (10).

To establish the validity of the thirty poems chosen for the study, a panel of three experienced literature instructors from Cistercian Preparatory School was chosen to serve as judges. Each panel member was furnished with a copy of the poems and the list of values with definitions as defined in this study. The judges were asked to respond with a "yes" or "no" concerning whether the poems illustrated the value indicated. If two of the three judges indicated a "yes" concerning whether the poem illustrated the value indicated, the poem was used in the experiment. All of the poems received "yes" concerning their validity; therefore, all of the poems were used in the values-clarification exercises.

**Description of the Instrument**

The instrument used to determine value claims of the students was the *Values Inventory* (9), designed by Ryan of the Hawaii Educational Research and Development Center. This instrument was used to measure value claims in the following dimensions: (1) tolerance and worth of others, (2) persistence, (3) love and affection, (4) social egalitarianism.
(5) recognition-status, (6) altruism, (7) materialism, and (8) social friendliness.

Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

According to Ryan (8), evidence for content validity comes from logical and empirical sources. The value categories defined in the Values Inventory were deduced from central concepts in values theory. Twelve hundred items derived from literature were sorted into value-related and non-value-related statements by seven judges. The seven judges then assigned the value-related statements to value categories. Agreement of at least five of the seven judges was needed to assign a statement to a category. This agreement of at least 70 per cent of the judges resulted in 260 value statements for 51 value dimensions. Subsequent factor analyses collapsed the 51 dimensions to 17 categories. The items selected for the inventory corresponded to the intuitive value scales determined by the judges. Items included in the final inventory were selected on the basis that they (a) had the highest item scale correlations in two or more subsamples, (b) had the least extreme endorsement percentages, (c) were lowest in percentage of question marks and blanks, and (d) appeared to be consistent with the substantive construct measured by other items included on the scale. Based on these procedures the inventory would appear to have acceptable content validity. Ryan also found when establishing validity that there was
evidence of cross validation in the instrument as was indicated by the similarities of alpha coefficients on the preliminary form of the instrument and the final form of the instrument.

In terms of reliability, Ryan indicated that estimates of internal consistency reliability were computed for the samples. The scales for children showed an alpha coefficient of .56. He indicated that this coefficient was comparable to those of other instruments similar to this one.

Procedures for Collecting Data

The research design for this study was a Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design. The Values Inventory was administered at the beginning of the experiment and again after the values clarification experiences had been completed. The instructor of the experimental group administered the pretest and posttest to his class; the instructor of the control group administered the pretest and posttest to his class.

Each subscale of the Values Inventory had an answer sheet on which the boys responded to each item on the instrument by rating each item on a scale from one to five (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree). See Appendix C for a copy of the answer sheet. When the subjects took the pretest and posttest, the instructors read the directions to their classes and then instructed them to read each item and mark the answer by circling the number on the one to five scale according to their own beliefs.
The Values Inventory was administered in one sitting of approximately fifty minutes. In response to questions about whether subjects should guess, the instructors said: "Answer every question. Since there are no wrong answers, answer as honestly as you can."

**Statistical Procedures**

The questions on the Values Inventory are keyed as "positive" or "negative" questions, according to Ryan's original scale. In scoring the results of the Values Inventory, the responses to the negative questions were scored as follows: For each response of 1, the 1 was converted to a 5; for a 2, the 2 was converted to a 4; for a 4, the 4 was converted to a 2; for a 5, the 5 was converted to a 1. For a 3, the 3 remained the same since the 3 represented neutral on the 5 point scale. No conversion was made for the responses to the positive questions. After the responses have been converted for the negative questions, a mean for each subscale of the Values Inventory was calculated. The above calculation was made on the pretest in the experimental group and on the pretest in the control group at the beginning of the study. The same calculation was made on the posttest in the experimental group and on the posttest in the control group at the end of the experiment.

