A review of recent educational and theoretical research reveals a consistent concern with at least three moral imperatives: (1) the importance of students' reflecting upon the events, situations, and circumstances in their own learning experiences or in those of others; (2) the importance of asking students to determine the most meaningful moral principles in those events, situations and circumstances; and (3) the importance of asking students to find within themselves justifications for rightness of their own conclusions that can be supported by the moral force of symbols and metaphors of language and thereby articulated or given some form of demonstrable expression. In other words, values run all through every aspect of recent educational research. The question is then posed for future research if values are important in a writing class or in the curriculum development of a business course. The three developmental considerations mentioned earlier seem to be logical extensions of the thinking of Jean Piaget who indicated in 1965 that games can be used effectively to further the moral development of children and young adults. Lawrence Kohlberg (1982) has also maintained that moral development requires that an individual put him or herself in the place of others. However, there is still considerable cause for concern about values. The research of L. W. Anderson and L. O. Pellicer (1990) documents the widespread presence of counterproductive practices in schools—isolating students, pitting students against each other, encouraging public self-criticism, and engaging in teacher-directed, boringly, repetitive practices. (Contains 155 references.) (TB)
Introduction

As a part of the 1992 presidential campaign, the incumbent vice president used the theme of "family values" in an effort to generate support for the reelection of the sitting president. Many Americans who may have felt that they intuitively knew what Dan Quayle meant by family values may have been disappointed to discover with the publication of his 1994 book that such values did not include loyalty to other members of George Bush's inner circle.

Many conservatives like Rush Limbaugh (1992), William Bennett (1993), Pat Robertson (1990, 1991), and Cal Thomas (1994) frequently advance the need for enterprise and entrepreneurship as well as devotion to God and country. (Unfortunately, on the last two points, these pundits often seem to be arguing for their own conceptions of God and something akin to "America, love it or leave it.") Liberals such as Mario Cuomo (1993), Gloria Steinem (1994), and Joseph Campbell (1973), as well as lesser known figures like White (1994), Wiley (1993), Noddings (1986), and Bellah, et al (1985) stress the rights and needs of the disadvantaged, freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and the merits of dissent—matters which were prized in recent memory but which many in this country currently seem to be rather ambivalent about. Whose values are the true, "American" values? Our political and cultural landscape has always been in a state of flux about such fundamental attitudes—witness the contrasting 19th and 20th century attitudes toward America's indigenous peoples (Matte, 1993; Geertz, 1979; Josephy, 1961).

Considered in a non-political context, America's atheists and fundamentalists might espouse conflicting values. Among the so-called mainstream religions Unitarians and Baptists might see things differently. Certainly Christians and Jews were, to say the least, antagonistic for many centuries. Within the business community, the interests of a firm's management will often be at odds with those of a union. Consumer interests may run counter to stockholder (ownership) interests. And the organization must find ways to satisfy all such groups.

Given such fundamental differences in attitudes and opinions, should anyone's values be manifest in the classroom? If so, whose? Is this more or less important in a writing class? How about a business and/or professional writing class? Some will say that we need to let students develop their own values, but is that what we really want? Much of the time we seem to be saying to young people: 'You have a right to your own opinion as long as it's consistent with mine. What role should the values of the teacher play in all of this? What should occur if such a teacher has values that are different from those of his or her colleagues, from the administration, the parents, the community at large? Whose views should prevail? Whose values? What follows is an attempt to deal with at least some of these questions and issues within a research-based context.
and modification, the values that have been imparted to us by our families, our communities, and our ongoing educational processes.

