NOVA

University of Newcastle Research Online

nova.newcastle.edu.au

Lovat, Terence; Clement, Neville 'So who has the values?: challenges for faith-based schools in an era of values pedagogy', International Handbook of Learning, Teaching and Leading in Faith-Based Schools p. 567-581 (2014)

Available from: <http://www.springer.com/us/book/9789401789714#aboutBook>

The final publication is available at www.springerlink.com

Accessed from: <http://hdl.handle.net/1959.13/1064698>

So who has the Values?

Challenges for Faith-based Schools in an Era of Values Pedagogy

Terence Lovat & Neville Clement

Introduction

The paper speaks to the emergence of values pedagogy, understood as a holistic approach to education that focusses on the values that should underpin the environment and drive the practice of education. In this sense, values becomes so all-encompassing and determinative of the educational process that it comes to constitute a comprehensive pedagogy, a way of going about the entire business of education. The past decade has seen a significant increase in emphasis on values pedagogy, in this defined sense, variously titled values education, character education and moral education, across the world, including heavily in governmental and broadly non faith-based educational contexts. The potential of such pedagogy to influence educational outcomes, ranging from socio-emotional to academic outcomes, has been demonstrated in ways that supersede most historical evidence. Granted that most of the earlier evidence about the effects of values pedagogy has come from faith-based contexts, the chapter will explore the challenges for faith-based schools in an era that sees much of its traditional distinctive pedagogy being implemented and arguably perfected more widely outside such contexts.

Values Monopoly of Faith based Schools

In earlier days, differences between faith-based and general (public/government) schooling were held to be largely around the presence of explicit religious and moral (values) education. In turn, these differences were deemed to constitute the main reason for evidence of greater wellbeing and success, including academic achievement, in faith-based schooling (Bryk et al. 1993; Hawkes 2005; Hill et al. 1990; Jeynes and Beuttler, 2012). As a result, much early evidence about the positive effects of values pedagogy was to be found in faith-based school settings. Investigation into the relative academic performance of students attending faith-based schools in the US of over a decade or more by Jeynes (2002a, 2002b, 2003, 2005, 2012) has consistently identified an academic advantage for students attending faith-based schools. For instance, investigation into the performance of grade 12 students pointed to five contributing traits as being characteristic of such schools, even after

controlling for the effects of socio-economic status (SES): “These traits included a better school atmosphere, a higher level of racial harmony, more homework, less school violence, and more school discipline” (Jeynes 2002b, p. 29).

Students from low SES backgrounds who attended faith-based schools were more likely to have higher academic achievement than their counterparts in non-religious schools (Jeynes 2002a). Additionally, the taking of more advanced courses and diligence were characteristics associated with faith-based schools, especially Catholic Schools (Jeynes 2003). Furthermore, a recent meta-analysis by Jeynes (2012) of 90 quantitative studies covering the period 1960-2011 (mostly from the US) compared the effects on student outcomes of public, charter and faith-based schools. After controlling for SES, selectivity and other measures, Jeynes found that faith-based schools accounted for an effect size of approximately twenty percent of a standard deviation on academic achievement, and thirty-five percent of a standard deviation on behavioural measures. Furthermore, Jeynes (2002a, 2002b, 2003) attributed this academic advantage in faith-based school students over their regular school equivalents to a number of values-related factors concerned with school atmosphere, student care, degree of non-violence and social inclusiveness.

Various other investigations into the impact of faith-based schooling on student academic achievement have unearthed the influence of values in the practicalities of teaching and learning. Prominent among these studies are those by Bryk et al. (1993) and Hill et al. (1990), both of which noted the success of Catholic schools in regard to disadvantaged youth. Bryk et al. noted teacher modelling, commitment to and interest in their students as characteristic, and so notions of trust and shared values as central underlying values that were drawn upon in order to explain the better performance of these schools. Other studies have also observed these kinds of embedded values in Catholic schools and noted their positive effect (e.g. Grace 1998; Groome 1998; Powney et al. 1995). So convinced of these kinds of benefits of the Catholic system was Bryk (1996, cf. Jeynes 2012) that he would go on to use the system as the primary model for a reform agenda for all Chicago schools.

Moreover, Hill et al. (1990) noted that a feature that explained the success of Catholic schools and special purpose schools was their freedom and capacity to structure their school in order to achieve their mission for the students. The embedded nature of positive values as underlying an effective teaching and learning environment was also observed by Hawkes’

(2005) study in the UK of a Church of England primary school with above average performance in English, maths and science. Again, themes that emerged from the study as significant included the teachers caring for and valuing students, modelling values, imposing clear boundaries for behaviour and creating a positive classroom ambience for learning. The values which emanated from the Christian principles that underpinned the school were implicit in the school's ethos and found expression in the following way:

... through school policies, positive relationships, and prayer. ... The evidence suggests that the school's values have acted as the foundation for the school's learning environment which is acknowledged by Ofsted and the Diocese to be of such good quality. (Hawkes 2005, p. 179)

As important as it is for values to be embedded or implicit within an educational system, Hunt's (2004) Australian study emphasizes the greater synergy that occurs when values are also taught explicitly as part of the curriculum and melded with the implicit values of the school and its supporting community so that there is consistency between the implicit and explicit: "It is apparent from the data collected ... that values are both taught and caught" (Hunt 2004, p. 140). Furthermore, Hunt observed that explicit teaching of values not only increased their knowledge of values, but widened their appreciation of the application of values "... beyond themselves to family, community and world perspectives" (p. 140). In this approach, the express statement of school core values and positive parental influence and support for school values supported the students' incorporation of values. Together with other studies, Hunt's (2004) study pointed out the vital interplay between the implicit, as reflected in the modelling of values and school ambience, and explicit, as expressed through teaching and the curriculum. It seems it is the implementation of this type of values pedagogy that is likely to impact positively upon the social, emotional, spiritual, cognitive and academic development of students.