Analysis of covariance with the pretest as the covariate was used to test whether the differences were significant between the mean gain of the pretest and posttest for the
experimental group on each subscale of the Values Inventory and the mean gain of the pretest and posttest for the control group on each subscale of the Values Inventory.

Analysis of covariance with the pretest as the covariate was used to test whether the differences were significant between the total mean gain of the pretest and posttest for the experimental group and the total mean gain of the pretest and posttest for the control group on the complete Values Inventory.

The level of significance was set at .05 level. Computer processing at North Texas State University was used for the statistical analysis of all data.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which the use of high-level questioning, through eliciting responses to selected poems, affected the expression of value positions on (1) tolerance and worth of others, (2) persistence, (3) love and affection, (4) social egalitarianism, (5) recognition-status, (6) altruism, (7) materialism, and (8) social friendliness.

To test the hypotheses of this study, a Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design was used. The .05 level of significance was selected as the basis for accepting or rejecting the hypotheses.

The data obtained from the study are organized into two sections for presentation. The first section is designed to report the mean values, standard deviations, and adjusted means of the pretest and posttest for the experimental group and for the control group on each of the eight subscales of the Values Inventory. The results of the analysis of covariance between the mean gains of the pretest and posttest for the experimental group and control group on each of the eight subscales of the Values Inventory are also presented by reporting the sum of squares, degrees of freedom, F Ratio, and level of significance.
In addition to the data reported for each of the eight subscales of the Values Inventory, the mean values, standard deviation, and adjusted means of the pretest and posttest for the experimental group and control group on the complete Values Inventory are also reported. The results of the analysis of covariance between the mean gains of the pretest and posttest for the experimental group and control group on the total Values Inventory are presented by reporting the sum of squares, degrees of freedom, F Ratio, and level of significance.

The second section is devoted to a discussion and analysis of the results of the data.

Analysis of Data

In Hypothesis I, it was predicted that the boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group would show significantly greater mean gains on the "tolerance and worth of others" subscale of the Values Inventory. The pretest means, posttest means, standard deviations, and adjusted mean scores used to test this hypothesis are presented in Table I.

Inspection of Table I indicates that although the pretest mean scores for the control group and the experimental group were very similar, the experimental group made a significant gain on the adjusted mean scores, while the control group dropped on the adjusted mean scores following the posttest.
TABLE I

PRETEST MEANS, POSTTEST MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS 
AND ADJUSTED MEANS ON THE "TOLERANCE AND WORTH OF 
OTHERS" SUBSCALE OF THE VALUES INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Posttest Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44.96</td>
<td>47.18</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>47.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45.14</td>
<td>44.11</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>44.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data for the sum of squares, degrees of freedom, F Ratio, and level of significance used to test this hypothesis are presented in Table II.

TABLE II

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCES IN SCORES 
ON THE "TOLERANCE AND WORTH OF OTHERS" SUBSCALE 
OF THE VALUES INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>791.37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>656.69</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>*0.0021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>134.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .01.

The F Ratio did reach the required level of significance. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted. This indicates that the magnitude of change between pretest and posttest scores
on the "tolerance and worth of others" subscale of the Values Inventory was significantly greater in the experimental group than it was in the control group.

In Hypothesis II, it was predicted that the boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group would show significantly greater mean gains on the "persistence" subscale of the Values Inventory. The pretest means, posttest means, standard deviations, and adjusted mean scores used to test this hypothesis are presented in Table III.

**TABLE III**

PRETEST MEANS, POSTTEST MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND ADJUSTED MEANS ON THE "PERSISTENCE" SUBSCALE OF THE VALUES INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Posttest Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>46.59</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>46.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43.14</td>
<td>42.51</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>42.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inspection of Table III indicates that although the pretest mean scores for the control group and the experimental group were very similar, the experimental group made a significant gain on the adjusted mean scores, while the control group dropped on the adjusted mean scores following the posttest.
The data for the sum of squares, degrees of freedom, $F$ ratio, and level of significance used to test this hypothesis are presented in Table IV.