Assumptions and Perspective

Without question a teacher should be extremely knowledgeable in the field in which he or she provides instruction. Each teacher should also create a classroom atmosphere and a course context that results in students becoming much more knowledgeable about that specific field than they were prior to the beginning of that course. Naturally any teacher will have certain personal viewpoints regarding various aspects of his or her field and each teacher should create a classroom atmosphere and a course context in which students are encouraged to develop their own knowledgeable points-of-view (i.e. opinions) about and within the field. The teacher should challenge and test the values of his or her students to be sure that they are well founded and thoroughly thought out. On the other hand a teacher should not intimidate or belittle students. A teacher should not try to supplant students' values and belief systems with his or her own—within reasonable limitations. (No psychotic attitudes, please.) Students should develop confidence in their own ideas and insights because of the teacher's encouragement. This educational philosophy is my own. I try to live it personally. But it is by no means a solitary opinion.

Prioritizing the Pursuit of Knowledge

In the early 1960's Gordon H. Hullfish and Philip G. Smith (1961) drew from a number of earlier studies and commentaries (Dewey, 1910; Kilpatrick, 1919; Bode, 1927; Counts, 1932; Judd, 1934) in concluding that knowledge is unique to each individual as a result of personal experience that is related to the individual's background and frame of reference. They indicated that one of the primary purposes of education is to improve the ability of individuals to reflect on the manner in which they process information and integrate it into their belief systems—to sensitize the student to the fullest possible range of his or her environment and to increase his or her ability to reflect on that environment. They maintained that as a person becomes increasingly capable of reflecting on his or her experience, the more likely he or she is to develop a realistic perception of the world and a realistic belief system that is uniquely his or her own. They concluded that it is necessary within a free and open society for people to work together both figuratively and literally in an effort to grasp one another's value systems and to learn to look at issues from one another's vantagepoints so that individuals can genuinely learn from one another and effectively deal with the broad range of issues that must be confronted if America is to sustain a pluralistic and democratic society.

Shortly thereafter, Richard Suchman (1962) introduced inquiry training as a technique to expose students to condensed experiences of the sort that scientists and scholars encounter. In inquiry training students are exposed to unexplained phenomena, the causes and fundamental nature of which are not immediately evident. He believed that students should be encouraged to employ the scientific method in probing these causes, in the logical analysis and interpretation of data, and in developing independent ideas and opinions in a disciplined fashion. They would thus be encouraged to develop scientific principles and to assimilate scholarly information through their own processes of inquiry. In this fashion Suchman believes that students can cultivate an awareness of thinking strategies, learn new strategies of their own, fine tune these analytical techniques, and come through a process of mutually-shared inquiry to a higher level of thinking that will permit them to gain personal insights about the uncertain and revisionary nature of knowledge, and give them an appreciation for the broad range of possible explanations that have potential applicability to the problems of life.
In 1961, William J. J. Gordon introduced "synectics" as a problem-solving technique that was expected to result in the manifestation of values in uniquely concrete ways. In numerous publications of his own (1970, 1973, 1977) and many others jointly authored with Poze (1971, 1975 a.b.c.) Gordon expanded upon this variation of the brainstorming technique. Gordon believed that creativity was optimal when people were moderately fatigued and that specifying the problem at the outset with a group of students only served to reduce the range of possible solutions. By working through a successive series of ever more substantively derived problems together with accompanying possible solutions, he believed that an opportunity would emerge both for wider ranging alternatives to be generated and for greater creativity to be developed through the fatigue induced by the additional time required.

In the mid 1960's Joseph Schwab (1965) presented the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study which was created to help students learn scientific content and processes in a realistic and constructive fashion. Like Suchman in particular, Schwab saw science and knowledge as incomplete and undergoing a process of continuous redevelopment. Application of his technique begins with introduction of any of a broad range of scientific problems that need resolution and for which no solution is evident. Students are then encouraged to define the problems from their own perspectives and in their own terms as well as to engage in speculation about the problems to fully flush out all the difficulties involved. Finally, students are encouraged to conjecture about how to resolve the problems either by restating them, restructuring the data, developing new data, new perspectives, etc. The Biological Sciences Curriculum Study was thereby designed to expose students to practical applications of the scientific method while encouraging development of individual ideas and personal interpretation of factual information.