It could be argued that, in the past at least, the synergistic interplay between the implicit and explicit, between modelling and teaching, has been more characteristic of the faith-based school, where the mission has been understood to include the cultivation of character and citizenship, than to be found typically in the public/ government school. In the traditional divide between faith-based schools and public/government schools, it is this mission that has often been taken to be the central difference, with the mission of the latter schools often stated in explicitly and supposedly values-neutral ways (Muehlenberg 2004). Furthermore, because this different mission has often been associated with values education, at least in

part, values education was therefore often cast as being germane to the faith-based school (as part of its mission, if not indoctrination) but as not having a place in the public/ government setting. The evidence above, however, illustrates that values pedagogy, as defined, has potential to have educational influence quite beyond what might be considered to be the exclusive mission of the faith-based school. It presents rather as an especially important ingredient in melding the various factors that contribute to holistic development, as it promotes student autonomy, critical thinking and academic learning (Pike 2010).

In summary, studies of faith-based schooling have contributed key insights into the relationship between mainstream teaching goals and values pedagogy. In many ways, this relationship has been implicit in such schooling, as demonstrated by the studies cited above, in particular those of Hill et al. (1990) and Bryk et al. (1993). Such studies indicate that a consistent provision of a trusting and caring environment, together with positive relationships between students and their teachers and a commitment to meeting the needs of individual students, impact significantly on student attainment and constitute an especially positive enhancement of the impact of teaching in reducing the debilitating effects of social disadvantage. Furthermore such studies of faith-based schooling demonstrate the importance of schools' having the freedom and capacity to structure schooling for the benefit of student success by creating a synergy between their mainstream educational goals and the broader goals of human development. In short, care and trust emerge as essential features of an effective pedagogy (Rowe 2004). Hence, the foregoing survey of faith-based schooling demonstrates that positive values exhibited by schools and teachers contribute significantly to student achievement and that the values-laden environment of faith-based schools has been seen to offer greater potential for enhanced student effects.

At the same time, new research insights are challenging some of the assumptions held by faith-based schools in earlier times that part of their system's distinctiveness was to be found around the values agenda. Recent developments in pedagogical thought and practice have persistently identified care, trust and an overall values oriented ambience as being a central ingredient in effective teaching and student achievement (Newmann & associates 1996; Forgasz 2002; Newell and Rimes 2002; Salman 2002; Tarlinton and O'Shea 2002; Hattie 2003; Rowe, 2004; Lovat and Clement 2008b; Lovat, Clement et al. 2010a, 2010b; Hattie 2011; Lovat, Dally et al. 2011a). Evidence from the Australian Government's Values Education Good Schools Project ([VEGPSP] Department of Education, Science and Training

[DEST] 2006; Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations [DEEWR] 2008) indicated the overwhelming benefit to schools, faith-based or otherwise, of reflecting on, re-evaluating and rethinking the implications of 'values education', as defined, for curricula, classroom management and school ethos in the interests of student wellbeing and progress. Hence, values education is being seen increasingly to have outgrown any earlier conceptions of being exclusively germane to, much less dependent on, the faith-based setting. It is this vital connection between values education (what we increasingly refer to as 'values pedagogy') and the type of holistic human development that underpins all effective pedagogy that we regard as the new paradigm in pedagogical understanding generally. It is to this connection that we will turn now in order to lay the ground for the argument that the distinctiveness of faith-based schooling's values base is being quickly eroded.

Forging the Connections between Values and Holism in Learning

Beyond the targeted research above, as indicated, much broader research of recent times has underlined the importance of a values-rich approach to education if the fullest effects of learning are to be achieved, including those related to academic learning. The Carnegie Corporation's 1994 Task Force on Learning (Carnegie Corporation 1996) represented a controversial turning-point in views about the power of teaching to intervene in what had been regarded as socially determined effects of student achievement paradigms. Carnegie asserted that effective learning requires a response that is as much about affect, social dynamics and morality as it is about mere cognition. In so doing, Carnegie determined that intellectual depth was the true goal and measure of effective learning. In turn, intellectual depth was defined in such a way as to imply that matters of communicative competence, empathic character and self-reflection were as significant to learning as were those technical skills normally associated with learning outcomes. Their significance lay in the fact that they represented an education engaged in holistic development, what Peters (1981) referred to as the 'value condition' that must be affiliated with the 'knowledge condition' for authentic education to proceed. Through Carnegie, the values orientation indispensable to any learning where student achievement is to be optimized was affirmed.