**TABLE IV**

**ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCES IN SCORES ON THE "PERSISTENCE" SUBSCALE OF THE VALUES INVENTORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>$F$ Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1319.79</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1073.30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>*0.0012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>246.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .01.

The $F$ ratio did reach the required level of significance. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted. This indicates that the magnitude of change between pretest and posttest scores on the "persistence" subscale of the Values Inventory was significantly greater in the experimental group than it was in the control group.

In Hypothesis III, it was predicted that the boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group would show significantly greater mean gains on the "love and affection" subscale of the Values Inventory. The pretest means, posttest means, standard deviations, and adjusted mean scores used to test this hypothesis are presented in Table V.
TABLE V
PRETEST MEANS, POSTTEST MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND ADJUSTED MEANS ON THE "LOVE AND AFFECTION" SUBSCALE OF THE VALUES INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Posttest Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44.96</td>
<td>48.96</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>48.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44.18</td>
<td>43.14</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>43.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inspection of Table V indicates that although the pretest mean scores for the control group and the experimental group were very similar, the experimental group made a significant gain on the adjusted mean scores, while the control group dropped on the adjusted mean scores following the posttest.

The data for the sum of squares, degrees of freedom, F Ratio, and level of significance used to test the hypothesis are presented in Table VI.

The F Ratio did reach the required level of significance. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted. This indicates that the magnitude of change between pretest and posttest scores on the "love and affection" subscale of the Values Inventory was significantly greater in the experimental group than it was in the control group.
TABLE VI

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCES IN SCORES ON THE "LOVE AND AFFECTION" SUBSCALE OF THE VALUES INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1180.38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>827.21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21.77</td>
<td>*0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>353.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P ≤ .001.

In Hypothesis IV, it was predicted that the boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group would show significantly greater mean gains on the "social egalitarianism" subscale of the Values Inventory. The pretest means, posttest means, standard deviations, and adjusted mean scores used to test this hypothesis are presented in Table VII.

TABLE VII

PRETEST MEANS, POSTTEST MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND ADJUSTED MEANS ON THE "SOCIAL EGALITARIANISM" SUBSCALE OF THE VALUES INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Posttest Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47.92</td>
<td>54.48</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>54.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48.11</td>
<td>47.85</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>47.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inspection of Table VII indicates that although the pretest mean scores for the control group and the experimental group were very similar, the experimental group made a significant gain on the adjusted mean scores, while the control group dropped on the adjusted mean scores following the posttest.

The data for the sum of squares, degrees of freedom, $F$ Ratio, and level of significance used to test the hypothesis are presented in Table VIII.

**TABLE VIII**

**ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCES IN SCORES ON THE "SOCIAL EGALITARIANISM" SUBSCALE OF THE VALUES INVENTORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>$F$ Ratio</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2160.62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1547.26</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20.21</td>
<td>$0.0000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>613.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $P \leq .001$.

The $F$ Ratio did reach the required level of significance. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted. This indicates that the magnitude of change between pretest and posttest scores on the "social egalitarianism" subscale of the Values Inventory was significantly greater in the experimental group than it was in the control group.
In Hypothesis V, it was predicted that the boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group would show significantly greater mean gains on the "recognition-status" subscale of the **Values Inventory**. The pretest means, posttest means, standard deviations, and adjusted mean scores used to test this hypothesis are presented in Table IX.

**TABLE IX**

**PRETEST MEANS, POSTTEST MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND ADJUSTED MEANS ON THE "RECOGNITION-STATUS" SUBSCALE OF THE VALUES INVENTORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Posttest Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35.85</td>
<td>39.62</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>40.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41.44</td>
<td>38.85</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>37.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inspection of Table IX indicates that the mean scores for the control group and the experimental group were quite different, but the experimental group made a significant gain on the adjusted mean scores, while the control group dropped on the adjusted mean scores following the posttest.