A year later Hilda Taba (1966) published a three-tiered combination of instructional strategies which she had applied with notable success to the teaching of social studies within the Contra Costa School District of California. In doing so she hypothesized that it is possible to teach students how to think, that the dynamics of the relationship between the individual and the information are critical to this process, and that the pattern in which material is learned is crucial in terms of whether or not it will be properly internalized. In fact, she advised a series of steps that she maintained could not be changed if certain cognitive skills were to be properly developed. She said that information had to be identified by the student and specifically articulated by him or her in his or her own terms. Then it had to be grouped in terms of similarities; then categorized and given appropriate names. She called this process "concept information." A second process which she called "interpretation of data" also involves three steps. The first of these is identification and differentiation of points about a subject or an issue. Having distinguished these points, the student is required to explain the points and relate them to other students in terms of their similarities and dissimilarities, causes and effects, etc. Students are then encouraged to move beyond the material to interpretive conclusions of their own. The third of Taba's strategies is designed to follow the other two. She called it "application of principles" and like the first two strategies it consists of three steps. In the first phase the student is asked to anticipate the outcome of an event or a set of circumstances. Then the student must substantiate this judgment with a detailed breakdown of the particulars involved in his or her reasoning. In the third phase the student is allowed to fully substantiate the situation to actually determine whether or not the earlier judgment and reasoning were correct.

In the same year Donald W. Oliver and James P. Shaver (1966) published the first in a series of works on the Jurisprudential Inquiry Model which was intended to stimulate logical thought and intelligent reflection on issues of the day. Like Taba's strategies, it was designed for use in social studies classes but can be applied to any academic area in which open discussion and individual interpretation are appropriate. In Oliver and Shaver's model, students are introduced to a situation and the particulars are reviewed by the students with the assistance of the teacher. The students are then asked to find a social issue that is central to all the divergent elements of the situation and to determine the social values that are at odds with one another. Before proceeding the teacher tries to be sure that all the students understand the fundamental
concepts that are involved. Students are then asked to take a stand on the issue, to explain the reasoning that has led them to that position, and to flush out their reasoning in some depth. The teacher then assumes a Socratic posture, confrontationally probing and questioning the weak points in the students' positions in terms of the values involved. It is believed that students should be compelled to determine priorities and that in doing so their awareness of issues and conflicts should become clearer. Equipoonderant and related situations should be explored and positions should be qualified. Student opinions should not be directly critiqued in conclusion but the pertinent values and issues should be analyzed in consideration of the ensuing discussion. The probable results and the likely by-products of the positions the students have assumed should be examined and explained in terms of their logical outcomes.

The Importance of Sensitivity

Simultaneously Byron Massialas and Benjamin Cox (1966), who like Suchman and Schwab saw all knowledge as incomplete and going through a process of continuous revision, introduced their concept of Academic Inquiry which, like Hullfish and Smith's conclusions prioritized the importance of reflective thinking, like Oliver and Shaver's model is primarily designed to deal with controversial contemporary social issues, and like Taba's strategies as well as Oliver and Shaver's model, was a technique specifically constructed for use in the teaching of social studies. In Massialas and Cox's method a real conflict situation is presented to students for which, in fact, there is no easy answer. The class does not proceed beyond this point until its members have been sensitized to the realities of the conflict situation. That situation is then formally articulated in language that properly defines the problem and is acceptable to all as a proper point at which to begin its resolution. A hypothetical explanation, or explanations, with the potential of leading to an ultimate solution is then proposed that must be consistent with the frame of reference of the students and teacher in terms of their backgrounds and experience and the known facts and evidence at hand. The hypothesis is then reworked and refined until everyone in the class is conversant about the conflict situation. The hypothesis is examined in depth and then expanded and restricted in every way that logic and good sense will permit. All possible factual and evidentiary information is then assembled. And finally a solution or solutions is articulated and the positive and negative aspects of each are examined and discussed. The teacher must remember that while he or she is a facilitator of everything that goes on under this model, the students are the ones who must work through the process if it is to be the learning experience it is capable of being.