In an allied sense, Newmann's (Newmann and Associates 1996) work focussed on the 'pedagogical dynamics' required for effective learning. These dynamics ranged from the instrumental (e.g., sound technique, updated professional development) to the more overtly values-oriented. 'Catering for diversity' referred to the respectful relationship between

teacher and student that ensures the student feeling accepted and valued. Similarly, ‘school coherence’ was about the mission of the school to be there first and foremost for the wellbeing of the student. This led in turn to the ultimate pedagogical dynamic of the ‘trustful, supportive ambience’, the *sine qua non* of effective learning.

Pedagogical research of the sort outlined above has been further confirmed by developments in a number of the sciences, including the neurosciences (Immordino-Yang and Damasio 2007) where the central focus is on the vital interrelationship between those neural systems that underpin reason, memory, emotion and social interaction. This research underscores the fact that cognition cannot be isolated as an independent function, but is enmeshed with neural processes relating to perception and affective states and responses within the social context. Furthermore, the emerging understanding of the interaction between genetic and environmental factors emphasizes the significance of the quality and type of the learning environment (Diamond 2007, 2009), and, in particular, draws attention to the importance of the quality of the affective ambience of the learning environment (Immordino-Yang 2011; Immordino-Yang and Faeth 2010; Rosiek and Beghetto 2009; Zembylas 2005, 2007).

Learning is increasingly understood as involving an incremental process in which the learner intuitively abstracts structure from both explicit and implicit elements of their experience (Goswami 2008; Meltzoff et al. 2009) and engages both implicit and explicit learning and memory systems (Squire and Kandel 2009; Squire and Stark 2008). This means that learning is inherent to what it is to be human and so occurs in response to all that a person experiences, whether in formal or informal learning or just the experiences of life in general. Cognition and memory cannot be treated as entities that can be isolated from the emotional and social dimensions that frame and set the demeanour of the learning experience (see Immordino-Yang 2011). These insights effectively re-conceive cognition as involving affective and social impulses’ working together to impel action, including around the moral dimension of behaviour. For educators, the work of the neurosciences adds to the emerging weight of evidence from other fields of educational research that seems to confirm the need for new pedagogy that engages the whole person in all dimensions of human development, including moral development (see Clement 2010; Clement and Lovat 2012; Lovat, Dally et al. 2011a).

Research insights such as these illustrate the central importance of education's being conceived as holistic. Such holistic perspectives are beginning to appear in public/government education regimes in which previously more clearly instrumentalist approaches were taken. In Australia, where late twentieth century education was characterized by narrow attention to technical and skills-based competencies and outcomes (Finn 1991; Mayer 1992), a gathering of senior federal and state political and bureaucratic forces in education designed to set the objectives for twenty-first century education based on the most recent research findings available enunciated the following more holistic sentiments, effectively a corrective against the erstwhile narrowness of goals:

Australia's future depends upon each citizen having the necessary knowledge, understanding, skills and values for a productive and rewarding life in an educated, just and open society. High quality schooling is essential to achieving this vision ... Schooling provides a foundation for young Australians' intellectual, physical, social, moral, spiritual and aesthetic development. (MCEETYA 1999, p. 1)

Furthermore, the Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians (MCEETYA 2008) underlined the appropriateness of such a perspective to twenty-first century schooling. In the Preamble to the Document, we read:

Schools play a vital role in promoting the intellectual, physical, social, emotional, moral, spiritual and aesthetic development and wellbeing of young Australians. (p. 4)

Concerning the curriculum actions that should follow from such a perspective, the document states:

The curriculum will enable students to develop knowledge in the disciplines of English, mathematics, science, languages, humanities and the arts; to understand the spiritual, moral and aesthetic dimensions of life; and open up new ways of thinking. (p. 13)

The Melbourne Declaration asserts that effective schooling of any kind and in any system requires an environment that encourages, supports and nurtures the holistic development of its students. In that respect, there is now an increasing store of evidence in the field of values pedagogy that the establishment of values-rich ambiances of learning, together with explicit discourse about values in ways that draw on students' deeper learning and reflectivity, has power to transform the patterns of student attitudes and behaviour, including in strengthening academic work (e.g., Noddings 2002; Arthur 2003; Rowe 2004; Campbell et al. 2004; Benninga et al. 2006; Carr 2006, 2007; Killen and Semetana 2006; Nucci and Narvaez 2008; Lovat and Toomey 2009; Lovat et al. 2009a; Lovat 2010a, 2010b; Arthur 2010; Lovat and Toomey 2010; Lovat, Toomey, et al. 2010; Lovat, Clement, et al. 2010a, 2010b; Lovett and

Jordan 2010; Lovat, Dally et al. 2011a). Increasingly, values pedagogy is being seen as an effective way to achieve a more holistic approach to learning, resulting, among other things, in enhanced academic diligence. The weight of evidence from international research indicates the futility of assuming that values pedagogy can be seen as the exclusive domain of any one schooling sector, faith-based or other, or that education in any sector can be values-neutral (see Lovat, Dally et al. 2011b). We will turn now to some of the more specific, largely empirical research that underpins such a claim.