The data for the sum of squares, degrees of freedom, F Ratio, and level of significance used to test the hypothesis are presented in Table X.
TABLE X

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCES IN SCORES
ON THE "RECOGNITION-STATUS" SUBSCALE OF THE
VALUES INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>699.17</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>*0.0079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>607.98</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>91.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P ≤ .01.

The F Ratio did reach the required level of significance. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted. This indicates that the magnitude of change between pretest and posttest scores on the "recognition-status" subscale of the Values Inventory was significantly greater in the experimental group than it was in the control group.

In Hypothesis VI, it was predicted that the boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group would show significantly greater mean gains on the "altruism" subscale of the Values Inventory. The pretest means, posttest means, standard deviations, and adjusted mean scores used to test this hypothesis are presented in Table XI.
TABLE XI

PRETEST MEANS, POSTTEST MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND ADJUSTED MEANS ON THE "ALTRUISM" SUBSCALE OF THE VALUES INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Posttest Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48.44</td>
<td>53.92</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>54.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50.92</td>
<td>49.11</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>48.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inspection of Table XI indicates that the pretest mean scores were different. The experimental group, however, made a significant gain on the adjusted mean scores, while the control group dropped on the adjusted mean scores following the posttest.

The data for the sum of squares, degrees of freedom, F Ratio, and level of significance used to test the hypothesis are presented in Table XII.

TABLE XII

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCES IN SCORES ON THE "ALTRUISM" SUBSCALE OF THE VALUES INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2611.34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>2033.15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>*0.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>578.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .001.
The F Ratio did reach the required level of significance. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted. This indicates that the magnitude of change between pretest and posttest scores on the "altruism" subscale of the Values Inventory was significantly greater in the experimental group than it was in the control group.

In Hypothesis VII, it was predicted that the boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group would show significantly greater mean gains on the "materialism" subscale of the Values Inventory. The pretest means, posttest means, standard deviations, and adjusted mean scores used to test this hypothesis are presented in Table XIII.

TABLE XIII

PRETEST MEANS, POSTTEST MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND ADJUSTED MEANS ON THE "MATERIALISM" SUBSCALE OF THE VALUES INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Posttest Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41.29</td>
<td>39.03</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>39.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43.62</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>41.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inspection of Table XIII indicates a difference in the mean scores for the control group and the experimental group on the pretest. Both the experimental group and the control
group, however, dropped on the adjusted mean scores following the posttest. The control group dropped to a greater extent than did the experimental group.

The data for the sum of squares, degrees of freedom, \( F \) Ratio, and level of significance used to test the hypothesis are presented in Table XIV.

**TABLE XIV**

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCES IN SCORES ON THE "MATERIALISM" SUBSCALE OF THE VALUES INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>( F ) Ratio</th>
<th>( P )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2411.95</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>2361.56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>*0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>50.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\( P \geq .05.\)

The \( F \) Ratio did not reach the required level of significance. Therefore, the hypothesis was not accepted. The magnitude of change between the pretest and posttest scores on the "materialism" subscale of the Values Inventory was greater in the control group than it was in the experimental group. The data does not show that there was a significant difference between the experimental group and the control group.
In Hypothesis VIII, it was predicted that the boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group would show significantly greater mean gains on the "social friendliness" subscale of the Values Inventory. The pretest means, posttest means, standard deviations, and adjusted mean scores used to test this hypothesis are presented in Table XV.

**TABLE XV**

**PRETEST MEANS, POSTTEST MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND ADJUSTED MEANS ON THE "SOCIAL FRIENDLINESS" SUBSCALE OF THE VALUES INVENTORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Posttest Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44.03</td>
<td>50.14</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>51.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48.22</td>
<td>45.62</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>43.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inspection of Table XV indicates a difference in the pretest mean scores for the control group and the experimental group. The experimental group, however, made a significant gain on the adjusted mean scores, while the control group dropped on the adjusted mean scores following the posttest.