In a similar vein in that same year Mark Chesler and Robert Fox (1966) advocated the use of role playing as an instructional methodology, as would Fannie and George Shaftel a year later (1967). This technique allows students to personally explore interactive relationships by acting them out and then discussing them with their peers. It is a somewhat tricky technique that may require some training and practice. Chesler and Fox advocated the use of pantomine as a preliminary step. The Shaftels suggested that the teacher discuss the setting and basic aspects of the action with the participating students so that they will have some sense of direction and also will feel comfortable with what they are about to do. Role playing sessions need to be brief with the teacher ending them as soon as the contours of the issues or characterizations begin to emerge. The point is to stimulate discussion and to bring issues to life. If the first enactment fails to accomplish this, then a second role playing situation should be considered. The technique forces students to take on the roles and positions of others, to consider nuances of meaning, the relationship between emotions and behavior, and unforeseen aspects and implications of their own ideas and attitudes.

A year later Herbert Thelen (1967) encouraged the selective grouping of students and teachers who possessed certain specifically compatible similarities. Like Hullfish and Smith, Thelen prioritized the importance of reflective thinking. Like Oliver and Shaver, Thelen believed the teacher should probe the students' ideas and opinions--although less confrontationally--rather than engage in expository instruction.
And like Oliver and Shaver, and Massialas and Cox, Thelen emphasized the importance of cultivating sensitivity about and generating ideas for dealing with contemporary social issues.

In 1969 Ronald Lippitt and Robert Fox developed the "Michigan Social Science Curriculum Project," which employed social psychological methods in much the same way that Schwab had used biological methods. Together with Schaible, they provided opportunities for students to observe human interactions within an academic context that also provided opportunities for inquiry. After cultivating the ability to make meaningful distinctions students would be encouraged to apply these reflective methods to themselves and their own behavior (Lippitt, Fox, and Schaible, 1969, a and b).

In the next two years Barak Rosenshine asserted that the nature of the feedback that students receive when they express opinions and advocate positions significantly influences their subsequent successes and failures. He maintained that better teachers spend more time with students, probe more deeply to ascertain the fullness of their understanding of related information, elicit responses from each individual, and provide comprehensive and meaningful feedback to all students (Rosenshine, 1970 and 1971).

Throughout the following decade David and Roger Johnson explored the value of cooperative learning methods together with several associates, concluded that cooperative tasks and shared rewards tend to result in greater cohesiveness within the group of learners, mutually supportive behavior, and stronger interpersonal relationships while ultimately improving the students' mastery of the material (Johnson and Johnson, 1972; Johnson and Johnson, 1974; Johnson, Johnson, Johnson and Anderson, 1976; Johnson, Johnson and Scott, 1978; Johnson, Johnson and Skon, 1979; Johnson, Maruyama, Johnson, Nelson, and Skon, 1981). In the late 1970s and early 1980s, Robert Slavin would come to similar conclusions about the efficacy of cooperative learning (Slavin, 1977, a, b, c, d; 1978, a, b; 1983). And Shlomo Sharan found that cooperative learning was even more effective in highly complex and extremely challenging circumstances (Sharan and Sharan, 1976; Sharan, 1980).

On the Shoulders of Others

Over much of the same period, James Block sought to advance the theories of John Carroll and Benjamin Bloom concerning mastery learning. Block and his predecessors maintained that with sufficient time, resolute determination, and additional quality instructions virtually all students can learn material and satisfy a commonly shared set of objectives. So the challenge is in finding ways to modify the curriculum so that slower students can be given extra time (Block, 1971; Block and Anderson, 1975; Block, 1980).

In 1974 David Rimm and John Masters sought to enhance the behavior modification theory originally advanced by B. F. Skinner but applied it to both therapy and education. They maintained that students could improve their self-control, their study skills, their overall academic skills, and their ability to interact socially by reducing their fears and anxieties, by replacing negative associations with positive ones, and by strengthening and reinforcing those positive characteristics that they already possessed (Rimm and Masters, 1974).