Updated International Research in Values Pedagogy

Osterman's (2010) work underlines the nexus between cognition, affect and sociality, and the inherent relationship between learning ambience and academic diligence, in illustrating the enhanced learning capacity in environments where students feel they belong and so experience greater emotional wellbeing. Osterman also underlines the close connection between the teacher relationship and the kind of pedagogy provided by the teacher. It is not the teacher who merely provides a supportive ambience or the one who merely instructs well whose practice enhances academic diligence. It is the teacher whose pedagogy is, at one and the same time, characterized by the supportive relationship and best practice that brings students to new levels of academic strength. Meanwhile, Davidson, Khmelkov and Lickona (2010) have shown that 'moral character' and 'performance character' are essential partners in effective pedagogy. As it is, educational effectiveness has tended to focus on performance without sufficient attention being paid to the moral dimension; conversely, values education research has too often focused on the moral without sufficient attention to the issue of performance.

Similarly, Sokol, Hammond and Berkowitz (2010) explore the binary relationship between performance and morality as a disjunction in the way that moral and developmental psychologies have developed and been interpreted in the education profession. They identify the psychological constructs that together constitute moral agency, each with its own developmental trajectory of self-regulation, autonomy, perspective taking and moral reasoning, and empathy and moral competence. They offer insight into why it is that many of the so-called 'foundations' of teaching have failed to inform and prepare teachers for the holistic nature of their work. At the other end of the spectrum, Arthur (2010) and Arthur and Wilson (2010) were involved in a UK study funded by the Templeton Foundation, titled *Learning for Life*, that concluded, among other things, that a concentration on character by

the teacher whose pedagogical practice models and exudes the virtues and values that underpin it has flow on effects that are able to transform the learning environment from one that naturally excludes those who lack dispositional readiness for learning to one that includes them. In contrast to the ‘old foundations’ of teaching, this UK work effectively offers a new set of foundations built around values pedagogy, including new foundations for teacher education (see Lovat, Dally et al. 2011b)

These research findings concur with what has been captured in the research and practice of the projects emanating from the Australian Values Education Program, a federally funded venture. This program began with a pilot study in 2003 (DEST 2003), and was followed by the development of a National Framework for Values Education in 2005 (DEST 2005). A range of attached research and practice projects was undertaken from 2005 to 2009, the most crucial of which were the two stages of the *Values Education Good Practice Schools Project* ([VEGPSP] DEST 2006; DEEWR 2008) and the *Project to Test and Measure the Impact of Values Education on Student Effects and School Ambience* (Lovat et al. 2009a, 2009b).

Within the two stages of VEGPSP, 316 schools organized into 51 clusters across the country, involving approximately 100,000 students, 10,000 teachers and 50 University academics, engaged in a variety of approaches to values pedagogy, all based on the central premise of an inextricable interrelationship between values and best practice pedagogy. Findings from stage 1 (DEST 2006) illustrated that a sound values orientation, including being implicit in relationships and ambience and explicit in teaching, can be a powerful ally in the development of best practice pedagogy. Positive effects were demonstrated across a range of measures, including persistent reference to the improved environment of learning and greater student attention to the regular academic work of the classroom:

Everyone in the classroom exchange, teachers and students alike, became more conscious of trying to be respectful, trying to do their best, and trying to give others a fair go. We also found that by creating an environment where these values were constantly shaping classroom activity, student learning was improving, teachers and students were happier, and school was calmer. (DEST, 2006, p. 120)

Based on the evidence of the outcomes of Stage 1 of the VEGPSP, the Executive Summary of the report (DEST 2006) pointed to the potential of values pedagogy to profoundly affect the total educational environment of a school, which, in turn, resulted in, among other features, the strengthening of teacher-student relationships, classroom climate and ethos, student

attitudes and behaviour, student knowledge and understanding and student achievement. Additionally, the Stage 2 Report (DEEWR 2008) identified strengthened and more sophisticated links between the implementation of values pedagogy and ensuing effects on student behaviour and performance. These links included a greater recognition of the centrality of the teacher's role, the explicitness of the pedagogy around values being seen to be determinative, and the emerging perception of the role of an experiential ('service learning') component as being a particularly powerful agency in promoting enhanced student behaviour and strengthened intellectual engagement.

In summary, VEGPSP results provided further evidence that a well-constructed, clear and intentional values pedagogy's being integrated into the fabric of the school has the potential to bring transformational changes in its classrooms and overall learning environment, so influencing student and teacher behaviour, and leading to beneficial effects on students' motivation to learn and, in turn, their strengthened academic diligence:

Starting from the premise that schooling educates for the whole child and must necessarily engage a student's heart, mind and actions, effective values education empowers student decision making, fosters student action and assigns real student responsibility ... In many of the Stage 2 projects students can be seen to move in stages from growing in knowledge and understanding ... to an increasing clarity and commitment ... and then concerted action in living those values in their personal and community lives. (DEEWR 2008, p. 11)