The data for the sum of squares, degrees of freedom, F Ratio, and level of significance used to test the hypothesis are presented in Table XVI.
TABLE XVI
ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCES IN SCORES ON THE "SOCIAL FRIENDLINESS" SUBSCALE OF THE VALUES INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1927.80</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1203.28</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30.70</td>
<td>*0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>724.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P ≤ .001.

The F Ratio did reach the required level of significance. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted. The magnitude of change between the pretest and posttest scores on the "social friendliness" subscale of the Values Inventory was significantly greater in the experimental group than it was in the control group.

In Hypothesis IX, it was predicted that the boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group would show significantly greater mean gains on the total Values Inventory. The pretest means, posttest means, standard deviations, and adjusted mean scores used to test this hypothesis are presented in Table XVII.

Inspection of Table XVII indicates a difference in the mean scores for the control group and the experimental group on the pretest. The experimental group, however, made a
significant gain on the adjusted mean scores, while the control group dropped on the adjusted mean scores following the posttest.

**TABLE XVII**

**PRETEST MEANS, POSTTEST MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND ADJUSTED MEANS ON THE TOTAL VALUES INVENTORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Posttest Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>350.22</td>
<td>379.96</td>
<td>16.68</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td>385.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>364.81</td>
<td>353.96</td>
<td>22.12</td>
<td>25.15</td>
<td>348.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data for the sum of squares, degrees of freedom, $F$ Ratio, and level of significance used to test the hypothesis are presented in Table XVIII.

**TABLE XVIII**

**ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCES IN SCORES ON THE TOTAL VALUES INVENTORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>$F$ Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27261.89</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>11301.89</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>72.01</td>
<td>* .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>15959.99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $P \leq .001$. 
The F Ratio did reach the required level of significance. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted. The magnitude of change between the pretest and posttest scores on the total *Values Inventory* was significantly greater in the experimental group than it was in the control group.

**Discussion of Data**

The nine hypotheses involved eight subscales on the *Values Inventory* as well as the total *Values Inventory*. Eight of the nine hypotheses were accepted. It is interesting to note that in comparing pretest and adjusted posttest mean scores of the experimental group on all eight subscales, there was a gain in the mean scores from pretest to posttest on seven of the subscales as well as a gain on the total *Values Inventory*. This indicates that there was a change in the experimental group on seven of the value domains being analyzed that did not take place in the control group.

It should be recognized that the experimental group had mean gains on seven of the value domains, while the control group had mean declines in all eight of the value domains. It also might be recognized that both the control group and the experimental group had declines in the means on the "materialism" subscale. It is interesting to note that the mean of the control group on the pretest of the "materialism" subscale was higher than the mean of the experimental group and the control group expressed less interest in "materialism" on the posttest. Although the control group declined more
than the experimental group, reasons for the greater drop in the control group are undetermined. In observing the discussions in the experimental group during the values-clarification experiences, the instructor did become aware that the viewpoints concerning the worth of "materialism" were quite varied. Some students indicated that although "materialism" was less important to them than other values, money was important in life. Perhaps, this sharing of ideas concerning the worth of "materialism" led to less decline in the posttest for the experimental group.

The difference of scores between groups on seven of the subscales as well as the total Values Inventory indicates that the exposure to the values clarification experiences had an effect on the students' value claims. During the values-clarification experiences in the experimental group a gradual change was noticed in the responses by the students. As the values-clarification sessions were continued, the students became much more open in their responses to the high-level questions. The students also began to give more reasons for their beliefs. As the poems were read and discussed and the values-clarification experiences continued, the students began to indicate stronger and clearer value claims.

The homogeneous nature of the two groups further indicates the significance of the value-clarification experiences, especially since the subjects came from very similar home and school environments.
Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to present, analyze, and discuss the data obtained for this study. The hypotheses were presented and the data were analyzed to determine acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses. The $F$ Ratio involved in Hypotheses I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VIII, and IX were all significant at the .01 level. Hypothesis VII, based on the "materialism" subscale, did not reach the required level of significance, both the experimental group and the control group showed a decline on the posttest means. The mean of the control group, however, declined more than the mean of the experimental group.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which the use of high-level questioning, through eliciting responses to selected poems, affected the expression of value positions on (1) tolerance and worth of others, (2) persistence, (3) love and affection, (4) social egalitarianism, (5) recognition status, (6) altruism, (7) materialism, and (8) social friendliness.