In the mid 1970's, David Aspy, Flora Roebuck, and their associates drew from the philosophy of Carl Rogers in advancing the theory that curriculum should be nondirective, allowing students to be partners in their own education, allowing them to determine their own values, and enabling them to develop a personally defined sense of self worth, while fostering individual creativity and personal expression (Aspy and Roebuck, 1973; Aspy, Roebuck, Willson, and Adams, 1974; and Roebuck, Buhler, and Aspy, 1976).
In 1979, M.A. El Nemr's meta-analysis indicated that the instructional methods advanced by Schwab (i.e., the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study), by Lippitt and Fox (i.e., the Michigan Social Science Curriculum Project) and by Taba (within the Contra Costa School District) accomplished their purposes quite effectively but that traditional teacher-dominated methods of instruction were largely ineffective (El Nemr, 1979).

Two years later Bredderman came to remarkably similar conclusions with a separate meta analysis (Bredderman, 1981). Two years after that, Kenneth Sirotnik came to the same conclusion about the ineffectiveness of traditional methods (Sirotnik, 1983), with yet another researcher coming to a similar conclusion a year after that (Bremer, 1984).

In 1980, Emily Elefant successfully employed Richard Suchman's inquiry training methods with deaf children, indicating that succinct but realistic scientific experiences can be quite effective learning tools for students who have sensory deprivations. Two years later, Voss (1982) came to similar conclusions with both elementary and secondary school children without sensory deprivation characteristics.

**Dramatic Considerations**

Throughout the 1980s—and particularly during the early to middle years of that decade following the 1983 publication of *A nation at risk: The imperative of educational reform* by the National Commission on Excellence in Education--James Cangelosi (1982; 1986; 1988) as well as a number of other researchers and theorists provided procedural recommendations and an abundance of accompanying insights about the establishment and maintenance of discipline within academic settings without resorting to counterproductive tactics. The opening line of the second paragraph of *A nation at risk* was: "If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war," an unmistakable expression of concern that received a considerable amount of media attention along with that of the educational community. The state of academic affairs--particularly in contrast with the advancements that appeared to be occurring in other countries--seemed to warrant immediate and almost revolutionary remedial measures. In that vein, a great many diverse recommendations were provided by educational theorists of every ilk toward the end of creating a newly invigorated and broad based level of educational improvement that was intended to manifest long-term academic excellence (McLemore, 1981; Dreikurs, Grunwald, and Pepper, 1982; Tillman, 1982; Bowman, 1983; Kerr and Nelson, 1983; Mendler and Curwin, 1983; Rust and Kinnard, 1983; Wikox, 1983; Bell and Stefanich, 1984; Carducci and Carducci, 1984; Duke and Jones, 1984; Rich, 1984; Seeman, 1984; Walker and Shea, 1984; Van Dyck, 1984; Boynton, DiGeronimo, and Gustafson, 1985; Charles, 1985; Lasley, 1985; Presbie and Brown, 1985; Rogus, 1985; Swick, 1985 a and b; Welsh, 1985; Woolridge and Richman, 1985; Doyle, 1986; Glassar, 1986; Jones and Jones, 1986; McDaniels, 1986; Parker and Gehrke, 1986; Petresheine, 1986, a and b; Strike and Solis, 1986; Wolfgang and Glickman, 1986; Shannon, 1986; Zumwalt, 1986). The stream of students from other countries to American educational institutions, and particularly to those of higher education, did little to ease the national fears and exacerbated those fears when international students or the children of immigrants outperformed American-born students.

In 1984 Theodore Sizer advocated self-directed learning that followed nine "common principles" of education. Sizer acknowledged students' abilities to utilize rote learning to internalize vocabulary and basic mathematical computations but maintained that students' reasoning skills and particularly those of analysis and synthesis were sorely deficient. He believed that teaching and learning needed to be personalized, that teachers should be cross-disciplinary generalists who function as coaches who encourage students to learn while serving as role models and also functioning as interactive learners themselves. He advocated the
development of a test-free environment, without low level grades, that featured concentration on a limited number of both subjects and skills which were to be studied and concentrated upon in depth.