The *Project to Test and Measure the Impact of Values Education on Student Effects and School Ambience* (Lovat et al. 2009a, 2009b) was designed to investigate, using quantitative and qualitative methods, the anecdotal and, in part at least, apparently measurable claims being made in the above project results, in order to see if such claims would stand up to formal empirical investigation. Further details of the methods employed and the results can be found in the report itself as well as in Lovat and colleagues (Lovat, Clement et al. 2010a; 2011; Lovat, Dally et al. 2011a). Both qualitative and quantitative data gathered in the project served as confirmatory evidence of the testimonies regarding improvement in school ambience recounted in earlier reports on VEGPSP (DEST 2006; DEEWR 2008). Overall, we found that the *Testing and Measuring Project* (Lovat et al. 2009a, 2009b) confirmed that a whole-school approach, characteristic of values pedagogy in Australia, is best served by a collaborative effort by all school staff, including ideally parents as part of the school community, in order to distil and actualize a shared vision for the school and so bring about positive changes in school culture and classroom ambience. Indications that such changes

were experienced are indicated by perceptions by teachers of an “improved environment” (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 89). One researcher observed:

Values Education has resulted in an increase in school cohesion. There is greater consistency across the staff in relationships with one another and with students. A clearer sense of purpose has been noted as staff work within a positive school culture ... (Lovat et al. 2009b, p 106)

Values pedagogy enhanced the wellbeing of both students and teachers. Apart from the improved student-teacher relationships noted above, such pedagogy affected both the classroom climate and student development, thus contributing to a better learning environment:

Teachers found, in the implementation of their units, that the values focus produced more respectful, focused and harmonious classrooms. It developed students’ social skills by increasing cooperation, empathic character, self-management and self-knowledge, which in turn led to more supportive and safer learning environments”. (Lovat et al. 2009b, p. 81)

Importantly, concurrent with improvements in the ambience of the school, were indications of greater academic diligence on the part of students. Because students were more engaged and thus displayed greater cooperation, responsibility and attentiveness (Lovat et al. 2009a, p. 37; 2009b, pp.13, 45, 100), as well as classrooms being calmer and more peaceful, the quality of the teaching was enhanced, and, in turn, teachers raised their expectations of student performance (2009a, p.13; 2009b, p. 100). Students were perceived by teachers to be ‘trying harder’ (Lovat et al. 2009b, pp. 29, 78, 98, 99, 100), and being more responsible for their own learning as well as respecting the rights of others to learn and listen to one another (p. 10). Improvement in the school ambience was associated with the corresponding development of student self-management of their behaviour and the honing of social skills. Observations of improvement in student academic diligence accompanying personal and social development of students are consistent with findings of educational research over several decades. For example, this research has demonstrated the efficacy of affective and social factors such as intrinsic motivation (Deci et al. 1991), social and behavioural skill levels (DiPetri and Jennings 2012) and self-control (Duckworth and Seligman 2005) upon academic engagement and achievement.

The reported observations strongly suggest that there is an observable and enduring interdependence between the various aspects of behaviour, a positive learning ambience, improved academic focus and motivation to learn. A diminution in any one of these elements is likely to lead to a diminution in the others. We summarized this synergy in the following manner:

... there was substantial quantitative and qualitative evidence suggesting that there were observable and measurable improvements in students' academic diligence, including increased attentiveness, a greater capacity to work independently as well as more cooperatively, greater care and effort being invested in schoolwork and students assuming more responsibility for their own learning as well as classroom 'chores'. (Lovat et al. 2009a, p. 6)

Values Pedagogy as Best Practice Pedagogy

The cumulative weight of philosophical thought and research evidence cited above presents a serious challenge to previous thinking that adjudged values pedagogy as being more appropriate to one educational sector than another. What has emerged is an alignment of values pedagogy as being best practice pedagogy underpinned by a symbiosis of morality and education to which ancients like Aristotle attested. In juxtaposing diverse perspectives from philosophy, educational neuroscience and research into the areas of faith-based education and values pedagogy, a convergence of thought becomes apparent around the qualities of a learning environment that will foster and support student engagement in learning. Such a view recognizes the nature of an holistic approach where students are engaged cognitively, affectively and socially. An indispensable element in this holistic approach is an explicit values discourse in order to draw students into deeper reflectivity and learning, thereby encouraging and cultivating those aspects of motivation, engagement, self-efficacy and self-management of behaviour associated with the enhancement of students' commitment and perseverance to learn, otherwise known as 'academic diligence' (e.g., Campbell et al. 2004; Benninga et al. 2006; Nucci and Narvaez 2008; Lovat and Toomey 2009; Lovat, Toomey et al. 2010; Lovat, Clement et al, 2011).

Confirmatory evidence of the importance of this symbiosis is supplied by educational neuroscience which attests to the coincidence of the cognitive, affective and social components in contributing to the predisposition and motivation to learn. An ambience typified by respectful, caring and trusting relationships, and good and orderly behaviour are aspects of a learning environment permeated by peacefulness and calmness. This harmonizes with the notion that a supportive environment attending to the emotional and social needs of students is one which optimizes student motivation and learning (Deci et al. 1991), an aspect highlighted by Furco (2008) specifically in regard to the impact of values pedagogy on academic achievement (Lovat, Clement et al. 2011). Furthermore, the realization that education is imbued with values comes at a time when there are appeals to set aside traditional antipathies between school systems and for all educational sectors to structure their

learning programs, processes and environments in the best interests of their students. In such a milieu, the different educational sectors would learn from each other's strengths (see Cooper et al. 2012; Jeynes and Beuttler 2012).