The hypotheses were stated as follows:

I. Boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group will show significantly greater mean gains on the "tolerance and worth of others" subscale of the Values Inventory.

II. Boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group will show significantly greater mean gains on the "persistence" subscale on the Values Inventory.

III. Boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group will show significantly greater mean gains on the "love and affection" subscale of the Values Inventory.
IV. Boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group will show significantly greater mean gains on the "social egalitarianism" subscale of the Values Inventory.

V. Boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group will show significantly greater mean gains on the "recognition-status" subscale of the Values Inventory.

VI. Boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group will show significantly greater mean gains on the "altruism" subscale of the Values Inventory.

VII. Boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group will show significantly greater gains on the "materialism" subscale of the Values Inventory.

VIII. Boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group will show significantly greater mean gains on the "social friendliness" subscale of the Values Inventory.

IX. Boys in the experimental group when compared with boys in the control group will show significantly greater mean gains on the total Values Inventory.

The subjects who comprised the experimental group and control group were boys attending one private Catholic school in a large metropolitan city in Texas. Twenty-seven seventh-grade boys were involved in the control group. Twenty-seven eighth-grade boys were involved in the experimental group.
Both groups were self-contained classes. The experimental group participated in values-clarification experiences during two forty-five minute periods each week for sixteen weeks. The control group was involved in a regular language arts program, emphasizing grammar and reading. The instructor of the control group utilized the lecture and group assignment approach. No attempt was made to work with values.

The instrument used to measure value claims was the Values Inventory. The Values Inventory contained eight subscales. All of the subscales were administered to both the experimental group and the control group at the beginning and at the conclusion of the values-clarification experiences.

After the data were gathered and tabulated, the results were statistically analyzed using the analysis of covariance technique. A significance level of .05 was required for acceptance of the hypotheses. All the hypotheses accepted were significant at the .01 level. The statistical analysis of the data gave the following results.

Hypothesis I was accepted. The magnitude of change between pretest and posttest scores on the "tolerance and worth of others" subscale of the Values Inventory was greater in the experimental group than it was in the control group. The experimental group made a gain in the mean scores, but the control group dropped on the adjusted mean scores following the posttest.
Hypothesis II was accepted. The magnitude of change between pretest and posttest scores on the "persistence" subscale of the Values Inventory was greater in the experimental group than it was in the control group. The experimental group made a gain in the mean scores, but the control group dropped on the adjusted mean scores following the posttest.

Hypothesis III was accepted. The magnitude of change between pretest and posttest scores on the "love and affection" subscale of the Values Inventory was greater in the experimental group than it was in the control group. The experimental group made a gain in the mean scores, but the control group dropped on the adjusted mean scores following the posttest.

Hypothesis IV was accepted. The magnitude of change between pretest and posttest scores on the "social egalitarianism" subscale of the Values Inventory was greater in the experimental group than it was in the control group. The experimental group made a gain in the mean scores, but the control group dropped on the adjusted mean scores following the posttest.

Hypothesis V was accepted. The magnitude of change between pretest and posttest scores on the "recognition-status" subscale of the Values Inventory was greater in the experimental group than it was in the control group. The experimental group made a gain in the mean scores, but the control group dropped on the adjusted mean scores following the posttest.
Hypothesis VI was accepted. The magnitude of change between pretest and posttest scores on the "altruism" subscale of the Values Inventory was greater in the experimental group than it was in the control group. The experimental group made a gain in the mean scores, but the control group dropped on the adjusted mean scores following the posttest.