During the same period Glen Doman (1985) advocated moving in the opposite direction. Building upon his experiences with and treatment of brain-injured children and firmly convinced that the brain's capacity increases with its use, he became convinced that a comprehensive exposure to a wide range of classical studies should be engaged in with students going through specialized repetitive exercises, concentrating on the fine points of renowned artists and esteemed thinkers, within a nurturing, enthusiastic environment for up to 12 hours a day.

In 1986, Tennyson and Cocchiarella compared contrasting approaches and concluded that compellingly insightful examples should precede the teacher's presentation of ideas and principles, in contrast with commonly prevailing practice, and that students also learn to master the execution of processes best when they are enabled to engage in considerable, unhurried practice. In 1990, Levin and Levin concluded that the use of examples and associations were also very effective in facilitating analysis, synthesis, and problem solving.

During the mid to late 1980s, Rita and Kenneth Dunn (1983, 1989, a and b) wrote extensively about their own system of characterizing and classifying diverse aspects of student behavior. They also recommended modifying educational externalities so as to optimize student development. They believed that the academic environment should be tailored to the individual learner's level of maturity and personality development, providing structure or independence, professional involvement or peer interaction, and much more as part of an extraordinary range of potential accommodations that would facilitate each student's movement toward the next stage of his or her development.

Consolidation

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, a number of researchers conducted studies that confirmed the value of cooperative (i.e., team or group) learning as opposed to individualistically competitive classroom settings (Sharan and Shachar, 1988; Johnson and Johnson, 1990; Kagan, 1990; Sharan and Shaulov, 1990; Slavin, 1990). Both Robert Slavin and Bruce Joyce would separately conclude in 1991 that, contrary to the opinions of many educators and parents, students who are highly successful in individualistic environments tend to be even more stimulated and challenged within the more humane contexts of cooperative environments.

Throughout the 1980s and early 1990s Bruce Joyce, working with a number of other researchers and writers arrived at a number of insightful conclusions. They determined that many people are comfortable with old familiar images and methods and they tend to be uncomfortable with educational innovation despite their rhetoric to the contrary (Joyce, Hersh, and McKibben, 1983). Most teachers never try new strategies because, to do so they need to modify their current, highly engrained teaching techniques, and their students need to learn complementary skills which they are also unfamiliar with (Joyce and Showers, 1981). Teachers' self concepts are crucial and their flexibility is vital (McKibbin and Joyce, 1980; Joyce, Peck, and Brown, 1981). Furthermore, it takes students awhile to learn to respond to a new educational method in order to demonstrate and fulfill their potentialities (Joyce, McKibbin, and Hush, 1983). They found that lecturing in an interactive context (an "advance organizer") can be very effective (Joyce and Showers, 1988); that cooperative learning methodologies can be very effective (Baveja, Showers, and Joyce, 1985; Joyce, 1991); that inductive methodologies can be very effective (Hunt, Joyce, Greenwood, Noy, Reid, and Weil, 1981); and that learning a variety of methodologies can increase a teacher's effectiveness considerably (Joyce, Murphy, Showers, and Murphy, 1989; Joyce, Weil, and Showers, 1992).
Three developmental aspects of moral imagination seemed to be a consistent thread throughout the educational research and theoretical developments that have been cited earlier in this paper. The first involves reflecting upon the events, situations and circumstances in one's own learning experiences or in those of others; the second involves determining the most meaningful moral principles in those events, situations, and circumstances; and the third involves finding within themselves justifications for the rightness of their own conclusions which could be supported by the moral force of symbols and metaphors of language and thereby articulated or given some form of demonstrable expression. In other words, values run all through every aspect of what has been presented here. Furthermore, those three developmental considerations seem to be logical extensions of the thinking of Jean Piaget who indicated in 1965 that games can be used effectively to further the moral development of children and young adults. Lawrence Kohlberg (1982) has also maintained that developing the ability to put oneself into the shoes of others empathetically is essential to moral growth. Brian Hall (1986) and James Cangelosi (1988) also maintain that a wide variety of interpersonal skills need to be cultivated in situational contexts. Stanley Hauerwas (1977), Iris Murdoch (1983), Robert Coles (1989), and Robert Craig (1989, 1991, 1993) have also provided evidence that situational contexts can be used to link developing individual values within areas that are appropriate for their potential applicability. However, there is still considerable cause for concern. Consistent with the findings of Sirotnik (1983), the research of Anderson and Pellicer (1990) documents the widespread presence of counterproductive practices—isolating students, pitting students against each other, encouraging public self-criticism, and engaging in teacher-directed, boringly repetitive practices. Yet as Angelo (1993) indicates, students' motivations to learn can be changed by good teachers who are willing to use methods that will connect with them and make learning more "real." However, most students will not simulate such creativity or incorporate such vitality into their internalization processes on their own (Seitz, 1994; Menge, 1995). These are absolutely crucial issues because the modes of thinking and problem solving that we are exposed to in our primary learning years impact upon us and to some extent they become a part of us influencing and affecting us throughout the rest of our lives. If those modes are narrow and inflexible then we are limited by those exposures and by the values they represent. On the other hand, if those modes are rooted in reality yet dynamic and creative then the resultant unleashed potentialities probably will be too.