Conclusion

A persistent theme to be found in values pedagogical research worldwide is in the potential for enhanced learning on the part of students, brought about it seems largely through a combination of more settled learning environments, more positive teacher-student and student-student relationships, enhanced self-esteem and a greater sense of citizenship. Claims around enhanced learning, intellectual achievement or academic diligence are without doubt the boldest claims to be made about the effects of values pedagogy. They are claims that such pedagogy might actually nurture academic success in ways that seemingly more predictable and explicitly academically focussed pedagogies persistently fail to nurture, especially with those students less naturally or environmentally disposed to learning.

The purpose of this chapter has been to acknowledge that such insights have traditionally been associated more with faith-based or religious schooling where holism of learning has tended to be more an emphasis, partly, if not exclusively, through the explicitness of agendas around its values base and orientation. Hence, faith-based schooling was often seen to have an explicit values agenda, where public sector schooling was said to be 'values-free'. At the same time, the chapter is suggesting that the advent of more explicit values pedagogy in the public/ government sector is blurring the boundaries between what have often been seen as traditional divisions between the sectors. As seen in the research cited within this chapter, the effects of values-rich environments of learning on holistic and academic success, once seen more clearly in the faith based sector, are now being seen across sectors as a whole as they introduce more values-oriented approaches to learning. This is at one and the same time an endorsement of faith based schooling's overall contribution to education but also a challenge to its erstwhile alleged uniqueness.

References

- Arthur, J. (2003). Character education in British education policy. *Journal of Research in Character Education*, 1(1), 45.
- Arthur, J. (2010). *Of good character: Exploring virtues and values in 3-25 year olds*. Exeter, UK: Academic Imprint.
- Arthur, J., & Wilson, K. (2010). New research directions in character and values education in the UK. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research*

- handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 339-358). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Benninga, J. S., Berkowitz, M. W., Kuehn, P., & Smith, K. (2006). Character and academics: What good schools do. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(6), 448-452.
- Bryk, A. S. (1996). Lessons from Catholic high schools in renewing our educational institutions. In T. McLaughlin, J. O'Keefe & B. O'Keefe (Eds.), *The contemporary Catholic school: Context, identity, and diversity* (pp. 25-41). London; Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press.
- Bryk, A. S., Lee, V. E., & Holland, P. B. (1993). *Catholic schools and the common good*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Campbell, R. J., Kyriakides, L., Muijs, R. D., & Robinson, W. (2004). Effective teaching and values: Some implications for research and teacher appraisal. *Oxford Review of Education*, 30(4), 451-465.
- Carnegie Corporation. (1996). *Years of promise: A comprehensive learning strategy for America's children. The report of the Carnegie Task Force on learning in the primary grades*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED397995).
http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2/content_storage_01/0000000b/80/27/28/9c.pdf. Accessed 17 January 2007.
- Carr, D. (2006). Professional and personal values and virtues in teaching. *Oxford Review of Education*, 32(2), 171-183.
- Carr, D. (2007). Character in teaching. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 55(4), 369-389.
- Clement, N. (2010). The first pillar of the student wellbeing pedagogy: The neuroscience research. In R. Toomey, T. Lovat, N. Clement & K. Dally (Eds.), *Teacher education and values pedagogy: A student wellbeing approach* (pp. 15-31). Terrigal, N.S.W.: David Barlow Publishing.
- Clement, N. D., & Lovat, T. (2012). Neuroscience and education: Issues and challenges for curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 42(4), 534-557.
- Cooper, B. S., McSween, R. B., & Murphy, P. (2012). Finding a golden mean in education policy: Centering religious and public schools. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 87(3), 368-382.
- Davidson, M. L., Khmelkov, V., & Lickona, T. (2010). The power of character: Needed for, and developed from, teaching and learning. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 427-454). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation and education: The self-determination perspective. *Educational Psychologist*, 26(3 & 4), 325-346.
- DEEWR. (2008). *At the heart of what we do: Values education at the centre of schooling – The final report of the Values Education Good Practice Schools Project – Stage 2*. Melbourne: Australian Government, Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR); Curriculum Corporation.
http://www.valueseducation.edu.au/values/val_vegps2_final_report,26142.html. Accessed 12 January, 2009.
- DEST. (2003). *Values education study: Final report*. Canberra; Melbourne: Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training; Curriculum Corporation.
http://www.dest.gov.au/archive/schools/publications/2003/VES/VES_Report.pdf. Accessed December 6, 2005.