Hypothesis VII was not accepted. The magnitude of change between pretest and posttest scores on the "materialism" subscale of the Values Inventory was greater in the control group than it was in the experimental group. The data does not show that there was a significant difference between the experimental group and the control group, although both groups declined on the means from the pretest and the posttest.

Hypothesis VIII was accepted. The magnitude of change between the pretest and posttest scores on the "social friendliness" subscale of the Values Inventory was greater in the experimental group than it was in the control group. The experimental group made a gain in the mean scores, but the control group dropped on the adjusted mean scores following the posttest.

Hypothesis IX was accepted. The magnitude of change between the pretest and posttest scores on the total Values Inventory was greater in the experimental group than it was in the control group. The experimental group made a gain in the mean scores, but the control group dropped on the adjusted mean scores following the posttest.
Conclusions

The findings of this investigation support the following conclusions:

1. It is concluded that values-clarification experiences using high-level questioning and selected poems, would be a strategy in helping early adolescents to value those qualities that pertain to effective social relationships.

2. It is concluded that poetry does provide students a tool through which to experience and to think about alternatives concerning value questions.

3. It is concluded that value questions can be effective in values-clarification experiences in helping early adolescents begin to discern what they think and how they feel.

4. It is concluded that since early adolescent years are critical years in the process of value formation, student value claims can be altered through values-clarification experiences.

Recommendations

Based upon the results of the study, it is recommended that:

1. Studies be conducted with samples drawn from differing populations, such as children from a low socioeconomic background, children in public schools, children in a comparable Catholic girls' school, and children of earlier age groups in order to determine if these samples exhibit
value claims different from those shown by the subjects in this study and if they offer different rationales in justification of their value choices.

2. A longitudinal study be conducted with the subjects used in this study, reinforcing the values-clarification experiences in an attempt to determine the developmental stages through the secondary school years.

3. A search be conducted for the purpose of locating other poems that might be more effective in this type study, followed by studies using these additional poems in order to determine the extent to which they affect children's value claims.

4. Studies be conducted using the same selected poems, but one that contains a new set of high-level questions, in order to determine if these new questions produce any differences in the children's value claims from this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Growing Up&quot;</td>
<td>Keith Wilson</td>
<td>Moments in Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A Time to Talk&quot;</td>
<td>Robert Frost</td>
<td>Into New Worlds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Note To My Mother&quot;</td>
<td>Phyllis McGinley</td>
<td>Moments in Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;My Native Land&quot;</td>
<td>Sir Walter Scott</td>
<td>Compass Points in Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Reuben Bright&quot;</td>
<td>Edwin Arlington Robinson</td>
<td>Explorations in Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;People&quot;</td>
<td>Charlotte Zolotow</td>
<td>Seabirds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Thumbprint&quot;</td>
<td>Eve Merriam</td>
<td>Into New Worlds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Abraham Lincoln&quot;</td>
<td>Mildred Plew Meigs</td>
<td>Seabirds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mother to Son&quot;</td>
<td>Langston Hughes</td>
<td>Explorations in Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;First Lesson&quot;</td>
<td>Philip Booth</td>
<td>Compass Points in Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;On Courage&quot; from &quot;On the Feelings of Immortality in Youth&quot;</td>
<td>William Hazlitt</td>
<td>Compass Points in Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Taught Me Purple&quot;</td>
<td>Evelyn Tooley Hunt</td>
<td>Interpreting Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Discovery&quot; by John Collings Squire from &quot;The Virginians&quot;</td>
<td>William Makepeace Thackeray</td>
<td>Into New Worlds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Negro Mother&quot;</td>
<td>Langston Hughes</td>
<td>Seabirds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Refugee in America&quot;</td>
<td>Langston Hughes</td>
<td>Explorations in Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Those Winter Sundays&quot;</td>
<td>Robert Hayden</td>
<td>Compass Points in Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Lost&quot;</td>
<td>Carl Sandburg</td>
<td>Compass Points in Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A Space in the Air&quot;</td>
<td>Jon Silkin</td>
<td>Interpreting Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Clamming&quot;</td>
<td>Reed Whittemore</td>
<td>Selected Poems of Edwin Arlington Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We Never Know How High&quot;</td>
<td>Emily Dickinson</td>
<td>Selected Poems of Edwin Arlington Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Vision of a Past Warrior&quot;</td>
<td>Peter La Farge</td>
<td>Selected Poems of Edwin Arlington Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I Am A Child in These Hills&quot;</td>
<td>Jackson Brown</td>
<td>Selected Poems of Edwin Arlington Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;To An Athlete Dying Young&quot;</td>
<td>Alfred Edward Housman</td>
<td>Selected Poems of Edwin Arlington Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Perfect Knight&quot;</td>
<td>Geoffrey Chaucer</td>
<td>Selected Poems of Edwin Arlington Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Benediction&quot;</td>
<td>Georgia Douglas Johnson</td>
<td>Selected Poems of Edwin Arlington Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Richard Cory&quot;</td>
<td>Edwin Arlington Robinson</td>
<td>Selected Poems of Edwin Arlington Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Cassandra&quot;</td>
<td>Edwin Arlington Robinson</td>
<td>Selected Poems of Edwin Arlington Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A Rumpled Sheet of Paper&quot;</td>
<td>William Carlos Williams</td>
<td>Selected Poems of Edwin Arlington Robinson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
SAMPLE HIGH-LEVEL QUESTIONS DESIGNED
FOR SELECTED POEMS