Proposed Future Research

I am therefore endeavoring to develop a test for such theories within a business and technical writing context. A copy of my current syllabus will be provided at the seminar in the hope that you will provide substantive suggestions as to how an academician could most effectively conduct such research. In considering this you should be aware that such a course is usually built around a recurring series of business and/or professional situations that must be dealt with in writing. The students must learn to deal with these situations effectively so that the organizational needs and the requirements of the moment will not eclipse the personal imperative to "do what's right."

However, one is struck by the enormity of the related professional literature. In some respects the theories that have been advanced seem to dovetail but there are notable differences as well. How is a teacher/researcher to determine which aspects of these theories are most applicable and which can be tested most effectively? I would greatly appreciate any ideas and insights which the seminar participants can provide.

It should be noted that others have already made efforts to synthesize and apply some of the foregoing. J.P. Miller (1976) has employed the reflective thinking concepts of Hullfish and Smith (1961) and
developed his own model to increase students' abilities to relate to one another's viewpoints and to use them to expand upon their own. L. E. Raths (1976) has moved in a similar direction to Miller demonstrating extensively the development of individual student confidence as a by-product of reflective thinking and determination of personal values. Fred M. Newman (1975) has reported on the effectiveness of the techniques of Oliver and Shaver for use in dealing with such issues as school desegregation and racial conflicts, collective bargaining and labor conflicts, fair trade laws and business competition, individual rights and federal loyalty and secrecy programs. George A. Steiner (1992) has also demonstrated the applicability of Oliver and Shaver's thinking to the introduction and stimulation of divergent views on such business issues as the determination of desirable economic policies both fiscal and monetary, ascertaining the social responsibilities of business, protectionism vs. free trade, and business ethics. E.F. Harrison (1981) has documented and demonstrated the applicability of various approaches to decision-making situations, including that of Hilda Taba. Frank C. Pierson (1979), drawing heavily from Taba, and Oliver and Shaver, has shown conclusively that the teaching of thinking and value systems is essential to the proper education of American businessmen.

Conclusion

Clearly there is an extraordinary volume of respected work--the surface of which has only been touched upon here--that indicates and advocates not only the teaching of thinking and value systems but also documents the validity of its utility. If we are not to be persuaded by such bodies of thought then perhaps we would do well to reflect on the fact that, if a single definitive "system" of thought with "right" values and proper "knowledge" is to be found (Such a thought scares me) then it will most certainly be discovered within an atmosphere which cultivates and encourages creative individual thought and personal quest for values.
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