- DEST. (2005). National framework for values education in Australian school.
<http://www.curriculum.edu.au/values/default.asp?id=8757>. Accessed 16 July 2009.
- DEST. (2006). *Implementing the National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools: Report of the Values Education Good Practice Schools Project – Stage 1: Final report, September 2006*. Carlton South, Vic.: Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training; Curriculum Corporation.
- Diamond, A. (2007). Interrelated and interdependent. *Developmental Science*, 10(1), 152-158.
- Diamond, A. (2009). The interplay of biology and the environment broadly defined. *Developmental Psychology*, 45(1), 1-8.
- DiPrete, T. A., & Jennings, J. L. (2012). Social and behavioral skills and the gender gap in early educational achievement. *Social Science Research*, 41(1), 1-15.
- Duckworth, A. L., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2005). Self-discipline outdoes IQ in predicting academic performance of adolescents. *Psychological Science*, 16(12), 939-944.
- Finn, B. (1991). *Young people's participation in post-compulsory education and training*. (The Finn Report).
[http://trove.nla.gov.au/result?q=subject%3A%22Finn+Report+\(1991\)%22](http://trove.nla.gov.au/result?q=subject%3A%22Finn+Report+(1991)%22). Accessed 28 January, 2013.
- Forgasz, P. (2002). On teaching values in Jewish schools: A survey of the educational literature. In S. Pascoe (Ed.), *Values in education: College year book 2002* (pp. 103-114). Deakin West, A.C.T.: Australian College of Educators.
- Furco, A. (2008). *Exploring the purposes, complexities and future of values education*. Keynote Address at the National Values Education Forum.
http://www.valueseducation.edu.au/verve/_resources/2008_National_Values_Education_Forum_Report_rev.pdf. Accessed 20 October 2008.
- Goswami, U. C. (2008). Principles of learning, implications for teaching: A cognitive neuroscience perspective. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 42(3-4), 381-399.
- Grace, G. (1998). Realizing the mission: Catholic approaches to school effectiveness. In R. Slee, G. Weiner & S. Tomlinson (Eds.), *School effectiveness for whom? Challenges to the school effectiveness and school improvement movements* (pp. 117-127). London; Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.
- Groome, T. (1998). *Educating for life: A spiritual vision for every teacher and parent*. Allen, Texas: Thomas More.
- Halstead, M., & Xiao, J. (2010). Values education and the hidden curriculum In T. Lovat, R. Toomey & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 303-317). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Hattie, J. (2003). *Teachers make a difference: What is the research evidence?* Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER).
https://www.det.nsw.edu.au/proflearn/docs/pdf/qt_hattie.pdf. Accessed 30 February, 2013.
- Hattie, J. (2011). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. New York: Routledge.
- Hawkes, N. (2005). *Does teaching values improve the quality of education in primary schools? - A study about the impact of introducing values education in primary school*. Unpublished D Phil Thesis, Oxford University, Oxford.
- Hill, P. T., Foster, G. E., & Gendler, T. (1990). *High schools with character*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Hunt, A. (2004). Values: Taught or caught? Experiences of year 3 students in a Uniting Church school. *International Education Journal*, 4(4), 129-143.

- Immordino-Yang, M. H. (2011). Implications of affective and social neuroscience for educational theory. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 43(1), 98-103.
- Immordino-Yang, M. H., & Damasio, A. R. (2007). We feel, therefore we learn: The relevance of affect and social neuroscience to education. *Mind, Brain, and Education*, 1(1), 3-10.
- Immordino-Yang, M. H., & Faeth, M. (2010). Building smart students: A neuroscience perspective on the role of emotion and skilled intuition in learning. In D. A. Sousa (Ed.), *Mind, brain, and education: Neuroscience implications for the classroom* (pp. 66-81). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2002a). Educational policy and the effects of attending a religious school on the academic achievement of children. *Educational Policy*, 16(3), 406-424.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2002b). Why religious schools positively impact the academic achievement of children. *International Journal of Education and Religion*, 3(1), 16-32.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2003). The learning habits of twelfth graders attending religious and non-religious schools. *International Journal of Education & Religion*, 4(2), 145-167.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2005). The impact of religious schools on the academic achievement of low-SES students. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 18(1), 22-40.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2012). A meta-analysis on the effects and contributions of public, public charter, and religious schools on student outcomes. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 87(3), 305-335.
- Jeynes, W. H., & Beuttler, F. (2012). What private and public schools can learn from each other. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 87(3), 285-304.
- Killen, M., & Semetana, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of moral development*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lovat, T. (2010a). The new values education: A pedagogical imperative for student wellbeing. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 3-18). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Lovat, T. (2010b). Synergies and balance between values education and quality teaching. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 42(4), 489-500.
- Lovat, T., & Clement, N. (2008a). *Religious and values education: Divorced and in the marketplace*. Paper presented at the European Association for Research on Learning and Instruction (EARLI) SIG 19 Conference on Religious and Spiritual Education.
- Lovat, T., & Clement, N. (2008b). Values education: Bridging the religious and secular divide? *Journal of Religious Education*, 56(3), 40-49.
- Lovat, T., Clement, N., Dally, K., & Toomey, R. (2010a). Addressing issues of religious difference through values education: An Islam instance. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 40(3), 213-227.
- Lovat, T., Clement, N., Dally, K., & Toomey, R. (2010b). Values education as holistic development for all sectors: Researching for effective pedagogy. *Oxford Review of Education*, 36(6), 713-729.
- Lovat, T., Clement, N., Dally, K., & Toomey, R. (2011). The impact of values education on school ambience and academic diligence. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 50(3), 166-170.
- Lovat, T., Dally, K., Clement, N., & Toomey, R. (2011a). *Values pedagogy and student achievement: Contemporary research evidence*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Lovat, T., Dally, K., Clement, N. & Toomey, R. (2011b). Values pedagogy and teacher education: Re-conceiving the foundations. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(7), 30-44. <http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol36/iss7/> Accessed 1 February 2013