"A Time to Talk"
by Robert Frost

High-Level Questions:

1. Do you generally want companionship? Why?
2. Do you always know when you need companionship? Why?
3. "Another person's view of a situation may be as good as ours." Do you agree with this statement? Why?
4. In terms of things people want, is every individual different from everyone else? What are some examples?
5. What do you have in common with other people?
6. Is respect for one's self more important than respect for others? Why?
7. Are you unimportant when viewed as a part of the whole population of the world? Why?
8. With people all around, is it possible to feel lonesome? How? Why?
9. Do you think that to know that other people are interested in you, what you feel, know, and want is important? Why?
10. Is it easy to hold wrong ideas about people and things? Why?
11. Are you able to accept people as individuals? Why?
12. Do you think it is wise to judge others from your own beliefs? Why?

"Refugee in America"
by Langston Hughes

High-Level Questions:

1. Does happiness always come from within a person? Why?
2. Does happiness come when a person is busy doing worthwhile things for others? Why?

3. Should you think of your own happiness? Why?

4. In order to be happy, do you have to love someone? Why?

5. Do you tend to take your loved ones for granted? Why?

6. Do you think that love and brotherhood are stronger or weaker than other emotions? Why?

7. What does brotherhood mean to you?

8. Do you believe in loving all people? Why?

9. Does love and brotherhood have priority over other parts of life? Why?

10. What do you think that you must do in order to promote love and brotherhood as you interpret "love and brotherhood?"

11. Does love always lead to happiness? Why?

12. Do you see any differences between "respect" and "love?" Why?

"The Perfect Knight"
by Geoffrey Chaucer

High-Level Questions:

1. What character traits do you want to be known for? Why?

2. What traits are you not proud of possessing? Why?

3. Had you rather be recognized for your character traits or for your accomplishments? Why?

4. How do you judge what are "good" character traits?

5. Are you satisfied with the traits that you have at the present? Why?

"Cassandra"
by Edwin Arlington Robinson

High-Level Questions:

1. What is the difference between wealth and money?
2. Is money a sign of success? Why?

3. If your life has been easy in the past, will it be necessarily so in the future? Why?

4. Can money cloud one's vision of the world? How? Why?

5. In your opinion, what is the place of money in your life?

## APPENDIX C

### VALUES INVENTORY ANSWER SHEET

Circle the number which best indicates how much you believe in the statements in the **Values Inventory**.

1 = Strongly Disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Neutral  
4 = Agree  
5 = Strongly Agree

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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