- Lovat, T., & Toomey, R. (2010). The evolution of student wellbeing pedagogy and its implications for teacher education. In R. Toomey, T. Lovat, K. Dally & N. Clement (Eds.), *Taking values education to teacher education: A student wellbeing pedagogy*. Terrigal, NSW: David Barlow Publishing.
- Lovat, T., & Toomey, R. (Eds.). (2009). *Values education and quality teaching: The double helix effect* (International ed.). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Lovat, T., Toomey, R., & Clement, N. (Eds.). (2010). *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Dally, K., & Clement, N. (2009a). *Project to test and measure the impact of values education on student effects and school ambience. Final Report for the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) by The University of Newcastle, Australia*. Canberra: DEEWR <http://www.curriculum.edu.au/values/>. Accessed 20 April 2009.
- Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Dally, K., & Clement, N. (2009b). *Project to test and measure the impact of values education on student effects and school ambience: Associated case study reports*. Final Report for the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) by The University of Newcastle, Australia. Canberra: DEEWR. <http://www.curriculum.edu.au/values/>. Accessed 20 April 2009.
- Lovett, B. J., & Jordan, A. H. (2010). Levels of moralisation: A new conception of moral sensitivity. *Journal of Moral Education*, 39(2), 175 - 189.
- Mayer, E. (1992). *Key competencies: Report of the Committee to advise the Australian Education Council and Ministers of Vocational Education, Employment and Training on employment-related key competencies for post-compulsory education and training*. (The Mayer Report). Canberra: NCVER. <http://www.voced.edu.au/content/ngv28045>. Accessed 28 January, 2013.
- MCEETYA. (1999). The Adelaide declaration on national goals for schooling in the twenty-first century. <http://www.mceetya.edu.au/mceetya/nationalgoals/index.htm>. Accessed 5 December, 2005.
- MCEETYA. (2008). *Melbourne declaration on educational goals for young Australians*. Melbourne: Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA). http://www.mceecdya.edu.au/verve/_resources/National_Declaration_on_the_Educational_Goals_for_Young_Australians.pdf. Accessed 18 May 2009.
- Meltzoff, A. N., Kuhl, P. K., Movellan, J., & Sejnowski, T. J. (2009). Foundations for a new science of learning. *Science*, 325(5938), 284-288.
- Muehlenberg, B. (2004). Why the Prime Minister is right on state school values. *National Observer*, 60. http://www.nationalobserver.net/2004_autumn_muehlenberg.htm. Accessed 28 January, 2013.
- Newell, C., & Rimes, J. (2002). Beyond pious platitudes: Values, spirituality and curriculum. In S. Pascoe (Ed.), *Values in education: College year book 2002* (pp. 92-102). Deakin West, A.C.T.: Australian College of Educators.
- Newmann, F. M., & Associates. (1996). *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Noddings, N. (2002). *Educating moral people: A caring alternative to character education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Nucci, L. P., & Narvaez, D. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of moral and character education*. New York: Routledge.

- Osterman, K. F. (2010). Teacher practice and students' sense of belonging In T. Lovat, R. Toomey & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 239-260). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Peters, R. S. (1981). *Moral development and moral education*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Pike, M. A. (2010). Christianity and character education: faith in core values? *Journal of Beliefs & Values*, 31(3), 311-321.
- Powney, J., Cullen, M.-A. C., Schlapp, U., Glissov, P., Johnstone, M., & Munn, P. (1995). Understanding values education in the primary school, SCORE Research Report No 64 (pp. 102). <https://dspace.gla.ac.uk/bitstream/1905/257/1/064.pdf>. Accessed 10 January 2013.
- Rosiek, J., & Beghetto, R. A. (2009). Emotional scaffolding: The emotional and imaginative dimensions of teaching and learning. In P. A. Schutz & M. Zembylas (Eds.), *Advances in teacher emotion research: The impact on teachers' lives* (pp. 175-194). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Rowe, K. J. (2004). In good hands? The importance of teacher quality. *Educare News*, 149(July), 4-14.
- Salman, S. (2002). Values in education: An Islamic perspective. In S. Pascoe (Ed.), *Values in education: College year book 2002* (pp. 115-124). Deakin West, A.C.T.: Australian College of Educators.
- Sokol, B., Hammond, S., & Berkowitz, M. W. (2010). The developmental contours of character. In T. Lovat, R. Toomey & N. Clement (Eds.), *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 579-603). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Squire, L. R., & Kandel, E. R. (2009). *Memory: From mind to molecules* (2nd ed.). Greenwood Village, CO: Roberts & Co.
- Squire, L. R., & Stark, C. E. L. (2008). Memory systems. In J. R. Pomerantz (Ed.), *Topics in integrative neuroscience : From cells to cognition* (pp. 243-264). Leiden: Cambridge University Press.
- Tarlinton, R., & O'Shea, F. (2002). Values education: A Catholic perspective. In S. Pascoe (Ed.), *Values in education: College year book 2002* (pp. 85-91). Deakin West, A.C.T.: Australian College of Educators.
- Zembylas, M. (2005). *Teaching with emotion: A postmodern enactment*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publisher.
- Zembylas, M. (2007). Emotional ecology: The intersection of emotional knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge in teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(4), 355-367.